

Classical Scholarship in Berlin Between the Wars

†*Friedrich Solmsen*

EVER SINCE publishing “Wilamowitz in his Last Ten Years,”¹ I have been urged by colleagues and friends on both sides of the Atlantic to produce an account of developments in German classical scholarship between the two wars. What my late friend Hermann Strasburger deplored as widespread ignorance of this period and a minimal sense of continuity with it—due of course to the intervening twelve years of darkness and destruction—is proved by the abundance in recent articles of false and half-true statements, suggestions of questionable motives, and other distortions of what took place in that period. The reconstruction I offer here is based almost entirely on my own recollections of those years in Berlin. It cannot and should not be regarded as representative of Germany as a whole; similar reports from other centers, especially Munich and Leipzig, probably also Göttingen and Kiel, would complement the picture in essential ways.

I

In the years immediately after 1918, teachers of the classics were confronted with a new attitude on the part of the public. Among the many traditions affected by the catastrophe of the old political order was the primacy of the Humanistic Gymnasium, which normally included in its curriculum six weekly hours of Greek for the last six years before the final exam. The

¹ *GRBS* 20 (1979) 89–122. While I have made it a point to avoid repetitions, the present essay is inadequate in form as well as in content; its only justification is that some developments recorded in it ought not to be forgotten or distorted. I regret that matters of gossip could not be completely avoided and that some scholars who showed me kindness are presented in a not very favorable light.

cultural hegemony of Greece so emphatically proclaimed by Winckelmann, Goethe, Schiller, and others early in the nineteenth century inspired Wilhelm von Humboldt's conception of this type of education. Despite attacks from time to time, the gymnasium had maintained its honored position for nearly a century, but the beliefs and convictions that had shaped it had by and large receded. Even teachers possessed of a flair for literary qualities were at times embarrassed to define the unique educational value of the years devoted mainly to Greek grammar and Homer—and besides Homer, normally one or two plays of Sophocles, a good deal of Xenophon, and a sampling of Herodotus. After the loss of the First World War, left-wing governments and progressive elements of the public argued energetically against a privileged position for the humanistic school. The demand for practical results and the notion that Greek was useless for a future physician, lawyer, or businessman were important components of the attack, but there was also the notion that German literature rather than Greek or Latin should dominate the curriculum, and this view had many supporters. The effect of these new currents was the disappearance of some gymnasia and the threat facing those that survived. There was a need for reform and reorganization and—most of all, it would seem—a new understanding of what humanism was and what it had to offer.

How did this critical situation affect the academic study of the classics and in particular of Greek around 1920? The first answer is that there were considerably fewer students than before 1914. If in a large university the enrollments had declined from some two hundred to, say, forty or fifty, the quality and the motivation would normally be superior; but the students who returned from the war—and hardly less those coming directly from the schools—were infected by a critical spirit, struggled with new problems, and had a new outlook and made new demands. If the literary works of the Greeks embodied profound truths and superlative values, should not the teachers focus on these? Why was there such concern with the personal circumstances of the poets? Why was there discussion of conflicting traditions about their lives and of personal or intellectual relations in the world of letters? To be sure, some measure of literary appreciation was included in the courses offered by most professors, but the criteria of literary merit were undergoing a

change. The favorite authors of the youth—Hölderlin, Nietzsche, Stefan George—set a new model of greatness, and Gindolf's incomparable books on Goethe, George, the Romantics, and other poets achieved a degree of penetration that made students wonder whether something of similar power could also be produced by classicists. Criticism of the *Wissenschaft des Nichtwissenswerten* had appeared even before the war, but was brought home much more forcefully now.

Did the high priests of the beleaguered temple respond to this situation? For Wilamowitz, Eduard Meyer, and Eduard Schwartz, the questioning of Greek was just a symptom of the general confusion and corruption they sensed in the early years of the Weimar republic. By and large they ignored it or treated it with irony. Confrontations developed rarely, and of collisions in print the most significant example is almost certainly Eduard Schwartz's merciless review of a pamphlet by Paul Friedländer and Walther Kranz,² in which the former advocated for the universities, the latter for the gymnasias, a reform in the direction of wholehearted concentration upon the great "Schöpfungen." It was the implied neglect of textual criticism and biographical or historical background that provoked Schwartz into extolling τέχνη, especially editorial τέχνη, as a most noble pursuit and as an end in itself, with no need of any synthesis (*i.e.*, literary history or artistic appreciation).

Not many of the reform-minded younger classicists would agree with Friedländer's extreme position. How far then did they actually go? Generalizations are impossible; still, an intensive effort at penetrating to the personality of the great authors, their spiritual and artistic traits, and their achievements was characteristic of scholars as different as Jaeger, Eduard Fraenkel, Reinhardt, Hermann Fränkel, Friedländer, Regenbogen, Klingner, Von der Mühl, and many others of this generation and their pupils. Attention to externals, while losing ground, varied naturally with the subject; I recall Jaeger in his course on Aeschylus keeping it at a minimum, while in that on Demosthenes it loomed large. Some of the most brilliant in this group never edited an author, and no one as far as I can discern devoted his

² The pamphlet in question being unavailable to me, I rely for its content on the report and the quotations in Schwartz's review in the first volume of his *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin 1938).

entire productive energy to codices and editions. However, a new closeness to the classical texts was typical, with a greater readiness to listen, ponder, and understand rather than judge and criticize. Greek literature of the imperial age received a minimum of attention (except for Plotinus), and even Hellenistic poetry, which Wilamowitz had done so much to render alive, suffered neglect. It seems also worth recording that in filling vacant chairs of Greek or Latin, increased attention was given to a candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and his ability to defend the subject.

Among the professors of Greek who were born in the 1860's and 1870's I knew some who completely ignored the new demands, and some others—*e.g.* Max Pohlenz—who admitted that there was a new generation for which they could develop a certain amount of sympathy. As has just been seen, however, one has to turn to those born in the 1880's to find a strongly affirmative attitude and an eagerness to develop a new understanding and the right way to convey it. In Karl Reinhardt's *Poseidonios* (1920) new ground was broken; the departure from the 'tradition' was even proclaimed, but the author was competent to unite *Wissenschaft* and *Leben*. The book caused a sensation; it was admired by many who regretted their ignorance of most of the subjects covered but grasped something of Reinhardt's 'inner form'—the persistent endeavor to distinguish between dogma, doctrine, and doxography on the one hand, and what was uniquely personal on the other. It may seem odd to mention after *Poseidonios* Eduard Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus* (1922). Here were no difficulties of understanding, no reasons to doubt the soundness of original scholarship; yet the way in which the results of the analysis were presented showed a contemporary feeling for literary qualities, while the elegance and liveliness of the presentation distinguished this book from the sternly scholarly language of Fraenkel's revered teacher, Friedrich Leo, in his *Plautinische Forschungen*.

After Reinhardt and Fraenkel had shown, albeit in very different ways, a new vitality in classical research—more specifically a desire and capacity to penetrate deeper to the core of great figures—there appeared in 1923 Jaeger's *Aristoteles*: a book that Diels, who knew much of its content but did not live to see it, had prophesied would "revolutionierend wirken." This prophecy was fulfilled. Here warm and sympathetic interpretation

went through and beyond the text to the personality of the author and for the first time actually revealed Aristotle as a person. What for centuries or indeed millennia had been a system, impersonal and authoritative, was suddenly transformed into a human being with human experiences and human development. Aristotle also, for the first time, became a part of Greek intellectual (as distinct from merely philosophical) history. Recently described by an English philosopher (Jonathan Barnes) as perhaps "the most influential work written on Aristotle in this century," it was also a symbol and representative of the new post-World War I attitude towards the classics and of a new sensibility and changed aspirations. The new attitude may be defined as a judicious combination of closeness to great thoughts and reverential distance from great minds. What was not expected was the flood of studies in the next decades, suggesting alternatives to one phase or another in Aristotle's development. A few critics went so far as to question the basic concept of the book. Others maintained that if Aristotle developed at all, it was rather by moving closer and closer to Plato. Jaeger's reaction to such criticism varied. At first he tended to laugh it off, describing it ironically: "Ich denke mir das und das so und so und das stimmt dann nicht zu Jaeger...." The subjectivity and irresponsibility of most attacks deserved nothing better. In the end the persistent polemic of von Arnim (Vienna), who was seconded by Paul Gohlke in Berlin, depressed Jaeger severely and he needed considerable time to recover his balance. (On the crux of the polemic, the authenticity of the *Magna Moralia*, Wilamowitz's discovery of a textual variant proved Jaeger to be right; in another major controversy, on the question of the date of biological research carried on in Lesbos, his opponents were in the end shown guilty of gross negligence in maintaining a date earlier than Jaeger had proposed.)

In 1924 when the galloping inflation had finally been stopped and political and economic conditions in Germany seemed on the way to stabilization, the most distinguished representatives of the younger group came together for a meeting in Weimar to consider the ways and means of expressing themselves. This meeting, which must have been preceded by a considerable number of informal conferences and deliberations, included also archaeologists and ancient historians of comparable orientation. Scholars found themselves confronted by a twofold task: on the

one hand they felt that certain conditions in the profession ought to be improved and reformed; on the other they realized the necessity of again securing for the study of ancient civilization the interest of a wider general public. To begin with the esoteric situation, what these men would have liked was a new periodical in addition to *Hermes*, *Philologus*, and *Rheinisches Museum* to serve as the vehicle of new ideas. Financial considerations proved this not feasible. Postponing the project in the hope that there might be changes in the editorial staff of the periodicals just mentioned, they decided on a journal devoted to reviews, a *Kritische Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft*, or *Gnomon*. Archaeology was represented by Rodenwaldt and Ludwig Curtius, ancient history by Gelzer and Wilhelm Weber, and the board also included the philosopher Ernst Hoffmann and the Swiss scholar Peter Von der Mühl. Not wishing to exclude other generations, the editors also secured for the board three senior scholars: Eduard Schwartz, the eminent linguist Wilhelm Schulze, and the papyrologist Wilhelm Schubart. Richard Harder, a recent Ph.D. of Jaeger, was chosen as managing editor. With extraordinary energy, skill, and political prudence, Harder succeeded within a few years in establishing *Gnomon* as one of the most important classical journals in the world. Its international character deserves to be emphasized, for in reviewing books of foreign scholars, and soliciting reviews from foreign scholars, *Gnomon* in the later '20's did much to rebuild academic contacts during the postwar period.³ It was only in the first years of *Gnomon* that Fraenkel could take thirty-five pages for a review of Housman's *Lucan*,⁴ or Pas-

³ In view of the numerous international conventions, symposia, etc., of the 1970's and '80's, it must be hard to imagine the isolation and resulting ignorance on the part of German students about classical scholarship in other countries. To be sure Oxford texts were used (e.g. for Plato, Euripides, Cicero), and the average student might at examination know about eight or ten foreign scholars (Murray, Shorey, etc.). The professors were of course familiar with achievements elsewhere and gradually filled the gap after 1914. But when Norden and Jaeger returned from visits to receive honors in England they brought tales of an unknown world. Regenbogen pointed out repeatedly that classicists abroad knew German scholarship better than Germans what was done beyond the frontiers.

⁴ The rather critical review produced an angry postcard from Housman: "Vobis criticis hoc est commune ut vobis me multo magis circumspecti videamini; estis autem multo minus." There followed specific points in which Hous-

quali discuss Paul Maas' *Textkritik* in a review that he himself called unique in the history of reviewing since it took up more space than the work reviewed. At the beginning of 1934, when Fraenkel was forced from office, Curtius, Reinhardt, and others resigned in protest, and *Gnomon* was saved by the reduced board of Harder, Gelzer, and Rodenwaldt.

To recapture the interest of the educated public at large, *Die Antike* was launched, with subscription to it tied to a newly-organized Gesellschaft für antike Kultur. *Die Antike*, elegant in its makeup and intellectually demanding, appeared quarterly beginning with 1925. To go into detail about Jaeger's editorial policies would require a special article; suffice it to recall the great extent to which he resorted to archaeological articles with first-class reproductions to make sure of contact with the prospective readers' eyes as well as minds. Other articles characteristic of the early volumes, I cite at random: Paul Friedländer's three articles on the Attic tragedians, a number of Stenzel's searching studies on Greek philosophy, and Regenbogen's new understanding of Herodotus. The Gesellschaft developed satisfactorily, and its seriousness of interest was proved signally by the number of members, which remained constant even in the years of the economic depression after 1929, when some financial retrenchment became imperative for almost everyone in Germany. In Berlin the Gesellschaft was large enough to sponsor a number of meetings and public lectures. Ludwig Curtius' archaeological lectures impressed by the cosmopolitan breadth of his culture; Walter F. Otto's new conception of Artemis was admired even by those who remained less than fully convinced.

Besides serving as vice president (and in fact the guiding spirit)⁵ for the Gesellschaft für antike Kultur and editor of *Die Antike*, Jaeger was also elected head of the Philologische Fach-

man was held to prove his case against Fraenkel. Despite this and some other exchanges, Housman received Fraenkel cordially when he came to England in 1934 and supported him warmly for the Oxford chair (one sentence, the exact wording of which I cannot guarantee: "I wrote this recommendation with regret since I had hoped he would become my successor at Cambridge"). Other supporters of Fraenkel on this occasion included W. M. Lindsay, Bowra, Eduard Schwartz, Norden, Wilhelm Schulze, and Pasquali. Gilbert Murray and others well-disposed to Fraenkel were on the Committee of Elections for this chair.

⁵ As president was chosen, *more Anglico*, a member of the German government, Johannes Popitz, undersecretary of the Department of Finance.

tagung, which was founded in 1924, met again in 1925 with a program of lectures, and in 1926 and afterwards every second year, perpetuating the spirit of the 1924 meeting, yet unlike that meeting open to academic teachers of every age-group, plus a few specially-invited persons. On every occasion questions of policy were discussed, relating in part to the organization of the Fachtagung itself, but even more frequently to desirable and less desirable trends in the humanistic gymnasium and such concrete problems as the place of linguistics in the training of students. A report by Gelzer about Byzantine history provoked different opinions between those regarding Byzantine history as part of ancient history and those including it in the Middle Ages. Of individual lectures only a few may be mentioned. At the convention of 1925 Wilhelm Weber built "Greek History of the second millennium B.C." on Forrer's recent identification of Achaeans and other familiar Greek names in Hittite texts (he courted disaster, for Eduard Schwartz, who rejected Forrer's theories, ripped Weber's confident assertions to pieces). Norden spoke at an early meeting about one of the archaic Roman religious texts he was to treat much later in his final book; Schadewaldt discussed the development of Thucydides' historiography. The convention of 1930, which it was necessary to organize in Naumberg instead of in Weimar, was the most remarkable of all because its program consisted of a symposium on "Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike." The eight lectures composing it were published by Jaeger shortly after the meeting. The contributions of Fraenkel, Friedländer, Schadewaldt, and the archaeologist Bernhard Schweitzer were conceived in a new spirit. Its high intellectual level secured for the symposium a sympathetic reception.

With this symposium the new sensitivity for the *wesenhafte* and *wertvolle* in ancient civilization may be said to have achieved its form. Scholars of different background had met for a common purpose and found themselves in basic agreement on the subject—in fact on a subject that the extreme historicism of Wilamowitz considered futile. Among important works reflecting the new outlook, most published after 1933 but with their roots in our period, may be mentioned, if only *titulo tenuis*: Reinhardt's *Sophokles* (1934), Jaeger's *Demosthenes* (1936), Schadewaldt's *Iliasstudien* (1938), and the two volumes of Friedländer's *Platon* (1928–30). Klingner's fine articles on the great Latin auth-

ors, most of them produced after 1933, should not go unmentioned. Finally, it would not be fair to omit two books which, ironically, were written or at least completed abroad. One is Hermann Fränkel's *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (New York 1951); the other, Eduard Fraenkel's *Horace* (Oxford 1957).

II

In Berlin the younger academic teachers could give more of their time to students and were expected to be closer to their interests and aspirations. Nobody could live up more fully to that expectation than Eduard Fraenkel, who started his academic career as Privatdozent and Ausserordentlicher Professor in Berlin in 1917–23. He kept warm and firm contact with a large number of students, remained informed of what they were doing and, whether consulted or not, influenced the planning of their next work. Fraenkel's lectures rarely treated problems as problems; more generally he had found the solution, and what he offered was a synthesis of old and new insights presented with extraordinary dynamism, interspersed with glimpses right and left at related topics. The intensity of his scholarly engagement was contagious. Positive as he was about his opinions, he nevertheless proved receptive to arguments and objections, examined the material afresh, and encouraged—in fact, often joined in—the exploration of unresolved questions. The enormous range of his knowledge and his quick grasp enabled him to help on almost every subject; after all, he had an equal competence in literary, philological, and linguistic problems. He avoided interfering with the policies of senior colleagues and in accordance with prevailing usage did not choose for his courses the major authors covered by the *ordinarii*. It may be, however, that Norden, who in regular intervals had a lecture course on Plautus, relinquished his monopoly while Fraenkel was preparing his first book. Fraenkel taught courses on Aristophanes, Catullus, and Terence, and in his last semester in Berlin on “das archaische Latein und seine Verskunst.” There was nothing yet of the gloomy and brusque Fraenkel whom people in Oxford—especially foreign visitors—feared to meet. On the contrary, he was always accessible. His house was open e.g. to Schade-

waldt, Knoche, and Annemarie Bethmann,⁶ and on every second Saturday a group of about twenty-five students were welcomed for an informal get-together. The younger students profited from the experience of those close to their examinations, and the senior students presented and exchanged their critical reactions to recent publications or other readings and tried out their own ideas on one another. Fraenkel himself moved easily from group to group discussing matters of scholarship, but conversing also about concerts, plays, lectures, and even on more personal matters such as the living and housing conditions of the students—no simple matter in those years of post-war misery. Interest in these troubles was also taken by his very charming wife, herself the author of an excellent dissertation (*De dialecto Arcadica*), but now preoccupied with practical matters. In the one semester of my presence—Fraenkel's last in Berlin—Zuntz once gave an informal talk about questions of musical harmony, and on another evening Hajo Holborn reported on new tendencies in contemporary theology. I understand that earlier there was a reading by the group of Greek plays, in particular of Aristophanes. *Birds* was Fraenkel's favorite play, which he also read later with a similar group in Kiel.

For students in the proseminars Fraenkel had a successor in the person of Otto Regenbogen. Fraenkel's equal as a superb teacher, he was no less accessible to students and probably had absorbed as broad a range of learning; but while he was a good interpreter of poetry, his principal interest was in prose—most of all Ionic and early Attic prose. Having been closest to Diels he often referred to and tried to convey something of the "Ethos von Hermann Diels." In fact there was a decidedly moral and moralizing strain in his personality, and it was most probably Jaeger's influence that turned him from a stern moralism of a broadly-speaking Kantian type to the richer and freer heritage of Greek ethics. In this spirit he saw to it that even in a primarily text-critical proseminar the 'Werte' embodied in the text would never be lost sight of, and it was quite remarkable

⁶ Annemarie Bethmann, like the slightly older Ulrich Knoche, followed Fraenkel in 1923 to Kiel, intending to finish her studies there. She returned after a while, however, and wrote a dissertation under Norden on archaisms in Sallust. She married Hajo Holborn; their daughter is Hannah Holborn Gray, president of the University of Chicago.

how much of this he could bring into the discussion of, say, the fifth book of *De finibus*. Roman philhellenism in its various forms and manifestations, Greek conceptions of πόλις and πολιτεία, θεραπεία ψυχῆς as practised by the various Hellenistic schools, and the βίος τέλειος of Aristotle's ethics (which for Aristotle had become a reality in Plato, and for Germans in Goethe) are topics that I happen to remember. In eloquence no academic teacher I have known came near him, and his splendid Ciceronian periods, which were generally admired (and occasionally made fun of), were never empty. Before his habilitation he had several years of full-time employment at a gymnasium; and his wholehearted dedication to his teaching (which he prepared meticulously) may have kept him from getting his projects ready for publication in the 1920's. Later psychological problems and hard political experience had a similar effect. The *RE* article on Theophrastus, composed while he was debarred from teaching, gives perhaps the best (though not a complete) idea of his broad and penetrating scholarship. Editions of Theophrastus' botanical works were completed, but not to the publisher's liking. Other projects, including chapters of his dissertation on the *Hippocratica* and a text of the Old Oligarch ('Xenophon' πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων) never received the final touch. Although Regenbogen was fully active at Berlin only two years (Easter 1923–Easter 1925) before taking up the chair at Heidelberg, the space I have given him is not out of proportion to the impact he made.

Rudolf Pfeiffer taught as Associate Professor less than a whole semester in Berlin. He had been called there from Munich, where he was Privatdozent, early in the spring semester (1923); before this semester ended he knew that he would move on to a full professorship in Hamburg. As the time was too short for a regular lecture course, he conducted a proseminar (upper level) on the letters of Italian humanists. To become in this way acquainted with Petrarch, Salutati, Poggio, and Bruni was a privilege that some of us relished by returning from time to time to these delightful writings. But that Pfeiffer would someday (after the completion of his *Callimachus*) be declared "the greatest living classicist" (by Jacoby, himself a candidate for this place of honor) was not expected during his term in Berlin.

Pfeiffer's successor was Fritz Klingner, a pupil of Paul Fried-

länder; but now the government allowed him only the status of Privatdozent. He taught three semesters before he too moved on to Hamburg. He had his following among the students, which is not astonishing in view of the originality evident in his analysis of Boethius' *Consolatio philosophiae* and his brilliant Antrittsvorlesung, "Rom als Idee." He was commonly described as a "feinsinniger Interpret." Although a Latinist, he belonged like Beckmann and Fuchs to Wilamowitz's *Graeca*, and in an even more private *Graeca* read Plotinus with Harder and Schadowaldt. That he would henceforth be one of the quartet—Fraenkel, Jachmann, and Stroux being the others—of immediately obvious candidates for an important vacancy for a Latinist could be no surprise.

Fraenkel's strong hold and influence on the bright students was hardly impaired during the first three semesters of Jaeger's presence. For Jaeger, as one might expect, was preoccupied with getting his young family settled in Berlin, finding his bearings, and most of all with bringing his *Aristoteles* to a conclusion. The three courses that he offered in these semesters—Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Aeschylus' *Prometheus*—had been taught by him earlier in Basel or Kiel, though he clearly re-examined the problems. Beginning with the summer semester of 1923, it was understood that Jaeger had most to offer in his teaching: for one thing, Wilamowitz did not give what one might think he could offer, and Jaeger's reputation was henceforth unrivaled.

Once for all it must be said that to those not personally acquainted with Jaeger, it is impossible to convey the magnetism and charm of his personality. One aspect that stands out and in which he differed from all others—from Wilamowitz, Norden, Fraenkel, Regenbogen, and Deubner—was his patience and quiet, unhurried tempo. This was as characteristic of his teaching as of conversations in his office. In his lecture courses and even more in seminar and proseminar, he seldom presented firm and fixed opinions. Calling on him in his office, one found him invariably relaxed and ready to give unstintingly of his time. He listened patiently to everything that was brought up, waiting to the end before he came forward with an opinion or perhaps a decision of his own. (These decisions were never apodictic or authoritarian but were always accompanied by con-

vincing arguments.)⁷ He noticed a great deal about the colleague or (much more frequently) student who came to consult him. No change in temperament, enthusiasm, or (speaking more generally) physical and mental condition escaped him. He also sensed likes and dislikes between individuals in the Institut für Altertumskunde without having received a hint about them. No less astonishing was his capacity to understand human problems and conditions, many of which one would consider quite foreign to his own experience. The understanding and the sympathy that accompanied it proved comforting and often helped a person to shake off his discouragement. There were to be sure a number of students, some rather able on the technical side, with whom a relationship could not develop.

Those with whom he felt in harmony were during the winter semester of 1923/4 asked to meet in his home every second Saturday evening from eight to eleven or eleven-thirty for an "intensive" study of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Here the breadth of his knowledge and his firm grasp of philosophical and other intellectual problems had the greatest scope and operated freely in whatever direction his inspiration led him. He had told us to expect many digressions—in fact, more digressions than straightforward study and interpretation of the text. Actually digressions covered subjects as varied as the concept of τέχνη (for Jaeger something very characteristically Greek), ἔργον and ἐνέργεια, differences between ancient ethics and modern theories (especially Kant's imperative, which Jaeger disliked), medical and mathematical models for Aristotle's ethics, the problem of esoteric Platonism, Greek concepts of justice, the weakness of Meineke's recent *Idee der Staatsräson* (faulted for its neglect of Greek and Roman contributions), the "so-called Pythagoreans," possible Oriental influences upon Greek thought, peculiarities of early Christianity, Erasmus, Wilhelm von Humboldt, the continuity of the classical tradition in England (after Jaeger's

⁷ Eduard Fraenkel arrived in Berlin from Kiel or Göttingen as a rule bristling with criticism and protests against recent decisions passed in Berlin and, as he correctly surmised, through Jaeger's influence. Having worked off his πάθη against whoever happened to meet him first, quite often Schade-waldt, he finished: "so bald ich eine Stunde bei Jaeger gesessen habe, bis ich wieder vollkommen besoffen" (*sic*). This proved true: "quanta pax habitum tulit" (Seneca *Herc. Oet.* 1685) was how he once summed up his impressions.

first English visit and honors), and much else. The fifteen or at most twenty students present tried to contribute, a few perhaps more eagerly than was necessary. Everyone appreciated Jaeger's rich and varied inspiration, conscious of an extraordinary broadening of their horizon.

We had also been prepared to expect discussions of acute organizational problems and in fact some evenings were taken up by a critical study of projects submitted for a new curriculum of the gymnasia. On other topics there may have been a few reports by individual members, but the only one I remember was Richard Walzer's on some Hebrew thoughts and beliefs that could be compared or contrasted with the Greek ideas we were studying. Walzer also acted as secretary of the meetings, reporting at the beginning of each the major conclusions reached in the preceding one. After Jaeger moved to more comfortable quarters in the Steglitz, these meetings often ended on a social and convivial note. They continued, if memory does not deceive me, for three semesters. Thereafter, as Jaeger needed more of his time for the preparation of his course on humanism, he urged the members of the group to go on meeting without him. At that point Schadewaldt, Harder, and Erwin Wolff, pupils of Jaeger close to or already in possession of the Ph.D., joined the group. After continuing the meetings for some time in the established way,⁸ it was decided to change the program. Instead of experimenting with the *Ars poetica*, it seemed best to have every member discuss the subject of his personal research and submit it to the criticism of the others. In this way Jaeger's pupils, Ph.D.'s and candidates for the Ph.D., became a rather close-knit unit. The resulting stimulus was very intense.

When in 1932 Jaeger passed on the presidency of the Fachtagung to Regenbogen, there was almost unanimous realization that he had done more than anyone else to keep the classics alive. His involvement in all efforts and organizations devoted to saving or reforming was so deep that almost inevitably the subject of humanism took precedence over all other scholarly projects. In 1925, after a semester of sabbatical leave, the subject

⁸ Although Jaeger once remarked to Walzer (facetiously), "If you continue so diligently, we shall finally get the long-desired kind of commentary on the *E.N.*," we did not work beyond some point in Book 4.

had matured enough to be presented as a full-fledged semester course (four hours per week): "Humanismus: Idee und Geschichte." At the University of Berlin it was definitely a major event. The audience included many who were not students of the classics—indeed not students at all, but Privatdozenten and members of the Berlin intelligentsia. In freshness, compactness, and some other aspects—*e.g.*, the broader concept of *paideia*—the lectures, which carried the history from Homer to Aristotle, seem to me to have an advantage over the first volume of *Paideia*, most of which was written during 1933 in a far from peaceful atmosphere. I have sometimes regretted that the lecture course was not published, with a minimum of adjustments and supporting notes. Still, "Plato im Aufbau der griechischen Bildung," three public lectures delivered in Munich and published in *Die Antike*, did much to familiarize a wider circle with Jaeger's message. So did lectures delivered elsewhere by him or his friends and other humanists familiar with his outlook. Jaeger's humanism, whether conceived as *paideia* or not, whether accepted with major or with minor reservations, served as a rallying point.

I cannot attempt a κατάλογος of the wholehearted supporters, the halfhearted allies, and the opponents (even if my memory were more reliable, fluctuations would make this attempt futile). Suffice it to say that in the first group around 1930 were *inter alios* Pfeiffer and A. Rehm (both in Munich), Jacoby, Jachmann, Regenbogen, also the orientalist Schäder, the archaeologist Schweitzer, and of course Jaeger's students, three of them professors by then, while in the third group I would include Weinreich (in Tübingen) as utterly uninterested, Rudolf Herzog (in Giessen) as brutally hostile—he referred to *Die Antike* as "die Zeitschrift für Schwätzer"—and the two Hamburgers, Kapp and Snell, as intelligent opponents. Still, an outlook that by 1916 was poorly represented was now familiar even where *paideia* did not flourish. The Greeks were known and actively thought of as the creators of Western civilization, responsible for its specific character, its concentration on man and the exploration of his inherent qualities, his potentialities, his mind and emotions, the conditions of his life, and perhaps also his destiny.

Jaeger, having been eminently successful as defender of the classical tradition in the uncertain atmosphere of the Weimar re-

public, could not abandon the hope of continuing this rôle after the political world had changed again in 1933. It took some time to realize that the likelihood that National Socialism would calm down and come to terms with civilization was illusory.

In his correspondence with Wilamowitz immediately after receiving the Berlin offer, Jaeger had expressed a strong feeling that the eminent position with its large responsibilities came too early for a person of thirty-three. He was under no illusion about the amount of time claimed by administrative duties and matters of business. Speaking now from a distance, it is clear that the offer did come at a very early juncture, but it was doubtless the best decision open to Wilamowitz and Diels, and Jaeger's fifteen years in Berlin proved immensely fruitful. Still, there were inevitable drawbacks in the accumulation of duties at a stage in his professional life when he had still to find his way to a good number of central subjects, including Homer's *Odyssey*, Sophocles, and Thucydides. On one occasion, arriving five or ten minutes late for his lecture, he apologized, informing us that there had been for weeks no day on which he could turn before midnight to the preparation of next morning's lecture. Of the diverse duties that claimed so much of his time only a fraction may here be recorded. There were inquiries by faculty committees at the German universities, as a rule about candidates to fill vacant chairs, and similar inquiries by the authorities in the governments (of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, etc.) about lists of candidates submitted for their decision. The Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft sent proposals (and probably also manuscripts) it was asked to finance. After his election to the Academy in 1924, Jaeger had to take care of the *Medici Graeci*, more specifically of the edition of Galen that had been started by Diels. Publishers approached him with their worries. Problems concerning the gymnasia had to be settled in cooperation with the teachers, a cooperation not always in perfect harmony but most satisfactory in its results. Exactly how severe the danger for the humanistic gymnasia was I do not recall. Articles submitted for *Die Antike* needed to be examined and so of course did dissertations and other manuscripts handed in by the students in the seminar or at later stages. Correspondents included a growing number of foreign, especially British, scholars. A brief mention should finally be

made of Jaeger's own project of an Institute at the Academy concerned with editions and monographs. Aristotle, medical authors, and perhaps also the Cappadocian Fathers (Gregory of Nysa) were included in the project, which encountered first economic and soon also political difficulties. There were other projects whose realization would have been difficult even if conditions had remained stable, and which never moved beyond the planning stage.

Norden's chief concern in these years was his research. The pace of his work had slowed down; conclusions were arrived at with hesitation and worry, for he was not only conscientious but also conscious of his enormous reputation, which must on no account be endangered. His lecture courses were spirited, forceful, clear, and, with the exception of the hopeless Cicero course, effectively organized. He provided the students with the information they needed. Still, his presentation lacked the stimulus—familiar from Jaeger's, Regenbogen's, and I suppose Fraenkel's courses—of watching a great scholar seeking his way to the mind of an important author. In Norden's case this understanding had been reached long ago; only on rare occasions did he give new thought to the subject of a lecture. Of stylistic observations there was less than one might have thought likely. He knew most students who took his courses and was apt to resent frequent absences. On the whole he was kind to students and well-meaning. From time to time he seemed to aim at closer contact with them, and tried to involve them by making individuals translate or read aloud the poetry of Vergil or Horace in his classes. But these efforts did not go far. I believe his great period as a teacher was during his Breslau years (1898–1906). Later he remained in the shadow of Wilamowitz and Diels and after the great change occurred in 1921 could not really compete with the younger men. His hope of producing academic progeny remained unfulfilled until just at the end, when Werner Hartke qualified. Earlier Norden had adopted Franz Beckmann, a student of Hermann Schöne, for habilitation. But while Norden suffered frustrations as an academic teacher, he had no lack of general recognition. In addition to previous honors he received an honorary degree from Cambridge in those years and was elected rector of the University of Berlin for the academic year 1927/8.

At this point something ought to be said about the activities in Berlin of Deubner, who in 1927 finally took Diels' chair, a position declined by Boll in 1921 and by Von der Mühl in 1925 (and filled in the intervening years by Regenbogen and, very briefly, by Dornseiff as *Ausserordentliche Professoren*). Owing to my limited acquaintance with him, all I can report is the great popularity he enjoyed with students and the close to ideal manner in which his teaching complemented Jaeger's. He had been chosen with the idea that he would take care of the *Realien*: Greek private life (in close contact with archaeology), Greek religion, Roman religion, Greek comedy were the subjects of his courses, besides the lyric poets and a survey of Hellenistic poetry (seven subjects all told—was the seventh Roman *satura*, a favorite of the Usener-Bücheler school?). Every eighth semester he, like Jaeger, was entitled by the terms of his contract to a sabbatical leave. He was very effective with some able students who remained strangers to Jaeger's approach, but there were not a few who felt at home in both camps. Relations between him and Jaeger were cordial, and on matters of policy he regularly sided with Jaeger rather than with Norden or Wilamowitz.

Paul Maas, an *Ausserordentlicher Professor* from 1920 until 1930 (when he took the Greek chair in Königsberg), offered courses on the lyric poets, on Aeschylus, Theocritus, and Callimachus in addition to his Byzantine subjects. Regular proseminars on Greek metrics and Greek style secured contact with most students. Style meant in effect textual criticism, and in this area great profit might have been derived from his teaching and example. But given the variety of other offerings, relatively few availed themselves of this chance, and my overall impression is that Maas received his full measure of recognition only in his Oxford years (1939–64).⁹

Behind everything was the towering figure of Wilamowitz. His standing during this period may be summed up by observing that he maintained his authority in the faculty and in the profession at large intact but lost his popularity with the young student generation. *Publica* (i.e., courses designed for a large public

⁹ For further information see E. Mensching's recent book *Paul Maas, Über einen verfolgten deutschen Altphilologen* (Berlin 1987). For Deubner see the biographical sketch by his son Otfried in the edition of his *Kleine Schriften* (Hain 1982).

audience outside the 'Fach') he no longer offered, and in his regular lecture courses he had instead of the two hundred and more who filled the benches prior to 1914 an audience of between twenty and forty. The general quantitative decline of classical studies was only in part responsible for this change. Putting it simply, he was no longer the same man—how far the political 'Erschütterung' of 1918 accounted for it I would not say. There was nothing of the power by which he had between 1900 and 1914 *totos tenuit*—excellent students as different as Karl Reinhardt and Ludolf Malten, Walter Kranz and Eva Sachs, Paul Friedländer and Günther Klaffenbach. To the new mentality he could find no bridge.

On public occasions his opinions carried enormous weight. In 1921 at the first convention of Philologen after the war, he opened the meeting with an address in the course of which he declared "darüber müssen wir uns klar sein: die Führung liegt jetzt bei der Archäologie." This greatly dismayed Hellenists and Latinists who were confident that by attacking their subjects with new questions and in a new spirit they were giving it a maximum of vitality. He just did not see things this way; nor did his expectations of archaeology relate to the refined discrimination of stylistic individualities, *i.e.*, the method associated with the name of John D. Beazley (if any development in classical research ever passed him by, this may have been it): what he had in mind was the increase of knowledge resulting from excavations.

I have said earlier that habilitations in classics needed his approval, but even after he had given his nod he crushed Bickermann when, having listened to his probationary lecture on the Maccabees, he demolished its principal source, declaring, "Malalas können Sie überhaupt nicht trauen." Fortunately Wilcken, Bickermann's sponsor, prevailed upon him to allow a second try. But there was no review possible after the disastrous verdict, "Das war nichts; wir müssen ihn ja aber nun habilitieren," by which he decided the future of Eduard Meyer's weakest candidate.¹⁰ Cooperative as he generally was with Jaeger, he firmly

¹⁰ The members of the committee were shocked, but only Deubner spoke out in protest and voted no. After the meeting restraint broke down and there were passionate recriminations. Wilamowitz defended himself weakly. The next day, as Jaeger told me, there ought to have been resentful if not hostile

opposed habilitation of one of his students, causing the disheartened candidate to broaden the basis of his competence; as a result Wilamowitz became unwittingly responsible for the man's unique command of Greek-Arabic interrelations. No doubt there were many instances where Wilamowitz used his authority to good effect (I do not quote "the good is oft interred with their bones" because some of the good he did is likely to be remembered by those he supported or by others).

The young generation was confident that in the central area of Greek literature "noch Alles zu tun war" and that they could do it, following the examples of Jaeger, Reinhardt, Fraenkel, Klingner, and Schadewaldt. But the picture would not be complete without recording the admiration paid to some eminent scholars in other universities. There was, in the first place, Eduard Schwartz in Munich, President of the Bayerische Akademie, a brilliant editor and a brilliant stylist in his reconstruction of political, literary, and text history. Hard and sharp in his judgments, distant and cool, he could on rare occasions show genuine understanding for human problems. Besides editorial enterprises of normal dimensions he took on gigantic projects: Eusebius' *Church History* required twenty-seven years for completion, while only a small portion of the *Acta* of the church councils remained to be completed by others at his death in 1940. Between such strenuous, sober, and self-denying labors, he allowed himself from time to time to engage in highly speculative ventures. *Das Geschichtswerk des Thucydides* (1919) was restored to what he considered its original form, and some years later he was engaged in dividing the *Odyssey* into earlier and later strata (and poets). His spirited style and numerous excellent observations on matters of detail account for the strong impression produced especially by the earlier book; but before long most of his positions had been shaken. Although out of sympathy with new tendencies, Schwartz was anxious not to lose contact and maintained a very friendly relationship with a few of the leading lights, among them Fraenkel, Jaeger, Pfeiffer, and Stroux—the last-named in a sense his 'Schüler', and there were other 'Schüler' whom he continued to support.

feelings "but we all moved about with heads bowed like conspirators conscious of a crime in which we had a part."

By 1920 Jacoby's reputation, despite the superb *RE* article on Herodotus, became somewhat clouded, but it rose steeply and continued to rise after the publication in 1923 of the first volume of the *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. The thoroughness and completeness of the presentation forced everybody to include him in the highest rank. *Akribeia* was what he demanded as a classicist's foremost and distinguishing virtue. Unfortunately Jacoby continued to be his own worst enemy: his widely known brutality of word and action made colleagues at large universities unwilling to appoint him, as it also discouraged full professors from becoming his advocates in Kiel. Volume II of the *Fragmente* increased the admiration; but while everybody eagerly looked for the continuation, it came as a shock that he left his wonderfully prepared road, edited Hesiod's *Theogony* (along very subjective lines), and proceeded from Hesiod to Theognis and from Theognis to aspects of the Homeric question. Classicists and historians wondered what would become of the magnificent project. It helped little to receive from Norden assurances that Jacoby "had it all *in scriniis*." There was no sign of Jacoby's continuing the enormous enterprise in the late 20's and early 30's. He went back to it only after the catastrophe and the psychological upheaval of 1933. A new home in Oxford saved the great project, as it assured the life and security of the author.

There was also Heinze in Leipzig, a friend (and fellow student) of Norden, a friend of Wilamowitz, and also much admired by Jaeger. With his penetrating studies of poetry, especially his superb *Vergils epische Technik* (1903), he was far ahead of his time and actually offered in fully matured form—scholarly in method and sensitive to the artistry involved—that approach to the great authors which the new generation wished to develop. Exemplary too was his close study of such central Roman 'Wertbegriffe' as *auctoritas* and *fides*. Some expected him to write the Cicero book which the twentieth century needed. His death at the age of 62 put an end to such and other expectations.

Others were not as well known or perhaps not as much appreciated as they deserved to be. Alfred Körte was supposed, whether rightly or wrongly I cannot say, to have an anti-Berlin

animus.¹¹ The absence of Greek comedy (and papyrology?) from the subjects most studied in Berlin was partly responsible for this inadequate appreciation. Reitzenstein was for other reasons not within the horizon of Jaeger's pupils. I consider the case of Wilhelm Kroll as curious and in fact unique. In the esteem of the Anglo-Saxon world no German classicist of his generation compared with him, probably not even Norden; he was the only one to receive honorary degrees from both Cambridge and Oxford and he was the first after 1918 to be guest professor at an American university (Princeton). What a contrast to Germany, where nobody included him with the top scholars or was properly impressed by his competence in fields as diverse as Latin astrology and syntax, Catullus, rhetoric, and Neoplatonic commentaries on Plato and on Aristotle, to say nothing of his editorship of *Glotta* and the *Realenzyklopädie*. When a volume of the latter was complete but for a few articles of minor or medium importance, he often improvised these items himself. His strength was common sense: he did not try to be profound and was temperamentally averse to speculation. From personal experience I can vouch for his integrity and strong sense of justice. It should not be forgotten that he and his fellow-editor Mittelhaus kept the *RE* open to, and even invited articles from, certain scholars whom Nazi regulations prevented from publishing elsewhere.

Information on the period we have been recalling has been so much desired because it seems widely regarded as the last phase of Germany's eminence in the field of classical scholarship. How far this is true is not for me to decide. Still, without intending any injustice to the standards maintained in Berlin after 1936 by Deubner, Schadewaldt, and Stroux, I must let the facts and dates of the years from 1921 to 1936 speak their eloquent language. Diels died in the spring of 1922; Wilamowitz, after reducing and finally (in the spring of 1929) ending his activity as a teacher, died in September 1931; Norden retired in 1935 under

¹¹ Fraenkel in 1930 referred in conversation with me to Körte and L. Malten (in Breslau) as prominent Hellenists jealous of Jaeger's influential position in Berlin. About Malten he was doubtless correct. Another of whom it would be true is J. Mewaldt (in Vienna), who in 1936 recommended himself as Jaeger's successor, stressing his political qualifications.

a new law placing the age limit at 65; Jaeger, after first resisting an offer from Chicago in 1935, accepted a permanent contract in 1936 (which however did not bind him, for he was free three years later to move to another position, at Harvard). In the closely allied field of ancient history Eduard Meyer reached the age limit at Easter 1923. The Prussian government, being committed to a 'Sparpolitik', ignored the faculty's proposals for a successor, deciding that one full professor of ancient history sufficed. The remaining full professor was Ulrich Wilcken, who in his years as colleague of Meyer had been an ideal second man. His great and pioneering achievements are well known in the areas of papyri and ostraca—and not only in these. Meyer's lecture courses, poorly organized and full of digressions and improvisations as they were, still fascinated by the broad historical sweep, by the perspectives and large lines of development that emerged. Wilcken, on the other hand, dealt with every problem elaborately, conscientiously, and systematically; but vision and the *Atem der Geschichte* were missing.¹² When he retired in 1931, Gelzer was the faculty's choice for successor, but Wilhelm Weber in Halle had political pull that helped him into the chair despite a negative declaration by the majority of the faculty.¹³ His early publications had earned praise, but recognition and academic success had gone to his head and he was known as a boastful and unpleasant colleague who dispensed pretentious generalities and shallow rhetoric in his teaching. It did not take long until the relationship with his philological colleagues was as bad as had been feared. Deubner, the soul of politeness,

¹² When I read in Wilamowitz's exceptionally interesting correspondence with Schwartz his σύγκρισις of Wilcken and Adolf Wilhelm, I vividly recalled an additional proof of the latter's superiority. In March or April 1933 Jaeger, dismayed by the first manifestations of the new government, expressed his feelings to Wilcken, whose only reply was "Aber es war doch so stimmungsvoll in Potsdam" (where Hitler and some others had placed wreaths on the tomb of Frederic the Great). And Wilcken, at seventy, was not considered senile! Schulze said in those days to Jaeger: "Ich bedaure Sie dass Sie so viel junger sind als ich und so viel mehr von der Zerstörung der deutschen Kultur miterleben werden."

¹³ The faculty had asked Rostovtzeff whether he would be inclined to accept an offer of this chair in Berlin. The answer—so embarrassing that for some years the faculty kept it secret—was that he could have forgiven the Germans if they had won the war, but he could not forgive their having deprived him and others like him of their homeland.

despite Hilbert's famous definition "Ein Kollege ist jemand den man trotzdem grüsst," was no longer on greeting terms with him; and one of Jaeger's last experiences in the Berlin faculty was Weber's attempt, under violation of the statutes, to launch a protégé into an academic career without the *Habilitationsarbeit*; his candidate had been rejected by the committee after a bitter fight but was appointed by the 'Partei' a few days later.¹⁴

CHAPEL HILL
December, 1988

¹⁴ [This paper is drawn in part from remarks prepared for the celebration of the centenary of Jaeger's birth, at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, July 1988. The editors are grateful to Mrs Solmsen for making it available to us, and to Helen F. North for assistance with the manuscript; thanks are due also to Zeph Stewart for supplying additional information.]