

*DOCEAT MORTVVS VIVOS:*  
IN QUEST OF ULRICH VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF

Questions are posed for the understanding of Wilamowitz. The sources for a biography are discussed: the Family Chronicle, family memoirs, autobiographies, interviews, eyewitness accounts. There is especial emphasis on the challenge of using scholarly works as autobiographical documents and on the letters, the bones of any biography. Wilamowitz is estimated to have written *ca.* 67000 letters in his lifetime. Some 4000 (plus some 2000 to him) survive. Finally certain problems in Wilamowitz' life are discussed in the light of the new material.

1. Introduction

The classical scholar fundamentally is interpreter but not of the words alone. These he will never fully understand if he does not understand the mind<sup>1</sup> from which they come. He must also be the interpreter of this mind. Biography then which is wholly based on interpretations is essentially the work of a philologist, only raised to a higher power. His task turns out after all to be no more than understanding an author's development, intention, thought, and influence.<sup>2</sup>

Wilamowitz thus justified the method and intent of his *Platon*, the book which, Werner Jaeger said<sup>3</sup>, restored the man Plato to the world. His words are the program for my investigation into his own

<sup>1</sup> The German is *Seele*. Not English *soul*, as H. Cherniss, *Selected Papers*, Leiden 1977, p. 5, translates. Manfred Landfester, «Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff und die hermeneutische Tradition [sic] des 19. Jahrhunderts», *apud Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert: Zur Geschichte und Methodologie der Geisteswissenschaften*, edd. Hellmut Flashar, Karlfried Gründer, Axel Horstmann, Göttingen 1979, pp. 170-171, has first drawn attention to the immense importance of this word to Wilamowitz' hermeneutic. I have learned much from the article but it propagates grievous misconceptions. August Böckh (p. 164) exercised no formative influence on Wilamowitz. F. G. Welcker (unmentioned) was the model for the *Totalitätsideal*. And not F. A. Wolf, of whom Wilamowitz thought little, but Julius Wellhausen, decisively influenced his Homeric analysis: see CW 74, 1980-1981, pp. 33-34.

<sup>2</sup> Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon* I, Berlin 1920, p. 4. Why this edition was secretly dedicated to Friedrich Nietzsche I discuss in *Nietzsche Studien* 11, 1982.

<sup>3</sup> HSCP 82, 1978, p. 326.

life. I own some 72 volumes by Wilamowitz. Each of these volumes has continued to exert an incalculable influence on subsequent scholarship. May we not say that Wilamowitz has created the conception of Hellenism that has dominated German, if not European, scholarly thought for some 75 years? It is a central task of the history of classical scholarship, one may even say a central task of *Rezeptionsgeschichte*, of which *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* is a fundamental part, «to interpret the interpreter», as Professor Momigliano has recently urged us<sup>4</sup>. The task is daunting. «One could not see through him, as one could with Mommsen. There were cracks and mist there.» So wrote Eduard Schwartz, who knew him long and well<sup>5</sup>.

Am 22sten December 1848 bin ich, Ulrich Friedrich Wichard von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff<sup>6</sup> geboren, und zwar Mittags Schlag zwölf, und das eines Freitags, so dass ich Geister sehen kann<sup>7</sup>, was mir freilich bisher noch nicht passiert ist.<sup>8</sup>

In 1867, in an ironic imitation of the opening of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Ulrich, aged 18, thus began his autobiography. I do not intend to continue it with a summary of events and dates, of books, and academic posts, most of which you could glean from the *Erinnerungen* or elsewhere. I wish fifty years after his death to direct attention to certain specific questions, albeit biographical ones, for which he did not give us answers but rather concealed answers and to say a word of the present state of research in the subject<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> A. Momigliano, «Premesse per una Discussione su Wilamowitz», *AnnPisa* 3, 3, 1, 1973, p. 117: «Ma l'opere di Wilamowitz offre un compito più immediato, lungo e difficile, di interpretare l'interprete Wilamowitz».

<sup>5</sup> *Quaderni di storia* 7, 1978, p. 211. Friedrich Solmsen's assertion at *GRBS* 20, 1979, p. 103 that he was «basically uncomplicated» has nothing to do with fact. It is the nostalgic recollection of an adoring student almost sixty years younger than his master.

<sup>6</sup> I have never seen *Emmo* attested in Wilamowitz' hand. Konrad von Krosigk brilliantly suggests an attempt at a masculine parallel to Emma. For Emma von Schwanenfeld (ca. 1800-1876) and Ulrich see my «The Riddle of Wilamowitz' *Phaidrabild*», *GRBS* 20, 1979, pp. 219-236.

<sup>7</sup> Because the hour of Pan: see *GRBS* 12, 1971, p. 564, n. 11.

<sup>8</sup> See «Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: An Unpublished Autobiography», *GRBS* 12, 1971, pp. 561-577 and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *In wie weit befriedigen die Schlüsse der erhaltenen griechischen Trauerspiele?: Ein ästhetischer Versuch*, ed. William M. Calder III, Leiden 1974, pp. 17-26.

<sup>9</sup> I have noticed little on how one writes a biography: see Michael Holroyd, «The Slow Progress of a Biographer», *Unreceived Opinions*, Penguin 1976, pp. 27-41 and especially Jeffrey Meyers, «The Quest for Katherine Mansfield», *Biography* 1, 1978, pp. 51-64.



With intellectuals the inner experiences are infinitely more important and I suppose with an individual the most remarkable is not at all the finished product but how he got there.<sup>10</sup>

Why did Wilamowitz desert his past and become a scholar? What persons influenced him? When was the decision made? Are there ways in which Wilamowitz' personal life distorted his scholarship? Professor Luciano Canfora of Bari has recently written two lively books concerned with the politics of Wilamowitz<sup>11</sup>, a patriot and, like Mommsen<sup>12</sup>, a monarchist. Are there places where his politics have intruded into his scholarship or indeed have perverted it?<sup>13</sup> One of the pleasures of studying Wilamowitz' life is that one meets so many captivating figures who cross his path. Among his teachers one finds Otto Jahn, the daemonic Anton Springer<sup>14</sup>, and his later father-in-law, Theodor Mommsen<sup>15</sup>. There are his scholarly friends: Hermann Diels, Georg Kaibel, Friedrich Leo<sup>16</sup>, Eduard Norden, Otto Lüders, Carl Robert, Eduard Schwartz, and «the farmer boy», Julius Wellhausen. There are two women, his mother and his aunt, Emma von Schwanefeld. Friedrich Wolters in Wilamowitz' lifetime protested shrilly that he had befouled (*angemistet*) every German genius of his time<sup>17</sup>. He means Wagner, Nietzsche, and George. He might have added Thomas Mann<sup>18</sup>. Is there truth in this disgusting slander? Finally there are

<sup>10</sup> Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*, Berlin 1910, p. 18 (of Euripides). Jørgen Mejer first drew my attention to the autobiographical importance of the remark.

<sup>11</sup> Luciano Canfora, *Cultura classica e crisi tedesca: Gli scritti politici di Wilamowitz 1914-1931*, Bari 1977, with the review of W. Buchwald, *Gnomon* 51, 1979, pp. 780-782, and *Intelletuali in Germania*, Bari 1979.

<sup>12</sup> See W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, Oxford 1920, p. 264, n. 1 (after Harnack).

<sup>13</sup> Professor Canfora will address the International Wilamowitz Symposium at Bad Homburg on just this subject in September 1981.

<sup>14</sup> See Herbert von Einem, *apud 150 Jahre Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn 1818-1968: Bonner Gelehrte Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften*, Bonn 1968, pp. 413-417 with portrait facing 424 and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen 1848-1914*, Leipzig 1929, pp. 95-96.

<sup>15</sup> See especially Friedrich und Dorothea Hiller von Gaertringen, *Mommsen und Wilamowitz: Briefwechsel 1872-1903*, Berlin 1935, with Werner Jaeger, *Scripta Minora* 2, Rome 1960, pp. 137-147 and *HSCP* 82, 1978, p. 320.

<sup>16</sup> See my contribution to *Festschrift Irmscher* forthcoming.

<sup>17</sup> Friedrich Wolters, *Stefan George und die Blätter für die Kunst: Deutsche Geistesgeschichte seit 1890*, Berlin 1930, p. 183. I owe the reference to Ulrich K. Goldsmith.

<sup>18</sup> Material collected at *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 281, n. 32.

Wilamowitz' seven great Berlin students: Eduard Fraenkel, Paul Friedländer, Felix Jacoby, Werner Jaeger, Paul Maas, Karl Reinhardt, and Wolfgang Schadewaldt. They were all brilliant men of independent judgment. They created a new philology. Yet they never could escape him. Maas<sup>19</sup>, Ed. Fraenkel, and Jacoby never tried. Schadewaldt never really tried<sup>20</sup>. Jaeger and Reinhardt in quite different ways almost succeeded. Paul Friedländer, closest of them all, in a tragic struggle sought to free himself from Wilamowitz, failed, and was broken.

## 2. Sources

Since I began to devote scholarly attention to Wilamowitz ten years ago a considerable amount of new evidence has accumulated. I have visited and photographed all the places important to his life. I have interviewed and taped relatives and surviving students. I have begged people who knew him to write for me their recollections. Friedrich Solmsen has recently published his<sup>21</sup>. Others will be published. Others are being written. I have recently published the *Chronik der Familie des Freiherrn von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff*<sup>22</sup>. Discovered in West Berlin, the chronicle preserves information about the family of considerable importance and elsewhere unattested. The discovery of the unpublished memoirs of his aunt, Emma von Schwanefeld, has made of his ancestors individuals rather than names<sup>23</sup>. Wilamowitz' own *Erinnerungen* are, next to letters, the most revealing source. There is an expected vagueness in absolute dating. Much is omitted. Wilamowitz told his family that he could not write the full truth of Mommsen, because the latter's children still lived. They end at 1914. There is almost nothing on his students. We know the care he gave their composition. They are based on contemporary letters and an unfailing

<sup>19</sup> Wilamowitz in an unpublished letter of 14 April 1919 to Eduard Norden writes: «Ich würde am liebsten Maas als Byzantinisten zum a. o. Prof. hier oder sonst wo befördern. Als Philologe hat er keine Aussicht, ist auch bei allem Scharfsinn zu enger Emendator».

<sup>20</sup> For Schadewaldt and Wilamowitz see «Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Wolfgang Schadewaldt on the Classic», *GRBS* 16, 1975, pp. 451-457.

<sup>21</sup> Friedrich Solmsen, «Wilamowitz in his Last Ten Years», *GRBS* 20, 1979, pp. 89-122 with my «The Berlin Graeca: a Further Note», *GRBS* 20, 1979, pp. 393-397 and his reply *ibid.*, pp. 398-400.

<sup>22</sup> *Quaderni di storia* 10, 1979, pp. 197-223.

<sup>23</sup> Parts are cited in Fanny Gräfin von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen und Begegnungen*, Berlin 1936, p. 62 ff.



memory. I have found only one factual error in the book. The death of Paul de Lagarde is wrongly dated <sup>24</sup>. Throughout Wilamowitz' honesty and accuracy are beyond praise. One need only compare the fraudulent memoirs and diaries of Heinrich Schliemann <sup>25</sup>, a man whom Wilamowitz detested <sup>26</sup>. Five other briefer autobiographies have survived of varying importance <sup>27</sup>.

Interviews and eyewitness accounts must all be treated critically and wherever possible controlled by contemporary documents. Memory is fallible. There is the tendency to embroider truth <sup>28</sup> and to make gods in our own image. There is also a delusion abroad, odd among scholars, that one who knew him, however slightly, knows him better than one who has studied him. Remarks in the letters and memoirs of contemporaries are difficult to assemble. Men as different as Ortega y Gasset, Gerhart Hauptmann, Friedrich Meinecke, Max Weber, not to speak of the George Circle, the Nietzsche Circle, and Albert Einstein, had something to say of Wilamowitz. Hostile accounts are often the most revealing. But a fundamental difficulty is unavoidable. Only a classical philologist can write a life of the greatest classical philologist; and a philologist is not an historian of nineteenth century German thought. But we are blessed with interested coöperative relatives, unconcerned with censorship. The curse of Nietzsche biographers, the *Schwesterquelle*, lacks.

Wilamowitz thought little of the adoring biographer of his two friends, Hermann Diels and Carl Robert <sup>29</sup>. Otto Kern's Orphic work was rubbish <sup>30</sup>. As an editor of scholarly letters he lacked judg-

<sup>24</sup> To 1890 rather than 1891 at *Erinnerungen*, p. 230, and to 1900 at *My Recollections*, p. 277.

<sup>25</sup> See *GRBS* 13, 1972, pp. 335-353 and Wolfgang Schindler, *Philologus* 120, 1976, pp. 271-289.

<sup>26</sup> See my «Wilamowitz on Schliemann», *Philologus* 124, 1980, pp. 145-151.

<sup>27</sup> See *supra*, n. 8; Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Observationes Criticae in Comediam Graecam Selectae*, Diss. Berlin 1870, p. 58; *Ecce der Landesschule zur Pforte*, Naumburg 1931, p. 8; *de praeceptoribus meis*, *AuA* 27, 1981.

<sup>28</sup> E. g., Friedrich Solmsen at *GRBS* 20, 1979, pp. 97-98, alleges that the Italian government arranged that a submarine take Wilamowitz from Cyrene to Trieste. In a letter of 3 January 1927 to Ed. Norden Wilamowitz writes: «Von Kyrene sag' ich nur, dass die Italiener mich verwöhnt und alles unübertrefflich gemacht haben. In einem Torpedoboot bin ich von Hafen Kyrenes bis Tolmetta-Ptolemais gefahren, bei ruhiger See, sonst wär's übel gewesen.»

<sup>29</sup> Otto Kern (1863-1942): see Friedrich Hiller von Gærtringen, *Gnomon* 18, 1942, pp. 124-125.

<sup>30</sup> *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 292 with n. 101.

ment<sup>31</sup>. The family rightly did not encourage the publication of Kern's *Wilamowitz*. It was not worthy its subject. But the unfinished MS survives and is valuable for facts otherwise unknowable. Wilamowitz' working copies of the chief Greek authors (some Latin, e. g., Catullus) have miraculously survived. It is hoped that a catalogue will soon appear. His extensive marginalia will be of immense value to editors.

Certain of Wilamowitz' scholarly books are biographical sources of importance. I do not mean the autobiographical reminiscence, so familiar to his readers<sup>32</sup>. Clearly they must be sifted out. But Wilamowitz drew a distinction between what we may best call *Pflichtarbeiten*, the editing of texts, papyri, and inscriptions, the reviewing of new secondary literature, and those profoundly personal interpretative works into which he chose to pour his own blood. Might we call them *Neigungsarbeiten*? Wilamowitz formulated this distinction in a letter of 16 May 1903 to Eduard Norden:

Entweder sind unsere Büche etwas fremdes, an dem wir arbeiten, wie eine Edition, oder sie sind Kinder: die kann man nicht noch einmal machen, die sind Fleisch von unserm Fleisch. Die leben aber, wenn sie geboren sind, ihr eigenes Leben.

M. Isnardi Parente briefly drew attention to parallels between *Erinnerungen* and *Platon*, which can only be understood when read as a crypto-autobiography<sup>33</sup>. I have argued that the figure behind Wilamowitz' *Phaidrabild* is not Hedda Gabler but his aunt, Emma von Schwandenfeld; and, that in his youthful period, he saw himself as Hippolytus<sup>34</sup>. *Herakles* reflects the middle period. B. L. Gildersleeve with a flash of insight saw what would draw Wilamowitz to Pindar: «another requisite for the understanding of Pindar is the experience of a losing

<sup>31</sup> Wilamowitz to Ed. Norden in a letter of 2 July 1908 on Kern's edition of K. O. Müller's *Familienbriefe*: «Aber der Familienklatsch durfte nicht gedruckt werden. Die Impotenz des Editors stinkt zum Himmel»; cf. *DLZ* 29, 1908, 3077-3080.

<sup>32</sup> E. gg., *Platon* I<sub>2</sub>, Berlin 1920, p. 758 = I<sub>3</sub>, Berlin 1959, pp. 602-603 (on first reading *Pl. Smp* at Schulpforte); *Euripides Hippolytos: Griechisch und Deutsch*, Berlin 1891, p. 54, n. 1 (on reading his translation of *Hippolytus* to his aunt); *Herakles* III<sub>3</sub>, p. 147, n. 1 (chatting with Bernays). There are countless others.

<sup>33</sup> M. Isnardi Parenti, *AnnPisa* 3, 3, 1, 1973, pp. 153-154.

<sup>34</sup> «The Riddle of Wilamowitz' *Phaidrabild*», *GRBS* 20, 1979. Attention may be drawn to Landfester's remark *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1), p. 176 that Wilamowitz interpreted «eine Gestalt aus der Tragödie und Komödie» as he did an historical figure. That he saw his aunt as Phaedra simply confirms this insight.



side»<sup>35</sup>. There is as well the negative clue, the disgust he feels toward Demosthenes<sup>36</sup>.

But a biography rests on letters. One cannot write the life of a man who uses telephones. It has been estimated that Thomas Mann wrote between 12000 and 15000 letters in his lifetime. Some 3200 survive in the Zürich archives. I do not think it unreasonable to assume that Wilamowitz wrote three letters/postcards a day after his return from the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. That gives us 65700 for the last sixty years of his life. If we add 1300 for the period 1858 (earliest preserved letter) to 1871, we may estimate that in his lifetime he wrote *ca.* 67000 letters. Today I have the texts of some 4000. Some 2000 letters to Wilamowitz also survive. These are largely from correspondents whose names begin with the letters A through N. Wilamowitz' heirs arranged alphabetically by correspondent and chronologically within each correspondent's letters all those letters surviving in 1931. Wilamowitz regularly dated his letters but allowed postcards to be dated by cancellation. The Berlin archive contained a number of these letters by Wilamowitz that had been returned to him or his heirs by survivors of their receiver. All were stored in the cellar of Eichenallee 12, Charlottenburg. An American bomb severely damaged the house in 1944 rendering it uninhabitable. In 1945/46 neighbors broke into the cellar (itself undamaged) and began to use the packets of filed letters as fuel. They had worked from Z to N before they were stopped<sup>37</sup>. Some 4000 letters may have been lost. The greatest loss was the correspondence with Julius Wellhausen<sup>38</sup>, the close friend and colleague at Greifswald and Göttingen<sup>39</sup>, whose work on the dating of the Pentateuch deeply influenced Wilamowitz' analytical study of the Homeric poems. He dedicated *Homerische Untersuchungen* to Wellhausen on his fortieth birthday<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> B. L. Gildersleeve, *AJP* 34, 1913, p. 110.

<sup>36</sup> See my «Wilamowitz on Demosthenes», *CW* 72, 1978-1979, pp. 239-240.

<sup>37</sup> I have learned this from Schwester Hildegard von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

<sup>38</sup> Thus Schwester Hildegard. Ernst Bammel, «Judentum, Christentum und Heidentum: Julius Wellhausens Briefe an Theodor Mommsen 1881-1902», *ZKG* 80, 1969, p. 221, n. 3 alleges: «Wellhausens Briefe an Wilamowitz sind während des letzten Krieges verbrannt». This is not compatible with Schwester Hildegard's recollection. Whether Wilamowitz' letters to Wellhausen were stored at Eichenallee 12 I do not know yet.

<sup>39</sup> For the biographical material on Wellhausen see Fausto Parente, *AnnPisa* 3, 19, 3, 1979, p. 1060, n. 35.

<sup>40</sup> Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, «Homerische Untersuchungen», *Philologische Untersuchungen* 7, Berlin 1884, p. v: «Göttingen, 17. Mai 1884». The whole preface rewards scrutiny.

Because the more famous Wilamowitz became, the less apt people were to discard his letters, our documentation for the Berlin years (1897-1931) far exceeds that of the earlier period. But three large groups of letters from the early period have survived. Contrast the pitiful handful of letters by A. E. Housman before the London professorship. One may also recall that from the lifetime of Erwin Rohde (1845-1898), the friend of Nietzsche, only some 800 letters and postcards survive<sup>41</sup>. There are 582 letters largely between Wilamowitz and his mother (1851-1874). They have survived in two typescripts, one more comprehensive than the other but both containing letters the other lacks. They were prepared by Wilamowitz' children at his request to aid composition of the *Erinnerungen* in 1927/28. At this time he burned some 150 of his letters to his mother<sup>42</sup>. He seems to have censored several of those by his mother. The originals were destroyed in the sack of Markowitz by the Poles in August 1939<sup>43</sup>. 444 letters between Mommsen and Wilamowitz (1872-1903) survive published by Friedrich and Dorothea Hiller von Gaertringen partially censored in 1935<sup>44</sup>. The originals are lost. Over 1000 letters to and from Georg Kaibel survive from the period 1873-1901. They are the nearest we have to a diary but for several reasons are often indecipherable. Many are in pencil and they are bound in a way that makes duplication difficult. Among smaller collections from the early years attention should be drawn to the Bormann<sup>45</sup> and Max Fraenkel<sup>46</sup> letters.

Three other large later groups survive: 1. 329 letters to his son-in-law, the epigraphist, Hiller von Gaertringen (1886-1909); 2. 289 letters to Eduard Norden (1900-1931); 3. the letters to and from his Danish friends, especially A. B. Drachmann and J. L. Heiberg, some 300 letters (1892-1931), of especial value because most of both sides of the corres-

<sup>41</sup> See Hedwig Däubler, «Friedrich Nietzsche und Erwin Rohde mit bisher ungedruckten Briefen», *Nietzsche-Studien* 5, 1976, p. 322.

<sup>42</sup> See *Trauerspiele* (*supra*, n. 8), p. 4 with n. 22.

<sup>43</sup> See *Quaderni di storia* 10, 1979, p. 220: «Eine poln. Bande ermordet sämtliche dort wohnenden Deutschen und legt Feuer an das Schloss, das mit all seinen Erinnerungsstücken, den wertvollen Bildern, der Bibliothek ein Raub der Flammen wird. Nur wenige Gegenstände werden gerettet.»

<sup>44</sup> See n. 15, *supra*. Ernst Bammel, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 38), p. 221, n. 4 *et passim* consistently cites Eduard Schwartz as editor. He merely wrote the preface.

<sup>45</sup> See «Three Unpublished Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf», *GRBS* 11, 1970, pp. 139-166. The accidental purchase of these letters at a West German auction stimulated my concern with Wilamowitz.

<sup>46</sup> The father of Hermann Fränkel, who on his deathbed at Santa Cruz in 1976 entrusted the letters to me. With Richard Kannicht I hope to publish them.



pondence survives. The Drachmann Family Archives have also yielded a group of letters from Marie to Frau Drachmann and a valuable small collection of A. B. Drachmann to his wife, written while guest at Eichenallée 12 for the Historical Congress of 1908. In these letters we experience the beginning of Tycho's great Sophocles book. Among large collections, known to have existed but now lost, I still hope to find the letters to Johannes Geffcken, Friedrich Leo, Carl Robert, and Eduard Schwartz. Several smaller collections have been edited of considerable biographical, historical, and philological interest. I note the letters to Ed. Fitch, Ed. Fraenkel, Sir James George Frazer, Adolf von Harnack, Werner Jaeger. Hans Lietzmann, James Loeb, Wolfgang Schadewaldt, Julius Stenzel, Hermann Usener, Sir Herbert Warren, Georg Wissowa, and Eduard Zeller. The letters of Jacob Bernays and August Nauck to Wilamowitz have also been published. Numerous other smaller collections, often of considerable interest, await publication.

Though rewarding the editing of the letters is for two reasons a difficult and time consuming task. Dr. Wolfgang Mommsen, the grandson of Theodor and nephew of Ulrich, retired President of the Bundesarchiv, has written me: «Ich brauche Ihnen nicht zu sagen, dass die Hand von Wilamowitz eine der schwierigsten Gelehrtenhände ist, die der Archivar kennt». Not until June 1898 did Wilamowitz receive a typewriter (an American one that typed Roman and Greek letters), a typewriter which, A. B. Drachmann said, «never learned to spell». When writing foreigners he regularly used the typewriter. Secondly, today the letters require extensive commentary if they are to be understood even by highly educated readers. Not only is the *Inhalt* often obscure; but even cultivated native speakers disagree on the meaning of the language<sup>47</sup>, not to speak of tone or nuance<sup>48</sup>.

What are we learning from this vast material that was not known before from the *Erinnerungen* or the published philological work? With exceptions the letters fall into three groups. The largest is Wilamowitz' responses to the receipt of books or offprints. Scholars throughout the world<sup>49</sup> mailed their writings to him, in part to honor him and greedy also for a word of praise. The more Wilamowitz approved a book, the

<sup>47</sup> Are there two Germans who agree on the translation of Wilamowitz' judgment of Leo: «Das schwere Stück Selbsterziehung, das er geleistet hat, rechtfertigt die Erstarrung seines endlichen Wesens»? See *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 282 with n. 36.

<sup>48</sup> Irony and parody are regularly attributed to arrogance.

<sup>49</sup> E. g., Sir James George Frazer put Wilamowitz at the top of a list of those to whom his publishers, MacMillan, were to send complimentary copies of his works: *PCPS* NS 24, 1978, p. 31.

more detailed his reply. Beware the brief acknowledgement! <sup>50</sup> A reply may become a review of the book, the case with Ed. Fraenkel's *Iktus und Akzent* <sup>51</sup>. Theodor Gomperz and Ed. Norden received letters containing the kernel of articles that would forever influence subsequent scholarly opinion on the matter <sup>52</sup>. Often Wilamowitz' reply is of far greater interest than the modest offprint that elicited it: *e.g.*, his letters on Apollonius Rhodius to his only American student, Edward Fitch <sup>53</sup>. The next group are letters that deal with scholars, either letters of recommendation <sup>54</sup>, answers to queries for candidates to fill vacant chairs <sup>55</sup>, or evaluations of the recently deceased <sup>56</sup>. Wilamowitz' former students regularly turned to him for advice but others too consulted the Berlin oracle. Wilamowitz only gave advice when asked <sup>57</sup>. His brilliant aphoristic characterisations and his fearless honesty make these documents of greatest interest for *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Only the letters of Ed. Schwartz, himself profoundly influenced by Wilamowitz, are comparable. One hears the authoritative voice of the aristocrat, neither a pastor's nor a schoolteacher's son <sup>58</sup>. Finally there are letters that are *réportage*. These include most of the *Familienbriefe*, many of the letters to Kaibel, a good number of those to Drachmann. From them we learn his views of political and cultural events, impressions of visits abroad, the decline of philology in Holland or the Germanic culture of Vienna.

<sup>50</sup> An instructive example: *Philologus* 122, 1978, pp. 300-301.

<sup>51</sup> *HSCP* 81, 1977, pp. 285-287.

<sup>52</sup> Compare *Philologus* 122, 1978, pp. 296-298 with *KS* 2, pp. 30-47. A long reply to *Antike Kunstprosa* (1898) became «Asianismus und Atticismus», *Hermes* 35, 1900, pp. 1-52 = *KS* 3, pp. 223-273.

<sup>53</sup> *HSCP* 83, 1979.

<sup>54</sup> *E. gg.*, Wilamowitz recommends Edward Fitch to the American School of Classical Studies in Athens: *HSCP* 83, 1979; or in an unpublished letter of 7 May 1903 Felix Jacoby to Eduard Norden as habilitand in Breslau.

<sup>55</sup> *E. gg.*, *HSCP* 81, 1977, pp. 291-294, a splendid example that reveals the «Souveränität seines Geistes». In an unpublished letter of 15 June 1920 Georg Busolt invites Wilamowitz' views of Kornemann, Kolbe, W. Weber, W. Otto, and Gelzer, as his successor. A number of letters that I shall publish to A. Körte concern appointments.

<sup>56</sup> *E. gg.*, *HSCP* 81, 1977, pp. 281-282 on Friedrich Leo and *Philologus* 122, 1978, pp. 293-296 on Jacob Bernays.

<sup>57</sup> Friedrich Solmsen's recollections at *GRBS* 20, 1979, pp. 100-101 generally agree with contemporary letters, although Wilamowitz' view of Paul Maas (*supra*, n. 19) was more critical than Solmsen admits.

<sup>58</sup> See Ed. Fraenkel's splendid characterization in his letter of 9 August 1968 to Dorothea Freifrau Hiller von Gaertringen at *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 295 (especially his «unabhängiger Herrentum»).



A practical hint. I have always detested filecards, which, for me, deaden any subject. But one cannot remember the dates and contents of over 6000 letters. A cardfile with a card for each month of Wilamowitz' life was the only solution. Every dated document and event has been entered at its day (month or year if only that is known). This eases the editing of new letters by making contemporary documentation instantly available. Bibliographical references are included for published material. Unpublished letters have been arranged alphabetically and within each collection chronologically. Transcriptions or summaries are regularly attached to photocopies of the originals. Once I publish a letter I donate the original if mine to the Göttingen library. I agree with Agrippa (Plin. *HN* XXXV 26) that private collections are to be discouraged.

### 3. *Problemas*

Karl Reinhardt called the Schulpforte years (1862-1867) «a religious experience» for Wilamowitz<sup>59</sup>. His instinct was correct. «Quo felicius evenire mihi non poterat» wrote Ulrich in 1870 of his time there<sup>60</sup>. The letters have immensely deepened our awareness of the complexity of that formative experience. We know that a house tutor, one Herr Pickert, convinced Ulrich's mother to send him to the Pforte rather than the military academy at Brandenburg. He lived as *extraneus* (dayboy) at the home of the Rector Portensis Karl Ludwig Peter. This lessened the cost considerably and convinced his thrifty, banausic father, Arnold, to send him. In September 1862 some sort of crisis occurred at school<sup>61</sup>. Ulrich may have been smoking and was betrayed by another boy. An humiliating public punishment followed. Ulrich wished to leave school but was convinced by his mother not to. His reaction was further withdrawal. He made no friend among the boys but de-

<sup>59</sup> Karl Reinhardt, *apud* Hermann Heimpel, Theodor Heuss, and Benno Reifenberg, *Die Grossen Deutschen* 5, Berlin 1957, p. 416 = *Vermächtnis der Antike: Gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. Carl Becker, Göttingen 1960, p. 362. For Schulpforte at the time see R. Bohley, «Über die Landesschule zur Pforte: Materialien aus der Schulzeit Nietzsches», *Nietzsche Studien* 5, 1976, pp. 298-320 and S. L. Gilman, «Pforta [sic] zur Zeit Nietzsches», *Nietzsche Studien* 8, 1979, pp. 398-426.

<sup>60</sup> Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Observationes criticae in Comoediam Graecam*, Diss. Berlin 1870, p. 58. He dedicated the dissertation to Rector Peter not *parentibus optimis*, an untruth.

<sup>61</sup> For details see *Trauerspiele* (*supra*, n. 8), pp. 1-15.

terminated to prove all those who had criticized him wrong by becoming the best student of his time at Schulpforte. His only rival was a schoolboy, a poor, fatherless, pastor's son, three years ahead of him <sup>62</sup>, Friedrich Nietzsche. I shall examine elsewhere this famous quarrel that ended in Wilamowitz' two polemical pamphlets against *Die Geburt der Tragödie*, written in 1872 <sup>63</sup>. Suffice it to say that it began as a schoolboy's jealousy of a rival too much admired by the adored rector Peter. We have two remarkable letters written by Wilamowitz to Peter from Markowitz, the family estate in Posen <sup>64</sup>, as he worked without books upon his review *Zukunftsphilologie*. The title, a parody of Wagner's *Zukunftsmusik*, enraged Nietzsche, who himself some years later borrowed Wilamowitz' tactic to give to a famous work another parodied title: *Götterdämmerung*. This attack, forgotten by philologists, has had a devastating effect on lay opinion of Wilamowitz. In an arrogant, utterly unfair dismissal of Wilamowitz, Thomas Mann declared that since his attack on Nietzsche (made at age 23!) Wilamowitz never again deserved to be taken seriously as a thinker <sup>65</sup>. The George Circle, who deified Nietzsche, John the Baptist, who prefigured the Messiah, again and again insulted Wilamowitz in the crassest terms <sup>66</sup>. We have no reason to believe that the most obstreperous of them, Kurt Hildebrandt, was competent to judge the issues nor indeed that he had even read the polemical pamphlets <sup>67</sup>. I have yet to read a biographer of Nietzsche or Wagner who presents the matter fairly <sup>68</sup> or who has the barest credentials to judge the philological technicalities. Wilamowitz' demonstration

<sup>62</sup> My statement (*Trauerspiele*, p. 13, n. 57) that the difference in age «precluded any school friendship between Wilamowitz and Nietzsche» does not mean that it precluded any postschool rivalry as Viktor Pöschl seems to think *apud* Flashar-Gründer-Horstmann, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 1), p. 150, n. 30.

<sup>63</sup> For the fairest treatment of the matter see J. H. Groth, «Wilamowitz-Möllendorf [sic!] on Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*», *JHI* 11, 1950, pp. 179-190.

<sup>64</sup> He was not born in East Prussia; and, so far as I know, never visited the place. Correct Arnaldo Momigliano, *AnnPisa* 3, 3, 1, 1973, p. 105 («nacque a Markowitz nella Prussia Orientale») and earlier Frederik Poulsen, *Liv og Rejser: Omkring Aarhundredshiflet*, Copenhagen 1946, p. 60 («østprøjsisk»).

<sup>65</sup> I have collected the shameful evidence at *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 281, n. 32.

<sup>66</sup> For an exemplary presentation of the evidence Ulrich K. Goldsmith, «Wilamowitz and the Georgenkreis: New Documents», forthcoming and *supra*, n. 17.

<sup>67</sup> Kurt Hildebrandt, «Hellas und Wilamowitz», *apud* *Der George-Kreis: Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften*, ed. Georg Peter Landmann, Köln-Berlin 1965, pp. 141-149. The Nietzsche affair is raked up again in the libelous polemic of Hans Blüher, *Ulrich von Wilamowitz und der deutsche Geist 1871-1915*, Berlin 1916.

<sup>68</sup> I should except Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau, *Wagner und Nietzsche: Der Mystagoge und sein Abtrünniger*, Munich 1979, pp. 83-84, 98-99.



that Nietzsche preferred intuition to historical philological method and founded his thesis on an uncritical use of sources twisted to substantiate preconceived opinion has never been refuted. Today *Die Geburt der Tragödie* is read only by those interested in the intellectual biography of Nietzsche or the relation of Wagnerian opera to Greek tragedy. Wilamowitz' *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* remains the fundamental book in the field. Oddly when one compares the two treatments, differences are less than one would expect. Jealousy provided the pathological intensity of Wilamowitz' attack. A letter of 1869 to Walter Bormann attests his tolerance. Wilamowitz wrote Bormann who preferred intuition to hard work:

The historical and intuitive, however, are two different approaches; and to justify something in a scholarly way naturally always presupposes that you have no presuppositions. But I am far from denying that an approach from the purely artistic, abstract side is unfruitful. Quite the contrary, because it is just this approach that comprehends the essence of the thing and —if it is successful— brings out from within through intuition far more perfect results than we, who only believe what we know, can bring into it from without.<sup>69</sup>

But the detested rival was not the innocuous, utterly negligible, Bormann. Nietzsche must be dealt with otherwise.

At Schulpforte, not at the university, Bonn or Berlin, Wilamowitz decided to become *ein Jünger der Wissenschaft*, a disciple of scholarship. At the end of his Schulpforte autobiography of 1867 he rejects his aristocratic Prussian heritage for a profession that could only disgust his father. His proud words, rediscovered ten years ago, deserve citation:

I want to become a disciple of Scholarship, of my own volition, quite apart from relatives, those close to me, removed from the supposedly higher circles in which birth has placed me. Good. No problem. I follow irresistible urges, respected men, who take a friendly interest in me; and true friends will recompense me with more than anything I might lose. So forwards!<sup>71</sup>

Eighteen years old! He abandons his father and his past to gain something better. What strikes us again with Wilamowitz is not change that comes with age but the extraordinary precocity and persistence of his convictions<sup>72</sup>. That he had done so well at Pforte was decisive and

<sup>69</sup> GRBS 11, 1970, p. 156.

<sup>70</sup> GRBS 12, 1971, p. 570.

<sup>71</sup> The version is considerably more idiomatic than ten years ago and I hope reflects better the tone of the original.

<sup>72</sup> See *Trauerspiele*, p. 12 and 'Wilamowitz on Schliemann', *Philologus* 124, 1980, pp. 146-151.

that men like Peter and Corssen, whom he deeply admired, encouraged him. Ulrich had never been close to his father, a brutish Junker. Karl Ludwig Peter, intelligent, civilized, gentle while stern, was the father he had sought. Wilamowitz cited Nemesianus when he thought of him <sup>73</sup>:

Laeta tibi uultu grauitas et mite serena  
fronte supercilium, sed pectus mitius ore.

At Bonn students meant most, the best, members of the Philological Society, Diels, Kaibel, Robert <sup>74</sup>. Of teachers only Otto Jahn mattered, a Schulpforte old boy, broken and dying, the teacher remarkably both of Wilamowitz and Th. Mommsen <sup>75</sup>; and the brilliant, elusive, complex homosexual, Jacob Bernays, of whom one could say so much <sup>76</sup>. User was difficult. There was a public quarrel about the seclusion of passages in Euripidean prologues. One version holds that User, young and insecure, put the brilliant savage (*genialer Wildling*) out of the class <sup>77</sup>. The death of Jahn at Göttingen in 1869 («voluit quiescit») caused Wilamowitz to change to Berlin. Newly discovered letters to Max Fränkel reveal his admiration for Kirchhoff. Officially Moriz Haupt directed the dissertation. Wilamowitz confesses in a letter to Mommsen: «I only spoke with him about six times» <sup>78</sup>.

Mommsen only began to influence Wilamowitz after 1872. The long complex friendship of thirty years with its loves and hates, its triumphs and disasters, may be traced through the *Erinnerungen* and the extensive published correspondence. Because the original letters do not survive, the censored bits will never be recovered. As one would expect the adoration of the youthful Wilamowitz declined with age. *Sordescunt enim diui*. Political differences existed. They were not decisive. The two rarely discussed contemporary politics. Proud men, they did not yield easily. That Wilamowitz towered some forty centi-

<sup>73</sup> Nemesianus, *Ec.* 1 56-57, where (*Erinnerungen*, p. 75) he has replaced *blanda* of the *textus receptus* with *laeta*.

<sup>74</sup> See Hans Herter, *Bonner Kreis 1854-1960*, Bonn 1960. I am grateful to Hermann Funke for my copy of this rare prosopography.

<sup>75</sup> See Georg Luck, *apud 150 Jahre Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn 1818-1968: Bonner Gelehrte Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Bonn: Philosophie und Altertumswissenschaften*, Bonn 1968, pp. 144-164. This succinct wellwritten account rewards attention.

<sup>76</sup> See *Philologus* 122, 1978, pp. 294-296 with literature there cited.

<sup>77</sup> A. Körte, *Die Antike* 11, 1935, p. 218.

<sup>78</sup> *Briefwechsel* (*supra*, n. 15), No. 8, p. 13 (14 February 1874).



meters over his father-in-law must have irritated the little man who preferred to sit on high stools. Mommsen refused ever to be photographed near him. Wilamowitz never wrote books of the sort that Mommsen approved, six volume comprehensive studies of Attic jurisprudence or Athenian history, nor indeed of the early church or of the history of dogma. Mommsen, it was whispered, complained that his son-in-law wrote only interpretations. Adolf Harnack (1851-1930) was different. Mommsen's approval was obvious. He succeeded Mommsen as Secretary of the Academy, a prestigious and well paid post. A conservative monarchist—he accepted his «vor.» in 1914—so long as monarchy survived, after the November Revolution he became an ardent Republican. Wilamowitz refused to dine at his home again. Meetings of the Kirchenväterkommission were held in neutral territory<sup>79</sup>. As he had earlier detested Nietzsche, the rival for Peter's love, he later detested Harnack, who, he said, «has stolen from me the heart of Mommsen»<sup>80</sup>. And more and more he thought that Mommsen had deceived him. Many good things praised in *Römische Geschichte V* were his.

I refuse to censor or suppress letters that I discover. A distinguished European Hellenist has regreted that I published Wilamowitz' letter of December 1917 to Werner Jaeger:

Of course he retained the mood of the forty-eighter, as he held to the forms of his early verse. For all economic and indeed for all social matters he had only one old *Credo*. In life he did not abandon the *Cäsarnatur*. He was most reluctant to go other ways than detours. He paid no attention to laws and had no respect for persons. He liked laying down the law, not so brutally as Virchow, but he did it. That contrasted with the jurist which he always was; but life teaches us that this contrast is not at all rare.<sup>81</sup>

Wilamowitz believed that Mommsen drank too much and could not hold his liquor nor his tongue<sup>82</sup>. In Adelheid Mommsen's recollections of

<sup>79</sup> Schwester Hildegard von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. For Wilamowitz' correspondence with Harnack see Jürgen Dummer, «Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff und die Kirchenväterkommission der Berliner Akademie», *Studia Byzantina* 2, 1973, pp. 351-387.

<sup>80</sup> Werner Jaeger, *SM* 2, p. 145; cf. *HSCP* 82, 1978, p. 320, n. 105. Friedrich Solmsen's remark, *GRBS* 20, 1979, p. 399, that «In the 1920's their relationship was friendly», is wishful thinking, nothing more.

<sup>81</sup> *HSCP* 82, 1978, p. 320.

<sup>82</sup> *De praeceptoribus meis*, *AuA* 27, 1981. The bullying, obnoxious character of the aged Mommsen is confirmed at Frederick Poulsen, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 64), pp. 84-86. *Sunt morosi et anxii et iracundi et difficiles senes* (Cic. *de sen.* 18, 65). For Mommsen's incontinence see Alois Brandl, *Zwischen Inn und Themse*, Berlin 1936, pp. 251-252.

her father, Wilamowitz scarcely appears<sup>83</sup>. Shortly after Mommsen's death on 1 November 1903<sup>84</sup> Wilamowitz had a dreadful quarrel with his brother-in-law, Wolfgang Mommsen; and, although they both lived in Berlin, never saw his relative for twenty-five years<sup>85</sup>. A careful study of Wilamowitz' friendship with Mommsen by a scholar able to control the Roman material is needed. There is ample material. The result would be rewarding.

Of Wilamowitz' closest contemporaries, Diels, Kaibel, Leo, Robert, Schwartz, and Wellhausen, we can document in detail only the friendship with Kaibel. The letters to the others are either destroyed or lost<sup>86</sup>. Georg Kaibel, known to scholars as the editor of Athenaeus, *IG XIV* (the Greek inscriptions of Sicily and Italy), Sophocles *Electra*, Sophron and Epicharmus, could have been a concert violinist as easily as a classical scholar. One thinks instinctively of Mommsen's friendship with Jahn. Schadewaldt once astutely observed to me that the friendship with Kaibel contrasted with the enmity for Nietzsche and proved that a musician could be a friend of Wilamowitz<sup>87</sup>. Kaibel, like Leo, was the weaker. The book he enjoyed writing was his *Electra* commentary. The others were *Pflichtarbeiten* imposed by either Mommsen or Wilamowitz. His career followed closely Wilamowitz' own. He succeeded him both at Greifswald and at Göttingen. Posts at Breslau and Strassburg he accepted after Wilamowitz had declined them. The intensive period of their *Zusammenarbeit* followed the discovery of Aristotle, *Athēnaion Politeia* (1891). Together they edited the text (1891). Kaibel's commentary followed. Wilamowitz produced *Aristoteles und Athen* (2 volumes, 1893), the most frequently cited modern book on Aristotle. The letters document their coöperation. Seven years af-

<sup>83</sup> Adelheid Mommsen, *Theodor Mommsen in Kreise der Seinen: Erinnerungen seiner Tochter*, Berlin 1936.

<sup>84</sup> Because Wilamowitz on that day was at Thera, Harnack delivered the funeral oration. We may surmise he disapproved. He writes on 2 December 1917 to Ed. Norden: «Am Abend musste ich eine lange Rede von Harnack dulden, der aber meist von sich sprach; es war mir kaum erträglich. Er hat ja keine Vorstellung von Mommsen.» The occasion was the centenary.

<sup>85</sup> Dr. Wolfgang Mommsen (Coblenz) *per litt.*

<sup>86</sup> 63 of Diels' letters to Wilamowitz survive. Wilamowitz' to Diels were destroyed in the second burning by the Germans of the library at the Catholic University of Louvain on 17 May 1940: see Émile de Strycker, S. J., *Philologus* 121, 1977, pp. 138-139. Because Diels never systematically filed letters received as did Wilamowitz (he carelessly inserted some into books) many of Wilamowitz to him may have been lost or discarded before his death on 21 June 1922.

<sup>87</sup> *GRBS* 16, 1975, pp. 452-453.



ter the death of Kaibel (1901) A. B. Drachmann, the Copenhagen Hellenist, editor of the *scholia Pindarica*, and since 1894 friend of Wilamowitz, attended the Berlin Historical Congress of 1908 and stayed at Eichenallée 12. His daily letters to his wife provide a glimpse into Wilamowitz' household. In one he reports a long conversation with Tycho, the birth of the young man's great Sophocles book<sup>88</sup>. Later Tycho, Drachmann and Wilamowitz argued heatedly about Sophocles. When Wilamowitz, *ganz angeregt*, dashed upstairs to his study to fetch a book, Drachmann, fearing he had gone too far, apologized to Marie Mommsen. «No, no; go on!», she cried, «He has not done this since the death of Kaibel.»

A large correspondence with Leo once existed<sup>89</sup>. All I have found are five letters of Wilamowitz to Leo<sup>90</sup>. From February 1906 they document Wilamowitz' attempt to attract Leo to Berlin as successor of the difficult Vahlen. This would recreate the productive intimacy of the Göttingen years<sup>91</sup>. Leo declined: «If I had gone to Berlin, I should have lost one to two years of my scholarly work; and I don't have them to lose!»<sup>92</sup> Of course Wilamowitz was disappointed but he wrote his friend: «A serious man does not regret what he has done λόγω πειθόμενος.» Wilamowitz had often complained that departure from Göttingen meant that the happiest part of his life was over<sup>93</sup>. Small wonder Leo refus-

<sup>88</sup> See H. Lloyd-Jones, «Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on the Dramatic Technique of Sophocles», *CQ* NS 22, 1972, pp. 214-228.

<sup>89</sup> Wilamowitz alludes to it in a letter of May 1925 to Ed. Fraenkel: *HSCP* 81, 1977, p. 282 with n. 34.

<sup>90</sup> See *Festschrift Irmischer*, forthcoming.

<sup>91</sup> Two devoted foreign students recalled years later in independent passages of remarkable similarity how short before 11:00 a. m. in the park before the University Auditorium at Göttingen two men would walk up and down engaged in deep conversation: compare Edward Fitch, *CW* 8, 1914-1915, p. 40 and Frederik Poulsen, *op. cit.* (*supra*, n. 64), pp. 70-72. Poulsen remarks (p. 71, translation of Jørgen Mejer): «Because Greek was my minor, I asked Leo if I had to follow Wilamowitz' lectures on Greek Lyric. 'Do you have to?', scolded Leo, 'As if you didn't have to catch every word from the mouth of this man, when you now have the good fortune of being near him!'. In 1902 Wilamowitz again offered ancient lyric. Poulsen, in Berlin, asked if he should attend; for he had heard Wilamowitz on the subject in 1896. «He answered with a smile: 'You better show up, because then I didn't know what I know now': see Frederik Poulsen, *I det Gaestfrie Europa: Liv og Rejser indtil Første Verdenskrig*, Copenhagen 1947, pp. 12-13. The description that follows of his large international audience is of great interest.

<sup>92</sup> Friedrich Leo, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* I, ed. Eduard Fraenkel, Rome 1960.

<sup>93</sup> Wilamowitz, *Erinnerungen*, p. 239. Eduard Schwartz imitated Wilamowitz' complaint when he left Strassburg for Göttingen again to succeed Kaibel: Ed. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften II: zur Geschichte und Literatur der Hellenen und Römer*, Berlin 1956, p. 8.

ed. Eduard Norden came instead, an ideal colleague for Wilamowitz. He was intelligent, hardworking, loyal, wholly convinced that Wilamowitz was his intellectual superior and Greek superior to Latin. Werner Jaeger once told me that this was the reason why Norden sought a Greek source for every verse in Vergil, *Aeneid* VI. I suppose it was the reason why Eduard Fraenkel called *The Divine Comedy* «Vergil's greatest work».

Eduard Fraenkel leads us to that extraordinary group of Berlin students. Fraenkel, Jacoby, Maas continued what Wilamowitz called *ordentliche Philologie*, texts, commentaries, elucidations of texts. Friedländer, Jaeger, Reinhardt<sup>94</sup>, and Schadewaldt are more interesting because they rejected, albeit in different ways, the historicism of Wilamowitz to form a whole new phase of German philology. Fraenkel observed to the youthful Lloyd-Jones that Nietzsche had made the difference in the philology of his generation<sup>95</sup>. If so Fraenkel was not different. I should not want to pursue the Nietzschean in Fraenkel. Certainly there was a turning away from Wilamowitz, natural among gifted young men with minds of their own. After World War I they began to question «editing for editing's sake». «I cannot start up in 1919 where I left off in 1914», confesses Friedländer to Wilamowitz in a letter of 4 July 1921, that I have called «The Credo of a New Generation»<sup>96</sup>. There must be a deeper reason than *Pflicht*. The difference over Plato is revealing. *Platon als Mensch*, sc. the Wilamowitzian Plato, is not enough for Friedländer, who wants the Plato of the George Circle, *Platon als Gestalt*, a timeless heroic figure, whose art and thought must some way be amputated from his time and place and made an eternal possession of mankind. «I struggle against the Wilamowitz in me!» mourned Friedländer, at the same time admitting «Much of the best that is in me I owe to you». He never could exorcise the Wilamowitz in him. He dedicated his *Lebenswerk, Platon*, to «Udalrico de Wilamowitzio ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΙ». He sought a third way between *Mensch* and *Gestalt*, disappointed both sides, Wilamowitz and George, and wrote a book that failed. The reaction against Wilamowitz is characterized by attention to the great Greek authors (Friedrich Klingner, of whom Wilamowitz

<sup>94</sup> I have been unable to trace any of the Reinhardt-Wilamowitz correspondence.

<sup>95</sup> See Hugh Lloyd-Jones, «Nietzsche and the Study of the Ancient World», *Studies in Nietzsche and the Classical Tradition*, edd. J. C. O'Flaherty, T. F. Sellner, and R. M. Helm, Chapel Hill 1976, p. 1 = *TLS* (21 February 1975), p. 199.

<sup>96</sup> See my «Paul Friedländer to Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: the Credo of a New Generation», *AuA* 26, 1980.



thought little, is the only Latinist prominent in the movement)<sup>97</sup> with neglect of traditional philology, and ancillary disciplines, epigraphy, numismatics, metrics, palaeography, always the stepchild of German philology. Ernst Buschor, who applied the movement to art history, compared the great scholar to a man walking into the ocean. So long as his feet touch ground, that is lab-work (*Laborarbeit*); once he is over his head, that is *Wissenschaft*<sup>98</sup>. A trifle Nietzschean.

The death of Schadewaldt in September 1974 closed surely this creative, dangerous post-Wilamowitzian period of about fifty years. Its achievement remains to be assessed. We observe in Western Germany a return to Wilamowitzian historicism<sup>99</sup> or even pre-Wilamowitzian positivism by specialists that lack his training and his breadth. Their work is often valuable. It is very different.<sup>100</sup>

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

<sup>97</sup> Bernhard Kytzler, *apud* Eduard Norden, *Kleine Schriften zum Klassischen Altertum*, Berlin 1966, pp. 689-690, lists fifty-two dissertations directed by Norden (1898-1936). Perhaps three are known to more than the narrowest specialists. The best known, Konrat Zeigler (Breslau, 1905), is familiar as an editor of Teubner texts and author of *RE* articles on Greek subjects. The contrast with Wilamowitz' students cries out. The situation of Latin in the Bundesrepublik today (not to speak of my own country) is no surprise.

<sup>98</sup> Wolfgang Schindler *per coll.*

<sup>99</sup> The classical statement of his historicism is at *Aristophanes, Lysistrate*, Berlin 1927, p. 5. The critic must become a member of the original audience. «Endlich muss das Gedicht, das für eine Stunde bestimmt ist, erst als das verstanden sein, was es in diesem Momente sein wollte, ehe man es auf seinen absoluten Wert hin betrachtet.» See further *AuA* 25, 1979, pp. 95-96. Compare Michael Bernays' goal in his treatment of *Hermann und Dorothea* in a letter of 5 January 1877 to Hermann Uhde: «Meiner Methode gemäss lehnte ich die eigentlich aesthetische Betrachtung ab und suchte nur zur erklären, wie das fertige Werk auf die ersten der Zeitgenossen, vor allen auf Schiller, den befugtesten und strengsten Richter, wirkte und wirken musste. Darnach begann ich, das Werk vor den Zuhören entstehen zu lassen, indem ich die geschichtlichen Bedingungen vorführte, unter denen es sich bildete.» Hermann Uhde-Bernays, *Briefe von und an Michael Bernays*, Berlin 1907, p. 11.

<sup>100</sup> An earlier version of this paper was delivered as a public lecture at the University of Konstanz (18 January 1979), the University of Madrid (5 November 1979), the University of Tübingen (9 November 1979), Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg i. Br. (16 January 1980), The University of Tel-Aviv (23 January 1980), Friedrich-Schiller-Universität-Jena (DDR) (18 February 1980). I am grateful to the Fondation Hardt for leisure in which to prepare the written version.