1-1-2000

Future Philology! by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff - Translated by G. Postl, B. Babich, and H. Schmid

Babette babich
Fordham University, babich@fordham.edu

FUTURE PHILOLOGY![i]

a reply

to

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE'S

Ordinarius Professor of Classical Philology at Basel

„birth of tragedy"

by

Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff

Dr. Phil.

᾽Οξωτὰ σιλφιωτὰ βαλβός τεύτλιον
ὑπότριμμα θρῖον ἐγκέφαλον ὀρίγανον
καταπυγοσύνη ταῦτ᾽ ἐστὶ πρὸς κρεας μέγα.
— Aristophanes, *Age* 17[ii]

---

[i] *Zukunftsphilologie* is a play upon the 1861 German publication of Wagner's ironically titled "*Zukunftsmusik*" ["Music of the Future" — the quotation marks are Wagner's own], an open letter to Frederic Villot, Conservator of the Picture Museums at the Louvre, first translated into and published in French in 1860. See L. J. Rather, *Reading Wagner: A Study in the History of Ideas* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), p. 56. [*Zukunftsmusik* may already then (Grimm's *Wörterbuch* will confirm it) have had the perjorative connotation of 'something built on nothing.' — J. I. Porter.]

[ii] "Condiments, vinegar, piquant seasonings, scallions, beets, highly refined sauces, leaves stuffed with brains, oregano — delicacies for a catamite compared to a good hunk of meat." Providing an important key to the overall theme of the review as well as the history of its effects, Wilamowitz's epigraph follows August Meineke, *Comoedia Antiquae*, Vol. II: *Fragmenta Comicorum Graecorum* (Berlin: Reimer, 1840), Aristophanes' ΓΕΡΑΣ, fr.17, p. 1000. Meineke includes the following gloss emphasizing Aristophanes' judgment of Euripides' poetry (according to Diogenes Laertius [IV. 18-19] the epigraph corresponds to one of Aristophanes' contests between Euripides and Aeschylus, but for the obscene meaning of the term καταπυγοσύνη, cf. Iulius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, Bk. 2, 184) as so much decadent spice — stimulating depravity: "*Dicta haec sunt in Euripidis poesin, quae ut ipse alicubi locutus est*, κινοῦσα κορδὰς τὰς ἀχινήτους φρενῶν *animorum motius gravissimos excitabat, itaque comparari potuit cum cibis, qui effrenatas libidines stimularent et accendaerent*." Meineke, *Comoedia Antiquae*, Ibid. See, too, L. Seeger's German translation: "*Gewürze, Weinessig, Zwiebelknollen, Beete, Hirn, Hackfleisch, Feigenfülle, Wohlgemut, kurz*

New Nietzsche Studies, Volume Four: Nos. 1 & 2, Summer/Fall 2000, pp. 1-33.
 ISSN 10910239.

... how suddenly the desert of our exhausted culture, just described in such gloomy terms, is changed when it is touched by the Dionysian magic! A tempest seizes everything that has outlived itself, everything that is decayed, broken, and withered, and whirling, shrouds it in a cloud of red dust [red?] to carry it into the air like a vulture [how is this?]. Confused, our eyes look after what has disappeared; for what they see has been raised as from a depression into golden light, so full and green, so amply alive, immeasurable and full of yearning. Tragedy is seated amid this excess of life, suffering, and pleasure, in sublime ecstasy, listening to a distant melancholy song [who is singing?] that tells of the mothers of being whose names are: Delusion, Will, Woe — Yes, my friends, believe with me in Dionysian life and the rebirth of tragedy. The age of the Socratic man is over; [This strange species of man is also called theoretical man, critic, optimist, non-mystic — all those are quite horrifying things.

{*Footnote ii continued from previous page*.}
lauter Dinge, die zur Geilheit reizen!" *Aristophanes Werke* (Frankfurt am Main: Literarische Anstalt, 1846), Vol. 3, p. 424. Current editions include R. Kassel and C. Austin, eds., *Poetae Comici Graeci. III 2. Aristophanes, testimonai et Fragmenta* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984) and F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldert, eds., *Aristophanis Comoediae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954 [1901]), fr.130, which follows the 1869 Dindorf edition. For the scato-erotically satiric expression, καταπυγοσύνη, Jeffrey Henderson in *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), offers the surprisingly standard (given the author's happy break with tradition by translating Greek terms into Anglo-Saxon rather than Latin correspondent terms) and ultimately insufficiently exact — where allusion is the vehicle and barb of the epigraph — periphrasis "pathic depravity" [καταπυγοσύνη is defined as "brutal lust" in the Liddell and Scott lexicon]. Even James Davidson (in an otherwise unprecedented and useful critique of the term in an extended section included in a study illuminating the background context of the epigraph as a whole) stops short of a translation although and specifically summarizing Aristophanes' epigraph as a "spendid piece of metaphor mixing, compar[ing] Euripides' tragedies to dishes overdressed with spices and condiments, 'all this is *katapugosune*,' he says, 'compared to a real piece of meat.'" Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (Harper: New York, 1999), p. 168, and, further, pp. 167-182. Nietzsche provides ample material for such an 'Aristophanic' feast in BT 11, and the tone of Wilamowitz's epigraph echoes in its rhetorical associations with passivity or effeminacy (see Wilamowitz, pp. 17-18 below; cf. Davidson, pp. 172-173). By means of such barbed aristophanic color, Wilamowitz, seemingly on Euripides' behalf, meant to install Nietzsche in a place worse than that reserved for Euripides/Socrates in Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*. See too the correspondence between Nietzsche and Rohde. Rohde objected to Nietzsche's communication of Overbeck's proposal of "*Afterphilologie*" as a possible title for the reply Rohde was composing on Nietzsche's behalf in response to Wilamowitz as excessively "*aristophanesque*" [letter from Rohde, 27 July 1872], but ultimately accepted Overbeck's suggested title. Discussions of *Afterphilologie* are not in short supply and may be found in nearly any commentary on the public aftermath of Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*.

> But with the exception of the musicians of the future, everything that participates in Hellenic culture since Socrates belongs to this group. It is also since Socrates that there is something like an "Alexandrian culture"[1] most keenly expressed as culture of the opera] put on wreaths of ivy, put the thyrsus into your hand, and do not be surprised when tigers and panthers lie down, fawning, at your feet. Only dare to be tragic men [or Buddhists — which is the same (18, 110/116; 19, 118/126); Nirvana, of course, not taken to be what it means historically but how it appears within the metaphysical orbit]! You shall accompany the Dionysian pageant from India to Greece. Prepare yourself for hard strife, but believe in the miracles of your god. (20, 123-24/132)

This is just a sample and foretaste of the tone and tenor of *The Birth of Tragedy*, both of which seem self-incriminatory in any case. However, I am convinced that by criticizing and warning against it — as best as I am able — my efforts will not have been unnecessary. I felt the need, having read the book, to render fitting thanks to the author. As it stands, tone and tenor are the book's main offenses. Mr. Nietzsche by no means presents himself as a scholarly researcher. Insights garnered by intuition are presented part pulpit-style, part journalistic logic — all-too-closely related to the "paper slave of the day" (20, 122/130). As an *epopt* of his god, Mr. N announces miracles already performed and those still to come — doubtless quite edifying for his faithful "friends." Nor is the the usual anathema of those faiths promising the exclusive key to salvation lacking in the "gospel of universal harmony" (1, 37/29). Thanks to R. Wagner (Mr. N's "sublime predecessor," to whom the book is dedicated), tragedy and the tragic myth are now reborn (Euripides killed them; Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller seem, according to p. 82 (12, 82/83), to have composed merely "*dramatized epos*"; other dramas of utterly natural origin, such as those of Kalidasa and Calderon are not even mentioned). Now "Dionysus speaks the language of Apollo; and Apollo, finally, the language of Dionysus" (21, 130/140).[2] In short, after these "glorious experiences" (22,132/142) of viewing tragedy, anyone who "does not feel that he is above the pathological-moral process, should despair of his aesthetic nature" (22, 133/142). Aristotle and Lessing, naturally, did not understand tragedy: Mr. N does. Mr. N "was granted such a surprising and unusual insight into the Hellenic character that it necessarily seemed to him as if our classical-Hellenic science that bears itself so proudly had thus far (meaning, until Mr. N) contrived to subsist mainly on shadow plays and externals" (16, 101/104). But Mr. N is also, as he himself indicates, one "of nature's darling children who are fostered and

nourished at the breast of the beautiful" (19, 120/127). I have no need to besmirch myself with the subsequent diatribe contra Otto Jahn:[i] mud thrown at the sun falls back all by itself upon the head of the one throwing it. But I know I shall fall victim to the Dionysian curse, and I would love to deserve the insult of being a "Socratic man," (20, 124/ 132) or at least a "healthy" (1, 37/29) one. ὑγιαίνειν μὲν ἄριστον ἀνδρὶ θνατῷ.[ii] In any case, I want nothing to do with N, the metaphysician and apostle. Were he only this, I would not have bothered to appear as a "new Lycurgus"[iii] against this Dionysian prophet, because I would have then hardly encountered his revelations. Yet Mr. N is also Professor of Classical Philology. He engages some of the most important questions of Greek literature. Fancying himself to be solving the "riddle" of the orchestra (8, 65/63), he thinks "the rise of Greek tragedy" addresses him "with luminous precision" (17, 105/ 109); along with other world-shattering discoveries, he provides a completely new understanding of Archilochus and Euripides. This is what I want to illuminate: for here, it is easy to prove that when making such claims, imagined genius and impudence are directly proportionate to ignorance and lack of the love for truth.

Based on metaphysical dogmas, to which "Richard Wagner, by way of confirmation of their eternal truth, affixed his seal" (16,100/104-105), Mr. N concedes that the unusual nature of his claim {12, 83/102} must be contrasted with events of the present. Indeed, this was the origin of his "glorious experiences" (22 132/142). Would it be possible to admit a πρῶτον ψεῦδος[iv] in a more naïve fashion? Because R. Wagner "affixed his seal" to Schopenhauer's "eternal truth," namely that music has an exceptional status in comparison with other artforms, this same insight had to be found in classical tragedy. I claim that this is the exact opposite of the type of research which the heroes of our (and ultimately, every real) science have pursued. Unwavering in their pursuit of a final result and honoring only truth, they proceeded from one understanding to the next, seeking to

---

[i] *Otto Jahn* (1813-1869), archaeologist and philologist, author of works on music, was Friedrich Ritchl's putative opponent during the *Philologenkrieg* — a feud that grew out of a dispute corcerning the name of Soma/Haoma — that divided not only Bonn but the whole of Europe. See Hermann Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1915), pp. 281-283.

[ii] "To carry oneself well — for a mortal, nothing is better." Cited by Athenaus. *Dipnosophistae*, XV. 50. [*The Sophists at Dinner*; fr. 7, *Frag. Elegiae Graecae*, Oxford, 1962).]

[iii] Sophocles, *Antigone*, vv. 955-959.

[iv] "first false statement." Aristotle, *Pr. Anal.*, ii, ch. 18, 66^{a}16.

grasp each historical phenomenon based on the sets of assumptions of its own time, thereby justifying it in its historical necessity. This critical-historical method, in principle common to the scientific community, is, as I claim, the exact opposite of a dogmatic point of view which demands ongoing self-confirmation: Mr. N could not overlook this either. His remedy is to revile the historical-critical method (23, 136/145), denouncing any aesthetic view that deviates from his own (22, 132/142), and blaming an age in which (due to Gottfried Hermann and Karl Lachmann)[i] philology in Germany was raised to never before imagined heights for "completely perverting the true purpose of antiquarian studies" (20, 122/130). But *Atē*, ἡ πάντας ἄαται,[ii] who treads with ease on even the hardest human skull, caught up with him as well. Among those whose "spirit has so far striven most resolutely to learn from the Greeks" (20,121/129), as opposed to those who "misjudge antiquity," next to Schiller and Goethe,[3] Mr. N considers only Winckelmann. I suppose he is writing only for those who — like himself — have never read Winckelmann. Anyone who has learned from Winckelmann to view the essence of Hellenic Art only in the beautiful will turn in disgust from the "cosmic symbolism of primordial pain in the heart of the primal unity" (6, 55/51), from the "joy involved in the annihilation of the individual" (16,104/108), and from "joy in dissonance" [cf. 24, 141/152]. Anyone who has learned from Winckelmann to grasp the essence of beauty in a historical sense, as it revealed itself in different ways during different time periods and in particular to do justice to the double sense of beauty which Winckelmann has developed in such a masterly fashion,[4] will never talk about an "obvious degeneration of the Hellenic spirit" [cf. BT 17]. He will never talk about the inartistic nature of an era when Zeuxis and Apelles, Praxiteles and Lysippos created a beauty which—to be sure, unlike the notion developed by Pheidias and Polygnotos and, as far as I am concerned, a beauty without ἦθος [*ethos*] — was unimagined in the previous era, admired and admirable for all eternity. An analogous opposition, although less sharp, separates the art of Euripides and Menander from that

---

[i] *J.G. Hermann* (1772-1848), who employed Wolf's historical method in his edition of the *Orphica*, the *Iliad*, and *Aeschylus*, was the author of a Greek metric and a grammar. *K. Lachmann* (1793-1851) was the author of critical editions of Propertius, Catullus, and Lucretius, in addition to studies of the *Nibelungen* and the *Iliad*, deploying his technique of textual criticism.

[ii] "who destroys all." *Iliad*, XIX, 91. [*Atē*, ruin, goddess of blindness, moral fury; for E. R. Dodds, "a state of mind — a temporary clouding and bewildering of the normal consciousness." Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1951), p. 5.]

of Aeschylus and Aristophanes. Isn't it precisely Winckelmann who, adducing an everlasting example, demonstrated the way in which the general rules of scientific criticism are necessary too for the history of art, indeed, for an understanding of every individual work of art? Wasn't it Winckelmann who showed how aesthetic appreciation can be derived only from perceptions of the time in which the work of art arose and from the spirit of the people that produced the work of art?

But does Mr. N dare to claim any familiarity with Winckelmann? He demonstrates a truly infantile ignorance the moment he deals with any archaeological issue. He favors the satyr, his "simple man" [*"der tumbe Mensch"*] (8, 65/63), with goat feet; he can't distinguish between Pan, Silenus, or the satyr;[5] he has Apollo swing the Gorgon's head rather than the Aegis (2, 39/32); and, when attempting, in a "titanic and barbaric" (4, 46/40) fashion, "to level *Apollinian culture*[6] stone by stone" (3, 41/34), he finds the "*Olympian* figures of the gods standing on the gables of this structure; their deeds, pictured in brilliant reliefs, adorning its friezes" (*ibid*.). In response to this, one can only cite the pupil of the pastor of Laublingen.[i] But one peek at his vignette[ii] is enough to grasp Mr. N's artistic taste; one glance at this symbol of "the myth that rose again," the sight of which should have "at once" "convinced" R. Wagner that "the author certainly has something serious and urgent to say" (Preface, 31/ 23); one look at Prometheus, "the hero of pessimistic tragedy" in the "glory of activity" (9, 69/67), and at this bird to which, when appearing "before the unerring judge Dionysus," (19, 120/128), the "art deity" will pay his respects:

> ἤδη πότ᾽ ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ νυκτὸς διηγρύπνησα
> τὸν ξουθὸν ἱππαλεκτρυόνα ζητῶν τίς ἐστιν ὄρνις.[iii]

"Returning from these hortatory tones to the mood befitting contemplation" (21, 124/132), I would first like to explore the "eternal truths of the Apollinian and Dionysian" (19, 114/120), as Nietzsche's idea of a "tremendous opposition" of style in Greek art is tied to those two "art deities." "Those two different tendencies [Apollo and Dionysus to whom

---

[i] *F.G. Klopstock* (1724-1803) wrote a poem entitled, *My Error*, to resurrect hope during the French revolution and was a poetic follower of Samuel Gotthold Lange (1711-1781), a lyric poet who introduced unrhymed verse and was, from 1737, pastor of Laublingen.

[ii] The reference is to the image of Prometheus unbound featured on Nietzsche's original fontispiece.

[iii] "Thus I, after a long time, I remain sleeplessly thinking of that brown horse-rooster." Aristophanes, *Frogs*, vv. 932-932. The first verse parodies Euripides, *Hippolytus*, v. 375.

dream and ecstasy correspond], run parallel to each other, for the most part openly at variance; and they continuously incite each other to new and more powerful births, ...; till eventually, by a metaphysical miracle of the Hellenic 'will,' they appear coupled with each other, and through this coupling ultimately generate an equally Dionysian and Apollinian form of art — Attic tragedy" (1, 33/25-6). But in comes the evil Euripides — spurred on by the evil Socrates — and kills tragedy. It is granted to Mr. N that Dionysus "sought refuge in the ... flood of a secret cult" (12, 86/88), and so on, down to the "surprising and unusual insight into the Hellenic character" (16, 101/104). If eternal truths turn out to be quite transitory, hazy constructions, the whole edifice that rests upon them obviously vanishes into thin air. If I may be allowed to quote Mephistopheles who embraces "the seductive Lamiae" (18, 118/113) — "I choose the fairest of the fair... A scrawny broomstick! Oh despair!"[i] —, as soon as he gets hold of them the puff-ball bursts into pieces. Now, if one takes hold of it, what is Apollo's "art-world"? The dream. Apollo, the god of dreams! Was it the prophecy of the "dragon" Euripides to sing this way? Since Apollo took hold of the Delphic oracle νύχιαΧθὼν ἐτεκνώσατο φάσματ᾽ ὀνείρων, οἵ πόλεσιν μερόπων τά τε πρῶτα τά τ᾽ἔπειθ᾽ ὅσ᾽ ἔμελλε τυχεῖν ὕπνου κατὰ δνοφερὰς εὐνὰς φράζον . . . ἐπὶ δ᾽ ἔσεισεν κομάν, <Ζεύς> παῦσεν νυχίους ὀνείρους ἀπό λαθοσύναν νυκτωπὸν ἐξεῖλεν βροτῶν καὶ τιμὰς πάλιν θῆκε Λοξίᾳ.[ii/7] To be sure, it takes immense courage to transform Apollo "who (as the etymology of the name indicates) is the 'shining one'" (1, 35/27) into the deity of mere appearance (meaning the "mere appearance of mere appearance" (4, 45/39)), of "the higher truths of dreams" as opposed to the "incompletely intelligible everyday world" (1, 35/27), by punning means.[8] But, to be sure, for anyone ὅστις τὰ σιγῶντ᾽ὀνόματα οἶδε δαιμόνων,[iii] "Apollo" is "the transfiguring genius of the *principium individuationis*" (16, 99/103).[9] Apollo "gave birth to this entire Olympian world, and in this sense [he] is its father" (3, 41/34) Δῖνος βασιλεύει τοῦ Διὸς τεθνηκότος.[iv] Thus, in this way, the golden tree of

---

i Goethe, *Faust*, Part II, 7769ff.

ii "Earth gave birth to dream visions of the night; and they told to the cities of men the present, and what will happen in the future through dark beds of sleep on the ground ... He <Zeus> shook his locks of hair, to put an end to the night voices, and took away from mortals the truth that appears in darkness, and gave the privilege back again to Loxias..." Euripides, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, vv. 1261-1267, vv. 1276-1281.

iii "Those who know the hidden names of God." Euripides, fr. 781, 13.

iv "Vertigo [Rotation] will reign once Zeus is dead." Wilamowitz substitutes [Διὸς] τεθνηκότος for "Zeus dethroned" [Δι'] ἐζελῃλακώς in Aristophanes, *Clouds*, v.

the Hellenic world of the gods is supposed to grow from Schopenhauer's notion of grey theory. This so-called Apollinian culture enabled the Greeks who "felt the terror and horror of existence" (3, 42/35) and who were "so singularly capable of *suffering*," to "overcome an abysmal and terrifying view of the world and the keenest susceptibility to suffering through recourse to the most forceful and pleasurable illusions" (3, 43/37), i.e., through the Homeric gods who are themselves nothing other than the deification of all things.[i] Mr. N cannot know that these "mirrorings of beauty" and "illusions" (3, 44/ 38) were actually created in a half-unconscious state and were taken to be true bodily beings, grown out of — as Aristotle had put it still more appositely than the majority of more recent philosophers[10] — μετέωρα [heavenly phenomena] and περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν συμβαίνοντα [accidental affects of the soul]. He cannot know that, at least at their first impulses, they appeared during a period when the Hellenes had not yet separated themselves from their siblings, thus, during the earliest childhood of the human race. He cannot know that the gods were fully real for the Homeric Greek, even more real than what the Dionysus-believing philologist of the future regards as the miracles of his God. And he cannot know that the Apollo of the Homeric period did not carry the seeds of the religious-political power, which he will hold from the eighth century on. All this Mr. N cannot know because he does not know Homer beyond the blind beggar of the ἀγὼν Ὁμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου [the contest between Homer and Hesiod].[11] Had he known Homer properly, how could he attribute to the Homeric world — a world of youthful freshness, cheerful exuberance in the sweet pleasures of life, refreshingly unspoilt hearts of youthful naturalness, to this springtime of a people who truly dreamt the dream of life in the most beautiful fashion — pessimistic sentimentality, elderly people's yearning for non-existence, and conscious self-deception? The Greeks were eternal children, innocently and unsuspectingly enjoying the beautiful light — especially in that period of time. So, what are Mr. N's proofs for the sufferings they endured — or rather, enjoyed — allegedly in impotent lust? "The Moira enthroned inexorably over all knowledge, the vulture of the great lover of mankind, Prometheus, the terrible fate of the wise Oedipus, the family curse of the Atridae | these Gorgons and Medusas |,[ii] in short, that entire philosophy of the sylvan god, ..., which caused the downfall of the

828. Aristophanes uses τεθνηκότος in *Frogs,* v. 68.

[i] "...in dem alles Vorhandene vergöttlicht ist." (3, 41/35)

[ii] Nietzsche's references to "gorgons" and "medusas" were dropped in the second edition of *The Birth of Tragedy*.

melancholy Etruscans" (3, 42/36). What a pile of rubbish! Melancholic Etruscans (one should read Athenaeus, XII. 517)! Gorgons and Medusas! χρῆσον συ μάκτραν εἰ δὲ βούλει κάρδοπον.[i] And the family curse of the Atridae, etc. — all this should be Homeric, even pre-Homeric! What a disgrace, Mr. N, to alma mater Pforta! It must appear as if you were never given *Iliad* B 101 or the corresponding passage in Lessing's *Laokoon* to read; and Schneidewin's introduction to Sophocles's *Oedipus Rex* is also part of the wisdom which a first-year student at Pforta picks up during his first semester. You will surely try to talk your way out of this, claiming you had just misplaced a few centuries, and that numbers are merely banal mathematical matters. Now, since Plato (and despite Schopenhauer), it is inscribed above the doors of philosophy:

μηδείς ἀγεομέτρητος ἐνθάδ' εἰσίτω.[ii]

I only wish they had adhered to this saying in Pforta, at least in the version ἐνθένδ' ἐξίτω.[iii] One further aspect of the Hellenic belief system at the time of the popular epic has the character of some prior "deep glance into the horrors of nature," such as in the "empire of Titans" (3, 43/37), in which the gods around Zeus (and especially the Nietzschean primal god, Apollo) overthrow the Titans. Only, one can take it as an established fact that the reign and power of the Titans (in particular the Hesiodic dynasties and genealogies) are, in the Hellenic consciousness, on the one hand, further removed from and, on the other hand, demonstrably younger than Homer's Olympian circle of gods.[12] It is also questionable that there was ever a time when a Greek, unfamiliar with Zeus, Athena, or Apollo, would have made sacrifices to Uranus, Cronus, or Ericepaeos and Phanes. Nevertheless, such a 'bronze age of art' is assumed in BT 4, 47/41. Abstractions and allegories

---

[i] "Lend me a dish, and, if you please, a saucer." Aristophanes, *Frogs*, v. 1159. [Aristophanes's contest between Aeschylus and Euripides is set to prove who is the best tragic poet. Euripides challenges: "Sage Aeschylus says the same thing twice," and when Dionysus asks: "Twice, how so?" Euripides calls attention to the words Aeschylus uses: "'I am come to this my land,' he says, 'and do return.' To come is the same thing as to return." to which Dionysos accommodatingly replies, "Yes, by Zeus, it is as if one were to say to one's neighbor, 'Lend me a dish, and, if you please, a saucer' — thus eliciting Aeschylus's defensive invocation of the rules of rhetoric: "That's not so at all, you blabbermouth, It's not the same, but uses the best choice of words."]

[ii] "Let no one enter who is without geometry." [Traditionally said to have been inscribed above the entrance to Plato's academy.]

[iii] "Let no one leave this place." [The allusion is to Nietzsche's well-known weakness in mathematics.]

of this kind have value only for dogmatic theosophies, such as the Hesiodic, Pherecydean, or Orphic worldviews.

Mr. N's lack of familiarity with Homer reveals itself still more clearly in his views about ancient Greek literary history. Homer is, for him: "a single being" (3, 44/37), a "self-absorbed dreamer," an "Apollinian naïve artist" (5, 48/42) and Archilochus[i] — "in connection with whom scholarly research has" allegedly "discovered that he introduced the *folk song* into literature" (6, 52/48). The first claim creates delusions,[ii] the second is untrue. Even the most faithful shepherd of unity[13] will not want to deny that the background of both of Homer's incomparable poems is in an extremely fertile rhapsody which blossomed for centuries before and after the life of this author (one need only think of the critical study of the Homeric hymns which, since G. Hermann, has not advanced a single step). Homer himself could emerge as "an individual being" only from the soil of a very extensive poetry of songs. And anyone familiar with analogous phenomena in other nations (and Mr. N had already as a seventh-grader the opportunity to read the twenty songs of the *Nibelungen*), would not want to confuse the essence of naïve art, as set out by Schiller with Nietzschean reverie and false mirroring of beauty? For, "having looked boldly right into the terrible destructiveness of so-called world history as well as the cruelty of nature" (7, 59/56), even a Serb or a Finn would have to overcome the longing for Nirvana with "colorful deception." With respect to Archilochus, one is at a loss to start with; for one immediately notices that Mr. N's view of lyric poetry cannot hold if Archilochus is taken to mean what 'Greek history reports about him' (cf.

---

[i] *Archilochus* of Paros, ca. seventh century B.C., introduced iambic verse according to Herodotus who cites him as a contemporary of Gyges. Cf. Herodotus, 1, 12. Iambic verse was thought to be luxurious and violent, associated with the cult of Demeter (fr. 296) and was said to have been originally satiric or mocking in character.

[ii] Reference here is made to the celebrated Homeric question. This is the debate regarding the authorship (individual or collective) of Homer's poems, which, so expressed is also the question of Homer's real (or mythic) existence. In the context of oral and literary traditions of poetry, the so-called Homeric question also addresses the means of individual or collective composition of the poems. See for a brief account, G.S. Kirk's 1972 inaugural lecture at Bristol, "The Search for the Real Homer" in Ian McAuslan and Peter Walcot, eds., *Homer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 38-52 or, at greater length, Joachim Latacz, *Homer: His Art and His World*, trans. James P. Holoka (Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1998).

BT 6).[i] But can such an obviously false statement be attributed, even with the glimmer of probability, to an error? As unbelievable as it might sound, Mr. N has the audacity to compare Archilochan poetry with folk songs from *The Boy's Magic Horn* [*Des Knaben Wunderhorn*] — some of which are, by the way, rather hybrid. In other words, he dares to compare, so to speak, authorless poetry with some one who writes only about himself, his passions and experiences, of the kind that even Critias — himself a very respectable and also rather subjective and passionate poet — felt particularly uneasy about.[14] This claim, however, was necessary if the lyrical poet who received his song from passion, according to the popular view, "has already surrendered his subjectivity in the Dionysian process." Thereby he produces, first, an "inchoate, intangible reflection of the primordial pain in music," and then "a second mirroring as a specific symbol or example" (5, 49/44), which is the song itself. However, if Mr. N is right, Archilochus does not at first sing of his love and then later of his hate for Neobule[ii] [Mr. N nonsensically claims this to be "simultaneous"]. Instead, according to Mr. N, Archilochus talks about "the only truly existent and eternal self, resting at the basis of things" (5, 50/45). In order to claim that the words of the song are created after the melody, that they were an "imitative fulguration of music in images and concepts" (6, 55/50), Nietzsche had to attribute a lyrical strophic form and predominantly musical function to Archilochus's poetry. Thus he had to misjudge Archilochus together with the whole history of Greek music. I thought Plato had spoken clearly enough: τὴν ἁρμονίαν καὶ ῥυθμὸν ἀκολουθεῖν δεῖ τῷ λόγῳ.[iii/15] And even if the epodic verses invented by Archilochus could justifiably be called rhythmic strophes, they are certainly not musical since the essence of musical strophes lies in the recurrence of the same melody in different texts (as in the choral lyric). Due to their size alone, Archilochus's verses exclude the possibility of such a presentation; just as it is unlikely that the elegiac distych, and probably even the original heroic hexameter, were in rhythmic strophes. One cannot even imagine actually singing the iambic verses of Archilochus — just remember the tradition of παρακαταλογή.[iv/16] But more than anything else, the

---

[i] In his second edition, Nietzsche substituted "scholarly research has discovered." [*die gelehrte Forschung <hat> entdeckt*] for the original: "the history of Greece informs us" [*die griechische Geschichte berichten*].

[ii] Archilochus fell in love with Neobule and when Lycambes, her father, refused to grant her hand in marriage to Archilochus, he retaliated with such venomous satires that it is said both the father and his daughter hung themselves.

[iii] "Harmony and rhythm should follow the language."

[iv] *Paracatalogue*: rhythmic, non-melodic recitation with instrumental accompani-

uncertainty concerning the relative chronology of Terpander[i] and Archilochus can be counted as proof for Archilochus' independence from the first κατάστασις.[ii] But Mr. N has cleverly withheld the one word which is on the tip of the tongue of everyone who deals with the earliest period of Hellenic lyric. This word immediately dissipates all these stories of lyric's musical origins, of the Nietzschean folk song, of the Nietzschean musical "recast of the world" (5, 49/42). And this word is: elegy. Whether invented by Archilochus or not, the elegy is the oldest Hellenic form of lyric poetry. The sister form of iambic verse,[17] the elegy includes all aspects of what we now call lyric poetry: love and wine, war songs and mockery, the gnomic and the didactic. Nor was it sung. Mimnermos[iii] and Tyrtaios,[iv] Phoklydes[v] and Theognis[vi] were not musicians; as befits its origins, elegy is close to the folk epic, both in its style and language and in its form of recitation. Furthermore, for the masters of the first κατάστασις, words predominate, and only with the second does instrumental music appear. This account is incompatible with Nietzsche's version. However, the case to be made for it cannot be presented with any great brevity. Yet, considering that my task here is not a positive one and that we are already crossing over into the realm of the second "art deity," I might as well follow Mr. N and, in one elegant sentence, ignore the walls separating several centuries, as well as all poets and musicians, from long ages past, and consider only the birth and the tomb of tragedy.

Dionysus is not as easily summarized as Apollo. In a Nietzschean spirit, one could make a further abstraction and call Dionysus the genius of the music of the future, even of the gospel of the future. By so doing, one could show clearly the "contrasting styles" — opposing at the same time everything truly Hellenic as well as, one would hope, everything truly German.

---

ment. See Westphal, p. 194. For his discussion of the elegiac, see 258, note 2.

i *Terpander,* ca. first half of the seventh century B.C., famous musician of Lesbos, said to have invented the Aeolic and Boeotian modes.

ii *Katastasis*: musical and literary revolution accomplished by *Thaletas* [semi-legendary Cretan poet, ca. seventh century B.C., who came to Sparta, thereby possibly introducing Cretan meters into Greek poetry] and his school in Sparta.

iii *Mimnermus*, Ionian poet, later seventh century B.C., known for his nostalgic poems to youth.

iv *Tyrtaeus*, Spartan poet originally of Attica, mid-seventh century B.C., author of war songs and civic-spirited elegies.

v *Phocylides*, Milesian poet ca. sixth century B.C., known for aphoristic gnomic couplets in elegies and hexameters.

vi *Theognis*, Megarian elegiac poet, sixth century B.C..

"By the mystical triumphant cry of Dionysus the spell of individuation is broken (thus, the Apollinian is overcome), and the way lies open to the Mothers of Being" (16, 99/103). "The Dionysian, with its primordial joy experienced even in pain, is the common womb of music and tragic myth" (24, 141/152). That Mr. N does not question the extent to which the ancients shared these rather recent views about music no longer really surprises us, or whether even in his dreams or intoxicated states the Greek went so far as to consider an art form 'the language of the absolute unaesthetical' [cf. 19, 116/122]. But that is exactly what Mr. N claims when he names music the language of the will (16, 103/107) and when names the will the "*an sich* unaesthetical" (6, 55/50). Perhaps it is too mathematical to conclude that the equivalence of two quantities yields a third equality? As has been claimed repeatedly, intoxication is the analogy for the Dionysian art world, and in the "paroxysms of intoxication, the artistic power of all nature reveals itself to the highest gratification of the primordial unity" (1, 37/30). It seems that Dionysian religion came from the Orient to Hellas. But there it led to the "reversion of man to the tiger and the ape" (2, 39/32), while "the Dionysian orgies of the Greeks" have "the significance of world-redemption and days of transfiguration" (*ibid*.). Of course, at first Apollo "held out the Gorgon's head to this grotesquely uncouth Dionysian power" (*ibid*.), because "the *Dionysian* seemed 'titanic' and 'barbaric' to the Apollonian Greek" (4, 46/ 40). But finally the two antagonists reconciled, "the boundary lines to be observed henceforth by each were sharply defined, and there was to be a periodical exchange of gifts of esteem" (2, 39/32). Or, as Nietzsche puts it later, they entered a mysterious marital union (4, 47/42): Apollo and Dionysus as Nero and Pythagoras!

To be sure, it is known that the introduction of the Phrygian piping[i] mode encountered resistance from the "Apollonian Greeks." The right-thinking, "healthy" man dreaded those very Dionysian orgies, just as much

[i] Phyrgian pipes or *elymoi* consisted of a pair of flutes, one of which was was a curved or horn pipe. See Martin L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 91-92. Not the typical aulos.

as those of the mother goddess, of Sabazios,[i] of Bendis,[ii] and of Cotytto[iii] which, in Hellas, were also accompanied by indecency. And, naturally, the Hellenic spirit especially, striving for moderation in all things, resisted this eccentric, orgiastic mysticism which knew no limits—just as a healthy, clear mind vigorously resists transcendental servility. But of course, the Greeks were unable to eradicate this mysticism since it had the dangerous power to liberate the animal nature in humans and ultimately to undermine the entire, true culture of a people — however repulsive its mixture of absurdity and lust might have been. For all I care, one can trace all these different movements in Hellas back to one primary source. One can even call this primary source the Dionysian, especially if one gives the name Apollinian to the specifically Hellenic. But one should not identify it with everything rightfully named Dionysian, in particular not with what is genuinely Hellenic in Dionysus himself, as the god of wine, and in the original beings associated with him, such as Silenus, satyrs, and nymphs.[18] This is where the earliest festivals and customs of a nature-cult originate (such as the wine harvest, the crushing of grapes, the cheerful consumption of the new, rousing beverage).[19] The Dionysian festivals, tragedy as well as comedy, arose out of these cults. On the other hand, one must not import into the Dionysian of this early time all the nonsense concerning mystical vapors and rude syncretism with which subsequent writers burdened it. I should have thought the time was past when a lot of hubbub would be made of nunnish creatures in archaeological inquiry, even of Aion[iv] and Eniautos.[v] But, taking our science seriously, who does not find it "humiliating and laughable" that even today, in the manner of Saint-Croixe or Creuzer,[vi] one

---

[i] *Sabazius*, a Phyrgian and Thracian deity associated with the Phyrgian great Mother, or Cybele, as well as a name, like Iaccos, Bromios, Euios, Zagreus, ec., for Dionysus. See Jane Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991 [1903]), pp. 417-420.

[ii] *Bendis*, Thracian moon goddess. See Harrison, *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (London: Merlin Press, 1963), pp. 61-64 for the connection between Bendis, Kotyto (Cotytto below), Cybele, and Dionysus.

[iii] *Cotytto*, a Thracian goddess associated with Cybele and worshiped with licentious orgies.

[iv] *Aion*, oriental deity identified by the Greeks as the god of transcendent time or eternity, compounding the association of *Cronus* (Saturn) with time (*Chronos*).

[v] *Eniautos*, seasonal god, or: personification of the New Year.

[vi] G. de Sainte Croix (1746-1806), author of *Mystères du paganisme*. [M. Le Baron Silvestre de Sacy, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur les Mystères du paganisme par M. le Baron de Sainte-Croix*, (Paris: Bure Frères, Libraires du Roi, M DCCC.

talks about "wonderful myths" in "the Mysteries," "the epopts' roaring hymns of joy" (10, 73/72), about a Dionysian world-view which "sought refuge" from critical barbarians, such as Euripides and Socrates, "in the mystical floods of a secret cult" (12, 86/88) and which, "does not cease, in its strangest metamorphoses and debasements, to attract serious natures" (17, 106/111). Thus, Schopenhauerian philosophy, Wagnerian music, and even Nietzschean philology is precisely now the mystical wisdom of the hierophant! Furthermore, the opposition between Apollinian and Dionysian music must not be overemphasized either. Hellenic music had already adopted keys from the near East during the time of Thaletas,[i] and even before him. Beginning with the Pythian games, Hellenic music resounds with the invention of Olympus, the νόμος πολυκέφαλος,[ii / 20] for an auletic agon does exist.[iii / 21] The flute as well as the Spartan *embaterion*[iv] accompanies the *paean*.[v / 22] Even the Bacchic *hyporcheme*[vi] rejects the flute[23] and calls its round dance Doric. Even Dithyramb, represented as a satyr, can lead the cithara.[24] By contrast, Mr. N views "the fruit of reconciliation between the two antagonistic art deities" as only taking place after tragedy has arrived. Concerning lyric, he claims Dionysus alone, which is to say music, as predominant, such that instrumental music influences even the language of Dorian lyric [cf. 6, 55/51]. Finally, it is hardly justified to extend the "folk-diseases" of Dionysian enchantment (1, 37/29) to a such an early period (as the sixth and fifth centuries), when they in fact only later reach the entire

---

XVII). Friedrich Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker besonders der Griechen*. (3rd Ed. Leipzig and Darmstadt: 1836-1843).

i *Thaletas*, semi-legendary Cretan poet. See note on *katastasis*, p. 13 above.

ii *Polykephalos nomos*, the manyheaded nome (named for the Gorgon, Euryale). See below and, further, West for a discussion, p. 244.

iii According to Pindar, the flute was a gift to mortals from Athena, who gave her name to "polycephalic song" and "auletic nomos," songs accompanied by the flute, evoking the swaying movement of the many-heads of the serpent hair of the Gorgon. Wilamowitz would appear to be mistaken in this claim: the song of the Pythian Games was accompanied by a lyre and a single (not a double) flute. But see, further, West, pp. 81f.

iv *Embaterion*, war song, or rather, an air for charging the enemy. One routinely sang at the moment of attack. Possibly defining a genre, that of the bellic elegiac, instaurated by Tyrtaeus.

v *Paean*: hymn to Apollo. See West, pp. 15-16.

vi *Hyporcheme*, Grek choral song in honor of Apollo and accompanied by dance (thus opposed to the paean) and a pantomime of Cretan origin (Cf. Plato, *Ion*, 534c). Yet the song of Demodocos (*Odyssey*, Bk. VIII) is a solo rather than choral hyporcheme, as in Euripides.

population and lead them into a senseless frenzy[25] — I at least have never heard of them in this period. At the acme of Hellenic lyric, not even the dithyramb, the purely Dionysian verse song, is incompatible with all the other forms of choral poetry. And although mimesis is especially important in the case of the dithyramb — after all, it led to the rise of drama itself[26] — other forms of verse song are not at all excluded from the dithyramb and are not therefore to be taken as an "intensification of the Apollinian solo singer" (8, 64/61) [one need only think of corybantiasts, caryatids, pyrrhicists!]. And it is not at all the case, as Mr. N seems to believe, that the dithyramb was always sung by a satyr chorus.[27] Anyone who has read the fragments, above all Pindar 53, would not say silly things like this. And if we find under the name of Philoxenus[i] a very different form of poetry, the explanation is actually not all that difficult. Only the conective links are missing! One has to wonder how many hundreds of poems were required for those extremely popular *cyclic* choruses, and what a very small part of them survived at all, and which part in a million are only known to us in fragments preserved by chance. The entire later period, and the grammarians in particular, completely neglected this poetry from before the classical melic form.[28] In addition, the musical form that is of lasting nature in Hellas owes its origin and cultivation to the great dithyrambic poets. The significance of these innovations is evident from the intensity of the polemic as well as from the admiration, but in particular from the success, of the form in the musical domain.[29] We are not in a position to judge these achievements — merely to aspire to do so is already frivolous. But how enormously frivolous is it to revile a genre which one does not know! And Mr. N calls this music "excitatory or reminiscent music, that is, either a stimulant for dull and faded nerves, or tone-painting" (108). Of course, his ignorance and refusal to pursue his investigation further permits him to claim that tragedy brings music "to perfection" (21,125/134). No tragedian (as in the case of Phrynis[ii] or Timotheus[iii]) is a musical specialist.[30] But Mr.

---

[i] *Philoxenus* of Cythera, a poet, attended the court of Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse (cf. Pausanias, 1.3.1) and died towards the end of the fourth century, B.C. Only fragments of his dithyrambs (*The Cyclops and Galatea*), and his satiric poem (*The Feast*) remain, filled with neologisms and dodecasyllabic words.

[ii] *Phrynis* of Mytilene, born ca. 480 B.C., poet and musician who is regarded as having added two strings to the lyre, bringing it from seven to nine strings, and as having introduced effeminate innovations, according to *Frogs* (1323-1328).

[iii] *Timotheus*, Milesian musician, censured by the Spartans who hung his harp in the Scias, house of assembly, as a sign of disapproval of his addition of four more strings to the originally seven-stringed lyre. See Pausanias, 3.12.10.

N claims that tragedy absorbed all previous artistic genres (cf. 14, 90/94) while in fact elegy remained quite popular in Athens (next to the dithyramb) and the iamb was absorbed by comedy.[31]

If he is describing two parents who "in a mysterious union" created tragedy, finding "glorious consummation in this child — at once Antigone and Cassandra" (4, 47/42),[32] it may seem superfluous to examine every detail concerning the act of birth. But since this is the only place where we find an admittedly weak attempt to provide a historical and philological justification, let us take a quick look at some details. As one might guess, the premisses are already more than problematic. There is continuous talk of a "tragic dithyramb." I have to admit my unfamiliarity with this genre. Is it not a relative of the immortalized lyrical tragedy? The main support for this claim is the assumption that there once was a tragedy without actors. True, to be sure, prior to Thespis. Even one which dealt only with the πάθη τοῦ Διονύσου [sufferings of Dionysus], before Thespis.[33] But what does the explanation of Aeschylus's dramas have to do with hallucinations about the presumed state of affairs of a presumed preliminary stage to a presumed time? And how does the claim that there did exist a drama without actors harmonize with the other claim — stated with the same certainty — that the chorus in Aeschylus consists only of "*humble beings who served*" (8, 65/62)? O yes, it does indeed go together, but only with a "joy in a primordial contradiction." Mr. N seems not to know anything about tragedy either. So far, Aeschylus's chorus was supposedly a riddle, because it "consisted only of humble beings who served." But what about the *Eumenides*, the *Suppliants*, the *Danaïds*, and the *Daughters of Phorcys* where the chorus is the main character? And furthermore, it "is (as) undisputed that (in) Greek tragedy ... the only stage hero was Dionysus himself," just as "until Euripides, Dionysus never ceased to be the tragic hero" (10, 73/ 71). Mr. N has announced that he will lecture on his explanation of the *Choephoroi* this summer semester. Did he ever read it? Who is in it? Who is in the *Suppliants*, the *Eumenides*, and the *Persian*; who in *Ajax*, *Electra*, and *Philoctetes*, is the tragic avatar of Dionysus's Zagreus? This is all background knowledge — prerequisites which would "permit" Mr. N "such a surprisingly deep insight into the nature of ancient tragedy" (cf. 16, 101/104). Naturally, this produces an understanding of the chorus about which one has to wonder how it did not turn out to be even more outlandish — were it not all that different from Schlegel's view.[34] The chorus is "a vision of the Dionysian mass of spectators, just as the world of the stage, in turn, is a vision of this satyr chorus" (8, 63/60). Splendid, brilliantly new! Even newer, more brilliant and splendid is the comparison: "The form of the

Greek theater recalls a lonely valley in the mountains: the architecture of the scene appears like a luminous cloud formation that the Bacchantes swarming over the mountains [who seem to correspond to the audience in the theater] behold from a height" (*ibid*.). It takes quite a strong insight into primordial contradictions to have the clouds glow in the valley. The height of this nonsense, though, is the role assigned to the satyr chorus, which is tacitly identified with the chorus in general. And why not? If Xerxes is Dionysus then the loyal council might as well consist of satyrs. But then Mr. N has been taken by the satyr, οὐτιδανὸς καὶ ἀμηχανόεργος.[i] First, to make him happy, he is given a few goat feet. Then, "the man of culture [including Mr. N?], confronted with this natural being who lives ineradicably, as it were, behind all civilization, [is] shriveled into a mendacious caricature" (8, 61/58). The satyr is a creature of the woods — but not an ape![35] He is primordial man but he is unable to become cultured. At the same time, he is "the ecstatic reveler ... who proclaims wisdom from the very heart of nature" (*ibid*.). But whenever the satyr chorus appears ῥαψάμενος σκύτινον καθεῖμενον ἐρυθρὸν

ἐξ ἄκρου παχύ τοῖς παιδίος ἵν' ᾖ γέλως,[ii]

thus the phallus is no phallus: "the unconcealed and vigorously magnificent characters of nature" (8, 61/58), neither do the Greeks, the eternal children, laugh at grotesque obscenities. No: "the Greeks used to contemplate with reverent wonder (the sexual omnipotence of nature)."[36] *Ohe jam satis est*.[iii]

Let us now move on quickly to a more serious image: to the "death" of tragedy through the hands of Euripides [10, 75/74]. Mr. N reproaches him with the following: "What did you want, sacrilegious Euripides, when you sought to compel this dying myth to serve you once more" [Beware of being too hot-tempered! The reader reaches a passage (17, 108/113) where he finds out that Sophocles had already put the tragical myth to his service]? "It died under your violent hands — and then you needed a copied, masked myth ...the genius of music died on you, too...and because you abandoned Dionysus, Apollo abandoned you ... your heroes, too, have only copied, masked passions and speak only copied, masked speeches" (Again so hot-tempered! Ten pages later the affects of the same characters are called real and true to nature. [BT 10]). In the end, Euripides himself turns out to be

---

[i] "vile and indolent." Hesiod, fr. 44, 2.

[ii] "...dangling leather stitched on, red at the tip and thick, to make the young boys laugh." See Aristophanes, *Clouds*, v. 538-539. Cf. James Henderson's English translation, Loeb edition, p. 111.

[iii] Stop! enough already.

a mask (12, 82/83). Through him the new god, Socrates, speaks. In this old, corny fairy tale of the relationship between those two men, Mr. N thinks he has found the solution for the many mysteries posed by Euripides's poetry, and perhaps even more so, by his character. Mr. N's actual reason for associating those two men is the burning hatred he feels toward both of them. The means for venting this hatred do not embarrass him; he is happy with any means. For the most part, the poet Euripides — as dear and familiar to antiquity as was Homer — has had to forfeit his fame. This is partly justified, and partly because his flaws are more obvious to us than his positive qualities. Many a harsh judgment has been passed upon him (particularly following A.W. Schlegel). But how can Mr. N have the nerve to claim that Euripides "has been ... changed into a dragon by the art critics of all ages?"(12, 82/83) Are Aristotle and Quintilian, Lessing, Goethe, and Tieck no critics of art? But even this is too lenient for Mr. N. His weapons are deliberate distortions, like the one just mentioned. Success may teach us who is injured by such weapons. Is it not a deliberate distortion when he says that Euripides placed his hopes in "civic mediocrity" (11, 77/77). The words of the poet are:

τριῶν δὲ μοιρῶν ἡ ᾽ν μέσῳ σώζει πόλιν[i/37]

If, in a text by Philemon, somebody wants to hang himself in order to see Euripides, εἰ ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν οἱ τεθνηκότες αἴσθησιν εἶχον,[ii /38] it is translated with artificial ambiguity as: "if only he could be certain that the deceased still had possession of his reason" (11, 77/76). Did I use too harsh a word? But let us return to the mask of Socrates, to this association which rests on only a few comic verses which prove nothing,[39] a tradition consisting only of anecdotes, which, although only of value to the literary historians of gossip, obstruct the entire tradition of personal histories of antiquity.[40] Then, he invents some silly saying of the oracle.[41] Now, it is not surprising that, to my knowledge, nobody has yet taken the trouble to fully refute this association. Joining the sophistic tragedian with the great sophist seemed so natural.[42] It suggested itself to future generations to relate the two most popular figures of the time, both from the same city, on a personal level — especially because the comic tradition seemed to confirm this connection. But it is not too difficult to see through this mistake. Socrates was fourteen years old when Euripides's first play was performed. The remains of the *Peliades* demonstrate that his style was at least as close to the style of *Medea*

---

i "the median class is the city's salvation." Euripides, *Suppliants*, v. 244.

ii The standard rendering is: "If mortals were as truly bereft of feeling as many claim, I shall be off to see Euripides." Philemon, fr. 40a.

as *Medea's* was to the style of the *Phoenician Women*. The importance of Socrates cannot be proven for the time before Pericles's death.[43] Euripides's most important and deepest creations, such as *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Aiolos*, and *Bellerophontes*, *Ion*, and *Telephus* all predate this. It can be shown, then, that the declining care in the construction of the verse form, which has long been known, extended to the entire structure and even to the task in general. Furthermore, if there were any truth to this relationship, especially to the oracle, the Socratics should have known about it. But both Plato and Xenophon nearly ignore Euripides, or else pay him no special note. The melancholic and resigned poet, the willing student of the Sophists, could not arouse any sympathy in [Plato], the Homer of philosophy who happened to be their most bitter critic.[44] The main point, though, is that we should be able to trace Socratic influences in Euripides' worldview (as can be shown with the teachings of Anaxagoras and Protagoras or with reminiscences of what he read — he was, after all, the first book collector).[45] But this is not the case. Mr. N of course boldly claims that Euripides admits to the Socratic principle that virtue is knowledge. But Mr. N does not know Euripides. For even if Euripides at one point, like Protagoras, puts forward the tenet of the teachability of virtue,[46] the frequency of omissions in this regard guarantees that he assumed that every man brings into this world an unchangeable, natural predisposition[47] (a view also more worthy of the great tragic poet). Tragic actions develop necessarily out of these collisions between — one might say — the personal predestinations of the characters. This view also renders it self-evident why man's striving and wrongdoing, erring and atoning, seemed hopeless and without consolation to Euripides. And, as far as the Socratic tenet goes, Euripides expresses the exact opposite idea. After deep brooding, Phaedra claims that the misery of this world results from knowing what is right but not doing it,[48] which is precisely the Christian view that "the mind is willing but the flesh weak." One might reasonably assert that it is exactly this disrupted harmony between wanting and doing which he brought to the stage through his characters, his all-too-truthful characters. Try as they might, in a wild rage of passion, of love as well as of hate, to break all boundaries, in the end they learn the vanity of their striving and because of it, fade away; they fight the same hopeless, destructive battle of the individual against the basic laws of nature and tradition, in particular regarding the relationship between the sexes. Yes, anyone who wishes to go further could even feel tempted to recognize in this disharmony between wanting and doing the actual core, also the worm in the core, of the entire poetical nature of Euripides himself. Everything the poet wanted and knew contrasted with and was overshadowed by

Aeschylean glory, by the eternally cheerful amiability of Sophocles, in harmony with himself and the whole world. But it is not my goal to explain Euripides; I just want to show that Mr. N did not understand him and that he did not make any effort to do so either. It's easy to show this. He calls Pentheus "the most intelligent adversary" (12, 81 /82) of Dionysus. Had he just taken to his heart

> μηδ᾽ ἢν δοκῇς μὲν ἡ δὲ δόξα σου νοσεῖ
> φρονεῖν δόκει τι.[i/49]

Euripides's basic principle is allegedly that "to be beautiful everything must be intelligible." (12, 83/85) But concluding from what I just said, he often enough acknowledged bad deeds which Socrates, as we know, denied.[50] Allegedly, it was Euripides who killed myth while actually, like no other, it was he who defined the form of myth for generations to come. It was through him that some of the most familiar and most moving myths became part of literature and of people's general consciousness.[51] Allegedly, he strove for poetic justice while, actually, in his view, the essential feature of this world and its infirmity was injustice: *Medea*, *Heraclidae*, *Andromache*, the *Phoenician Women* are scornful manifestations of this injustice. Sophoclean drama is held up against him, in particular *Oedipus at Colonus* which was staged four years after his death. Concerning the *Bacchae* (which he wrote in and for Macedonia), it is claimed that he showed brazen contempt for the audience, which he himself had educated. At the end of his life, the audience allegedly worshiped him. In the same breath, we are told that Sophocles was adored by the people until the end of his life and even far beyond. And Sophocles outlived Euripides. Oh, I am tired of correcting prof. Nietzsche's practice exercises. τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐξαντλοῦμεν ἡ δ᾽ ἐπεισρέε.[ii] And if I had a thousand tongues and a thousandfold mouth, attempting to follow his labyrinthine paths, μυρμήκων ἀτραποῖς [upon ant-trails], I would never reach the end. Socrates becomes the "despotic logician" with the "one great cyclops eye" (14, 89/92), Plato "the typical Hellenic youth" (*ibid*.,) and creator of the novel (14, 91/94). The predicates speak for themselves. And since he fiercely hates Socrates for his non-mysticism, — and this is too amusing not to be mentioned — he retrospectively and with a serious mien advises the Athenians as to what they should have done with him: "Being

---

i "Abandon that notion. Your spirit festers, with only the illusion of wisdom." *Bacchae*, v. 311. [Cf. T.A. Buckley's translation: "nor, even if you think so, and your mind is diseased, believe that you are being at all wise."]

ii "for no sooner is one drained than another is replenished." Lucian, *Alexander the False Prophet*, § 49.

thoroughly enigmatical, unclassifiable, and inexplicable, he might have been asked to leave the city" (13, 89/91). But for this, Socrates was too cunning. He cleverly knew how to arrange it so that they would sentence him to death: in this way he "became the new ideal ... of ... Greek youth" (*ibid*.). Here, as well, I refrain from making any judgments. Since my eye is denied "the pleasure of gazing into the Dionysian abysses" (*ibid*.), it is not possible to discover wisdom "(developed ... excessively...) through a hypertrophy" (13, 88/90), and correction without the hope of making oneself understood is slave labor. Thus, I let Mr. N quietly violate Menander: just a single glance at the "Promethean tragic writers" (11, 77/76) will suffice.

Mr. N's way of dealing with Sophocles is too amusing. He does not dare to condemn him but he also does not know how to hide how little he likes him. He admits that Sophocles took the first step to destroy the chorus (BT 14). Apart from this, the already well known art of silence has to suffice,[52] e.g., when Euripides's characterization of Odysseus is fiercely rebuked, the even less favorable portrait in *Philoctetes* is ignored. The highlight of his view of Sophocles, though, is his presentation of Oedipus. Allegedly, Sophocles saw him as the extremely wise and noble man who perishes due to an overabundance of wisdom. ὁ μηδὲν εἰδὼς Οἰδίπους, whom Tiresias reproaches with σὺ καὶ δέδορκας κοὐ βλέπεις ἵν' εἶ κακοῦ![i] Yes, Oedipus regards himself as wise. But through the very delusion that brings about his downfall the inadequacy of our nature is revealed. Since his self-confidence causes his destruction, he preaches in Colonus ἐν [γὰρ] τῷ μαθοῖν ἔνεστιν ηὐλάβεια τῶν ποιουμένων.[ii] Since he considers himself as ὁ πᾶσι κλεινὸς Οἰδίπους καλούμενος,[iii] he plummets inexorably and unwillingly into the net of destiny. Since suffering καὶ τὸ γενναῖον τρίτον στέργειν διδάσκει,[iv] he is most rich when poor, most esteemed when banned, most loved when despised. If only the myth had spoken of "Dionysian wisdom," and had Oedipus solved in the riddle of the sphinx a "riddle of nature" (9, 69/67), in

---

i "Oedipus, the ignorant [...] though you have sight, you do not see what a state of misery you are in." Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex*, v. 347; 413. English translation, Sir Richard Jebb.

ii "Circumspection in the action resides in reflexion." *Oedipus at Colonus*, v. 115. Cf. Jebb's translation: "For in learning is the safeguard of our course."

iii "Oedipus renowned by all." *Oedipus Rex*, v. 8.

iv "And, third, my pride taught me resignation." *Oedipus at Colonus*, v. 7-8.

a parallel myth, it would have been impossible that a Ker[i] could be killed by one Koroibus.[ii] / 53

But Mr. N hopefully knows and understands Aeschylus (on whom he lectures) and Aeschylus should suit the canon of "metaphysically comforting" tragedy. O yes, whoever is not satisfied with the sample just provided should take a look at "pessimistic tragedy." Goethe allegedly presents the character of Prometheus in the following words: "I form men after my own image." Yet Prometheus does not form them. Nietzsche supposes him to be a "man, rising to Titanic stature" (9, 69/67). But Aeschylus's Prometheus is as much a god as Zeus, μῶν τάδε λεύσσεις φαίδιμ᾽ Ἀχιλλεῦ . . . ἰήκοπον οὐ πελάθεις ἐπ᾽ ἀρωγάν;[iii] and the Aeschylean view of the world with its metaphysical foundation in mysteries, (δύο σοι κόπω Αἰσχύλε τούτω)[iv] should teach us that "Moira (is) enthroned above the gods ... as eternal justice" (9, 70/68).

> οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι πάντ᾽ ἐπισταθμώμενος
> πλὴν Διὸς[,] εἰ τὸ μάταν ἀπὸ φροντίδος ἄχθος
> χρὴ βαλεῖν ἐτητύμως.[54/v]

And according to the teachings of Prometheus, the "Dionysian mask," "all that exists is just and unjust and equally justified in both" (9, 72/71). τρίτος Αἰσχύλε σοι κόπος οὗτος.[vi] What a world! This is your world![vii] triumphs Mr. N. He does not suspect that Faust, in bitter irony, asks the same question.[55] So, did he not even understand Goethe? τηλαυγὲς πρόσωπον,[viii] the dreamworld appears to him already on the first pages as

---

i *Ker*, generally, a winged creature. According to Harrison, who has chapters on the theme, the term Ker is "perhaps the most untranslatable of all Greek words," a Ker can mean "[g]host, bacillus, disease, death-angel, death-fate, fate, boegy, magician." *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, p. 212.

ii Harrison gives an account of Coroebus and the Ker (*Poine*, penalty or vengeance, visited by Apollo as a plague upon the Argives) Coroebus slew. *Op. cit.*, p. 213. See Pausanias, 1.43.7.

iii "See'st thou this, shining Achilles?" Aristophanes, *Frogs*, v. 992; *"crash*, ah, why do you not come to our aid?" v.1266.

iv "That's two crashes for you, Aeschylus." Aristophanes, *Frogs*, v. 1268.

v "I weigh all things in the balance, I have nothing to compare save Zeus, if in truth I must cast aside this vain burden from my heart." Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, v. 163-166. English translation, Herbert Weir Smith.

vi "This is your third crash, Aeschylus." Aristophanes, *Frogs*, v. 1272.

vii Inverted quotation from BT 9.

viii "Whose face shining from afar." Cf. "Hymn to Helios," *Homeric Hymns*, 31, 11-12, for the invocation of luminosity at a distance for the son of Hyperion, Helios,

"the whole divine comedy of life, including the inferno" (1, 35/27). Truly, this proof for his understanding of Dante calls out to every reader looking for reason to *lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate* [abandon hope all ye who enter here].[i] And furthermore, what of his understanding of Hamlet who, by the way, is also Dionysus? In one passage, nauseated by the wisdom of Silenus, his action is prevented by insight (7, 60/57); in another, he talks more trifflingly than he acts (17, 105/119)! Several things seem completely upside down here. Thank god I was not called into this world to rearrange them!

I think the proof for my severe accusations of ignorance and a lack of devotion to the truth has been supplied. Nevertheless I fear that I did not treat Mr. N fairly. If he replied to me that he would not want to know anything about "history and criticism" (23, 136/146), about "so-called world history," but only wanted to create a Dionysian-Apollinian work of art, "a metaphysical means of comfort," that his claims were to be referred not to the ordinary everyday world but to the "higher truth (of dreams)" (1, 35/27) — well, then I would revoke and denounce what I have said in the best possible manner. Then I would gladly let his gospel be since it is not addressed by my weapons. Of course, I am neither a mystic nor a tragic man. For me, it can always just be "a pleasant sideline, a readily dispensable tinkling of bells that accompanies the 'seriousness of life'" (1, 31/24) and the seriousness of science as well. So much for the dream of the intoxicated or the dreamer's intoxication! But one thing I demand: that Mr. N be faithful to his word. Let him seize the thyrsos; let him move from India to Greece. But let him step down from the lectern from which he is supposed to teach knowledge. He may gather tigers and panthers around his knees but not Germany's philologically interested youth who are supposed to learn — in the asceticism of self-denying work — to look everywhere for nothing but the truth, to free their judgment through deliberate devotion, so that classical antiquity will provide them with the unique and eternal insight that only the favor of the muses promises, and that only classical antiquity can guarantee in its abundance and purity:

"Let meaning be in their hearts and let form be in their minds!"[ii]

— *Translated by Gertrude Postl, Babette E. Babich, and Holger Schmid*

---

the sungod's "far seen face...." See Pindar's use of the same metaphor as a gleaming portico for his victory ode: "for when a work is begun, it is necessary to make its front shine from afar" — *Olympian Odes*, 6, 3-4.

[i] Dante, *Inferno,* chap. III, v. 9.

[ii] Goethe, *Dauer im Wechsel*, final lines.

NB: Greek and Lain translation by Babette Babich and Holger Schmid.
Additional corrections to the Greek by James I. Porter and Alexander Nehamas.

Acknowledgments

The original German text of Wilamowitz's review is reprinted without alteration in Karlfried Gründer, ed., *Der Streit um Nietzsches „Geburt der Tragödie"* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1989), pp. 27-55.

Wilamowitz's references to Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* have been corrected to correspond to currently standard editions and citations given in the parentheses in the body of the text refer to the BT section number as well as indicating page references in both Kaufmann's translation and the KSA edition.

Wilamowitz does not always reference his quotations from Nietzsche and where possible, such additional references have been added. Endnotes below correspond to Wilamowitz's own notes, with translations and clarifiying references provided in brackets. Wilamowitz's original text includes neither translations of his citations in Greek nor, in most cases, references to his sources (including quotations from Goethe, etc.). Translations of shorter Greek expressions in Wilamowitz's text have been supplied in brackets. Additionally, footnotes have been added, numbered with roman numerals on each page, including biographical notes on cited authorities, longer translations from the Greek, textual sources, and clarifying references.

In addition to the original German text of Wilamowitz's critical review, the response to it by Erwin Rohde, Wilamowitz's own counter-reply, along with letters by Friedrich Ritschl as well as Richard and Cosima Wagner reacting to the initial publication of and responses to *The Birth of Tragedy* may be found in the Olms reprint edition, noted above: *Der Streit um Nietzsches "Geburt der Tragödie."* However, as a reprint edition, Gründer's collection includes neither critical commentary nor a secondary apparatus (translating citations from the Greek or, indeed, indicating the source of those same citations). The preliminary research for preparing the current secondary apparatus including bracketed translations and footnotes was greatly aided by the earlier efforts of the team of editors and translators who contributed for their part to the comprehensive French translation directed by Monique Dixsaut, *Querelle autour de «La Naissance de la Tragédie,»* introduction by Michèle Cohen-Halimi, trans., Michèle Cohen-Halimi, Hélène Poitevin and Max Marcuzzi (Paris: Vrin, 1995). Their exemplary philological apparatus is characteristic of the best — thorough and balanced — French scholarship. In addition to consulting available English translations (mostly Loeb editions), the following general references were also consulted in preparing footnotes and clarifying commentary: Gerald F. Else, *The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy*, New York: W.W.Norton, 1972 (1965); Lilian Feder, *Crowell's Handbook of Classical Literature*, New York: Lippincott & Crowell, 1964; Hermann Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, Munich: Beck, 1962; Richmond Y. Hathorn, *Greek Mythology*, Lebanon: American University of Beirut, 1977; Jane Harrison, *Themis: A Study of the Origins of Greek Religion*, London: Merlin Press, 1977 (1963) and

Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991 [1903]; Sir Paul Harvey, *Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986 [1937]; Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991; Carl Kerény, *The Gods of the Greeks*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1951; Joachim Latacz, *Homer: His Art and His World*, trans. J. P. Holoka, Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1998; Ian McAuslan and Peter Walcot, eds., *Homer*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998; Gregory Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990; Martin L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. Other sources are listed in the footnotes.

The fact that Wilamowitz himself provided neither translations of his Greek citations nor, in the majority of cases, did he note his sources, might seem to be little more than esoteric pedantry to today's reader — English speaking or not. However, Wilamowitz's deliberate esotericism was not only professionally routine (it was) but it was also — beginning with his epigraph, (see footnote ii, pp. 1-2 above) — intended as more than a scholarly (with the excessive eagerness of a young scholar's ambitious precision — the kind Nietzsche mocks as "tyronism" [*Anfängerei*] in his preface to *Beyond Good and Evil* —but object demonstration of the point of Wilamowitz's polemical dispute with Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy Out of the Spirit of Music*. Wilamowitz's use of Greek citations stood in starkly specific contrast to Nietzsche's own text: not only does *The Birth of Tragedy* begin with a preface to Wagner, but the first citation in the book refers to nothing less than *Die Meistersinger*. From a classicist's perspective, this must have seemed egregiously unprofessional: one looks nearly in vain for a single Greek word in the *Birth of Tragedy*, despite the disciplinarily relevant fact that Nietzsche's entire discussion turns upon the so-called Homeric question and features a philosophically and philologically critical focus on the problem of tragedy as such in the wake of Aristotle's defining discussion of its cathartic pain/pleasure, and, in addition, seeks to unpack the significance of Sophocles's poetic expression of the "tragic wisdom of Silenus," the very same life-wisdom that the poet, Friedrich Hölderlin affixed as epigraph to the second book of his hugely popular, and, for Nietzsche, very influential, *Hyperion* — and it is relevant that Hölderlin's epigraph was in the same Greek that Nietzsche, the classical philologist, rendered in German translation in his own later text. For a contemporary discussion of these questions, see James I. Porter's two forthcoming books (cited in his essay below).

Special thanks are due to the efforts of the first listed translator Gertrude Postl, without whom this demanding project could not have been begun. Thanks, too, to Holger Schmid, for his kind assistance, as unstinting as it was indispensable, in revising and correcting the final translation with Babette Babich, as editor. As co-editor of the journal, *New Nietzsche Studies*, David B. Allison not only lent his eye to editing the final translation but it should also be said that the project itself as a concept began as his idea. Further thanks are owed for the valuable suggestions regarding the translation and the Greek generously offered by James I. Porter. And thanks are due to Alexander Nehamas, who checked the Greek so carefully that he

suggested several corrections to Wilamowitz's own 1872 orthography [see the Olms edition for the original]. These corrections have been included wherever the reprint text may have reproduced (or engendered) errors, especially in the breathing marks or accents (a speck of dust can produce misleading effects). But Wilamowitz's calculatedly provocative epigraph is cited as first printed despite its divergence from currently received editions of Aristophanes' fragment (a tradition beginning with Dindorf's edition in 1869 although Wilamowitz plainly uses the Meineke edition of 1840, which was also the basis for the German version by Seeger then available). Depending on relevance — and it is hoped that this will be useful — other different readings have been noted where possible in the notes throughout.

— *Babette E. Babich*

(Tübingen, August 2000)

Endnotes

1. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Kritische Studienausgabe*, Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, eds., (Berlin: de Gruyter,1980) vol 1, *Die Geburt der Tragödie*, § 18, p. 117; *The Birth of Tragedy* with *The Case of Wagner*,. Walter Kaufmann, trans. (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), section 18, p. 111. Subsequent references included in the text and in the notes first list the section number, followed by the page numbers of the English translation and the KSA.
2. This is commendable advice. It explains not only the lack of grammatical construction of Wagner's so-called poetry and, according to common critique and logic, its lack of sense (e.g. the quote cited 22, 131/14 [from *Tristan*]) but also the monstrosity of its words, the modern φλαττοῦράτ [burlesque onomatopeia; *Frogs*, vv.1286-1296]: the proverbial *wigala weia*. For in Dionysian ecstasy, man "has forgotten how to walk and speak." Instead, "the animals now talk...and to the sound of the chisel strokes of the Dionysian world artist rings out the cry of the Eleusinian mysteries: 'Do you prostrate yourselves, millions?'" (2, 37/38). Is this how Mr. N translates κόγξ ὄμπαξ? At least the *Aglaophamus* is on the Dionysian curia's index. [C. A. Lobeck (1781-1860), *Aglaophamus, seu de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis libri tres ... idemque poetarum Orphicorum dispersas reliquias collegit* (Königsberg: Bornträger, 1829).]
3. Even a totally harmless "optimist," a "curious *quid pro quo*" (see 1, 38/30), might expect to have Lessing mentioned at this point. Somebody less lenient would probably not draw any flattering conclusions from Lessing's absence — Mr. N himself condemns the author of the *Anti-Goeze*. He considers him "the most honest theoretical man" because he preferred the search for truth to truth itself (15, 95/99). Understandably, Mr. N cannot agree. Indeed, assuming to know truth seems, in advance, to exclude the genuine search for truth.
4. If the word did not have a Dionysian imprint here, I would rather speak of a "stylistic contrast in style" between high and beautiful styles.
5. The predicate "wise and rapturous," which is attributed to the satyr (8, 65/63), can be traced back to Silenus who was caught by King Midas (according to Mr. N, an "old legend," that is allegedly pre-Homeric). Too bad that the Dionysian *thiasos* is altogether absent from folk epic — since this legend can hardly be

found before the fifth century (*Bakchylides*, 2).

6. I.e., Dorian. That much Mr. N has learned from O. Müller. Yet, he takes credit for Müller's view of the Dorian-Apollinian nature (39/40). [K.O. Müller (1797-1840), philologist, mythologist, archaeologist, etc. Author of: *Die Dorier* (in which Müller identifies the Apollinian as Doric), *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*, and a history of Greek literature.]
7. Λαθοσύνα νυκτωπός [nocturnal oblivion] has always been the dream for the Hellene. According to Mr. N, for the dreams of the Greeks, we have to assume "conjecturally, though with reasonable assurance ... a certain logic of line and contour, colors and groups, a certain pictorial sequence reminding us of their finest bas-reliefs" (2, 38/31). The best reliefs are doubtless those that present one sequence of action as opposed to several. For Mr. N, Homer is a dreaming Greek; the Greek, a dreaming Homer (39). The latter is simply nonsense. Otherwise one could, "if one possessed the authority," call Mr. N a dreaming professor and draw the conclusion that a professor is a dreaming Nietzsche. But in order to make the previous claim, one has to rid oneself of dream literature. Mr. N accomplishes this with the elegance of one who has never seen Artemidorus. [*Artemidorus*, Lydian, second c. A.D. author of five books on divination, the *Oneiroticriticon*.] He would have found thousands of dreams there, of course, more tasteless than anything I have ever encountered. No trace of a change of sequence, neither of dreams with " logical causality," nor of the conscious self-deception which tells Mr. N, when dreaming, the verse: "It is a dream! I will dream on!" (1, 35/27) Certainly, the old world was especially interested in the "morbid and pathological effects" (...) of the dream which Mr. N dismisses. This is obvious in the famous passage of Lucretius (IV, 960-029). However, if Mr. N wants to claim that one dreamt differently during Homer's time than during the time of Lucretius (and unfortunately one dreams quite frequently in Homer, if without "logical causality" and mostly, according to Artemidorus, ἐνύπνια [dream visions] rather than ὀνείρους [dreams]), so be it. *Affirmanti incumbit probatio* [the burden of proof is on the claimant].
8. Elsewhere, "Apollinian lucidity" (9, 67/67) is attributed to Sophocles's language. *Loxias*! [Apollo, *the oblique*. Wilamowitz means by this: *to move crookedly*, with reference to Apollo's protection of snakes and lizards and fondness for mice and moles as Smintheus — god of mice. Other scholars, however, derive *Loxias* from *legein*, to speak.]
9. It is a shame that Mr. N is insufficiently familiar with Greek literature to pay tribute to the Pythagorean etymology of ἀ-πολλων [the "non-multiple," the one].
10. In Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Dogmatists*, III, 20. Aristotle, *On Philosophy*, fr. 12, Rose, Berliner Akademie Ausgabe, Bekker, ed., vol. 4.
11. There, at least, Homer expresses "that entire philosophy of the sylvan god" (3, 42/35) — that it is best to have never been born, which Mr. N takes as pre-Homeric.

12. More so than to others, we owe a true understanding of Homer to Aristarchos [grammarian of Samothrace, second c. B.C., and author of a rigorous critical edition of Homer and Pindar] and to Lachmann. [The renaissance of the Homeric question is the result of the Vichian idea that the epopt is the productive organization of the spirit of a people (*Volksgeist*), and, in Lachmann's case, with respect to the Nibelungen. As F.A. Wolf (1759-1824), conceives the question in Homeric philology (*Prolegomena ad Homerum*, 1795), it yields the claim that Homer did not exist but was merely a generic name, or as Wilhelm Christ puts it, simply "a member of a singer's guild," *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians*, 4th ed., (Munich: Beck,1905).] They have realized that those texts which show a similar view of heavenly affairs (e.g. the fifth and the thirteenth song, particularly the theomachy) are not truly Homeric; and they are also, for the most part, younger. (*Il*. Bk. 1, v. 400 may also show the relative youth of the second part of the first book.)
13. In case anybody is wondering how Mr. N reached this conviction concerning Homer's personality, it should be noted that Schopenhauer "affixed his seal of ... eternal truth" (16, 100/105) [Wilamowitz's word order is reversed and Nietzsche is referring to Wagner in this case, as Wilamowitz himself affirms in his own text above] to the reaction against Wolf's insights. [See previous note.]
14. Aelian [ca. 200 A.D.], *Varia Historia*, X,13.
15. Plato, *Republic*, III, 398d. Not even Mr. N will consider iambs among θρῆνοι (threnodes) and ὀδυρμοί [lamentations], which are excluded there. If only he had read the entire passage just once before reviling the *stilo rappresentativo*. Mr. N's reasons for reviling it are in accordance with Plato's claims for Hellenic music in general. Even if Plato might pass judgment more self-consciously than Mr. N, especially since he was corrupted by the evil Socrates, at least he does not belong to the category of men who with bald-faced cheek present senseless ideas as generally valid truths. But if his claims concerning old music are right, who then may ask: "What will become of the eternal truths of the Dionysian and Apollinian when the styles are mixed in this fashion ... (where) music is regarded as the servant, the text as the master" (19, 118/126)? The "dragon" may again reply: τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν ῥέπει. [Nothing leads to nothing. Euripides, fr. 532, (Kock).]
16. I am familiar with the remark from Heraclitus in Diogenes Laertius IX, 1. But it does not challenge the form of presentation of the iamb; neither does the Olympian victory song, nor the ambiguous term ᾄδειν [to sing, to celebrate] challenge it. In contrast, the melic metres — mostly dactylic and closely related to the elegiac — completely fade away in importance.
17. Archilochus himself is once (Περὶ ὕψους, 33, 5, [Ps.-Longinus]) contrasted with Eratosthenes, and so is taken to be an elegist; Simonides of Amorgos writes elegies as well as iambs, Solon, iambs as well as elegies, etc.
18. Mr. N knows the muses in Dionysus' company! He is sitting with them at the "edge of the forest." Why should they be sitting there? We find out later: in order to sleep. They sleep as intoxicated dreamers, "the sleep on the high

mountain pasture, in the noonday sun, (as Euripides depicts it)" (5, 49/44). Yes, my dear Mr. N, he would be the wretched poet which you want to portray him as had he actually written such nonsense. Just keep in mind, anyone who wants to sleep is not laying down in the noonday sun but in the shadow. This is what Euripides depicts. Look it up (*Bacahae*, vv. 677, 684) and admit not having understood the passage. We console ourselves with Mephistopheles: "It is not the first one." [Goethe, Faust, v. 4400 "Sie {Gretchen} ist die erste nicht."]

19. Of which allegedly "the (hymns) of all primitive men ... speak" (1, 36/29); but hardly the Greeks, Italics, or Teutons. But I wager that Mr. N has heard of the hymns of India and Bactria, which refer to the sacrifice of the Soma, maybe also of the drink which intoxicated Odhin [Odin] at Gunnlödh (Hawamal 12 in Simrock; Edd. Säm.12b) [Karl Simrock, *Die Edda, die ältere und jüngere nebst den mythischen Erzählungen der Skalda übersetzt und mit Erläuterungen begleitet* {*Edda Saemundar*} (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1851)] ; I quote from Grimm, *Mythology*, 1086). But who would want to inquire in such detail!
20. *Schol. Pind. Pyth*. XII. *de musica*, 7. [Ps.-Plutarch.]
21. During the first Pythian Games, Sacadas was already victorious (Paus. X. 7. Plut. 1.1. Hesych. s.v. Σακάδιον).
22. Archilochus, fr. 78.
23. Pratinas, fr. 1. [*Pratinas* of Phlius, ca. 496 B.C., rival of Aeschylus, reputed to have been the inventor of satyric drama.]
24. Welcker, A. D. III, 125. [*F. G. Welcker* (1784-1863), *Alte Denkmäler erklärt. Dritter Theil: Griechische Vasengemälde* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1851), pp. 125-135, discusses "Dithyrambus" as personification (p. 128). Nietzsche invokes Welcker's *Griechische Götterlehre*, vol. 1, with regard to the battle of the Titans, to assert that the Homeric era was not the "youth" of the Greeks, contra Wilamowitz. See Nietzsche's letter to Rohde, 16 July 1872.
25. E.g., Plutarch, *Life of Antonius*, 24; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, IV, 2.21. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, VII, 72.
26. This has already been adequately pointed out by Aristotle. In instances where we have less fragmentary information, as is coincidently the case concerning the events which paved the way for comedy, his judgment has of course been confirmed. Other relevant customs, in particular those of the cult, are known to be found in Lobeck (e.g. *Aglaophamus*, p. 174 and elsewhere which I cannot present in detail here).
27. This was not even originally the case. Philochoros [4th-3rd c. B.C., scholar and polygraph, author of a book on tragedy] states this clearly and with credibility in Athenaeus, *The Dipnosophists,* XIV, 628 a.
28. An exception is Philodemus who quotes them quite frequently.
29. The songs of Timotheus [ca. 447-357 B.C., citharode of Miletus] and Polyidus [fourth-century dithyrambic poet] are still alive in second-century B.C. practice. (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum*, ed., A. Boeckh, No. 3053).

30. One could think of Phrynichos who was master of the orchestra. Compare the likely apocryphal epigram in Ps-Plutarch, *Qu. Symp.*, VIII, 9. [*Phrynichos*, fifth-century B.C. Athenian poet, author of lyric tragedies with a solo actor, mocked for the lack of action in his pieces in Aristophanes *Frogs*, (910-913, 1300); he was the author of a meter which bears his name, Ionian lesser catalectic.]
31. That the comedian Hermippos wrote iambs as well is confirmed only by the Aristotelian report.
32. I will give a suitable reward to anyone who is able to explain these last words (for which Mephistopheles's remarks concerning the magic formula are quite fitting). *Davos sum non Oedipus* ["I am Davos and not Oedipus." (Terence, *Andria*, 94). Davos is the character of a slave in the new comedy; the phrase means: I am only a lowly man and not the decipherer of enigmas. Mephistopheles comments upon the "one only time" (Goethe, *Faust*, 2552) of the sorcerer, "but who would wish to torment oneself with such folly? Man believes himself to be ordinary, from the moment he understands the words, which absolutely must contain a thought" (2564-2566).]
33. Even though it is more than probable that no tragedy of Thespis [a quasi-legendary poet, c. 534 B.C., associated with Icaria in Attica] survived, it is doubtful that the titles in Suidas are false. Certainly, it is not possible to know anything about their content and form. And concerning the tragedy of Thespis, everyone other than the philologist of the future is satisfied with the *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*. [The Suda is the name of a Greek lexicon compiled during the tenth century A.D., based on earlier lexica as well as scholia and commentaries from Greek authors. R. Bentley (1662-1742), *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, demonstrates the inauthenticity of the *Letters*. Bentley, professor at Cambridge and conservator of the Royal Library, is unkindly depicted by Jonathan Swift in *The Battle of the Books*.]
34. Mr. N gradually begins to understand that it is basically not all that different whether one views the chorus as ideal spectator or thinks that "there was at bottom no opposition between public and chorus" (8, 62/59). And nevertheless, how harshly does he scold A.W. Schlegel, 7, 56-7/53-4)! And what, up until Mr. N, has happened to "the riddle of the orchestra" (8, 65/62)?
35. Does Mr. N here protest against Darwinism? (And why should not this world-view as well be equally presented as the esoteric doctrine of the mysteries?) Otherwise it would be unclear why he informs us about his disbelief in Pausanias's euemeristic silliness.
36. I hope it is acceptable if I use terms taken from the comedy for the description of the satyr costume; this seems correct, even by Mr. N's standards. According to him, "the drunken satyr, or demigod, in comedy, had determined the character of the language" (11, 77-8/77). This is one of the few occasions where he mentions this twin sister of the tragedy — in truly golden words! If one wanted to expose the craziness of Nietzsche's idiosyncracies, one could begin with comedy and apply to it the doctrines given for tragedy. [Ever fond of the distinction between above and below, Nietzsche reserves *demigod* [*Halbgott*] for

tragedy; the term employed in the passage Wilamowitz cites is thus "demi-human" <*Halbmensch*> not demigod.]

37. Euripides, *Suppliants*, v. 244. For further explanation compare *Phoenician Women*, v. 535 ff. It was honorable and natural — but not at all specifically Euripidean — to trust the capability of the civic citizens (because they were midway between a popular democracy and a nobility that could not be trusted). Incidentally, the *Suppliants* are from an era where the harsh, dark poet let himself be carried away by the genius of the "young lion" — only to be bitterly disappointed like the rest of Hellas. The relationship, which turned out to be extremely fertile for Euripides, is worth investigating in greater detail.
38. Philemon, inc. fr., 40a.
39. Aristophanes's *Clouds*, Teleclides, Callias, in the passage interpolated by Diogenes Laertius II, 18.
40. Most fully developed in Aelian, II, 13. Other passages are to be found in any life of Euripides.
41. Or perhaps the Delphic Apollo in the fifth century spoke in iambs with an anapaest in the second position and with the form Σοφοκλῆς? I am, by the way, I am unable at the moment to tell whether the oracle is found beyond the wisdom seeker [mentioned] in Plato's *Apology*. Mr. N has strange bad luck with oracles. Archilochus' "Apollinian nature" is also confirmed through a Delphic saying — the one condemning his murderer. If one looks up the passages that Wyttenbach compiled in his commentary on Plut. (*de ser. num. vind.*, p. 81), it immediately becomes obvious that this invention is rather recent. Moreover, Oenomaus asserts a different name for the murderer than the rest of the testimonia.
42. As is, e.g., the case in Aristophanes's *Clouds*, without being based on a personal connection. {II, v. 1367.}
43. Of course, it does not prove anything that individual dialogues, such as Plato's *Protagoras,* are set in an earlier time.
44. Usually Plato talks only very coldly about Euripides as a great tragedian (e.g. the *Phaedrus* 268c). In the *Republic* (VIII, 568a), he once credits him with a special σοφία; just as Dionysus, in the *Frogs*, retails the common opinion (1413).
45. Thus, e.g., *Autolycus* 34, is certainly not written without the impact from Xenophanes 2; Helen in v.1617 refers to the well-known epicharmic saying; individual accurate points are also to be found in the early writer περὶ κλοπῶν cited in the sixth book of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria; and the list could easily be extended.
46. *Suppliants*, v. 917.
47. *Electra*, v. 367, where parallel passages are interpolated; *Hecuba*, v. 596; *Hippolytus*, v. 961; *Phoenix*, v. 807; frs, 1050, 1053.
48. *Hippolytus*, v. 374; cf. *Chrysippus*, fr. 838, and the fragment of the same source, v. 912.

49. *Bacchae*, v. 311; cf. 324, 332, 359, 480, 1302 — ἀχαλίνων στομάτων ἀνόμου τ' ἀφροσύνας τὸ τέλος δυστυχία [Of the reinless lips that will own no master, of the folly o'er law's pale stubborn stray — One is the end of them, even disaster." [vv. 386-387. English trans., Way, Loeb edition.] A saying which, hopefully, has not yet lost any of its truth.
50. E.g., *Medea*, v.274; *Iphigenia among the Taureans*, v. 924.
51. Protesilaus, Stheneboea, Bellerophon, Aeolus, Phaedra, Heracles, Merope, Iphigenia, Auge, Antiope, etc.
52. This is the same trite art Mr. N exercises with respect to Aristotle in the same passage; and, of course, he approves of Sophocles' treatment of the chorus (*Poetics*, 1456a, 27). In general, though, his polemic against Aristotle is latent. "Friends" might get a little suspicious if they were to realize the contrast between their mystagogue and the philosopher whose theory of poetry had, for Lessing, the compelling cogency of Euclidean postulates. For anyone still wishing to entertain himself with Mr. N., I suggest tracking the leaps he makes with respect to *catharsis* [see Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1449 b28].
53. The interpreters of Ovid. *Ibis*, v. 575; *Anth. Pal*., VII, v. 154.
54. Compare also in Nauck [*Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*], the fragment of the *Heliades* under Euphorion. [*Euphorion* of Chalcis, ca. 235 B.C., epic poet and head librarian at Antioch, Aeschylus's son, wrote on mythic themes. Since 1889 edition, the fragment is listed under Aeschylus.]
55. It is well known that the regrettable use of the quote from [Schiller's] *Ode to Joy* (in the passage mentioned in note 2) is likewise in an interrogative mode.