

Wilamowitz in his Last Ten Years

Friedrich Solmsen

IT WAS NOT from my own impulse but in response to the urging of others that I have put down some impressions of Wilamowitz as they have remained in my mind.¹ Even someone more talented for vivid portraiture might be discouraged by the existence of Wilamowitz's own *Erinnerungen 1848–1914* and of the few but extraordinarily brilliant pages in Karl Reinhardt's essay "Akademisches aus zwei Epochen."² My aim is far more modest and may have some justification. I am trying to supply factual information for a period of his life not covered by any coherent account and at the same time to dispel some widespread misunderstandings. As the interest in his work and personality seems as lively as ever, it is perhaps inevitable that speculation has begun to fill the gaps of available knowledge and that new material, especially in the form of recently found correspondence, is frequently misinterpreted. A subject which has never been explicitly recorded and which when alluded to in "Prefaces" or letters almost invariably leads to erroneous conclusions is his Graeca, the group of young scholars meeting in his home regularly during the last ten years of his life. I shall deal with it at some length as soon as I have provided the necessary background information.

The law which set the age limit for professors at 68 was passed in Prussia in the very first years after it had become a republic. Wilamowitz was 70 in 1918; he continued in office until the winter of 1921/22

¹ I have been reminded of some items by my wife, Lieselotte Solmsen, and owe the knowledge of others to Theodor E. Mommsen, a nephew of Wilamowitz, who was my colleague at Cornell for several years in the 1950s. Erich Burck and Fritz Wehrli have been helpful by answering inquiries. Almost half a century after the events described my memory is bound to have erred in a number of instances, especially by conflating one episode with another. For the quotations I claim no more than approximate correctness but feel sure that they convey the right flavor.

² In *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen and Zurich 1959) 380ff, esp. 381ff; see *ibid.* the biographical sketch and appraisal pp.361ff and the essay "Die klassische Philologie und das Klassische" 346ff.

when Jaeger had been chosen and took over as his successor. Although close to 73, *i.e.* five years beyond the newly established limit, he was most indignant that a man as vigorous as he and with so much to offer should be let go as no longer adequate for the job (for thus he understood the law). At a general convention of "Philologen und Schulmänner" in 1921 he ended his address with the declaration: "Hier steht der alte Lehrer. Man will ihn vom Katheder vertreiben. Aber er lässt sich nicht vertreiben. Er lehrt weiter." It made a deep impression, but there was in it decidedly something of the theatrical manner for which his lectures in and outside the University were known (and of which there was less in the last ten years); for the new law did not interfere with his teaching or with his right to direct Ph.D. theses. What passed to the successor was the Greek seminar, the official representation of the subject, the right to examine candidates for teaching positions at the gymnasia and a variety of administrative duties. Wilamowitz came to accept the new situation, but I doubt whether he ever admitted what most of us realized at the time and what seems no less true in retrospect: the much lighter load of duties made it possible for him to gather the scholarly harvest of his life in the amazingly rich and uninterrupted productivity which began with *Pindaros* (1922) and *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (1924) and continued to the very last weeks of his life when he almost finished the enormous *Glaube der Hellenen*. In the years 1900–1914 when his popularity was at its peak and demands on his time multiplied, he had often felt frustrated in his scholarly projects. After 1921 special demands might have decreased, but the official duties would have become more onerous and far more distasteful. For the political and intellectual climate had changed, and much was done and had to be done in ways not at all to his liking.

Although his dealings with students and young scholars in Berlin by no means ceased at that time, they were considerably reduced; as the Graeca began to meet in 1921 the prevailing opinion was that it was designed to make up for his lessened contact with younger minds. Maas told us, however, that when on some semi-official occasion Kranz in the course of an address said something to this effect—and I am sure it was done with the utmost tact—Wilamowitz emphatically disagreed: "So war es ja nun nicht" . . . but he did not say how it had been.

The Graeca met in term time every second Saturday afternoon for roughly two hours in Wilamowitz's home to study a Greek work with almost exclusive attention to textual problems. To my regret I cannot produce a complete list of the texts discussed. Some were those on which he was engaged in research that would in due course result in a book, but such personal interests did not normally determine the choice. In the instance of Hesiod's *Erga* the edition had not been intended but emerged from the intensive study with this group. Other items read included some latter books of the *Odyssey*, parts of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, hymns of Callimachus, epigrams by a number of poets in the *Anthologia Palatina*, three of Plutarch's moral essays,³ "Longinus," almost certainly the "Old Oligarch," and in the last two years Empedocles' *Katharmoi* and *Peri physeos* (in this order), Demetrius' *Peri hermeneias* and Plato's *Laws*. Instead of the *Laws* he himself would have preferred to study Theocritus because the papyrus just published by Hunt and Johnson promised new light on the text, but most of the younger members foresaw difficulties in arguing about an author whom he had edited (even though he referred to his Oxford text as "verfehlt"), and when the vote produced no clear majority—for Polybius too had been suggested—ballots were thrown into a Greek urn and Lachesis decided in favor of the *Nomoi*. We began to read Book V but cannot have met more than three times before Wilamowitz fell ill (in May 1931). He recovered, but he felt that in the time left to him he needed his entire strength to finish the second volume of *Der Glaube der Hellenen*.

Of the participants I can give a more nearly complete account. Two were present from beginning to end, Günther Klaffenbach and Friedrich Spiro, the editor of Pausanias, a man of broad culture and a personal friend of Wilamowitz. Paul Maas was a member from the first meetings until February 1930, when he accepted the Greek chair at Königsberg. Walther Kranz and Luise Reinhard participated from 1921 to 1928, when Kranz became the head of Schulpforta (Wilamowitz's old school), and Miss Reinhard left for personal reasons. Eduard Fraenkel took part until he went to Kiel in 1923,

³ Specifically *De E ap. Delphos*; *De Pyth.orac.* and *De gen.Socr.*, where in the Teubner edition (*Moralia* vol. 3 by Pohlenz and Sieveking, 1929), besides Wilamowitz's own examination of every line, his reading of the works *domi suae cum iunioribus philologis* is acknowledged. Emendations proposed by some of these—Maas, Klaffenbach, Sykutris—may be found in the apparatus.

Regenbogen until he went to Heidelberg in 1925. Rudolf Pfeiffer was in Berlin only a few months of 1923, during which he probably participated, but neither in his case nor in those of the Latin Privatdozenten Klingner and Beckmann am I quite sure. Sykutris was a member for (I should think) three or four semesters in the latter half of the 1920s. In the last years Harder, Schadewaldt, Harald Fuchs, Walzer, Deichgräber and I were invited to join as soon as we had completed our doctorates. The three last mentioned remained to the end. So did (besides Spiro and Klaffenbach), Werner Kappler of the '*Septuaginta* Werk' in Göttingen, who did his research in Berlin, and Werner Peek, the last to do his dissertation (*Hymnus in Isim Andrius*, 1929) and take his Ph.D. with Wilamowitz. Rudolf Güngerich, a student of Deubner, whom he followed from Freiburg to Berlin, was present during the winter of 1929/30 before he fell ill, but he impressed Wilamowitz so strongly that he spoke to Deubner with warm admiration of his fine emendations "ganz bescheiden vorgetragen."⁴

His was an exceptional case. On the whole the gap between Wilamowitz and us 'Anfänger' was discouraging. Fortunately he was invariably patient and polite, so that the consciousness of what we gained consoled us for the disappointment with our performance. In the winter of 1929–30 Maas was still present and was the only one who could meet Wilamowitz's knowledge and experience with comparable equipment. It was breathtaking to watch how whenever one of them referred to a parallel passage—no matter where—the other remembered not only the passage itself but the problems of attestation, the attempts to correct it, etc. "Viel unnötig daran herumkonjiziert worden," Maas said once when the argument got livelier, "leider auch von Excellenz." Wilamowitz smiled and tried to defend his conjecture.⁵ Most of the younger members met with

⁴ Although unexpected vindications of the transmitted text were appreciated, emendations which passed the scrutiny received the warmest welcome. Wilamowitz did not like a despondent attitude on the part of younger members. To one who declared that he "could not" emend he pointed out the discouraging experience of a rather well-known scholar who in his youth had been similarly reluctant. "Und jetzt?" he went on, "wie ist es jetzt? Jetzt hat er sein Griechisch vergessen!"

⁵ I do not remember Wilamowitz ever laughing out aloud. Nor did he ever grin (like Eduard Meyer, who seldom or never smiled). Wilamowitz and Harnack had by a decision of Wilhelm II become "Wirklicher geheimer Rat," which implied the address "Excellenz." Younger scholars considered it an act of due respect to address him thus. I doubt

Maas in the University for an hour before proceeding in a group to the Graeca. In these preliminary sessions a large number of futile ideas for text and interpretation met their deserved fate; only what survived this screening was afterwards presented. When Maas had left, these meetings continued but with slight success. There was no one any longer who could make the distance between Wilamowitz and us less glaring. Even in cases where his opinion seemed to most of us arbitrary it was not easy to dislodge him. Still he sometimes yielded to sustained attacks: "Ich sage ja nicht. . . dass die andere Lesart. . . nicht allenfalls eben so gut ist; was kommt jetzt?" When arguments were exhausted and the decision hung in the balance, Wilamowitz had a way of quietly pondering the sentence in his mind for say, five to ten seconds. He might also read it aloud to judge whether it sounded Greek. This was done for his personal satisfaction. Although unwilling to leave alone even hopeless passages and trying out, *e.g.* with the fragments of Comedy in Demetrius, reconstructions that one felt he himself would soon forget, he did admit, perhaps once or twice in a session, that a question defied solution. If it was a minor point he might remark: "Das [*scil.* to find the answer] macht uns ja auch nicht glücklich." Lexica or indices were not consulted during the meetings, similar passages very seldom looked up. Wilamowitz relied on his memory, which never failed to supply what he needed. No less impressive, in fact even more fascinating, was the elasticity with which he moved from one angle of approach to another.

About the huge gain derived from watching Wilamowitz in action and trying to participate no two opinions were possible, but I do not know whether my contemporaries would agree with me that what we acquired in the Graeca was more substantial and proved a more lasting enrichment than what we learned in his courses. His lecture courses in the 1920s were no longer what they had been in earlier

whether Maas regularly did so; nor (I believe) did his other colleagues, let alone contemporaries or old friends. In the story about Harnack told below (*infra* n.11) "Excellenz" is a part of the mock-solemn tone. The first academic victim Wilhelm II had chosen for the title was Mommsen, and the story how he escaped bears telling (and may easily have been told elsewhere). Catching wind of this intention, as one might in Berlin, Mommsen was appalled, and although no longer active in politics he at once wrote an article scathingly critical of some official policies. He sent this to a progressive newspaper with the request for immediate publication. When it had appeared there was no more talk of "Excellenz Mommsen."

decades when large audiences listened spellbound to his 'Publica' ("für Hörer aller Fakultäten") and brilliant minds responded to his presentation by deciding to devote their lives to the Classics.

In the Sophocles course of winter 1922/23 the selection of items he took up seemed haphazard. Observations on a Greek idiom were followed by a remark on staging, a decision between textual variants, a protest with a good dose of irony against an erroneous interpretation, a reference to an earlier version of the myth.⁶ The details did not integrate. Also while he left us in no doubt as to what episodes or indeed what plays he admired less, hardly anything that he said led to an appreciation of Sophocles' poetry, of his characters, his view of life or whatever it was that set him apart from Aeschylus and Euripides. Thoughtful students resented his too realistic, almost trivializing comments, *e.g.* about the ending of *Antigone* (of which he had always been critical).⁷ The post-World-War-I generation for whom the value of the Classics had become a problem did not find an answer to their question what made ancient civilization particularly significant and worth intensive study. A few students still 'swore by' Wilamowitz; most of those in Berlin turned to Jaeger, Eduard Fraenkel and Regenbogen, who were closer to the students' minds and were aware of the issues that ailed the world. All three of them, while they had significant new insights to offer, also showed us how to arrive at them. Some students discovered Karl Reinhardt and went to Frankfurt. The Swiss found what they were looking for in Peter von der Mühl (Friedländer and Hermann Fränkel were not so visible at the time and Klingner only just coming to the fore).

Still critical or not truly satisfied as many felt, there was much in

⁶ Unlike the great majority of his colleagues, Wilamowitz had no carefully worked out 'Kolleghefte' (course books) which he would keep up-to-date and use again on the next occasion, *i.e.* after four or five years when the same subject was due again. Having nothing remotely like such regular sequences of subjects, all he brought to his lectures (or seminars) was the text and a few leaves or slips of paper on which he had noted passages he meant to use for comparison. On the rare occasions when he brought a few other books he explained why he had "nicht verschmäht einen Arm von Büchern mitzubringen." I understand that he had the same habit in earlier years.

⁷ With metaphors involving the sea or navigation (*χειμάζειν, κυβερνᾶν* etc.) he had a very easy way: "Die See ist den Griechen so nah"; hence their ready recourse to such expressions. At times it seemed rather too simple. Many years later when the hunt for 'controlling metaphors' was going full-blast and maritime imagery in particular was regarded as cardinal for understanding, I sometimes wondered whether too little was not better than too much.

these courses that was most admirable and much that only Wilamowitz could do.⁸ In the semester following the Sophocles course he lectured for the first time in his life on a Roman author. Asked to replace Norden, who was ailing, he chose Catullus as his subject. He was not squeamish about the realistic poems, but his main effort and interest went to the use and adaptation of Hellenistic models in the larger pieces (he was at work on the *Hellenistische Dichtung*). A few semesters later his course on "Geschichte der griechischen Sprache" was again a new venture. Dedicating the larger part of it to the peculiar developments of Greek in the different literary genres, he pointed out many features to which the great Wilhelm Schulze, the professor of Indo-European linguistics and one of his closest friends, would hardly give attention in his courses on Greek Dialects and on Homeric Greek (alas, if we had only been better able to appreciate it). My memory tells me, but I do not find it confirmed,⁹ that in those years he taught a course on the Literature of the Imperial Age which covered the Greek as well as the Latin developments and proceeded by *synkrisis*; he compared Plutarch and Suetonius, Epictetus and Seneca, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Quintilian,

⁸ As for his seminars at the time, the only one I took (Winter 1925/26) can hardly have been typical. The subject was the latter books of the *Odyssey*. Being engaged on *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, he expected us to cooperate in the analytic treatment of these books; but as some of us had previously taken Jaeger's course on the *Odyssey* or had been exposed to a unitarian approach, contributions and enthusiasm fell short of what he had hoped for. Unaware of the reasons, he concluded the last session with a rather ungracious remark that the members of the seminar had given themselves an easy time, regarding it as the professor's part to do the work. It must have been around 1920 that Wilamowitz began to use German instead of Latin for the discussion in the seminar. "Sonst sagen Sie ja nichts." The reports about 'Seminararbeiten', which took about a fourth or fifth of the time, were still in Latin, every member having another's paper assigned for a critical appraisal. When the linguist Johannes Lohmann submitted a paper which used Slavic languages for the understanding of Greek moods and tenses, we had the unusual experience of watching Wilamowitz as he readily listened and learned. A few times he tried to recover the smattering of Bulgarian that he had acquired in 1917 when called by the army for lectures in that area of the Balkans, but he admitted that it did not suffice and was glad when Lohmann supplied additional information.

⁹ *Scil.* in the *Wilamowitz-Bibliographie 1868-1929* (Berlin 1929), which includes a list of his 'Vorlesungen' (and Seminars etc., pp.75ff). Although this list was prepared with the same painstaking care as that of his publications, some errors must have crept into the statements relating to the 1920s. The seminar on the *Odyssey* in the winter 1925/26 (see n.8) is not recorded. Conceivably the list was based on the official 'Vorlesungsverzeichnisse' which appeared considerably ahead of time. Departures from them were frequent, but it would not be easy for the compilers to find out about them.

Athenaeus and Gellius; often, one would think the differences must have loomed larger than the similarities. Students taking his course on Homer (?)¹⁰ in 1926 had a surprising experience. He had for some weeks pursued his analyses when a copy of Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* reached him. Even in earlier years it had been his habit, when an exciting new book appeared, to interrupt his lectures and give the next hour to a critical appraisal of this book. In the case of Rostovtzeff's work he may have intended just this, but when he had spent an hour in the most animated discussion of Rostovtzeff's theses, he felt that he had only just begun and asked the class for permission to continue since there was so much in the book that fascinated him and his eagerness to assess the validity of Rostovtzeff's theories could not be stifled. It must have been weeks before he returned to the original subject.

Wilamowitz himself had a few years earlier, in the autumn of 1922, given two public lectures in Zürich, one of which was on the Decline of Ancient Civilization (the other was on the Platonic Eros). Still profoundly affected by the German catastrophe of 1918 and the loss of much that was dear to him, he was (I understand) often closer to German conditions than to the world of late antiquity, and he repeatedly concluded the description of an aspect or a symptom of the decline with the words, "ganz wie bei uns." In 1925 when he spoke in Florence at an important gathering designed to restore cultural ties between Italy and Germany, he must have been in better spirits. The lecture was a great success, widely reported in newspapers, and he himself recalled the occasion with satisfaction, mentioning *inter alia* that he had made an effort to pronounce Greek and Roman proper names in the Italian manner. For October of the same year I find "Et faengslende Homer-Foredrag" on the historical elements in the *Iliad* recorded for Copenhagen.

Public lectures in Germany must have been numerous. It is by sheer accident that I know of one in the University of Hamburg whose topic was Menander's *Epitrepontes*, so that it is likely to have preceded or been simultaneous with his edition of the play in 1925.

¹⁰ My information, which was specific *e.g.* about Wilamowitz's use of inscriptions etc., should be basically correct but is again at variance with *Bibliographie* (see preceding note). Perhaps the entry for the summer 1927, "Kultur der römischen Kaiserzeit," preserves some recollection of what happened. (There may be an element of confusion on both sides, but the change from the original subject of the course is certain.)

The lively presentation of Menander's activity and of the play itself made the audience visualize plot and performance and delighted even very critical people. Somehow these public lectures must have given more of a complete impression and thus have been closer in their effect to his academic lecture courses in earlier decades. Again by accident I was present when late in 1927 he explained to Max Adolf Warburg, a son of Aby Warburg and fellow-student of mine, why he had thought it necessary to decline an invitation for a lecture in the Bibliothek Warburg (where he had spoken at least once in earlier years). It was just getting too much, he said, adding that he had also decided to discontinue his regular (*i.e.* probably yearly) lectures to an outfit of naval officers who had to be kept from falling into an intellectual slump. Very few people in Berlin are likely to have known about these lectures at the naval base of Wilhelmshafen.

Earlier in that year he had enjoyed a most stimulating experience. On an invitation of the Italian government he went to see newly excavated Cyrene and was present at a festive occasion when the site was opened to visitors.¹¹ He absorbed all he saw with extraordinary alacrity and derived great satisfaction from correlating the many events of Cyrene's political and cultural life that were in his mind with the concrete impressions of the place itself (his Akademie lecture "Kyrene" delivered a few months later embodies some of these impressions). I believe that on this last of his many journeys to the South he found it possible to include visits to some other sites, but the brief stop in Syracuse which he mentions in the *Erinnerungen*¹ (p.166) as his first and only visit to Sicily is all I can adduce. There may have been a promise on the part of the Italian authorities that he would be back in time for the general convention of classicists in Göttingen; for in the years after 1918 Wilamowitz thought it his duty to attend these meetings. When it became clear that the promise could not be implemented by any of the normal means of transportation, the Italian government arranged for a submarine to take him from

¹¹ Jaeger, who was very good at take-offs, reported a conversation between Harnack and Wilamowitz shortly before the latter's journey to Cyrene. Unfortunately the contrast in tone and tempo cannot be conveyed. Harnack (very solemnly): "Excellenz gehen jetzt nach Afrika. Excellenz müssen sehr vorsichtig sein mit Ihrer Gesundheit, müssen sich immer von Eingeborenen in einer Sänfte tragen lassen." Wilamowitz (*prestissimo*): "Werden nicht viele Eingeborene mit Sänften zu haben sein. Werd schon selber laufen müssen, sehen was die alten Knochen hergeben."

Cyrene to Trieste. He appeared in top form at the meeting, which produced no sensation to match this mode of arrival of its *princeps*.

Wilamowitz's relations with his successor Werner Jaeger were as good as they could be and much better than one might have feared. Although bitter about his forced retirement, he did not make Jaeger the victim of his hard feelings. It stood to reason that if the successor tried to continue in the ways of Wilamowitz he would be despised because he was bound to fall short of the standards, whereas if he proceeded in a different spirit he would be criticized. Actually everything went well and there were no frictions. Wilamowitz recognized the high quality and in some cases downright excellence of the work produced by Jaeger's students, and while he was bound to feel critical about much that Jaeger did, he very seldom expressed such feelings, except perhaps to persons so close to him that he could be sure of their discretion. Individuals who would have enjoyed poisoning the atmosphere were not lacking. They included a regular visitor from abroad, who had annoyed Jaeger by spreading an unkind remark of Diels in 1922; in Wilamowitz's home he received substantial help for his scholarly work yet never the kind of gossip which he craved. Still on a few occasions Wilamowitz's impulsive nature got the better of his restraint, and someone barely familiar with the situation received complaints that Jaeger gave more attention to *Die Antike* than to the *Corpus Medicum* (of which the Berlin Academy had put him in charge after Diels' death). He was also known to disapprove of what he considered excessive concentration of dissertations and seminar papers on Plato and Aristotle. But all of this amounted to very little, and although he sighed "von der Philosophie verstehe ich ja doch nichts,"—he consented again and again to being second referee on a dissertation dealing with the philosophers, read it with care,¹² and in every instance where he favored a rating—*eximium, valde laudabile, laudabile, idoneum*—higher or lower than what

¹² Conscientiously he worked his way through a dissertation on the *Magna Moralia* in which the thoughts of this treatise were compared with those of Aristotle's genuine *Ethica*; the objective was to prove the post-Aristotelian origin of *MM*. The method was new to Wilamowitz and he himself would never have used it. Still he recognized its validity, accepted the conclusions but felt a special satisfaction when he discovered in the apparatus the name *Νηλεύς* (*i.e.* Neleus of Skepsis), which had been rejected by the editors and which sufficed to date the treatise in the generation of Theophrastus (see his note *Hermes* 62 [1927] 317). "Ich lese ja nun auch was unterm Strich steht," he told the author of the dissertation in a tone of mild reproach. It must be admitted that constant reference to the apparatus had gone out of fashion in my student generation.

Jaeger suggested, he yielded as a cooperative colleague and in conformity with what the second referee was supposed to do (but by no means always did). For a few years after 1921 he remained the editor of the *Philologische Untersuchungen*, which he had founded in 1880; then realizing that Jaeger would appreciate a serial of that kind for his own students, after publishing volume 30 (Paul Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* [1925], a worthy conclusion of the series) he immediately passed the *Untersuchungen* on to Jaeger. To *Die Antike* he made a token contribution, and for *Gnomon*, the other new periodical organized by Jaeger and like minded contemporaries, he reviewed Christian Jensen's edition of Menander in 1929.

Jaeger, although convinced that Wilamowitz was out of sympathy with some of his policies and innovations, never learned what form the disapproval took; in conversation with his friends or pupils he would sometimes speculate—in a tone half serious and half facetious—what Wilamowitz might “say,” but no unkind word reached him. He on his part was careful never to hurt Wilamowitz's feelings; in fact he went out of his way by offering Wilamowitz repeatedly a chance to direct the Greek seminar while he himself took over the upper division of the Proseminar. That Wilamowitz's more informal ‘Colloquia’ in the Proseminar (upper and lower division combined) on Greek geography, Greek gods and/or heroes, etc. continued as he had conducted them before his emeritation may have been rather a matter of course.¹³ About the elaborate plans Jaeger made for Wilamowitz's eightieth birthday I shall speak later. Of other situations in which Jaeger was most considerate one happens to be particularly well known to me. After Richard Heinze's death the publisher of *Hermes* asked Jaeger's advice about the best editors for the journal; protracted negotiations ensued, yet the hoped for reorganization proved impossible because Jaeger declared *Hermes* to be “Wilamowitz's Zeitschrift” (he had never been an editor but contributed to it far more than to any other periodical) and refrained

¹³ In the Colloquium on Greek geography (the only one that I attended) he proceeded somewhat in the manner of Strabo, dealing with one region after another and moving from the geographical conditions and the major settlements to important historical events and individuals of particular distinction in politics, literature etc. References to contemporary Greece and to his own experiences in the course of his extended travels in the country did much to enliven the meetings.

from making any suggestions to the publisher that did not meet with Wilamowitz's approval. As Wilamowitz did not support any of Jaeger's proposals and as his own proposals (on which he actually was rather half-hearted) did not meet with the approval of the publisher, the editorship remained unchanged in one man's hands, although neither Wilamowitz nor Jaeger liked this monarchical arrangement.

Even while he was no longer the official representative of his subject, Wilamowitz's reputation secured him an enormous authority in his own faculty and great influence in almost all other German universities. In Berlin no classicist could be habilitated (*i.e.* admitted to the faculty as Privatdozent) of whom he did not think well enough to give his active support. In ancient history the situation was similar, yet he more readily acceded to the wishes of Eduard Meyer and Ulrich Wilcken. In one instance he even supported a candidate of Eduard Meyer against his own better judgement and, *incredibile dictu*, took his stand on the principle of authority, using words that would have made any opposition of the younger professors tantamount to an insurrection.

With the other German universities his policy was not to volunteer an opinion about the best candidate for a vacant chair (something that was done quite frequently by others, who thought rightly or wrongly that their views should carry weight). One instance in which he broke this rule was to recommend Jacoby for the Freiburg chair of Greek in 1929 on the ground that a scholar of such merits ought to be in a university larger than Kiel. The effort was in vain. In Berlin he worked for the appointment of Paul Maas to a full professorship. There was resistance, but his repeated expressions of admiration for Maas' exceptional qualities helped greatly to start the action that led to Maas' appointment in Königsberg.

When consulted by German faculties or by their *ad hoc* appointment committees, his answers left no room for doubt. Often they were forceful and outspoken, yet there were also instances in which he wrecked a candidate's chances by shallow or conventional praise. In the first years after his emeritation such letters with their curious combination of temperament and diplomacy must have been very influential. Gradually their effect weakened, and he was less often approached. I can specify two reasons but do not suggest that they fully account for the decrease of his influence. It was

evident that his opinions, especially about Berlin people, reflected whatever happened to be his most recent impressions, and in writing about young scholars he tended to judge exclusively by the quantity and quality of their scholarly output. "Er soll wissen dass ich so lange gegen ihn bin als er nichts schreibt," he said of a man whose potential he had probably earlier (when he saw much of him) rated as highly as those who at the time were close to him. He wished to see scholarly capacities applied to advance the innumerable subjects that called for investigation.

After Franz Boll's sudden death in 1924 the faculty of Heidelberg looked for a successor who, besides possessing the scholarly qualifications, would bring new life to Greek studies now in critical condition and who might intellectually hold his own to the high-powered representatives of other subjects in the humanities. The man who more than any other fitted this description was Otto Regenbogen, a pupil of Wilamowitz and Diels, 33 at the time and associate professor in Berlin. He was warmly recommended by Jaeger and others in Berlin, as well as by Heidelberg students who had studied a semester or two in Berlin; but Wilamowitz, when asked for his opinion, protested most vigorously, declaring that Regenbogen had deserved none of the promotions and other recognitions given him after his Ph.D. and that an appointment to a major chair would be a great mistake. Since this outburst was obviously caused by the absence of publications, the Heidelberg faculty acted on the assurances it had been given of Regenbogen's excellent and very productive mind and waited patiently; about five years after his appointment Regenbogen felt ready to come forward with his fine work on the Hippocratics, Herodotus, Lucretius, Seneca and whatever else followed in remarkably quick succession.

This was not the only instance in which Wilamowitz showed no understanding for arguments based on the critical status of the Classics. He did not realize the need of justifying their study to a generation for whom the continuity of a tradition that reached back to the age of Goethe was weakened (though not completely broken) and whose outlook was still in the process of formation; many in fact were consciously striving for a new orientation. There was a chance—but for what? Hardly for Wilamowitz's 'Alttertumswissenschaft', which included so much that only he himself could render alive. The generation of Jaeger, Reinhardt and Hermann Fränkel (to name

but these) brought new points of view to the interpretation of the great Hellenic poets and thinkers. I have mentioned their appeal to the students and shall presently explain how welcome and reassuring most of their work was to Wilamowitz. But his sympathy came to an end when they attempted to define the nature of the Greek achievement or its unique place in Western civilization. Averse to all theorizing, he thoroughly disliked efforts to isolate and describe a 'classical age' or to treat particular authors, particular literary forms and works as 'classical'. He was shocked when the "ästhetische Gerede" of a meeting devoted to such a purpose appeared as a book (*Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike*, 1931).

Throughout his life he had expanded the study of Greek literature and civilization in every direction; his conception of *das Altertum* was all-inclusive, embracing the smallest as well as the greatest, and though fully alive to differences of quality, he refused to look, like Winckelmann and Goethe, upon any period or indeed on the Greeks themselves and their literature and civilization as 'classical' in the sense of exemplary. His concern was with variety and individuality, with the particular, not with the *καθόλου* except for such brilliant generalizations as sometimes emerged—almost accidentally one felt—in the course of his own research.

To return to Regenbogen (although other appointments may have included no less characteristic episodes, I happen to be especially familiar with this), when he had received the offer of the Heidelberg chair he thought it proper to ask Wilamowitz for advice whether or not to accept it. Wilamowitz, who doubtless knew a courteous gesture when he saw one, now looked upon the proposition not from the academic but from the human point of view. He dwelt on the difference to one's personality that a period in South Germany was bound to make. It was a pity, he remarked, that Diels had never spent a number of years in a southern university. Obviously what he expected was that the gentle and more relaxed style of life in South German surroundings would have a softening effect on the stern austerity of Regenbogen's personality. This response was one of the surprises one might at any time experience with Wilamowitz. Utterly unexpected as coming from someone so thoroughly Prussian, who in the course of his life may have paid a few visits to German towns south of the Main and who certainly was far more familiar with Italy, Greece and perhaps also Scandinavia, it showed that

while he judged a candidate *qua* scholar he was thoroughly aware of him as a human being.

Nor did it take him long to form his opinion about a person. Both his observation and the intelligence he brought to bear upon it were keen and constantly active. He grasped the characteristic traits as he grasped so much else, intuitively. How well he understood complex personalities I would not venture to say, but I find it hard to believe that he had much patience or sympathy for more delicate psychological problems. To 'rake over' someone's personality, to analyze it into its components and to describe or explain these elaborately—practices in vogue among the younger generations, though hardly yet on Freudian or Jungian lines—would not appeal to him.¹⁴

Basically uncomplicated as he was, he would not easily let difficult situations turn into problems. His upbringing as well as his personal temperament would show him the way. "Da gab es kein Besinnen" (*Erinnerungen* 176) must, one is compelled to think, have been the rule with him. Nor would he easily regret, let alone repent a decision; and if he regretted he would not waste time over it but move on. Whatever gain may be in a more differentiated psychological condition and a more sophisticated understanding of others, almost everybody who knew him, including the more complex ones, agreed that there was something healthy in this sureness and firmness with its absence of doubts and hesitations (of "die Problematik die uns verrückt macht," as Eduard Fraenkel once put it). Jaeger spoke of "etwas archaisches in Wilamowitz's Genialität." His vigorous physical health was simply another aspect of the same personality. If the *Erinnerungen* did not contain information to the contrary, one would have supposed that he had never been ill before 1931. A stranger to inhibitions, repressions, obsessions and the like, he would have been the last to carry a Nietzsche complex through the larger part of his life.¹⁵ The notion (which seems to have some vogue today)

¹⁴ Peter von der Mühl told me that when as a student and friend of Tycho he spent some time in Wilamowitz's home, father and son argued at length—he may have said "for hours"—about general problems of life and human behavior, perhaps even of Weltanschauung. Wilamowitz never lost his temper nor did he grow impatient. This must have been around 1905. In the 1920s it would be difficult to imagine him engaged in such conversation or to think of anyone who would have been his partner.

¹⁵ The chapter (5) of his *Erinnerungen* where he speaks of *Zukunftsphilologie* contains no evidence to the contrary. To ignore these events would have been impossible. Wilamowitz would have been accused of cowardice and worse than this, would have despised himself

that he could not fall asleep without worrying about what he had done to Nietzsche and that his first thought on waking up was “how can I ever live down ‘Zukunftsphilologie’?” represents the height of absurdity—although I would not insist on its being more absurd than the opinion, which one may also hear and even read nowadays, that Nietzsche, when he resigned his Basel chair of Classics in 1879, “followed Wilamowitz’s advice.”

In the 1920s when his direct influence as a teacher was reduced, he watched developments in German classical scholarship with some worry. Fortunately there was much to reassure him. For this was the decade when Jaeger, Reinhardt, Pfeiffer, Friedländer, Hermann Fränkel, von der Mühl, Latte, finally also Regenbogen and on the Latin side Eduard Fraenkel, Jachmann, Stroux and Klingner came to the fore, a splendid generation—most of them born in the latter half of the 1880s, when Jacoby’s *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* began to appear to his utter delight¹⁶ and when much else happened that he was bound to appreciate. His almost unerring sense of quality convinced him, *e.g.*, of the great worth of Pfeiffer, who had published little when he came to Berlin but the little sufficed for Wilamowitz to hand over to him the material he had prepared in earlier decades for an edition of the *Fragmenta Lyricorum Graecorum*. After Klingner’s beautiful lecture (in 1923) “Rom als Idee” Wilamowitz said audibly enough: “So etwas hört man gern” (a noteworthy comment, since the history of thought was decidedly not his passion and Klingner surprised by the complete novelty of his point of view).

Still every scholar had to be prepared for ups and downs in Wilamowitz’s estimation. There was no difference in this respect between his own former students and others. However, he assured us that Apollonius Rhodius was “in den besten Händen” (*scil.* Hermann Fränkel’s), expressed the same confidence about Latte’s edition of Hesychius, and continued to remind scholars *privatim et publice* of what he and “unsere Wissenschaft” expected of them, *e.g.* Alfred Körte of the *Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum*, von der Mühl of the edition of Diogenes Laertius. If there was one in whom his confidence

as timid. The curious pages (129f) which move back and forth between explanation, admission of his mistake, defense, attack and self-assertion culminate as it were in the triumphant declaration: “mit dem Endergebnis traf ich ins Schwarze” (180). What he does regret is to have published something naive and immature.

¹⁶ “die vollkommenste (Fragmentsammlung) die wir besitzen” (*SitzBerlin* 1926, 125).

never wavered it was Karl Reinhardt. After *Poseidonius* and *Kosmos und Sympathie* (1921 and 1924) had appeared, books that shocked most of the senior scholars as revolutionary and a break with the tradition, Wilamowitz referred in the seminar to Reinhardt's views on the *Somnium Scipionis*, commenting "Daraus," *scil.* from the books as a whole, "kann man eine Menge lernen. Wenigstens ich tue das." (The *unus sed leo* motif was not entirely absent; also Wilamowitz liked to be 'different' and cultivated certain *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* tendencies; yet I am sure that he could have backed up his opinion.) What mattered for him in a scholarly book was the substance, not at all the idiosyncrasies of form or style.¹⁷

Still, however much satisfaction or indeed delight he felt in many instances, he could not fail to realize that no one kept up the universality of his own approach. The integration which came so naturally to him, of Greek literature with religion, with political, institutional and social history, with the discoveries of archaeology and the geographical conditions—all on the basis of his unmatched familiarity with the language—was something that he had achieved and that was not to be achieved again. Some of the younger scholars frankly declared that they did not wish to be so all-embracing because not everything was equally worth knowing; most of them proved their honesty by admitting that they could not achieve what they considered not worth achieving. Wilamowitz would not have understood this attitude. He realized of course that his approach—his way of seeing things whole—was not to survive him, but he kept his disappointment to himself. The only pertinent remark of which I know was made by Frau von Wilamowitz. "Wollen Sie eigentlich alles rückgängig machen?" she asked a brilliant young scholar when in the course of the conversation he admitted that he had never yet been to Greece. He had expressed his regret and explained what circumstances had prevented his going, but the terrible word was spoken, and there could be no doubt as to whose opinion it expressed.

As I said, he watched developments with intense concern. This

¹⁷ A dissertation produced at the end of the 1920s drove Jaeger to despair because of the author's arrogant language and because the presentation was so arbitrary or absurd that the valuable content almost disappeared. When Wilamowitz had read it, he suggested some few and relatively simple changes by which the substance would become more visible. This would suffice, he said. "Der Mann ist nun mal verrückt. Er hat aber Begabung." Jaeger accepted the suggestions (I remember his appreciative comment, "Er ist ja praktisch").

concern and interest extended to the youngest scholars who were just appearing on the scene. Once (at least) he said that as it became increasingly difficult for him to keep up with everything that was published he made it a special point to see what the youngest had to contribute. This was no purely theoretical interest; rather he wished to help and to guide budding talent in the right direction. No doubt he often only glanced at a dissertation, but when the first impressions caused him to read more of it, he wrote the author indicating what he accepted and what he thought might have been done better. I happened to know an able young scholar in a provincial university who in his dissertation was reconstructing a regional cult from the *Inscriptiones Graecae*. He had the habit—not uncommon in his generation—of referring in a somewhat ironical manner to “Ulrich,” yet he never did so again after the day on which, to his utter surprise, he came across a glowing review of his dissertation by Wilamowitz in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*.

Fritz Wehrli, who had taken his Ph.D. in Basel (1928), happened to be in Berlin when he received copies of his dissertation “Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum.” He sent one of them to Wilamowitz. In reply Wilamowitz asked him to come to his home on some afternoon. When Wehrli arrived and the maid directed him to the staircase, all he saw in the darkish atmosphere of the hall was the white hair of Wilamowitz, who awaited him at the top of the staircase. Wilamowitz led him into the study, where he talked for an hour most amiably and vividly about various tendencies in the ancient exegesis of Homer. Others may have had a similar “unauslöschliche” (as Wehrli calls it) experience. At the Christmas celebration of the Classics students in 1930, the last at which he was present, he spoke briefly but warmly to them, referring to a recent Berlin dissertation on “Hesiod’s” *Scutum* where he had found a good new conjecture “und dann noch eine andere, auch richtig so dass ich sie auch in meinen eigenen Text eintrug”—simple words, but coming from him they could not but have a very encouraging effect on the students. Wherever he thought it worthwhile to help by a word of approval or of warning, he would communicate with the young author. Even on sending him a review a recent Ph.D. received a post card ending “*plaudo tibi.*”

Yet there were difficulties and disappointments. Ironically or rather, tragically—the first instance of the kind seems to have been

his own son Tycho, whose book on Sophocles heralded a new understanding of the plays. When Tycho was killed in the War, the chapter on *Oedipus Coloneus* had not yet been written and Wilamowitz decided to supply it. What he wrote showed clearly that he had not opened his mind to the novel point of view Tycho had applied to the other six plays. In Schadewaldt Wilamowitz recognized unusual gifts and tried hard but not very successfully to do him justice. As second referee of the dissertation he had serious hesitations about its soundness, yielded however also in this case to Jaeger's opinion, and was delighted when in the revised form which Schadewaldt published (*Monolog und Selbstgespräch*, 1926) he could appreciate genuine merits. He welcomed ("begrüssen") book and author in a review, and the review in turn was welcome—who would not be happy to start his career with Wilamowitz's blessings?—but it was obvious to Schadewaldt and his friends that the new ideas had not registered with Wilamowitz.¹⁸ Self-deceptions of this kind were rare, frank admissions of disappointment more frequent, and he was clearly grieved when a good young scholar did not live up to his expectation. "Es ist ja wohl notwendig dass die Jugend andere Wege geht als die wir für die richtigen halten" was an admission that must have been exceptional and reflected (I suppose) his high esteem of the young scholar to whom in the seminar he had referred as *iuvenis eximius* and who in his middle years and old age fully lived up to Wilamowitz's original judgement.

The *Wilamowitz Bibliographie* lists in separate paragraphs the books of which he was M(it)A(rbeiter), but there was no possibility of recording the projects he discussed with young scholars when he was consulted by them, e.g. on attempts to restore as genuine what had lately or generally passed as 'pseudo-'. He would also examine conjectures in the major authors when asked for his judgement by someone confident to have found a new emendation. Knowing how visitable he was, epigraphers would show him newly deciphered inscriptions, hoping to receive some helpful suggestions, and archaeologists would come to report the latest discoveries. He always

¹⁸ Wilamowitz was happiest about Schadewaldt's second book: *Zum Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikions*. This was dedicated to him and appeared shortly before his 80th birthday. In his letter of thanks Wilamowitz said that the best he could wish Schadewaldt was that if he reached so high an age a younger scholar might in similar fashion on the basis laid by him "über ihn hinauskommen."

listened attentively and when in the mood for it brought up other subjects that he knew to be of interest to the visitor. Judging by my own relatively limited experience I would say that one other subject was the rule and probably his idea of courtesy. Even so the visits, rewarding as they were for the caller, hardly ever lasted long. One did not feel hurried, but one would not normally be asked to stay when he took leave. Students or young scholars would not find him ill-humored on such occasions. Different moods on different days or even in different parts of the same day were, however, a familiar experience to those who knew him well and were frequent visitors in his study. Also his oldest friends, if they called on him while for a few days in Berlin, might come away exasperated: "mit dem kann man sich überhaupt nicht mehr unterhalten; der widerspricht ja bei allem." On the telephone he was often impatient, especially when it meant an interruption of his work. This was difficult to avoid, but an unfortunate assistant who called on a question of business was sometimes left uncertain of what Wilamowitz wished to see done.

In the University he was generally friendly to students and remarkably polite to the women; for although at heart he did not believe in women's study, they were 'Damen', and with a kind of old-time courtesy he kept his hat in his hands as long as he talked to them. Meeting a student in the Institut für Altertumskunde a few days before his oral Ph.D. examination he cheered him up, urging him not to spend the last afternoon and evening in hectic reading—"in Göttingen I used to tell my students to climb the Hainberg" (on the last day); next, pulling from his pocket a paperback edition of an English novel, he recommended some light reading and spoke appreciatively of the ease with which English and Scandinavian but not German *belles lettres* could be carried about. His pocket to be sure was bulging, but Wilamowitz was not much of a dresser in those days; one would call him negligent rather than elegant.

I recall also an instance in which he consoled a new Ph.D. who was dismayed at the unexpectedly low mark his thesis had received. Don't give up, he said in effect. "Kennen Sie den [Paul] Friedländer? Der hat mir ein scheussliches Buch geschrieben, den *Herakles*. Er ist nicht scheusslich; ihn habe ich sehr gerne. Und ich wusste was in ihm steckte"—hence he had published *Herakles* in his *Philologische Untersuchungen*. Oddly enough the person to whom he talked thus paralleled Friedländer in a steady upward development. One wonders

whether Wilamowitz, whose acumen in such matters could be amazing, had sensed his potential. It would be most remarkable; for I do not think that anybody else expected so much. The episode is noteworthy also because while generally in his decisions justice prevailed over kindness, he was ready to stretch a point for a young scholar who showed promise.

The Institut für Altertumskunde was the realization of his own great vision of all branches of classical studies—Greek, Latin, ancient history and the ‘Hilfswissenschaften’—brought together in one large room; only archaeology had for practical reasons found a home by itself in adjoining quarters. With seating accommodations for around 200 people and huge book collections on open shelves it offered excellent opportunities for study. In the years immediately following his emeritation Wilamowitz was frequently seen in it, arriving after his lecture or at some other hour and invariably for the purpose of consulting a book or periodical. Having found it he sat down wherever he happened to see an unoccupied chair and looked up what he wished to examine. He never stayed long, and his departure was barely noticed. Later on—say between 1927 and 1930—his visits to the Institute became noticeably fewer, and the janitor, a man of Wilamowitz’s own age, saw to it that each such visit became an event. With great aplomb both sides of the central door to the Institute were thrown open; every student at work in the rows of places nearby looked up expecting something very solemn to happen, and there slipped in as unobtrusively as was possible under the circumstances the familiar figure of Wilamowitz at a pace quick and businesslike rather than dignified; looking neither to the right nor to the left he headed for the place where he knew the item he needed was to be found.

I do not recall that he ever on such occasions looked at the new acquisitions that were displayed on a special table near the entrance. For a long time he had been used to having books and other items sent to him by their authors. After 1918 this was no longer the case—at least not generally—with Britain, France and, I imagine, the U.S.A. On the other hand, connections with Switzerland, Italy, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries became if anything closer. He could rely on Hiller, Maas, Klaffenbach and some others to show him what they expected to interest him. I am not sure but think it probable that he ordered books likely to contain valuable

information. It was factual information rather than literary criticism for which he cared in those years.¹⁹ Paul Hinneberg, the shrewd editor of the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, offered him numerous books for review. Even so it was inevitable, as he himself readily admitted, that he missed out on a good deal that was published. *Der Glaube der Hellenen* shows to what extent he had remained *au courant*, but it shows it only if studied and scrutinized with care; for the opinions set forth often imply a critical reaction to theories whose author he does not bother to identify. In areas with which I happen to be familiar I have noticed much tacit rejection or correction of what others had tried to establish in the preceding ten or twenty years.

It is certainly true that he went to bed earlier than most of his colleagues and got up at a very early hour, but I cannot say precisely what 'early' means in either case. He was said to need fewer hours of sleep than most mortals, and I am inclined to regard this too as true—for in Berlin at least legends had hardly yet begun to develop. Five hours may be the best guess, though I do not vouch for it. Having risen early and worked for some hours on *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, he felt the need of fresh air and went into the garden where he liked to do some weeding. One by one the other members of his family appeared, his wife, his son and his unmarried daughter, the deaconess, if she happened to stay in the house. Once they were just in time to notice that he had a spell of giddiness. Alarmed they called the family physician, Ernst Mommsen his brother-in-law, who advised him at his age not to engage in garden work. "Das bischen Jäten" (=weeding with the hoe) he retorted, unwilling to be deprived of his fresh air and physical activity.

Wilamowitz doubtless knew his worth. But there was far less of the typical 'Gelehrten-Eitelkeit' in him than in many others. It was not his way to refer with pride to his own achievements, to cite his own books *ad nauseam* or to play up confirmations that resulted from new discoveries. There must be other cases like that noted by Jachmann (*Gött.Nach* 1949, 209), where three verses of the *Odyssey* (10.56–58)

¹⁹ "Der (x, y, z) soll ganz ordentliche Philologie machen" was a comment he frequently made, which reflected his opinion that many literary studies on modern lines led to no worthwhile results and that the author would in his own interest and for the good of scholarship do better to improve his technical equipment. 'Ordentliche Philologie' would be an edition based on independent research about the Mss or a thorough commentary. On a good number of literary essays which he showed to the Graeca his comments were ironical; others, he seemed to think, were hardly worth an ironical remark.

athetized by Wilamowitz in his *Homerische Untersuchungen* of 1884 (p.127 n.6) were absent in a papyrus of the third century B.C. published in 1925 and where Wilamowitz, when coming back to the passage in his *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (pp.1–2 n.3) of 1927, simply took his stand on the text of the papyrus without referring at all to his early discussion. His numerous former students, including about twenty (all told) who held chairs, were now scholars in their own right; unlike most of his colleagues he was not in the habit of referring to them as his ‘Schüler’ or claiming, if only by implication, credit for high-class work they had done or for suggestions of his that had inspired their productions. In his lectures he used to cite “*x* in seiner Dissertation” without adding that the dissertation had been written under his direction, though he probably cited such dissertations more frequently than others. When he said that “*y*” (a foreign scholar) “der in Deutschland studiert hat—und” (he added hesitatingly) “bei uns studierte,” ‘uns’ would not mean more than ‘in Berlin’ or, if such was the case, ‘in Göttingen’, though some of those present might know and others guess that it really meant ‘bei mir’. Of complacency he had very little, especially if compared with one or two of his eminent contemporaries, and what little he had was hardly of a personal nature but rather pride about the way ‘die Wissenschaft’ had developed and was flourishing; yet even this was outweighed by an almost obsessive awareness of the huge tasks still waiting to be done.

To jealousy and academic intrigue he was a stranger. So he was, broadly speaking, to pettiness, including all of the customary fuss about priority, although “jetzt merken es allmählich die anderen auch” was something one heard him say, especially in cases where he had been far ahead in recognizing a scholar’s outstanding worth. I am anxious not to offer an idealized picture of him, yet having thought a good deal about the question I find it hard to remember any symptoms of the common academic ambition. To be sure he had had honors, distinctions and recognitions of the highest order and in such numbers that he could easily afford to be casual, indifferent or even annoyed about them (or to act that way; how could one know, and where would one draw a line?); and when they ceased coming or went to younger men, he accepted the situation without protest and went on with his work. That “es nur auf die Sache ankommt” or “alles um der Sache willen, um der Sache willen aber auch alles”

were declarations he had made rather too often, and between 1870 and 1930 they had become more and more of a cliché; yet he really felt that way. At the large scale centenary celebrations of the Archäologische Zentralinstitut in 1929 the planners feared that he would be hurt if they did not ask him to give the solemn opening address. Quite probably they were right, though I do not think that he would have been deeply affected or developed a lasting resentment. He loathed compliments and flattery. When they were uttered by awkward young people he had his way of not hearing them. To senior men he was brusque in such cases. Thomas Mann, who was with him on the cultural program in Florence mentioned above (p.96), assured Wilamowitz at an evening reception that he had listened to his "Vortrag" with great interest. Wilamowitz cut him short: "Ach, lassen wir doch unsere dummen Vorträge und geniessen wir lieber die entzückende Kühle dieses giardino" (Pasquali was present and reported the episode).

I am aware that much of what I have said conflicts with the impression of self-assured rudeness that created some enemies in Germany and made his personality look unattractive abroad. In a way it may actually have added to his popularity, not only by making him more colorful but also because often when hearing "I do not like Wilamowitz" one senses that the person who speaks thus while crushed under the weight of Wilamowitz's scholarship regains his self-esteem by knowing himself to be more of a gentleman. The impression was created by the polemics in his writings. There were instances of brutal polemic also in his lecture courses and in more informal talks; in fact some of these were worse than the worst he ever printed. When disagreeing with his friends and close collaborators he could become impatient and show irritation but avoided (as far as I know) downright offensive language. At times they must have found it hard to endure him, but they consoled themselves by remembering what Eva Sachs very aptly called his 'Heraclitean' quality: *νέος ἐφ' ἡμέρα*. Tomorrow everything would again be different. When annoyed with scholars of established merit—merit that he himself had recognized on other occasions—he could pass grossly unfair judgements: "Der hat ja noch nie eine Idee gehabt" or "dem ist ja noch nie etwas eingefallen." Throughout his life the opinion that Catullus' poems about Lesbia lacked a biographical basis had been anathema to him. In 1922 shortly before his course on Catullus

the theory had been advanced once more, this time by a member of the Berlin faculty whose academic experience had been a succession of misfortunes. Wilamowitz, who had never thought well of this man, was merciless in his condemnation of the recent article. To argue against the opinions of a colleague was legitimate and normal at a German university, but Wilamowitz's ruthlessness on this occasion made a painful impression on most of the students present.

The firm conviction that his opinion was true must have characterized Wilamowitz throughout his life, and even though he shared it with most of his contemporaries, at least in Germany—in the U.S.A. Shorey must have been similar—few had it in so extreme and provocative a form. And yet he did revise many of his early views, more often as a result of his own maturing than by yielding to others. Such yielding was seldom painless. Looking back at opinions he had discarded he could be as hard on them (and on himself) as he was on those of others. The more tolerant attitude frequently found in the younger generations, the understanding of another person's point of view and allowance made for alternative possibilities, would have struck him as a deplorable weakness, a symptom of decline. Nor would he ever have approved of the policy obtaining today in some journals that papers are accepted on grounds of quality rather than of agreement (*scil.* of the editor with the author). For him what was not true could not be good.

If it is asked how this certainty to possess the truth was compatible with his almost unerring sense for outstanding ability—for inevitably some of those in whom he believed must often have displeased him by their writings—I prefer not to attempt an answer. There were many conflicting facets to his personality. Traits and tendencies that one would regard as mutually exclusive were combined in him—I hesitate to say peacefully, but there was certainly no discord. If his habit of coming forward with strong convictions suggests that he was intransigent, his record in academic organizations proves the opposite. Theories never meant as much to him as concrete impressions, and even his principles did not stand in the way of concessions, which curiously enough never seemed to be compromises. Above all, he must have had a shrewd sense of what was possible. (I ought perhaps to apologize for coming back again and again to aspects of his personality; my excuse is that all efforts to 'figure him out' have had the same fate of never coming to an end.)

In retrospect an attitude seems worth recording of which during his life little notice was taken. He respected an individual scholar's freedom and inclinations. For the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, of which the Berlin Academy had put him in charge, he found Hiller von Gärtringen and somewhat later Klaffenbach enthusiastically ready to take on one volume after another; both of them could in thorny questions count on his help. Yet though he could doubtless have employed more scholars for this and other large enterprises of the Academy, he never used his authority to assign a volume to a man—or a man to a volume—in disregard of the person's own interests. Mommsen, Diels and professors in other fields had done so regularly and without hesitation in the conviction that their magnificent projects required and justified this practice. Given the tremendous influence that Berlin professors had on a scholar's career since they were consulted by faculties as well as by the appointing agencies of the governments, young men knew that if they declined they incurred the risk of lasting disfavor. It need not be thought that most of them hated the task thus put on them or that they did not profit and appreciate what they learned by doing the assigned work; in some instances, however, there must have been bitter feelings about being turned away from subjects dearer to their hearts. Wilamowitz did come forward with suggestions, usually with the idea that they might have a special appeal to the particular scholar, but there was no pressure connected with these suggestions, nor did they bear any relation to the large scale projects of the Academy.

A striking illustration of this regard for individual inclination is his conduct toward Paul Maas. He and Diels had in 1909 called Maas from Munich to Berlin, where he was to build up Byzantine philology. When duly established as Privatdozent, Maas did provide instruction in the Byzantine field, but he also before long announced courses on poetry of the classical (and probably also of the Hellenistic) period. In terms of the University statutes this was perfectly legitimate; but Diels let him know that he disapproved, and when Maas went to see him, he learned that he was meant to stay within the confines of the subject for which he had been specifically appointed and where, if he did well, he could expect to make his way upward on the academic ladder. Dismayed at being treated merely as a part of the organization, Maas turned to Wilamowitz, who encouraged him to go ahead with whatever he wished to teach and

assured him that there would be no interference with his freedom. By acting contrary to Diels' wishes Maas lost the prospects of promotion, but being a man of private means he did not worry about this until inflation following World War I made havoc of his financial resources. At that point he again turned to Wilamowitz, who promised help and soon secured for him an associate professorship (*Extraordinariat*). How Diels reacted at this juncture I do not know, and it is possible that Maas himself, who in 1929 told me of these experiences, had not learned about it. It stands to reason, however, that on the occasions when Wilamowitz definitely wanted something—and especially when he had so good a case as in this instance—nobody would interfere with his efforts.

About Wilamowitz's political reactions it is somewhat embarrassing to write, yet the subject is too important to be passed over in silence. Anyone looking at the "Vorwort" of his *Platon II* will know how he felt around Christmas of 1918, when the world to which he had belonged since his childhood broke down. Although by no means an admirer of Wilhelm II and his closest advisers, he never rid his mind of the notions which German official propaganda had spread during the war and which right-wing conservative and nationalistic ideology kept alive in its fight against the Weimar Republic. The emotional outbursts of grief, despair and hostility, which he could not suppress even in his teaching and public lectures, became gradually less frequent; around the middle of the 1920s they had almost ceased. Some passages in his *Pindaros* are revealing for his feelings in 1922 (I quote only two sentences on p.198: "So redet ein ehrlicher treuer Mann nach dem Zusammenbruche des Vaterlandes. Er überwindet die Lähmung seiner Kraft, die ihn zuerst niederhielt, und kehrt zu seiner Kunst zurück"; see also p.413). The same unquenchable vitality that had rebelled so ferociously against the destruction of things dear to him helped him to overcome despair and carry on with his work. By 1925 he had calmed down, and there was more again of his charm, *esprit* and sense of humor.²⁰

Such grievances about the government as he voiced in conversation were often hardly different from the kind of criticism that he had

²⁰ Cf. Reinhardt, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 364; "Auch endete er nicht wie...der Achtundvierziger Mommsen in Verbitterung. Sein Temperament blieb auf die Dauer heiter... Im menschlichen Verkehr war er schlechthin bezaubernd" (others might have preferred to say that he could be enchanting).

expressed under the monarchy.²¹ Fundamentally, however, he was not and indeed could never have become reconciled to the new political conditions. Whether he ever woke up to some of the basic truths—*e.g.* that the German army had in 1918 been defeated, not stabbed in the back, or that the Weimar Republic had besides the harsh conditions of the peace to bear a huge mortgage of debt for the imperial policy—I do not know. The tone in which his *Erinnerungen* refer to the *Novembermänner* (*i.e.* of the 1918 revolution) was no great surprise, even though one may believe that in dwelling on bygone days his feelings were stirred more violently than they had been for some time.

I emphasize that what I know of his political utterances is a matter of chance, yet two additional items deserve to be recorded. In 1919 his family's estate in Markowitz and the entire region where he had spent his youth passed under Polish control. This caused him bitter grief, and no less than ten years had to pass before he again visited the estate, which by that time belonged to one of his nephews.²² Shortly after his return when meeting Richard Walzer in the suburban train he described his impressions. The good physicians of the German period had departed and had been replaced by men considered less competent. Other developments too caused him regret, but the balance of his impressions was by no means wholly negative, and he reported in the tone of a man who had looked at the changed conditions with interest and tried to assess their implications. It was probably even later—in 1929 or 1930—that his son persuaded him to attend a political meeting of the Stahlhelm or a similar right-wing organization. He was quite repelled by the reac-

²¹ In November 1927 when I went to see him on some item of business, he was very hard on the Prussian Ministry of Education for "not living up to its duty" of building up the University of Bonn to something like its former importance. "If I had to choose," he said, "between studying Latin at Cologne with Jachmann or at Bonn with X, I would not have a moment's hesitation." He did not trust the newly founded University of Cologne and retained a warm attachment to Bonn with its strong tradition in the Classics, where he himself had studied. For Usener and Bücheler he had throughout his life a genuine if not uncritical veneration, and to August Brinkmann, Usener's successor, he referred in the seminar as a man "der geradezu unheimlich viel Griechisch konnte." But there was no love lost between himself and Bücheler's first and second successors.

²² It seems clear to me that this visit took place after the publication of the *Erinnerungen* and after his 80th birthday. Where the *Erinnerungen* refer for contrast or some other purpose to "more recent" conditions he is recording what he saw during visits prior to 1914.

tionary, unconstructive tenets of the group. "Da kann ich nicht mitmachen. . . das geht viel zu weit" he told Norden (who in 1933 mentioned it to me). While the nationalistic parties became increasingly radicalized, feeding on the widespread economic misery, and while developments headed almost inexorably toward the catastrophic dénouement of 1933, Wilamowitz, for the first time in his life out of touch with politics, concentrated his remaining strength on the great work he still wished to complete.

Individuum est ineffabile. The forces and influences that (while they certainly did not produce) helped to shape Wilamowitz's personality lie far in the past. Hardly any historian today is likely to give attention to conditions in the areas which Prussia had annexed in the second Polish partition (1793; confirmed 1815) and where throughout the 19th century varying policies toward the native population were pursued. My own task is not a historian's, but since elsewhere in this essay I have sought to dispel misconceptions, I may be forgiven if passing outside my self-imposed chronological limits I point out that Wilamowitz's political outlook was first and foremost Prussian rather than German.²³ Although he rejoiced when in his 23rd year Germany became united with "his king" at the head and though he subsequently adjusted his political opinions to the new situation, his basic devotion remained to the king of Prussia, and it was in Prussia that his entire career took place. In fact, to describe him as a Prussian will hardly suffice unless it be added at once that his family belonged to that core of the Prussian nobility from which the prince electors (*Kurfürsten*) and kings drew their devoted servants to fill positions of army officers, administrators and state councillors. The ownership of a large estate ('Gutshof', 'Rittergut') in the eastern provinces was another traditional occupation of this aristocracy; it could be combined with one of the other functions, yet in the case of Wilamowitz's

²³ In making this point I follow Wilamowitz's own leads. See *e.g.* "Vorwort als Nachwort" in *Platon II* (1918) or the last sentence in the "Vorwort" of his *Erinnerungen*. What he quotes at the end of this book (p.318) from his address at an international meeting as his opinion of Jakob Grimm ("Hesse" rather than "German"), Carlyle and Renan applies to himself. The reason stated (*ibid.* 208) for declining a chair at a non-Prussian university is extreme. Hardly any other German professor would have regarded the 'Beamteneid' as a commitment for life. Extreme too—and reflecting his penchant for the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*—is a story told by L. Radermacher about his conduct at a Dutch university during a banquet in his honor. When the Dutch professors raised their glasses for a toast to the German Emperor, Wilamowitz did not do likewise but waited until everybody in utter amazement put down his glass, then got up and drank: "Zu dem König von Preussen."

father the estate formed a kind of Prussian outpost in the midst of a foreign population. What view the family took of their educational mission he himself explains better than anybody else could.²⁴

As we learn from the *Erinnerungen*, Wilamowitz had both on his father's and on his mother's side links with the outstanding generals of Friedrich II ("der alte Fritz"). But the great king belonged to the 18th century. The immediate loyalty or *Treue* went to "meinem alten König," Wilhelm I. Of Wilhelm II Wilamowitz was critical, not least because his tone, conduct and style of life were so much at variance with what he considered the good old Prussian traditions. It is probably true that Wilamowitz had the characteristically Prussian virtues, yet had risen above all bureaucratic pedantry of which Prussia had far too much and was free of many, though by no means all, prejudices of the ruling class. He did indeed dislike and distrust democracy; the "urteilslose Menge" which lacked education and was in his eyes morally unreliable was spoken of with contempt,²⁵ and not only in political contexts. Other typical prejudices were anticatholic and antisemitic sentiments. He voiced both of them rather frankly, but it is characteristic that neither of them affected his opinions of nor his decisions about individuals.

Among his Prussian virtues his sense of 'Pflicht' should probably be mentioned first, even though it is obvious that he appealed to it far too often. More than one generation of his students wondered

²⁴ The return of his native territory to Polish control in 1918 (and 1919) produced so many utterances of bitterness and grief that the younger generations—not only the youngest—were quite surprised to learn from the *Erinnerungen* how "Polen-freundlich" his and his family's attitude had been. Whether it is true that the new Polish government after 1918 recognized this attitude by leaving the family in undisturbed possession of the estate I am not in a position to say.

²⁵ The *Volk* could not take care of itself; it needed to be governed—which did not mean that those governing it under the monarchy were immune to his sharp criticism. It was indeed not on *Volk* but on *Staat (Reich)*, *Vaterland* and the monarchy that his nationalism centered. His address on becoming rector of the University of Berlin (*Reden aus der Kriegszeit*, Viertes Heft, Berlin 1915) includes, besides assertions typical of the wartime atmosphere, some remarkably honest admissions and startling insights such as: "Von einem preussischen Volk kann man eigentlich nicht reden" (because of its disparate ingredients), "nur von dem Staate" which "die Fürsten . . . geschaffen (haben)" (22f). I can quote only one more statement: "Unsere Feinde pochen auf den Gegensatz zwischen dem Deutschland Goethes und dem Bismarcks. Ganz leer ist das nicht." Officially this Gegensatz did not exist (at least until 1919, when the Republic somehow acknowledged it by choosing Weimar as the place for the constitutional convention). 'Leer' is Wilamowitz's personal idiom for 'meaningless'.

whether he did not apply this moral concept on countless occasions where other motives were no less strongly operative.²⁶ The satisfaction and delight that accompany the solution of problems or the grasp of important subjects, in fact any kind of fuller understanding and its successful communication to others, cannot have been unknown to him. His brilliant achievements in his great days as a teacher and his large influence on educated men and women must have given him an emotional reward that Hellenists would identify with the *ἡδονή* which (for Plato and Aristotle) is an inseparable aspect of the 'intellectual excellences' rather than with the performance of duty. But for a good Prussian—not only for Kant, whom Wilamowitz, odd though it may sound, probably never read—*Lust*, *Freude* and *Neigung* are the foes of *Pflicht* and therefore anathema. In Wilamowitz's thinking *Pflicht* was closely associated with *Wahrheits-suche*, *Dienst* and *Treue*, the latter two again attitudes fostered by the Prussian monarchy (it has often been noticed that he carried them too readily into his discussion of ancient authors). The associations just mentioned may incidentally explain how his—or the Prussian—concept of duty differed from the strong if far less dramatized feeling of responsibility that is found in other countries. Still however much we discount, it was certainly a sense of duty, coupled with defiance of the Weimar Republic, that made him after 1918 on days of traffic strikes go on foot from his home in Westend across the whole length of Charlottenburg to the University, and having done his teaching, seen students and taken care of whatever else was to be done, go back on foot; it must have taken about an hour and a half each way.

Other virtues that come to mind are integrity (including of course honesty and general reliability), discretion, the desire to do justice and, not least in importance, parsimony. Having been brought up simply, he had never enjoyed luxury or any kind of unnecessary spending of money. In the 1920s when conservatives generally regarded a return to 'altpreuussische Sparsamkeit' as a means of salvation and blamed the Republic for spending recklessly on enterprises for which the monarchy would have provided little or nothing, he for one set an example. In 1924 some of my fellow students and I realized that our monthly allowance sufficed for second-class tickets in the suburban trains to and from the University; the advantage of

²⁶ See again Reinhardt, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 384f, yet also 364, where he correctly decides: "seine Wissenschaft [blieb] ihm ebenso Lust wie Pflicht."

finding a seat and being able to read was considerable. Mentioning this quite innocently in a family which I used to visit, I was put to shame by the remark: "Sie fahren zweiter Klasse und Wilamowitz fährt dritter Klasse." A Ph.D. candidate received suggestions and bibliographical references more often on the back of a used envelope or of discarded drafts than on regular stationery. At an afternoon party in his yard (where we were expected to admire his climbing roses) he told the members of the Graeca and their wives how he had lately visited a new colleague—a rare event for him in those years but "einmal in meinem Leben muss ich doch sehen wie der Professor Deubner wohnt"; he had carefully reasoned out what suburban trains and other means of public transportation would take him close to Deubner's home. Clever and practical as all of it was, most professors, even if far less than 81, would have taken a taxi. For him taxis existed as a last resort in emergencies. His home, as far as I remember, was characterized by a preference for simple comfort;²⁷ on the one occasion when I called on Hiller von Gärtringen, I was struck by the difference in elegance between his house and that of his father-in-law a few steps down the other side of the same block.

In his old age and most particularly in his last years, Wilamowitz was not in the mood to go out for evening entertainment; if he went to see a play, it was a Greek tragedy performed most probably in his own translation so that he felt in duty bound to go, especially when he had received an invitation. Having remained a stranger to music, attendance of concerts was out of the question. Considering how little inclination he had to leave his home in the evening, it was gracious of him to attend the large meetings of the Gesellschaft für antike Kultur, whose president was Johannes Popitz, the Undersecretary of Finance, and whose vice-president and prime mover was Jaeger. I recall Wilamowitz's presence at lectures of Ludwig Curtius and of Walter F. Otto.

On 22 December 1928 Wilamowitz reached his 80th birthday. Jaeger and a few others had for some time deliberated how to celebrate the day in a manner that would express the gratitude and admiration of the learned world. Unfortunately several plans proved unworkable. His opposition to Festschriften was well known. As an

²⁷ Of items in his study the only one I recall (besides the urn mentioned above p.91) is the small glass of wine which one could always see on his writing desk, where it helped him to refresh his spirits.

alternative the committee arranged what one of its members frivolously called the 'Zeitschriften-Proskynese', the dedication to him of the classical periodicals of the coming year (copies of the first issue carrying the dedication could be ready in time). Even this project could be realized only in part. Few if any editors of foreign journals saw their way to cooperate, since his "Kriegsreden" and other activities of those years had not been forgotten, and even in Germany the editor of *Rheinisches Museum* who had never liked Wilamowitz sent a negative reply. Another honor decided upon proved a great success in the end but the implementation required more time than was available. This was the *Wilamowitz Bibliographie*, which was taken in hand by Klaffenbach with the help of several other scholars. On the 80th birthday the project was officially announced; on the 81st a copy was ready and could be presented to Wilamowitz.

The number of those who assembled in his home on 22 December 1928 must have been large. I do not know how many friends and former students had come from outside Berlin. Besides dignitaries of the government and of the University, the cultural attachés of foreign embassies were present to congratulate him. When the Italian attaché addressed him in German, Wilamowitz replied in Italian, speaking of his numerous personal and scholarly ties to Italy. He similarly answered the Greek attaché in modern Greek, the Swedish in Swedish, the Danish in Danish and still another one—it must have been either the Norwegian or the Dutch—in that country's language.

There was at least one more public lecture after this day. On the program for a wider audience that the Berlin Academy had arranged for the year 1930/31 he spoke on "Kaiser Marcus," dealing with aspects of his personality and his reign including the mistakes, the fatal first of which was that he begat a son instead of adopting one; then he turned to *Εἰς ἑαυτόν* and after a brief introduction read a good number of passages in his translation. The audience was deeply moved even before he at the end asked what might be the gain of such acquaintance with the emperor's mind and after a moment's pause came forward with the answer: "dass wir in Frieden auseinandergehen."

For some years he had urged Ph.D. candidates and others working with him to speed up whatever task needed his assistance; for he would not be there to help them much longer. He spoke in similar words to visitors and to others leaving for a longish period. Under the

impression of his healthy appearance, his firm carriage and unbroken energy of work, the idea that he might equal or exceed Mommsen's 86 years seemed more probable; but in May 1931 he fell seriously ill, and although he pulled out of this spell of suffering ("so weit herunter dass ich zu Bett liege. Hoffentlich wird's noch einmal besser," he wrote on May 20), it must have been evident to himself, the family and the few others still in contact with him afterwards that his life was drawing to an end.

Harnack died in May 1930, Eduard Meyer in August of the same year. Wilamowitz, the oldest of the three, died in September 1931. There was a vivid feeling that the great epoch of German scholarship had come to an end.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL

December, 1978