



DAVID LEWIS

Jane Bown

David Malcolm Lewis 1928–1994

DAVID LEWIS, the outstanding ancient Greek historian and epigraphist of his time, died of myeloma at his home in Oxford on 12 July 1994, aged 66.

Lewis was born on 7 June 1928 in Willesden, Middlesex (Outer London). His grandparents were all part of the Jewish immigration from the Russian Empire in 1883–1900, one from Warsaw, the rest from Lithuania. Little is known about the families, except for a probable connection with Aron Alexandrovitch Solts (1872–1945), member of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Control Commission, and friend and eventual victim of Stalin.

Lewis's parents were born in the United Kingdom and were educated in good East London schools. His mother, the daughter of a furniture manufacturer with a small workshop, stopped her education on the verge of a degree course on deciding that she would not enjoy teaching. His father, the son of a general dealer, left school in his matriculation year in a fit of wartime restlessness, and after a brief spell in accountancy, spent the rest of his career with an auctioneering firm which he did much to expand, and which eventually took over the West End firm of Phillips. His memory for detail was encyclopaedic and legendary. In early married life he supplemented his income with book-dealing; the house was always full of books.

Lewis himself started school in a local elementary school with classes of fifty, but transferred at eight to a small but efficient private school. The attraction of this for his mother was that it offered more

possibilities for physical exercise to a badly co-ordinated child; that it also started French and Latin immediately was a later discovery. From here he moved on to City of London School (CLS) with a scholarship. This was in September 1939, and the greater part of his school career was spent billeted round the town in Marlborough, Wiltshire, site of a famous boarding-school; here the two schools had an uneasy symbiosis. Intellectual life was lively and a compensation for absence from home. The ethos of CLS and some of its contrasting classical masters, such as the enlightened C. J. Ellingham, have been described in various writings of Lewis's senior Kingsley Amis, who remarks in this connexion that the CLS teachers were 'imitable eccentrics almost to a man'¹ and puts this down not just to the stylising effects teaching has on behaviour but to the nature of the adolescent observer 'for whom all grown-up behaviour is so fantastic as to defeat discrimination'. An acute, but amused and tolerant, facial expression was characteristic of Lewis in middle age, and one can imagine that, for a teacher, a veneer of blustering eccentricity might be a useful mechanism of defence against such very observant observers as the youthful David Lewis. But CLS did not merely provide an entertaining spectacle of spectacle-chewing pedagogues, it imparted civilised values. Amis's *Memoirs* praise the school for freedom from every sort of prejudice and factionalism. There was just one public attempt in Amis's time at anti-Semitism and it was a frostily received failure. 'Differences of class, upbringing, income group and religion', wrote Amis, 'counted for little. In particular, although perhaps fifteen percent of the boys were Jewish, not a single instance of anti-semitism [with the exception noted earlier] came to my attention in the seven years I was a pupil there. The academic teaching was of a standard not easily to be surpassed, but more important still was that lesson about how to regard one's fellows'. There was an assumption that the classical side was the only side for a bright boy; Lewis started Greek at eleven. Mathematics was not neglected, though science was. By present-day standards, much was expected linguistically, and the Classical Sixth's standard diet of unseen translations came from old papers set for the 'Ireland' at Oxford. In later life Lewis recalled that 'ability to construe through a brick wall was the ideal, but a wide range of reading was also encouraged'. The regime, which had once turned out Prime Minister H. H. Asquith, produced in Lewis's day not only a series of top civil servants, but three Oxford teachers of

¹ K. Amis, *Memoirs* (London, 1991), pp. 26, 34.

ancient history, Peter Fraser, James Holladay, and David Lewis. In addition, Michael Jameson, later of Philadelphia and Stanford, was four years ahead of Lewis at CLS, and just remembers him from 1939 or 1940, when Lewis ‘must have been eleven or twelve and made an impression even then’, but apparently only as being one of two ‘tiresome young squirts in a break between classes’. More than fifty years later, at the beginning of his contribution to Lewis’s *Festschrift*, Jameson was to acknowledge how much he had learnt from the honorand,² the tiresome young squirt of 1939.

Lewis went up to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1945, again with a scholarship. He was aged only seventeen, and there was no certainty that he would be allowed to remain for more than a year, but in the event he took Mods. and Greats in the usual way (1947 and 1949) and got Firsts in both; one of his examiners in 1949 was his future collaborator Russell Meiggs. Corpus, then as now, was a tiny college, particularly strong in classics. In 1994, Lewis contributed a chapter to *Corpuscles* (a collection of Corpus undergraduate reminiscences edited by Brian Harrison), and a new copy of the book was lying around in the family home at Ferry Pool Road a few days before he died. His Mods. tutor was Frank Geary, whom he found old-fashioned and uninspiring; most of what he learnt during Mods. came from E. R. Dodds and Eduard Fraenkel, then professors of Greek and Latin respectively. It was Fraenkel, for whom Lewis had a very warm personal regard and who was *ex officio* a fellow of Corpus and a friendly and encouraging influence to the undergraduate classicists, who by example convinced Lewis that he had an academic future. If Mods. was a disappointment, Greats was another matter. In those days, and indeed until 1972, the syllabus consisted of philosophy and ancient history, with no option of offering literature instead of one of the other two subjects. To a young man with Lewis’s extraordinary brain, philosophy was not a problem; he was taught by Frank Hardie and (out of college) Paul Grice. But his true intellectual milieu was on the other side of the school, in ancient history. Here his tutor Frank Lepper provided, as Lewis later recalled, a rigorous training in how to deal with facts, and he ‘caught the bug of the most exciting developments of the days in the relationship of Attic epigraphy to the Athenian Empire’. There is a revealing sentence in

² M. H. Jameson, ‘The Ritual of the Nike Parapet’, in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 307–24, at p. 307n.

Corpuscles to the effect that Lepper ‘found me messes to clear up and I enjoyed clarifying them’. There is a sense, as we shall see, in which this description sums up Lewis’s entire academic career—clearing up messes dumped on his desk by other people. A puzzled undergraduate letter to Marcus Niebuhr Tod of Oriel was the origin of a long association with Benjamin Meritt: in 1974, at the beginning of his contribution to the *Meritt Festschrift*, Lewis wrote that it was ‘just twenty-five years since Meritt answered a piece of undergraduate scepticism of mine, sent on to him by Tod, with infinite thoroughness and courtesy’.³ For the rest of his life Lewis was warmly attached to Corpus, to which as we shall see he returned as a Junior Research Fellow: even when at Christ Church he regularly took in Corpus undergraduate pupils for the minority fourth-century BC option in Greek history.

Academic work was important to him at this stage but it was not everything, any more than it was in later life. He had interests (‘intellectual rather than ambitious’ as he admitted in *Corpuscles*) in the Liberal Club and was back-handedly grateful in retrospect to the Army for saving him from standing for Parliament in the Liberal debacle of 1950. His other main extra-curricular interest was in the Jewish Society. This was at the time of the end of the Palestine Mandate and the creation of Israel: he chaired a meeting at which he ‘narrowly averted the lynching of Max Beloff, who had been suggesting that there was something to be said for British government policy’.

There followed two years of national service. Rather unwillingly, he found himself with the Royal Army Education Corps (RAEC), but always acknowledged later the value of a compulsory spell of administration as an Assistant Brigade Education Officer in Germany, organising the distribution of newspapers and examining the ‘licensed illiteracy’ of the Army Certificate of Education, Third Class. A long campaign with superiors about what the RAEC really ought to be doing eventually landed him in a more Oxford situation, sitting in Rhine Army HQ as the only second lieutenant on the establishment, with his general reading and attempts to learn Russian interrupted once a week by frantic preparation to produce current affairs hand-outs. These were and are impressive not just for their range, shrewdness, and prescience (two foolscap pages on Indo-China, dated April 1951, are a particularly good read, as is a kind of Platonic dialogue on the US

³ D. M. Lewis, ‘Entrenchment-clauses in Attic Decrees’, *ΦΟΡΟΣ Meritt* (1974), pp. 81–9, at p. 81. From this point on, all references are to work by Lewis unless stated.

Constitution), but for their accessible English prose style. Accessibility was not to be a feature of Lewis's more specialist writing, but in the last years of his life, when writing for the *Cambridge Ancient History*, he showed that he had not forgotten the RAEC apprenticeship in the production of crisp, clear and interesting English. It was during this period that he made his one attempt to get off the academic path by enquiring what the BBC might offer along these lines.

In 1949 the University of Oxford had awarded Lewis a Craven Fellowship, which carried an obligation to spend part of the year abroad. But it was not until 1951 that this possibility of overseas study became a reality, when he applied for and got a Jane Eliza Procter Fellowship which enabled him to go to Princeton University for the year 1951–2; at the same time he was, unusually, awarded membership of the Institute for Advanced Study nearby—the ‘Mecca of Greek epigraphy’ as he put it later—where he was allocated an office. He certainly did plenty of epigraphy. His Princeton supervisor A. E. (‘Toni’) Raubitschek recalls that Lewis tried to spend most of his time with Benjamin Meritt at the Institute: ‘I had to call his attention to the terms’ [of the fellowship]. His letters home to his parents reveal that he also had epigraphic discussions with the doyenne of archaic Greek inscriptions, L. H. (‘Anne’) Jeffery, who happened to be at the Institute that year and had a study close by; but Lewis seems to have been slightly in awe of her at this stage and he paints a strange picture of her in his letters home, as of a formidable recluse. During the Christmas vacation, supervisor Raubitschek and his precocious British pupil took a walk on the Graduate College grounds. Lewis said, ‘How about getting a Ph.D. with you?’, and Raubitschek told him he was sure he could get him a (Princeton) fellowship for the following year. Lewis said, ‘No, this year’, and refused to be deterred when Raubitschek pointed out the hurdles (‘preliminaries’, exams, a dissertation). As for a dissertation, Lewis suggested ‘The Peace of Nikias’ or ‘The Indirect Tradition of Thucydides’. Raubitschek said, ‘Nikias is easy’. Lewis: ‘Then I do the other!’ And he did. Almost every week Raubitschek got a chapter on an author: ‘Thucydides in Isokrates’, ‘Thucydides in Plato’, ‘Thucydides in Aristotle’, and so on. He got his degree on time, and went on to be an usher (‘Honorary Assistant Sergeant-at Arms to the West Virginia Delegation’) at the 1952 Eisenhower-Taft Republican Convention in Chicago. Though the Peace of Nikias was spurned at this stage, it is worth noting that in 1957 Andrewes and Lewis published

their 'Note on the Peace of Nikias'.⁴ This short and elegant study, the conclusions of which still stand, took its origin from a typically brilliant observation of Lewis that ten of the seventeen names of Athenians, listed by Thucydides at v. 19 as having sworn to the Peace, are in the official tribal order. The immediate occasion for the publication of this piece was surely the publication in 1956 of the relevant volume of Gomme's *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, which missed the particular point and generally showed little interest in personal names; but one wonders how much earlier (?1951) Lewis had thought of the basic idea for the article.

But the option chosen in Princeton was 'The Indirect Tradition of Thucydides' and the eventual thesis, called *Towards a Historian's Text of Thucydides*, was recommended for acceptance by the Department of Classics in May 1952: not many theses of this quality can have been written in less than five months. Little of it got into print directly, apart from 'Ithome Again',⁵ an attempt to solve the worst problem of Thucydidean chronology, that of the mid fifth-century helot revolt, by an ingenious supposition: that a Hellenistic scholar, who got his history from Ephorus, used that history to 'correct' the text of Thucydides. In 1977 Lewis virtually retracted this article, saying he had 'long since ceased to believe much' of what he said in it.⁶ But note 'much': the retraction surely applied only to the particular argument about the numeral at Thucydides i. 103. 1. We have no right to think that he repudiated the dissertation as a whole (a view I have sometimes heard expressed). The contrary can be proved: in *Gnomon* 1966, when reviewing Kleinlogel's *Geschichte des Thukydidestextes im Mittelalter*, he explicitly directed the reader to 'see in general my Princeton dissertation, *Towards a Historian's Text . . .*', and recapitulated one of his particular 1952 suggestions.⁷

The main argument of the dissertation was that the text of Thucydides as it has come down to us suffers from officious 'emendations' by

⁴ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, lxxvii (1957), 177–80, esp. n. 7.

⁵ *Historia*, ii (1953/4), 412–18. Some of Lewis's 1953 work has since got into print indirectly, either via his own reviews or in other ways: see below, n. 7.

⁶ *Sparta and Persia* (Leiden, 1977), p. 46, n. 135.

⁷ *Gnomon*, xxxviii (1966), 136, discussing Thuc. ii. 25. 1, cp. pp. 44–6 of the dissertation; see also *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, lxxvii (1957), 329 for another authoritative and highly technical review of a book on the text of Thucydides (Hemmerdinger). It is relevant to the question what value did Lewis attach to his dissertation, that he was prepared in after years to make it available to commentators on Thucydides; see e.g. K. J. Dover, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. iv (Oxford, 1970), p. 237.

Hellenistic scholars who were familiar with, for example, the poems of Homer and the history of Ephorus, and who misapplied this familiarity. The approach is perhaps best explained by an example which draws on more than one kind of tradition: Lewis's ingenious handling of Thucydides iv. 107. 3. Thucydides here mentions Oisyme in north Greece; the equivalent passage of Diodorus (xii. 68. 4) has Syme, which has usually been emended to Oisyme, partly because Stephanus of Byzantium quoted Oisyme from Thucydides and this seemed to guarantee the longer form of the name. Now, tribute quota-list no. 21 contains a place called Syme in what, from the historical or geographical point of view, was 'extremely strange company' (in fact, in a northern context, whereas the well-known Syme was an island off Caria). Lewis suggested that the Carian Syme and the Syme of list 21 were distinct places, and that the latter was Thracian. 'I am not trying to create two towns where one had stood before. I suggest that the same town had, side by side, two names. Οἰσύμη has fifth-century warrant from Antiphon, Σύμη I suggest from the quota lists . . .'. There were, Lewis suggested, two alternatives:

- a) It is possible that Thucydides wrote Οἰσύμη, that Ephorus thought he knew better and wrote Σύμη. To confute this we do not need the negative criterion of the absence of *ὀνομαζομένη* or *καλουμένη*. Ephorus is quoted by Harpocration as having used Οἰσύμη in the fourth book. He is hardly likely to have changed his opinion later. b) It is however quite likely that he transcribed a name from Thucydides without thinking about it too clearly. On this hypothesis Thucydides, who knew this area as well as any Greek of the fifth century, wrote Σύμη. This will have been an idiosyncrasy not found elsewhere in literature and possibly the Alexandrians may have considered it a mistake. This will have been made easier by the fact that Οἰσύμη is no ordinary name. It was identified with the Αἰσύμη of Iliad VIII 304. This implies that the vast body of theorising on the Homeric corpus touched the name. I suggest that at some time this theorising affected an ancient editor's views on the text of Thucydides.

That Lewis did not publish his dissertation in full should not be taken as evidence that he had a low view of it (though he made dismissive remarks at the time and later): publication frenzy is recent, and has been partly caused by pressures on individuals and institutions which hardly existed at the beginning of the 1950s. In any case, Lewis's main preoccupations soon moved towards the more purely epigraphical—though the example above shows him interweaving epigraphic, historical, and literary arguments in a way which already puts us on notice that this was a scholar who refused to separate the epigraphist's

job from that of the historian, a cardinal Lewis belief, to which I shall return. To conclude on Lewis's textual work: as recently as 1995, a scrupulous and excellent monograph by Karl Maurer on interpolation in Thucydides⁸ cited Lewis's thesis and referred to 'uncertain, but still very interesting possibilities' raised by it, specifically the idea discussed above, that the indirect tradition preserves some good Thucydidean material lost from the direct tradition; a few pages later Maurer says that 'the best review of Kleinlogel's book is that by D. M. Lewis'. It should not be doubted that Lewis's contribution to the study of the text of Thucydides was not merely ingenious but important.

Lewis divided the next two years (1952–4) between Oxford and Athens. He was a Senior Scholar at New College, which provided a small stipend, supplemented by his Craven Award. The choice of college was enhanced for Lewis by the presence in it of H. T. (Theodore) Wade-Gery and of Antony Andrewes, who was to succeed Wade-Gery as Wykeham Professor of Ancient Greek History in 1953;⁹ Lewis had from Princeton been in negotiation with both men, and also with H. M. Last, the former Camden Professor of Ancient Roman History. The connection with Tony Andrewes was the beginning of an exceptionally close and warm working friendship which ended only when Lewis wrote Andrewes's obituary for the *Independent* and for these *Proceedings*¹⁰ (by then he had already, in 1987, written the Academy obituary of Anne Jeffery,¹¹ and had long discovered her great personal charm, so rectifying the callow and utterly wrong impression of her which he had acquired in 1951–2. His only other obituary of any sort¹² was of Benjamin Meritt and was published in the *Independent*, 14 July 1989; all these were written within a very few years of each other and though the undergraduate Lewis had attended lectures by Andrewes

⁸ K. Maurer, *Interpolation in Thucydides. Mnemosyne*, supp. cl (Leiden, 1995), pp. 204, 220, n. 7. This book contains other favourable references to Lewis's dissertation. At p. 75, n. 30, however, Maurer declined to follow Lewis all the way in his positing of systematic interference, by Hellenistic editors, with the text of Thucydides.

For Lewis's effortless command of Thucydidean textual issues see also *Sparta and Persia*, p. 101, n. 74.

⁹ In fact, Wade-Gery was to be elected to a Senior Research Fellowship at Merton College on his retirement in 1953, but was surely part of the New College furniture in Lewis's time.

¹⁰ *Independent*, 15 June 1990; *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 80 (1993), pp. 221–31.

¹¹ *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 82 (1987), pp. 505–16.

¹² There is a mystery about an obituary of Eduard Fraenkel, not listed in the list of his own publications which Lewis prepared towards the end of his life, and not found among his papers by Peter Rhodes, but mentioned by Lewis when considering candidates for inclusion in his volume of *Selected Papers*. It is published in no obvious or even not so obvious place.

and no doubt also by Jeffery, all three relationships seem to have originated at the personal level in what for Lewis was the academically crucial year 1951–2.¹³)

From New College, Lewis made long visits to the British School at Athens (BSA) where he worked in the city's Epigraphic Museum and in the Agora Museum. (This took him to the other side of the world from Princeton physically, but was not really an academic departure because of the magnificent collection of paper squeeze-impressions of Attic inscriptions in the Institute for Advanced Study. It was on these that he had worked with Meritt in what is now called the Meritt Library, though the fifth-century squeezes themselves were taken by Meritt to Austin, Texas, on his retirement in the 1970s.) Lewis later recalled that he was able to acquire a firsthand knowledge of the resources of these two Athens museums 'in a more casual and easier atmosphere than greater governmental restrictions have since made possible'.

The work he did at the BSA appeared in the School's *Annual* for 1954 and 1955 in two articles unassumingly called 'Notes on Attic Inscriptions' and 'Notes on Attic Inscriptions II'.¹⁴ No address is given; the reader is intended to assume that work published under the auspices of the School was done from that address. The two epigraphic articles are a miscellany: some of the twenty-nine studies are very short, and some are very much *pour les spécialistes*. Nevertheless, they announced to the scholarly world, instantly and convincingly, an addition to the topmost flight of Greek epigraphists. They are also and primarily the work of a *historian* applying epigraphic method. To reread them is to be impressed above all by their range. The first of the two collections opens with a re-edition of the so-called Praxiergidai inscription (now *IG* 1³ 7), a mid-fifth-century BC text which guaranteed the religious privileges of an old and proud Athenian *genos* or family. Lewis's suggested restoration of a word meaning 'things decreed' in the third and fourth lines did indeed fit the line well, as Lewis modestly claimed. That, however, was not all. He continued, 'I suggest an implied assertion by the *demos* [people] that even the oldest privileges depend on the will of the people'. The historian speaks. Lewis's succinct observation has since been developed elsewhere and by others, above all by his

¹³ One other important influence should be mentioned, that of A. M. Woodward, whose work Lewis admired greatly; see Lewis and Woodward, 'A Transfer from Eleusis', *BSA*, lxx (1975), 183–8.

¹⁴ *BSA*, xlix (1954), 17–50; and l (1955), 1–36.

subsequent graduate pupil, J. K. Davies, who in more than one place compares the democracy's treatment of the Praxiergidai with the reforms associated with the name of Ephialtes, who in the late 460s stripped venerable institutions of their political and judicial privileges and insisted that what they retained, they retained by the permission of the sovereign people.¹⁵

The opening study in the second Attic collection, that of 1955, deals with Aristophanes: it contains Lewis's famous suggestion that *Lysistrata* was 'deliberately modelled' on the real-life priestess of Athena Polias, Lysimache. Forty years later, this idea has held up well, though recent commentators are shy of the strict implications of 'modelled', and tend to insist that we are not dealing with an identification like that between Kleon and Paphlagon in the *Knights*.¹⁶ The piece is interesting for Lewis's intellectual biography, not just because it illustrates his precocious range ('Who was Lysistrata?' has only religion, in the broadest sense, in common with 'The Praxiergidai'), but because it illustrates its author's lifelong facility for seeing in a flash how new evidence could help solve old problems. In this instance, the new evidence was the grave epigram for the priestess of Athena Nike, Myrrhine, now *IG* 1³ 1330. J. Papademetriou had suggested a link between this Myrrhine and the character of that name in the *Lysistrata*. Lewis's 'Lysistrata' also illustrated his co-operative tendencies; he was always ready to work with others and—as with Papademetriou—to show them courteously how their ideas could be taken much further. This was to make him in the course of time the ideal collaborator, the ideal scrutineer-in-advance of books and articles, and the ideal graduate supervisor. In a selfish world, however, it was a cast of mind which was to slow down his advancement.

An authoritative and virtuoso appendix to this section (which started

¹⁵ J. K. Davies, *Democracy and Classical Greece*² (1978, 2nd edn., 1993), pp. 57–8; *Cambridge Ancient History* v² (1992) 300, cp. P. J. Rhodes (another Lewis pupil) at p. 70, n. 27, of the same volume, in the chapter on, precisely, Ephialtes. It is a pity that Louis Robert in the *Bulletin Épigraphe* 1955 (no. 84) chose to report 'The Praxiergidai' as merely a contribution to the study of the topography of the Acropolis. For reservations about the Praxiergidai point see R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 124 *et seq.*

¹⁶ See the editions of the play by J. Henderson (ed.), *Aristophanes' Lysistrata* (Oxford, 1987), pp. xxxix–xl; A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes: Lysistrata* (Warminster, 1990), p. 5; note also D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 240–2. Richard Rutherford reminds me that Lewis's concern for the literary aspect of the identification should be stressed: 'he is concerned to ask also what this [the identification] does for our appreciation of the *play*, and makes points which matter for any interpreter (p. 3)'.

with Aristophanes) gives and discusses the evidence for priestesses of Athena Polias through the fourth century and the Hellenistic and Roman periods; included here are some serious contributions to the prosopography of Roman Athens. Exchanges with R. Syme, evidently as with an equal, are duly acknowledged, on such points as the identity of Roman individuals from the second century AD.¹⁷

The twenty-seven other pieces include an epigraphically-based essay on the career of the atthidographer Androtion,¹⁸ and an examination of the fourth-century problem of the epistates of the proedroi (when did the proedroi replace the prytaneis as presidents of the Council and Assembly?)

1954 brought the need for Lewis, now twenty-six, to decide between the succession to Geoffrey de Ste Croix in his Ancient Economic History post at the London School of Economics, and the gamble on an Oxford career represented by a P. S. Allen Junior Research Fellowship at Corpus. He chose the latter, and was the first holder of the title. During his one year there he did some teaching, and his pupils included his brother Philip, then in his fourth year. In *Corpuscles*, David was to record that Philip 'stayed behind after their first Greats revision class to tell me with some emphasis that for the first half hour I had not earned my keep'. David also noted that this Corpus teaching gave him a 'pretty false idea' of what undergraduate teaching was like, a typically round-about way of saying that his pupils were exceptionally good.

In 1955 he moved to the Greek History tutorship at Christ Church, which had been turned down by the first choice, M. I. Finley, who took a Cambridge lectureship in preference. The outgoing tutor was R. H. Dundas, a historian of a different generation and a very different attitude to publication; in a piece for the Christ Church Annual Report for 1955, Dundas wrote of Lewis's learning as 'positively unseemly. He has published articles; and will publish many more.' In fact, and despite this patronising tone, Dundas was very kind and helpful to Lewis on the

¹⁷ It may be observed at this point that when Elizabeth Rawson wrote in 1985 that 'Roman historians and Greek epigraphists do not always talk to each other as much as they should' (E. Rawson, 'Cicero and the Areopagus', *Athenaeum*, lxiii (1985), 44–66 at 44 = *Roman Culture and Society* (Oxford, 1991), p. 444) the grateful accompanying footnote makes it clear that David Lewis is emphatically not included in the implied indictment.

¹⁸ See, however, G. L. Cawkwell, 'Notes on the Social War', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, xxiii (1962), 34–49. It was characteristic of Lewis's generosity and intellectual scrupulousness that he later spoke of this correction of one detail as having exposed a 'major howler' in his own study.

latter's arrival; Lewis had expected hostility from that quarter because of his religion.

For the next thirty years, until he was appointed to a personal professorship (1985), Lewis taught Greek history, from the archaic period to Alexander, to Christ Church undergraduates; he remained a Student (i.e. Fellow) of Christ Church until his death. Most Oxford tutors in this field were and are expected to teach both Greek and Roman history, but until Lewis's change of status, Christ Church was fortunate and rich enough to have two tutors in ancient history; the other was for Lewis's first twenty years Eric Gray, an expert in Asia Minor and its epigraphy, who was replaced in 1977 by Alan Bowman, a historical papyrologist. Christ Church in Lewis's time was a great centre for the documentary study of the ancient world: from 1965 the literary papyrologist Peter Parsons was also Student of Christ Church (and Regius Professor of Greek from 1989 in succession to Hugh Lloyd-Jones). The remarkable result was that in the decade-and-a-half from 1980 the following books were published by Christ Church scholars: Lewis's *Inscriptiones Graecae* (3rd edn.); Parsons and Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*; and Bowman's *Vindolanda Tablets* (with J. D. Thomas: 1983).

But though Lewis was by nature a collaborator, his only Christ Church collaboration was with his colleague as literary tutor, John Gould (Student of Christ Church from 1954–68). In 1968, the year of Gould's departure to the Chair of Classics at Swansea, they produced a revision of Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. This, and the collection of Greek historical inscriptions which Lewis published with Russell Meiggs (also 1968), were, at least until his involvement in the *Cambridge Ancient History* in the last phase of his life (from 1979), the part of Lewis's scholarly output most obviously geared to the needs of undergraduates and their teachers. Both works surely grew from Lewis's own teaching activities as a college teacher and university lecturer. This is therefore a good point at which to consider Lewis as an undergraduate teacher and lecturer.

As we saw, the Corpus pupils whom Lewis taught (and continued to teach for fourth-century history) were exceptionally bright. Christ Church was and is a different sort of place—not just rich, but large, and at that time more aristocratic in tone and intake than any other Oxford college. Such a social milieu was bound to produce a wide mix of ability, and it was just as well that Lewis was not only clever but by nature tolerant and kind. Even so, there were undergraduates who found

him hard to keep up with: his manner of self-expression was always economical or even elliptical. For his part Lewis confessed (in a letter of reply to an older friend who wrote in 1985 to congratulate him on his promotion to the personal Chair) that although he had mixed feelings about the change of status, he was on the whole glad that he would never again have to 'listen to another $\beta+$ essay on the hoplite theory of tyranny'.

At Christ Church, Lewis was secretary to the governing body for many years and is remembered for his instant and accurate recall of detail, particularly on matters of finance (he was for many years a valued member of the Committee on Investments). John Sparrow, the Warden of All Souls, used to divide university academics into those who could have been something other than dons, and those who could not. There is no doubt that David Lewis could have had a successful career as a civil servant in some exacting department like the Treasury, or as a merchant banker or barrister (like his brother). And yet, as we have seen, his only attempt to explore a non-academic career was his 1951 approach to the BBC. As far as I know he made only one broadcast, to be considered below. Though he took that opportunity to state, early in his career and emphatically, his position on important matters of epigraphic principle, it is hard to think of him as a broadcaster *manqué*. It would not be absurd to regard him as an administrator or professional financier *manqué*, but that is not the right expression because his college and above all the Jewish community in Oxford (see below) received some of the benefit of that special mix of acumen and organisational talent; his skills as an organiser were not fully seen in a purely academic context until his work as editor and eventually senior editor of the classical Greek volumes of the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

College teaching was only one part of his teaching duties: from 1956 he was also university lecturer in Greek epigraphy. He gave practical classes on epigraphy from time to time both in this capacity and later as professor; but he did not develop, or seek to develop, a school of Greek epigraphy in Oxford. The way he passed on his epigraphic knowledge at the local and didactic level (as opposed to publication) was different, namely by supervising historical dissertations which had an epigraphic component. This was surely by preference, and reflects his conviction that history and epigraphy are inseparable. I shall reserve an attempt to assess Lewis's supervision of graduates, the area of instruction in which above all he excelled, until I reach the 1970s and his professorial period

(1985–94); although that is an artificial postponement because Christopher Ehrhardt,¹⁹ Albert Schachter,²⁰ John Davies, and Peter Rhodes had all passed through his hands by the beginning of the 1970s.

In addition to his obligation to lecture on epigraphy, he had to lecture on Greek history generally and regularly gave courses on Demosthenes (separate courses on the public or political speeches and—under the title ‘Some Athenian Attitudes’—on themes illustrated by some of the private speeches²¹) and on classical Athens. He was never a communicator of the frothy or theatrical type, so that some undergraduates found his lectures too concise and demanding to be, in the Thucydidean phrase, immediately pleasurable, while conceding that if you took good notes and worked through them later, the profit was permanent and immense. The lectures were like concentrated orange juice: you had to add water. But some of my Balliol contemporaries found ‘Athenian Attitudes’ refreshing and frank in their treatment of aspects of sexual and social life not normally covered in the Oxford lecture-list at that time.²² In any case, he seems over the years to have made more concessions to his audience, and half-way through his final lecture series, which was on a selection of texts from ‘Meiggs and Lewis’ and which he courageously insisted on giving although he had known for several months that he was dying, one of my undergraduate pupils told me they were the best lectures he had ever attended. (He went on to ask me whether the lecturer was anything to do with the Lewis of ‘Meiggs and Lewis’, a point David had modestly not made clear.)

Dundas’s announcement of Lewis’s appointment described him as unmarried, but this was not to be true for much longer. As early as his Princeton year he was finding it necessary, in letters home, to deny rumours, put about by well-meaning but inquisitive New York City relations, that he was engaged. In 1958 he married Barbara Wright, daughter of the eminent physiologist Professor Samson Wright. In 1981 he was to describe Barbara, in the preface to the second fascicle of

¹⁹ Ehrhardt wrote a B.Litt. thesis (a shorter dissertation than that required for a doctorate) on ‘The Third Sacred War’ (1961).

²⁰ Schachter’s *Cults of Boiotia*, still not quite complete, began life as an Oxford doctoral dissertation supervised by Lewis.

²¹ These lectures were centred round the person of Apollodorus, the son of Pasion (on whom Lewis’s graduate student, J. C. Trevett, was to write his dissertation in the 1980s). They are included in a collection of unpublished papers which has been deposited in libraries in Oxford and elsewhere.

²² I am here indebted to a letter from Richard Jenkyns, dated 14 March 1996.

Inscriptiones Graecae, as the ‘mainstay of my life’, *columen vitae meae*, and *The Jews of Oxford* (1992) is dedicated to ‘Barbara, who always asks the right questions’. It was a happy marriage to a generous, impulsive and talkative partner (Miriam Kochan’s address at the memorial service rightly spoke of Barbara’s ‘intelligence and dynamism’), and a happy family life: Joanna was born in 1959, followed by Isabel (1961), Helen (1963), and Eve (1968). Up to this point, David had been an intense worker at all hours: his Princeton letters record long sessions of bridge with fellow-addicts, followed by expiatory bouts of academic work into the small hours. Life in Corpus and Christ Church, as a living-in bachelor, cannot have been very different. From 1958 on, that all changed. The work and the productivity never flagged, but an absolute divide was placed between the working day and the time set apart for family and normal life. When he brought work home, he never shut himself away but could read and write against household noise and activity; he worked five days a week; and was essentially a nine-to-seven man. There was a rich domestic life to entice him home punctually (‘home’ was first Old Road, Headington, then Charlbury Road, and finally 1, Ferry Pool Road): helping with the children’s homework (he learned New Maths for this purpose); gardening; games of scrabble. Music, especially opera, was an interest which, unlike bridge, he never abandoned, except that in adult life it was as a listener not a player (he had played the piano competently in youth but let it lapse). In other ways, too, the Lewis household was not a silent one; it was a friendly, hospitable (the Lewises regularly held Sunday lunch-parties for Christ Church pupils, and there were many academic and other visitors from outside Oxford), interested in other people’s doings, and noisy with laughter and simultaneously conducted conversations. He lived long enough to be a grandfather twice over, with the arrival of Isabel’s two children (1992 and 1993), and this was an enormous source of pleasure and quiet pride. By the time the grandchildren arrived, Isabel was in Israel, and this gave further reason and opportunity for visits to a country where the Lewises had many friends. David enjoyed travelling, and adventurous holidays were an important part of family life. He took to camping in his forties. He was not really happy travelling alone, and had a less than idyllic time on a visit to Sicily without Barbara in the late 1980s as odd man out in a commercially organised archaeological tour group, conscientiously looking at sites and terrain in connection with his chapter on Dionysius I for the *Cambridge Ancient History* vi. Surprisingly, it was not till the summer of his

sixtieth birthday that Barbara and David visited Turkey and David set himself with characteristic thoroughness to read up modern Turkish history in preparation, though the Turkish language defeated him.

Distractions and non-academic activity on this scale (and I have not yet said anything about his work for the Oxford Jewish community) might have slowed down the output of a less disciplined worker, and a less quick mind. Not David Lewis. But hard work and acumen alone will not make an epigraphist in the full sense, that is, an editor of *new* inscriptions. For that, a connection with an excavation is necessary. Lewis's opportunities came to him from the American excavations in the Athenian city centre or *agora*, not from the British school, whose excavations have always tended to be on prehistoric sites. Of the sites excavated by the British in the post-war period, only Chios was likely to turn up classical Greek inscriptions, and George Forrest had already been booked as the dig epigraphist there. In any case, Lewis's interests were at this stage essentially Athenian. The connection with Benjamin Meritt was therefore crucial, because Meritt was responsible for the publication of the epigraphic material from the *agora* and passed important texts to Lewis. The relationship with the American School's excavations went well beyond this; it is clear from extensive correspondence over many years between Lewis and Homer Thompson, the field director of the *agora* excavation, that the Americans consulted the Lewis oracle across a range of issues going well beyond the purely epigraphic, taking in, for example, architectural history and the likely siting of individual monuments.

Lewis's first big publication of American material was in *Hesperia* (the journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) 1959. Three separate articles appeared under his name; the most substantial in terms of bulk was 'Attic Manumissions', but a second and shorter piece, a publication of a new fragment relating to the Lesser Panathenaia, was wider-ranging and more controversial; here Lewis displayed his outstanding ability to derive far-reaching historical conclusions from small epigraphic indicators.²³ Other *Hesperia* articles followed: one of them, in 1979, was written in collaboration with R. S. Stroud. It was the publication of a new fragment of an Athenian decree honouring Evagoras of Cyprus and enabled Lewis to combine

²³ The text mentioned a five percent tax on the 'Nea', 'a specific and well-known area of state land'; for the subsequent controversy over the identification of this see L. Robert, *Hellenica*, XI–XII (1960), 294 and Lewis's brief rejection of Robert, *Hesperia*, xxxvii (1968) 374, n. 18. On Lewis's view the tax was on produce, and constituted evidence that such a tax did not disappear with the Peisistratids (*Hesperia*, xxviii (1959), 244).

his epigraphic skills with that interest in Persia which found most obvious expression in *Sparta and Persia*, 1977.

The indivisibility of history and epigraphy was implicit in all these periodical publications, some of them at first sight highly technical. In 1959, the year of the first *Hesperia* articles, Lewis expounded his beliefs to a wider audience, in a Third Programme radio broadcast called 'Testimony of Stones' and subsequently published in the now-defunct *Listener* magazine.²⁴ The talk was in fact a review of A. G. Woodhead's *Study of Greek Inscriptions*;²⁵ though acknowledging the usefulness of the book, Lewis objected to the author's tendency to speak as if an epigraphist were a distinct class of person. 'We must, however, ask whether the epigraphist is a distinct specialist. As soon as the scholar starts thinking about the content of his inscription, he is outside the area of pure epigraphy. He will stop thinking as an epigraphist and start thinking as a historian of politics, economics, religion or whatever . . . Why after all should we stress the medium through which facts and texts are transmitted?' Lewis added to this an autobiographical remark, very relevant to his lectures, noted above, on Demosthenes and to his collaborative revision of Pickard-Cambridge's *Dramatic Festivals*: 'I myself do a good deal of work on Athenian inscriptions of the fourth century BC, but what goes most naturally with these is not late epitaphs from Anatolia, or Hellenistic dedications from northern Greece, but the speeches of the Athenian orators of the period'. The talk concludes with a plea that scholars should cease to talk of the field of epigraphy and should realise instead that every branch of classical scholarship involves inscriptions and they may have to know how to use them. This is far and away the clearest statement known to me of David Lewis's view of his own life's work. There is a similar, but less transparent and forthright, statement in the short paper on August Boeckh which he delivered in 1967 to the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin epigraphy, and published in the conference *Acta* in 1971. He quoted with approval Boeckh's view that epigraphy is not an art or a discipline at all, because its subject-matter is not uniform; and he commented, 'I am sure that it is good for us to be made to wonder from time whether epigraphy exists'.²⁶ He ended that paper by saying

²⁴ *Listener*, 20 August 1959, 281 and 284.

²⁵ Cambridge, 1959; rev. ed. 1981.

²⁶ 'Boeckh, Staatshaushaltung der Athener, 1817–1967', in *Acta of the Fifth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Cambridge, 1967* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 35–9, esp. p. 39. For a rather similar point see Jowett's *Thucydides*, rev. W. H. Forbes and E. Abbott (1899), p. x (from the introductory section 'On Inscriptions of the Age of Thucydides').

‘we should all have our *Hellen*, individual or communal’ — a reference to the synthetic book which Boeckh planned as the crown of his studies.

Boeckh never wrote his *Hellen*, but he did launch the project which he saw as a preparation for *Hellen*, a mere means to an end. The ‘means’ was the great corpus of the Greek inscriptions (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*). Lewis’s 1967 decision to hang his reflections on Boeckh was not fortuitous: since 1962 he had himself been part of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* project, the successor of *CIG*. In that year, as Lewis was to put it in his own 1987 memoir of Anne Jeffery,²⁷ ‘a small cabal persuaded Professor Klaffenbach of the Berlin Academy that I was the person to organize a new edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, I, the volume containing Attic inscriptions to 403 BC’.

There is no one or obvious point at which an obituarist should deal with a project which was to last from 1962 to 1994. When Lewis accepted the job he was either thirty-three or thirty-four, young for such an honour and responsibility. When copies of the second fascicle reached the libraries he was approaching sixty-six and dying. Half a life for *IG* 1³.

The new edition was in fact the third; Hiller von Gaertringen’s so-called *editio minor*, really a second edition, had been published in 1924. Much had happened since then, most obviously the finds from the American *agora* excavations, but also (as he explained in the preface to the first fascicle) the development of ‘architectural epigraphy’ by scholars like W. B. Dinsmoor. ‘Architectural’ here means that you pay attention to the monument as a physical structure, as opposed to merely concentrating on decipherment of the letters. In the 1990s this tendency has been taken further still, as scholars insist on the monumental character of much ancient public epigraphy and even ask how much of it was meant to be read at all. In the 1993 conference honouring David Lewis, his one-time pupil John Davies asked ‘how many people before the 20th century AD do we suppose ever brought a step-ladder in order to consult the top lines of the First Stele of the Tribute Lists?’ Davies cited Rosalind Thomas, who in turn has remarked of Athens’ fifth-century Coinage Decree that it was intended ‘to intimidate as well as communicate, to impress as well as to record on stone’.²⁸ We never

²⁷ See above, n. 11; see pp. 513–4.

²⁸ J. K. Davies in *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (see above, n. 2), p. 212; R. Thomas, ‘Literacy in Archaic and Classical Greece’, in A. K. Bowman and G. D. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 44. For a more extreme position see C. Hedrick in *Ritual, Finance, Politics*.

discovered in detail what Lewis thought of this scholarly shift (the editors of his *Festschrift* hoped to extract from him a reply to the papers, but he fell ill almost immediately). What the 1981 preface makes clear is that Lewis was alert to the big shifts of direction and found them exhilarating. (In the same way his reaction in 1990 to the new technique of laser enhancement—see below—might have surprised those who expected outright hostility merely because the technique threatened to dislodge traditional datings.) Nevertheless, the 1981 preface also makes clear that he did not accept (*'etiamnunc firme repellimus'*) the wholesale down-datings of Harold Mattingly. (It should be remarked here that this controversy, unlike that between Lewis's teacher Meritt and W. K. Pritchett, was always conducted on both sides with respect and absence of personal rancour, and this characterised other arguments Lewis conducted, for example that with Margaret Thompson on Athenian New Style Coinage²⁹).

The preface to the first fascicle of *IG* 1 was dated 1976, five years before eventual publication. The material had been basically completed and passed to Berlin by as early as the summer of 1972, but Klaffenbach's successor, E. Erxleben, wanted and extracted full rather than minimal exposition of the texts. The book was a work of collaboration—in particular the tribute lists (nos. 259–90) were the work of Meritt and M. F. McGregor, and other old friends like Jameson and Raubitschek contributed—but Lewis's part was easily the largest: as with the *Cambridge Ancient History* many years later he was both a hands-on editor and a large-scale contributor. At the end of four pages of critical discussion in the *Classical Review*, Michael Osborne confessed 'the foregoing are essentially matters of detail, and they represent utter minutiae in so massive an enterprise'. He was right to predict that *IG* 1³ would be 'not so much popular as indispensable to studies of fifth-century Athens'.³⁰

In the Jeffery memoir Lewis remarked 'fighting the public inscriptions through to publication as a first fascicle in 1981 had not been

²⁹ *Numismatic Chronicle* ii, 7th series (1962), 275–300 and 290–2.

³⁰ *CR*, xxxii (1982), 255–8 at 258. It can be added that the third edition of *IG* I represents a massive contribution to the history of scholarship; see for instance no. 1453 (from the second fascicle) for Lewis's mastery of the history of the texts and of their interpretation. The age of Boeckh (i.e. *CIG*) and of the first and even second editions of *IG*, were pioneering days; but by the late twentieth century an epigraphist who handles central texts like the Coinage Decree needs to be not just a historian in the sense insisted on throughout the present memoir but a historian of his or her subject—that is, a modern as well as an ancient historian.

easy'. The second fascicle, partly for reasons to do with Anne Jeffery's own state of health, was harder still. It carries the publication year 1994 and its preface is dated February 1993. Lewis's sentence quoted above, about the cabal who sold his name to Klaffenbach, continues: 'I needed collaborators and was in particular certain that I could not move a step without Anne'. He goes on to explain why it was that, although she had readily agreed to handle the bulk of the private texts, they were still unpublished in 1987: the trouble was, the material needed rethinking and reworking, partly in order to meet the standards of Erxleben who, as we have seen, wanted fuller presentation; and towards the end Anne Jeffery herself no longer had the health or the heart for this job. What emerges only slowly from Lewis's account is that he himself was left 'tidying for publication'. (This is a typical Lewis story: to my knowledge, more than one of the chapters in the *Cambridge Ancient History* volumes for which he was responsible as senior editor were pretty extensively rewritten by Lewis himself, but there is no hint of this in the relevant volume.) As the preface and (at greater length) the 1987 memoir makes clear, the difficulties were not merely practical: there was a serious and fundamental problem about the dating of inscriptions before and after 480, the year of the Persian sack of the Acropolis: this is the problem of the so-called 'Perserschutt'. The 1993 preface records a curious kind of death-bed confession by Anne Jeffery that her criteria for distributing material before and after 480 had been unsatisfactory; evidently, the resulting need to allocate the material more reliably was met by Lewis himself, a task calling for finesse in the highest degree. But her contribution had been large and the second fascicle appears under the joint editorship of Lewis and Jeffery, with the help of E. Erxleben, 'adiuvante Eberhard Erxleben'. The achievement represented by the first great fascicle of *IG* 1³ was surely the main reason why Lewis was honoured with corresponding membership of the German Archaeological Institute (1985).

Big team projects such as that described above are commonplace in the academic life of the 1990s, but they were less usual in 1962. (An obvious example from Lewis's own field was the collaborative four-volume *Athenian Tribute Lists* which appeared between 1939 and 1953, and in which even so individual a scholar as H. T. Wade-Gery submerged himself.) It was typically far-sighted, and typically modest, of Lewis to grasp at so young an age the important truth that there are severe limits to what even the sharpest and most industrious scholar can achieve in one lifetime. F. Jacoby had produced fifteen fat volumes of

the fragments of the Greek historians by the time he died in the late 1950s, but that was barely three-fifths of the whole task he had set himself back in 1909; an international team has only recently (1994) set to work on the remaining portions. As a Jewish refugee, Jacoby had at one time been kept going by the hospitality of Oxford and Christ Church; did Lewis have in mind this local lesson in what a single dedicated genius can and cannot do?

There is further and more significant evidence that from an astonishingly early point, Lewis saw his life's work as a collective enterprise, in fact as the direction of a kind of one-man research programme. I say 'more significant' because *IG* was after all an idea put to him by others, it was not an initiative of his own. It can be shown, I think, that from very early in his career, perhaps already in 1959, he had in his head an interlocking set of thesis topics for future graduate students, amounting to no less than a programme of research into the history of classical Athens. This is extraordinary enough (not many supervisors outside the sciences start off with a defined and related set of thesis topics to be parcelled out for years to come); it was and is even more extraordinary that he succeeded so brilliantly. There was an element of luck: how could anyone have foreseen that in his first few years at Christ Church he would be presented with two graduate students of the calibre of J. K. Davies and P. J. Rhodes? 1959 was the year in which he suggested the Athenian liturgical (i.e. propertied) class to John Davies as a 'focus for attention'³¹; and in 1963 he suggested to Peter Rhodes the subject of *his* dissertation: the Athenian *boule* or Council of Five Hundred.³² The 'master-plan' is not just my own fanciful retrospective imposition of order on random events. Looking back in 1984, in an unpublished paper delivered at Birmingham called 'M. H. Hansen on the Athenian Ecclesia', he said, with a characteristic mix of tentativeness and firmness (and perhaps irony?):

it is not totally clear whether my activity has any overall plan to it, but if it ever has had, it was certainly at least once along the lines that John's original thesis, now happily all in the public domain,³³ on the propertied families and Peter's work on the *boule* needed completing first by one more book on the non-assembly features of the Athenian constitution, i.e. on the strategoi and other elected officials, and finally another on the workings of the assembly

³¹ See J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 BC* (Oxford, 1971), preface.

³² See P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford, 1972), preface.

³³ A reference to J. K. Davies, *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens* (New York, 1981), which supplemented the gazetteer cited above, at n. 31.

itself. It was here that a yawning gap in Athenian studies, mostly filled with platitudes, existed when Mogens [Hansen] began his work.

In other words, Hansen had pre-empted a topic earmarked for some future Lewis pupil, but that was one potential Oxford thesis which could be struck off the list: Lewis could only offer (with applause) some comments on detail, and that he went on in Birmingham to do. As for the other project (the *stratēgoi* (generals) etc.), that too was done outside Oxford, by R. Develin in his *Athenian Officials 684–322 BC* (Cambridge, 1987); but there is certainly Lewis input throughout, as the preface acknowledges, and as I remember from a visit to Lewis's rooms in Christ Church at the time he was working through the draft typescript.

As we have seen, Lewis's main work on the first fascicle of *IG* 1³ was done in the decade 1962–72; but this was not the only book he was working on during these years. In 1968 and 1969 he published two books, both of them collaborative. The first to appear was 'Gould and Lewis', the revision of *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Pickard-Cambridge's last and posthumously published book (1953). The work of revising *DFA* was 'essentially completed in the late summer of 1964'. Lewis greatly expanded and improved the epigraphic material, particularly the appendices to chapters 1 and 2 (on the festivals) and 7 (on the Artists of Dionysus). Chapter 7 itself was pretty thoroughly overhauled and now represents an important contribution to Hellenistic and even Roman cultural history. It was above all the deficiencies of this section of the 1953 book which made a new edition desirable from the epigraphic point of view. Jeanne and Louis Robert, in the *Bulletin Épigraphique* 1954³⁴ were harsh about the non-Attic material. They commented that Pickard-Cambridge used inscriptions extensively, and that they were conveniently reproduced—as far as Attica went. 'Mais toutes les fois qu'on sort d'Athènes, la documentation est vieillie soit *passim* soit spécialement dans le chapitre final', which, as they said, reproduced some texts from Teos with grave errors and 'phrases inextricables'. Lewis not only put all that right, but widened the geographical sweep of the relevant epigraphic appendix considerably. (It was thus a little ungenerous of the *Bulletin* not to notice the 1968 revision at all.)

This was not the whole story, however, nor (for students of Athens and Attic drama) the most important one: the second edition improved and rearranged the first throughout, in ways which the 1968 preface

³⁴ *Revue des études grecques*, lxxvii (1954), *Bull. Épigr.*, no. 54.

handily summarises. What the mere list of changes in that preface imperfectly brings out is the tactfully-executed but crucial shift of direction in the direction of the political. Not only was the paragraph on the politics of *choregoi* (p. 90) new; so too was the change in what the preface—too blandly and modestly—calls the ‘account of theatrical taste’ at pp. 274 *et seq.* It would be better to say that the problem of political comedy was now confronted directly, in some paragraphs which read far more incisively than their 1953 predecessors. ‘To put the question in a concrete form’, the revisers asked, ‘how could *Knights* win first prize without, apparently, Kleon’s position being affected in the least?’ It was to this precise question that Christopher Carey attempted an answer in his 1993 contribution to the Lewis conference.³⁵

Simon Goldhill, in his contribution to the conference in honour of David Lewis, put *DFA*² alongside Fraenkel’s *Agamemnon* as one of the books which changed his academic life;³⁶ he added, almost incidentally, that he made much use of it as a work of reference. Its value as a reference-work is clear from the need for a second revision in 1988 (this not only provided, for example, new epigraphic material on the festivals and some exciting new evidence for Aristophanic costume, but also, at p. 364, a valuable new section on political censorship, a topic oddly omitted in the two previous editions; this carries still further the extension of the book in a political direction). Goldhill was, however, right to speak of the book as much more than a dry compilation of the evidence. His own paper addressed one of the most controversial questions addressed by the book in both 1953 and 1968: did Athenian women attend performances at the theatre? (In 1968, however, the question was no longer confusingly put, because it was now prised apart from the separate question of attendance by boys.) The urgency and topicality of the question has been underlined by the poet and playwright Tony Harrison in an interview:

Were women present at theatrical performances? Now why is that not one of the main questions being asked about Greek drama, considering the context? It would make all the difference between a stag party and a mixed party; it would make the sexual hostility of the plays understandable . . . I found a reference pointing to the fact that, if women were admitted, they sat separately from the men, which again creates a different kind of expectation. One

³⁵ See *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (see above, n. 2), pp. 69–83.

³⁶ S. Goldhill, ‘Representing Democracy: Women at the Great Dionysia’, in *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (see above, n. 2), pp. 346–69 at p. 346.

of the techniques of the stand-up comedian, who knows how to relate to his audience, is the way he polarises the audience sexually.³⁷

For anyone interested in such questions, *DFA*² is the first recourse. For Lewis's biographer, *DFA*² is important as showing that his insistence that history and epigraphy are inseparable could equally well be expressed as a proposition about epigraphy and literature; or rather, we could say that Lewis's conception of history took in literature—and religion: the Dionysiac content of the book makes it an essential handbook for students of some of the main Athenian festivals. The only feature of the book which we might regret in 1997 is its relative inaccessibility to the Greekless reader. In their 1968 preface, Gould and Lewis wrote 'we offer no apology for the continued prominence of Greek text'. Fortunately, this problem has now been solved by Csapo and Slater, who have provided translations of the primary material.³⁸

Though Goldhill, on the page I have already quoted, generously called *DFA*² 'really a new book', the revisers would have deprecated that description: however much they had improved on Pickard-Cambridge, his name alone appears on the spine. By contrast, Russell Meiggs and David Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (1969) definitely superseded M. N. Tod's volume i, and was 'in no sense a new edition of Tod's work', though the authors deliberately preserved his title for the new book. The preface, from which I have just drawn, ends with the following charming sentence, after a string of acknowledgments: 'we should also compliment one another, for we have found a surprising measure of agreement and our few differences of opinion have never escalated'. The most obvious and explicit of these differences is on p. 184, concerning the dating of no. 67, the contributions to the Spartan war-fund: c.427 (Meiggs) or much later, perhaps even 396–5 (Lewis)? The two datings are juxtaposed, but Lewis evidently bowed to his collaborator's view; his own would have excluded the text from the volume altogether. It would on Lewis's 1968 dating have had to wait for the replacement of Tod's fourth-century volume (once planned by Lewis himself for his retirement and now to be carried through on rather different lines by Robin Osborne and Peter Rhodes). In any case, this

³⁷ See Neil Astley (ed.), *Tony Harrison: A Critical Anthology* (Newcastle, 1991), p. 243, part of a 1983 interview with John Haffenden and reprinted from *Poetry Review*, 73 (1984). The 'reference' here is presumably Ar. *Pax* 962 *et seq.*, discussed at *DFA*², p. 264.

³⁸ E. Csapo and W. J. Slater, *The Context of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor, 1995).

is one text where Lewis was able, in the revision which (like that of *DFA*²) appeared in 1988, to point to new fragments of the stone which made Meiggs' date preferable.³⁹

There was hard work to be done for ML, as the book has come to be called, and Lewis did some of the necessary work on squeezes during another visit to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton in 1964–5. But it must also have been fun choosing the sixteen new texts: their discovery was after all (p. vi) the main avowed reason for producing a new book rather than a new edition. The first six inscriptions were all new since Tod's book of 1933, although (for instance) the oath of the settlers at Cyrene (no. 5) had been known since the 1920s, so that Tod could have used it if he had wished. One of the newly included texts, the 'Themistocles Decree' (no. 23), nowadays attracts scholarly interest for reasons other than those which seem primarily to have led Meiggs and Lewis to print it: not so much as a factual corrective to Herodotus on the events of 480 as because it is a palmary example of invented tradition about the Persian Wars. Other exciting new texts threw light on Athenian relations with Carthage (no. 92) and life in Attica away from the city of Athens itself (no. 53: from the deme of Rhamnous). There were losses too, such as the two inscriptions which dealt with the amphictyonies of Delphi and Delos: Tod nos. 39 (*IG* 1³ 9) and 85 respectively. Thucydides' neglect of this important aspect of fifth-century life is bad enough without compounding it.⁴⁰ But the date and interpretation of the very fragmentary *IG* 1³ 9 are controversial, and the commentary on ML 62 contains valuable compensating material on Delos and its amphictyons, although that text does not actually use the word. Other excisions must have been painful: a Thucydidean such as Lewis must have felt a pang at the jettisoning of Tod no. 72 (*IG* 1³ 83), the Quadruple alliance between Athens, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis, cp. Thuc. 5.47. But no one can fail to be grateful for the exemplary discussion of such complex topics as the use of the tribute lists (nos. 39; 50; 75).

³⁹ See p. 312 of the 1988 revision (slightly different on this point in the paperback reissue of 1989) and the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vi² 28, n. 17. Still more recently, Ionian War dates for this inscription have been argued for, above all by M. Piérart, *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique*, cxix (1995), 235–82 (an article which is dedicated to the memory of David Lewis, and whose first footnote reports Lewis's unpublished flexibility on the dating of the inscription; it may be that Lewis would have accepted Piérart's dating).

By 1988 Russell Meiggs of Balliol had only a short time to live and left the work to Lewis; see the latter's reference to 'my ever generous and trusting colleague' in the preface to the revision.

⁴⁰ See *HSCP*, xciv (1992), 169–97.

Like *IG* 1³, and like Meiggs' 1972 book *The Athenian Empire*, ML rejects the wholesale downdatings of H. Mattingly and is to that extent conservative on Attic letter-forms at least; but Meiggs may have felt more strongly on this point than did Lewis (note in any case such discussions as p. 121 on ML 47, where the rejection of Mattingly is by no means confident or doctrinaire). The book was fully collaborative and it is hard to guess who wrote what; but work on such a book has to start somewhere and the two scholars divided the inscriptions among themselves. Thus I remember asking Lewis in about 1990 why the ML date for no. 74, the Delphic thank-offering of the Messenians at Naupectus, is given without explanation as 'c.421 BC' whereas Tod had put it '425 BC' (i.e. Tod thought such a dedication at Delphi could have been made during rather than after the Archidamian War); the answer, roughly, was that Meiggs had been responsible for that one. This being so, it seems reasonable to suppose that Meiggs had first go at the imperial inscriptions.⁴¹

I hope it is abundantly obvious, from what I have said already, that Lewis had a collaborative gift amounting to genius. This was perhaps most successfully displayed in his supervision of graduate students—the area of teaching in which above all he excelled: he was, in a word, professional about it. 'Collaboration' is perhaps not quite the word for even the closest graduate supervision in historical studies, but Lewis supplied his ideas and material to his students with the same automatic open-handedness that a scholar might show to a co-author or a co-editor with whom he was to share equal credit. No doubt there have been other supervisors of whom similar things could be said; what made Lewis so remarkable was the quantity and quality of the ideas and material so supplied. When I began research myself in 1974, Keith Thomas asked me, at dinner in my then college, who was my supervisor. When I told him, he commented, 'Ah yes, Lewis, the man who writes other people's books for them'. We have seen that there is a literal sense in which this was true, because Lewis (with others) *rewrote* books by Tod and Pickard-Cambridge, and some of the skills of revision are transferable to supervision: in both operations, one of the things most needed is a good nose for what is worth keeping and what should be discarded. But

⁴¹ See e.g. p. 226 on no. 75, 'serious objections' against West's dating, cp. *Athenian Empire*, p. 340. But 'imperial inscriptions' is a broad concept and presumably ML 63, which discusses Lewis's own published views and has a paragraph of argument against Mattingly, is the work of Lewis.

Lewis was an adder and a multiplier, not just a subtracter. Above all—and here for the first time in this memoir I speak with firsthand experience, having on good advice asked for Lewis as a supervisor in early 1974—he *raised your game*, simply by making you aware that his standards were so high. Although as we have seen he was remarkable for having a clear general idea in advance of the graduate topics which needed to be done, nevertheless he did not give any help along the way about what particular aspect of the topic might be tackled next or at all; to that extent he was the least *dirigiste* of supervisors. Peter Rhodes, although his thesis topic was suggested by Lewis himself, received equally little direction beyond an initial set of suggestions for reading. Nor, although I lived only a couple of hundred yards away, did I find his conversation (which was alarmingly omniscient for a postgraduate rusty on Greek history after more than two years qualifying for the Bar, and which left too many gaps in thought to be supplied) as profitable as his written comments on a draft. These, as anyone who ever showed work to Lewis will confirm,⁴² were pure gold. They could themselves be highly elliptical and concentrated, but at least you had them there as a possession, and could spend the next day or two slowly working through them, to your immense profit. This should not be taken to mean that he was impersonal or unsupportive; the opposite was true. He could be calming and witty at the same time. I once sent him an over-excited and anxious letter after what I was afraid must have seemed a non-productive period, concluding with a promise that a draft of a new chapter of my thesis would be on its way to Christ Church in a week or so. I got a postcard back which read, ‘I await your chapter 4 without impatience’. Even at the time I could appreciate the marvelously ambiguous phrasing of this piece of reassurance.

It may be thought that the above account errs by treating him as too little of an independent scholar. Was all his work, it may be objected, team work? What—to be specific—about his one sole-authored academic book on a classical topic, *Sparta and Persia* (1977)? I do not think the general objection a damaging one even if it were true, but in any case it misses what I think is an essential point: Lewis was, I suggest, keen on delegation, co-operation and sharing not because of some inbuilt academic gregariousness (his widow testifies to his groans over many years about the demands of *IG* in particular) but precisely

⁴² Not just historians either. For the debt owed by a close literary colleague note C. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), p. 20, n. 1; p. 52, n. 1; p. 139, n. 56.

because he knew how little one scholar can do in one working lifetime. His own premature death shows how right he was—in a way; and yet, in another way, how much he *did* do! As for the specific objection, *Sparta and Persia* demonstrates that in the rare case where a topic could not be farmed out to a pupil he would do it himself.

Let me explain this. Here, at the risk of being autobiographical rather than biographical, I think I can throw light on the immediate genesis of *Sparta and Persia*. Part of the book's origin⁴³ undoubtedly lay in the help Lewis was giving to Tony Andrewes in the 1960s and 1970s, when Andrewes was working on the difficult book 8 of Thucydides, with its satrapal Persian material. (We recall the Corpus undergraduate of many years earlier, for whom Frank Lepper found 'messes to clear up'.) Andrewes' letters to Lewis from this period survive, and it is clear that very complex and detailed matters were being intensely discussed between these two heavyweights. So much indeed is clear enough from the published final volume of the *Historical Commentary* (1981); but the correspondence shows that Lewis himself was deeply engaged with the doings of Tissaphernes, Pharnabazus and the Greeks who had to deal with them. So when a graduate student (myself) appeared at the end of 1973 with an expressed wish to do something on Persia and the Greeks, Lewis put him to work on the subject-matter of what was eventually to become *Sparta and Persia*, that is, on a study of the complex diplomatic history of the late fifth-century Greek and especially Spartan involvement with the satraps of western Asia Minor. This, however, lasted only about six months, because in summer 1974 I was diverted into studying Mausolus and his dynasty by becoming aware, thanks to Peter Fraser, of the then recent (1972) epigraphic material from Labraunda published by Jonas Crampa; this was shortly to be followed in autumn 1974, after my switch of subject, by the discovery of the trilingual inscription from Lycian Xanthus ('if you haven't read the new *CRAI*' ran a postcard from David Lewis, 'drop everything and do so'). The excuse for introducing Mausolus and

⁴³ But only part. In an unpublished lecture delivered at Chicago in 1993, he recalled that 'it was Aramaic evidence from Egypt, Driver's Arsam archive [i.e. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC* (Oxford, 1957)] which, in 1957, prompted my first publication related to Persia [i.e. 'The Phoenician Fleet in 411', *Historia*, vii (1958), 393–7]. It needed the quantity of new material provided by Hallock's Fortification Tablets [R. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (Chicago, 1969)] to get me going at all seriously'. The chatty and smooth-paced Chicago lecture is of interest as disclosing Lewis's own linguistic qualifications in the relevant languages: 'patchy Hebrew' (this was certainly much too modest) and some Elamite, in addition to Aramaic.

myself into this memoir is that I believe that David Lewis decided to write *Sparta and Persia* only after the point in summer 1974 when it was clear I was going to stray away from the topic which he had decided needed investigating. As a result he realised he would have to do it himself, so he did, and much better than I could or would have done.

Sparta and Persia was given as the Donald Bradeen Memorial Lectures in autumn 1976 at Cincinnati, Ohio; before that he tried parts of it out on a small lecture audience in Oxford (summer 1975). I remember the Oxford audience as being very small, and as including Robin Lane Fox and myself; apart from that I have only my notes on the lectures themselves—useless for academic purposes, because so soon superseded by the book. The lectures were not easy listening but I do not remember learning so much so quickly from any other lecture course in my life. The Cincinnati invitation was given and accepted when Bradeen, with whom Lewis had worked on the funerary inscriptions from the *agora*,⁴⁴ was still alive; but by the time Lewis arrived Bradeen was dead.

The book has established itself as a classic. It was slow to do so, partly (one suspects) because of its absolutely uncompromising presentation: a slim, dark red volume, not issued by a promotionally minded university press⁴⁵ but by Brill of Leiden; no dust-jacket; no subtitle; no chapter titles (though the running heads were informative); long footnotes containing untranslated Greek; few reviews.⁴⁶ Nevertheless it was and is an exciting and original book. The first two chapters introduced Persia and Sparta: the Sparta chapter took for its subject-matter some more or less traditional themes to do with the structure of Spartan society and the nature of Spartan decision-making and transformed them. The opening and matching Persia chapter was revolutionary in more obvious ways, exploiting as it did, and for the first time in an account aimed at Greek historians, the evidence of the Persepolis Fortification Tablets, which were to occupy Lewis on and off in the remaining twenty years of his life. One of his last published essays, called ‘The Persepolis Tablets: Speech, Seal, and Script’,⁴⁷

⁴⁴ See *Classical Quarterly*, xxix (1979), 240–6.

⁴⁵ The book was offered to neither Oxford nor Cambridge, as Hilary O’Shea and Pauline Hire confirm. (Publication was evidently by special arrangement. The book does after all describe itself as *Cincinnati Classical Studies*, vol. i, and was published with the financial support of the Classics (Sample Fund) of the University of Cincinnati.)

⁴⁶ Nothing, for instance, in *Classical Review*.

⁴⁷ In Bowman and Woolf (see above, n. 28), pp. 1–15.

exploited the tablets from the point of view of literacy, and some material, still unpublished at the time of his death, has been absorbed into a study by Christopher Tuplin.⁴⁸ *Sparta and Persia* uses the tablets for the understanding of the Persian economy and political system, and in order to trace the movements of high-ranking personnel: these movements are traceable via their allocations of rations. The results are usually unspectacular in detail (although Lewis was able to illuminate the career of a figure known as 'Datis the Mede', well-known from Herodotus and the *Lindian Chronicle*, in a short follow-up article in 1980⁴⁹). But the whole discussion is a superb demonstration of what a 'gift-giving' society (in the sense in which twentieth-century anthropology has taught us to understand that notion) was really like at the level of detail—though the book contains no references to such theoretical discussions.⁵⁰ Equally, the book does not explicitly acknowledge, what was surely true, that some of Lewis's fascination with the Persepolis material flowed from the same sources as had his youthful fascination with the Athenian tribute lists: this was concrete, nuts and bolts, epigraphic evidence for imperialism otherwise known only from generalised data in literary sources: Thucydides in 1952; Herodotus in 1977.⁵¹

The structure of the rest of the book is essentially narrative, covering the second half of the fifth and the early part of the fourth centuries BC. It would be too much to say that it solves a problem per page, but twenty years on, it is possible to gauge the book's importance by the way whole learned articles and even books⁵² have been generated and stimulated by suggestions advanced in it. Thus a single page in *Sparta and Persia* called into existence a 'Treaty of Boiotios' of 407 BC, to solve certain diplomatic puzzles of that period and of the 390s; this has been much discussed since 1977.⁵³ A single footnote in the book offered a solution, in terms of Thucydides' narrative technique, to the

⁴⁸ Forthcoming.

⁴⁹ *JHS*, c (1980), 1941 *et seq.*

⁵⁰ Note, however, 'Persian Gold in International Relations', *Revue des études anciennes*, xci (1989), 227–34 at 227: 'although it did not attract the attention of Marcel Mauss, the master of the subject, the Achaemenid Empire in fact constitutes a textbook case of a gift-centred economy'.

⁵¹ See 'Persians in Herodotus' in *The Greek Historians, Literature and History: Papers Presented to A. E. Raubitschek* (1985), pp. 101–17, and his postscript to the 1984 reissue of A. R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks*.

⁵² Note the tribute in the preface to E. Badian's *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (1993), p. ix.

⁵³ See the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vi² 65, n. 89, for references..

problem of Artaxerxes I's death-date: Matthew Stolper then took this up in 1983 in a full-length article.⁵⁴ The essential point was that Thucydides (iv. 50) could anticipate his own narrative—a technique which narratologists call 'prolepsis'—by some considerable margin, and finish off an incidental episode before reverting to the main story-line. If *Sparta and Persia* was illuminating about Thucydides, it was no less so about Herodotus: witness for instance the observation (p. 148) that one of the themes of Herodotus' *History* is that the Persians gradually discover what the Spartans are like. More than any other of Lewis's works, *Sparta and Persia* manages to combine its author's normally separate spheres of expertise: Greek history and historiography; Greek epigraphy (see, for example, p. 129, n. 132: Evagoras); and the study of the newest evidence from and about Achaemenid Persia. Even the Jews are there—surprisingly perhaps, given the book's title (see pp. 20 and 51, n. 5, Nehemiah; cf. p. 153, n. 118).

Despite the actual publication date of 1977, 1976 was really the year of *Sparta and Persia* (the preface to the book is dated November 1976, and the lectures were given that autumn), and was thus a year of international professional success for its author; but it was also a year of local professional disappointment. At the beginning of 1976 it became clear that the Wykeham Professorship of Ancient (Greek) History at Oxford, due to fall vacant after a long tenure by Tony Andrewes at the end of September 1977, would be filled without a gap of the kind now familiar. Only two candidates were considered by the electors: David Lewis, and George Forrest, who was elected in May 1976, after a very short meeting indeed, and without the holding of interviews. The preference of M. I. Finley, the Cambridge elector, then at the height of his influence, seems to have been a, or even the, decisive factor; he apparently⁵⁵ considered Lewis to be ruled out as a mere epigraphist. If this memoir has not been completely useless, it should have prepared the reader to reject that assessment. On the other hand, George Forrest was certainly the more successful and charismatic

⁵⁴ M. Stolper, *Arch. Mitt aus Iran*, xvi (1983), 23–36, developing *Sparta and Persia*, p. 71, n. 140 (a suggestion offered by Lewis as an *alternative* to that in his text). The implications for Thucydides' narrative technique were noted by Andrewes, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, v. 366.

⁵⁵ I am indebted to the reminiscences of Peter Brunt, himself an elector (he was Camden Professor of Roman History at the time, but a notable Greek historian as well). The other electors (apart from the Vice-Chancellor and the Warden of New College, to which the professorship is attached by university statute) were G. E. M. de Ste Croix, H. R. Trevor-Roper, and C. M. Robertson.

communicator of the two (his undergraduate lectures were famously well attended in the 1950s and 1960s, and he had published two sparkling books in recent years, one called *The Emergence of Greek Democracy* (1966) and one *A History of Sparta* (1968). Both were lightly documented but crammed full of ideas, and both were politically *engaged*, as books about ancient history rarely are. But Lewis had been an FBA since 1974 and was already a figure of international and magisterial distinction, to whom one automatically looked for a lead in seminars and conferences. If the electors were unaware that *Sparta and Persia* was on the way (and astonishingly, it does seem that they *were* unaware), the fault was partly Lewis's own. In a letter to a senior friend in America dated 9 January 1976, he asked in the briefest possible way for a reference for the Wykeham job, and made no mention of projects in hand, although the book as we have seen had been tried out on an Oxford audience as early as summer 1975. The referee in question therefore wrote to the electors in admiring but rather apologetic vein about Lewis's failure to produce a book of his own, and about how he preferred to revise other people's work.

Lewis took the rejection calmly, as far as the outside world could see; to his referee in the US he wrote a laconic note of the result, added thanks for support, and ended, 'I do not find myself greatly disturbed or distressed'. But he was privately shaken, and did seriously contemplate moving to the US at this time. The possibility had arisen a few years earlier, with the retirement of Ben Meritt from his professorship at the Institute for Advanced Study; at that time Lewis had declined to be considered for the succession to Meritt. His wife says one of his reasons for staying put at that earlier time was that he 'did not want his children to grow up in Nixon's America'. It is good to be able to record that in 1985 Oxford University offered Lewis a personal professorship, and that he greatly enjoyed the professorial role. From that point on he lectured more, as his duties required; he took on more graduate students and over a wider range of topics. It would be parochial to say more on this topic, but his chairmanship of the reformed 'Oxford Classical Monographs' series helped to bring many Oxford classical and historical theses to publication.

His professorial duties enabled him to shine as an extremely effective 'committee man', for instance in 1991–2 as Chairman of the Literae Humaniores Faculty Board (a notoriously fractious and unwieldy body which includes philosophers and literary specialists, as well as ancient historians). His gifts for administration, however, were

not confined to the Oxford academic scene. We shall see what he did for the Oxford Jewish community; and in London he was highly valued for his work for the British Academy. The Secretary, Peter Brown, recalls that he ‘took the Academy *seriously* and was loyal to it and personally forthcoming to us here. He chaired its Ancient History section, he served on Council, and he was one of the three “wise men” who reviewed the Academy’s Research Projects.’

Not long after the professional reverse of 1976–7, Lewis became involved in the large-scale historical project which was to last the rest of his life, and through which he was to reach out to a wider audience than ever before: the *Cambridge Ancient History*. He became an editor of and contributor to volume iv, which covered the later sixth and early fifth centuries BC; Lewis’s own contribution was on the later Pisistratids (Pisistratus himself had been covered by Tony Andrewes in volume iii, part 3 (1982)). John Boardman writes that Nicholas Hammond ‘got David in on *CAH* iv mainly with an eye to the future, wanting someone on the spot to cope with the core history and not wanting to go on himself’. So much for the motives of his editorial colleagues; what of Lewis’s own? One wonders if he agreed (albeit reluctantly; see below) because something inside him compelled him, at just that time of his life, to assert as unequivocally and publicly as possible his credentials as a mainline historian rather than ‘merely’ an epigraphist. But the letter from Lewis to Jeremy Mynott of Cambridge University Press dated 18 July 1979 merely says ‘my conversion stems from the beneficial effect on my pupils’ Solon essays caused by reading the Solon chapter’ [i.e. Tony Andrewes’ material, in draft].

Lewis’s own chapter in volume iv is tightly argued and fairly short (16 pp.; contrast the following chapter by Martin Ostwald: 44 pp.); but it packs a lot in and is notable for its attention to religious aspects.⁵⁶ However his contribution did not stop there because his editorial input was considerable: thus he made large-scale but self-effacing improvements in the long opening chapters on the Persian Empire and its neighbours. This was, as I have already noted earlier, even more true of the volumes of which he was senior editor, namely volumes v and vi, covering the post-Persian-Wars fifth century, and the fourth century, respectively. The title ‘senior editor’ is not one which appears on the title pages of the *Cambridge Ancient History* volumes; but for each

⁵⁶ And is duly cited in the notes to the appropriate pages (pp. 86 *et seq.*) of R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (see above, n. 15); see also the preface to that important book.

volume there is a primary organising individual and taker of initiatives, on to whom much of the donkey work falls. Pauline Hire of Cambridge University Press recalls Lewis's initial reluctance to get mixed up with the *Cambridge Ancient History* at the editorial level at all: it was clear to her that his chief reason was that he knew how much work would be involved if he did it properly (and being Lewis, he was not capable of doing anything in any other way). He did the job, he did it properly, and he did it so as to win from the experienced Pauline Hire the description 'my perfect editor'.

Volumes v and vi are, together with *IG* 1³, Lewis's historical memorial. The two volumes were designed as a pair (a conception symbolised by John Boardman's accompanying plates volume, which covers volumes v and vi together). Thus the regional studies in volume vi are intended to cover the fifth century as well as the fourth, and the religious material in volume v draws (as the preface to volume vi points out) on 'later sources'. Lewis himself wrote no fewer than four chapters for volume v, all of them on absolutely central topics in this most central of all the Greek volumes of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. A lifelong interest in historiography generally, and in Thucydides in particular, gives special authority to his elegantly written opening chapter on the written sources (note the suggestive remarks on Thucydidean selectivity at p. 5). As in volume iv, his gift for compression was at a premium (see especially the treatment at pp. 111 *et seq.* of the so-called First Peloponnesian War, a topic which Lewis had handled elsewhere⁵⁷) but the writing is trenchant and authoritative, and there is no crabbedness or obscurity about his meaning. And some of the material, like the account of the run-up to the main Peloponnesian War, is ample and almost leisurely. Some initial reactions to this magnificent volume were oddly negative (I think of Peter Green in the *Times Literary Supplement*), but M. H. Jameson, reviewing the book more judiciously and at the perspective of four years after its appearance,⁵⁸ wrote more cordially and correctly that Lewis's 'sure, subtle and restrained interweaving of the evidence of inscriptions into the narrative of political and military events is one of the major achievements of this book, an achievement in which Peter Rhodes and Davies, scholars who have worked closely with Lewis, also share'. Note the careful and correctly

⁵⁷ In the Festschrift for M. F. McGregor, *Classical Contributions*, ed. G. S. Shrimpton and D. J. McCargar (Locust Valley, NY, 1981), pp. 71–8.

⁵⁸ *Class. Journ.*, xci (1996), 193–6.

balanced emphasis here, on both the individual achievement of Lewis the scholar and on the vicarious achievement of Lewis the teacher and collaborator.

The final, fourth-century, volume vi was published after Lewis's death, but he had by early 1994 corrected proofs of his own chapters and missed seeing a bound copy by only a matter of weeks. Again, the overarching conception was to a great extent Lewis's, and I know of two chapters, ostensibly written entirely by other contributors, which looked very different before Lewis put his editorial hand to them—one indeed he virtually rewrote, the other he annotated creatively. Of his own two chapters, chapter 2 on 'Sparta as Victor' (i.e. on the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War) took him back to 'Sparta and Persia' country, with a bonus in the form of an elegant treatment of the Thirty Tyrants. The other (chapter 5) is on 'Sicily 413–368' and could hardly be more different. It includes the tyranny of Dionysius I and includes sections (see especially pp. 153–6 on the character of the tyranny) written in a racy style next to which, for instance, his own handling of the death of Theramenes in chapter 2, looks abrupt and dead pan. This chapter is, with the possible exception of his *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article on Pericles,⁵⁹ the closest he got to writing in a popular manner and are a complete answer to anyone who ever doubted his ability to write accessibly and for the general reader. For the professional historian the chapter is notable, first for its argument for the postponement of Dionysius' tyrannical ambitions until a point later than that usually assumed, and secondly, for its treatment of the sources of Diodorus' Sicilian narrative for the period, a notoriously tricky question.

By the beginning of the 1990s, when volume v of the *Cambridge Ancient History* appeared, David Lewis was a towering name in classical Greek history locally, nationally, and internationally, especially after the death of Tony Andrewes in June 1990 removed the most obviously distinguished British practitioner of the previous generation. When at just this time Robin Osborne, whose Cambridge thesis Lewis had examined and whom Lewis helped to bring to Oxford, had the inspired idea of a combined celebration to honour Lewis' sixty-fifth birthday and the 2,500th anniversary of democracy as inaugurated by Clisthenes, the response from ex-pupils and colleagues was heartening

⁵⁹ First published in 1974 and still included in the 1992 impression of the 15th ed., at vol. 9, pp. 290 *et seq.*

and massive. The conference was held in July 1993 in Christ Church and became a book, in fact both a Festschrift and a volume of conference proceedings rolled into one. The conference, called 'The History and Archaeology of Athenian Democracy', was internationally attended: seventy-five scholars, and twenty-five contributors—not forgetting David Lewis's wife, his four daughters, and his brother Philip, all of whom attended the dinner which was held on the evening of the penultimate day and at which Lewis himself spoke memorably and wittily in reply to the toast to his health. During the four days of the conference Lewis himself attended all the papers (a packed and punishing schedule) and commented in his acute but benign way after most of them. By the end he seemed pleased, if exhausted.

The early 1990s also saw the culmination, in book form, of another side of his life. This was *The Jews of Oxford* (1992), a history of the Jewish community in Oxford written to commemorate the foundation of the Congregation in 1842. We saw earlier that as an undergraduate he was active in (indeed President of) the university Jewish Society, and in mature life he served the community tirelessly, eventually holding office as Secretary (1969–75) then President (1977–9) of the Congregation. The greatest achievement of this period was the financing and construction in the early 1970s, during Lewis's secretaryship, of the new synagogue building in Nelson Street in the suburb known as Jericho. Lewis was also a trustee of the company formed in 1974 to hold the building, the Oxford Synagogue and Jewish Centre Limited. All this is set out in the latter part of the 1992 book, with modest reticence about the author's own role, and a sprinkling of crisp humour. (Of the first and very famous Danish architect, Lewis comments 'in the spring of 1971, he was dismissed and died, unfortunately in that order'.) The book is an absorbing read throughout, showing on every page that modern social history lost (but perhaps we should say it finally gained) a superb practitioner in Lewis; but for the outsider the most interesting part is surely the account (chapter 7) of the impact of the Second World War and of the evacuation of Jews to Oxford from London and further away, with the tensions thereby caused.

The Jews of Oxford was Lewis's only sustained piece of writing about the modern world since his army education days; but the interest in Jewish history is manifest throughout his career (he chose, after all the title of Professor of *Ancient* History, rather than just Greek history, and by 'ancient' he surely had in mind Jewish as well as Persian). His

bibliography is littered with reviews of Judaica,⁶⁰ including some of the most important works of the period such as the various volumes of Schurer-Vermes-Millar, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. Lewis's most significant contribution in this area, apart from his improvements to the *Cambridge Ancient History* material, is the appendix on the Jewish inscriptions of Egypt at the end of Tcherikower, Fuks, and Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Again, one may note the willingness to let his efforts be absorbed into a book which carried the names of other scholars on its spine; those efforts remain, however, a distinctive and important contribution to the whole work.

During the month after the 1993 conference in his honour, Lewis fell ill after a family holiday in Cornwall and told his friends that he had kidney trouble which would mean shedding some of his organisational load (editorial work on *CAH* vi²; the direction of graduate studies in ancient history, a task he had taken up only recently). By September he knew that he had terminal cancer of the bone-marrow. His courage and calm in the ten months left to him were matched only by those of Barbara, who made sure he was at home as much as was possible, despite the need for regular hospital visits for blood transfusions, tests, and chemotherapy. Even the dialysis was done at home for a long period, in the room which had been planned as the study for his retirement. Miraculously, he continued to work, first on annotating his *Selected Papers* for Cambridge University Press, and then on Persian material (though he also managed to catalogue some of his father's collections of children's books). The most astonishing achievement of this period was the very successful course of lectures he gave in the spring term of 1994 (see p. 570, above). But he also took very seriously his role as an elector to the Lincoln Chair of Classical Archaeology and visited the Ashmolean Library to read work by candidates. This all took some organisation on his part and on Barbara's: the dialysis had to be performed every few hours so he could not be far from base (they did, however, manage a family visit to London). It was beneficial that he had for many years kept up to date with computer technology;⁶¹ he was, for instance, using e-mail before most of us knew what that expression meant. This enabled him simply

⁶⁰ Not just reviews: see 'The First Greek Jew', *Journal of Semitic Studies*, ii (1957), 264 *et seq.*

⁶¹ See the preface to *IG* 1³, fascicle 2. Early in the history of serious computer use in Oxford, he was active in promoting computer facilities for arts subjects both in his college and in the university.

to bring his machine home from Christ Church and work from there. Although with characteristic detachment, and need to understand, he made himself an expert on the disease which was destroying him, he often got bored with thinking about it all and naturally expected amusement and information from visitors. I recall going into the garden as late as June of 1994 and (after the shortest possible social preliminaries) being interrogated about what I thought of Harold Mattingly's new argument for a late date for the Coinage Decree, just published in *Klio*. He pretended to be incredulous and shocked that I did not know about it; I think he was really rather pleased to be, where he always had been, a jump ahead. Incidentally, those who assume that a scholarly position once taken up can and should never be abandoned may like to know that he was intrigued and attracted by the new argument for the late dating, though it went against much that he had written.⁶² Similarly, his view about the radical down-dating, by techniques of laser enhancement, of the Athenian alliance with Egesta in Sicily (Meiggs and Lewis, no. 37) was not hostile but open-minded: it did after all involve the application of new technology, and this as we have seen is something which never ceased to excite and fascinate him. What he felt about *that* particular breakthrough by Mortimer Chambers and his collaborators was that good scientific method demanded the wider application of the technique, on less controversial readings.⁶³

When liver complications set in (June 1994) he went downhill very fast and died on 12 July. He was buried two days later in the Jewish section of the Wolvercote cemetery, and in November of that year a memorial service was held in the synagogue he had done so much to bring into existence. A David Lewis Memorial Lecture, endowed by private subscriptions topping up an initial gift from his brother Philip, is to be held annually in Oxford.

David Lewis's gifts were those of kindness and of illumination, of charity and clarity; I am tempted to add, Lewis-fashion, 'in that order', but I am not really sure which is the right order. His published work is voluminous and stands at the highest possible level of scholarly

⁶² But note already 'The Athenian Coinage Decree' in I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 53–71 at p. 53: 'I detect a suggestion that they [the organisers] hope for some degree of confrontation and that Lewis in 1986 is expected to hold the same views as Lewis in 1969. I shall say at once that I have no confidence that I know the truth about the problems . . . '.

⁶³ See *CR*, xliii (1993), 461. On the personal side, Mortimer Chambers recalls that when he sent Lewis an offprint of the relevant article, he received in return a postcard with the one word: 'Brooding'.

achievement; in a specialised and technical age he was a supremely accomplished specialist and technician, with a matchless eye for detail; but he never forgot the unity of the ancient world and wandered cheerfully across the borders of the constituent disciplines of his subject;⁶⁴ and his own historical reading, *outside* what on the most hospitable definition could have been called his subject, was wide and more than just a relaxation. On the contrary he put it to occasional but lively and illuminating use (witness the last few pages of *Sparta and Persia* where we are suddenly in the 1920s and the world of Curzon and the Treaty of Lausanne). Finally, the Greeks Lewis studied were real people whose ways of thinking could be illuminated by reference to our own, even when the issues involved were complex and arcane.⁶⁵ All this amounts to a distinctive and supremely able and variously talented academic personality.

But his real legacy to his many pupils and admirers is a peculiarly rich and generous scholarly method. He could see combinations, between old evidence and new, faster than anyone; his immediate second thought was to share his first thought. Particular examples of this will long continue to abound in the scholarly literature and in the published and unpublished work of his pupils. (Who but David Lewis could have dared to suggest that the Kallimachos, with no ethnic or other identifying feature, who features in a third-century Athenian list of donors, might be the famous poet?⁶⁶) But even when all Lewis's own ideas, floated so prodigally, have got into print, the method, and the example, and the memory of the kindness and generosity, will survive. He died far too young; but we have vast amounts to be grateful for.

SIMON HORNBLOWER

Oriel College, Oxford

⁶⁴ I hope enough evidence of this has already been given; but for a choice final example see the suggestion at *Sparta and Persia*, p. 21 about the significance of the Aristophanic name Paphlagon. A year later (*CR*, xxxiii (1983), 175, reviewing A. Sommerstein's edition of the *Knights*, which missed this suggestion) Lewis ruefully remarked 'it serves me right for putting Aristophanica in a historical work'.

⁶⁵ See p. 196 of his 'The Athenian Rationes Centesimalum' in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre* (Paris, 1973) for an amusing parallel between some oddities of Athenian prices and what went on at Athenian furniture auctions in post-war England.

⁶⁶ This suggestion is to be found, with acknowledgment, in the D.Phil. thesis of one of Lewis's last graduate pupils, Graham Oliver, a study of the politics and grain supply of Hellenistic Athens. The inscription is *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, xxxii (1982), 118, col. 1, l. 70. Curiously, the review by Alan Griffiths of Alan Cameron's *Callimachus and his Critics* (1995), in the *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 April 1996, quotes Cameron as saying, that 'maybe the [Athenian] inscription honouring the poet with proxeny and citizenship . . . will turn up'.

Note. Sources, in addition to those specifically cited: a memoir by Lewis himself about his early years, compiled for the Academy; letters from and/or conversations with, the following: Mrs Barbara Lewis (who also supplied correspondence from various phases of her husband's life); John Boardman; Peter Brunt; Mortimer Chambers; Anna Morpurgo Davies; Pauline Hire; Michael Jameson; Richard Jenkyns; Oswyn Murray; Hilary O'Shea; Toni Raubitschek; Peter Rhodes; Richard Rutherford; and Homer Thompson. A draft of this memoir was commented on and improved by Richard Rutherford, Peter Rhodes, and Barbara Lewis, to all of whom I am grateful. For other sorts of help I am indebted to Jasper Griffin. The photograph was kindly made available by Richard Rutherford, Christ Church, Oxford.