

*DIE HELLENISCHE GESCHICHTSSCHREIBUNG IST  
ZEITGESCHICHTE:*  
EDUARD SCHWARTZ ON GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY IN A  
1939 LETTER TO J. ENOCH POWELL<sup>1</sup>

— IVAN MATIJAŠIĆ —

ABSTRACT

*In early 1939, the British classical scholar, and later notorious politician, J. Enoch Powell (1912–1998) sent a letter in German to Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) alongside a copy of his newly published book The History of Herodotus (Cambridge 1939). This interesting letter was published by Eckart Mensching in 1999, while Schwartz's reply lay unpublished among Powell's papers at the Churchill Archives Centre in Cambridge. Both letters are here published with an English translation, displaying not only their value for the biographies of both scholars, but also for Schwartz's concise yet significant reflections on Greek historiography, the relationship between history and poetry, and the role of historians in ancient societies.*

KEYWORDS

*Eduard Schwartz, J. Enoch Powell, Herodotus,  
Thucydides, Greek Historiography*

**1. Eduard Schwartz: biography, bibliography, and political engagement**

Eduard Schwartz was born in Kiel in 1858, but the family soon moved to Göttingen, where his father Hermann Schwartz (1821–1890) was a

<sup>1</sup> Most of this paper was written in Edinburgh in October 2024 where I was a Visiting Fellow sponsored by Ca' Foscari University of Venice and hosted by the School of History, Classics and Archaeology. My thanks go to Mirko Canevaro, Edward Harris, and David Lewis for the engaging discussions we had during and after a seminar I gave while in Edinburgh. I would also like to express my gratitude to Peter von Möllendorff (Gießen), Tim Rood (Oxford), Jeffrey S. Rusten (Cornell), Federico Santangelo (Newcastle), Eckhard Wirbelauer (Strasbourg), and Giorgio Ziffer (Udine) for their invaluable assistance at different stages in the writing of the present article. Finally, I am grateful to the anonymous peer reviewers of *HCS* whose feedback has significantly improved this text. Unless otherwise reported, all translations of German texts into English are my own.

Professor of Gynecology at the prestigious local university.<sup>2</sup> Related to the philologist Otto Jahn and the archaeologist Adolf Michaelis, and linked by family ties to the historian Johann Gustav Droysen, Schwartz was part of the German professorial bourgeoisie. He attended the *Gymnasium* in Göttingen and then enrolled in Classical Philology in 1875, attending courses by Hermann Sauppe and Curt Wachsmuth. His academic journey led him to study with Hermann Usener and Franz Bücheler in Bonn, with Theodor Mommsen in Berlin, and finally with Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in Greifswald, who, along with Usener, greatly influenced Schwartz.<sup>3</sup> He graduated at the University of Bonn in 1880 with a thesis on Dionysius Skytobrachion (*De Dionysio Scytobrachione*), an author with uncertain chronology and identity, on whom he later wrote the entry for Pauly-Wissowa.<sup>4</sup>

In 1881, he received a scholarship from the German Archaeological Institute in Rome, where he stayed for two years and learned Italian. In 1884, he obtained his Habilitation in Bonn and taught there as a Privatdozent until his appointment to the Chair of Classical Philology in Rostock in 1887. From Rostock, he moved to various university positions: Gießen in 1893, Strasbourg in 1897, Göttingen in 1902, Freiburg im Breisgau in 1909, and then back to Strasbourg in 1914. In 1918, after Germany's defeat in the war and the transfer of Strasbourg to France, he was forced to leave the city and lost his possessions. The war also brought personal losses to the Schwartz family: Gerhard, the eldest son, died in November 1914, while Ivo succumbed to his injuries in late 1918 in Frankfurt am Main.

It was in Strasbourg that Eduard Schwartz decided to put in writing his thoughts on the history of the composition of Thucydides' work. The book *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* was finished in 1917 and published in 1919: it was, as Schwartz himself claimed, 'a product of the war'.<sup>5</sup> In the same year, Schwartz was appointed to the Chair of Classical

<sup>2</sup> Schwartz's own scientific autobiography ('Wissenschaftlicher Lebenslauf') written in 1932 was eventually published in the second posthumous volume of his collected essays: Schwartz (1956). His son Gustav printed privately an autobiographical book: Schwartz (1964) (used extensively by Möllendorff [2000]). For Schwartz's biography see Rehm (1942); Momigliano (1979); Baumgarten (2012); Rebenich (2014); (2021), 207–24.

<sup>3</sup> The letters from Wilamowitz to Schwartz were published in Calder / Fowler (1986) while those from Schwartz to Wilamowitz have not survived: see Calder / Fowler (1986), 19.

<sup>4</sup> Schwartz (1903a). Cf. Rusten (1982), esp. 16.

<sup>5</sup> In the letter to Powell, Schwartz wrote: 'Mein Thukydidesbuch ist eine Frucht des Krieges' (see below § 3). Schwartz (1929), 364 already noted in the afterword of the book itself: 'Das Manuskript dieses Buches wurde im September 1917 abgeschlossen

Philology in Munich, succeeding Otto Crusius. He remained in Munich until his death on 13 February 1940, after witnessing the crisis of the Weimar Republic, the rise of Nazism, and the start of the Second World War.

Eduard Schwartz is remembered both as a classical philologist and a historian of the Church.<sup>6</sup> In the field of Greek historiography, besides the aforementioned book on Thucydides, between 1894 and 1907 he published over two hundred entries dedicated to Greek historians for Pauly-Wissowa.<sup>7</sup> As an editor of texts, he published the scholia to Euripides (in 2 vols., 1887–1891), the *Oratio ad Graecos* of Tatian (1888), the *Libellus pro Christianis Oratio de resurrectione cadaverum* of Athenagoras (1891), as well as the critical edition of the Church history of Eusebius of Caesarea (3 vols., 1903–1909) and the *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* from 431 to 553 (4 vols., 1914–1940). Church historians also remember him for the multi-volume work *Zur Geschichte des Athanasios* (1904–1911).<sup>8</sup>

From this brief list of Schwartz's most relevant works, one can immediately grasp the breadth of his interests which spanned from Greek historiography to New Testament studies, from Greek epic poetry to the history of the Church in Late Antiquity.<sup>9</sup>

Despite not featuring in some reference works on the history of classical scholarship,<sup>10</sup> Schwartz remains a figure of great interest that transcends the boundaries of classical philology, not only for his studies on the history of the Church, but also for his role in the society and politics

und ist im wesentlichen unverändert abgedruckt' ('The manuscript of this book was completed in September 1917 and is printed essentially unchanged'). Further autobiographical considerations on the *Thukydidesbuch* in Schwartz (1956), 17–18.

<sup>6</sup> Parente (1979); Meier (2011).

<sup>7</sup> The most important entries are collected in Schwartz (1957).

<sup>8</sup> See several chapters in Heil / Stockhausen (2015). For Schwartz's bibliography see Rehm (1942), 67–75, with additions and corrections in Schwartz (1960), 329–44 and Schwartz (1963), 362.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Momigliano (1979), 1001–3.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. no mention of Schwartz in W.W. Briggs and W.M. Calder's *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia* (1990), the 'heavyweight encyclopedia of the pantheon of classical scholarship' (Beard (2000), 13), nor in its online continuation: Rutgers' Database of Classical Scholars (<https://dbcs.rutgers.edu>). Hugh Lloyd-Jones, in his introduction to the English translation of Wilamowitz's *History of Classical Scholarship*, does give a shoutout to Eduard Schwartz, alongside other contemporaries of Wilamowitz: Herman Diels, Friedrich Leo, Eduard Meyer, Richard Reitzenstein, Eduard Norden, Jacob Wackernagel, and Wilhelm Schulze: see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982), xvi.

of his time. Schwartz was appointed Rektor in Strasbourg for the academic year 1915/1916, right in the middle of the war, and published several political pieces between 1914 and 1919, mostly reissued in his *Gesammelte Schriften*. Like Wilamowitz and Eduard Meyer, Schwartz was in favour of the war effort in 1914.<sup>11</sup> However, unlike his older peers, he did not sign the infamous open letter *An die Kulturwelt!* of 4 October 1914. The letter — signed by ninety-three German intellectuals including Max Planck, Adolf von Harnack, Wilhelm Dörpfeld, as well as Wilamowitz and Meyer — defended German militarism and the annexation of Belgium. It provoked formal responses from several countries and created a rift that would last well beyond the end of the conflict.<sup>12</sup>

Even though Schwartz was not aligned with the more extremist and warmongering section of the German academic elite, he still used his position in Strasbourg to praise German culture and education in 1916 and defend the Germanness of Strasbourg and Alsace in 1919, when the region had already been handed over to the French.<sup>13</sup> He was a staunch nationalist and had conservative political views, as did most of his peers. With the rise of National Socialism in Germany and the election of Hitler as chancellor in 1933, the political situation became tenser, and many German academics started to think about emigration. Schwartz aided Kurt von Fritz and Rudolf Pfeiffer to emigrate to Oxford.<sup>14</sup> In *Der Krieg als nationales Erlebnis*, a speech delivered in the Saal der Aubette in Strassbourg on 24 October 1914, Schwartz rejected racism as an analytical category: ‘We are not intoxicated by the phrase of the battle of the races, because we know that civilised people are not bred like racehorses and hunting dogs’ (‘Wir berauschen uns nicht an der Phrase vom Kampf der Rassen, weil wir wissen, daß Kulturvölker nicht gezüchtet werden wie Rennpferde und Hühnerhunde’).<sup>15</sup> Reprinted in 1938, this phrase might

<sup>11</sup> Schwartz (1938), 139–54 (‘Der Krieg als nationales Erlebnis’ [1914]).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Ungern-Sternberg / Ungern-Sternberg (1996). It must be noted that the first shot in this intellectual war was fired by Gilbert Murray and other British writers with an open letter published in *The Times* on 18 September 1914 condemning the war and the invasion of Belgium and claiming that the militaristic spirit was ‘inculcated upon the present generation of Germans by many celebrated historians and teachers’ (see Murray [2024], 265–6).

<sup>13</sup> Schwartz (1938), 195–220 (‘Gymnasium und Weltkultur’ [1916]), 259–65 (‘Das Ende der Straßburger Universität’ [1919]).

<sup>14</sup> See Rebenich (2014), 426–7, where extracts from the letters by Schwartz in support of von Fritz and Pfeiffer are published; these letters are preserved at Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

<sup>15</sup> Schwartz (1938), 147 (‘Der Krieg als nationales Erlebnis’ [1914]). Cf. Canfora (1977b), 182.

have raised some eyebrows with right-wing readers and was openly at odds with the pseudoscientific eugenics policies of the Nazis.

In his letter to Powell, he even expressed contempt for a war that was all but inevitable in early 1939: ‘May heaven protect us from a war that can only bring destruction, of which we have enough and more than enough here’ (‘Bewahre uns der Himmel vor einem Krieg, der nur Zerstörung bringen kann, an der wie hier im Land genug und übergenuß haben’: see below § 3). Besides representing a critique of the aggressive foreign policy of National Socialism, this phrase and the use of the present tense related to the destruction also show that Schwartz was highly critical of the political situation in Germany under the Nazis.<sup>16</sup>

## 2. John Enoch Powell and his intellectual debt to Eduard Schwartz

At the beginning of 1939, John Enoch Powell’s short but dense book *The History of Herodotus* was published by Cambridge University Press.<sup>17</sup> It was the third book by this 26-year-old Professor of Greek at the University of Sydney and former Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge: he had already published an edition of Greek papyri from the Rendel Harris collection at Woodbrooke College, Birmingham, as well as *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, a collection of all the Greek words in Herodotus’ *Histories* that is still an indispensable tool for any serious research on that author. In the same year, 1939, Powell’s edition of Book VIII of Herodotus appeared.<sup>18</sup>

In the preface to *The History of Herodotus*, after narrowing his investigation specifically to the problem of the composition of the *Histories*, Powell acknowledged his intellectual debt to Schwartz: ‘That in spite of this restriction of my subject I have chosen to entitle this study ‘The History of Herodotus’ arises from a wish to indicate that I am here trying to do for Herodotus what Eduard Schwartz did for another Greek historian in his brilliant *Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*’.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> On German classical scholars and politics in the early twentieth century, see Losemann (1977); (2009); Canfora (1977a); (1979); (2004). Specifically on Schwartz’s politics: Canfora (1980), 31–8, 133–59; Rebenich (2014), 424–7; (2021), *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Powell (1939a). For Powell’s biography: Heffer (1998); for his career as a classicist: Matijašić (2020), 219–2 with further bibliography.

<sup>18</sup> Powell (1936), (1938), (1939b).

<sup>19</sup> Powell (1939a), vii. Engagement with Schwartz’s book and praise of it can also be found in Powell’s unpublished 1934 dissertation *The Moral and Historical Principles of Thucydides and Their Influence in Later Antiquity* as well as his 1936 paper titled *The War and its Aftermath in their Influence upon Thucydidean Studies*: the latter is

Powell's debt to Schwartz's book was not confined to the preface, but runs throughout *The History of Herodotus*. He employed the same philological methods to analyze and attempt — though not always convincingly — to identify and date the layers of composition of Herodotus' work. He claimed that the Peloponnesian war represented an impulse to write history not only for Thucydides, but also for Herodotus:

The external impulse for both Herodotus and Thucydides had come from the Peloponnesian war; but a deeper resemblance lies in this, that the source of their inspiration was for both men Athens. Both were her apologists. Thucydides after her downfall took up his pen once more to illuminate and justify rationally her imperial policy; Herodotus in a time of bitterness and suspicion was determined that the immortal merit of Athens as the champion of Greek freedom should not be forgotten.<sup>20</sup>

These remarks left a strong impression on Schwartz, who stated in the letter printed below (§ 3) that Powell's conclusions have brought Herodotus closer to him ('Herodot mir näher gerückt').

Others were toying with these ideas even before the outbreak of World War I. It is reported that the British historian, diplomat, and international relations theorist E.W. Carr (1892–1982), who gained a double first in classics at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1916, acquired his first understanding of history from an unnamed tutor in Ancient History. This 'rather undistinguished' specialist in the Persian Wars suggested that Herodotus' account was influenced by his perspective on the Peloponnesian war, which was ongoing as he wrote. This revelation greatly impacted Carr's later views on history and historians.<sup>21</sup>

For Schwartz, the Great War was the impulse to collect his thoughts on Thucydides which he had developed in earlier lectures. In this book, he aimed to demonstrate how the long Peloponnesian war affected the historian. Simultaneously, the book itself benefitted from those challenging times:

Um eine dauernde, scharf anspannende Arbeit zu haben, machte ich mich nach Ablauf meines Rektorats daran, meine schon durch viele Vorlesungen hindurchgeschleppten Gedanken über Thukydides' Geschichtswerk zu einem Buche zusammenzufassen, das darstellen

published in Matijašić (2022a), 114–24, while the dissertation will appear in a forthcoming book by Ivan Matijašić, Tim Rood, and Daniel Sutton.

<sup>20</sup> Powell (1939a), 86.

<sup>21</sup> Davies (1983), 476 also quoted in Pitcher (2025), 263 n. 12.

sollte, wie der lange Peloponnesische Krieg auf den Geschichtsschreiber gewirkt hatte. Das entsprach der schweren Zeit und ist der Form des Buches zustatten gekommen; im übrigen wäre es wohl besser gewesen, ich wäre mit meinen Gedanken früher hervorgetreten.<sup>22</sup>

In order to have a permanent, sharply challenging work, after the end of my rectorate I set about summarising my thoughts on Thucydides' historical work, which I had already dragged through many lectures, into a book that was to show how the long Peloponnesian War had affected the historian. This was in keeping with the difficult times and benefited the form of the book; otherwise it would probably have been better if I had come forward with my thoughts earlier.

Peloponnesian War and World War I, ancient history and contemporary history intertwine in both Powell's and Schwartz's approaches and ideas even before their exchange of letters.

### **3. The correspondence between J. Enoch Powell and Eduard Schwartz**

After the publication of the book on Herodotus on 17 February 1939,<sup>23</sup> Powell sent a copy to numerous scholars, including Eduard Schwartz. Schwartz's Munich address was provided by Bruno Snell, whom Powell had met in person in December 1938 during his one and only visit to Germany before the outbreak of the war.<sup>24</sup> The accompanying letter to the book, typewritten in German, was published and commented on by Eckart Mensching in 1999, the year following Powell's death: it is reproduced here for convenience, alongside an English translation.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Schwartz (1956), 17–18.

<sup>23</sup> The exact date of publication can be inferred from the letters and documents preserved in Cambridge: Churchill Archives Centre, POLL 1/6/18 (Part 1). See Matijašić (2023), 116–19.

<sup>24</sup> The letter of 23 January 1939 where Bruno Snell provides Powell with Schwartz's address is preserved at the Churchill Archives Centre, POLL 1/6/13 (Part 2).

<sup>25</sup> Mensching (1999). There are two copies of the letter: one was retained among Powell's papers and is currently housed in the Churchill Archives Centre in Cambridge (POLL 1/6/18, Part 1); the other is the one sent to Schwartz and is preserved in his Nachlass in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich (Schartziana IIA: Powell, Enoch).

Trinity College,  
Cambridge, England  
am 'März 1939' [added by pen in the copy in Munich]

Sehr geehrter Herr Kollege,

Ich sende Ihnen in diesem Augenblick ein Exemplar meines soeben erschienenen Herodotbuches mit der Bitte, die Nennung Ihres Namens in der Vorrede als eine Art Widmung aufzufassen. Bei unserem persönlichem Unbekanntsein glaubt ich zu einer eigentlichen Widmung nicht vorschreiten zu dürfen. Ich kenne in der Tat kein zweites Buch auf dem [*lege* die] Gebiete der klassischen Philologie, dem ich so viel verdanke wie Ihrem [*lege* Ihre] Geschichtswerke des Thukydides, obwohl ich den allermeisten seiner Ergebnisse ablehnend gegenüberstehe; worin sich wie in einem Kleinbilde meine ganze Haltung dem deutschen Volke und der deutschen Kultur gegenüber widerspiegelt, ein seltsames Gemisch von Liebe und Hass. Ich, bitte, dieses vielleicht unverschämt offene Zugeständnis, wie es sich wohl nur unter Unbekannten geziemt, zu entschuldigen.

Ich habe vor, wenn ich nach meiner zweiten Abwesenheit in Australien von jetzt bis November zurück sein werde, deutschen Boden, den ich vor einigen Wochen eine kurze Zeitlang zum ersten Male betrat, wieder zu besuchen, falls der Krieg worauf ich hoffe nicht dazwischenkommt. Dann würde es die Reise über München lohnen, wenn Sie mir die Gelegenheit zu einem persönlichem [*lege* persönlichen] Zusammentreffen mit Ihnen gestatteten.

Mit Verehrung,

Ihr Ergebener,

J. Enoch Powell [signature by pen in the copy in Munich]

#### English translation:

Dear colleague,

At this moment, I am sending you a copy of my recently published book on Herodotus, with the request that you regard the mention of your name in the preface as a kind of dedication. Given that we are not personally acquainted, I felt I could not proceed with a formal dedication. In fact, I know of no other book in the field of classical philology to which I owe as much as your *Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, even though I stand opposed to most of its conclusions. In this, as a small reflection, my entire attitude towards the German people and German culture is mirrored — a strange mixture of love and hate. I ask you to excuse this perhaps brazenly candid admission, which befits only strangers.



I plan to visit German soil again — where I set foot for the first time only a few weeks ago — after returning from my second absence in Australia, from now until November, provided the war, which I hope will not intervene, does not disrupt these plans. In that case, the journey would be worth passing through Munich if you would allow me the opportunity for a personal meeting with you.

With admiration,  
Yours faithfully,  
J. Enoch Powell

The content of the letter is rather odd. Powell, while admitting an enormous debt towards Schwartz and his book on Thucydides, acknowledges that he disagrees with his conclusions. At the same time, he confesses to a mixture of love and hate ('ein seltsames Gemisch von Liebe und Hass') for the German people and German culture. Finally, despite recognizing the irreverence and candor of his message, he asks Schwartz for a meeting in November 1939.

We have a testimony of Schwartz's amused reaction to Powell's letter. As reported by Rehm in his 1942-biography,

Schwartz erzählte im Sommer 1939 lächelnd von einem Brief, in dem ihm ein Engländer (es dürfte Powell gewesen sein) seinen Besuch ankündigte, falls nicht etwa der Krieg dazwischen käme; er wünsche dringend seine Bekanntschaft zu machen, da er ihm zwar nichts von dem glaube, was in dem Thukydidesbuche vorgetragen sei, es aber für das weitaus Beste halte, was jemals über den Autor geschrieben sei.<sup>26</sup>

In the summer of 1939, Schwartz smilingly told of a letter in which an Englishman (it was probably Powell) announced his visit, if the war did not intervene; he urgently wished to make his acquaintance, as he did not believe anything of what was presented in the Thucydides book, but considered it to be by far the best thing ever written about the author.

From this personal recollection, it can be inferred that Schwartz did not take offence at Powell's unconventional letter. On the contrary, he seized the opportunity and replied in the same frank vein. His handwritten letter is preserved solely among Enoch Powell's papers at the Churchill Archive Centre and is published here for the first time:<sup>27</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Rehm (1942), 56.

<sup>27</sup> Churchill Archive Centre: POLL 1/6/18, Part 1. Schwartz's *Nachlass* in Munich contains the letters sent to Schwartz, not those he sent out.

München, Georgenstr. 4  
18. ii. 39<sup>28</sup>

Hochverehrter Herr College!

Ihr Buch und Ihren Brief habe ich erhalten und sage Ihnen dafür meinen herzlichen Dank. Nach den Regeln internationaler Höflichkeit müsste ich Ihnen in einem Englisch antworten, das an Trefflichkeit einigermaßen Ihrem Deutsch gleichkommt, aber ultra posse nemo obligatur. Englische Schriftsteller sind zwar, ganz abgesehen von der Fachliteratur, seit früher Jugend die Gefährten meiner Musse gewesen von Walter Scott Bulwer<sup>29</sup> Thackeray an bis zu Galsworthy und Priestley, aber zum freien schriftlichen und mündlichen Gebrauch hab ich es nicht gebracht. So muss ich es mit Ihnen ebenso halten wie mit meinem verstorbenen Freunde C. H. Turner in Oxford und Deutsch schreiben.

Mein Thukydidesbuch ist eine Frucht des Krieges; dessen Druck, doppelt stark in der Grenzfestung (Strassburg) hat es mir abgezwungen. Die Grundgedanken waren erheblich älter; es wäre besser gewesen, ich hätte sie gleich als sie entstanden, formuliert & hinausgeworfen. 1918 war es zu spät; von einer analytischen Philologie wollte man in Deutschland schon damals nicht viel mehr wissen und jetzt prangt die Kunst alle Incongruenzen, Widersprüche, Unmöglichkeiten mit breitem Gerede zu übermalen in üppiger Blüte. So bin ich freudig überrascht dass mir die Rolle des Propheten der draussen mehr gilt als im Vaterlande, zu Teil geworden ist, und dass auch von meiner *ταπεινότης* abgesehen, es überhaupt noch Philologen giebt, die eine Analyse grossen Stils für nötig halten und sich dadurch nicht abschrecken lassen dass sie insofern eine unendliche Aufgabe ist, als

<sup>28</sup> Schwartz's handwritten letter is dated 18 February 1939, but this must be a slip for 18 March 1939: 'ii' should be corrected with 'iii'. The main reason is that Powell's book was published on 17 February 1939 (see above) and it is materially impossible that the book reached Schwartz so soon. Powell's own letter is dated generically 'März 1939', but we also know, from his correspondence with his parents, that on 26 February 1939 he was flying over Crete on his route to Australia (POLL 1/1/3), which means that he probably prepared the letter and arranged for the Press to send it alongside the book to Schwartz. In fact, Powell wrote to Schwartz: 'Ich habe vor, wenn ich nach meiner zweiten Abwesenheit in Australien von jetzt bis November zurück sein werde, deutschen Boden (...) wieder zu besuchen'. *Von jetzt bis November*, 'from now until November': which means that he was already in Australia when the letter reached Schwartz. See also the letter sent to Powell by Jacoby from Finkenkrug near Berlin after reading his book, which is dated 16 March 1939: Matijašić 2023, 117 (unfortunately in this case, we don't have Powell's initial letter to Jacoby). Hence, it is reasonable to assume that Schwartz penned his reply on 18 March 1939.

<sup>29</sup> Writer and politician Edward Bulwer-Lytton (1803–1873).

ihre reinliche, restlose Lösung unmöglich ist. Die echte, classische hellenische Historiographie, die mit Herodot anfängt und mit Thukydides aufhört, ist auch darin eine Tochter des Epos, dass sie wie dieses ohne Analyse nicht verstanden werden kann — Das Epos ist das Werk einer Dichterschaft, die Geschichtsschreibung ist von Individualitäten, starken Individualitäten geschaffen, aber von Individualitäten, die mit und durch ihr Werk geworden sind und nicht als eine starre Einheit genommen werden dürfen; ihr Leben war ihr Werk und dies Leben war ein echtes, fließendes, nicht ein Tümpel stehenden | Wassers. Die hellenische Geschichtsschreibung ist Zeitgeschichte, und dadurch gross, dass sie unter dem Druck eines Geschehens steht und mit diesem fertig werden, ihn gewissermassen bezwingen, sich von ihm befreien will. Darin, denke ich, stimmen wir überein, und darauf kommt es an; ob wir uns in Einzelnen ablehnen, macht nichts aus. *βραχὺς ὁ βίος, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρή*,<sup>30</sup> man könnte auch sagen *ἄπειρος*.

Herodot ist aus der ionischen Cultur erwachsen, aber er war kein Ionier, und wollte es nicht sein. Er übernimmt die *ἱστορίη*,<sup>31</sup> aber er reist um das ionische Erdbild als eine den Erfahrungstatsachen widersprechende Speculation zu erweisen. Weil er kein Ionier ist, beschwert ihn die attische Herrschaft nicht, empfindet er es immer noch als eine grosse Tat dass Athen die Perser von der asiatischen Küste vertrieben hat. Das Problem ist meines Erachtens, wie und wodurch die beiden Elemente, die ionische *ἱστορίη* mit ihrem antiionischen Zweck und die Erzählung von dem Sieg über die persische Macht zu einer Einheit zusammengewachsen sind. Ich habe Ihr Buch, da ich mit dringenden Arbeiten überlastet bin, nur blättern anlesen können, so dass ich weiss worauf Sie hinauswollen. Manches leuchtet mir nicht ein, das Bild das Sie am Schluss entwerfen, hat mir sehr zu denken gegeben, Herodot mir näher gerückt.

Schade dass Sie erst im November kommen können. Bewahre uns der Himmel vor einem Krieg, der nur Zerstörung bringen kann, an der wie hier im Land genug und übergenuß haben. Ferner liebt ein 80jähriger, auch wenns ihm leiblich so gut geht wie mir, lange Fristen nicht, da er jeden Tag, den er noch arbeiten kann, als eine Gunst

<sup>30</sup> Hippocratic aphorism often quoted in ancient sources, especially in Galen, usually as *ὁ βίος βραχὺς, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρά*. The Latin version is also famous: *ars longa vita brevis*.

<sup>31</sup> In a rather pedantic way, Schwartz uses the Ionic form of *ἱστορία* with *-ιη* ending and smooth breathing (*spiritus lenis*) on the initial *iota* (i.e. psilosis). Neither Schwartz nor Powell, in their published works, use psilosis to render East Ionic, even though the latter, in his introduction to the commented edition of Herodotus' Book VIII, criticizes the appearance of rough breathings in texts of Herodotus as 'but a venerable absurdity, not practised in the writing of Aeolic' (Powell [1939b], xviii).

empfindet. Hoffen wir also das Beste; wenn Sie den Weg zu einem alten Manne finden, dem die Gegenwart im Ganzen nichts mehr ist, so wird mir Ihre Gegenwart, die nicht zu kurz dauern darf, eine grosse Freude bereiten.

Nochmals herzlichen Dank und alles Gute für Ihre Fahrt zu den Antipoden.

Ihr aufrichtig ergebener

ESchwartz

#### English translation:

Esteemed colleague,

I have received your book and your letter, and I extend my heartfelt thanks to you for them. According to the rules of international courtesy, I should respond to you in English that somewhat matches the excellence of your German, but *ultra posse nemo obligatur* [no one is obliged beyond their abilities]. Apart from the scholarly literature, English authors have indeed been my companions in leisure since my youth, from Walter Scott, Bulwer[-Lytton], and Thackeray to Galsworthy and Priestley, but I have not mastered the free written and spoken use of the language. So, I must address you in the same way as I did my late friend C. H. Turner in Oxford, by writing in German.

My book on Thucydides is a product of the war; the pressure, doubly strong in the border fortress (Strasbourg), forced it upon me. The fundamental ideas were significantly older; it would have been better if I had formulated and published them as soon as they came to fruition. By 1918, it was too late; even back then, there was little interest in Germany in analytical philology, and now the art of glossing over all incongruities, contradictions, and impossibilities with elaborate rhetoric is flourishing. Hence, I am pleasantly surprised that my role as a prophet is more valued abroad than in the homeland, and that, aside from my *ταπεινότης* [lowness, vileness], there are still philologists who consider analysis on a grand scale necessary and are not deterred by the fact that it is an infinite task, in the sense that a clean, complete solution is impossible. Genuine, classical Hellenic historiography, which begins with Herodotus and ends with Thucydides, is also a daughter of the epic in that it cannot be understood without analysis. The epic is the work of a guild of poets, whereas historiography is crafted by individualities, strong individualities, but individualities that have grown with and through their work and should not be taken as a rigid unity; their life was their work, and this life was a true, flowing one, not a stagnant pool of water. Hellenic historiography is contemporary history and thus great in that it stands under the pressure of events and seeks to come to terms with it, to conquer it, and to free itself

from it. In this, I think we agree, and that is what matters; whether we disagree on specifics does not matter. *βραχὺς ὁ βίος, ἡ δὲ τέχνη μακρὴ* [life is short, and craft is long], one could also say *ἄπειρος* [boundless].

Herodotus grew from Ionian culture, but he was not an Ionian and did not want to be one. He adopts the *ἱστορίη* [sic], but he travels to demonstrate that the Ionian worldview contradicts empirical facts. Because he is not an Ionian, the Athenian dominion does not burden him; he still feels it a great deed that Athens drove the Persians from the Asian coast. The problem, in my opinion, is how and by what means the two elements — the Ionian *ἱστορίη* with its anti-Ionian purpose and the narrative of the victory over Persian power — merged into a unity. Your book, which I have only been able to skim due to pressing work, has given me insight into your aims. Some aspects are not clear to me, yet the picture you paint at the end has given me much to ponder and brought Herodotus closer to me.

It's a pity that you can only come in November. May heaven protect us from a war that can only bring destruction, of which we have enough and more than enough here. Furthermore, an 80-year-old, even if physically well as I am, does not have long to wait, as each working day is perceived as a favour. Let us hope for the best; if you find your way to an old man to whom the present as a whole means nothing, your presence, which must not be too brief, will bring me great joy.

Once again, many thanks and all the best for your journey to the Antipodes.

Yours sincerely,  
E. Schwartz

These two letters represent the only surviving correspondence between Schwartz and Powell that I am aware of. The meeting that both wished for never took place for the one reason that could have prevented it: the outbreak of war in Europe. Powell, having returned hastily from Australia in the early days of September, spent the following months at the Royal Warwickshire Regiment's recruitment camp.<sup>32</sup> Another event finally precluded a personal meeting between Powell and Schwartz: on 13 February 1940, Schwartz died aged 81.

<sup>32</sup> The most exhaustive account of Powell's military career is in Heffer (1998), 56–98.

#### 4. Schwartz's letter to Powell and Thucydidean studies in the interwar period

The letter that Schwartz sent to Powell in 1939 is fascinating for several reasons. In the first place, it offers a vivid glimpse of the *respublica litterarum* in Europe on the eve of World War II. Despite the significant setback to international scholarly collaboration caused by World War I,<sup>33</sup> Powell's letter points to the enduring relationship between British and German classicists. Another notable example is the historian and archaeologist Ernst Fabricius who travelled to England and Scotland in the 1920s, entertained collaborations with eminent British scholars, namely R.G. Collingwood, F.G. Simpson, George Macdonald, and Eric Birley, and even received an honorary doctorate from the University of Durham in 1928.<sup>34</sup>

Schwartz's taste in English novels, which he evidently read in the original, is quite telling. Except for J. B. Priestley (whose grandfather was an illiterate mill worker),<sup>35</sup> Walter Scott, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, William Makepeace Thackeray, and John Galsworthy are all upper-middle class novelists who explored major social issues from a historical perspective. Walter Scott, who started publishing his historical novels in 1814, had a profound impact on historical writing, influencing professional historians in Britain and across Europe.<sup>36</sup> Bulwer-Lytton was not only the author of the memorable opening phrase 'It was a dark and stormy night...'<sup>37</sup> but also of a lesser-known yet intriguing history of Athens.<sup>38</sup> Thackeray, Galsworthy, and Priestley published several historical novels as well as plays: they were quite popular in their time and some of their works are still adapted and revived. Galsworthy, whose star has waned a bit, was also the recipient of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1932. It is unsurprising that Schwartz appreciated these authors; and yet having direct evidence of his literary tastes is invaluable.

Furthermore, the letter reveals Schwartz's perceived place within the German scholarly tradition. He complained that analytical philology in Germany was no longer practised ('von einer analytischen Philologie wollte man in Deutschland schon damals nicht viel mehr wissen') and that his role as a prophet ('die Rolle des Propheten') was more valued

<sup>33</sup> See Murray (2024), 263–72, who is a little too radical on the crisis caused by the war to the Republic of Letters.

<sup>34</sup> On Fabricius' scholarly network: Wirbelauer (2016), 262–4.

<sup>35</sup> For Priestley's biography, see Cook (2004).

<sup>36</sup> Murray (2024), 124–6.

<sup>37</sup> Bulwer-Lytton, *Paul Clifford*, 1830, ch. 1.

<sup>38</sup> On Bulwer-Lytton and the history of ancient Athens: Murray (2024), 127–47.

abroad than in Germany, an allusion to the Gospel of Matthew: ‘And Jesus said unto them: A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house’.<sup>39</sup> Overemphasising the lack of analytical approaches to classical texts after World War I and claiming that his own work was more valued abroad than in Germany was a way of being nice about his correspondent.<sup>40</sup> He was genuinely surprised at receiving Powell’s book with the attached letter and finding out that he had been indirectly a mentor to a young British scholar, especially since he did not found a school, according to Schwartz’s own admission.<sup>41</sup>

Only a few lines after complaining about his prophetic role outside of Germany, he added that ‘there are still philologists who consider analysis on a grand scale necessary’ (‘es überhaupt noch Philologen giebt, die eine Analyse grossen Stils für nötig halten’). This was probably a reference to the works of analytical philology applied to Thucydides by Max Pohlenz and Wolfgang Schadewaldt. Pohlenz took issues with several of Schwartz’s claims, especially with his considerations on the speeches at Sparta in Thucydides’ Book I, while Schadewaldt used a similar approach to argue for the artistic unity of the whole work, which was completely at odds with Schwartz’s conclusions on the stratification of Thucydides’ *History*.<sup>42</sup>

Although Schwartz’s *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* became a classic for the analytical study of Thucydides,<sup>43</sup> its initial reception among his German colleagues left him somewhat disheartened. In fact, it was not appreciated by his teacher Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who expressed — publicly and privately — his negative views of Schwartz’s *Thukydides*.

Immediately after its publication, Wilamowitz published a review-discussion of Schwartz’s book, challenging his belief that the alliance between Sparta and Athens described in Thuc. 5.23 could not have

<sup>39</sup> *Matthew* 13.57: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The English translation is from the King James Version.

<sup>40</sup> It is unlikely that Schwartz was here referring to Momigliano (1930), one of the very few examples of such an approach outside of Germany. It is notable that Momigliano’s study is discussed in Pohlenz (1936).

<sup>41</sup> Schwartz (1956), 8; Calder / Fowler (1986), 17–18; Möllendorff (2000), 471–3; Rebenich (2014), 407.

<sup>42</sup> Pohlenz (1919), (1920), (1936); Schadewaldt (1929). Powell was well acquainted with these publications: cf. Matijašić (2022a), 116–17. On Thucydides in Germany in the interwar period: Schelske (2017).

<sup>43</sup> For the reception of *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*: Momigliano (1979), 1009; Calder / Fowler (1986), 9; Bleckmann (2010); Rusten (2015), 65–6; Schelske (2017) 175–8.

occurred and that all references to it must be interpolations.<sup>44</sup> Wilamowitz ended his long and sharp discussion with the quip: ‘One should untie the knots rather than cut them’ (‘Man soll die Knoten lösen, nicht zerhauen’).<sup>45</sup>

In a letter to Max Pohlenz of 3 March 1919, Wilamowitz wrote:

Schwartz Thuk. ist gewiß geistreich, und wie sollte er nicht, und er ist als ἐνστατικός<sup>46</sup> höchst verdienstlich. Aber wo ich die Conjecturen geprüft habe, waren sie falsch (...). Zwei Probleme sind: die Chronologie von I und das athen. spartanische Bündnis. Für das zweite gibt Schw. eine *mögliche* Lösung. Für I ist die Behandlung der Reden für mich noch nicht befriedigend.<sup>47</sup>

Schwartz’s Thucydides is certainly ingenious, and how could he not be, for he is highly meritorious as an ἐνστατικός. But where I have examined the conjectures, they were wrong [...]. Two problems are: the chronology of Book I and the Athenian-Spartan alliance. Schwartz gives a *possible* solution to the second. For Book I, the treatment of the speeches is not yet satisfactory to me.

Similarly, Wilamowitz also complained about the book in a letter to Eduard Norden on 19 March 1919:

Er [*scil.* Schwartz] will sich auch mit Macht in seine Konzilien stürzen. Das ist auch besser als daß er im Thukydides conjicirt. Er muß als Herakles in einem Chaos Ordnung machen.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919). On Wilamowitz and Thucydides: Chambers (2000).

<sup>45</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919), 957 (404 in Wilamowitz’s *Kleine Schriften*). Hornblower (2008), 55 is appreciative of this final apophthegm.

<sup>46</sup> Ancient grammarians who found difficulties and started controversies in Homer were termed ἐνστατικοί by Eustathius of Thessalonica (*Comm. Il.* 4.270.11 van der Valk); cf. LSJ, 574, s.v. ἐνστατικός III. The same reference to Homeric scholarship is used in Wilamowitz’s review-discussion of Schwartz’s book: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1919) 934 (380 in Wilamowitz’s *Kleine Schriften*).

<sup>47</sup> The letter is published in Calder / Ehlers (1991), 113–14.

<sup>48</sup> See Möllendorff (2000), 466–7 n. 2 for further references to Wilamowitz’s disagreements with Schwartz’s edition of Euripides’ scholia and his book on the *Odyssey*. Cf. Kurt von Fritz’s judgement on Schwartz’s book on Thucydides: ‘So ist das geniale Buch von Eduard Schwartz nicht nur immer noch bei weitem das Beste, was innerhalb der Versuche, die von Ullrich zuerst gestellte sogenannte thukydideische Frage zu beantworten, geschrieben worden ist, sondern es hat auch das Verdienst, zum erstenmal auf die wirklich zentralen Probleme, die das Werk stellt, energisch hingewiesen zu haben. Wenn sein Resultat trotzdem nicht angenommen werden kann, so



Schwartz also wants to throw himself with might into his Councils. That is also better than his conjecturing on Thucydides. As Heracles, he must bring order to chaos.

Criticisms from the leading German classicist of the era, along with the reception of his work on Thucydides by the younger generation of German classical philologists, may have caused some bitterness that later surfaced in Schwartz's letter to Powell. In 1932, reflecting on his Thucydides book, Schwartz acknowledged its greatest merit: that it reignited debate about the ancient historian.<sup>49</sup> This is certainly something to be proud of, even if others have tackled the problems in different manners and found different solutions.

## 5. Schwartz's considerations on Greek historiography

Since Powell sent his book on Herodotus and mentioned *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* both in the preface and in his letter, in his reply Schwartz decided to take up one last time his professorial mantle and offer a short lecture on Greek historiography. The views expressed in his letter were already expounded in previously published articles and books.<sup>50</sup> For instance, the connection between early Greek historiography and epic poetry ('Die echte, classische hellenische Historiographie, die mit Herodot anfängt und mit Thukydides aufhört, ist auch darin eine Tochter des Epos') resembles word-for-word Schwartz's judgement in *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*: 'Die hellenische Geschichtsschreibung und damit die Geschichtsschreibung überhaupt ist eine Tochter des Epos'.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, Schwartz's remark on the distinction between epic poetry as a guild of poets and historiography as essentially

liegt dies an etwas anderem' ('Thus Eduard Schwartz's ingenious book is not only still by far the best that has been written in the attempts to answer the so-called Thucydidean question first posed by Ullrich, but it also has the merit of having for the first time vigorously pointed out the truly central problems posed by the work. If its result can nevertheless not be accepted, this is due to something else': von Fritz [1967], 574). See also Momigliano (1979), 1000.

<sup>49</sup> Schwartz (1956), 18.

<sup>50</sup> For a thorough analysis of Schwartz's approach to Greek historiography: Bleckmann (2015).

<sup>51</sup> Schwartz (1903b), 27. Further considerations on epic poetry and historiography in Schwartz (1928), 69–70 (here and below, the page numbers refer to the *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1938); for a more general context on the relationship between epic poetry and early Greek historiography, see Matijašić (2022b), 16–17.

individual ('Das Epos ist das Werk einer Dichterschaft, die Geschichtsschreibung ist von Individualitäten') displays his awareness that 'analysis' was not the same thing when applied to Homer or Thucydides.<sup>52</sup>

According to Schwartz, Herodotus grew out of Ionian culture, without being himself an Ionian ('Herodot ist aus der ionischen Cultur erwachsen, aber er war kein Ionier, und wollte es nicht sein'): this allowed him to see the flaws in the worldview of Ionian thinkers<sup>53</sup> and, simultaneously, to grasp the significance of the Athenian victory and the expulsion of the Persians from the west coast of Asia Minor ('empfindet er es immer noch als eine grosse Tat dass Athen die Perser von der asiatischen Küste vertrieben hat'). For Schwartz, the challenge was to explain how the two parts of Herodotus' *Histories* — the first four books, with their ethnographic and geographic focus, and Books 5–9, which recount the main narrative of the Persian Wars — merged into a single narrative. In his book *The History of Herodotus*, Powell sought to achieve this through an analytical approach, and it is precisely this effort that earned Schwartz's appreciation.

When Schwartz claimed that true classical Greek historiography began with Herodotus and ended with Thucydides, he was articulating in a sharp and somewhat narrow way a judgement on the development of Greek historiography that he articulated in the essay *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen* published in *Die Antike* in 1928 and reprinted in the *Gesammelte Schriften* in 1938. There he also recognized the principle ('Gesetz'), followed by ancient historians, that the content of historiography is contemporary history ('der Stoff der Geschichtsschreibung die Zeitgeschichte ist') and that Greek historiography of the imperial age was impaired ('verkümmerte').<sup>54</sup> These are the same concepts he illustrated to Powell: 'Die hellenische Geschichtsschreibung ist Zeitgeschichte' ('Hellenic historiography is contemporary history'), by which he meant that only those actively engaged in the politics of their time could subsequently write a proper work of history.

Schwartz's perspective on the importance of contemporaneity in the works of ancient historians was not unique and, most importantly, was not without followers. Felix Jacoby's use of *Zeitgeschichte* for the

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Rusten (2015), 61: 'For almost a century (1846–1936), the study of Thucydides by scholars (especially in Germany) descended down a rabbit hole of reconstructing the phases of the composition of his history, and identifying the layer of each different section. By a misleading analogy with Homeric studies, this movement came to be called "analysis"'.

<sup>53</sup> I.e. the Ionian school of Presocratic philosophy: Diog. Laert. 1.13–15, cf. Laks (2018), 17.

<sup>54</sup> Schwartz (1928), 68.

structure of the collection of Greek fragmentary historians, formulated for the first time at the historical congress in Berlin in August 1908 and published in *Klio* the subsequent year,<sup>55</sup> was due to Eduard Schwartz (and Wilamowitz). Concerning the structure of the *Fragmente* and the plan laid out in the 1909 article, several years later Jacoby admitted being ‘too much under the influence of Wilamowitz and Schwartz’.<sup>56</sup> He clearly took inspiration for *Zeitgeschichte* from Schwartz, even though he bent the meaning of the composite German word from ‘contemporary history’ to ‘contemporary historiography’, which gave an intrinsic ambiguity to the concept.<sup>57</sup>

The prominence that Schwartz assigned to contemporary historiography goes hand in hand with an extremely positive evaluation of Thucydides, the ancient writer of contemporary history *par excellence*. This view was again taken up by Felix Jacoby, who stated that the development of Greek historiography reached its natural culmination with Thucydides:

Erst mit Thukydides hat die griechische Historiographie τὴν ἀντὴς φύσιν erreicht, indem sie die Gattung erzeugt, die nun dauernd die vornehmste und wichtigste bleibt, ja die eigentlich allein als ‘Geschichtsschreibung’ gilt, die Zeitgeschichte.

[...] only with Thucydides did Greek historiography reach τὴν ἀντὴς φύσιν [‘its true nature’, a phrase taken from Aristotle’s *Poetics* 1449 a 15], in that it creates the genre that now permanently remains the noblest and most significant, which actually alone truly ranks as “historiography”, namely contemporary history.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Jacoby (1909). Cf. also Jacoby (1926), 24.

<sup>56</sup> Jacoby (1949), 382 n. 10.

<sup>57</sup> The issues with Jacoby’s structure of the *FGrHist*, based on his changing ideas of the development of Greek historiography, have been discussed in several articles by Guido Schepens: see Schepens (2009); (2010); and especially (2022) with further bibliography.

<sup>58</sup> Jacoby (1909), 98. For the English translation by Chambers and Schorn: <https://histos.org/index.php/histos/issue/view/13>, 31. See Schepens (2022), 42–3. On the importance of *Zeitgeschichte* in Greek historiography, cf. Canfora (1999), 90; (2000), 9 (‘Il centro, concettuale ed emotivo, di un’opera di storia era quasi sempre l’epoca contemporanea dell’autore: il che dava ai testimoni diretti degli eventi il massimo ruolo’. My English translation: ‘The conceptual and emotional centre of a work of history was almost always the author’s contemporary era: this gave direct witnesses of events the greatest role’).

The same view on the significance of contemporaneity for history-writing was also developed in 1912–1913 by the philosopher Benedetto Croce, though from a viewpoint that is no longer political but rather idealistic: ‘If contemporary history springs straight from life, so too does that history which is called non-contemporary, for it is evident that only an interest in the life of the present can move one to investigate past life. Therefore this past fact does not answer to a past interest, but to a present interest, in so far as it is unified with an interest of the present life’.<sup>59</sup> The immediacy of present life is precisely what compelled Thucydides to write the history of the Peloponnesian War, and similarly, the events of World War I prompted Schwartz to get out his ideas on the composition of Thucydides’ *History*. Benedetto Croce’s assertion that ‘every true history is contemporary history’, which might initially seem paradoxical, becomes, in this context, compelling.<sup>60</sup>

As we have previously noted, in his letter to Powell Schwartz also discusses the significance of ‘individualities’, by which he means those who write historiography: the historians. He defines their life as part of their work, a life that was a flowing one, ‘not a stagnant pool of water’ (‘ihr Leben war ihr Werk und dies Leben war ein echtes, fliessendes, nicht ein Tümpel stehenden Wassers’). It is interesting to compare these words with the closing sentence of the essay *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen*:

Denn — das Gesetz gilt für alle Zeiten — echte Geschichtsschreibung ist nur möglich in einem Volke, das den Willen hat, sein Schicksal selbst in die Hand zu nehmen, und allen Stürmen und Widrigkeiten zum

<sup>59</sup> Croce (1921), 12. Croce’s book was initially published in German in 1915, followed by the first Italian edition in 1916; the English translation was made on the second Italian edition (1942). See the Italian text in Croce (1989), 14: ‘E se la storia contemporanea balza direttamente dalla vita, anche direttamente dalla vita sorge quella che si suol chiamare non contemporanea, perché è evidente che solo un interesse della vita presente ci può muovere a indagare un fatto passato; il quale, dunque, in quanto si unifica con un interesse della vita presente, non risponde a un interesse passato, ma presente’.

<sup>60</sup> Croce’s famous phrase — ‘ogni vera storia è storia contemporanea’ — appears immediately after the passage quoted above (see Croce [1921], 12). Croce developed the same ideas in subsequent years especially in the collection of essays *History as the Story of Liberty*: ‘The practical requirements which underlie every historical judgment give to all history the character of “contemporary history” because, however remote in time events there recounted may seem to be, the history in reality refers to present needs and present situations wherein those events vibrate’ (Croce [1941], 19). For an approach to the modern practitioners of Greek history that is based on Croce’s premises, see Murray (2024), with explicit citations of both Crocean passages at 5 and 303.

Trotz nicht aufhört, sich für seine Ehre, seine Größe und seine Freiheit verantwortlich zu fühlen.<sup>61</sup>

For — the law applies at all times — genuine historiography is only possible in a people that has the will to take its fate into its own hands and, despite all storms and adversities, does not cease to feel responsible for its honour, its greatness, and its freedom.

These words also shed light on Schwartz's disdain for Greek historians of the Roman imperial era: they composed their histories in a time when such works could not exert any political influence, rendering them useless, 'a product of rhetoric'.<sup>62</sup>

## 6. Conclusions

Schwartz's scholarly views crystallized over a long and prolific career and his perspective on the evolution of ancient Greek historiography developed with the changing political climate of the early twentieth century. As previously noted, Schwartz was a politically active member of the academic community, committed to supporting the war effort and upholding the greatness and liberty of German culture following the defeat of 1918. The events of World War I prompted Schwartz to publish his thoughts on composition of Thucydides' *History*.

The correspondence between J. Enoch Powell and Eduard Schwartz in early 1939 offers a glimpse into their intellectual biographies and insights on the background of some of their published works. Moreover, Schwartz's letter displays his interests in English literature, his considerations on World War I and on the impending conflict in Europe, and his disdain for National Socialism. Schwartz also addressed significant issues regarding the genesis and objectives of his book on Thucydides and

<sup>61</sup> Schwartz (1928), 87.

<sup>62</sup> Schwartz (1928), 68: 'ein Produkt der Rhetorik', referred to the works of history of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Arrian. See also his *Wissenschaftlicher Lebenslauf*, where he recounts the work for Pauly-Wissowa and his encounter with Greek historians of the imperial age: '... so mußte ich Appian, der interessant war, Cassius Dio, der schon weniger anzog, und den unausstehlichen Dionys von Halikarnaß mit verarbeiten und, was ja nicht schadete, mit der Problematik der römischen Geschichte vertraut werden' ('So I had to work through Appian, who was interesting, Cassius Dio, who was less attractive, and the obnoxious Dionysus of Halicarnassus and, what did not hurt, become familiar with the problems of Roman history': Schwartz [1956], 4). On Schwartz and Greek historiography of the Roman imperial era: Gabba (1979), with a synthesis in Gabba (1991), 6–9; Bleckmann (2015), 80–1.

the state of analytical philology in Germany, contributing to the broader history of classical philology. Finally, Schwartz's views on Greek historiography highlight his belief in the unique roles of Herodotus and Thucydides as the only true representatives of historiography, with a preference for the latter as the author of *Zeitgeschichte* ('contemporary history'). For Schwartz, political historiography focused on contemporary history stands as the sole legitimate form of historiography, underscoring his perception of historical writing as inherently linked to the political discourse of its time.

Ivan Matijašić  
*Università di Messina*  
ivan.matijasic@unime.it

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAUMGARTEN, R. (2012), 'Schwartz, Eduard', in P. Kuhlmann / H. Schneider (Hrsg.), *Geschichte der Altertumswissenschaften. Biographisches Lexikon*, Stuttgart / Weimar (Der Neue Pauly Supplemente Bd. 6), 1154–5.
- BEARD, M. (2000), *The Invention of Jane Harrison*, Cambridge MA.
- BLECKMANN, B. (2010), 'Eduard Schwartz und Thukydides', in V. Fromentin / S. Gotteland / P. Payen (éds.), *Ombres de Thucydide. La réception de l'historien depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'au début du XXe siècle*, Bordeaux, 539–49.
- BLECKMANN, B. (2015), 'Eduard Schwartz und sein Bild der antiken Historiographie', in U. Heil / A. Von Stockhausen (Hrsg.), *Crux interpretum. Ein kritischer Rückblick auf das Werk von Eduard Schwartz*, Berlin / Boston, 51–95.
- BRIGGS, W.W. / CALDER, W.M. (eds.) (1990), *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia*, New York.
- CALDER, W.M. / D. EHLERS (1991), 'Wilamowitz to Max Pohlenz on Eduard Schwartz', *AJPh* 112, 111–14.
- CALDER, W.M. / R. FOWLER (1986), 'The Preserved Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Eduard Schwartz' (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Jg. 1986, H. 1), Munich.
- CANFORA, L. (1977a), *Cultura classica e crisi tedesca. Gli scritti politici di Wilamowitz*, Bari.
- CANFORA, L. (1977b), 'Eduard Schwartz, Sul futuro statale dei Reichslande', *Quaderni di Storia* 6, 173–82.
- CANFORA, L. (1979), *Intellettuale in Germania. Tra reazione e rivoluzione*, Bari.
- CANFORA, L. (1980), *Ideologie del classicismo*, Torino.
- CANFORA, L. (1999), *La storiografia greca*, Milan.
- CANFORA, L. (2000), *Prima lezione di storia greca*, Roma / Bari.
- CANFORA, L. (2004), *Le vie del classicismo*, vol. 3: *Storia, tradizione, propaganda*, Bari.
- CHAMBERS, M.J. (2000), 'Wilamowitz on Thucydides', in W.M. Calder III (ed.), *Wilamowitz in Greifswald: Akten der Tagung zum 150. Geburtstag Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorffs in Greifswald, 19.-22. Dezember 1998*, Hildesheim, 504–23.
- COOK, J. (2004), 'Priestley, John Boynton (1894–1984)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/31565>.
- CROCE, B. (1921), *Theory and History of Historiography*, translated by D. Ainslie, London 1921 (Italian edition: *Teoria e storia della storiografia*, a cura di G. Galasso, Milan 1989).
- CROCE, B. (1941), *History as the Story of Liberty*, translated by S. Sprigge, London 1941 (Italian edition: *La storia come pensiero e come azione*, Rome / Bari 1938).

- DAVIES, R.W. (1983), 'Edward Hallett Carr, 1892–1982', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 69, 473–511.
- FRITZ, K. von (1967), *Die Griechische Geschichtsschreibung*, vol. 1: *Von den Anfängen bis Thukydides*, Berlin.
- GABBA, E. (1979), 'Eduard Schwartz e la storiografia greca dell'età imperiale', *ASNP* s. 3, 9, 1033–49.
- GABBA, E. (1991), *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / Oxford.
- HEFFER, S. (1998), *Like the Roman. The Life of Enoch Powell*, London.
- HEIL, U. / A. VON STOCKHAUSEN (Hrsg.) (2015), *Crux interpretum. Ein kritischer Rückblick auf das Werk von Eduard Schwartz*, Berlin / Boston.
- HORNBLOWER, S. (2008), *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 3, Oxford.
- JACOBY, F. (1909), 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historiker-Fragmente', *Klio* 9, 80–123 (English translation by M. Chambers and S. Schorn: <https://histos.org/index.php/histos/issue/view/13>).
- JACOBY, F. (1926), 'Griechische Geschichtsschreibung', *Die Antike* 2, 1–29 (reprinted in H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung von Felix Jacoby. Zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag am 19 März 1956*, Leiden 1956, 73–99).
- JACOBY, F. (1949), *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
- LAKS, A. (2018), *The Concept of Presocratic Philosophy. Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, transl. by G.W. Most, Princeton / Oxford (originally published as *Introduction à la 'philosophie présocratique'*, Paris 2006).
- LOSEMANN, V. (1977), *Nationalsozialismus und Antike. Studien zur Entwicklung des Faches Alte Geschichte 1933–1945*, Hamburg.
- LOSEMANN, V. (Hrsg.) (2009), *Alte Geschichte zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Gedenkschrift Karl Christ*, Wiesbaden.
- MATIJAŠIĆ, I. (2020), 'Solon in Cambridge: An Unpublished Paper by John Enoch Powell', *Quaderni di Storia* 91, 219–38.
- MATIJAŠIĆ, I. (2022a), 'John Enoch Powell, Thucydides, and Historical Analogy', in L. Iori / I. Matijašić (eds.), *Thucydides in the 'Age of Extremes'. Academia and Politics* (History of Classical Scholarship Supplement 5), Newcastle / Venice, 89–124.
- MATIJAŠIĆ, I. (2022b), 'Introduction: How Homeric was Herodotus? Ancient and Modern Readers', in I. Matijašić (ed.), *Herodotus — The Most Homeric Historian?* (Histos Supplements 14), 1–37.
- MATIJAŠIĆ, I. (2023), 'Powell's *The History of Herodotus* and Three Letters from Felix Jacoby from 1939: A Rude Preface, Nazi Germany, and Antisemitism', *Histos* 17, 112–43.
- MEIER, M. (2011), "'Ein dogmatischer Streit' — Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) und die 'Reichskonzilien' in der Spätantike", *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity* 15, 124–39.



- MENSCHING, E. (1999), “... ein seltsames Gemisch von Liebe und Haas”. E. Powells Deutschland-Bild in einem Brief an Ed. Schwartz (1939)’, *Latein und Griechisch in Berlin und Brandenburg* 43, 74–82.
- MÖLLENDORFF, P. von (2000), ‘Eduard Schwartz und Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff’, in W.M. Calder III / M. Dubischar / M. Hose / G. Vogt-Spira (Hrsg.), *Wilamowitz in Greifswald*, Hildesheim / Zürich / New York, 466–90.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1930), ‘La composizione della storia di Tucidide’, *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* s. 2, 67, 1–48 (reprinted in A. Momigliano, *Nono contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, ed. by R. Di Donato, Rome 1992, 45–113).
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1979), ‘Premesse per una discussione su Eduard Schwartz’, *ASNP* s. 3, 9, 999–1011 (reprinted in A. Momigliano, *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1984, 233–44; English translation in A. Momigliano, *Studies in Modern Historiography*, ed. by G.W. Bowersock / T.J. Cornell, Berkeley 1994, 187–96).
- MURRAY, O. (2024), *The Muse of History. The Ancient Greeks from the Enlightenment to the Present*, Cambridge MA.
- PARENTE, F. (1979), ‘Eduard Schwartz storico del cristianesimo antico’, *ASNP* s. 3, 9, 1051–88.
- PITCHER, L. (2025), *Appian*, Oxford.
- POHLENZ, M. (1919), ‘Thukydidesstudien I’, *NGG*, 95–138 (reprinted in Pohlenz [1965], 210–53).
- POHLENZ, M. (1920), ‘Thukydidesstudien II–III’, *NGG*, 56–82 (reprinted in Pohlenz [1965], 254–80).
- POHLENZ, M. (1936), ‘Die thukydideische Frage im Lichte der neueren Forschung’, *GGA* 198, 281–300 (reprinted in Pohlenz [1965], 294–313).
- POHLENZ, M. (1965), *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von H. Dörrie, vol. 2, Hildesheim.
- POWELL, J.E. (1936), *The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College — Birmingham*, Cambridge.
- POWELL, J.E. (1938), *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, Cambridge.
- POWELL, J.E. (1939a), *The History of Herodotus*, Cambridge.
- POWELL, J.E. (1939b), *Herodotus, Book VIII*, Cambridge.
- REBENICH, S. (2014), ‘Eduard Schwartz und die Altertumswissenschaften seiner Zeit’, *Hyperboreus* 20, 406–35.
- REBENICH, S. (2021), *Die Deutschen und ihre Antike. Eine wechselvolle Beziehung*, Stuttgart.
- REHM, A. (1942), *Eduard Schwartz’ wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk* (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Jg. 1942, H. 4), München.
- RUSTEN, J.S. (1982), *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, Wiesbaden.
- RUSTEN, J.S. (2015), ‘Carving up Thucydides. The Rise and Demise of “Analysis,” and its Legacy’, in Ch. Lee / N. Morley (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Thucydides*, Malden MA / Oxford, 61–74.
- SCHADEWALDT, W. (1929), *Die Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides*, Berlin.

- SCHELSKE, O. (2017), 'Der Kampf um die Demokratie. Thukydides in Deutschland nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg', *Ktèma* 42, 167–82.
- SCHEPENS, G. (2009<sup>2</sup>), 'Il carteggio Jacoby-Meyer. Un piano inedito per la struttura dei *FGrHist*', in C. Ampolo (a cura di), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa, 357–95.
- SCHEPENS, G. (2010), 'Die Debatte über die Struktur der *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*', *Klio* 92, 427–61.
- SCHEPENS, G. (2022), 'The So-Called *Zeitgeschichte*: A Reassessment', in V. Fromentin (éd.), *Écrire l'histoire de son temps, de Thucydide à Ammien Marcellin* (Entretiens Hardt LXVII), Vandœuvres, 9–51.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1903a), 'Dionysios Scytobrachion', *RE* 5.1, 929–32.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1903b), *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*, Leipzig.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1914), 'Der Krieg als nationales Erlebnis [Oktober 1914]', in E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1, Berlin 1938, 139–54.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1928), 'Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte bei den Hellenen', *Die Antike* 4, 14–30 (reprinted in E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1, Berlin 1938, 67–87).
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1929<sup>2</sup>), *Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, Bonn (first ed. 1919).
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1938), *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1, Berlin.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1956), 'Wissenschaftlicher Lebenslauf (1932)', in E. Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1–21.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1957), *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber*, Leipzig.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1960), *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 4, Berlin.
- SCHWARTZ, E. (1963), *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 5, Berlin.
- SCHWARTZ, G. (1964), 'Alles ist Übergang zur Heimat hin': *mein Elternhaus; Eduard Schwartz und die Seinen in ihrer Zeit, 1897–1941*, Wiesbaden.
- UNGERN-STERNBERG, J. von / W. von UNGERN-STERNBERG (1996), *Der Aufruf "An die Kukturwelt": das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg: mit einer Dokumentation* (Historische Mitteilungen, Beiheft 18), Stuttgart.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. von (1919), 'Das Bündnis zwischen Sparta und Athen', *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, 934–57 (reprinted in U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 3, hrsg. von F. Zucker, Berlin 1969, 380–405).
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. von (1982), *History of Classical Scholarship*, translated by A. Harris, edited with introduction and notes by H. Lloyd-Jones, Baltimore MD.
- WIRBELAUER, E. (2016), 'Die "Kriese" des Althistorikers Ernst Fabricius (1857–1942)', in K. R. Krierer / I. Friedmann (Hrsg.), *Netzwerke der Altertumswissenschaften im 19. Jahrhundert*, Wien, 249–66.