

Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff:

Sospitator Euripidis

William M. Calder III

I BEGIN with a word on achievement. Wilamowitz wrote on Euripides first in 1867,¹ last in 1931.² For 64 years he was concerned with Euripides. Athenian tragedy always remained a center of his interest. Within this center he wrote least on Sophocles,³ more on Aeschylus,⁴ but most on Euripides. The Hiller/Klaffenbach bibliography lists 45 items on Euripides, against 19 on Aeschylus and 18 on Sophocles.⁵ Four great books, whose influence on subsequent scholarship in tragedy has been incalculable, are concerned wholly with Euripides: the Habilitationsschrift, *Analecta Euripidea* (1875); the two-volume *Herakles*, first published in 1889; the commentary, text, and translation of *Hippolytus* (1891); and the edition of *Ion* (1926). Marcello Gigante has written that neither Wilamowitz nor Nietzsche published a *magnum opus*.⁶ Wilamowitz intended *Herakles* to be that, and completed it in his fortieth year—his acme in the ancient sense⁷—with a dedication to Schulpforte, meaning it to be the fulfillment of a vow taken as a schoolboy to become a scholar worthy of his *alma mater*.⁸ His history of the text, from autograph to latest edition,⁹

¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *In wie weit befriedigen die Schlüsse der erhaltenen griechischen Trauerspiele? Ein ästhetischer Versuch*, ed. W. M. Calder III (Leiden 1974 [hereafter *Trauerspiele*]) 95–148.

² *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin 1932) II 597f s.n. ‘Euripides’.

³ For details see my “Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on Sophocles: A Letter to Sir Herbert Warren,” *CalStClAnt* 12 (1979) 51–63 (= *Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff: Selected Correspondence, 1869–1931*, ed. W. M. Calder III, *Antiqua* 23 [Naples 1983, hereafter *Antiqua* 23] 279–91).

⁴ For Wilamowitz’s work on Aeschylus see Herwig Görgemanns, *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, edd. W. M. Calder III, Hellmut Flashar, and Theodor Lindken (Darmstadt 1985 [hereafter *50 Jahren*]) 142–45.

⁵ F. Hiller von Gaertringen and G. Klaffenbach, *Wilamowitz-Bibliographie 1868 bis 1929* (Berlin 1929).

⁶ *ParPass* 156 (1974) 214.

⁷ Wilamowitz draws special attention to the notion that a great man is not ready until he is forty. He cites Goethe and Plato; a third is implied: cf. *Euripides, Herakles* (repr. Darmstadt 1959 [hereafter *Herakles*]) I 18.

⁸ *Herakles* I vii.

⁹ Originally published in the first edition (Berlin 1889) of *Herakles* I as ch. III of the “Einleitung in die attische Tragödie,” of which I–IV were omitted from the second

permanently altered critical method. One need only cite the reaction of August Nauck (1822–1892),¹⁰ whom Wilamowitz considered most competent to judge.¹¹ His life of Euripides¹² remains the most authoritative ever written, and is today plagiarized indirectly by monoglots unaware of their debt. His commentary was model and inspiration for Kaibel's *Electra* (1896), Ed. Fraenkel's *Agamemnon* (1950), and Norden's *Aeneis Buch VI* (1903, 1916²).¹³ The introduction and commentary exemplified the *Totalitätsideal* that Wilamowitz had inherited from F. G. Welcker (1784–1867)—the conviction that the particular may only be elucidated by a knowledge of the whole. The interpreter's goal was to experience the play as its first audience had.¹⁴

Three times, excluding revisions, Wilamowitz discussed the entire *oeuvre* (1867, 1905, 1923).¹⁵ Again and again he elucidated metrical, textual, and exegetical *cruces* in Euripides. Only eventual publication of the *index locorum Wilamowitzianus* will allow appraisal of the vast extent of this contribution. Hundreds of *loci* from other plays are treated in his edition of *Heracles* alone. Wilamowitz never edited all of Euripides because he believed that anything accurate or lasting in Gilbert Murray's *Oxford Classical Text* was his, even the collations. The sixty preserved letters of Wilamowitz to Murray put this beyond doubt, though not as sharply as a remark to Georg Kaibel:¹⁶

My English friend, Murray, sends at least one drama a week of his Euripides. I am serious. What he does is almost sheer nonsense. A pupil of Verrall. . . . The first proof will contain seven dramas, I think. I am not touching the *Cyclops*, because he has made so incredibly many stupid mistakes there.

edition of 1895 but later reprinted separately as *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1906ff); the three-volume Darmstadt reprint includes this material in volume I; II–III correspond to the two volumes of the edition of 1895.

¹⁰ In a letter of 2 October 1889: *Antiqua* 23, 236–38.

¹¹ *Herakles* I 251.

¹² *Herakles* I 1–43.

¹³ Cf. the observation of G. Kaibel, *Sophokles, Elektra* (Leipzig 1896) vii, “dass aber v. Wilamowitz' Heraklescommentar zu den meist citirten Büchern gehört, wird jeder natürlich finden.”

¹⁴ See Wilamowitz's later words at *Aristophanes, Lysistrate* (Berlin 1927) 5; cf. *Antiqua* 23, 19 n.99. For an evaluation of *Herakles* see Görgemanns, *50 Jahren* 138–42.

¹⁵ See *Trauerspiele* 95–148 (where I draw attention in my notes to later discussions); *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums* (= *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache. Die Kultur der Gegenwart* I.8³, ed. Paul Hinneberg [Leipzig/Berlin 1912; first edition 1905; second 1907]) 78–82; “Die griechische Tragoedie und ihre drei Dichter,” *Griechische Tragoedien* IV (Berlin 1923) 363–94.

¹⁶ See *Antiqua* 23, 222 n.37.

If the proofs corrected and annotated by Wilamowitz still survive, they will likely confirm Murray's debt. Wilamowitz translated eight Euripidean plays into German verse—*Alcestis*, *Bacchae*, *Heracles*, *Supplices*, *Hippolytus*, *Medea*, *Troades*, *Cyclops*¹⁷—and affixed a lengthy essay to each. I shall discuss later the staging of these translations in the German-speaking world.

In a teaching career spanning one hundred and eleven semesters (without sabbatical), Wilamowitz taught Euripides in seventeen of them.¹⁸ The plays he taught included *Alcestis*, *Hecuba*, *Heracles*, *Hippolytus*, *Ion*, *Iphigenia in Aulide*, *Medea*, *Phoenissae*, *Troades*. He once taught the choral lyrics and once Euripides' *Life and Work*. No other author is represented on this scale. Plato, Homer, Aeschylus (all favorites) lag far behind. But of the eighty-eight dissertations directed by Wilamowitz, only three concern Euripides.¹⁹ Of these the only one still read by specialists is von Arnim's of 1881, on the prologues,²⁰ a theme recalling Wilamowitz's youthful dispute at Bonn with Usener on interpolations in the prologues.²¹ It is revealing that his students did not share his enthusiasm for the neglected poet.

The achievement is dazzling. No scholar of modern times—by which I mean since Friedrich August Wolf's matriculation at Göttingen in 1777—has done more for Euripides. Nauck, Murray, Verrall cannot be compared. Wilamowitz's books have endured as have none by his contemporaries on tragedy.²² Yet his publications on Euripides constitute only a small fraction of the *Lebenswerk*: six volumes, more or less, out of over seventy!

¹⁷ They are easily available in U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Tragödien* I–IV (Berlin 1899ff).

¹⁸ For the details of Wilamowitz's teaching see Hiller/Klaffenbach (*supra* n.5) 75–83. For its influence see *QuadStor* 25 (1987) 151.

¹⁹ See Hans-Ulrich Berner, "Index dissertationum Udalrico de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff promotore conscriptarum," *QuadStoria* 15 (1982) 227–34.

²⁰ Hans von Arnim, *De prologorum Euripideorum arte et interpolatione* (diss. Greifswald 1881; publ. Jena 1881).

²¹ See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen 1848–1914*² (Leipzig 1929 [hereafter *Erinnerungen*²]) 92, and for later implications my "Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Kekule von Stradonitz on Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker," *StItal* n.s. III.21 (1984) 130 n.104.

²² What Ed. Fraenkel writes of Wilamowitz's work on Aeschylus could be well applied to his Euripidean achievement (*Agamemnon* [Oxford 1950] I 61): "But what he has done is more than enough to encourage and enable his successors to fill some of the gaps he left. If the serious study of Greek survives, as we hope it will, then Wilamowitz's work on Aeschylus will maintain its stimulating and enlightening power for many generations to come."

I. Why Euripides?

The achievement is undeniable. Si monumentum requiris, circumlege! But why did the Junker-scholar, unlike his teachers, friends, and students, lavish such attention on the Ishmael of classical Greek poetry? Chance and inclination, I suspect, rather than *Zeitgeist*. That is, the reasons are biographical, an approach that students of the history of ideas disapprove.²³ First, chance. Thanks to a suggestion of Koberstein, his German master at Pforte,²⁴ the schoolboy determined to write his senior essay on the subject: "How far are the ends of preserved Greek tragedies satisfying?"²⁵ Joachim Wohlleben has indicated the sources behind the young man's approach.²⁶ The choice of topic itself caused Wilamowitz at age eighteen to do what very few other men in Europe had done in 1867: he read all the preserved tragedies of Euripides critically; and he memorized great stretches of text.²⁷ On turning to Euripides in this essay he writes:²⁸

From one of the first-class poets of the world [*sc.* Sophocles], certainly from two first-class tragedians [*sc.* Aeschylus and Sophocles], we descend to an average poet and a bad tragedian, Euripides.

He then proceeds through all the preserved plays and *Rhesus*, which he thinks too bad even for Euripides,²⁹ and provides scholarly and aesthetic judgments of great perspicacity on all of them. One need only contrast the eighteen-year-old schoolboy's ability to see Euripides historically with the embarrassing superficiality of Richard Porson's Latin inaugural of 1792 on *Hecuba* to see how far and how swiftly science had progressed.³⁰ Wilamowitz later tellingly observed that the great English critics never athetized or transposed verses:³¹

²³ This is precisely why philosophers detest Wilamowitz's *Platon*: see E. N. Tigerstedt, "Interpreting Plato," *Stockholm Studies in the History of Literature* 17 (1977) 47–50.

²⁴ On August Koberstein (1797–1870) see Elisabeth Frenzel, *Neue deutsche Biographie* 12 (Berlin 1980) 246f.

²⁵ I discovered the essay still preserved at Schulpforte, and published it in 1974 (*supra* n.1).

²⁶ See Joachim Wohlleben, "Der Abiturient als Kritiker," *50 Jahren* 3–30, and Görgemanns, *ibid.* 132–35.

²⁷ See *Trauerspiele* 10.

²⁸ *Trauerspiele* 95.

²⁹ *Trauerspiele* 95–98. He taught it 1895/6.

³⁰ See *Ricardi Porsoni Adversaria*, edd. J. H. Monk and C. J. Blomfield (Cambridge 1812) 1–31; M. L. Clark, *Richard Porson: A Biographical Essay* (Cambridge 1937) 38: "Hastily written as it was, we may be grateful that it was preserved, if only because of the limitations it reveals."

³¹ *Herakles* I 231. What attracted Porson to Euripides was his "nativa venustas et inaffectata simplicitas"!

they read word by word and could understand neither plays nor passages.

By 1869 Wilamowitz's opinion of Euripides had improved. He still thought little of him as a poet: he does not belong to world literature, but, as a representative of one of the most interesting periods of history, as a highly talented, reflective mind, Euripides now seemed to Wilamowitz to be "one of the most interesting persons of all literature."³² Chance now intervened again. In January 1872 Friedrich Nietzsche published his first book, *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik*. The title alone was provocation to a man who could never play a musical instrument.³³ In the text Nietzsche roundly condemned Socrates and Euripides. Rudolf Schöll (1844–1893) trapped Wilamowitz into reviewing the book. I have explored elsewhere the schoolboy rivalry that lay behind Wilamowitz's savaging of Nietzsche.³⁴ Inevitably, therefore, Nietzsche's condemnation of Euripides, so ably investigated here by Professor Henrichs, demanded that the youthful and passionate Wilamowitz defend him. Hence the two polemical pamphlets of 1872 and 1873.³⁵ The appearance of *Geburt* during Wilamowitz's palaeographical, epigraphical, and archaeological *Wanderjahre* in Italy may be regarded as a spur to his collation of Euripides. Professor Pintaudi of the Biblioteca Laurentiana has discovered in the guest book of the Library for 11 September 1872 the entry, "Dr U. v. Wilamowitz di Berlino." The result was *Analecta Euripidea*, which among much else contains a critical edition of *Supplices*—a work that would long appeal to Wilamowitz,³⁶ in part surely because of its patriotism—and an essay on the staging of *Hippolytus*. We shall see that the play exerted extraordinary influence on the youthful Wilamowitz. That he was already concerned with staging proves that he began early to insist on seeing plays as scripts, not simply as poems—anticipating the performance of his own translations, the *actio* of his *editio maior* of Aeschylus (1914),³⁷ and

³² From a letter to Walter Bormann: *Antiqua* 23, 37, and Görgemanns, *50 Jahren* 135.

³³ *Antiqua* 23, 258f.

³⁴ See my "The Wilamowitz-Nietzsche Struggle: New Documents and a Reappraisal," *Nietzsche-Studien* [hereafter *NSi*] 12 (1983) 214–54 (= "Studies in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship," *Antiqua* 27 [Naples 1984, hereafter *Antiqua* 27] 182–223, 306f). A newly-discovered letter of Wilamowitz to Ernst Howald confirms much of the argument there: see Jaap Mansfeld, *NSi* 15 (1986) 41–58.

³⁵ They are available at *Der Streit um Nietzsches "Geburt der Tragödie": die Schriften von E. Rohde, R. Wagner, U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff*, ed. Karlfried Gründer (Hildesheim 1969) 27–55, 113–35.

³⁶ *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin 1875 [hereafter *Analecta*]) 73–130. Cf. *Griechische Tragödien* I⁴ (Berlin 1904) 285–369.

³⁷ *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, ed. Udalricus de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Berlin 1914).

his son's epoch-making investigations of the dramatic technique of Sophocles.³⁸

Analecta Euripidea is dedicated (iii) to Wilamowitz's future father-in-law, the brilliant, arrogant Theodor Mommsen.³⁹ Fifty-three years later, long after the disenchantment with Mommsen, Wilamowitz rationalized that the dedication was politic.⁴⁰ Mommsen was rector of the University (1874–75) and, since 16 March 1874, Secretary of the Academy. First Otto Jahn had died (1869); now, on 5 February 1874, Moriz Haupt. There remained only one patron. In two years Mommsen presented the *cliens* with the Greifswald chair. "From him I could count on a friendly reception; from him I could learn not only Roman studies, but above all scholarship" ("Wissenschaft überhaupt").

There was a deeper reason. Not only the Schlegels and Nietzsche had condemned Euripides: so had Theodor Mommsen. In his widely read *Roman History* (1854–56), which won for him in 1902 the Nobel Prize for Literature, he damned the poet.⁴¹ The historian Mommsen, as would later Eduard Meyer, conceded Euripides' prophetic insight, proven by his adulatory reception in Hellenistic and Roman times. Yet Mommsen made four criticisms of Euripides. The first two are Aristophanic and had been revived by the Schlegels. In Mommsen's opinion (170) Aristophanes' indictment was irrefutable:

The criticism of Aristophanes probably hit the truth both morally and poetically; but poetry influences the course of history not in proportion to its absolute value, but in proportion as it is able to forecast the spirit of the age, and in this respect Euripides was unsurpassed.

By abandoning the grand character-types of his predecessors, Euripides was able to portray man as he is, through what Werner Jaeger later described as the introduction of bourgeois realism into tragedy.⁴² But his retention of the external forms of tragedy—the use of masks,

³⁸ Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (= *Philolog. Unters.* 22 [Berlin 1917]). For an intelligent discussion of the book, with frequent comments by Ed. Fraenkel, see H. Lloyd-Jones, *Blood for the Ghosts: Classical Influences in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London 1982) 219–37.

³⁹ The preface (iv) is dated Berlin, 15 May 1875.

⁴⁰ On this rationalization, found at *Erinnerungen*² 170, see *AuA* 27 (1981) 45f (= *Antiqua* 27, 158f).

⁴¹ *Römische Geschichte* II 436–40 (= *The History of Rome III*², tr. by W. P. Dickson [New York 1898] 166–70). I cite from Dickson's version, with occasional minor revisions. For the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of Mommsen's *History* see Karl Christ, "Theodor Mommsen und die 'Römische Geschichte'," *Römische Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte* III: *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* (Darmstadt 1983) 26–73.

⁴² *Paideia*, tr. Gilbert Highet, I (New York 1945) 344ff.

the chorus—made it impossible for him to delineate man in his entirety and to set these fully-realized individuals into higher poetic form. This, Mommsen held, only Shakespeare accomplished, and so (in a conclusion in part anticipating Nietzsche), “Euripides was able to destroy ancient tragedy, but not to create the modern” (167). The introduction of suspense and melodrama further cheapened the coin. So much for the literary criticism; now the moral. Mommsen, like Friedrich Schlegel, is offended by Euripidean women (168f):

Euripides is a master in what are called effects; these, as a rule, have a sensuously sentimental colouring, and often moreover stimulate the sensuous impression by a special high seasoning, such as the interweaving of murder or incest with subjects relating to love. The delineations of Polyxena willing to die and of Phaedra pining away under the grief of secret love—above all, the splendid picture of the mystic ecstasies of the Bacchae, are of the greatest beauty in their kind; but they are neither artistically nor morally pure, and the reproach of Aristophanes [*Thesm.* 547], that the poet was unable to paint Penelope, was thoroughly well-founded.

His profound detestation of Phaedra survived into old age.⁴³

Mommsen went further than the Schlegels. He adds two criticisms of his own. Euripides was both subversive and anti-nationalistic (168f):

But, above all, poetic effect is replaced in the tragedies of Euripides by moral or political purpose. Without strictly or directly entering on the questions of the day, and having in view throughout social rather than political questions, Euripides in the legitimate issues of his principles coincided with the contemporary political and philosophical radicalism, and was the first and chief apostle of that new cosmopolitan humanity which broke up the old Attic national life. This was the ground . . . of that opposition which the ungodly and un-Attic poet encountered among his contemporaries. . . .

Euripides was prophet of the *oikoumene*. This anticipates Mommsen’s criticism of the Jews in his *Roman History* III as “an effective fermentation of Cosmopolitanism and national decomposition,” a phrase later varied by Joseph Goebbels and Adolf Hitler.⁴⁴ Mommsen never

⁴³ For his letter of 17 September 1891, written when he was seventy-three, cf. Friedrich and Dorothea Hiller von Gaertringen, *Mommsen und Wilamowitz: Briefwechsel 1872–1903* (Berlin 1935) 425–29, fully discussed in *GRBS* 20 (1979) 226–29 (= *Antiqua* 27, 172–75). Ironically, the plays most distasteful to Mommsen were Wilamowitz’s favorites as early as 1869; see *Antiqua* 23, 37: “ich habe Hippolytos, auch Bakchai, die ich nur gegen in [sc. ‘ihn’] herabsetzte, stäts für grosse schöpfungen gehalten.”

⁴⁴ *Römische Geschichte* V 216, on which see Karl Christ, *Von Gibbon zu Rostovtzeff* (Darmstadt 1979) 91f. For the use of Mommsen’s phrase by later anti-semites from Paul de Lagarde to Goebbels and Hitler see Christhard Hoffmann, “Das antisemitische

recanted. In 1886 at Lincoln College, Oxford, when asked by the Rector whether he still held to his view of 1856 on Euripides, Mommsen retorted sharply: "If I were to write that passage again now, I should put it still more strongly."⁴⁵ Wilamowitz never caused him to change his mind. I have already noted the letter on Phaedra of 1891. Mommsen always attributed Wilamowitz's weakness for Euripides to aristocratic decadence.

A need to disagree with authority—with his father, with Rector Peter on Nietzsche, Usener on Euripides, Mommsen on Euripides—is typical of the young Wilamowitz, certainly through the Greifswald period and in many cases beyond. The first word of *Analecta* (iii) is "subirascere": you may grow angry at my dedicating to you a book about a poet "quem quantum contemneres non reticuisti." But the messianic task remains, expressed in the provocation, later recalled by Eduard Schwartz:⁴⁶ "Nova docere volo; nota praefabor" (131). Wilamowitz's later adoration of Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918),⁴⁷ the Old Testament scholar and Greifswald colleague, was fuelled by seeing Wellhausen, as the philological martyr, betrayed by stupid orthodoxy.⁴⁸ In the *dedicatio* of *Homerische Untersuchungen* to Wellhausen on his fortieth birthday (17 May 1884) Wilamowitz writes that the philological problem of the analysis of Homer and the Old Testament is "etwas revolutionäres."⁴⁹ Everyone who has sought to solve it has to struggle (*kämpfen*) with the mighty power of tradition, of superstition, and of inertia. This "something revolutionary" in Wilamowitz

Schlagwort vom 'Ferment der nationalen Dekomposition',” *Die Darstellung von Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (diss. Berlin F. U. 1986) 44–49. A reference should be added to Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Berlin 1939) 743.

⁴⁵ W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (Oxford 1920) 251.

⁴⁶ Cf. Eduard Schwartz, *Gesammelte Schriften I: Vergangene Gegenwärtigkeiten* (Berlin 1938) 372, who alleges that passages such as this caused Wilamowitz to remain longer in Greifswald than expected.

⁴⁷ For Wellhausen and Wilamowitz see *AuA* 27 (1981) 46f (= *Antiqua* 27, 158f), and Wilamowitz's letter of 18–19 March 1918 to Ed. Schwartz in W. M. Calder III and R. L. Fowler, "The Preserved Letters of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff to Eduard Schwartz," *SitzMunich* 1986.1 78–84 (=no. 31).

⁴⁸ See for this episode in Wellhausen's life Alfred Jepsen, "Wellhausen in Greifswald: Ein Beitrag zur Biographie Julius Wellhausen," *Der Herr ist Gott: Aufsätze zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament* (Berlin 1978) 254–70. Wilamowitz arranged for the Philosophical Faculty to present him with an honorary doctorate on the occasion of Wellhausen's dismissal by the Theological Faculty: see *Erinnerungen*² 190.

⁴⁹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, (= *Philolog. Unters.* 7 [Berlin 1884]) iv. Wellhausen in an unpublished letter of 20 October 1884 to his mother-in-law vigorously denies influence on Wilamowitz. I owe knowledge of the text to the kindness of Professor Dr Rudolf Smend (Göttingen).

drew him to the defense of Euripides, cast out by nineteenth-century German neo-classicism whose darling was Sophocles, especially his *Antigone*.⁵⁰

This strain of the revolutionary or perverse—of what Solmsen happily called the *unus sed leo* in Wilamowitz⁵¹—drew him to a poet despised by the Establishment. But more than that, Wilamowitz was peculiarly attracted to two famous characters in Euripidean tragedy. This attraction, even identification, was so remarkable that one may speak of his youthful and middle periods as the *Hippolytus* and *Heraclides* periods.⁵² Still a schoolboy he wrote:⁵³

What is more, Hippolytus is a youth filled with an ideal striving for the unfulfillable, a phantast, a by far more German character, which leads to the point where he goes too far and falls.

More German means 'more like me'. It recalls also Niebuhr's conception of Germany as the New Greece.⁵⁴ By 1868 he had translated *Hippolytus*; between semesters that year at Bonn, while vacationing at his family estate in Posen, he visited his paternal aunt, Emma von Schwanefeld (1800–1876), and read his translation aloud to her. Wilamowitz never forgot this meeting and the effect, almost a conversion, that it produced. Sixty years later he wrote of it in his autobiography.⁵⁵ Twice in scholarly publications he had earlier recalled it.⁵⁶ The power of lofty poetry had effected a change in a susceptible soul. The poetry was Euripides', and because it was in the transmuted version of Wilamowitz it elicited a powerful affinity. The importance of this early incident is underlined by the fact that later Wilamowitz based his influential portrait of Phaedra on his aunt.⁵⁷ He taught

⁵⁰ At age eighteen Wilamowitz already found *Antigone* unsatisfactory: see *Trauerspiele* 77 and Görgemanns, *50 Jahren* 145. The influence of his Bonn teacher, Jacob Bernays (1824–1881), ought not to be underestimated: see *Herakles* II 147 n.1.

⁵¹ Friedrich Solmsen, *Kleine Schriften* III (Hildesheim/Zürich 1982) 446.

⁵² See W. M. Calder III, "Ecce Homo: the Subjective in Wilamowitz' Scholarly Work," in *50 Jahren*, 91.

⁵³ *Trauerspiele* 114.

⁵⁴ See *The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr and Selections from his Minor Writings*, ed. and tr. by Susanna Winkworth, III (London 1852) 297: "... Greece fell, the Germany of antiquity." Attention should be drawn to his condemnation of Euripides (178).

⁵⁵ *Erinnerungen*² 55 n.1; cf. *GRBS* 20 (1979) 221 n.12 (= *Antiqua* 27, 167 n.12).

⁵⁶ For a translation of the later of these, which appears in *Griechische Tragödien* I⁴ (Berlin 1904) 121 n.1, see *GRBS* (*supra* n.55) 221f.

⁵⁷ I have documented this in my "The Riddle of Wilamowitz' Phaidra-bild," (*supra* n.55) 219–36 (= *Antiqua* 27, 165–82). I provide evidence that any alleged influence from *Hedda Gabler* is chronologically impossible. H. Lloyd-Jones replies at *The Justice of Zeus*² (Berkeley 1984) 248: "This does not alter the general truth that Wilamowitz at that period of his life saw Euripides in an Ibsenian way, even if he was not directly

Hippolytus in 1875, 1881, 1882, 1886/7. In 1891 his great edition appeared.⁵⁸ For anyone familiar with the young Wilamowitz, his characterization there of Hippolytus is a distorted self-portrait (51):

The quintessence of Hippolytus may be described in Greek with one word. It is *anepaphroditon*. Aphrodite is for him the devil, not because he was taught that but because it lies in his nature. Anything to do with Aphrodite is not for him. . . . Of course he is a husky, handsome young man, given over to equestrian pleasures and master in these arts. He is a born leader and inevitably creates an impression of arrogance. That his comrades who will stand completely under his tyranny deify him is no contradiction. . . . He does not brood, and has no political ambition, as his father would wish. He has the right to pluck blossoms in the meadow of Artemis. More he does not demand. . . . He is free from human weakness. That may open heaven for him. He does not belong on earth, ruled by the gods who rule it.

Hippolytus attracted Wilamowitz because he persevered in spite of hardship and injustice, loyal to his ideals: chastity and the oath. Wilamowitz's loyalty was to *Wissenschaft* (he plucked blossoms in the meadows of Athene). This loyalty led him to renounce his aristocratic past, a military or diplomatic career, and marry a bourgeois woman, the first in his family to do so in over two hundred years.⁵⁹ This leads directly to a profound affinity with Hippolytus. Both young men suffered the curse of a father, Theseus and Arnold; and in neither case for a crime.

September 10, 1879, was the silver wedding anniversary of Theodor Mommsen, who with his wife passed it at Greifswald with the Wilamowitizes. His son-in-law had prepared a gift, a text and translation of Euripides' *Heracles*.⁶⁰ Even Wilamowitz perceived that a poem whose hero brutally murders his wife and children served awkwardly as a commemoration of twenty-five years of connubial bliss and fourteen children. He apologizes in the dedicatory epigraph.⁶¹ The point is that wife and children did not matter. Mommsen in 1879 was the Heracles of *Wissenschaft*, the *θείος ἀνὴρ*. The famous epigram easily applies to Mommsen:⁶²

influenced by *Hedda Gabler* or any other work of Ibsen." This is a *confessio fidei* and cannot be refuted by historical scholarship.

⁵⁸ *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Berlin 1891).

⁵⁹ For the *Family Chronicle* see now *Antiqua* 27, 239–65.

⁶⁰ See *Euripides Herakles als Manuskript gedruckt* (Berlin 1878). For the Mommsens at Greifswald see *Erinnerungen*² 183.

⁶¹ Indirectly of course: see *Elegeia*, ed. W. Buchwald (Berlin 1938) 55.

⁶² *Herakles* II 38. The language recalls the Creed.

Mensch gewesen, Gott geworden;
Mühen erduldet, Himmel erworben.

This was the fundamental meaning of the figure (“Grundbedeutung der Gestalt”). Mommsen won greatness through toil and, like Heracles, became in the Greek sense a hero after his death: on Mommsen’s hundredth birthday, Wilamowitz urged young men to invoke him.⁶³ In the ten years that followed, Wilamowitz’s disenchantment began; by the publication in 1889 of the completed *Herakles*, he had dethroned Mommsen and saw himself as the Heracles of Wissenschaft. This identification was made easier because Wilamowitz wrote not in the manner of a modern historian of mythology or religion, but of Plutarch’s *Vita Heraclis* (=fr.6–8 Sandbach). Similarly early Nietzsche projected a *Vita Promethei*.⁶⁴ Further, Wilamowitz documented carefully the ancient tradition of drawing contemporary parallels with Heracles (the νέος Ἡρακλῆς).⁶⁵ Placing special emphasis on a passage in Aristotle ([Pr.] 30.1) where Heracles is discussed along with Plato and Socrates as the type of the “melancholic man,” the unstable genius, Wilamowitz set him “in the ranks of the heroes of the mind.”⁶⁶ Heracles dared to undertake tasks that would daunt the greatest contemporaries. He was the man who attained heaven through the (distinctively Prussian) ethic of hard work. After his death he became a god, as Wilamowitz said Mommsen did—and as Werner Jaeger and Eduard Fraenkel would say of Wilamowitz.⁶⁷

Wilamowitz took a further step. He identifies not only with the character Heracles but with the poet Euripides. This is how Wilamowitz sums up Euripides’ genius:⁶⁸

A restless mood, a bleak, tormented mood, that disdains gods and men, possessions and pleasures; and, along with it, a new strength to create and an audacity, a tireless striving after new tasks and new solutions, an ever-youthful receptivity to all that is new, good and bad, that comes his way—one cannot take sufficient pains to describe that human mind [*Menschenseele*] for which it was possible to create this series of contradictory works.

⁶³ *Kleine Schriften* VI (Berlin 1972) 28. See in greater detail my remarks at *50 Jahren* 95.

⁶⁴ *Nietzsche Briefwechsel: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* I.1, edd. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari (Berlin/New York 1975) 60f (no. 70: Pforte April-May 1859).

⁶⁵ See my documentation at *50 Jahren*, 96f.

⁶⁶ See *Herakles* II 93.

⁶⁷ See W. Jaeger, *Humanistische Reden und Vorträge*² (Berlin 1960) 220f; Ed. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* II (Rome 1964) 545: in 1948 Wilamowitz remains “so immensely alive”; cf. 557, where he has the eyes of Apollo, the lips of Hermes, and on his forehead Zeus has impressed “the seal of power.”

⁶⁸ *Herakles* II 133.

Wilamowitz had written his own epitaph: the enormous and varied production, the tireless energy, the intellectual curiosity, the scholar and the poet. Wilamowitz was an excellent poet, as the volume *Elegeia* proves, and a brilliant parodist.⁶⁹ He says of Euripides:⁷⁰ "Like a true scholar he left behind only one treasure that moths could corrupt: his library." His brother Hugo had inherited the estates.

This leads us to a further reason for Wilamowitz's preference for Euripides over the other two tragedians. Wilamowitz's approach, wherever possible, was biographical. He was attracted to great individuals whom he could admire, whether fictional or historical. He could never write a book on a man whom he detested, such as Demosthenes.⁷¹ This approach was a legacy of German New Humanism, represented especially by Wilhelm von Humboldt. The quintessence of humanism was *das Menschliche*, which attains expression in the great individual, the hero. Wilamowitz tells us that Carlyle influenced him.⁷² Euripidean delineations of character, especially of women—whose rôles, detested by the Schlegels and Mommsen, Wilamowitz preferred to play in family productions and readings—attracted Wilamowitz because he discerned in them reflections of persons he knew. With an intelligent variation of Waldock's "documentary fallacy"⁷³ he could fill out the characters. That Euripides gives us in Aristotle's phrase "men as they are" is interpreted by Wilamowitz as Euripides' great achievement, not his flaw. Euripides did not hate women, as Aristophanes, Friedrich Schlegel, and Mommsen argue. "There are few poets to whom the female sex has reason to be so thankful."⁷⁴ Thus Wilamowitz refuted all three. The judgment derives from one who since Pforte had preferred the tragedy of character to that of ideas.

Finally, there was an unexpected bond between poet and scholar. They shared, in Wilamowitz's opinion, the same religion:⁷⁵

⁶⁹ For his parody of Voss see *Philologus* 124 (1980) 148 and for his parodies of Stefan George see Ulrich K. Goldsmith, *50 Jahren* 583–612 and "Wilamowitz as Parodist of Stefan George," *Monatshefte* 77 (1985) 79–87.

⁷⁰ *Herakles* I 11.

⁷¹ See my "Wilamowitz on Demosthenes," *CW* 72 (1978/9) 239f.

⁷² *AuA* 27 (1981) 47 with n.85 (= *Antiqua* 27, 160 with n.85).

⁷³ See A. J. A. Waldock, *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Cambridge 1951) 11–24; cf. R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Gnomon* 25 (1953) 350B; Görgemanns, *50 Jahren* 148 n.87. On the other hand the tradition should not be forgotten that Sophocles created rôles with particular actors in mind: see *FGrHist* 334F36 = *TrGF* IV T1.27–30 Radt.

⁷⁴ *Herakles* I 10.

⁷⁵ *Griechische Tragödien* I⁴ (Berlin 1904) 120. I am grateful to Albert Henrichs, who first convinced me of the importance of this passage. Wilamowitz did not find it incompatible with *fidem profiteor Platoniam*. In his view Euripides was a precursor of Plato in his struggle against popular religion.

Euripides himself did not believe at all in the gods whom he brought on stage, or rather he did not believe in them as his fellow citizens did, who prayed and brought offerings to them; but he believed in them, as I confess I also believe in them.

Wilamowitz elaborates. Aphrodite is the anthropomorphic incarnation of sexual desire. An abstraction is grey and pale. We are not so far from Nietzsche's Dionysus and Apollo.⁷⁶ For Wilamowitz Euripides, in this respect, stands in sharpest contrast to Sophocles, whose religion was base superstition.⁷⁷ He typically prefers the personal to the abstract, the concrete to the theoretical.⁷⁸ This is historicism and not *Geistesgeschichte*.

II. Professional Productions of Translations

Professor Hellmut Flashar has expertly assembled and analyzed the elusive data still available on the professional (in contrast to academic) production of Wilamowitz's translations in German-speaking lands.⁷⁹ Predictably, Wilamowitz's *Oedipus Rex* was the first of his translations to be performed, in the Berliner Theater in February 1900 under the direction of Hans Oberländer. A famous production of his *Oresteia* soon followed, with a sold-out première on 24 November 1900 in the *Theater des Westens*. The director again was Oberländer, with a musical setting by Max von Schilling.⁸⁰ *Herakles*, the first Euripidean translation, was not performed until 6 January 1902—not at Berlin nor in Vienna, but at a matinée of the Viennese Academic Association for Art and Literature at the *Theater in der Josefstadt* (a suburb of Vienna): an 'off-Broadway' production in a theater

⁷⁶ See in general Martin Vogel, "Apollinisch und Dionysisch: Geschichte eines genialen Irrtums," *Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* VI (Regensburg 1966).

⁷⁷ See in nuce: *Antiqua* 23, 279–91 and further Albert Henrichs, *50 Jahren* 298–301. There is a corrective at *Kleine Schriften* VI (Berlin 1972) 210–13, where Wilamowitz tries manfully to see Sophocles on his own terms.

⁷⁸ See briefly Werner Jaeger, *Five Essays*, tr. Adele M. Fiske R.S.C.J. (Montreal 1966) 61.

⁷⁹ "Aufführungen von Griechischen Dramen in der Übersetzung von Wilamowitz," *50 Jahren* 306–57. What follows is little more than a summary of this fundamental study, which continues his pioneer work in the new subject of 'revival as reception' in "F. Mendelssohn-Bartholdys Vertonung antiker Dramen," *Berlin und die Antike: Aufsätze*, edd. Willmuth Arenhövel and Christa Schreiber (Berlin 1979) 351–61. See further his "Die Entdeckung der griechischen Tragödie für die deutsche Bühne," *Kunsterfahrung und Kulturpolitik im Berlin Hegels* (= *Hegel Studien* 22, edd. O. Pöggeler and A. Gethmann-Siefert [Bonn 1983]) 285–308.

⁸⁰ Through the efforts of Hellmut Flashar and Hans Jaskulsky, Max von Schilling's score was revived at Bad Homburg on 25 September 1981.

whose repertoire of thirteen plays by eight authors included Euripides, Goethe, Ibsen (the first German production of *Peer Gynt*), Hauptmann (of whom Wilamowitz thought little), and Maeterlinck. In short, avant-garde. The impression of the performance was powerful and lasting.⁸¹ This was the first professional revival of Euripides in Europe, preceding Gilbert Murray's efforts in England.⁸² *Hippolytus* followed on 7 November 1902 in Vienna.⁸³ Finally in February 1904, at the instigation of Max Reinhardt, Wilamowitz's *Medea* was performed in Berlin in the New Theater under the direction again of Oberländer.⁸⁴ In this performance Wilamowitz himself deleted the Aegeus scene.⁸⁵ The set, according to a surviving program, was modeled after Heinrich Schliemann's excavation at Mycenae. Wilamowitz's reaction would have been ambivalent.⁸⁶ *Medea* was played in an excessively naturalistic manner by Rosa Bertens, who "hurled herself emotionally on the ground, in daemonic wild passion, with petrifying features."⁸⁷ Reviews were not favorable. Critics preferred Grillparzer's watered-down *Medea*, based largely on Apollonius Rhodius.⁸⁸ In Wilamowitz's own lifetime only one other of his Euripidean translations was professionally produced, *Alcestis* in 1909, not at Berlin nor Vienna but at provincial Stuttgart. Of the 35 professional productions of Wilamowitz's translations recorded by Flashar (including posthumous ones), 13 are Euripidean compared with 15 of the *Oresteia* and only 7 of Sophocles. The influence of these performances on viewers is difficult to assess, but occasional reactions that have survived, such as that of Theodor Gomperz to the *Oresteia*, attest to their extraordinary power.⁸⁹ One should recall here the

⁸¹ See the contemporary evidence gathered by Flashar, *50 Jahren* 330–32.

⁸² See Francis West, *Gilbert Murray: A Life* (London/New York 1984) 92–97, and my review at *Gnomon* 57 (1985) 313–16. Murray's involvement in the productions was more active than Wilamowitz's; but it must be remembered that at this time Murray held no job and lived off the doles of his mother-in-law, the Countess of Carlisle. Wilamowitz was a working-man. See now R. Ackermann, "Euripides and Professor Murray," *CJ* 81 (1985/6) 326–36.

⁸³ See Flashar, *50 Jahren* 332 n.86. A production of *Hippolytus* recorded for three performances at Berlin in 1851 seems to have been under the influence of Seneca and Racine.

⁸⁴ For details see Flashar, *50 Jahren* 332–35.

⁸⁵ He had early argued its superfluity: *Hermes* 15 (1880) 481–523 (= *Kleine Schriften* I 82–109). T. V. Buttrey, *AJP* 79 (1958) 1–17, decisively defends the relevance of the scene (without reference to Wilamowitz's discussion).

⁸⁶ See *Antiqua* 27, 229–34.

⁸⁷ Flashar, *50 Jahren* 335.

⁸⁸ For details see Flashar, *50 Jahren* 335 with n.99.

⁸⁹ See Theodor Gomperz to his son Heinrich (Vienna, 8 December 1900), in Heinrich Gomperz and Robert A. Kann, "Theodor Gomperz: Ein Gelehrtenleben im Bürgertum der Franz-Josefs-Zeit," *SitzWien* 295 (1974) 325: "Gestern sah ich Berger in

attack on Wilamowitz by the George Circle, occasioned by the popularity of his translations and the success of their performances. Their anger became public with the publication in March 1910 of Kurt Hildebrandt's *Hellas und Wilamowitz: Zum Ethos der Tragödie*, in large part a protest against the allegedly colloquial diction of Wilamowitz's verse. The similarity to T. S. Eliot on *Euripides and Professor Murray* (1920) is striking.⁹⁰

III. A Few Words on Influence

Wilamowitz had reacted against Friedrich Nietzsche and Theodor Mommsen, ultimately against the Schlegels. In *Herakles* (1889) Wilamowitz sought, by assembling all preserved evidence, to understand Euripides historically. He succeeded in making him respectable as well as accessible. The enthusiastic astonishment of August Nauck, as he first read the book, typifies the best of the older generation.⁹¹

But no seed could germinate on that ground. Nauck would remain until his end a *Wortphilolog*, albeit in the best sense. Paradoxically, the avant-garde claimed the conservative Junker as one of their own. In 1896 A. W. Verrall (1851–1912), whose work had early attracted Wilamowitz,⁹² published an adulatory review of the revised *Herakles* (1895)⁹³ that is of greatest importance for the reception of Wilamowitz in Anglo-Saxony. The book had come as a revelation to Verrall (44):

To me the book came at first, and doubtless to many others—for no one is really in front of his time—as just the thing that waited for utterance. In reading it again, I have seen, as already said, that it has dwelt with me more even than I knew; I have even unconsciously cited it; and in short shall readily reckon as high as any one may think fit my debt to Professor von Wilamowitz-Möllerndorff [*sic*].

einem Zwischenact der Orestie. . . . Der Erfolg des Theaters sei über alle Erwartungen gross. . . ." For the reaction to *Herakles* see Hermann Barr, *Rezensionen Wiener Theater 1901–1903* (Berlin 1903) 112–20.

⁹⁰ For details see U. K. Goldsmith, "Wilamowitz and the Georgekreis: New Documents," *50 Jahren* 600–10.

⁹¹ See *supra* n.10.

⁹² See his review of Verrall's *Medea* at *DLZ* 2 (1881) 1845f and of his *Ion* at *DLZ* 12 (1891) 1899–1901.

⁹³ A. W. Verrall, "Wilamowitz-Möllerndorff's *Heracles* of Euripides," *CR* 10 (1896) 42–46. Because Hiller/Klaffenbach (*supra* n.5) at no. 162 do not notice the review, it has been neglected.

Predictably the anti-clerical Verrall most approved Wilamowitz's view of Euripides' religion (46):

The merit of Prof. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, as an expositor of Euripides, is simply this: that he, and he first, so far as I know, in modern times, has sat down to expound a religious play by Euripides upon the principle, firmly grasped and plainly stated, that the main purpose of the dramatist was to present a criticism of religion. Others may have said as much, or nearly as much in words; no one else, or none with equal energy, has acted on it; and "im Anfang war die That."

He finds what he already believed.⁹⁴ But he saw that Wilamowitz considered Euripides' abstract, intellectual sort of religion a considerable advance over cult, represented by Sophocles. In Mommsen's eyes this avoidance of the local made Euripides ungodly and un-Attic, cosmopolitan, and 'Jewish'. Only in this sphere of religion does Wilamowitz, a product of the *Aufklärung*, approve the revolutionary, the subversive. Euripides the poet, the student of human psychology—as well as the prolific hard worker—won Wilamowitz's admiration; he avoids moral judgments on Euripides' thought and ignores, rather than defends or excuses, Euripides the wrecker. Wilamowitz's disgust with Gerhart Hauptmann, whom he condemns in *Erinnerungen*² and sought to bar from the Order of Merit,⁹⁵ proves that with Euripides he swept a good deal under the carpet. Comparable is his portrayal of Socrates in *Platon*. He admires the ceaseless quest for truth. He ignored what caused Cato the Elder to call Socrates "a man of violence and a revolutionary."⁹⁶

Where then did the crucial turn occur that caused those qualities of Euripides that offended Aristophanes, the Schlegels, Th. Mommsen, and Nietzsche—and which Wilamowitz largely ignored—to become his virtue? Or, when did Euripides become, in Wilhelm Nestle's words, "the poet of the Greek Enlightenment?"⁹⁷ To answer this

⁹⁴ For Verrall's assertion (45) that Wilamowitz denies the divine paternity of Hercules see Wilamowitz, *Herakles* II 114, and for Verrall's own views see his "A Soul's Tragedy (*Heracles*)," in *Essays on Four Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1905) 134–98, largely an expansion of this review.

⁹⁵ See *Erinnerungen*² 256, where the piece that caused displeasure is G. Hauptmann, "Festspiel in deutschen Reimen," *Sämtliche Werke* II, ed. Hans-Egon Hass (Berlin 1965) 943–1006. For Hauptmann's generous view of Wilamowitz see his *Sämtliche Werke* XI, edd. H.-E. Hass and M. Machatzke (Berlin 1974) 1086–90, 1105f. For Wilamowitz's discussion of Hauptmann and the Order of Merit see his revealing letter of 14 June 1924 to Eduard Schwartz: Calder and Fowler (*supra* n.47) 89 with n.433.

⁹⁶ See Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 23.1; cf. B. L. Gildersleeve, *Essays and Studies Educational and Literary*² (New York 1924) 240f.

⁹⁷ *Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung* (Stuttgart 1901).

question we must summon a towering figure in late nineteenth century German Hellenism, Erwin Rohde (1845–1898).⁹⁸ In *Psyche* (1894), his masterpiece, he devotes fifteen remarkable pages to Euripides.⁹⁹ His Euripides is the opposite of Nietzsche's. Euripides is the hero who struggles against his time, the restless skeptic, the nihilist, the precursor of modernism. Rohde has turned Nietzsche's condemnation upside down. This is the more striking because in 1870 he had wholeheartedly accepted his friend's view.¹⁰⁰ Rohde's early loyalty to the young Nietzsche is too well known to require extended notice here.¹⁰¹ Only recently have we learned its cost. The alliance, against his better judgment, with Nietzsche and (worse yet) Richard Wagner, in opposition to scientific philology, permanently injured his professional career. The Establishment, ironically with the exception of Wilamowitz, who never hesitated to praise his scholarship,¹⁰² never forgave him his apostasy. He was early denied an expected raise.¹⁰³ His authoritative study of the Greek novel was boycotted in the journals in 1876.¹⁰⁴ He secured the Heidelberg chair only through governmental intervention.¹⁰⁵

What caused Rohde, some twenty-five years later, to reject his earlier opinion of Euripides, and thus required him to reject the Nietzschean Euripides of 1872—a view he had boldly defended against

⁹⁸ The standard biography, with all its shortcomings, remains Otto Crusius, *Erwin Rohde: Ein biographischer Versuch* (Tübingen/Leipzig 1902). There is little of value in Ernest Seillière, *Nietzsches Waffenbruder, Erwin Rohde* (Berlin 1911). The most important recent contribution is by Rohde's grand-daughter: see Hedwig Däuble, "Friedrich Nietzsche und Erwin Rohde," *NSr* 5 (1976) 321–54. For a brief life with bibliography see W. Schmid, *BiogJahr* 102 (1899) 87–114, who (109) calls him "a man of the Achilles type." All earlier biographical work on Rohde has been antiquated by the exemplary study of Hubert Cancik, "Erwin Rohde: ein Philologe der Bismarckzeit," *Semper Apertus: Sechshundert Jahre Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg 1386–1986* II, ed. W. Doer (Berlin/Heidelberg 1985) 436–505. The forthcoming publication of the Rohde-Overbeck correspondence by Andreas Patzer (Munich) will provide valuable new source material.

⁹⁹ *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*² (Leipzig/Tübingen 1898) 247–62 (tr. W. B. Willis [London 1925] 432–38).

¹⁰⁰ Crusius (*supra* n.98) 223f.

¹⁰¹ See the material I have gathered at *NSr* 12 (1983) 238f (= *Antiqua* 27, 207f).

¹⁰² See *NSr* 12 (1983) 247 n.242 (= *Antiqua* 27, 216 n.242) and especially Albert Henrichs, *50 Jahren* 285f with nn.107–09.

¹⁰³ See *NSr* 5 (1976) 330 n.25.

¹⁰⁴ So W. Schmid, *BiogJahr* 103 (1899) 94. *Die griechische Roman* was reviewed by F. Blass alone, later a critic of Wilamowitz: see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos Interpretationen* (Berlin 1914) 203ff. Blass (1843–1907) had done his dissertation under Ritschl at Bonn (1863) and was a follower of Rohde at Kiel (1876): he belonged to the other side. For Blass see Wilhelm Crönert, *BiogJahr* 32 (1909) 1–32. Wilamowitz reveals in his letters to Friedrich Althoff how little he thought of Blass.

¹⁰⁵ Albrecht Dihle, *NSr* 12 (1983) 246.

Wilamowitz? Otto Regenbogen called *Psyche* "etwas wie ein Totenopfer an den lebend geschiedenen Freund," the hopelessly ill Nietzsche.¹⁰⁶ Its composition extended until autumn 1893 and embraced, therefore, the collapse of Nietzsche at Turin in January 1889 and the receipt of the *Wahnsinnszettel*, mailed by Nietzsche from Turin on 4 January 1889, in which he places Rohde among the gods and sets the most beloved goddess next to him¹⁰⁷—a sentiment concerned with the subject of *Psyche*, the survival of the soul after death. Nietzsche signs himself *Dionysos*. The presence of Nietzsche in Rohde's mind during composition of *Psyche* is undeniable. He experienced his friend's collapse as a tragedy:¹⁰⁸

Es bleibt eine schwere und traurige Tragödie; eine *rechte* Tragödie, weil auch ihr Verlauf, wie jedes ächte Trauerspiel, *nothwendig*, durch keine Willkür, keine Reflexion, keine menschliche Güte und Liebe aufzuhalten war.

I suggest that Rohde included an epitaph for the living but departed friend in his *Psyche*, a book about the soul and immortality. His mature *Euripidesbild* of 1893 is thus no less influenced by Nietzsche than his youthful one of 1870: Rohde's picture of Euripides the poet, musician, scholar, philosopher, sophist, iconoclast, atheist, and believer is an antique *Nietzschebild*. Rohde saw a distorted portrait of Nietzsche in his Euripides. The evidence is twofold. Rohde's Euripides shares numerous traits with the historical Nietzsche. A number of the most distinctive cannot on the available evidence be proven; they are colors added by Rohde's brush. But the association becomes clear:¹⁰⁹

His [Euripides'] was a spirit that urgently desired to know the truth and he followed every available guide to knowledge and wisdom for a stage upon his¹¹⁰ journey. But he was never able to continue permanently in any one direction; in the restlessness and bewilderment of search and experiment he is the true son of his age.

His philosophical and sophistical leanings were sufficiently marked to make it impossible for him to accept any part of the belief or

¹⁰⁶ Otto Regenbogen, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Franz Dirlmeier (Munich 1961) 580. His statement that Nietzsche is never mentioned in *Psyche* is untrue: see *Psyche* II 200 n.4, with Albert Henrichs, *HSCP* 88 (1984) 227 n.48.

¹⁰⁷ Regenbogen (*supra* n.106) knows of the existence of the *Wahnsinnszettel*, which was first published by Hedwig Däubler, *NSt* 5 (1976) 340. That he never sent it to Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche proves its value to Rohde.

¹⁰⁸ Rohde to Förster-Nietzsche, 23 April 1897, edited at *NSt* 5 (1976) 352.

¹⁰⁹ *Psyche* 432f (=II 247f). For Nietzsche's view of Euripides, see Albert Henrichs, *supra* 369ff.

¹¹⁰ Willis has "their," which cannot be right.

tradition of his countrymen without trial . . . he instituted an un-sparing and unhesitating criticism of all accepted things, and in the process felt himself immeasurably superior to the wit and wisdom of the past. And yet he never satisfied himself. He could never rest content with a merely negative position, for all onesidedness was foreign to his nature. The tremendous honesty of his nature made it impossible for him to admit that element of frivolity which made the sophistic movement and the dialectical negation of all certainty so simple and attractive, and at the same time took away half its sting. But he could take nothing easily; and so with all his sophistic enlightenment he was never happy. The pupil of the Sophists would hear every other side as well; there were even moments when he longed to take refuge in the restful narrowness of old and traditional piety. But it was not given to him to settle down in any fixed set of opinions; all his convictions were provisional, mere hypotheses adopted for the purposes of experiment. Afloat on a changeful sea, he let himself be driven hither and thither by every wind of intellectual excitement or artistic necessity.

This is Rohde's epitaph for Friedrich Nietzsche. It is also the first time since the Hellenistic period that Euripides was applauded on his own terms. The use by Christian apologists of isolated sentiments as texts for homilies (the Euripides of Tennyson) is something quite apart.¹¹¹ Rohde's portrait of the vilified tragedian in *Psyche* is the turning-point in the modern rediscovery of Euripides. What since Aristophanes had been considered vices are first here considered virtues.

Thus, remarkably, the three warriors of 1872 reunite in 1894 with Euripides again at the center. Admittedly, Rohde used *Herakles* only grumpily.¹¹² He never reviewed it. But without Wilamowitz's achievement, Rohde could never have seen Euripides historically, a precondition of his conclusions. On the other hand, if Wilamowitz provided the bones, Rohde wrapped them in the flesh and blood of Nietzsche. His love and sorrow for his ruined friend caused Rohde to understand and admire an Athenian Nietzsche. Nietzsche—and here is the highest irony—who had sought to destroy Euripides with the weapons of Schlegel, provided the weapon that allowed the friend and defender (“Waffenbruder”) to redeem the destroyer of tragedy. The weapon was Nietzsche's own tragic destiny.

¹¹¹ For the Christian reception of Euripides see Hermann Funke, “Euripides,” *JbAnt Christ* 8/9 (1965/6) 233–79.

¹¹² He cites it for disagreement: e.g. II 259 n.1. His use of it for Euripides' treatment of traditional religion goes unacknowledged: see *Psyche* II 251f (almost Verrallian) and cf. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* II (Tübingen/Leipzig 1901) 233 n.1.

The next year (1895) the Viennese Jew and liberal, Theodor Gomperz,¹¹³ included Rohde's Euripides in his *Griechische Denker*.¹¹⁴ His indebtedness to *Psyche* is clear. Euripides was a liberal thinker who thought, not surprisingly, much like Gomperz. He doubted received religion. He questioned the blessing of children. He was impatient with an aristocracy of birth and, like Hobbes and Rousseau, in favor of the equality of mankind. Mommsen forty years before had condemned what he felt Euripides shared with Jews, anti-nationalism and subversion. Precisely this, the cosmopolitan and wrecker, Gomperz extolled. He first called Euripides "the poet of the enlightenment."¹¹⁵ It was the right phrase at the right time, and agreed beautifully with Rohde.

In 1901 appeared the expected work of an epigone, a monument of enlightened pedantry based on the work of Wilamowitz and intended to provide Rohde's Euripides with a philological foundation; it bore a provocative title, taken from Gomperz: Wilhelm Nestle's *Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung*.¹¹⁶ This book's pedigree is revealing. Nestle (1865–1959) took his doctorate at Tübingen in 1889 under Otto Crusius (1857–1918), the biographer of Rohde, with the dissertation *Untersuchungen über Dodona* (Tübingen 1889). Later with Crusius he edited Friedrich Nietzsche, *Philologica* III (Leipzig 1913). Crusius, with his interest in Greek religion, drew Nestle to *Psyche*, of which he prepared the posthumous edition (issued in 1910). Wilamowitz, who did not need such things, would have dismissed Nestle's Euripides book as a *Sammelarbeit*. With a pack of file-cards the schoolmaster Nestle dissected the preserved work of Euripides, collecting, classifying, and publishing sentiments under such labels as: the old faith; criticism of the old faith; criticism of particular myths; what Euripides thought divine; psychology; human life; the family; the state; the nobility; rich and poor; slaves; and, revealingly, cosmopolitanism ("Weltbürgertum"). From Nestle on, Euripides was a progressive. It was easier to accept his thesis than to read his book. With

¹¹³ For his biography see *supra* n.89 and my remarks at *Antiqua* 23, 153f with notes.

¹¹⁴ Theodor Gomperz, *Griechische Denker: Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* II⁴ (Berlin/Leipzig 1925) 8–15; for his use of *Psyche* cf. 522 nn.6f (=II¹ [Leipzig 1902] 534). Oddly he cites neither Rohde nor Wilamowitz's *Herakles* for Euripides.

¹¹⁵ Gomperz (*supra* n.114) 15: "der Dichter der Aufklärung." At II¹ 12 he writes: "ein Vertreter der Aufklärung."

¹¹⁶ Stuttgart 1901. For the life of Nestle see H. Hommel, "Wilhelm Nestle," *Karls-gymnasium Stuttgart* 12 (1965) 5–7. Because most of his life he was a schoolmaster, he has never received his due. Among his students were K. Schefold, H. Gundert, W. Steidle, and W. Hädicke. For a bibliography of his work see R. Nestle, *Bibliographie Wilhelm Nestle* (Stuttgart 1965).

Nestle's closing chapter (361–68), a eulogy of *Weltbürgertum* written in the epochal year 1900, the circle begun by Mommsen was closed. His book ends with a paean (368):

Euripides prophetically foresaw this spiritual empire of a Hellenistic period and in his own way he aided in attaining it. If Alexander with his weapons conquered the world for Greek culture, so Euripides was one of the greatest and most successful leaders in the battle of minds; and the thoughts expressed in his tragedies wandered to the most distant frontiers of the ancient world in East and West. His own time failed to recognize him; posterity has granted him his due. History has justified him. He too might have said of himself what the champion of ideal cosmopolitanism said 100 years ago:

‘For my ideal the century is not ripe.
I live a citizen of a century to come’.

Finally, in a masterly synthesis of Wilamowitz and Rohde, Eduard Meyer (1855–1930) in his universal history of antiquity presents an historical portrait of Euripides as revolutionary, “the great prophet of modern ideas”:¹¹⁷

No human being, not even one of the Sophists, did so much as Euripides to topple and annihilate the old way of thinking . . . so that within the brief span of a generation it sank into a distant past beyond recall; and he created a place for something new, for modern thought and culture.

The transformation is complete. We have Euripides fixed in stone, a creator of the modern mind.

A last word on Wilamowitz. At the end of his life—in the context of the history of religion, but influenced by Rohde and Meyer, his admired Berlin colleague—Wilamowitz wrote:¹¹⁸

Certainly it is corrupting for the morality of the nation to spread abroad orally and in writing views that negate all morality. But it is not the Sophists who bear the blame for the brutalizing of traditional feeling. Euripides portrayed a world without *aidos* and *nemesis*, because that is what he saw.

And it is what Wilamowitz, the only conservative who led the revival of Euripides, saw in the death-throes of the Weimar Republic—as far removed from January 18, 1871, the founding of the Second Reich in

¹¹⁷ Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* IV.1⁸: *Das Perserreich und die Griechen bis zum Vorabend des peloponnesischen Krieges*, ed. Hans Erich Stier (repr. Darmstadt 1980) 805. Otto Crusius read proofs of the first edition of this volume (Stuttgart 1901, p.xi).

¹¹⁸ *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II² 215.

the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, as is late Euripides “von des attischen Reiches Herrlichkeit.” The humiliation and decadence of Germany after World War I provided Wilamowitz with the key by which he could forgive what he had disapproved and therefore ignored in Euripides. Euripides was not a wrecker. He was an honest reporter.¹¹⁹

THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER
August, 1985

¹¹⁹ I am grateful for considerable improvement to Ernst Behler (Seattle) and Albert Henrichs (Harvard). Earlier versions of this paper were delivered at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Cincinnati on 29 December 1983, at the University of Washington in Seattle on 24 May 1984, as the fiftieth Hulley Lecture at the University of Colorado at Boulder on 7 March 1985, at the University of Milan on 8 May 1986, and at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign on 30 March 1987. [Addendum (June 1986): Professor Dr Klaus Heinrich (Freie Universität Berlin) suggests to me that in *Geburt* there is a self-identification of Nietzsche with Euripides. If this is the case, it makes Rohde's identification of Nietzsche with Euripides more easily explicable.]