

ricchissimo materiale per soddisfare diversi e ampi interessi, una fatica tanto più difficile e meritoria in quanto avvenuta fuori del giro delle grandi biblioteche, a Urbino. Ormai vi si lavora con aiuto del Centro Elaborazione Dati, uno strumento efficace, ma in questo caso dai risultati, mi pare, abbastanza ineleganti, anche se la media delle bibliografie non è molto alta. Tuttavia la cosa più importante è che qui abbiamo un ottimo lavoro, assai utile per tanti utenti. Tale bibliografia speciale stava già diventando un *desideratum* dopo quella ristretta del Maniet nell' ANRW e gli *incrementa* reperibili in *Année Philologique*. In breve, non esiterei di raccomandare l'acquisto dell'opera: è essenziale e indispensabile.

*Timo Sironen*

*Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*. Herausgegeben von *William M. Calder III, Helmut Flashar, Theodor Lindken*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1985. XVIII, 802 S. DM 98.—.

This volume proves to be a fascinating mine of information for anybody who, like the present reviewer, cannot read ten lines of Wilamowitz without getting impressed and annoyed at the same time. Its XVIII + 802 pages of close print, with heavy scholarly apparatus, do not amount to a lasting monument, fortunately: Wilamowitz would not need one. Nor is the biographical element very much in the foreground, although the book, and the conference from which it emanates, obviously owe very much to the activities of William M. Calder III. Its main value may be summarized as follows: by presenting a wide register of approaches, many of them decidedly sophisticated and critical, to Wilamowitz seen in his relations to classical scholarship, the book turns into a picture of an epoch — an epoch of crucial importance not only to the character and the fate of classical studies today, but also to European intellectual history in general. The volume was certainly worth publishing, chiefly because of Wilamowitz' uniqueness and his central position in Philologie and Altertumswissenschaft of his age, but definitely also because of his personal faults, his prejudices and his shortcomings. It renders credit to the editors and the 23 contributors from various countries, that they have on the whole succeeded in keeping a noble distance from their subject, avoiding the traps of devotion, apology, derogation, or cynicism. Yet the symbolism of the title of Calder's own contribution, 'Ecce homo', should be observed: since 1931, Wilamowitz has perhaps received more castigation than applause, especially outside Germany and even by those who would not deny his greatness.

It would be pointless to try to select the essence of the rich contents. Just two details with some bearing on what Wilamowitz himself considered to be the chief task of a classical scholar: the 'revivification' of antiquity. His life-long involvement with Greek tragedy, which began at school, arose from a complicated relationship with drama and music and the lack of proper teachers (Görgemanns 130ff.) and always meant to him interpretation of his own life (cf. Calder 94ff., on Mommsen as his 'Herakles'). And his 'Platon', whose influence can be seen in many different quarters even today, was an intensely personal document where in a sense he identified himself with the philosopher (cf. e.g. Canfora 64, Calder 101ff., Mansfeld 178ff., Kopff 569ff.). Can we after all separate the fate of the classics from ourselves?

*H. Thesleff*