

PLATE XXVI



EDUARD FRAENKEL

EDUARD FRAENKEL

1888–1970

I

EDUARD DAVID MORTIER FRAENKEL was born on 17 March 1888 in Berlin of Jewish parents. His mother, Edith *née* Heimann, had been the youngest of five children and was born after her father's premature death. The family was then looked after by a close friend of Eduard's grandmother, a Pole by birth but resident in Berlin, Mortier Lewy; his generosity was remembered in one of Eduard's given names.

Edith Heimann's only brother Hugo was joint owner of the *Guttentag'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, a publishing house specializing in legal commentaries that attained high authority as interpretations of the law. He became wealthy and was active politically in the Social-Democratic party; he was elected to the Reichstag and became chairman of the Budget Committee. But he avoided public office and did not accept a Cabinet post even in the Weimar Republic. At his own expense he presented to the city of Berlin a *Volksbibliothek* and was made an *Ehrenbürger* of the city. In 1933 he was forced to leave his country and died in New York at the age of 90. To this man Eduard owed many things, but outstandingly his interest in law and legal history, and, of course, his library. Fraenkel's magnificent library (now acquired by the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford) was founded on books either presented by his uncle or obtained at discount prices through his uncle's influence.

Eduard's father, Julius Fraenkel, inherited from his father the *Weingrosshandlung* 'D. Fraenkel und Gesellschaft' in Berlin. It was not particularly congenial work to him, except for the annual trips to wine-producing areas. Eduard never troubled to acquire a specially educated palate, but all his life he loved drinking wine (he never drank spirits) and he no doubt owed to his father's profession his own deep interest in all technical details of wine-production, regions, vintages, prices, etc. Albert, a brother of Julius, became a distinguished doctor; he was director of the Urban Hospital in Berlin and the first scientist to describe the pneumococcus. A son of Albert was the Classical philologist, Ernst Fraenkel, author of many linguistic studies

(for instance, *Griechische Denominativa*, Göttingen, 1906). Julius Fraenkel's mother was born Traube, and her brother was the father of Ludwig Traube, the most inspired palaeographer of his century and virtually the founder of the modern study of the transmission of Latin texts. Eduard's mother knew Ludwig Traube quite well, but, to Eduard's intense regret in later life, she never introduced him to Traube.¹

His mother was the great influence on his early life. She was a highly educated woman, with a knowledge of the Classical languages and a deep interest in literature and music. It was she who provided the impulse to Classical studies and she first took him to Italy. His relationship with his mother was always close and he remembered her with great affection (he dedicated the two volumes of his *Kleine Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* to her memory in 1964). He was particularly dependent on her because, about the age of ten, he had a very bad attack of osteomyelitis in his right arm and nearly died. The disease left the arm more or less useless and constantly painful ever after.² Yet, with grim determination, he slowly taught himself to write with the now grossly deformed hand, and even to ride a horse and a bicycle (he kept up both activities till he left Göttingen in 1931, though he remained all his life frightened of horses). His mother's love and encouragement during this terrible period³ matched his own determination, but the experience left him a little indifferent to suffering—his own no less than that of other people—and it certainly left him capable of indifference to physical comfort. He enjoyed good living, when it was available to him, with great gusto, but its absence did not cost him a second's thought (unless he was also deprived of good coffee—and wine, however ordinary), and physical hardship was of no account to him.

Fraenkel was educated from 1897 to 1906 at the Askanisches Gymnasium in Berlin, then directed by Adolf Busse. His greatest debt there, he always acknowledged, was to Otto Gruppe, the author of the still indispensable *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1906). They became firm friends and Fraenkel wrote of him: 'animum meum ad Graecorum amorem primus inflammavit'. Although his mother encouraged his love of Classics, the rest of the family wanted him to become a lawyer,

¹ Ludwig Traube died when Fraenkel was 19.

² Although he suffered a series of unpleasant operations and, with his mother, visited various therapeutic clinics in Bavaria.

³ Both Fraenkel's parents died in 1920.

⁴ *Diss. inaugur.* p. 111.

and this was his intention for his first semester at Berlin in 1906. In the following winter he went to study in Rome and, although he continued to concentrate on law, his mind was turning back to Classical studies. When he returned to Berlin, he dropped law and gave himself wholly to Classics. His classical training began in earnest under Wilamowitz whose flair and genius captivated him; he was always capable of seeing Wilamowitz's errors,¹ but when he spoke of him, it was with an admiration that was instantly perceptible in his eyes and voice and whole manner. He constantly quoted *obiter dicta* of Wilamowitz and vividly recalled times spent with him. For Leo and a few others Fraenkel felt love and devotion,² but Wilamowitz seems to have been beyond the range of such intimacies. Something of the extraordinary impact which Wilamowitz made can be gathered from the address which Fraenkel gave on the occasion of Wilamowitz's becoming Emeritus Professor at Berlin in 1921,³ or from the following description:⁴

Im Wintersemester 1907/08 hörte ich in Berlin Wilamowitzens Vorlesungen über "Griechische Literaturgeschichte in der attischen Periode." Er hielt damals die Privatvorlesung zweimal wöchentlich von 4 bis 6 Uhr. Eines Nachmittags — es war in einer der ersten Wochen des Semesters — sprang er mit allen Zeichen freudiger Erregung auf das Katheder und erklärte, er könne jetzt unmöglich mit dem Stoff der Vorlesung fortfahren. Am Tage vorher hatte er die Erstausgabe des Kairener Papyrus erhalten und durchgearbeitet. Und dann, mit dem Buche vor sich, zauberte er uns in anderthalb Stunden die Hauptscenen der Epitrepontes und den Umriss ihrer Handlung, grosse Stücke der Perikeiromene und die erhaltenen Szenen der Samia (wenn ich die entzückenden Verse, 244–52, lese, in denen dem armen Nikeratos klar gemacht wird dass was seinerzeit dem Akrisios passiert ist auch ihm passieren könne, sehe ich noch immer Wilamowitz agieren) — er zauberte uns dies alles aus dem Dunkel der ganz unzulänglichen Publikation hinauf in das Licht seiner strahlenden Verlebendigung. Ich habe seitdem viel über Menander gehört und gelesen, aber nichts, das mir auch nur annähernd so adaequat erschienen wäre.⁵

¹ Cf., for example, *Agam.* i, pp. 59–61.

² On Fraenkel's desk there always stood prominently a large photograph of Leo, together with photographs of Giorgio Pasquali and Alan Blakeway (an ancient historian, Fellow of Corpus, and a close friend before his very premature death in 1936). On the walls of his library were photographs of Wilamowitz and Mommsen.

³ It is reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge*, ii. 555–62.

⁴ Leo, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, i, p. xxxii n. 1.

⁵ Cf. also the late essay 'The Latin Studies of Hermann and Wilamowitz', *JRS* 38 (1948) 28–34 (= *Kl. Beitr.* ii. 563–76).

After two years in Berlin, Fraenkel went to Göttingen and stayed there till 1912 (with the exception of one semester spent back in Berlin in 1910). There he fell under the influence of Leo. For Leo he always felt not just admiration but also a personal affection. Leo was a stern taskmaster, with most exacting standards of scholarship and an instinct for a disciplined life¹ that awoke a deep response in Fraenkel. But this stern side of Leo's character was clearly softened by an attractively humorous understanding of human character. Fraenkel told of an early meeting with Leo:²

Ich war am Anfang des Sommersemesters als recht unreifer Student nach Göttingen gekommen; von einer Bewerbung um das Seminar konnte noch keine Rede sein. Leo, mit dessen älterem Sohne ich von Berlin her befreundet war, lud mich sehr bald auf einen Sonntag zum Mittagessen ein. Nach dem Essen ging er in seinem schönen Garten mit mir auf und ab und erkundigte sich sehr freundlich nach meiner Arbeit. Ich hatte damals den grösseren Teil des Aristophanes gelesen und fing an Leo davon vorzuschwärmen, mich über den Zauber dieser Poesie, die Schönheit der Chorlieder zu verbreiten, und ich weiss nicht was noch alles. Leo liess mich ruhig ausreden, vielleicht zehn Minuten lang, ohne irgend ein Zeichen der Missbilligung oder der Ungeduld. Als ich fertig war, fragte er: "In welcher Ausgabe lesen Sie eigentlich den Aristophanes?" Ich dachte: hat er denn überhaupt nicht zugehört? was hat denn seine Frage mit dem zu tun, was ich ihm erzählt habe? Nach einem Augenblick unmutigen Zauderns antwortete ich: "In der Teubner-Ausgabe". Er: "Ach, Sie lesen Aristophanes ohne kritischen Apparat". Er sagte es ganz ruhig, ohne jede Schärfe, ohne einen Hauch von Spott, nur ehrlich erstaunt, wie es möglich war dass ein leidlich intelligenter junger Mensch so etwas tun konnte. Ich sah auf den Rasen neben mir und hatte nur eine einzige, überwältigend starke Empfindung: *νῦν μοι χάνοι εὐρεία χθών.*

No scholar can ever have had a finer tribute from a pupil than the introduction which Fraenkel wrote in 1960 to his own edition of Leo's *Kleine Schriften*.

Wilamowitz and Leo were, however, only the most influential of his teachers. It was the greatest period of German Classical scholarship and Fraenkel learnt from his studies with many great men—especially from Schulze and Wackernagel, but also from

¹ Leo had fought in the war of 1870 in France and in 1905 he wrote: 'Der Krieg hatte mich gelehrt das Leben ernster zu nehmen, gelehrt was Pflichterfüllung und Kraftanstrengung bedeuten und vermögen; und ich war entschlossen, dass die Lehre für mein Leben nicht verloren sein sollte.'

² Leo, *Ausgew. Kl. Schr.* i, pp. xl-xli.

Dessau, Diels, Harnack, Helm, Hirschfeld, Ed. Meyer, Norden, and Vahlen at Berlin, and at Göttingen from Busolt, Jacobsthal, Pohlenz, Reinach, and Wendland.

Fraenkel's doctoral dissertation was accepted and published in 1912; in 1913 he began work as a humble assistant on the staff of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. He looked back on these two years as a period of essential drudgery which taught him the practical application of the philological work he had done with Schulze and Wackernagel. But he was really hoping for academic work and, as a step on the way, he spent 1916 as a teacher in the Augusta-Gymnasium in Charlottenburg. In 1917 he was appointed Privatdozent at the University of Berlin and this post, precarious though it was, gave him the opportunity to propose marriage to a young lady whom he had met at Schulze's seminar in Berlin.

Ruth von Velsen came of Dutch and Westphalian stock, her family were Lutherans and in occupation they ranged from parsons to coal-merchants. Her father was a widely travelled mining engineer who became chief civil servant in the German State Mining Ministry. She was a scholar in her own right and had been awarded a doctorate for a dissertation on the Arcadian dialect. Marriage to Fraenkel meant giving up her own scholarly interests, and Fraenkel once told me how he had carefully explained to Ruth when he proposed marriage that it was to be on the understanding that his work came first. So it did, always. Fraenkel, writing about Leo, said that he would have been offended by an account of his life that went into personal details 'vor allen auf seine wunderbar glückliche Ehe, die unerschütterliche Basis seines ganzen späteren Lebens und Wirkens'. The same can be said of Fraenkel. Ruth was a delightful person, with an old-fashioned courtesy and dignity, with more sense of humour and more tact than Eduard, firm and intelligent, interested and interesting, kind and self-denying to a fault. In Germany Eduard always worked at home and the whole routine of the house was organized to preserve quiet for his studies; Ruth was given the difficult task of repressing their five children and of warding off unwelcome callers. This was nightmarish in small flats in Berlin and at first in Kiel, but thereafter the family lived in large houses till they came to England. In addition, she constantly helped Eduard with his work, acting as a secretary in filing papers and typing books and articles, as a librarian in organizing his books and offprints, and as a research assistant in checking references and correcting proofs. Little time remained for work of her own,

and she gave it selflessly—to translating, for instance, Viktor Ehrenberg's¹ *Alexander and the Greeks* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1938) or to contributing to *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (O.U.P., 1957). It was to her, jointly with J. D. Beazley, that Eduard dedicated his edition of *Agamemnon*.

Fraenkel remained Privatdozent from 1917 to 1920 when he became Professor Extraordinarius in the University of Berlin. But in 1923, after the publication of *Plautinisches im Plautus* in 1922 had made his name, he was appointed Professor Ordinarius of Classical Philology with special reference to Latin at the University of Kiel. He stayed at Kiel until 1928. These were happy years for the family and Fraenkel worked very hard and productively—a former pupil can remember that there was a light in his study at whatever time of night he happened to pass. There were good seminars, though the scene was naturally dominated by the far senior figure of Jacoby. In 1928, however, Fraenkel could not resist a call to Göttingen. It was a sad move and it only lasted for three years. In Göttingen the children fell ill and the death of their son Andreas was a heavy blow. The atmosphere of a small town, the circle of university wives and the gossip were uncongenial to Ruth. In the university, where, at the time, there was no generally accepted dominant figure like Jacoby at Kiel, there were personal quarrels and at one Faculty meeting a senior professor publicly called Fraenkel a 'frecher Judenjunge'.

In 1931 there came an opportunity to move to Freiburg im Breisgau. Fraenkel was not only himself ready to leave Göttingen, but at Freiburg there was a former pupil with whom he was on very close terms (even to using first names) and Freiburg was perfectly situated in fine country near the Swiss border and on the direct train-route to Italy. Life at Freiburg was ideal. Fraenkel and his family had never been happier. There were memorable parties with the students, renowned for the abundance of the wine and for Fraenkel's delighted eagerness to have his guests stay on even after 2 a.m. The Fraenkels seemed to have found a permanent home, until in February 1933, in consequence of the Aryan clause, Fraenkel was forbidden to teach in the university and in November was stripped of his professorship and pensioned. Fraenkel himself was slow to see, or accept, the facts. All that year Ruth urged him to leave the country. Books were burned, students disrupted classes, and friends drew back (one very close friend actually said to Fraenkel 'I can no

¹ They had been fellow-students in Berlin.

longer have anything to do with you'). Still he would not move and lingered on in increasing isolation and danger into 1934.

In that year, largely at the instigation of Gilbert Murray, the Faculty of Literae Humaniores invited Fraenkel to Oxford. He had had invitations from American universities, but for some reason he always convinced himself that he disliked America and obstinately refused to cross the Atlantic even to visit his beloved only sister Lilli (married to Herman Frankel, who was appointed to a Professorship at Stanford). Before he received the invitation from Oxford, he had wandered disconsolately about Scandinavia, lecturing here and there and unsuccessfully looking for a post. Financial help now came from Christ Church and Corpus Christi College, but, even with all Gilbert Murray's efforts, the money could only be found for a few months. However in August 1934 Trinity College, Cambridge, elected him to a Bevan Fellowship. On this tenuous basis but frightened by the Röhm Putsch, the Fraenkels brought the whole family out of Germany in the autumn of 1934, and they occupied a very humble little house by the railway yards in Cambridge. Fraenkel succeeded also in getting two railway wagon loads out of Germany containing all his books and most of their furniture. At this time they were greatly helped by friends in England, especially by Professor and Mrs. Donald Robertson.

But the financial resources were hopeless for so large a family and Fraenkel finally brought himself to the point of accepting a lecture tour in the United States of America, designed to begin in the middle of December 1934 and end in March 1935. He hoped that the visit would enable him to find a permanent post. Meanwhile, however, the Corpus Professorship of Latin at Oxford had fallen vacant when A. C. Clark resigned in 1934—*sic me servavit Apollo*, Fraenkel said later. He applied for the chair on 20 November 1934 and submitted eleven testimonials: from C. M. Bowra, A. E. Housman, Hugh Last, W. M. Lindsay, Einar Löfstedt, A. D. Nock, Ed. Norden, Giorgio Pasquali, E. K. Rand, Eduard Schwartz, and J. Wackernagel. Housman said in his letter:

His presence within our gates is a substantial augmentation of English learning, and Trinity College has done its best to detain him here by conferring on him the Research Fellowship founded by the late Professor Bevan. I cannot say sincerely that I wish Dr. Fraenkel to obtain the Corpus Professorship, as I would rather that he should be my successor in Cambridge.

As remarkable in its own way was the generosity of Lindsay's

tribute, for he was diametrically opposed to Fraenkel on fundamental questions of early Latin scholarship:

I rank Eduard Fraenkel as the greatest Latin scholar (of his time of life) in the whole world, and cannot bring him to comparison with those who may be rival candidates for the Corpus Professorship. Among them he is a giant among pigmies. Before this unlucky 'Aryan paragraph' he was thought the likely successor to Norden in the Latin Chair at Berlin, the highest preferment for Latin Scholars of Germany. . . .

The Electors appointed Fraenkel in time to enable him to cancel his American trip. He held the chair from 1935 to 1953 and, in that time, he decisively influenced the whole approach to the study of Classical antiquity in Britain by the comprehensiveness and professionalism of his own standards. The change was slow because his influence on already established scholars was small—they were set in their ways and Fraenkel was not an easy man to accept lessons from. His judgements on English scholarly methods were severe, and advice came with the force of an imperative.¹ Coolness and misunderstanding arose between Fraenkel and some senior scholars at Oxford. They were ready to admire him as a scholar, but personal dislike reinforced their instinct to disagree with his views on classical education. Fraenkel never mastered the art of marking examination scripts in the English manner, and this activity, highly sociable in Oxford, which would have provided occasions for informal meetings with other Classical scholars, was generally denied him, for he himself equally was not an easy man to teach.

In Germany the Fraenkels had come to enjoy living a varied social life. But in Oxford Fraenkel worked in college and the whole day was organized to accommodate his working hours. He had better working conditions in Corpus than he had had at home in Germany, but characteristically he resented the opportunity provided by his rooms in college for stray callers to waste his time (Ruth was not at hand to turn them away). Work came first, as always, and he caused the family to move from quite a pleasant house in Park Town to a far less suitable house in Museum Road because it placed him a few minutes' walking time closer to his work. So the Fraenkels never developed much

¹ In Germany once a distinguished pupil working on his dissertation was so short of money that he had to try for a post in another city. Fraenkel strongly opposed the idea, but finally said: 'Well go and try: report to me when you come back.' The pupil was unsuccessful and reported back, to be told coldly: 'Mr. —, you did not take my advice. You must no longer consider yourself my pupil.'

social life in Oxford. Instead, Eduard came to feel very much at home in the predominantly male life of Oxford colleges.

His influence grew steadily through his pupils, for it soon came to be recognized that attendance at Fraenkel's seminars was the most worth while academic experience for an able Classical student. The seminars were not confined to Latin and their topics had no designed relevance to the examination syllabus. In spite of this, Fraenkel's problem was always to keep the membership within reasonable limits. He made many lifelong friendships through these seminars and their influence can hardly be over-estimated.

Retirement in 1953 made almost no difference to his life—except for an anxious few months during which he searched for a room in Oxford capable of accommodating his library (Corpus generously provided the perfect room and Fraenkel expressed his gratitude in the dedication of his *Horace* in 1957). At the request of the sub-Faculty, he continued to give annual seminars and two or three courses of lectures. He had begun to travel again after the war, and every year he succeeded in getting to Italy, conducting seminars and giving lectures at Pisa, Urbino, Rome, and Bari. A new impetus came into his life when he met (about 1955) Giuseppe de Luca, the gifted and energetic priest who founded and directed the publishing-house Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura. The two men got on excellently together,¹ the ebullience of Don Giuseppe bringing out the same quality in Fraenkel. The association led to Fraenkel's selfless labours in editing Schulze's *Orthographica* and *Graeca Latina* (1958) and Leo's *Kleine Schriften* (1960), to his collecting his own *Kleine Beiträge* and to the publication of his last two books.

Fraenkel was uninterested in academic honours and only accepted them at universities with which he felt special ties: he was given honorary degrees by the Universities of West Berlin, Urbino, St. Andrews, Florence, Fribourg, and Oxford. An honour which gave him special pleasure was the conferment of honorary citizenship of Sarsina on him at a grand ceremony in the town on 12 June 1958. Fraenkel had been elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1941, but on 26 March 1964 he requested the Council to strike his name off the list of Fellows,² simply saying 'I have considered this serious step very carefully and cannot possibly reconsider it'; he made no mention of

¹ Fraenkel's own account can be read in *Don Giuseppe de Luca*, ed. M. Picchi, Brescia, 1963, 182–94.

² He had already become a Senior Fellow in January 1964.

disagreements which he felt with the policy of the Council. In spite of this, he accepted the award of the Kenyon Medal¹ in June 1965. Meanwhile his scholarly life went on in Oxford as it had done for thirty years or more, and it seemed reasonable to predict an indefinite prolongation of the activity. But Ruth's health gave him more and more cause for worry, and when she died on 5 February 1970, he had no will to continue living.

II

Fraenkel's Inaugural Dissertation of 1912 'De Media et Nova Comoedia Quaestiones Selectae', was dedicated to Leo. The subject was Fraenkel's own choice (for Leo always refused to suggest research topics), but it shows him completely under Leo's influence since, in the main, the plays of Plautus and Terence are used as evidence for New Comedy. It is a painstaking piece of work on the forms of lengthy speeches in drama, particularly speeches in comedy which show the influence of tragedy. Fraenkel's characteristic sensitivity to pattern in literary forms already appears clearly here.

The next ten years were mainly taken up with writing the work which was to mark the beginning of a new era in the study of Roman comedy. Early Latin studies had been dominated in the first half of the nineteenth century by the work of Friedrich Ritschl who founded the proper study not only of the text of Plautus, its history and the metres, but also of the Roman theatre and the Greek background. But after Ritschl scholarly work degenerated into arid squabbles over technicalities. In 1881 Friedrich Leo took up the study of Plautus and made two fundamental advances: he founded the modern text, with ancillary studies of the language, metre, and textual history, that put Plautus into proper perspective as a writer of Latin; secondly he put the study of the relationship of Plautus to Greek New Comedy on a wide basis. In this latter work, begun before the Menandrian discoveries of 1907, Leo worked from Plautus and Terence to New Comedy: that is, the Latin authors were evidence of the Greek, and attention was concentrated on *contaminatio* because (it was thought), where a plot showed incoherence, that was a point where Plautus was adding to one play

¹ The Kenyon Medal is awarded biennially by the Council of the Academy 'to the author of some work relating to Classical literature or archaeology (not necessarily produced within the period elapsed since the last previous award) which the Council shall judge to be worthy of it'.

material from another. The unspoken assumption was that Plautus did not invent. Leo's attitude was modified when the Cairo papyrus came to light, and the pages on this aspect of Plautus in his *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (1913) show some change in the point of view, but the revolution was the work of Fraenkel.

Plautinisches im Plautus is one of the most exciting works of Classical scholarship: with the exception of one chapter, the book is a marvellously original essay in the discovery of a new world. The reason for this is Fraenkel's realization that Plautus was no imitator of Greek comedy: the world of his comedy, the attitude to life it expresses, the language, even the dramatic forms are un-Greek. By painstakingly detailed examination of linguistic and dramatic forms, Fraenkel demonstrated the Roman genius of Plautus. The one chapter which is not really on the same level as the rest is the chapter in which he carried on Leo's method of detecting *contaminatio*. In other chapters some later discoveries of Menander necessitated minor modifications, and these are to be found in the Italian edition (*Elementi Plautini in Plauto*), devotedly translated by Franco Munari and published in 1960. All the rest has stood the test of time and forms the basis of modern study of Plautus. The method of the book is Leo's, the spirit is Wilamowitz's: everything starts from the patient observation of detail but the writing is exuberant and the book ends with a wonderfully lively chapter sketching the essential nature of Greek New Comedy and contrasting the genius of Plautus.

There had been little time while *Plautinisches im Plautus* was being written to pursue other interests. Nevertheless three significant articles were published (in addition to minor articles and reviews). Two arose from Fraenkel's work on the *Thesaurus*, and both showed the way in which he could move out from careful observation of linguistic detail to wider propositions of social interest: in the article¹ 'Das Geschlecht von *Dies*' (*Glotta*, 1917) he showed how the use of *dies* in the feminine had been developed to express vitally important distinctions in the Roman law of contract, and in 'Zur Geschichte des Wortes *Fides*' (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1916) he connected the use of the word with Roman legal and social phenomena. In the long article 'Lyrische Daktylen' (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1918), which he had severe doubts about reprinting in *Kleine Beiträge*, he made use of Wilamowitz's concept of

¹ This article (like most of the articles and reviews mentioned in this Memoir) was reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge*.

an original reservoir of popular metres from which the artistic metres used by Greek poets were derived. He lost faith in this concept later, but it represented a way of thinking which marks much of his writing and was the origin of some excellent ideas. For he delighted in intuiting the hidden history of phenomena (it was a pleasure he certainly learnt from Wilamowitz and not from Leo). Basic to his thinking were two related convictions: that widespread features of literary culture were likely to have their origins at a sub-literary level, and that Greece and Rome shared a common culture to such an extent that features of Roman culture were unlikely to have had an independent origin. These convictions provided the basis for Fraenkel's next book, for the articles 'Zur Form der *αἴνοι*' (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1920), and 'Die Vorgeschichte des Versus Quadratus' (*Hermes*, 1927), for his views on 'Kolon und Satz' and on the origin of the Saturnian, for his theory of the origin of *cantica* in drama (Ch. X of *Plautinisches im Plautus*), for his readiness to suppose colloquial origins for locutions and popular origins for patterns of speech (especially in the commentary on *Agamemnon* and in *Horace*), for the idea that formulas of politeness in Roman comedy which have analogies in Greek literature were transmitted at a social, not a literary, level, for the idea (expressed in his last book) that the cadences of formal Greek and Roman rhetoric had their origin in the ordinary speech-rhythms of educated conversation, for the willingness to trace common phrases in Republican and Augustan poets to lost parts of Ennius, and for many other intuitions about the origins of literary phenomena. Some of these ideas are too romantic and optimistic, but many are valuable and imaginative suggestions that will repay further investigation.

In the years after 1922 Fraenkel, inspired by his work on Plautus, began to work on problems of Roman law (an interest that lasted all his life) and between 1924 and 1927 he published a number of articles in the field. Outstanding among these is a review he published in the first number of *Gnomon* (1925), of which he was a founder-editor, on the interpretation of *carmen* in the Twelve Tables. In the next year he followed up a new-found interest in Lucan (cf. his lecture of 1924¹ 'Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos') by contributing to *Gnomon* a fundamental review of Housman's *Lucan* (which the victim greatly admired). But all this time he was working on *Iktus und Akzent im Lateinischen Sprechvers* (1928).

¹ Reprinted in *Kl. Beitr.* ii. 233-66.

This book was a disaster, and was reluctantly accepted as such by its author so that, in later years, he would scarcely speak of it (except for its observations on hyperbaton in prose and verse). The basic assumption of the book was that the non-lyric metres of Roman drama must reflect the speech of educated Romans and that consequently there must be non-rhythmic reasons for apparent clashes between metrical ictus and word-accent. Fraenkel hoped to show that, though the verse of the dramatists was not an exact echo of conversation (for it was artistic), yet, when an accent fell on a final syllable, it was to be accounted for by considerations applicable to, or by licences extended from, ordinary conversation. The book contains an enormous mass of material, excellently organized, a host of admirable observations on linguistic and metrical phenomena, and much of the detailed argumentation is plausible. Unfortunately the book is also an extended *petitio principii* because one must start with the conviction (incapable of proof) that accent was of major importance to the Roman dramatist in constructing his rhythms and therefore discard other considerations (such as caesura) which influence the positioning of words in the line and have nothing to do with Latin accent (being derived from Greek metre)—to say nothing of purely Latin metrical phenomena such as Luchs' law.

In *Iktus und Akzent* Fraenkel promised a study of Latin prose to bear out the conclusions reached there. In the event he was too discouraged to proceed and it was to be forty years before he published a (very different) book on the subject. Instead he changed direction and wrote the two papers *Kolon und Satz* (1932 and 1933 in the *Nachrichten* of the Göttingen Academy, amplified by a later study of the position of the vocative in *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz, Sitzgsb. Bayer. Ak.* 1965). The aim in all this was to find means of recognizing the constituent elements (*cola*) of sentences. The first article used the fact that enjambement was disallowed between the pentameter and the following hexameter in a series of elegiac couplets (he was undismayed by the artificiality of this type of composition, asserting—what was fundamental to his whole approach—that, as far as structure was concerned, poetry, oratory, and educated conversation were not qualitatively different). The second article hit on the original idea of using Wackernagel's law about the position of postpositives in Indo-European languages to identify as a colon not only the structure in which the postpositive occurred, but also the immediately preceding structure. The third article (1965) used

the placing of the vocative for the same purpose. These various criteria proved at least as useful in Greek as in Latin, and the articles rank among Fraenkel's most original writings.

The twenty years or more between *Iktus und Akzent* and his next book were taken up mainly with preparations for the commentary on *Agamemnon* and the book on *Horace*; this was also a period disrupted by exile from Germany, and by acclimatization to a new country and a strange academic milieu. Yet a series of important articles belong to these years (many reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge*) on *Agamemnon*, *Horace*, *Plautus*, *Virgil*, *Tacitus*, *Lucilius*, and *Aristophanes*. Fraenkel also worked from time to time on various ideas in the field of Roman law. But perhaps the most astonishing evidence of his erudition and his constant observation of detail over the whole field of Classical antiquity comes from the huge review¹ of the first volume in the new Harvard edition of *Servius'* commentary on *Virgil*. Without malice or rancour, it is an absolutely devastating review of fifty pages packed with detailed material (much of it original) over the whole range of ancient scholarship.

The commentary on *Aeschylus'* *Agamemnon* was published in 1950. It was the result of twenty-five years' labour. It is hard to view this monumental work as a whole. Fraenkel gave a series of reasons for deciding to follow the example of the old *editiones cum notis variorum* and include 'substantial quotations, or paraphrases, from the commentaries of earlier scholars'. He wanted to acknowledge debts,² to avoid blunting the edge of earlier arguments, to put the reader in a position to reject his interpretation, and, finally, 'it is neither likely nor desirable that in the near future another scholar should feel tempted to plod once more through so many commentaries, translations, books, and articles in order to bring together a representative selection of his forerunners' views'. It is impossible to doubt Fraenkel's sincerity, but there was confusion here which became greater when he declared on the one hand that he had written 'neither for those who have only a rudimentary knowledge of Greek nor for the specialists. My favourite reader . . . looked surprisingly like some of the students who worked with me for many years at Oxford',³ and, on the other, justified including extensive

¹ *JRS* 38 (1948) 131-43; 39 (1949) 145-54 (= *Kl. Beitr.* ii. 339-90).

² This instinct to acknowledge debts was fundamental and marks all his writings—not just debts to the dead and great but to many pupils and friends who helped him in all sorts of unassuming ways.

³ His moving tribute is quoted in full p. 438, n. 1 below.

digressions on technical questions because scholars could then find them more conveniently.

The sad result is that the commentary is practically unusable by Fraenkel's 'favourite reader'. Notes commonly extend to several pages and may need to be read several times before Fraenkel's own view becomes clear; this was due to a desire to give concrete expression to impartiality and, therefore, so to expound wrong views first that his own view emerged as if by the natural compulsion of logic. But the sheer accumulation of facts and views could become self-defeating, and it is hard to escape the impression that at times Fraenkel allowed the details to rob him of the sort of decision which is involved in selection, and even to rob him of decision altogether. Decisions are sometimes made on narrow technical grounds that give the impression of niggling and denying the voice of common sense; they can even seem arbitrary. One feels at times that if only brevity and selection had been enforced, the commentator's eyes and mind would have been opened.

Nor would this have been a disadvantage, for Fraenkel's ideal of completeness of presentation was not attained. Sometimes an important point of view was overlooked or a good emendation was not considered; often it is clear that the commentator's own view of a problem has unwittingly—but inevitably—controlled the presentation of evidence. The fact is that the required degree of completeness is humanly unattainable, and that Fraenkel himself would never have dreamed of trusting another scholar's claim to such completeness.

There are places too where judgement faltered. Often these are points of detail but at times the consequences are more far-reaching, for instance, Fraenkel (for once forgetful of drama) said of the hymn to Zeus (160 ff.):¹ 'On many occasions prayers are justified; Aeschylus would be the last man to deny or minimize their value. Yet when, at the stage of his maturest speculation, he endeavours in a sublime effort to unriddle the ultimate cause of the fate and suffering of man, any form of beseeching and imploring would be inadequate.' Here, and at many other points, Fraenkel identified views expressed by the chorus with Aeschylus' own views. It was perhaps this readiness to think in terms of Aeschylus' own views that led him to give prominence to the question of Agamemnon's guilt and to assert that his main crime was the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. A 'principle of interpretation' that weakened his work on other occasions too (for instance

¹ Vol. ii, p. 113.

on Horace) was dogmatically asserted: 'It must be regarded as an established and indeed a guiding principle for any interpretation of Aeschylus that the poet does not want us to take into account any feature of a tradition which he does not mention.' This prepares for the assertion that Aeschylus deliberately discarded the story of Agamemnon's slaughter of the sacred deer (familiar from the *Cypria*). But this view arose from an obsession with the theology, rather than the drama, of Agamemnon's guilt. The same principle was invoked to exclude also the story of the feigned marriage of Iphigeneia from the dramatist's mind. But the 'principle' is far from being such at all, as Fraenkel himself stated elsewhere.¹

Yet when all possible criticisms have been made, the work stands as an astonishing achievement. It does not mark a new epoch in studies of Greek tragedy, as the work of Humboldt² did or of Hermann or Wilamowitz's edition of Euripides' *Herakles*. It is rather that one man has brought to the interpretation of this one play a concentration of scholarship such as no Classical scholar has commanded for half a century. Fraenkel modelled his commentary on that of Wilamowitz, but it is the differences that strike one. Wilamowitz was a more original genius but a less accurate and erudite scholar; his sense of relevance was stricter and his expression of views pithier (he mentioned those of others briefly, if at all). But then *Herakles* is much simpler both in text and exegesis, and Wilamowitz was able to spread himself on his epoch-making analysis of the transmission of Greek drama. The text of the *Agamemnon* is far more problematical and Fraenkel contributed a new examination of the MSS. which has largely stood the test of time; apart from this he simply traced the main modern stages of Aeschylean scholarship. His own emendations were confined to modest suggestions of possible alterations or supplements in which he himself felt no personal confidence, but he often gave decisive support to the emendations of earlier scholars and to the recognition of interpolations.

But the edition has significance both for the whole of Greek tragedy, and also for Greek and Latin literature in general. Fraenkel's keen eye for formal elements in literature and language constantly led him to make important observations. He

¹ Vol. ii, p. 167: 'It may be quite unnecessary, perhaps even distracting, for the ancient poet to emphasize a point of detail which both he and his public can take for granted, while to the modern antiquarian it appears as something worthy of careful note.'

² Cf. *Agam.* ii, p. 255.

had too a wonderful ear for nuance and idiom; our knowledge of Greek usage is widely enriched by Fraenkel's patient observation of linguistic facts. His sensitive eye for detail led him to excellent observations on the way character is to be interpreted and even to apply psychology; sometimes badly,¹ but often with real insight, as on the character of the herald, or of Agamemnon (though the view is somewhat distorted later by a readiness to see Agamemnon as a 'gentleman'). The capacity to visualize the action on the stage seldom deserted him (there are excellent remarks on 'the grammar of dramatic technique'), and his sense of literary style and tone was always sharp.

Perhaps it is a prejudice, but, taken as a whole, the commentary gives the impression of being conceived by a mind that was more at home in Roman poetry: the freshness of Aeschylus, the naïvely vivid imagination, the bold linguistic fantasies—all seem somehow tamed by an approach that emphasises, above all, the precedents, the parallels, and the analogies. Yet to work through this commentary is an intellectual experience of a high order. Here is consummate scholarship brought to bear on problem after problem; the vision constantly widens beyond the immediate point and ranges over the whole of Classical antiquity, Greek and Roman alike. Again and again the remorseless grinding of material is lit by a flash of insight, a new question or a new way of putting an old question, a vista over centuries of literature, a new sense of the meaning of an old idea. These three volumes surely represent a mistaken notion of how a commentary should be written, but this is among the two or three most impressive works of Classical scholarship in this century.

In the years that followed, Fraenkel published some of his finest articles (all reprinted in *Kleine Beiträge*), including that on the *Culex* (*JRS*, 1952), the staging of the chorus in *Prometheus* (*Ann. d. Sc. Norm. Sup. di Pisa*, 1954), Catullus 62 *Vesper Adest* (*JRS*, 1955), 'Ein Motiv aus Euripides in einer Szene der Neuen Komödie' (*Studi in onore di Paoli*, 1955), 'Catulls Trostgedicht für Calvus' (*Wiener Studien*, 1956), and the excellent analysis of the pairs of speeches in Aeschylus' *Septem* (*Sitzgsb. Bayer. Ak.*, 1957). All of these are major articles and there were many minor ones too. These were the early years of his retirement and he felt a new access of energy and invention.

Horace was published in 1957; he had been working towards

¹ As, for instance, on 1650 where he makes Aegisthus address his body-guard as 'friends' (deliberately repeated in 'Zu den Phoenissen des Euripides', *Sitzgsb. Bayer. Ak.* 1963, p. 49 n. 1).

it for thirty years. It is a highly original book both in form and in the ideas it expresses. Fraenkel's method was to concentrate on detailed exegesis of single poems so that, after a preliminary analysis of the ancient *vita Horati*, a series of chapters follows, each devoted to a single work which is treated by a detailed analysis of selected poems. The method perfectly suited Fraenkel's immense erudition and his eye for unnoticed details, since it enabled him to say things that were new without compelling him to grind through the tralaticious material of a conventional commentary.

The best things in the book come from his knowledge of Greek lyric poetry and his appreciation of the differences between it as a social phenomenon and lyric poetry in the Augustan age. The consequences of this for Horace are excitingly worked out in the chapter on the *Epodes*, and this chapter alone marks a new era in the understanding of Horace. But again and again throughout the book Fraenkel not only saw (for the first time or, at least, afresh) the Greek background of particular poems, but he used this fact positively to produce a new view of those poems. The most spectacular contribution of the book is certainly to the understanding of Horace's lyric poetry, but Fraenkel's familiarity both with earlier Roman poetry and also with post-Platonic Greek philosophy made possible new interpretations of many passages of *Satires* and *Epistles*. In all this the book is of a magisterial originality.

But its faults too are clear. Fraenkel was inclined to assume a simple relationship between the poet's poetry and his life (cf. the identification of the chorus's views with those of Aeschylus). A curious feature of Horatian lyric is that scholars who set out to describe it often end up describing themselves and their own attitudes. At one extreme Horace is a prototype self-deprecating Briton, a discreet civil servant of clipped utterance and understatement, nimble to appreciate the policies of his political masters, more successful, however, when ironically posing as the lover, the *bon viveur*, the philosopher. If an opposite view is conceivable, it was Fraenkel's. 'From what I know of Horace I refuse to consider the possibility that in this poem (iii. 25) he is lying or not being serious. He implies that what he is setting out to do will, if he succeeds, be the crowning triumph of his life. I believe him' (p. 260). Equally in ii. 19: 'I think Horace means what he says. He did see Dionysus . . .' (p. 200). It is the same with Horace the lover and Horace the philosopher. Consequently most poems were interpreted on the same serious and literal

level: there is no difference in the poet's *persona* between *Satires* and *Odes*, and the *Epistles* are primarily real letters. This attitude conspired with Fraenkel's deep conviction of Augustus as a benevolent and reluctant monarch (of the truth, in fact, of Augustus' own account of himself) to produce a sentimental and certainly false picture of the relationship between poetry and politics. Oddly enough these views did not interfere with brilliant demonstrations of the literary background of the themes used by Horace.

But the book's value lies not in the generalities but in the details—in the series of excellent new interpretations of single poems. These were sometimes unduly limited by arbitrary assertion of the principle (cf. the commentary on *Agamemnon*) that every Horatian poem is not only absolutely independent, but also contains within it everything that is needed for its understanding. Some opportunities were thereby missed, though fortunately Fraenkel often overlooked this 'principle'. But there is throughout the book a recurring and uncharacteristic note of impatience and asperity, as if he knew that his views would be unpopular. He was, in fact, disappointed by the book's reception. The trouble was that it was the sort of book that goes straight into the intellectual blood-stream so that all that was right in it soon seemed obvious and accepted, while what was open to doubt stimulated the production of more satisfactory views without any credit accruing to the author. Reviewers were customarily respectful, even adulatory, but he sensed reserve in opinions that he valued. Many of us near to him had lived for years with his ideas, and, when the book came out, we were impressed with its faults. I think we were unjust. I remember him coming to my hotel room in Rome late one night. We had been dining and talking of much else, but also of his books. He taxed me with thinking more of his work on Plautus than on Horace. He was hurt and saddened by this because, as he explained, he had always hoped that he was not a 'one-book man, like Jaeger—his first', but that he had steadily grown in maturity and that his *Horace* was his most mature book. The real originality of *Horace* seems clearer now after thirteen years and its faults, though undeniable, can easily be allowed for once they have been recognized.

The last thirteen years of Fraenkel's life saw the publication of two more books, several major articles and reviews, and a host of articles on points of detail. He also edited Leo's *Kleine Schriften* (1960), with a moving and perceptive introduction, and

his own *Kleine Beiträge* (1964). He was feeling his life running out and at times sensed a weakening of his powers so that he was reluctant to commence a long-term project. Many of the published articles arose from his seminar-work on Sophocles' *Ajax*, and *Oedipus Coloneus*, Euripides' *Phoenissae*,¹ Plautus' *Pseudolus*, and Terence's *Eunuchus*. Books on Catullus and on the attribution of the *Rhesus* to Euripides awakened old interests and he wrote long reviews for *Gnomon*. There is no weakening of his powers to be seen here, nor in the book *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes* which he published in 1962. It is not so much a book as a miscellany; the major part consists of *adversaria* on Aristophanes, the fruits of a lifetime's interest in the poet and endless hours of work in seminars. This part of the book is full of excellent material and observations on language, forms, tone, text, dramaturgy, and characterization; some good emendations are proposed and there are acute defences of the traditional text. The book also contains two essays: one on the structure of the *Frogs* which admirably exposes the oddities in the play's construction and gives imaginative explanations for them, though the author is probably too concerned to defend the poet; the other is on the parabasis-songs and develops an interesting, if speculative, theory² which Fraenkel had long held about their origin and development.

The work which occupied his last few years was one which he several times abandoned in despair. It was finally published as *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* at the end of 1968. This is really the fulfilment of his promise, given in *Iktus und Akzent*, to examine the rhythms of Latin prose, but the line of approach is very different. Basically what Fraenkel does here is to analyse passages of Roman oratory and prose, using the technique developed in the three articles on *Kolon und Satz*; by this means he breaks sentences up into individual cola. He examines the rhythms of these cola, and, if particular rhythms tend to recur, he then recognizes these as having the status attributable to *clausulae*. Once again he asserts emphatically that the structural principles and features of the Latin sentence are basically the same whether in Augustan poetry, Ciceronian prose, or the ordinary conversation of educated Romans. The reason for the importance of this belief or assertion is that Fraenkel regards many of the rhythms which he demonstrates to be associated with particular types of cola as being 'instinctive' to educated

¹ See p. 431 above, n. 1.

² On Fraenkel's delight in this sort of theorizing, see p. 426 above.

Romans. The trouble here is that so many rhythms are thereby recognized as having *clausula* status that even a passage of the *mulomedicina Chironis*, chosen at random, can be demonstrated to exhibit them. This means that the definition of artistic prose must be reversed, it is no longer to be recognized as such in virtue of its rhythms, but in virtue of its exhibiting the kind of *Gliederung* that is analysable by the criteria of *Kolon und Satz*. This, however, reduces the importance of the concept of rhythm in prose to the point where one wonders if it would be possible to write Latin that did not, of its own accord, exhibit a high degree of acceptable rhythms. The book puts forward an ingenious and original hypothesis, but there is room for scepticism, and it was the realization of this fact that led Fraenkel several times to the point of abandoning the whole project.

Few Classical scholars have been as productive as Fraenkel, and in this respect too he invites comparison with Wilamowitz. Of his works *Plautinisches im Plautus* will live for its sheer originality; the commentary on *Agamemnon* will live too, not so much for the contribution it makes to the understanding of that play as for its immense resources of Classical scholarship; *Horace* too will continue to command attention. But probably Fraenkel's greatest contribution to learning lies in his articles. Here his originality and erudition combine. A commentary was probably unsuited to his genius because it was new ideas that set him alight, he had a mind that could see unexpected connections between unconnected facts. His commentary comes alive at such points, but in the nature of things that is relatively seldom; his articles, however, normally spring from such an idea or series of ideas and, like *Plautinisches im Plautus*, express the true excitement of intellectual discovery.

III

To describe Eduard Fraenkel is to risk the impression of caricature. He was short (not above five and a half feet) and, in later years (when a chronic condition of gallstones had compelled him to regard his diet), of meagre body. His head was disproportionately large, with a magnificent forehead merging into a dome that was bald except for a fringe of hair; he had fine eyes, large ears and nose, and a most determined jaw. His eyebrows were mobile and his face was expressive of his feelings to a comic degree, so that anger was a terrifying mask, laughter a complete dissolution of the features, and his smile a disarmingly

conspiratorial surprise. Unguarded moments of tenderness suddenly revealed a different character. Physically he was vigorous, he walked fast with a quick shuffling movement of his legs. But even as an old man he could tire men half his age or less, whether on city pavements or over rough country, and his sure-footedness on ladders in libraries was something to envy. His normal headgear was a brown beret which he would scrape on and off his head with a casual dexterity born of long practice. His voice was deep and varied in tone and pace, he read poetry with moving (and moved) expressiveness, and even in lectures he could break into song, to the delight of his young audience.

He was an excellent linguist, with an instinct for getting under the skin of a language, so that in Italy he was sometimes taken for an Italian and his English was unhesitatingly articulate. His command of idiom was good and totally unselfconscious, but he could surprise. In moments of excitement he could dismiss an argument as 'all sunshine' or recommend another as 'water-proof' or assure a host that he would 'sleep like a sack'. Students at a seminar recall the moment when he wished to give an impression of the plain of Argos: 'The plain of Argos is as flat . . .' (a pause for the exact comparison) '. . . as flat as a pikestaff!' In his writing of English he was spare and accurate, lapses are very infrequent, for instance, 'After receiving this crumb from the great man's table, Stanley rides a high horse in his commentary' (*Agam.* i, p. 82), or 'the witches . . . flee in horror, leaving behind valuable trimmings of their anatomy' (*Horace*, p. 123). His writing, however, was always dignified. He disagreed without abuse and triumphed without self-praise. But he was by nature a severe critic and an instinct to reprove error appears in frequent digressions. He hated glibness worse than a snake or a mad dog, and he could be waspish in exposing it. His conscious pride in painstaking accuracy came out in another way too: he often stated explicitly that he had already reached a result, or discovered a fact, before he read it in an earlier publication. Many a young scholar who tried to do the same, however, was reproved, 'There is no reason to give the reader a peep into your workshop.'

Fraenkel's mind was not, as a general characteristic, subtle; he had a good feeling for the mechanisms of language, but he could be less happy with fine distinctions of meaning which he could make sound forced and artificial. In the field of textual criticism, Classical scholarship over the last century has wavered between two extremes; here Fraenkel's good sense took a mid-way path and he disliked equally conservative editors and

exhibitionist emendators. His own few successful emendations involve problems where either syntax could be a guide or else a linguistic formula which his exceptionally keen eye could detect under the corruption of a tradition. Equally, by use of the same two criteria, he often successfully defended the tradition against unjustifiable emendation. But far and away the most striking and original characteristic of his mind was its capacity for association, that basic capacity which produces great inventions. It worked slowly and methodically; he would pursue a thought relentlessly, taking no pleasure in the volatile play of ideas that often marks academic conversation (sometimes embarrassing his interlocutor by persistence in following up what soon turned out to be a casual and foolish remark made on the spur of the moment). Yet, again and again, it was fascinating to present him with a fact or an idea and watch the process by which that fact or idea evoked other hitherto unrelated facts or ideas. Sometimes the result was disappointing or it would lead him into a false or implausible line of argument. But often his mind would catch fire and be transformed with a vision that was new and fresh. His really good and permanent discoveries are of this sort, and this made discussion with him exciting and adventurous. To such a mind nothing is dispensable or necessarily irrelevant, and his sense of the complete unity of *Altertumswissenschaft* (derived mainly from Wilamowitz)¹ opened the way for many discoveries and gave breadth to all his writing and teaching.

His physical energy sustained a rigorous regimen of work. He was at his desk not later than 8.30 each morning. Some time would be spent reading the newspaper, and he would mark interesting items in red pencil for Ruth to read later. Time was also allotted to correspondence—a reluctant minimum, though he was always a punctilious correspondent. But what religion is to some men, work was to Fraenkel: it gave shape, purpose, and meaning to his life. Unremitting application to scholarship was not so much a way of life or even a duty, it was the very reason for his existence. He learnt this from Leo, and he was always happy to quote Leo's reply to a student who complained of lack of time: 'There are twenty-four hours in a day; and, if that is not enough, there is the night too.' (Fraenkel himself did all the research for *Plautinisches im Plautus* and wrote it between the hours of 10 p.m. and 2 or 3 a.m. after his day's work was over.)

¹ See the appreciation of this aspect of Wilamowitz in Leo, *Ausgew. Kl. Schr.* i, pp. xviii–xix.

So, all his life, most of the morning was spent at work. Then came a simple lunch, followed by a siesta, coffee, and a walk. He worked till dinner, and, unless a guest claimed his attention, he would return to work till 10.30 or so. He then walked home to talk with Ruth (they loved talking together and during the day Eduard would make notes of topics to discuss later with Ruth) and very often to read to her. He retired to bed late, because all his life he was a poor sleeper (and always needed the aid of drugs); he would read during periods of wakefulness in the night—his favourite author at such times was Dante and he knew large sections of the *Divine Comedy* by heart.

To Fraenkel teaching was the communication of scholarship and he was a brilliant teacher, even apathetic students were infected with the vitality of ideas that struck home because they were actually lived by the speaker. In this way he roused interest in subjects like Greek metre which ordinary teachers reduce to mechanical formulae. Metre was for him the sound and movement of poetry and song: recitation (even singing) was predominant in such lectures (his raucous and ponderous rendering of the frog-song in *Frogs* was memorable). But his greatest contribution to teaching at Oxford was made in seminars, at least one of which he held every year almost to the very day of his death. In earlier years senior members of the University were admitted, but later Fraenkel excluded them, believing that their presence inhibited undergraduates and young graduates. These seminars were occasions of formidable and immediate confrontation with a very great scholar and, as such, terrifying. A victim once laughingly described the scene as a circle of rabbits addressed by a stoat. But most students learnt to forget terror in the sheer interest of learning to express their ideas and of having them tested against Fraenkel's scholarship and in acquiring and applying some of his techniques themselves.¹ Many of the most

¹ Cf. his own assessment (*Agam.* i, p. vii): 'My favourite reader, whose kindly and patient face would sometimes comfort me during the endless hours of drudgery, looked surprisingly like some of the students who worked with me for many years at Oxford in our happy seminar classes on the *Agamemnon*. Without the inspiring, and often correcting, co-operation of those young men and women I should not have been able to complete the commentary. If they thought a passage to be particularly difficult, that was sufficient reason for me to examine and discuss it as fully as I could; and more than once it was their careful preparation, their inquisitiveness, and their persistent efforts that made it possible to reach what seemed to us a satisfactory solution. Thus, ἀεὶ γὰρ ἤβαι τοῖς γέρονσιν ἐμαθεῖν, I was fortunate enough late in life to profit from the high standard of work in the classics at many schools in

distinguished Classical scholars alive today acknowledge these seminars as their own first-beginnings, and in this way Fraenkel has decisively influenced the whole concept of Classical scholarship in Britain.

It is a sad fact that he was less successful with research students. The constant weight of criticism and the sense of failing to achieve the expected standard proved often too great a discouragement. It was not that Fraenkel lacked sympathy and understanding for another's difficulties; it was rather that a single researcher—as distinct from a group in a seminar—was treated as an equal and allowed—for it was a privilege—to experience the full stimulus of uninhibited criticism. Many must have felt like Semele in the presence of Zeus. In later years, however, Fraenkel came to a more tactful understanding of the young scholar's feelings and fears, and in the last fifteen years of his life a number of researchers successfully completed work they had begun with him.

Fraenkel had great intellectual integrity and patience. He said in criticism of Verrall,¹ 'Unfortunately he had little of that patience and even less of that special gift of scholarly perseverance that enables a man to swallow vast clouds of dust in the faint hope that in the end his labour may be rewarded by a small grain of gold.' Those virtues were Fraenkel's. Ironically, however, the very scrupulous care with which he slowly weighed every possibility before making his mind up on a problem could lead to dogmatism. The sheer mental labour that was spent on reaching an opinion became self-protective against any contrary suggestion. After a lapse of time, however, his mind could become cautiously open again. It was clear that his earnest desire was for open-mindedness; a trusted friend could be heard out but would receive no indication of having made a favourable impression. (To try out an idea on him was awesome. His head would begin to shake long before you had ended, slowly, then more quickly—his cheeks quivering with dissent—till finally the word 'No' burst out.) Yet a sting could have been left because next morning a telephone call or a note could admit that Fraenkel now felt his view to need modification. But his basic instinct for open-mindedness was even clearer in the way

England and Scotland.' Cf. also *Agam.* ii, p. 400 n. 3: 'Anyone who has conducted seminar classes knows that the common sense of the young often shatters the subtle devices of their elders and that only bad teaching can deter them from speaking their mind.'

¹ *Agam.* i, p. 58.

that he could be caught off guard by something read or heard which he would suddenly realize altered some long-held view. His rueful excitement on such occasions, as he explained his error, was touching—though he would not forbear also to expound the justification for his previous view. His agnosticism, however, was dogmatic and uncompromising. He wrote in 1912 ‘Fidem profiteor mosaicam’;¹ but all trace of such a faith was erased from his personality and it was one of the few subjects on which a note of bitterness—or, perhaps, it was really irony—could creep into his voice. Yet, historically, he had a sensitive feeling for religion as an element in the life of a community or an individual and a wonderfully keen eye for its forms of expression.

A distressing form of dogmatism was shown in the way he maintained against any subsequent evidence an adverse judgement passed on a former friend who had hurt or displeased him; reconciliation in such cases, however good the grounds for it, was hardly ever possible. His view of people around him was both more simple and more dramatic than the reality, he saw them as more purely endowed with virtues or with vices than they were, and he tended to interpret actions as more deliberated than they normally are. Yet when he trusted someone and defences were not needed, no one could be kinder or more considerate.

In politics he seemed naïve. Friends remember the devoted enthusiasm with which he spoke of President Kennedy after hearing his ‘Ich bin ein Berliner . . .’ speech in Berlin in the summer of 1963. The truth is that he judged politicians as he judged people, on instinct with a simple trust in human nature that only reflected his own sincerity and lack of deviousness. He had a theoretical love of democracy, and when an issue in Oxford roused him he would take pride in going and voting with his feet in Congregation. In practice, however, since he judged politics more by personalities than by issues, he tended to a Platonic form of benevolent authoritarianism. This was the origin of his admiration for Augustus which is a serious defect in *Horace*: he detected instinctively a simple sincerity of purpose in Augustus and he read his own admiration into what Horace said. He was, consequently, an unsure judge of the content of political literature, whether it was a speech of Cicero or certain aspects of Augustan poetry or some chapters of Tacitus (he preferred the *Histories* to the *Annals* because he thought the latter flamboyant and exaggerated, refusing to consider the possibility

¹ *Diss. inaugur.* p. 111.

that the times covered by the *Annals* were more desperate). He was out of sympathy with the tough prosopographical analysis of Roman history which became a vogue in Oxford in his time, not from prejudice but because, in his view, it assumed that men were no more than the sum of their ambitions and it concentrated of necessity on a limited circle of leading men known to history for the success or failure of their ambitions. Fraenkel was always interested in the views and standards and way of life of ordinary people—especially of the peasants and burghers of his beloved Italy at all periods of her history—and he felt instinctive understanding of the way they saw the rule of Augustus.

To be in Italy with Fraenkel was to know a different person. In Oxford it was not that he faded into the background (for no background could easily absorb that striking figure), but rather he felt at home, unremarked and unremarkable, one among many, neither depressed by the fact nor stimulated. But in Italy the years fell away and something of the little boy came out; the language flowed naturally, in a torrent, on any and every topic, to anyone who showed an interest—and many did. Fraenkel would stand in a street, taking in the scene with a child-like delight. The country was intensely alive to him in all its history, ancient, medieval, renaissance, baroque, and modern; everywhere he looked, he loved and understood. His sense of history was not abstract or analytical, but emotional: he knew by instinct what it was like to live in a given period, incidents, anecdotes, facts flowed together in his mind as his vision created a scene and he was visibly moved as he spoke of it.

Fraenkel's generosity was great—not just his generosity with his time or scholarship,¹ but also his generosity with money. He was comfortably off but not in the least wealthy, yet he would unhesitatingly press financial help on a friend in need, and his entertainment of friends was totally unstinted. He always contrived to give the impression of being ready to spend money

¹ It is impossible to give any estimate of the amount of time which Fraenkel freely gave to helping other scholars: this was a constant—and ungrudged—drain on his time and energy. Two of many examples can be quoted: his editing of John Jackson's *Marginalia Scaenica*, Oxford, 1955 (see the preface for the story), and his contributions to Konrad Müller's fundamental new text of Petronius (Heimeran, 1961), recognized in the dedication. No one ever made a serious appeal for help and was turned away, back would come a prompt reply, either *viva voce* or in his own careful handwriting, at whatever length was necessary. He was unhesitatingly generous with ideas, but a principle which he often asserted was: 'κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φιλῶν applies to ideas but not to passages'.

without regard. This simply meant that he had made careful arrangements beforehand, but it was a characteristic habit of thoughtfulness that contributed to the sheer pleasure of being with him. For he could be great fun—a fact that would surprise those who knew only the formidable scholar. Conversation at times of relaxation was never difficult with him, he would laugh and joke uninhibitedly in restaurants or bars, often drawing neighbours into the conversation. He had not the least trace of snobbery or class-consciousness, and would take delight in finding that barmen or waitresses or shop-assistants were ready to talk with him. When relaxed, he was without self-consciousness, sometimes embarrassingly so: once in a hotel in the Scottish Highlands, he loudly (and truthfully) told the waiter who had brought coffee to a crowded lounge after dinner that it was undrinkable and ordered him to bring hot water so that he might there and then make his own from a jar of instant coffee, carried for just such an emergency.

The warmth and depth of his affections may also surprise. He gave himself unreservedly to friends whom he trusted. Likewise, he was impetuous and hot-headed, and easily hurt; when hurt or let down (as he thought), he often responded with quite unjustifiably drastic action, and in this way a number of friendships were abruptly lost throughout his life. But his affections were warm and un-self-regarding: once, coming off a plane to meet a friend whom he had not seen for a year, he ran forward in greeting, knocking the spectacles (without which he could scarcely see) off his face and trampling them into the concrete beneath his feet. Regardless of the sound of crunching glass, he delightedly embraced his friend. The deep and mutual affection between him and Ruth was the emotional centre of his life, and friends will not forget the quiet, harmonious hospitality of his home, with the gentle firmness of Ruth presiding. She was a wise person (more worldly-wise than Eduard and a shrewder judge of character). It was she who persuaded him out of Germany in 1933, and it was instantly to her that his thoughts turned in any crisis. It was only a couple of hours after hearing of her death that Eduard Fraenkel ended his own life on 5 February 1970.

GORDON WILLIAMS

I am indebted for information and help to many friends of Eduard Fraenkel, but special mention should be made of the help given to me by Mrs. Herman F. Frankel, Professor Gustav Fraenkel, and Professor Otto Skutsch.