

U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (1848–1931)
AND G. MURRAY (1866–1957):
CORRESPONDENCE 1894–1930 REVISITED*

“The first letter that I received from Wilamowitz was in Greek, covering four pages of his small fine handwriting” and “My deep admiration and friendship for this greatest Hellenist of our time was richly repaid”,¹ – these are the words with which Gilbert Murray chose to open and close his bland loosely chronological *Memories of Wilamowitz* in 1954. What happened in between has been attempted here in five steps. The First section (I) gives an outline of Murray the man and scholar, and the environment in which he found himself in the early days of his Professorship. What follows (II) describes Wilamowitz as *Briefschreiber* and Murray’s guide in all things Greek. The Third section (III) highlights the difficulties Murray faced when editing Euripides for OCT, while the Fourth (IV) deals with translations both Wilamowitz and Murray saw successfully staged. Section Five (V) witnesses the almost unbridgeable gap in the correspondence caused by the Great War.

I. “*To read and re-read the scanty remains now left to us of the Literature of Ancient Greece is a pleasant and not a laborious task*”, or: *The Glasgow Professor and Wilamowitz’ Correspondent-to-be*.

Back in 1888, Gilbert Murray, an alumnus of St John’s College, Oxford, was a young man of outstanding mastery of Greek. While up at

* The author must record her especial debt to Elena L. Ermolaeva for her sympathetic involvement in this work and to Alexander L. Verlinsky who not once reminded the author that Wilamowitz was, after all, *ein Mensch* and not flawless, and last but not least to Vsevolod V. Zeltchenko who generously undertook the reading of the draft and whose comments, to which the author has done her best to respond, have been splendid sources of help, illumination and encouragement. The burden of all the mistakes remains, however, solely for the author to bear.

¹ Murray 1954, 9, 14. The former shifted the emphasis, for Murray initiated this correspondence, and the latter strove to draw attention off the fact that the last part of the sentence about Murray as standing in Wilamowitz 1929, 228: “Meine herzlichen Gefühle sind für ihn [Murray] nicht erloschen, und es ist mir schmerzlich, daß er, ich ahne nicht, weshalb, sich abgekehrt hat” had gone missing in the English translation.

Oxford, he had scooped every open scholarship in composition² and upon graduation had all prospects for a brilliant academic career before him. As it eventually turned out, he was the man the times moulded as found most useful³ – a cultivated Victorian gentleman⁴ of broad learning⁵ and liberal ideals⁶ of championing the weak and oppressed, himself being among the privileged, and an avid believer in progress.⁷ Having just contributed his first (and, as it happened, the only) article to *Philologus*,⁸ he enthusiastically aspired to radically change the way Classics fared in Victorian England. Otherwise uncritical of either his teachers or his peers,⁹ Murray rebuked the contemporary Oxford professors for insipid teaching.¹⁰ He had early conceived admiration for German scholarship, fascinated with the brave new world of *Altertumswissenschaft* and willing to look to the Continent for guidance, he really meant to go to Göttingen to study under Wilamowitz.¹¹

² The gentlemen-scholars in England indulged in hobbyhorsical prose and verse composition even in their adulthood. See Stray 2013, 218. One can sample Murray's translation of A. E. Housman's "Fancy's Knell" (1922) in Henderson 1960, 121; his translations from Shelley in Murray 1901. He never wrote original Greek or Latin poetry, but could offer "kind and delicate criticisms" of the attempts of others. See Headlam 1907, XXII–XXIII.

³ In the Oxford of his day, Murray, a classicist, populariser and internationalist, commanded a combination of leading positions in the academic, cultural and political spheres. See Stray 1998, 288.

⁴ Social stratification in Victorian and Edwardian England allowed for usually unpaid Oxbridge gentlemen-amateurs and paid working-class professionals.

⁵ "Illuminating" was what he preferred. Cf. his hard saying on Denniston's *Greek Particles* (1934) cited in Collard 2007, 114 n. 26.

⁶ For what this "liberalism" was like, see Wilson 2007, 247–251.

⁷ His marriage in 1889 to the daughter of the ninth Earl of Carlisle, given to helping "the unfortunate", correcting "the humbug" and exclaiming "If you don't believe in progress, out of the house you go!", for which see Smith 1960, 112, further sent him this way.

⁸ Murray 1889, 363–365.

⁹ See Henderson 1960, 84–93. Although her account at times errs on the side of eulogy, it is hard to imagine Murray composing anything similar to the *quibus nihil debeo* part of the last autobiography of Wilamowitz, for which see Calder 1981, 48. Murray's autobiography lies sloppy and unfinished and has at times an unpleasant Dickensian feel.

¹⁰ This was given vent to in his letter to A. Sidgwick: "I think a prophet is a good deal wanted in Oxford to teach that there are really life and poetry and things to move one in ancient literature. Bywater, I suppose, knows that this is so, but I doubt if he can make anyone else know it". Wilamowitz, for whom a prophet was incompatible with scientific approach, turned into a prophet for Murray.

¹¹ *Wissenschaft* and Wilamowitz stood so close in the mind of a sympathetic foreigner as to become almost interchangeable. See Murray 1897, XIII, admiring

This, nevertheless, never happened¹² and he never fully realised how difficult it would have been to work under Wilamowitz, whose *Wissenschaftskartell* already had teeth.¹³ Instead, in 1889, “at the ripe age of twenty-three”,¹⁴ Murray landed the Glasgow Greek chair having succeeded R. C. Jebb.¹⁵ The ten years 1889–1899 he spent there instructing Scottish undergraduates, who had not gone through the formative public schooling in the ancient languages, taught him that command of the language was not enough to catch the spirit of Hellenism, a liberal “tuning fork” for the modern society, which alone could make studying Greek exciting for those whose experience of Greek had brought nothing but grief. Meanwhile, he was working on his first academic book, *A History of Ancient Greek Literature* (1897), the opening words of which earned him a reputation of an impertinent youth.¹⁶ It was in early 1894 that Murray, having found

Wilamowitz’ “historical insight and singular gift of imaginative sympathy with the Greeks”. Admiration for Germany was no news, see Fowler 2009, 172, 179; Stray 2013, 217–220. See also Murray 1954, 9. Cf. Murray’s ever so strong a desire to retell the anecdote about certain Englishmen in Wilamowitz’ class praised with “Nur die Engländer” for a correct answer to a trifling question which found its way even into his obituary for Wilamowitz in Murray 1931, 162; his proud reporting of the case when Wilamowitz approved of his explanation in Murray 1954, 11.

¹² Murray’s pupils C. M. Bowra and H. Lloyd-Jones in their memoirs sent Murray to study under Wilamowitz. See the selection of passages juxtaposed in Calder – Kopff 1977, 53. Both Bowra and Lloyd-Jones at this point indulged in wishful thinking.

¹³ *Großbetrieb der Altertumswissenschaft*, as developed on industrial scale by Th. Mommsen and overtaken by Wilamowitz, was superiorly, even gruellingly demanding, see Rebenich 1999, 93; Rebenich 2014, 412–417. Murray was not a man for *Kleinarbeit*. His beautiful reading voice and experience communicated in classroom inspired many, see Dodds 1957, 477: “To hear Murray read aloud and interpret a passage of Greek poetry brought successive generations of his students the intoxicating illusion of direct contact with the past, and to many of them a permanent enlargement of their sensibility”. Cf. Easterling 1997, 117. Murray’s judgement and interpretations survive in the *app. crit.* of his Euripides (many sound, some – as in *HF ad vv.* 64, 575 – overwrought and wrong), but mostly as marginalia to be obtained by sifting Oxford “redback” commentaries. See, for instance, Bond 1981, *ad v.* 977.

¹⁴ Dodds 1957, 476.

¹⁵ Jebb was not happy with Murray’s appointment. With Jebb’s correspondence (both sides, when possible) being recently published by C. Stray, one can see a politic and cautious Murray trying to cement a relationship with his predecessor.

¹⁶ Quoted in the heading. What Murray probably meant was that the expansive scale on which scholarly books were being made did not contribute that much to the real understanding of the ancients. By that time Murray had already been corresponding with Wilamowitz. On receiving Murray’s book, Jebb wrote: “I suppose we belong, in some sense, to rather different schools. The brilliant & daring Wilamowitz (in whom, as I gather, you place unreserved confidence), appears to me rather too fond of hypotheses which he propounds as ascertained facts, and rather too haughtily negligent of all

no sympathy for his proposed series of classical texts for undergraduates with scholia, metrical schemes and downsized critical apparatus,¹⁷ wrote to Wilamowitz “in elegantem Attisch”¹⁸ seeking advice and first-hand knowledge, and hoping to win recognition from his colleagues.

II. Φιλομώμυχος¹⁹ Μυρραΐω χαίρειν, or: *Thirty-six Years of Correspondence*.

No more than sixty letters were written by each and only the Wilamowitz’ letters survive,²⁰ largely due to interwar conditions and Murray’s reluctance to return the letters in his possession to the Wilamowitz’ *Nachlass* in Berlin. An enthusiastic and accurate correspondent²¹

opinions except his own, to be always a safe guide. On the other hand, your attitude towards English scholars and their work is not exactly that which I should have adopted in such a case <...> they are, indeed, not mentioned at all”. See Stray 2013, 218. Jebb’s discontent is understandable. He would have been surprised to learn about Wilamowitz’ reaction to the same book, though. See Bierl – Calder – Fowler 1991 (hereinafter *BCF*), 29–30: “Ich bin ein schlechter Richter, erstens weil ich selbst in dieser Umgrenzung des Themas nichts zu sagen mir getrauen würde, zweitens weil ich mir das Thema nie so eng fassen würde. <...> Sowol unserer Überlieferung wie der modernen Behandlung nach treten gerade in der griechischen ‘Litteraturgeschichte’ die Personen in den Zeiten ganz besonders hervor, wo es über die Personen gar keine Überlieferung gibt, und wo das Individuum sich von der Gattung noch weniger abhebt. <...> Dies und vieles ähnliches lässt mir die litterarische Geschichte der Hellenen ebenso wie die politische als seine Aufgabe erscheinen, die A. D. 2000 vielleicht versucht werden dürfte. Da nun der Lebende seine Bedürfnisse hat, so müssen solche Bücher geschrieben werden – das sehe ich ein; ich lasse sie gewähren, aber ich werde nur störend wirken, wenn ich zu ihnen Stellung nehmen wollte”. Wilamowitz also observed Murray’s disregard for English scholarship, see *BCF*, 59–60: “Ich möchte nämentlich sagen, dass Sie gegen die grossen Männer Ihres Volkes Porson Elmsley Dobree mir etwas ungerecht zu sein scheinen: die haben wirklich mehr herausgebracht”.

¹⁷ These were the so-called Glasgow Critical Texts, a project submerged by the nascent OCT. See Collard 2007, 106–108.

¹⁸ See Wilamowitz 1929, 228.

¹⁹ The *persona* of his verses, *der Streitbare*. The likeness it bears to his name (not being a translation) is an additional attraction.

²⁰ See *BCF*.

²¹ Apart from his notoriously illegible hand, for among all the letters only the *delta*-like “d” and the “t”, always crossed well above the letter itself, are immediately recognisable. Diels in one of his first *Lieber Prinz* letters called it “kleine Scholiastenschrift”, see Braun – Calder – Ehlers 1995, 4. Cf. the deliberate effort of A. Erman, Wilamowitz’ Berlin colleague, to get rid of his bad script, for which see Calder 1983, 59 n. 15. Prof. Calder suggests that Wilamowitz imitated Otto Jahn’s “scrawl”. Wilamowitz, aware of his difficult handwriting, indulged in an occasional *bon mot* (see *BCF*, 35), but his letters to foreign correspondents are usually typed. So are the majority of letters to Murray.

(so was Murray, but the mass of his extant letters had been weeded before being sent to the Bodleian²² and still lies unpublished in need of a trustworthy edition), from his early youth acutely aware of the historical significance of his writings,²³ Wilamowitz very seldom destroyed letters himself. But with tragic irony ever at work, Murray's letters to Wilamowitz ended up in fire. All the alphabetically and chronologically filed letters in the *Nachlass*²⁴ from M all the way through to Z²⁵ perished in Berlin in the winter 1945–1946, used by Charlottenburg neighbours as fuel.

It is no news that strangers often addressed letters to Wilamowitz as one being most competent to judge, but such exchanges had usually been brief.²⁶ Murray, then in his late twenties, first wrote to Wilamowitz in 1894 and last in 1929. An easy and evident explanation for this correspondence having been maintained for such a long time is that Wilamowitz had earnestly taken it as *Pflichtarbeit* of spreading German learning²⁷ and felt that cooperation with English scholars would be beneficial for the common cause, with the two schemes of philological

²² His papers in the New Bodleian Library are mss. Gilbert Murray 1–568; add. mss. 1–14. Correspondence from Wilamowitz is filed chronologically in the large section of general correspondence.

²³ He was at times inclined to model himself on the ancients. He even preferred to be photographed in profile, as if in relief. See an overview of Wilamowitz' iconography in Schröder 2007, 335–374.

²⁴ Thus, from the estimated 67000 letters he could have written in his lifetime, 4000 are lost irrevocably, and some 6000 (with both sides of the correspondence when preserved) are being gradually made accessible through the indeed Herculean effort of Prof. W. M. Calder III and his collaborators, who have made it their *Lebenswerk* to make the history of classical philology speak with its many voices. See by no means exhaustive Calder 1970; 1971; 1975; 1976–1977; 1977a–b; 1978a–d; 1979a–c; 1981; 1983; 1986; Ackerman – Calder 1978; Calder – Košenina 1990; Bierl – Calder 1991; BCF 1991; Braun – Calder – Ehlers 1995; Calder – Kirstein 1999; Calder – Huss 1999. Copious correspondence with Th. Mommsen, A. Harnack and F. Althoff, although not on the list, should also be mentioned here.

²⁵ See Calder 1983, 7. The author would like to refer at this point to the vivid parallel Prof. Alexander K. Gavrilov drew between the fate of these and the 'alphabetic' plays of Euripides.

²⁶ Two letters to James Loeb and letters to Robert Friedlaender, for instance. See Calder 1977b, 315–332; Calder – Košenina 1990, 163–186.

²⁷ See Wilamowitz 1929, 228: "So haben für mich zuerst persönliche Berührungen dazu geführt, daß ich einsah, wir Deutschen kümmerten uns zu wenig um den Betrieb unserer Wissenschaft in anderen Ländern, und daß ich die Pflege der internationalen wissenschaftlichen Beziehungen mir selbst vornahm und zur Mitwirkung gern bereit war, als der Gedanke an eine Vereinigung der Akademien auftauchte". Cf. also Calder 1985, 82–83, a reliable Euripides text as one of the "works of duty".

discipline being complementary to each other.²⁸ Moreover, he, unlike Murray,²⁹ had a genuine admiration for English scholarship of the turn of the nineteenth century,³⁰ while a versifier in him³¹ admired the almost extinct art of translating verses into Greek preserved in England.³²

The Greek *Antwortbrief*, written by Wilamowitz in October 1894,³³ is a remarkable example of his straightforward and slightly overbearing manner, for he announced from the outset that “ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἄριστον δοκεῖ τῇ οἰκείᾳ ἕκαστον χρῆσθαι φωνῇ· συνιέναι γὰρ τοὺς γε ἱκανῶς πεπαιδευμένους εἰκός, καί, τὸ γ’ ἄληθές εἰπεῖν, οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐν οὐδεμιᾷ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν ὁμοίως τὰ ἐννοηθέντα δύναιτο φράζειν καὶ εἰς σαφήνειαν καὶ εἰς εὐπέτειαν”.³⁴ He proceeded by expounding how a lexicon to Euripides (one of Murray’s ambitious projects never to be realised³⁵) was to be compiled, giving very precise advice and expressing readiness to share everything he had with “τῷ ὀρθῶς τοῦτου

²⁸ *BCF*, 100: “der Typus ‘gebildeter Mann’ den Sie in Ihrem Lande so schön gezüchtet haben, darf nicht verloren gehen”.

²⁹ In 1909 Murray would say of Elmsley: “And if you turn from Elmsley to the really brilliant achievements of modern literary criticism – say to Dr. Verrall’s analysis of the end of the *Choephoroe*, or the scene with the Phrygian in the *Orestes* – you feel that the thing itself had hardly been invented. The modern writer [presumably A. W. Verrall] sees ten things where Elmsley saw one, and that not the most vital one”, see Murray 1909, 13. Cf. Wilamowitz 1907, 227–230.

³⁰ Especially for the rigorous scholarship practised in Cambridge. While reviewing Cambridge Praelections 1906, he wrote (courteously, but with unfailing honesty), “cum saluberrimo Ottonis Jahnii praeceptoris mei iussu fundamenta studiorum in Porsoni et Elmslei libris collocarem”. See Wilamowitz 1906, 444 = Stray 2005, 161; cf. Wilamowitz 1921, 37–38.

³¹ His *Gelegenheitsgedichte*, original Greek and Latin verses in a great variety of metres, are no easy reading. See Körte 1939, 46–53.

³² Both the Greekness of W. Headlam’s Greek verses and his scholarship found an admirer in Wilamowitz; for the former see his elegiacs on Headlam’s death in Anon. 1908, 163 (especially high is his praise “καὶ πατρίαις πεφιλημένε Περὶ σὶν τε / Μοῦσαις”), for the latter – Wilamowitz 1906, 445 = Stray 2005, 168: “ab hoc praeceptore ductos in ipsa Musae Graecae penetralia introduci tirones”, though adding that Headlam clung too tightly to the transmitted wording. Headlam himself doubted the value of composition, or, at least, “constant exercise of it”. See Jebb 1907, 394.

³³ See *BCF*, 9–13.

³⁴ *BCF*, 9. [“As for me, I think it is best when one uses one’s native tongue: it is but natural that those with sufficient education will understand, and, to tell you the truth, no one would be able to express oneself in any foreign language with the clarity and ease of native speech”].

³⁵ In 1954, Murray wrote: “I did a good deal of this work on the Index using Nauck’s text but was greatly hampered by its constant need of correction”, see Murray 1954, 9–10. He seems to have later destroyed what work on this Index he had done and definitely grew weary of having to work with words.

τοῦ ἔργου ἀπομένω”.³⁶ Wilamowitz also discussed at large another of Murray’s endeavours – the editing of the whole of Euripides with selections from scholia and metrical cribs, and concluded in a way that discouraged Murray: “ἀμήχανον γὰρ τοῦργον ἀεὶ μᾶλλον φαίνεται ἀνασκοποῦντι”.³⁷ Due to the lopsided character of the correspondence, with the questioning party silenced, it is difficult to feel the depths of Murray’s ignorance of editorial techniques,³⁸ but the first plunge he took into the turbulent waters of mss. tradition, collation and recension when embarking on editing Euripides was definitely a chilling one.³⁹ Wilamowitz finished his Greek letter with a promise that “ἔτοιμόν μ’ εἶναι ἐὰν ἐκδίδως τὰ Εὐριπίδου ὅσα ἂν ἐθέλῃς κοινωνῆσαι σοι”,⁴⁰ and he did provide Murray with everything he had.

³⁶ BCF, 11 [“with the one earnestly set to do the work”]. Irrespective of the fact that LS (not yet J) 71882 already had full line references (even the first edition of 1843 did, see Stray 2010, 100), the job was too ungentlemanly technical and demanding and was largely out of Murray’s character. In his letter of 10th March 1895, Wilamowitz again expounds (on Murray’s query) how to compose a lexicon to Euripides advising against the usage of A. Nauck’s text as material, because it is “ein stark geänderter Text”, see BCF, 22. This letter, with its closing *Glückwunsch* “zu dem schweren, aber wichtigen Werke” is the last mentioning of the lexicon in the correspondence. Later (20th April 1900) Wilamowitz wondered how Murray could write original plays while working on the lexicon, see BCF, 32. From 1897 on, Murray was busy translating and editing Euripides and the lexicon was forsaken.

³⁷ BCF, 12 [“The more I think of this, the less feasible it seems”].

³⁸ In 1954 Murray wrote, “I have a complete set [of the OCT Euripides proofs] with his [Wilamowitz’s] annotations in the margin which I am sending to the Bodleian”, see Murray 1954, 10. The proofs are not there, at least neither Prof. Calder, nor P. G. Naiditch could discover them. C. Harris, the Superintendent of Special Collections Reading Rooms of Radcliffe Science Library, Oxford, also informed the author *per litteras* that they do not hold proofs with corrections by Wilamowitz.

³⁹ Murray found collation deadening drudgery. He went to Florence in March 1903, but, according to what J. Diggle intimated to C. Collard, he had never reached the main mss. See Collard 2007, 112 n. 24. In vol. I (possibly still a proof) posted to Wilamowitz (currently in Humboldt-Universität, Berlin as part of Wilamowitz’ *Handbibliothek*), Murray reported collation of P: “recognovi denique ipse Parisinos codices”, see Murray 1901b, ninth unnumbered page of the *Praefatio*, while the ubiquitously accessible vol. I first published in 1901 has a curious accretion added at some point after 1903: “recognovi denique ipse codices Parisinos Florentinos Romanos Neapolitanum; novaque aut accuratiora quae notarem non nulla inveni”, see Murray 1901a, IX. Wilamowitz was not only ready to share his collations, but discouraged Murray from collating, saying that “wirklich direct nutzbringendes wird aus den Codd. nicht mehr zu holen sein”, see BCF, 27.

⁴⁰ BCF, 12 [“In case you edit Euripides, I am ready to share with you whatever you might need”]. This willingness of his hero to share everything he had won admiration of Prof. Calder.

III. “*Ein so großes Werk muß ja auch notwendig langsam wachsen*”, or: *OCT Euripides within 1901–1909*.

In 1896 Murray was invited by the OUP to edit Euripides. From early 1897 Wilamowitz (amid his move to Berlin and *ohne Bücher*) was already instructing him on the making of a Euripides text, listing trustworthy editions and posting Murray batches of his collations of *Andromacha*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*, *Troades*, *Medea*, *Alcestis*, *Hecuba* and *Rhesus*,⁴¹ without actually knowing that Murray had embarked on editing.⁴² Having retired from his position in Glasgow in 1899,⁴³ Murray found himself unexpectedly free and was working at an astonishing pace. From 1901 on, he kept posting proofs to Wilamowitz, which he corrected with unfailing goodwill⁴⁴ and spared no pains to bring into the world⁴⁵ “einen brauchbaren Euripidestext”.⁴⁶ Two enclosures with Wilamowitz’ corrections survive among the letters, with improvements⁴⁷ on vv. 16–1156

⁴¹ *BCF*, 25, 30. By that time Wilamowitz had published not only *Analecta Euripidea* (1875) with a critical edition of *Supplices*, and *Herakles* (1889), but also *Hippolytos* (1891).

⁴² See his remark in *BCF*, 27 (16th September 1897): “Sie hatten zuletzt immer nur von einem Lexikon zu Euripides gesprochen; jetzt scheint es, daß Sie auf eine Gesamtausgabe zurückgekommen sind”. Murray seems not to have kept him informed or written often enough.

⁴³ Murray retired on the grounds of ill-health which, nevertheless, was temporary, for in 1905 he was back at Oxford with a teaching Fellowship of New College.

⁴⁴ *BCF*, 34 ff. The letters of Wilamowitz to his lifelong *Du-Freund* Georg Kaibel (1849–1901), whom he first met in November 1869 (for the jovial encounter at an outing of the Bonn Philological Society see Wilamowitz 1929, 90), must be very revealing in all respects, but resist publication. See Calder 1983, 8. Kaibel’s untimely death deprived us of many a candid appraisal of Murray’s work. The much-quoted view on Murray’s editorial endeavours, “Dabei schickt mir mein englischer Freund Murray von seinem Euripides die Woche ein Drama mindestens, das ist kein Spaß. Er macht fast nur Unsinn, Schüler von Verrall. <...> Den Kyklopen tangire ich dabei nicht: da hat er ungemein viele Dummheiten gemacht”, for which see Calder 1983, 222 n. 37, citing ms. Göttingen, is by far the only one we have. The reason why Wilamowitz wanted to share this with Kaibel was that they had read *Cyclops* together and Wilamowitz still had Kaibel’s emendations in 1906 when the third volume of his translations came out. See Wilamowitz 1906, 61.

⁴⁵ Wilamowitz thought big of all the undertakings in which he participated.

⁴⁶ *BCF*, 53. He could not catch up with Murray’s tempo, though, and many times his duties or travels prevented him from providing adequate help. So it happened in 1903 with Murray’s second volume. See *BCF*, 55–59.

⁴⁷ Certain verses still remain *sub iudice* and in the decisions taken Wilamowitz does not always have the upper hand. For instance, *ad v.* 16 of the *Alcestis* he wrote, see *BCF*, 38: “Unmöglich konnte der Prolog fortlassen, daß Vater und Mutter den Admetos im Stiche liessen, da sich darum das Stück dreht”, but Diggle bracketed the whole verse in his new OCT, see Diggle 1984, *ad loc.*; Kovacs did likewise, see Kovacs 2001, 154.

of the *Alcestis* and vv. 40–380 of the *Medea*,⁴⁸ other corrections were transmitted as *Randnotitzen* directly on Murray's proofs and are lost. From these enclosures one can gather that Wilamowitz' corrections were on such a scale that Murray must have felt quite out of his depth. He explicated the mss. tradition, assessed the variants and emendations, advised on the composition of the *app. crit.*, provided metrical analysis, offered dramatic, stylistic and aesthetic appreciation.⁴⁹

Murray also sent proofs to A. W. Verrall (1851–1912) of Cambridge, whose work on Greek tragedy he followed with much sympathy, and thanked him for providing copious insightful material,⁵⁰ otherwise known as “exerting a baleful influence”.⁵¹ Murray often felt insecure and was inclined to include eccentric readings and conjectures in his *app. crit.*⁵² Some of these were authored by Verrall. A truly Verrallian conservative-with-a-twist treatment could indeed be observed in *Eur. Her.* 348–351,⁵³ where Murray accepted his “defence” of the ms. L reading καλλιφθιτον, and this split into a decadent κάλλει φθιτόν, while a sound emendation of H. Estienne καλλιφθογγον was pushed aside. Murray was also prone

⁴⁸ *BCF*, 36–45.

⁴⁹ An engaging example could be found in the enclosure on the *Alcestis* 260–261, see *BCF*, 40, where Wilamowitz, desperate to defend the transmitted wording, queried: “was ist bei κυανανυγές βλέπειν furchtbar? blaue Augen sind ja schön. Aber die Ungeheuer haben finstere buschige Brauen, und daß man sie sogar blau malte, zeigt der Typhon von der Burg”, so κυανανυγές should go with the eyebrows. He reiterated this in the Latin postcard of 28 July 1901, when reading in proof: “nam ‘caeruleum’ spectare nihil torvi habet, et ‘sub <super>ciliis’ omnes videmus. At caerulei capilli, barba supercilia horrorem iniciunt”. Murray, who borrowed this unhappy conjecture of Monk adopted in Prinz–Wecklein's edition, see *ad loc.*, was persuaded in favour of the mss. reading ὑπ' ὀφρύσι κυανανυγέσι, but rightly understood it simply as “dark, sinister”, although in his translation, see Murray 1915, 17, these verses are rendered impressionistically and the vision is still more attractive than fierce: “So dark. The wings, the eyebrows and ah, the eyes!..”.

⁵⁰ See Murray 1901, XI: “plagulas omnes amicissime mecum relegit A. W. Verrall, poeseos Euripideae existimator acutissimus”.

⁵¹ Housman in a letter to Murray, thanking him for sending in a copy of the second volume of *Euripides* (1904), see Burnett 2007, 167.

⁵² Verrall published his commentary of *Medea* in 1881, making familiar passages unrecognisable. See his “new interpretation” of v. 228, adopted by Murray. It is to Murray's credit that he resisted other “interpretations” (or else Wilamowitz had purged them from the proofs), as of vv. 39, 234, 305, 339, 392, 434–437, 738–739, 846–847, 914–915, 942, 1087, 1096, 1174, 1184, 1194, 1221, 1243, 1346. About Verrall see Lowe 2005, 143–160. Verrall, however, yielded two happy emendations (*Eur. Hec.* 1162 and *Tr.* 463), both not mentioned by Murray, but fished out by J. Diggle and M. Platnauer and accepted in Diggle's new OCT. See Diggle 1984, X n. 17 *et ad loc.*

⁵³ Murray ³1913, *ad loc.*

to read psychopathological subtleties into Euripides quite of his own accord to defend the transmitted wording.⁵⁴

By the end of 1901 the first volume had gone to press and Wilamowitz duly received his copy. The receipt is not mentioned in the extant letters, but all three volumes survive as part of his *Handbibliothek* (a selection of books that were in quotidian use and bear his notes),⁵⁵ heavily marked.⁵⁶

The second volume was ready at the end of 1904,⁵⁷ and the third – in 1909, the year in which Murray, appointed by the Crown, took up the Regius Chair of Greek in Oxford.⁵⁸ No more of Wilamowitz' corrections survive, but a piece of sound advice he gave Murray in early 1904 allows for a conclusion that Murray was working much in the same vein: “Dann aber wird es geraten sein, dass Sie eine Anzahl Verteidigungen [of mss. readings] recht scharf prüfen. Man sagt sehr leicht etwas, das momentan

⁵⁴ See the “iam delirans” Hercules of v. 575 with *app. crit. ad loc.* or Medea’s “ne contempseritis me quod in indignos clamores effusa sim” *ad v.* 214–226.

⁵⁵ See Calder – Ehlers – Košenina – Schindler 1990, 255, 264.

⁵⁶ The author would like to give her heartfelt thanks to Prof. Bernd Seidensticker who had this volume (Murray 1901b) scanned and delivered it to the author. The notes are indeed numerous (about three fourths of the pages bear marks), both in pencil and ink, and include metrical schemes and strophic division for the choruses; remarks on dramatic technique (in Latin); alternative readings written in the margin or underlined in the *apparatus, loci* for reference; certain words crossed out both in the body of the text and in the *apparatus*; verses bracketed; translations into German (more difficult to decipher than Latin ones) which came to Wilamowitz while reading and must have come in handy later when he prepared or revised his *Griechische Tragödien*. Moreover, his editions of translations, originally for use in Greekless schools, have an appendix *Zum griechischen Texte* used as a mouthpiece to express his views on the verses treated unsatisfactorily in current editions, Murray’s including.

⁵⁷ It went through two revisions: ²1908 and ³1913.

⁵⁸ In his Inaugural Lecture, while paying lip service to historico-critical method, “the meaning [of literary works] will depend on all kinds of other questions: the daily lives those men lived, the houses and cities they dwelt in, the historical changes through which they passed, above all on the beliefs and ideas which they received unconsciously from tradition or built up by the labour of their own brains”, Murray sided more with the broad idealising Humanistic approach: “the English universities <...> have performed one remarkable and perhaps unique task; they have made the great Greek writers an integral element in our highest national culture, so that Homer Sophocles and Plato were living forces continually working upon English thought <...> it seems to me that you find always present <...> certain mitigating and hopeful strands of feeling which are due – of course among many other causes – to this permeation of Greek influence”. See Murray 1909, 9–10, 14. Wilamowitz, to whom Murray posted the lecture, very characteristically retorted: “Aber wenn die Forschung nicht immer tiefer dringt und immer neue Schätze zu gewinnen und der allgemeinen Kultur zuzuführen weiß, so müssen die Klassiker aufhören, als lebendige Kräfte zu wirken”. See Wilamowitz 1935, 283.

besticht, das einem aber auf die Dauer peinlich wird”.⁵⁹ But his willingness to provide Murray with everything he had and generous appreciation of his work⁶⁰ must have impressed Murray strongly. A telling, though, as often, a singularly light-hearted⁶¹ testimony of A. E. Housman bearing the date 4th November 1904 survives: “At *Her.* 1351 the order of the names *Wilamowitz et Wecklein* is neither alphabetical, nor chronological”.⁶² The order is what may be called “emotional”, Murray being unable to put Wecklein⁶³ before Wilamowitz in his OCT *app. crit.*

But the results of critical editing and exhaustive supporting research were, to Murray’s mind, meagre and not sufficient for a contribution a Classical scholar could make to the world.⁶⁴ Rather, inspired by

⁵⁹ See *BCF*, 60.

⁶⁰ Wilamowitz naturally never thought Murray to be his equal, but, together with sharing responsibility for the edition, he was pleased that Murray was a sympathetic foreigner: “es ist schön, wenn man die eigenen Gefühle von einem anderen befreundeten frischen Munde ausgesprochen hört”, see *BCF*, 86. In his Regius Chair Inaugural Murray quoted Wilamowitz’ “blood for the ghosts”, but was he not mocking at Wilamowitz in the same breath, when saying “[we are] a somewhat bloodless company, sensitive, low-spirited, lacking in spring; in business ill at ease, in social life thin and embarrassed”? See Murray 1909, 19–20. For Wilamowitz’ treatment of younger colleagues cf. Gavrilo 1990, 239, 245.

⁶¹ Cf. his letters to James G. Frazer, in Ackerman 1974.

⁶² Burnett 2007, 168.

⁶³ N. Wecklein was merciless in his review of Murray’s vol. I: “Könnte M. feinere Nuances des Gedankens auffassen, würde er nicht...”, “die Bemerkung läßt gesundes Urteil sehr vermissen”, “Verfasser gleicht seinem Freund Verrall, von dem viele teils exegetische teils textkritische Bemerkungen mitgeteilt sind, darin, daß die Annahmen von der gewöhnlichen Denkweise ganz abweichen und dem Gebiet des Abstrusen anzugehören scheinen”, “selbst die grammatische Auffassung geht nicht in die Tiefe”, “überhaupt ist seine [Murray’s] Kenntnis der Litteratur eine sehr beschränkte und zufällige”, see Wecklein 1902, 929–935. Wilamowitz’ *Analecta Euripidea* (1875) had also been reviewed unfavourably by Wecklein, and Wilamowitz never missed a chance to show contempt for the man, see Wilamowitz 1907, VIII. He boosted Murray’s self-esteem by telling him that his edition would put Wecklein’s off the map, see *BCF*, 62. Unlike *streitbarer* Wilamowitz, Murray seems never to have had any hard feelings towards Wecklein.

⁶⁴ Murray’s edition of OCT Aeschylus (1937, ²1955), his last editorial work, further reveals his conservative and, at the same time, individual approach to the text – few *cruces desperationis* and emendations and lots of punctuation marks and “closer interpretations”. See also Murray 1939, 11, reviewing Thompson’s edition of the *Oresteia* (1938) and revealing his principles. D. Page’s new Oxford edition of 1972 was in a way a reaction against Murray’s interpretative excesses. See Lloyd-Jones 1976, 6–7: “Murray’s idiosyncratic indentation, so often recalling the Mouse’s Tale in *Alice*, has been eliminated [in Page’s text]. There are many improvements in punctuation, though Page’s avoidance of commas often deprives the reader of guidance where he needs it”.

Wilamowitz' creed "das licht der alten verse mit alter wärme und in altem glanze in empfängliche seelen fallen zu lassen",⁶⁵ he enthusiastically took on the role of a cultural middleman and bore this burden to the end, suffering Murray the classical philologist to almost get lost in "good causes" much like the way in which in the nineteenth century able men fell victims to Church positions.⁶⁶ His most substantial work was done before the Great War: the year 1913 saw both his last (third) revision of the second volume of Euripides and *Euripides and His Age* go to press. Time has not been kind to his academic works, but his prominence as a translator was not meant to be forgotten, for his ashes rest in the Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey.

IV. *Unser Freund Euripides, or: Greek Tragedies for the Greekless.*

Both Wilamowitz and Murray were inspiring lecturers and could deliver to any audience.⁶⁷ They both pioneered Euripides through verse translations and scholarly books when such books were believed to be for libraries only.⁶⁸ For Murray Euripides was a poet of austere, even

⁶⁵ Wilamowitz 1907, 257, with the original orthography preserved.

⁶⁶ See Stray 2013, 221. Murray himself would never draw a line between scholarship and popularising. It is remarkable that a scholar like D. Page generously quoted Murray's translation of the *Medea* in his "redback" commentary, see Page 1938, X–XV, XXIX, and praised Murray's "admirable treatment" of v. 1271 ff., for which see Murray 1913, 240–242 and his stage directions in Murray 1911, II, 70–71.

⁶⁷ Wilamowitz' *propaganda fidei* lectures were numerous. See Wilamowitz 1901, covering the period from 1877 to 1900. He was a guest lecturer at Oxford in 1908, in Vienna, Utrecht and Leiden in 1909, Oslo in 1911, Copenhagen, Oslo and Uppsala in 1912, Warsaw in 1916, Brussels in 1918, Lund in 1919, Jena 1921, Olten and Zürich in 1924, Florence and Copenhagen in 1925. He also rather enjoyed lecturing to housewives in Berlin. See Wilamowitz 1929, 225–226. Murray lectured on the rise of the Greek epic in Harvard in 1907 (he was also the first to hold the Charles Eliot Norton Chair in Poetry in 1926–1927, lecturing on Classical tradition in poetry) and on the stages of Greek religion in Columbia in 1912 (of these voyages Wilamowitz, who never went to America, was slightly envious).

⁶⁸ See Schröder 2001, 367–368. Wilamowitz had been actively engaged with Euripides for his whole life, he first wrote about him in 1867 (*In wie weit befriedigen die Schlüsse der erhaltenen griechischen Trauerspiele?*) and last in 1931 (in *Der Glaube der Hellenen*), see Calder 1986. He published the first modern commentary on Euripides' *Herakles* back in 1889. Its impact has ever since been "electrifying". It survived twelve reprints, the last appearing in 1988. What strikes the present author in his commentary most is how he, to put it in his own words, "mit kühner Hand in das volle Leben greift". He also edited *Supplices* (1875), *Hippolytus* (1891) and *Ion* (1926) and set eight plays (the rest being, to his taste, not worth it) in German verse: *Alcestis*, *Bacchae*, *Heracles*, *Hippolytus*, *Supplices*, *Medea*, *Troades*, *Cyclops*.

serene beauty⁶⁹ and an apostle of progress and enlightenment,⁷⁰ for Wilamowitz, given to seeing him *als Mensch*, – a major thinker and a worthy rival. Murray's translations began coming even before he laid his hands on editing.⁷¹ On resigning from Glasgow, an “unilluminated place”,⁷² he found himself uncommonly free and, having retired to the English countryside (to Churt, Surrey⁷³ – a village favoured also by the

⁶⁹ “Beauty” (together with “romance” and “magic”) is Murray's favourite characteristic of things Greek. This “beautifying” seems to have been catching, for his legacy is described in terms of “what Murray did *for* Greek”, while A. E. Housman's is often “what Housman did *to* Latin”. See Briggs 1991–1992, 194. Wilamowitz's favourite qualifier was “lebendig”, to which his interest in *konkreter Lebenswelt* and his marvellous eye for detail also testify. See, for instance, Wilamowitz 1895, *ad* v. 781: “[Ξεστοὶ ἄγριοι] ist auf die athenischen berechnet, für welche meist nur der felsboden zu glätten war: in Thebens gartenlande war das anders. man klagt noch um 250 über den unergründlichen schmutz. straßenpflaster hat Theben wol niemals, in Athen wenigstens Euripides nicht gekannt”.

⁷⁰ See Murray 1913, 88 ff. P. B. Shelley (1792–1822) and A. Ch. Swinburne (1837–1909) were, to Murray's mind, the closest in spirit. Murray's judgement at times betrays facility. Thus, about *Hippolytus* he wrote, see Murray 1913, 87: “In construction, too, and general beauty of workmanship, *though not in greatness of idea or depth of passion* [my italics] *Hippolytus* is perhaps the finest of all his plays”.

⁷¹ Murray seems to contradict himself saying first, “I have in the *Hippolytus* followed my own critical edition published by the Clarendon Press; in *The Bacchae* I have acted on the same plan, though the volume containing that play has not yet been published” [my italics], and “This [understanding of the text] <...> I tried to accomplish many years ago in prose translations, very full and often verging on commentary or paraphrase, which I used as the basis of lectures in my classes at the University of Glasgow”. Murray 1902, VII–VIII. This, evidently, means, that once he had grasped the “spirit” of Euripides, he never revised his impression (nor, as a matter of fact, the text of his translations). Murray translated *Alcestis*, *Hippolytus*, *Bacchae*, *Electra*, *Troades*, *Medea*, *Iphigenia Taurica*, *Rhesus* into English rhyming verse. These were not only staged, but even broadcast on the BBC. See Morris 2007, 293–318. He also brought Euripides closer to the “unprivileged humble people” in a primer *Euripides and His Age*, 1913.

⁷² In a letter to Fischer, cited in Stapleton 2007, 263.

⁷³ He never once went to Greece and preferred to handle antiquity in his mind's eye. This, on the whole, does not prevent one from being an accomplished student of antiquity, but for one striving to be an interpreter of Greek life it is, on the whole, strange. See Murray 1909, 14–20. Cf. the sentiment in Wilamowitz 1929, 268: “Geblichen aber ist die Natur in Land und See, Quellen und durstigen Fluren; sie lehrt die Geschichte der Hellenen erst verstehen, die Bedingungen ihres Lebens, in vielem auch ihres Seelenlebens”. Murray never had any prominent interest in archaeology (when interpreting Euripides he was little concerned with what happened on stage in the original production, but what it would mean for a contemporary audience if played as he suggested, see Easterling 1997) or in the art and tended to disregard the material conditions exalting the spiritual achievement of Greeks. His interest in anthropology and comparative religion was, on the other hand, consuming.

Pre-Raphaelite John Everett Millais), set into verse the prose translations he had produced as aids when lecturing. The first to come were *Hippolytus* and *The Bacchae* (together with *Frogs*, purged of all obscenities).⁷⁴ Wilamowitz, who naturally received his copy, praised a versifier in Murray: “Die Götter haben Ihnen aber auch die Leichtigkeit des Reimes verliehen, und wirklich, im Englischen hat der Reim noch Kraft und Neuheit, was er bei uns eigentlich ganz eingeübt hat”.⁷⁵ Other letters also testify to Wilamowitz’ deep and lively admiration for Murray as poet.⁷⁶ If one compares this with the opinion of A. E. Housman, a scholar and a poet, it becomes unpleasantly evident that “in the literature of that Anglo-Saxon race to which we have the high privilege and heavy responsibility of belonging”⁷⁷ Murray’s rhymes and poetic vocabulary, imposing on every thought and feeling a set second-hand mannerism of Swinburne,⁷⁸ did not rank high and were anything but new.⁷⁹ But the

⁷⁴ Murray 1902. These, together with slavery, homosexuality and subjection of women were “remnants of primeval slime [largely ritual in origin, as everything with Murray] from which Hellenism was trying to make mankind clean”. See Murray 1907, 16.

⁷⁵ BCF, 54. He was rather fond of English, and “befriended” many English books. See Wilamowitz 1908, 3: “a very famous Magdalen man [Gibbon] has been an intimate friend of mine since my first years as a student”; in his Latin autobiography, Calder 1981, 41: “ante quem [Lessing] maxime Shakespeare et Homerus me iam puerum XI annorum ceperant. Hom. deinde non tenuit animum, semper tenuit Shak.”. Moreover, he had a soft spot for artists, especially for those who are no longer on the map now, and tended to exalt “lesser talents”. He could not stand H. von Hofmannsthal, for translations were free, not based on a critical revision of the text, and yet more popular, but Murray as *Künstler* could hold him “stark ergriffen”.

⁷⁶ BCF, 62–63, 93, 102.

⁷⁷ See Housman 1969–1970, 62. The sentiment, as cited in Davies 2007, 172 is: “The fashions of that interlude [the period which followed the publication of Swinburne’s *Poems and Ballads* in 1866] are already so antique that Mr Gilbert Murray can adopt them for his rendering of Euripides; and there they now receive academic approbation, which is the second death”.

⁷⁸ See Housman 1969–1970, 61–79: “voluble and diffuse”, “he seldom noticed any object of external nature unless it was very large, very brilliant, or very violently coloured”, “here comes Swinburne covering the grass with his cartload of words”, “his imagery is at once profuse and meagre”. Cf. the opinion of Murray’s chief castigator, T. S. Eliot, in *Swinburne as Poet*: “It is, in fact, the word that gives him [Swinburne] the thrill, not the object <...> language, uprooted, has adapted itself to an independent life of atmospheric nourishment. In Swinburne, for example, we see the word “weary” flourishing in this way independent of the particular and actual weariness of flesh or spirit”, for which see Eliot 1921, 134, 136.

⁷⁹ His favourite was in fact “old–cold–gold”.

enterprise itself, which went rather against the grain for a *Wortphilologe* in Housman, enjoyed immense popularity with the general public both on London stage and the BBC.⁸⁰

Wilamowitz, admitting that “offenbar wirken Sie durch diese freie Behandlungen so viel stärker als ich es vermag, dem das Uebersetzen doch nur die Krönung der philologischen Arbeit ist”,⁸¹ only translated when he had put together a reliable text and was *stets bereit* to introduce corrections and improvements.⁸² It is curious that Murray never expressed his opinion of Wilamowitz’ translations, and whatever judgement there is in his *Memories of Wilamowitz* is not his, but Wilamowitz’ own.⁸³ Likewise, Wilamowitz never mentioned Murray’s editorial work on Euripides in his *Erinnerungen*, reducing Murray to translator and poet: “Er schickte mir eigene Dramen, dann seine prachtvollen Übersetzungen. Der Poet ist stärker in ihm als der Philologe, aber es ist ein Segen, dass unterweilen ein solcher Poet unter uns aufsteht”.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ See Morwood 2007, 133–144.

⁸¹ *BCF*, 93.

⁸² Hence his flattering request of 14th September 1904 to have Murray’s “empfehlenswertesten Text” (the second OCT volume) at hand in order to revise his own first volume of translations. See *BCF*, 64.

⁸³ Without the letters, it would have been impossible to tell, for we would naturally expect such words as “his new introduction to the O. T. is much improved”, see Murray 1954, 10, to be Murray’s own opinion. It might come as a surprise that it is not. In December 1904 Wilamowitz sent Murray his newly revised first volume of *Griechische Tragödien* and reported in his usual manner on the alterations he introduced: “Wesentlich verbessert ist die Einleitung zum Oedipus und diese Uebersetzung”, see *BCF*, 65. Murray simply translated (his knowledge of German escapes us so far) this passage, turning Wilamowitz’ “verbessert” – more of a technical term equivalent to “revised”, “corrected” – into “improved”.

⁸⁴ Wilamowitz 1929, 228. Discussions on “Greek subjects” were thin throughout the correspondence and often ended in “was helfen Worte?” Murray’s *The Rise of the Greek Epic* brought about the following remarkable exchange. In June 1910 Wilamowitz wrote to Murray criticising his assumption about poisoned arrows, which runs as follows: “There is no doubt whatever that the primitive inhabitants of Greece poisoned their arrow-heads. The very word for poison, τοξικόν, means ‘belonging to an arrow’”. See Murray 1907, 129. Wilamowitz writes, see *BCF*, 94: “Mir war das ein Beleg für das, was uns allen begegnet, wir stehen unter dem Drucke der eignen Sprache. Weil Sie an intoxicante gewöhnt sind, scheint Ihnen Pfeilgift τοξικόν ganz selbstverständlich griechisch. Das ist es aber gar nicht; das Lexicon wird Ihre Erinnerung kontrolliren und bestätigen, daß Sie es nie gelesen haben”. Murray was resilient. He had it still in his revised editions, with a footnote “this has been questioned”, without mentioning Wilamowitz. See Murray 1911, 148 n. 1.

V. “*Dieser Dank wird in mir nicht verlöschen, und auch nicht mit mir, sondern meinen Söhnen vererbt bleiben*”, or: *Good Patriots in the Wake of the Great War*.

Contemporaries and fellow travellers along the road of Hellenism, with the outbreak of the war they both fought pen in hand the war of words. Correspondence was made impossible, but Murray was anxious to naïvely defend Wilamowitz and keep him apart from the “heavy-handed” *Wissenschaftstreiber* who signed the infamous *Anruf ‘An die Kulturwelt!’*, to which Wilamowitz himself was one of the signatories.⁸⁵ With his natural inclination to palliate and, towards the end of the war, also with growing assuredness that his cause was a just one, Murray was at pains to fit Wilamowitz into a “scholar and a gentleman” scheme, to discover in the man “the passion and imagination of the Slav”,⁸⁶ and a scholar who “adds to his learning a number of gifts which belong rather to the amateur than the professional”.⁸⁷ In 1915, when posting letters again became possible, Wilamowitz, still a believer in the existence of a *res publica litterarum*, wrote of “gemeinsamen Idealen”,⁸⁸ but Murray, though not exactly a fair-weather friend, next wrote to him only in 1923 (a draft of this letter survives), “for some of your friends were talking of you the other day”,

⁸⁵ For the history of the manifesto, and the waves it made see von Ungern-Sternberg 1996. Murray, a committed liberal (if only the “small dark nations” lacking classical education are kept in check and the benign domination of the British Empire abides), first opposed intervention, but soon became an active apologist of the British cause and shed ink most energetically, writing pamphlets for the Oxford patriotic series in 1914, 1915. It was in 1915 that he confessed: “When I see one day that 20 000 Germans have been killed in such-and-such an engagement, and next day that it was only 2000, I am sorry.” See Murray 1915, 7. William Archer, Murray’s close friend, dissected Wilamowitz’ *Reden aus der Kriegszeit* and defended his country and her navy to the best of his rhetorical abilities: “it was ultimately on the white cliffs of England that their [Philip II, Louis XIV, Napoleon] *Weltmacht* was shattered”. See Archer 1916, 19. It was only in 1918 that Murray finally drifted to pacifism and internationalism.

⁸⁶ He would say in his obituary for Wilamowitz: “warm imagination of a Slav”, see Murray 1931, 161. Patronising attitude to the Slavs on Murray’s part could be felt in his pamphlet *Thoughts on the War*, see Murray 1915, 17–18: “I am proud to think that the liberal and progressive elements in Russia are looking towards England and feeling strengthened by English friendship <...> We are fighting not only to defend Russian governors and Russian peasants against German invasion, but also, and perhaps even more profoundly, to enable the Russia of Turgenieff and Tolstoy, the Russia of many artists and many martyrs, to work out its destiny and its freedom”.

⁸⁷ As cited in *BCF*, 6 n. 23. Murray goes on to compare him to G. Hermann, Bentley and, last but not least, A. W. Verrall. Cf. Murray 1931, 161.

⁸⁸ *BCF*, 116.

and asking whether he wished to have any English or American books.⁸⁹ Wilamowitz asserted with what may only be called injured self-esteem: “Auch ich [like Diels who died in 1922] halte Treue mit germanischer Halsstarrigkeit”, but, nevertheless, inquired for publications of new material. Since 1928 (the year in which Wilamowitz’ *Erinnerungen* appeared) Murray’s chief concern was to resolve a “misunderstanding” which led Wilamowitz to write, “Meine herzlichen Gefühle sind für ihn [Murray] nicht erloschen, und es ist mir schmerzlich, daß er, ich ahne nicht, weshalb, sich abgekehrt hat”⁹⁰ and to justify the healthy instinct of the translator, G. C. Richards, who suppressed these words.⁹¹ Murray busily wrote to Wilamowitz to affirm (in a way never to be known to us) his affection and reported to *The Times* the happy outcome.⁹² He was to write the obituary for Wilamowitz in 1931, bestowing on him, among other things, the highest praise he knew, “Nothing that was Greek was alien to him”.⁹³

Tatiana Kostyleva
St Petersburg State University
tatianakostyleva@yahoo.com

Bibliography

- Anon., “Dr. Walter Headlam, 1866–1908”, *CR* 22 (1908) 163–164.
 R. Ackerman, “Sir James G. Frazer and A. E. Housman: A Relationship in Letters”, *GRBS* 15 (1974) 339–364.
 R. Ackerman, W. M. Calder III, “The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff with Sir James George Frazer”, *PCPhS* 204 (1978) 31–40.
 W. Archer, *The Villain of the World-Tragedy: A Letter to Professor Ulrich v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff* (London 1916).
 M. Armstrong, W. Buchwald, W. M. Calder III, *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Bibliography 1867–1990* (Hildesheim 1991).

⁸⁹ *BCF*, 117.

⁹⁰ Wilamowitz 1929, 228.

⁹¹ See Richards 1930, 273.

⁹² For the letter to *The Times* and its peculiarities see *BCF*, 120–121 n. 545. Wilamowitz wrote in 1929: “Ich weiss, daß Sie Sich nicht abgewandt haben, weiss, daß Sie überall in edelem Sinne wirken, und meine treue Freundschaft wird Sie überall begleiten”. It is difficult to imagine him writing differently.

⁹³ Murray 1931, 161. Cf. Murray 1909, 20: “[A true Hellenist] should be able to say, *Graeci nihil a me alienum puto*”. The English variant is rather wry.

- A. Bierl, W. M. Calder III, R. L. Fowler (eds.), *The Prussian and the Poet: The Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Gilbert Murray (1894–1930)* (Hildesheim 1991).
- A. Bierl, W. M. Calder III, “Instinct Against Proof: The Correspondence between Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Martin P. Nilsson on *Religionsgeschichte* 1920–1930”, *Eranos* 89 (1991) 73–99.
- G. W. Bond (ed.), *Euripides Heracles* (Oxford 1981).
- C. M. Bowra, *Memories 1898–1939* (London 1966).
- M. Braun, W. M. Calder III, D. Ehlers (eds.), „*Lieber Prinz*“: *der Briefwechsel zwischen Hermann Diels und Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1869–1921)* (Hildesheim 1995).
- W. W. Briggs Jr., rev.: “Gilbert Murray OM 1866–1957 by D. Wilson”, *CJ* 87 (1991–1992) 194–197.
- A. Burnett (ed.), *The Letters of A. E. Housman* (Oxford 2007).
- D. Butterfield, C. Stray (edd., introd.), *A. E. Housman. Classical Scholar* (London 2009).
- W. M. Calder III, “Three Unpublished Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff”, *GRBS* 11 (1970) 139–166.
- W. M. Calder III, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: An Unpublished Autobiography”, *GRBS* 12 (1971) 561–577.
- W. M. Calder III, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Wolfgang Schade-waldt on the Classic”, *GRBS* 16 (1975) 451–457.
- W. M. Calder III, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to William Abbott Oldfather: Three Unpublished Letters”, *CJ* 72 (1976–1977) 115–127.
- W. M. Calder III, “Seven Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Eduard Fraenkel”, *HSPH* 81 (1977a) 275–297.
- W. M. Calder III, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to James Loeb: Two Unpublished Letters”, *ICS* 2 (1977b) 315–332.
- W. M. Calder III, E. Ch. Kopff, “The Student-Teacher Topos in Biographical Fiction: Gilbert Murray and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff”, *CPh* 72 (1977) 53–54.
- W. M. Calder III, “Wilamowitz to Zeller: Two Letters”, *GRBS* 19 (1978a) 177–184.
- W. M. Calder III, “Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Theodor and Heinrich Gomperz”, *Philologus* 122 (1978b) 289–301.
- W. M. Calder III, “B. L. Gildersleeve and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: New Documents”, *AJPh* 99 (1978c) 1–11.
- W. M. Calder III, “The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff with Werner Jaeger”, *HSPH* 82 (1978d) 303–347.
- W. M. Calder III, “The Correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff with Edward Fitch”, *HSPH* 83 (1979a) 369–396.
- W. M. Calder III, “The Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Julius Stenzel”, *A&A* 25 (1979b) 83–96.
- W. M. Calder III, “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on Sophocles: A Letter to Sir Herbert Warren”, *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 12 (1979c) 51–63.

- W. M. Calder III, "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: An Unpublished Latin Autobiography", *A&A* 27 (1981) 34–51.
- W. M. Calder III, "Wilamowitz on Adolf Erman", *QS* 18 (1983) 273–282.
- W. M. Calder III, "Doceat Mortuus Vivos: In Quest of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff", in: W. M. Calder III, *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Selected Correspondence 1869–1931*, Antiqua 23 (Napoli 1983) 1–19.
- W. M. Calder III, "Ecce homo: The Autobiographical in Wilamowitz' Scholarly Writings", in: W. M. Calder III, H. Flashar, Th. Lindken (ed.), *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren* (Darmstadt 1985) 80–110.
- W. M. Calder III, R. L. Fowler, *The Preserved Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Eduard Schwartz*, SB Bayer. Acad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1986, H. 1 (München 1986).
- W. M. Calder III, "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: *Sospitator Euripidis*", *GRBS* 27 (1986) 409–430.
- W. M. Calder III, "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Sir Alfred Zimmern on the Reality of Classical Athens", *Philologus* 133 (1989) 303–309.
- W. M. Calder III, A. Košenina, (eds.), "Poesie, Philologie und Politik: Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs (1848–1931) Briefwechsel mit Robert Friedlaender (1874–1950)", *A&A* 36 (1990) 163–186.
- W. M. Calder III, D. Ehlers, A. Košenina, W. Schindler, "Katalog der Handbibliothek von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff nach einer anonymen Bearbeitung herausgegeben", *Philologus* 134 (1990) 254–285.
- W. M. Calder III, R. Kirstein (eds.), "*Der geniale Wildling*": *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff und Max Fränkel. Briefwechsel 1874–1878/1900–1903*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philos.-Hist. Kl. 5 (Göttingen 1999).
- W. M. Calder III, B. Huss (eds.), "*The Wilamowitz in Me*": *100 Letters between Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Paul Friedländer (1904–1931)* (Los Angeles 1999).
- C. Collard, "Gilbert Murray's Greek Editions", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford 2007) 103–132.
- M. Davies, "Gilbert Murray and A. E. Housman", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford 2007) 167–180.
- J. Diggle (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae* I (Oxonii 1984).
- E. R. Dodds, "Gilbert Murray", *Gnomon* 29 (1957) 476–479.
- P. E. Easterling, "Gilbert Murray's Reading of Euripides", *Colby Quarterly* 33 (1997) 113–127.
- R. L. Fowler, "Blood for the Ghosts: Wilamowitz in Oxford", *Syllecta Classica* 20 (2009) 171–213.
- A. K. Gavrilov (ed.), "Drei Briefe von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff an Michail I. Rostovzev", *Philologus* 134 (1990) 241–247.
- W. Headlam, *A Book of Greek Verse* (Cambridge 1907).
- I. Henderson, "The Teacher of Greek", in: J. Smith, A. J. Toynbee (eds.), *Gilbert Murray: An Unfinished Autobiography, with Contributions by his Friends* (London 1960) 125–148.

- A. E. Housman, "Swinburne", *American Scholar* 39 (1969–1970) 59–79.
- C. Jebb, *Life and Letters of Sir Richard Claverhouse Jebb* (Cambridge 1907).
- A. Körte, rev.: "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Ἑλεγεῖα", *Gnomon* 15 (1939) 46–53.
- D. Kovacs (ed., transl.), *Euripides I*, LCL 12 (Cambridge, Mass. 2001).
- H. Lloyd-Jones, rev.: "Denys Page: *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoediae*", *CR* 26 (1976) 6–8.
- N. J. Lowe, "Problematic Verrall: The Sceptic at Law", in: C. Stray (ed.), *The Owl of Minerva: The Cambridge Praelections 1906*, PCPhS Suppl. 28 (2005) 143–160.
- M. Morris, "That Living Voice: Gilbert Murray at the BBC", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford 2007) 293–318.
- J. Morwood (ed.), *Gilbert Murray's Euripides* (Bristol 2005).
- G. G. A. Murray, "Adnotationes ad poetas elegiacos Graecos", *Philologus* 48 (1889) 363–365.
- G. Murray, *A History of Ancient Greek Literature* (New York 1897).
- G. Murray, "Opening Scene of Shelley's *Hellas*", *CR* 15 (1901) 82–84.
- G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae I* (Oxford 1901a).
- G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae I* mit hs. Anmerkungen von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, digitalisiert von Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (Oxford 1901b).
- G. Murray (transl.), *Euripides* (NY – London 1902).
- G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford 1907, 21911).
- G. Murray (ed.), *Euripidis fabulae II*³ (Oxonii 1913).
- G. Murray (transl.), *The Plays of Euripides I–II* (London 1911).
- G. Murray, *The Interpretation of Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford 1909).
- G. Murray, *Euripides and His Age* (London 1913).
- G. Murray, *Thoughts on the War* (Oxford 1914).
- G. Murray, *How Can War Ever Be Right?* (Oxford 1915).
- G. Murray (transl.), *The Alcestis of Euripides* (London 1915).
- G. Murray, "Wilamowitz", *CR* 45 (1931) 161–162.
- G. Murray, rev.: "Headlam and Thompson's *Oresteia*", *CR* 53 (1939) 10–11.
- G. Murray, "Memories of Wilamowitz", *A&A* 4 (1954) 9–14.
- G. Murray (ed.), *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae* (Oxonii 21955).
- P. G. Naiditch, *A. E. Housman at University College, London: The Election of 1892* (Leiden–New York 1988).
- D. L. Page (ed.), *Euripides Medea* (Oxford 1938).
- S. Rebenich, "'Mommsen ist er niemals näher getreten'. Theodor Mommsen und Hermann Diels", in: W. M. Calder III, J. Mansfeld (eds.), *Hermann Diels et la science de l'antiquité*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XLV Fondation Hardt (Geneva 1999) 85–142.
- S. Rebenich, "Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit", *Hyperboreus* 20 (2014) 406–435.
- G. C. Richards (transl.), *Wilamowitz, My Recollections, 1848–1914* (London 1930).

- W. A. Schröder, "Fünf Briefe des Verlegers Eduard Eggers an Wilamowitz, betreffend die *Zukunftsphilologie!* und die *Analecta Euripidea*", *Eikasmos* 12 (2001) 367–383.
- W. A. Schröder, "Wilamowitz-Bildnisse", *Philologus* 151 (2007) 335–374.
- J. Smith, "1889–1957 Some Personal and Chronological Notes from the Correspondence", in: J. Smith, A. J. Toynbee (eds.), *Gilbert Murray: An Unfinished Autobiography, with Contributions by his Friends* (London 1960) 104–116.
- J. Stapleton, "The Classicist as Liberal Intellectual: Gilbert Murray and Alfred Eckhard Zimmern", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford 2007) 261–291.
- C. Stray, *Classics transformed: Schools, Universities, and Society in England, 1830–1960* (Oxford 1998).
- C. Stray (ed.), *The Owl of Minerva: The Cambridge Praelections 1906*, PCPhS Suppl. 28 (Cambridge 2005).
- C. Stray, "The Absent Academy: the Organisation of Classical Scholarship in Nineteenth-century England", *Hyperboreus* 19 (2013) 214–226.
- C. Stray, *Sophocles' Jebb: A Life in Letters* (Cambridge 2013).
- C. Stray, "Liddell and Scott: myths and markets", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Classical Dictionaries: Past, Present and Future* (London 2010) 94–118.
- J. von Ungern-Sternberg, W. von Ungern-Sternberg, *Der Anruf 'An die Kulturwelt!' Das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda in Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart 1996).
- A. W. Verrall (ed.), *The Medea of Euripides* (London 1881).
- N. Wecklein, rev.: "Euripidis fabulae. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Gilbertus Murray", *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 30 (Berlin 1902) 929–935.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Euripides Herakles* (Berlin ²1895).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Reden und Vorträge* (Berlin, 1901).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (transl.), *Griechische Tragödien* III² (Berlin 1906).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin ³1907).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, rev.: "Praellections Delivered before the Senate of the University of Cambridge, January 25, 26, 27, 1906", *CR* 20 (1906) 444–446.
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Greek Historical Writing and Apollo: Two Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford* (Oxford 1908).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Geschichte der Philologie*, Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft I, 1 (Leipzig – Berlin 1921).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (transl.), *Griechische Tragödien* XIII. *Euripides. Die Bakchen* (Berlin 1923).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen 1848–1914* (Leipzig ²1929).
- U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* I (Berlin 1935).
- P. Wilson, "Gilbert Murray and International Relations", in: C. Stray (ed.), *Gilbert Murray Reassessed* (Oxford 2007) 239–260.

The prolonged correspondence of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Gilbert Murray was summarised by Murray himself late in his life (*Antike und Abendland*, 1954). Once Wilamowitz' side of the correspondence – Murray's letters are lost – was published by A. Bierl, W. M. Calder III and R. L. Fowler in 1991, it revealed the correspondents' scholarly and personal relations to have been more complex. A selection of episodes pivotal to the correspondence is arranged in this article in the way witnessing not only the variety of the correspondents' talents and undertakings, but also the differences inherent in their ways.

Длительная переписка У. фон Виламовица-Мёллендорф(ф)а с Г. Мюрреем была кратко обобщена последним в конце жизни (*Antike und Abendland*, 1954). Письма Виламовица – от переписки сохранились лишь они, – изданные А. Бирлем, У. М. Колдером III и Р. Л. Фаулером в 1991 г., свидетельствуют о том, что научные и личные отношения корреспондентов были гораздо сложнее. Некоторые ключевые для переписки сюжеты соплагаются в настоящей статье таким образом, чтобы показать не только богатство интересов и занятий корреспондентов, но и различия в их подходах.

CONSPECTUS

ALEXANDER VERLINSKY	
Preface	187
MICHAEL POZDNEV	
Aufstieg und Niedergang des Schulklassizismus in Russland im 19. Jh.	195
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Victor Hehn en 1851 : un philologue de Dorpat et la <i>haute police</i> russe	216
MARIA KAZANSKAYA	
Collection Campana et sa contribution à la collection de l'art étrusque au musée de l'Ermitage	230
ANDREY VASILYEV	
Russian Institute of Roman Law in Berlin in Light of I. A. Pokrovskij's Scholarly Training	241
TATIANA KOSTYLEVA	
U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) and G. Murray (1866–1957): Correspondence 1894–1930 Revisited	249
VYACHESLAV KHRUSTALYOV	
Image of Pericles in Vladislav Buzeskul's Works and German Classical Scholarship: Some Notes	271
JÜRGEN VON UNGERN-STERNBERG	
Ernst von Stern über Catilina und die Gracchen	281
WILT ADEN SCHRÖDER	
Thaddäus Zielinski im Lichte seiner Autobiographie	305
JEKATERINA DRUZHININA	
Nikolaj Glubokowskij und Adolf von Harnack	326

STEFAN REBENICH

Das Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft:

Enzyklopädisches Wissen im Zeitalter des Historismus 339

ANNA USPENSKAJA

Dekadenz und Klassik: Dmitri Mereschkowskis Übersetzungen

der griechischen Tragödien 355

SOFIA EGOROVA

Die Brüder David und Erwin Grimm: zwischen der Universität

und dem Ministerium 365

OLGA BUDARAGINA

Iurij S. Liapunov – a Lost Classicist of the Great War Generation 373

Key Words 382

Indices

Index nominum 384

Index institutorum 389

Правила для авторов 392

Guidelines for Contributors 394