

5-19-1972

Sophocles in the Age of Goethe: An Analysis of Sophoclean Influence in the Klassik-Romantik Era

Edward J. Vodoklys '72

College of the Holy Cross, evodokly@holycross.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://crossworks.holycross.edu/fenwick_scholar

 Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#), and the [German Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vodoklys, Edward J. '72, "Sophocles in the Age of Goethe: An Analysis of Sophoclean Influence in the Klassik-Romantik Era" (1972). *Fenwick Scholar Program*. 7.

http://crossworks.holycross.edu/fenwick_scholar/7

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Projects at CrossWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fenwick Scholar Program by an authorized administrator of CrossWorks.

SOPHOCLES
IN
THE AGE OF GOETHE:
AN ANALYSIS OF
SOPHOCLEAN INFLUENCE
IN THE KLASSIK-ROMANTIK ERA

Fenwick Scholar Project

Director: Thomas Kennedy, M.A.

May 19, 1972

Submitted by:

Edward J. Vodoklys, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Introduction	1
II. Chapter I	
I. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing	5
II. Life of Sophocles	14
III. Chapter 2	
I. Christoph Martin Wieland	70
IV. Chapter 3	
I. Friedrich Hölderlin	78
II. Hölderlin's Theory of Drama	92
III. Hölderlin's Anmerkungen	97
V. Conclusion	133
VI. Appendices	
I. Dates on Antigone	138
II. Comparison of Choralode in Oedipus Colonus (668 - 94)	139
VII. Footnotes	142
VIII. Bibliography	151

INTRODUCTION

Sophocles, the second great Athenian dramatist of the 5th century, has often been considered the master of dramatic technique, especially since Aristotle chose him as the paradigm of drama in his famous treatise, the Poetics. German interest in Sophocles in the 18th and 19th century stems from a renewed interest in Aristotle's work fostered by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in the mid 1700's. Lessing reinterprets Aristotle's dramatic guidelines and thus sparked a new concern for the spirit of Sophoclean tragedy which was not to abate in Germany even to the present day.

The purpose of my paper is to investigate the influence of Sophocles, the man, and the entire corpus of his plays within the developing trends of 18th and 19th century German literature. Two trends predominate during this period: the Apollonian ideal of "edle Einfach und stille Größe", espoused by Winckelmann and, to some degree, Lessing, and the Dionysiac stress on the irrational and subconscious forces in nature and Man, a trend which emerged in the Sturm und Drang era of the 1770's and was to come to full fruition in the Romantic era of the early 1800's. Friedrich Hölderlin was the first German literateur to apply the latter trend consciously to his native composition while drawing from classical forms.

The value of Sophocles in the Klassik-Romantik era of German literature is evident in his appeal to exponents of both of these conflicting trends. I had originally intended to in-

investigate the influence of Sophocles upon a wide spectrum of writers in the Age of Goethe, but found it necessary to limit myself to a detailed investigation of Lessing and Hölderlin, the two precursors of the Klassik and the Romantik eras respectively. My research was conducted on two levels: Sophocles' influence upon the personal and literary achievements and lives; and their direct observations and criticism of Sophocles' own plays. although much of this influence is evident only by inference and passing remarks, Sophocles emerges as a true model of excellence in this age of German achievement.

I have found that an analysis of such influences as Sophocles' can only be properly appreciated by a study of the philosophy of the age, as well as the literary, philosophic and Aesthetic inclinations of the authors themselves. This need for background led me to an investigation of such contemporaries as Christoph Martin Wieland, Goethe, Schiller, Friedrich and August Wilhelm Schlegel, Hegel and Nietzsche. It was my intent to develop papers on the Sophoclean influence in each of these men's literary careers but time has prevented me from attaining this goal (except for Wieland). If I may be granted the opportunity, I will briefly summarize my cursory impressions of Goethe's and Schiller's estimation of Sophocles.

Goethe, the driving force behind the German Klassik era, considered Sophocles a model par excellence, a writer on the level of Homer, who, Goethe considered the greatest of all Greek literary geniuses. Goethe was very involved in the development

of the German National Theater at Weimar, the cultural center of Germany, and attempted to introduce a new dramatic awareness on the German stage which would combine classical elements of form and profound meaning. In his search for a model of this synthesis, Goethe turned to Aristotle and Sophocles for inspiration and imitation. Goethe's exposure to Sophocles' plays seems to have been very indirect. William Keller, in his article "Goethe's estimate of the Greek and Latin writers as revealed in his letters, works, diaries and conversations" (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1916), feels that Goethe's interest in Sophocles was the result of his examination of translations by Voss and Rochlitz, two contemporary dramatists and translators. Goethe did, however, gain deep insights into the art and spirit of tragedy from the works of Sophocles.

Friedrich Schiller, the other major contributor to the rise of German classicism, was far more akin to Sophocles in his choice of genre than was Goethe. Schiller was truly the dramatist laureate of the age. His famous essays, "Über die Naive und Sentimentalische Dichtung" and "Über den Gebrauch des Chores", a prefatory essay to his classical play Die Braut von Messina, were profound reflections upon the art of tragedy which Schiller brilliantly employed in his historical dramas. Goethe and Schiller both made conscious efforts to recreate the synthesis of form and meaning found in Sophocles in their own work. They achieved this goal by following primarily the spirit and secondarily the form of ancient tragedy. This success

may be a result of two important factors. First, Lessing had freed German drama from the French misinterpretation of Aristotle, an event which allowed the German creative spirit to seek its own level of achievement. The second reason, of course, is the native creative spirit so masterfully cultivated by these two men.

Goethe, Schiller and all the other literary masters of Germany agreed that Sophocles' most important asset was his ability to achieve the goal of all art: perfect harmony of all aspects of life. Harmony, for Sophocles, was a natural consequence, not a contrived tool of his dramatic technique. It arose out of a confrontation of different and often diametrically opposed forces in man, in nature and in the cosmos. Harmony did not mean ordered formalism for Sophocles. It was the goal of his human creativity. Thus, the German literateurs of the 18th and 19th century turned to Sophocles for inspiration and guidance in their efforts to give birth to a new age of human creativity in their own work. My hope is that I can find sufficient evidence to show a close relationship between the works and personality of Sophocles and the strivings and achievements of the German Klassik-Romantic era.

GOTTHOLD LESSING (1713-1779)

Gotthold Lessing, a major exponent of the Enlightenment in mid 18th century in Germany, was one of the most significant contributors to the rise of German Classicism. Guided by his religious and ethical principles of tolerance, as brilliantly expounded in his Nathan der Weise (1766), Lessing attacked the stultifying formalism of the 17th century French Classical Period and especially Freidrich Gottsched, the prime defender of French formalism in Germany. Lessing used his own literary magazine Die Hamburgische Dramaturgie to present the educational public of Germany with his own interpretation of Aristotle's Poetics. Lessing repudiated the claim of Gottsched that form was the primary concern of the dramatist; especially with reference to the three unities of time, place and action. He held that a work could only be judged by the reaction of the public. This stance was far more subjective, but also far more rewarding and broad-minded. It allowed Aeschylus and Euripides to be considered on their own merits and not as inferiors to Sophocles whom Aristotle had considered the epitome of Greek tragedy.

Lessing did not attempt to translate Sophocles, as did Helderlin a half century later, or to use him as a weapon of satire, as did Wieland, or a model, as did Schiller. He approached his study of Sophocles from two perspectives: as a literary critic with an aesthetic inclination and as an historian who sought to clarify the truth behind the myths of Sophocles the man, as developed in the Vita.

First, I will treat Lessing's literary interpretation of

Sophocles as a tragic poet. Lessing's famous treatise, Laokoon (1774), which was based on a famous forged antique statue of the Trojan Priest of Minerva in Virgil's Aeneid, was an attempt to investigate Winckelmann's famous dictum about Greek art - "edle Einfalt und stille Grösse."² Lessing compares the suffering of the figure of Laokoon to the excruciating pain of Sophocles' tragic character, Philoktetes.

... wie des Sophokles Philoktetes; sein Elend gehet uns bis an die Seele; aber wir wünschen, wie dieser grosse Mann, das Elend, ertragen zu können."]

Lessing, as most other German critics, was looking for a vehicle for genuine expression of feeling. He wanted to implement the enlightened principles of freedom of expression, freedom of the individual and tolerance and understanding for others in German drama. Lessing goes on to say in this section of Laokoon that the expression of such a great soul as Philoktetes or Laokoon even in suffering goes beyond the image of the beautiful. The power of the individual lies in his dual ability to relate to nature and to transcend its limitations. The poet must feel the strength of this spirit in himself as he recreates it in his character of stone or drama.

Lessing had a peculiar fascination for the depiction of pain among the ancients. He wrote an article "Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet"⁴ which contains a beautiful description of death and sleep as twin brothers or aspects of the same state of eternal tranquility. In the early part of the Laokoon, Lessing also treats the suffering of death in Sophocles' two plays Philoktetes and the Trachinian Women which deals with the death of Heracles.

As a preliminary task to understanding properly what Sophocles achieved in these plays, Lessing had to settle in his mind the qualities to be attached to the concept of tragedy. For assistance he turned to Aristotle's Poetics

Aristotle's Poetics Ch. XIII 2,3, 6 Perfect tragedy should, as we have seen, be arranged not on the simple but on the complex plan. It should, moreover, imitate actions which excite pity and fear, this being the distinctive work of tragic imitation. It follows plainly in the first place that the change of fortune presented must not be the spectacle of a virtuous man from prosperity to ruin: for this moves neither pity nor fear; it merely shocks us, nor again, that a bad man passing from adversity to prosperity, for nothing can be more alien to the spirit of tragedy; it possesses no single tragic quality, it neither satisfies the moral sense nor calls forth pity or fear. Nor again, should the downfall of the utter villain be exhibited. A plot of this kind would doubtless, satisfy the moral sense but it would inspire neither pity nor fear; for pity is aroused by unmerited misfortune, fear by the misfortune of a man like ourselves. Such an event, therefore, will be neither pitiful nor terrible. There remains then the character between these two extremes - that of a man who is not eminently good and just, yet whose misfortune is brought about not by vice or depravity, but by some error or frailty. He must be one who is highly renowned and prosperous - a personage like Oedipus, Orestes or other illustrious men of rich families (Aristotle's Poetics edited by Francis Ferguson) 5

Lessing accepted Aristotle's view that the purpose of tragedy is fulfilled through an arousal which would serve as a catalyst and cathartic to the emotions of the audience. He did so with reservations, however.

Lessing develops his own ideas on the subject in an exchange of letters with Friedrich Nicolai (1733 - 1811)⁶ his good friend and fellow critic, who began the exchange:

"Ich habe nur die Lehre von Trauerspiel von einer neuen Seite betrachten wollen, und also gedacht nichts in die Abhandlung zu bringen als was gewissermaßen neu ist. Hauptsächlich habe ich den Satz zu widerlegen

gesucht, den nachdem Aristoteles so oft nachgesprochen hat: es sei der Zweck des Trauerspiels die Leidenschaften zu reinigen oder die Sitte zu bilden. Er ist, wo nicht falsch, doch wenigstens nicht allgemein, und Schuld daran, daß viele deutsche Trauerspiele so schlecht sind. Ich setze also den Zweck des Trauerspiels in die Erregung der Leidenschaften und sage: das beste Trauerspiel ist das, welches die Leidenschaften am heftigsten erregt, nicht das, welches geschickt ist, die Leidenschaften zu reinigen." 7

Nicolai obviously takes a more mundane approach to tragic drama than does Aristotle. The purpose of tragedy is not as esoteric as a purgation of existing emotions or as noble as proper formation of morals; it is simply the strong arousal of these emotions which occur in everyday life. The value of tragic drama lies in its ability to depict life in as "true" or "natural" a state as possible, while elevating it to a high level of emotional intensity and abstract reflection.

Following Aristotle's outline, Nicolai further develops the concept of arousal of emotions in the light of dramatic action, one of the three unities. He considers action a crucial instrument for exciting the proper emotion at the right time. Three essential qualities of dramatic action which are necessary for arousal are "Grösse, die Fortdauer und die Einfalt". Nicolai, in his epistle to Lessing elaborates further on these three aspects of action. First, he says, actions are great and tragic not because they are performed by great people, but because they arouse deep emotion; secondly, dramatic action has "Fortdauer" (continuity) if it is not interrupted by another action; and finally, it possesses simplicity if it is never complicated by incidental actions which divert the attention of the audience.⁸ The unity of action, as described in continuity and simplicity by Nicolai, is a quality pertaining to the whole drama.

Otherwise, emotions will be aroused but never sustained long enough to achieve the desired effect.

Nicolai also categorizes different tragedies according to their action and the emotions they evoke in the same way as Aristotle. First, there is the "rührende" or "moving" tragedy which excites the audience with fright and compassion, "Schrecken und Mitleid". Next is the "heroische" drama in which fright and compassion help to evoke admiration. The third or "mixed" type of tragedy occurs when admiration, fright and compassion are of equal importance. A fourth type of tragedy is one in which admiration is aroused without the help of the usual fright or compassion. Nicolai observes that this type of tragedy is not practical because the hero "im Unglück, die größte Bewunderung, aber auch zugleich Mitleiden erregt." ⁹ Nicolai seems to have been rather indifferent to the moral and pedagogical aspects of tragedy which Aristotle recognized. He attributes the downfall of the tragic hero to a "mistake" which he commits as a result of frailty. This results in a conflict between the hero's desires and the objective order which cannot be reconciled. Thus, regarding Oedipus:

so ist z.B. in des Sophokles Oedipus der Fehler des Oedipus nicht der Mord des Laios, welcher außer Handlung ist, sondern die Neugier, aus welcher die Auflösung fließt. ¹⁰

Nicolai feels that, within the limits of the play's action, the tragedy of Oedipus arises out of his curiosity - his longing for self-identity. For Nicolai it is this unfortunate emotional urge and not the guilt incurred from the murder of his father which supplies the impetus for the Oedipus's eventual tragedy. Thus, the moral and pedagogical elements of the tragedy are diffused and

found to be extrinsic to the basic makeup of the tragedy.

Lessing replies to Nicolai in a letter, dated November 1756. He observes that Nicolai's analysis of tragedy is "very pleasant", but unfortunately based upon insufficient premises. Lessing accepts the arousal of emotion as a primary premise of tragedy. Lessing, however, is concerned with the quality of the emotions evoked as well as with their intensity. He subordinates the role of emotion to that of an instrument for attaining the goal of moral edification - "daß das Trauerspiel durch Erzeugung der Leidenschaften bessern kann".¹¹

Lessing next analyses the particular emotion by means of which Nicolai distinguishes the various types of tragedy. Lessing says that he considers compassion - Mitleid - as the sole and basic emotion evoked in the audience by true tragedy. Schrecken and Bewunderung - fright and admiration are not independent emotions according to Lessing but remain subordinated to the all-important evocation of pity. Fright is merely the sudden excitement of pity with or without knowledge of the object to which it is directed. Lessing cites as an example of the emotion the speech of the priest, Tiresias, in the Oedipus Tyrannus, who exclaims: "Du Oedip bist der Mörder des Laius! Ich erschrecke, denn auf einmahl sehe ich den rechtschaften Oedip unglücklich; mein Mitleid wird auf einmahl rege."¹² He next analyses the emotion of wonder as "das entbehrlich gewordene Mitleiden" pity rendered superfluous. Elicitation of wonder occurs when the hero is unlucky but has proudly risen so far above his misfortune that it loses its frightful aspects. Lessing uses Oedipus as the prime model of this

tragic character. His pride and determination evoke feelings of envy rather than pity.

In summing up the emotional release caused by pity "Mitleid", Lessing says:

"Die Bestimmung der Tragödie ist diese: sie soll unsere Fähigkeit, Mitleid zu fühlen, erweitern. Sie soll uns nicht bloß lehren, gegen diesen oder jenen Unglücklichen Mitleid zu fühlen, sondern sie soll uns so weit fühlbar machen, daß uns der Unglückliche zu allen Zeiten, und unter allen Gestalten, rühren und für sich einnehmen muß... Der mitleidigste Mensch ist der beste Mensch zu allen gesellschaftlichen Tugenden, zu allen Arten der Großmut der aufgelegtesten." 13

The tragic figure and the whole dramatic situation of a tragedy arouse pity in us and thereby make us better and more sensitive people. The question arises concerning the origin of this self-improving pity. What causes this effect of tragedy? In a letter to Moses Mendelssohn on 28 Nov. 1756, he writes:

"Es muß eine gute Eigenschaft sein, deren ich den Menschen überhaupt, und also auch mich, fähig halte. Und diese Eigenschaft schließe ich so wenig aus dem Trauerspiele aus, daß vielmehr, nach meiner Meinung, gar, kein Trauerspiel ohne sie besteht, weil man ohne sie kein Mitleid erregen kann. Ich will nur diejenigen großen Eigenschaften ausgeschlossen haben, die wir unter dem allgemeinen Rahmen des Heroismus begreifen können, weil jede derselben mit Unempfindlichkeit verbunden ist, und Unempfindlichkeit in dem Gegenstande des Mitleid, mein Mitleiden schwächt." 14

Lessing makes a surprising observation about tragic heroes here. The tragic hero is not a triumphant man, but a pathetic figure. True heroism for Lessing is success in the face of all odds which would be an obstacle to the excitement of pity, the ultimate purpose of a tragedy. In the letter to Nicolai cited above, Lessing says that a tragic "hero" must not view his righteousness in peace and tranquility like a god; he must suffer and make the audience feel

as though it suffers with him. A person who suffers catastrophes, as loss of an ideal, (e.g. Antigone), cannot be considered heroic in the normal sense according to Lessing. He feels that Sophocles and Euripides stripped Oedipus and Alcestes, their respective tragic figures, of all heroism in order to insure the effect of pity. Oedipus laments like a woman and Alcestes complains like one. Lessing reinterprets a tragic hero, then, as one who stands up for his ideal with a great display of human emotion and considerable indcision, eventually succumbing to his opposition.

Lessing waited almost six months to finish his analysis of Nicolai's vies on tragedy. Finally on 2 April 1757, he gives Nicolai his own interpretation of the real meaning of pity and fear.

"Aristotle erklärt durch die Unlust über ein hervorstehendes Übel uns sagt alles dasjenige erwecke in uns Furcht, was, wenn wir es an andern sehen, Mitleiden erwecke, und alles dasjenige erwecke Mitleiden, was, wenn es uns selbst bevorstehe, Furcht erwecken müsse. Aristotles würde bloß gesagt haben: Das Trauerspiel soll unsre Leidenschaften durch das Mitleiden reinigen, wenn er nicht zugleich auch das Mittel hätte angeben wollen." 15

Aristotle sees a means of arousing and purifying pity in fear. Lessing differs with this interpretation in that he feels pity purifies our emotions without relying upon fear as a separate emotion. Pity itself effects the release of the emotions. Fear is viewed as an aspect of pity.

The last point Lessing makes in this letter concerns character. Nicolai claimed that refinement of emotions was impossible without resort to moralizing and character analysis. Lessing says that tragedy could evoke pity and even fear without these two elements. The audience's resultant fear is a natural consequence of proper

dramatic action, i.e. the misfortune of the hero because of his emotions. Lessing does not allow Nicolai's assumption that: if emotions force a person into misfortune, he must have character. Emotion is not a sufficient impetus for the creation of character. Something else must be present in the person, i.e. the support of an ideal which is somehow connected to the welfare of all humanity. Lessing concretizes his interpretation of character in the example of Oedipus and Creon:

"Sie sagen nicht allzu richtig, daß der Charakter des Oedipus, in dem Trauerspiele dieses Namens von Sophocles, der einzige sei. Auch Creon hat einen Charakter, und zwar einen mehr edeln. Den Fehler des Oedipus suche ich auch nicht in seiner Heftigkeit und Neugierde, sondern ich habe hierin meine eigenen Gedanken, die ich Ihnen ein andermal melden kann, wenn Sie mich wieder daran erinnern wollen". 16

Lessing feels that Creon and Oedipus have character because they are searching for fulfillment of an ideal; self-knowledge for Oedipus; power for Creon.

I have been unable to find any further details in Lessing's letters concerning his view of Oedipus' mistake, which would be most enlightening for the sake of comparison with the views of other German critics.¹⁷

With the theoretical foundation of tragedy and the concept of the tragic hero fairly clear in his mind, Lessing began to apply these ideas to various dramatic pieces from all different countries. As previously mentioned, Lessing used the periodical, Die Hamburgische Dramaturgie to criticize the plays. Although Sophocles' particular dramas are not analyzed per se, they are used as sources for comparison with the modern plays.

Lessing's first major reference in the Hamburgische Dramaturgie to Sophocles and his works appears in the 31st articles dated 14 August 1767. Lessing's prime interest here is the character of Cleopatra in Corneille's play by that name. She is described as follows:

"Ihre stolzen Gesinnungen, ihr unbändiger Trieb nach Ehre und Unabhängigkeit, lassen sie uns als eine große, erhabne Seele betrachten, die alle unsere Bewunderung verdient. Aber ihre tückischer Groll; ihre hämische Rachsucht gegen eine Person,... ihre Leichtsinns... machen sie uns wiederum so klein, daß wir sie nicht genug verachten zu können glauben. Endlich muß diese Verachtung nothwendig jene Bewunderung aufzehren. 18

The characterization of Cleopatra is fully developed in the play according to Lessing's interpretation, but to such a degree that the favorable attitudes evoked in the audience are negated by her equally forceful vices. Lessing mockingly suggests several scenes which might be added to the text to give the intrigue more depth and direction.¹⁹ Lessing attacks Corneille for his formal conservatism which is so ballanced that the dynamics of the play are lost to the audience. He concludes:

"Ich weiß nicht, ob es viel Mühe kostet, dergleichen Erdichtungen zu machen; ich habe es nie versucht, ich möchte es auch schwerlich jemals versuchen. Aber das weiß ich, daß es einem sehr sauer wird, dergleichen Erdichtungen zu verdauern. 20

Lessing views Corneille as a master of form but like all classical French dramatists, he has no sense of direction in his work. He was too involved with imitation of form to really infuse it with inspiration. Pure imitation is not a difficult poetic process but sustaining the quality of the poetic form is a very tenuous proposition. Lessing compares the imitation and assimilation of

mores of expression to the digestive process. The poetry of the past must become an organic part of the dramatic poet. He should then be able to draw on this nourishment to create his own vital poetry. Corneille was able to accomplish this process of assimilation in the area of form but failed in conveying genuine meaning.

Lessing quotes Corneille's own reflections on this process of poetry which is important for his views on the Electra of Sophocles and Euripides.

"Veilleicht dürfte man zweifeln, ob sich die Freiheit der Poetic, so weit erwecket, daß sie unter bekannten Namen eine ganze Geschichte erdenken darf; so wie ich es hier gemacht habe, wo nach der Erzählung im ersten Akte, welche die Grundlage des Folgenden ist, bis zu den Wirkungen im fünften, nicht das geringste vorkommt, welches einigen historischen Grund hätte. Doch mich dünkt, wenn wir nur das Resultat einer Geschichte beibehalten, so sind alle vorläufige Umstände, alle Einleitungen zu diesem Resultate in unsere Gewalt. Wenigstens müßte ich mich keinen Regel da wider zu erinnern, und die Ausübung der alten ist völlig auf meiner Seite. Denn man vergleiche nur einmal die Elektra des Sophokles mit der Elektra des Euripides, und sehe, ob sie mehr mit einander gemein haben als das bloße Resultat, die letzten Wirkungen in dem Begegnissen ihra Heldin zu welchen, jeder auf einem besondern Wege durch ihm eigentümliche Mittel gelanget, so daß wenigstens eine davon notwendig ganze und gar die Erfindung ihres Verfassers sein muß.²¹

Corneille strove to divorce his plot from the traditional plot. This independence serves to insure the full development of his characterization. He cites the different plots of Euripides' and Sophocles' Electra to validate his claim that genuine tragedy need not be shackled by historical limitations. Each used his own peculiar style to achieve the desired dramatic effect. Sophocles created a conflict between Clytemnestra and Electra which was solved by Orestes! Euripides stressed the lowliness of Electra's spirit in its subordination to Clytemnestra. Both

however, achieved the desired effect: the elaboration of Electra's character in the context of her ideal love for Orestes and her father. Corneille, however, was hampered by his failure to infuse his own insights into the play to insure its vitality.

Lessing admits that all three dramatists have the poetic license to adjust circumstances to attain the most complete explication of the meaning incorporated in the form. Lessing devotes the entire next article in the Hambürgische Dramaturge (18 August 1769) to the examination of this theory by drawing upon examples from the history of drama from Thespis to Corneille. Each poet, relying on his feeling for the dramatic effect, must adapt certain details of a general plot to his theme. The Greek tragedians were in a unique position. Their audience was well-versed in the basic myths of Greek literature and were willing and able to accept and interpret any valid shift in plot which was introduced to facilitate the discovery of some new insight or the arousal of a new feeling.

Lessing feels that the French dramatists were far too concerned with the formal unity of action. This overemphasis robbed their dramas of a freshness and vitality which is the characteristic of the Greek theater. Time and place were also considerable obstacles to creative drama in France. The French misinterpreted Aristotle's concept of time and place. They were both considered as obsolete. A drama had to be centered in one central area or setting and last for only a day. Such limitations were frequent in Greek drama but were employed for a definite symbolic purpose. The progression of the play often followed the temporal passage

of an entire day from early dawn to evening. The peripeteteia of dramatic action would often come at midday when the sun shifted from waxing to waning position.²² Such symbolic form was not an absolute tenet for the Greeks. Variety was often used especially in the unity of place (e.g. in the Ajax). The French, however, lost sight of the meaning behind such forms. 17.

In an effort to collate the elements of dramatic action and characterization into a cohesive whole, Lessing returned to Aristotle's discussion of peripetēia, the dramatic turning point. It is at this very point in the drama that action, characterization and emotional evocation coalesce to shift the direction of the whole play. Lessing illustrates the flexibility of the peripeteia's position in the drama with two classical examples, Orestes and Oedipus:

"Der Glückswechsel kann sich mitten in dem Stücke erkaugen, und wenn er schon bis an das Ende fort dauert, so macht er doch nicht selbst das Ende: so ist z.E. der Glückswechsel in Oedipus, der sich bereits zum Schlusse des vierten Akts zugetragen, zu dem aber noch mancherlei Leiden (~~von~~) hinzukommen, mit welchen sich eigentlich das Stück schliesst. Gleichfalls kann das Leiden mitten in dem Stücke zur Vollziehung gelangen sollen, und in dem nehmlichen Augenblicke durch die Erkennung hintertrieben werden, so daß durch diese Erkennung das Stück nichts weniger als gefundet ist wie in der zweiten Iphigenia des Euripides, wie Orestes, auch schon in dem vierten Akte, von seiner Schwester die ihn aufzuopfern im Begriffe ist, erkannt wird. 23

Lessing feels that ancient tragedies were masters at fusing tragic reversal of fortune with the portrayal of suffering. They were not restricted by rigid rules as to the position of the peripeteia. The reversal should merely arise at the most natural point in the plot when the audience is psychologically prepared (or better still, - unprepared) for a deep emotional shock. This

shock should take the form of fear in agreement with Aristotle¹⁸. and encompasses the uncertainty of the audience's situation as well as that of the tragic character. This intimacy between the characters and the audience serves as a catalyst for the moral edification of the viewers. They should learn from the mistakes and suffering of the dramatic figure how to withstand misfortune nobly, if not to avoid its causes totally.

The fear of the audience is conditioned by the depth and validity of their pity for the tragic figure. Lessing attempts to clarify the true meaning and diversity of pity by citing Moses Mendelssohn's views:

"Das Mitleid ist eine vermischte Empfindung die aus der Liebe zu einem Gegenstande und aus der Unlust über dessen Unglück zusammengesetzt ist. Die Bewegungen, durch welche sich das Mitleid zu erkennen gibt, sind von den einfachen Symptomen der Liebe, sowohl - als der Unlust, unterschieden, denn das Mitleid ist eine Erscheinung. Aber wie vielerlei kann diese Erscheinung werden! Man Andre nur in dem betraurten Unglück die einzige Bestimmung der Zeit: so wird sich das Mitleiden durch ganze andere Kennzeichen zu erkennen seben. Mit der Elektra, die über die Urne ihres Bruders weinet, empfinden wir ein mitleidiges Trauern, denn sie hält das Unglück für geschehen, und bejammert ihren gehalten Verlust. Was wir bei den Schmerzen des Philoktets fühlen, ist gleichfales Mitleiden, aber von einer etwas andern Natur; denn die Quaal, die dieser Tugendhafte auszustehen hat, ist gegenwärtig, und überfällt ihn vor unsern Augen. Wenn aber Oedip sich entwickelt... was empfinden wir da? Immer noch Mitleiden! Aber mitleidige Entsetzten, mitleidige Furcht, mitleidiges Schrecken. 24

Mendelssohn views compassion as a phenomenon which is concretized in various ways. It can even manifest itself in polar opposites of love and hate without losing the essential quality of pity. Time is a definite factor in molding the particular way in which pity is evoked. The Germans seem to be preoccupied with the conditional effect of time in drama. The late 18th and early

19th century philosophers, Hegel and Schelling, as well as Hölderlin, felt that time played an important role in the development of dramatic plots and effects.²⁵ Mendelssohn analyzes the temporal conditionality in his examples of Greek tragedy.

Electra arouses the audience's pity because of the hopelessness of her situation resulting from an event which has already taken place in the past. Ismene, her sister, reports that Orestes, their brother must be dead because she saw a lock of his hair on the tomb of Agamemnon, their father. This news shatters all Electra's hopes for proper vengeance against her mother. Orestes appears with news of his own death and an urn supposedly containing his ashes. Sophocles creates one of the most moving scenes in all of Greek literature in Electra's lament over this urn. Electra's mourning, however, is soon discovered to be unfounded for Orestes reveals himself and fulfills Electra's wish for vengeance. Mendelssohn observes that the compassionate mourning aroused in the audience is truly sincere. Electra may have been deceived by circumstances, but her loss is psychologically real. Sophocles, under the aegis of poetic license, manipulates the circumstances to insure valid emotional response from his characters and audience. Deception is all too frequently a part of reality and plays a significant role in the emotional state of a person.

Mendelssohn next refers to the pity aroused by Philoktetes. Here pity is aroused as the result of ongoing pain. The excruciating torment caused by his festering sore causes Philoktetes to

demonstrate his anguish on stage, - a rarity in ancient Greek theater.²⁶ The immanence and overtness of this emotion compels the audience to be far more receptive to Philoktetes' adherence to his ideal: total commitment to friend and hatred for enemies. Lessing sees this portrayal and arousal of emotion as the most perfect syntheses of emotion and action, the goal of all drama.

Oedipus also arouses pity in his audience but through the ancillary medium of fright and dread. As he unravels the secret of his true self-identity, Oedipus becomes more and more fearful of any new development that might arise. Consequently, the audience is caught up in the dramatic revelation in the play and reacts with successive degrees of shock.

Lessing makes an interesting comparison between the Greeks and the Germans as regards their emotional involvement with the stage:

"Es ist bekannt, wie erpicht das Griechische und Römische Volk auf die Schauspiele waren; besonders jenes, auf das tragische. Wie gleichgültig, wie kalt ist dagegen unser Volk für das Theater! Woher diese Verschiedenheit, wenn sie nicht daker kömmt, daß die Griechen vor ihrer Bühne sich mit so starkem, so außerordentlichen Empfindungen begeistert fühlten, daß sie den Augenblick nicht erwarten konnten, sie abermals und abermals zu haben; dahingegen wir uns vor unserer Bühne so schwacher Eindrücke bewußt sind, daß wir es selten der Zeit und des Geldes wert halten, sie uns zu verschaffen? Wir gehen, fast alle, fast immer, aus Neugierde, aus Mode, aus Langerweile, aus Gesellschaft, aus Begierde zu begossen und begast zu werden, ins Theater: und nur wenige, und diese wenige nur sparsam, aus anderer Absicht.²⁷

The very tone of this passage suggests Lessing's disdain for the theatrical culture of the Germans. Lessing was apparently attacking the same Philistinism and disinterestedness which Wieland criticizes in his novel die Abderiten. While the Greeks

concentrated on tragedy (presumably for moral enlightenment) and the Romans dealt more with the genre of comedy which was light-hearted but often moralistic in tone. Germany was altogether lacking a recognizable National theater of any kind.

Lessing openly admits the Germans lack genuine drama and ethnic color in their theatrical pieces. He places blame on the unquestioning German acceptance and imitation of French Theater for well over a century. He claims that the French have no tragedy and what they consider to be tragedy is flat and formalistic drama. To support his view, Lessing quotes Voltaire who contends that French drama does not make a sufficient enough emotional impression to be called "classical" tragedy.²⁸ The French dramas evoke tenderness where there should be compassion; astonishment, when there should be fright; in short, the feelings of the French lack sufficient depth.

Voltaire maintains that the frigidity of the French stage stems from two sources: the spirit of petty gallantry and the pitious physical conditions of the French stage and its accoutrements. Lessing dismisses these excuses with varying degrees of severity. First, he states, gallantry is always cold and unsuitable for tragedy. Secondly, the shabby condition of the French theater houses should not be an excuse. Shakespeare accomplished far more dramatically with far less theatrical embellishment. Lessing cites the Greek theater as further proof of this point. He believes that the Greeks did not use elaborate scene decorations. The degree of prop-use in the Greek theater is a matter for debate. Some critics opt for the impressionistic stage,²⁹ others for the more elaborate, realistic stage in Greek drama.

Aristotle, himself, says that the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles need not even be staged, but merely recited to achieve its total effect.

Lessing continues attack on French tragedy as a poor imitation of the Greeks in the next article of the Hambürgrische Dramaturgie on 9 Feb. 1758. After preliminary assertions of his enlightened beliefs that Nature has endowed all men with the full array of emotions without any monopoly on the part of any nationality, Lessing attacks both the French and Gottsched, their major devotee in Germany, for their Eitelkeit, their false pride. Gottsched believed himself to be a first-rate poet. This belief was bolstered by the opinions of his pedantic colleagues. His false pride, however, Lessing maintains, prevented him from developing into a true poet and not merely a writer of verse.

The French, as a whole, suffered the same illusion as did Gottsched. Lessing quotes Racine's misinterpretation of Aristotle's Poetics to prove the failure of the French to accept the true meaning of tragedy in humility and openness:

"Notre Tragedie peut réussir assez dans la premiere partie, c'est a dire, qu'elle peut, exciter et purger la terreur et la compassion. Mais elle parvient rarement a la dernière, qui est pour tant la plus utile, elle purge peu les autres passions, ou comme elle roule ordinairement sur des intrigues d'amour, si elle en purgeoit quelqu'une, ce seroit celle-la seule, et par la il est aise de voir qu'elle se fait que peu de fruit". 30

The French dramas are more concerned with romantic intrigue than the arousal and purgation of pity and fear. Many secondary emotions may be stimulated by the clever portrayal of human action but never hit upon the essentials of pity and fear. Lessing strictly adheres to these emotions as the fundamental means of

tragedy to achieve an ultimate goal of moral edification.

Lessing found these basic human feelings in two cultures of the past, the Golden Age of Pericles in 5th Century in Athens and the Elizabethan period of 16th century England:

"Ich kenne keines (French play), welches mein
 Mitleid in dem Grade erregte in welchem die
 Tragödie es erregen sollte, in welchem ich, aus
 verschiedenen griechischen und englischen Stücken
 gewiß weiß, daß sie es erregen kann. Verschiedene
 französische Tragödien sind sehr feine, sehr
 unterrichtende Werke, die ich allen Lobes wert halte;
 nur daß es keine Tragödien sind. Die Verfasser
 derselben konnten nicht anders, als sehr gute Köpfe
 sein; sie verdienen, zum Teile, unter den Dichtern
 keinen geringen Rang; nur daß sie keine tragische
 Dichter sind; nur daß ihr Corneille und Racine, ihr
 Crebillon und Voltaire von dem wenig oder gar nicht
 haben, was den Sophokles zum Sophokles, den Euripides zum
 Euripides, den Shakespear zum Shakespear macht. Diese
 sind selten mit den wesentlichen Forderungen, des
 Aristoteles im Widerspruch; aber je desto öfterer." 31

Lessing fits into the beginning of a general pattern in
 18th century German Literature. The spirit of unbiased examina-
 tion, analysis and categorization which was characteristic of
 the best minds of the Enlightenment is to be found in Lessing.
 He would often have to crack a facade which had been fossilized
 in tradition to comprehend the full meaning of a play. Lessing
 was not primarily concerned with interpreting a work in the
 light of his own time as was Hölderlin, a generation later.
 Lessing wanted to lay the foundation for interpretation by
 ascertaining the timeless validity of the play itself. As the
 above quote indicates, Lessing found Sophocles, Euripides and
 Shakespeare to be genuine. They were guided by the spirit of
 tragedy, not a narrow interpretation of its structure and form.
 These playwrights were found to be in agreement with the essential

spirit of Aristotle's Poetics. Already Lessing felt the French had misinterpreted by overemphasizing Aristotle's formal observations.

The spirit of tragedy may be described as truth or faithfulness to the total human condition in all its complexity. Lessing in the 94th article, March 25, 1769,³² translates Horace's views on truth in poetry. Truth, he says, is found in Poetry as an expression which concurs with the general nature of things. Horace recommends an investigation of Socratic philosophy and the development of an exact knowledge of human life to achieve the truth of dramatic poetry. Lessing developed his own aesthetic search for truth in his study of drama. Influenced by Winckelmann's dictum of noble simplicity and simple grandeur, Lessing attempted to synthesize the idealization of a moment as captured in the plastic arts with the human elements of the dramatic art. He turned to Cicero and his Orators for advice on how to accomplish this:

"Nec enim Phidias, cum faceret Jovis formam aut Minervae, contemplantur aliquem e quo similitudinem duceret; sed ipsius in mente insidebat species pulchritudinis eximia quaedam, quam intuens in eaque defixus ad illius similitudinem artem et magnum dirigebat."³³

The true tragic poet should be able to abstract from the essence of a character every idiosyncrasy which sets him apart from the masses. This abstraction should be elevated, according to Lessing to the level of the "göttlichen Urbild" to insure its immediate imitation of the truth of reality. Lessing relates this reflection to the famous comparison of Sophocles and Euripides:

Ἰσοπλῆς ἔσθ', αὐτὸς μὲν ὁλοῦς ὅσι καὶ ἐσθλῶ,
 Εὐπλοῦν δὲ ὁλοῦ ἔσθ'.

Lessing interprets this in a way which is consistent with the view that Sophocles was not primarily concerned in individual characterization but in characterization only as a manifestation of some general human ideal or characteristic.

"Sophocles hatte, durch seinen ausgebreiteten Umgang mit Menschen, die eingeschränkte enge Vorstellung, welche aus der Betrachtung, einzelner Charakter entsteht, in einen vollständigen Begriff des Geschlechts erweitert; der philosophische Euripides hingegen, der seine Meiste Zeit in der Akademie zugebracht hatte, und von da aus das Leben überschauen wollte, hielt seinen Blick zu sehr auf das Einzelne, auf wirklich existierende Personen geheftet, verdankte das Geschlecht in das Individuum, und wählte folglich, den vorhabenden Gegenständen nach, seine Charaktere zwar natürlich und wahr, aber auch dann und wann ohne die höhere allgemeine Ähnlichkeit, die zur Vollendung der poetischen Wahrheit erfordert wird." 35

Lessing will not make the assumption that Euripides as a poet was deficient in his intellectual or experiential view of the world. Signs of his deficiency are hard to detect, Lessing feels. The audience or casual reader will not notice them as would perhaps an art critic. The art critic is often too critical for he may find fault with some aspect of a drama which was a source of beauty in the context of the poet's contemporary milieu. Lessing, like all the authors I have investigated, believes that the classics should be analyzed in light of the total social condition at the time the play was composed. The plays of Sophocles and Euripides had to be examined on their own terms, not according to some abstract preconceived notions of a modern critic.

Lessing concludes his study of Greek drama as an analytical matrix for all drama with a fairly detailed analysis of Euripides'

Electra. Lessing's main point in the 95th article of the Hamburgische Dramaturgie (29 March 1768) is to see how strong the expression of Electra's hatred for her mother can be, without arousing the suspicion of the audience. The answer lies not in abstract theory but in concrete dramatization of the emotion. We have seen Lessing's views on Sophocles' masterful treatment of this theme in the urn scene.³⁶ Lessing exhorts the reader to search for individual examples of extreme bitterness and hatred in drama and history. Although he generalizes without examples at this point in his discussion, Lessing claims that Euripides' depiction of Electra's emotion is not unnatural.

The discussion between Orestes and Electra about the ill pervading Electra's life leads to a dialogue concerning Orestes himself. Electra expresses her wish that her banished brother, Orestes, would return to avenge her father's murder and rescue her. Orestes asks her directly whether she would assist him in killing their mother. Electra's reply is far more than emphatic - it is enraged:

Ἐνοχλή, μητρὸς ἀπὸ ἐπισηλαῖο' κύρι'

Lessing maintains that this is not an unnatural response. He does concede, however, that the harshness of this expression may have a harmful effect on our sympathetic outlook toward Electra. Sophocles does not go so far in expressing Electra's emotion:

ἀλλ' οὐ ἄρτιον
 τὰν ἀεὶ ἀδούραν
 τόδε μὲν εἶ τοι' ἀκίονον ῥέονα,
 κροσσὸν ἔχου ἐνδόν
 γυναικῶν δὲ κίε'

Sophocles' depiction of this emotionally explosive scene is closer to the truth, according to Lessing, because Sophocles portrays his characters only after countless observations of the given type of emotion. The end result was more acceptable. Euripides, however, had noticed, in his more limited observation, and depicted his scene with all the excess humanly possible.

The suffering of human beings was of great importance to men of the Enlightenment who attempted to comprehend every facet of human existence. Lessing, as already mentioned, chose the book Laocoon to expound on his own theory of how art could capture the truth of human suffering in its two primary forms - painting and poetry. 39

Lessing, in his introduction to Laocoon, sets forth three examples of men who analyze the results of artificially depicting reality in sculpture and dramatic poetry: a lover of art, a philosopher and an art critic.

Die erste, welche die Malerei und Poesie mit Einander verglich, war ein Mann von seinem Geföhler der von beiden Künsten eine ähnliche Wirkung auf sich verspürte. Beide, empfand er, seien uns abwesende Dinge als gegenwärtig, den Schein als Wirklichkeit vor; beide tauschen, und beider Täuschung gefällt. Ein zweiter suchte in das Innere dieses Geföhls einzudringen, und entdeckte, daß es bei beiden aus einerlei Quelle fliesse. Die Schönheit deren Begriff wir zuerst von körperlichen Gegenständen abzählen, hat allgemeine Regeln, die sich auf mehrere Dinge anwenden lassen; auf Handlungen auf Gedanken, so wohl als auf Formen. Ein dritter, welcher über den Wert und über die Verteilung dieser allgemeinen Regeln nachdacht, bemerkte daß einige sehr in der Malerei, andere mehr in der Poesie herrschten; daß also bei diesen die Poesie der Malerei, bei jenen die Malerei der Poesie mit Erläuterungen und Beispielen aushelfen könne. 40

The art lover is the most natural of the three examiners

of the two art forms. He can grasp the perfect aesthetic balance of the two art forms while the philosopher and art critic are hampered by their conditioned outlook on life. Winckelmann, as quoted by Lessing, describes the ability of the Greeks to find this aesthetic balance in Poetry and painting in his observations concerning Greek sculpture, especially the Laocoon of Praxiteles.

"Diese (grosse und besetzte) Seele schildert sich in dem Gesichte des Laocoon, und nicht in dem Gesichte allein, bei dem heftigsten Leiden, Der Schmerz, welche sich in allem Muskeln und Sehnen des Körpers entdeckt, und den man ganz allein, ohne das Gesicht und andere Theile zu betrachten, an dem schmerzlichen eingesessenen Unterliege beinahe selbst zu empfinden glaubt; ... Der Schmerz des Körpers und die Grosse der Seele sind durch den ganzen Bau der Figur mit gleicher Stärke ausgetheilt und gleichsam abgewogen, Laocoon leidet, aber erleidet wie das Rhyaculus." 81

For Winckelmann, the plastic motive of sculpture is a proper medium for capturing the idealization of human suffering. Virgil's verbal depiction of this same scene in Book II of the Aeneid is filled with frightening screams. Winckelmann considers the purpose of Virgil's description is inferior because it is conditioned by the Epic technique of exaggeration. Virgil is trying to portray the evils of human suffering on a symbolic level. His character, Laocoon, is caught in a helpless web of pain. His immediate reaction to the situation is all that is captured by Virgil.

Winckelmann considers the suffering of Laocoon inferior to Philetetes because Sophocles' character expresses his reaction to pain but only in connection with other emotions. Winckelmann sees Sophocles leading his audience through the interplay of these

polar aspects of Philotetes' character in the direction of compassion.

Lessing discusses the significance of Philoktetes' suffering as part of the dramatic effect on stage.

Es is sonderbar, daß sein Leiden so verschiedene Eindrücke bei uns zurückgelassen - Die Klagen, des Geschrei, die wilden Verwünschungen, mit welchen sein Schmerz das Lager erfüllte, und alle Opfer, alle heilige Handlungen störte erschollen nicht minder schrecklich durch das öde Eiland, und sie waren es, die ihn dahin verbannten. Welche Töne des Unmuths, des Jammers der Verzweiflung, von welchen auch der Dichtere in der Nachahmung das Theater durchhallen ließ. 42

Lessing considers the outward expression of pain as the concretization of Philoktetes' emotional and psychological depression. The drama of Sophocles visualizes what the lover could naturally comprehend i.e. the abstraction of psychological or allegorical pain, vivified in the form of physical or real pain. Sophocles was able to synthesize the two in a masterful fashion in the drama. Drama can achieve this synthesis because it contains elements of poetry in the dialogue and chorus, and elements of abstraction and idealization in the characterization and theme.

Lessing observes that dramatically the scene of Philoktetes in the throws of pain is temporally short but psychologically longer than the other acts of the play. He bases this observation, not on the fact that the ancients had no concern for the length of scene as some critics believe,⁴³ but on the plaintive cries and wimpering of Philoktetes; the fragmented exclamation ἄ ἄ φευ αὐαὐαὐ, οὐοί, and the lines full of κακα, κακα .

The stress and isolation of these various elements appear much shorter to the reader than to the listener. This comment by Lessing shows his genuine concern for drama as a real theatrical experience for the audience rather than a vehicle for presenting philosophical abstractions.

Screaming is the natural expression of pain for Philoktetes as for all men. Homer's heroes and his gods, e.g. Mars, scream with pain. Lessing, however, marks a distinction between the way the Greeks and modern Europeans express pain.

So weit auch Homer sonst seine Helden über die menschliche Natur erhebt, so treu bleiben sie ihr doch stets, wenn es auf das Gefühl der Schmerzen und Beleidigungen, wenn es auf die Äusserung dieses Gefühls durch die Schreie oder durch Thränen durch Scheltworte ankömmt. Nach ihren Thaten sind es Geschöpfe höherer Art; nach ihren Empfindungen wahre Menschen. 44

Lessing captures the flavor of the prevailing German comprehension of the Greeks. The Greeks were able to raise themselves above the "average" man by their actions and nobility, yet in so doing paradoxically remained close to true depiction of human emotions. Lessing observes that the succeeding generations and nations have not been so fortunate:

Ich weis es, wir feinem Europäer einer klügeren Nachwelt, wissen über unsern Mund und über unsere Augen besser zu herrschen. Höflichkeit und Anstand verbieten Geschrei und Thränen. Die thätige Tapferkeit des ersten rauhen Weltalters hat sich bei uns in eine leidende verwandelt. Doch selbst unsere Vorfahren waren Barbaren. 45

The motto of the modern era is "suffer in silence" for Lessing. This silence, however, is a form of artificiality. It conceals a natural expression of human feeling. The courtly restraints of a suffering man were so extensive in Germany says

Lessing that rulers often gave their citizens the order not to fear anything and never mention the word fear. Lessing, using a triadic argumentative form retorts with a glowing analysis of the Greek's reaction to fear and feeling:

Nicht so der Grieche! Er füllte und fürchte sich; er kusserte seine Schmerzen und seinen Kummer; er schloste sich keiner der menschlichen Schwachheiten; keine mußte ihn aber auf dem Wege nach Ehre, und von Erfüllung seiner Pflicht zurückhalten. Was bei dem Barbaren auf Wildheit und Verhärtung entsprang, das wirkten, bei ihm Grundsätze. Bei ihm war der Heroismus wie die verbergenden Funken im Kiesel, die ruhig schlafen, so lange keine äußere Gewalt sie wecket, und den Stein wider seine Klarheit noch seine Kälte nehmen. Bei dem Barbaren war der Heroismus eine helle fressende Flamme, die immer tabte, und jede andere gute Eigenschaft in ihm verzehrte, wenigstens schwärzte. 46

The Greeks express the whole panoply of emotions in full gesticulation and verbalization. They are not hindered by stultifying standards of etiquette. They are guided by their natural inclinations which fall spontaneously into the larger cosmic order. They fight for their personal honor and fulfillment of their personal duty. All these heroic actions, however, are appropriate only in certain circumstances and are elicited by certain situations. They do not attempt to build false facades of constant heroism.

Although the Greeks were leath to show violent deaths on the stage e.g. Medea, Antigone, certain scenes of pain were portrayed with the full intensity of the emotion aroused. Lessing singles out two plays in which "der körperliche Schmerz nicht der kleinste Theil des Unglücks ist, das den leidenden Helden tritt". They are Philoctetes and the Trechinian Women which Lessing discusses

for their portrayal of the agonizing death of Heracles. Sophocles, according to the analyst allows these two characters to complain, wince, weep and scream. This is in sharp contrast to the genteel tastes of the French dramatists. Lessing, the master of the subtle jibe, attacks Chataubrion for his reinterpretation of the Philoctetes myth which we will discuss shortly. Chataubrion would not dare to recreate the story as did Sophocles because he, like most Frenchmen, was too timid to rise above the classical form of the Greek dramatists and accept the meaning of their spirit, a fault which Lessing found almost unforgiveable.

Lessing speculates at this point on the possible plot of Sophocles last play Laokoon:

Wenn uns das Schicksal doch auch diesen Laokoon gönnet hätte! Aus den leichten Erwähnungen, die seiner einige alter Gramatiker tun, läßt sich nicht schliessen, wie der Dichter diesen Stoff behandelt habe. So viel bin ich versichert, daß er den Laokoon nicht stoischer als den Philoktet und Herkules, wird geschildert haben. Alles stoische ist untheatralisch; und unser Mitleiden ist allezeit dem Leiden gleichmäßig welches der interessierende "Gegenstand aussert." 47

Lessing feels that there is a causal relationship between the degree of suffering of the dramatic character and the degree of the audience's emotional involvement in the play. Stoicism is the absence of emotion and adherence to this philosophy would eradicate the dramatic effect so frequently achieved by Sophocles.

Lessing develops a systematic analysis of the failure of the plastic artists and painters of Greece to depict real suffering or ugliness. Often ugliness was shown in a subtle or symbolic fashion. The Greeks knew that sculpture and painting were

limited in their ability to depict human emotions which are conditioned by the ephemeral status of time. Thus Timanthes, for example, in his painting, Sacrifice for Iphigenia, veils the face of Agamemnon to avoid revealing the sorrowful father's true emotions. Lessing feels that this restraint is proper for the plastic arts. All art is an ideal representation of reality and each genre must find its most suitable vehicle for expressing its ideal. Lessing cites a passage from Pliny to support his view:

Cum moestas pinxisset omnes, praecipue pestrum, et tristitiae omnem imaginem consumpsisset, patris ipsius vultum velarit quem digne non peterat ostendere. 48

The ancient plastic artist deemphasized the intensity of a particularly gruesome emotion to insure the desired response by the audience. He does this by choosing a related but less intense emotion. This process of selective idealization is far more restricted than the idealization involved in dramatic action.

The highest priority of the artist, poet and painter is imitation of reality. Both do so within their respective genres. The priority in dramatic poetry is the imitation of reality in the most natural and truthful way possible. In pictorial art it is the imitation of truth in beauty. Lessing and the Greeks realized that art forms such as painting and sculpture could idealize only one moment in time. Lessing will go on in the Laocoon to describe this phenomena as "Nebeneinander". The painter had to idealize the most efficacious moment of an on-going process for the proper aesthetic edification of his viewers. The question then rises: why not the worst moment of agony? The answer to this can be found in the problem of emotional arousal. As we have seen, Lessing views pity as the most basic of all emotions.

Abhorrence or disgust in a plastic work of art cannot be tempered and given their proper contextual relation to pity by the passage of time. Such limitations preclude the possibility of depicting the worst emotional state.

Poetry (Nacheinander) has the unique capability of giving the reader or listener a fuller context of emotions. Sophocles was able to show the fluctuation of emotions which naturally occurred in the development of his plots.

Das Drama, welches für die lebendige Malerei des Schauspielers bestimmt ist, darf vielleicht eben deswegen sich an die Gesetze der materiellen Malerei strenger halten müssen. In ihm glauben wir nicht bloß einen schreienden Philoktet zu sehen und zu hören; wir hören und sehen wirklich schreien. Je näher der Schauspieler der Natur kömmt, desto empfindlicher müssen unsere Augen und Ohren beleidiget werden; denn es ist unwidersprechlich, daß sie es in der Natur werden, wenn wir so laute und heftige Ausserungen des Schmerzes vermehren. Zudem ist der körperliche Schmerz überhaupt des Mitleidens nicht fähig, welches andere Ubel erwecken. Unsere Einbildung kann zu wenig in ihm unterscheiden, als daß die blosse Erblickung desselben etwas von einem gleichmäßigen Gefühl in uns hervor zu bringen vermöchte. Sophokles könnte daher leicht nicht einen bloß willkürlichen, sondern in dem Wesen unsrer Empfindungen selbst gegründeten Anstand übertreten haben, wenn er den Philoktet und Herkules so winseln und weinen, so schreien und brüllen ließ. Die Umstehenden können unmöglich so viel Anteil an ihrem Leiden nehmen, als diese ungemäßigten Ausbrüche zu erfordern schienen. Sie werden uns Zuschauern vergleichungsweise kalt vorkommen und dennoch können wir ihr Mitleiden nicht wohl anders, als wie das Maß des unsrigen betrachten. 49

Lessing claims the portrayal of pain in drama should evoke the audience's compassion. This compassion, is truly "suffering with" the tragic figure. We, the audience, have to be united to Philoktetes and Heracles by the bond of humanity, with all its capabilities and weaknesses. Lessing fears that such a close

relationship between the actor and audience may cause an undesirable coolness between the audience and the other characters. Sophocles avoids this dramatic obstacle by creating his other characters in such a way that we relate to them also through the medium of compassion. The audience is able to relate to the other characters because they are reflections of a variety of human types which relate naturally, if less intensely, to the main character.

Lessing next makes four general observations about the value of the Philoctetes. They concern the idea of a wound as representative of pain, the additional evils of Philoctetes, the verbalization of pain and the interests of the other characters. I will deal with these points as clearly and briefly as possible.

First Lessing praises Sophocles for his choice of a physical wound over an inner sickness:

Er wählte eine Wunde - (denn auch die Umstände der Geschichte kann man betrachten, als ob sie von seiner Wahl abgehangen hätten, in so fern er nemlich die ganze Geschichte, eben dieser ihm vertheilhafteten Umstände wegen, wählte) - er wählte, sage ich, eine Wunde und nicht eine innerliche Krankheit; weil sich von jener eine lebhaftere Vorstellung machen laßt, als von dieser wenn sie auch noch so schmerzlich ist. Die innere sympathische Blut, welche den Meleager verzehrte, als ihn seine Mutter in dem fatalen Brande ihrer schwesterlichen Mut aufopferte, würde daher weniger theatralisch sein, als eine Wunde. Und diese Wunde war eine göttliches Strafgericht. Ein mehr als natürliches Gift tobte unaufhörlich darinn, und nur ein stärkerer Anfall vom Schmerzen hatte seine gesetzte Zeit, nach welchem jedesmal der Unglückliche in einem betäubenden Schlaf verfiel, in welchem sich seine erschöpfte Natur erholen mußte, den nemlichen Weg des Leidens wieder antreten zu können. 50

Lessing considers this wound a brilliant theatrical device.

This praise may sound too mundane for the sublimity of Sophoclean

thought but Lessing was not as concerned about the lofty message conveyed by the whole play as he was about the naturalness of Greek drama. He was primarily searching for the truth of Greek tragedy. He discovered this truth in Sophocles' ability to depict a perfectly natural occurrence, e.g. a snake bite, and raise it to a symbolic level as the work of divine punishment for Philoktetes. In practically the same breath, Lessing criticizes Chateaubrien, the French dramatist, for his portrayal of Philoktetes' wound arising from the poisonous arrows of a Trojan. Lessing feels this plot is far less realistic than one involving a poison which for years saps the strength of the man without actually killing him. It is ^{not} viable dramatically and therefore less adaptable for symbolism.

The second point Lessing discusses is the other misfortunes of Philoktetes, his isolation from society.

2. so groß und schrecklich er aber auch die körperlichen Schmerzen seines Helden machte, so fühlte er es doch sehr wohl, daß sie allein nicht hinreichend wären, einen wirklichen Grad des Mitleids zu erregen. Er verband sie daher mit andern Übeln, die gleichfalls für sich betrachtet nicht besonders führen konnten, die aber durch diese Verbindung einen eben so melancholischen Anstrich erhielten, als sie den körperlichen Schmerzen hinwiederum mitteilten. Diese Übel waren, völlige Beraubung der menschlichen Gesellschaft, Hunger und alle Unvernünftigkeiten des Lebens, welchen nun unter einem rauhen Himmel in jener Beraubung ausgesetzt. 51

Lessing cites the unification of the two misfortunes of Philoktetes, the wound and social ostracism as a dramatic coup for Sophocles. A lonely figure like Robinson Crusoe, says Lessing, does not illicit our compassion for he has his strength and wits. We all, however, need reflective seclusion from society and often thrive on it as a source of recuperative

strength in our daily social intercourse. Lessing also feels that a person can bear the most painful illness in the company of concerned and helpful friends. The synthesis of these two human ills, illness and loneliness, however, represents the nadir of human existence. The thought of the audience's possible assumption of a similar role evokes shuddering and fright on their part. These emotions are responses evoked by this desperate situation. Lessing elaborates on the element of despair in the drama:

Wir erblicken nichts als die Verzweiflung in ihrer schrecklichsten Gestalt vor uns, und kein Mitleid ist stärker, keines zerschmelzet mehr die ganze Seele, als das, welches sich mit Vorstellungen der Verzweiflung mischet. Von dieser Art ist das Mitleid, welches wir für den Philoktetes empfinden, und in dem Augenblicke am stärksten empfinden, wenn wir ihn auch seine Begons beraubt sehen des einsigen, was ihm sein kümmerliches Leben erhalten mußte. 52

Despair is the worst emotion of all because it robs all other emotions of their meaning. Life becomes an empty shell in which suicide is the only answer to the void of meaninglessness.

Chataubriou, however, robs Philoktetes of this added dimension (social ostracism). He gives Philoktetes the companionship of a princess in the scene with the bow. Chataubriou even adds her entire entourage about which Lessing quips "Was it her idea or the poets?" Lessing is attacking the romantic sensitivity of the French as well as their stress on "naturalness". This naturalness is merely a reflection of French culture not the Greek culture. Lessing develops this contrast of the Greek and French dramas one step further. While the Greeks instill in us

the question of whether Philoctetes will have to stay on the desert isle and die pitiously without his bow, the sole means of his survival; the French present us with the fear that Philoctetes will be separated from his princess. This contrast between survival and romantic separation indicates for Lessing the shallowness of the French. Lessing sums up his evaluation of Chataubrion's play by saying that it should more properly be called "La Difficulté vaincue". It is not tragedy at all.

The third area of analysis for Lessing deals with the expression of pain within the context of the whole play. Within a general scheme, individual scenes have various degrees of affectiveness and importance for the total dramatic effect. Lessing observes the importance of this total effect.

Nach der Wirkung des Ganzen betrachte man die einzeln Scenen, in welchen Philoktet nicht mehr der verlassene Kranke ist; wo er Hoffnung hat, nun bald die trostlose Einöde zu verlassen und wieder in sein Reich zu gelangen; wo sich also sein ganzes Unglück auf die schmerzliche Wunde einschränkt. Er wimmert, er schreiet, er bekommt die gräßlichsten Zuckungen. Hierwider gehet eigentlich der Einwurf des beleidigten Anstandes. Es ist ein Engländer, welcher diesen Einwurf macht; ein Mann also bei welchem man nicht leicht eine falsche Delicatesse argwohnen darf. Wie schon berührt, so gibt er ihm auch einen sehr guten Grund. Alle Empfindungen und Leidenschaften, sagt er mit welchen andere nur sehr wenig sympathisiren können, werden anstößsig, wenn sie man zu heftig zu ausdrückt". 53

The English criticism against the scenes of Philoctetes' overt lamentations are given by Adam Smith, the philosopher-economist of the 18th century who was to set up the basic of classical economics for the next 125 years in his famous Wealth of Nations (1774). Lessing cites a passage from his work "The Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759)

It is for the same reason that to cry out with bodily pain, how intolerable soever, appears always unmanly and unbecoming. There is, however, a good deal of sympathy even with bodily pain. If, as has already been observed, I see a stroke aimed, and just ready to fall upon the leg and arm of another person, I naturally shrink and draw back my own leg or my own arm; and when it does fall, I feel it in some measure, and am hurt by it as well as the sufferer. My hurt, however, is no doubt, excessively slight, and, upon that account, if he makes any violent outcry, as I cannot go along with him, I never fail to despise him. And this is the case of all the passions which take their origin from the body: they excite either no sympathy at all, or such a degree of it, as is altogether disproportioned to the violence of what is felt by the sufferer." 54

This passage occurs in a chapter entitled "On Propriety". Smith considers the affect of the actor and his emotions upon the feelings of the audience to be minimal and very disproportionate to the intended goal of tragedy. Lessing observes that nothing is more deceptive than a general rule for emotions. Lessing feels that the initial arousal of emotions does not cause contempt if the suffering individual uses every possible means to suppress his pain; if the audience sees that he is a man of constancy; or if he would rather submit to pain than revoke his adherence to his ideal. This last condition applies in particular to Philoctetes whose total love for his friends and hatred for his enemies is viewed as a moral greatness by Lessing. His personal pain has not robbed him of other emotions. He can still weep for his dead friends and refuse to yield to the plots of his enemies.⁵⁵ All this behavior is consistent with his noble character. It is strange that Lessing does not cite Adam Smith's praise of the Philoctetes which Smith considered superb tragedy because of the expression of pain within the limits of decorum.

"In some of the Greek tragedies there is an attempt to excite compassion by the representation of the agonies of bodily pain. Philoctetes cries out and faints from the extremity of his sufferings. Hippolytus and Hercules are both introduced as expiring under the severest tortures, which it seems, even the fortitude of Hercules was incapable of supporting. In all these cases, however, it is not the pain which interests us, but some other circumstance. It is not the sore foot, but the solitude of Philoctetes which affects us, and diffuses over that charming tragedy, that romantic wildness which is so agreeable to the imagination. The agonies of Hercules and Hippolytus are interesting only because we foresee that death is to be the consequence. If these heroes were to recover, we should think the representation of their sufferings perfectly ridiculous. What a tragedy would that be, of which the distress consisted in a colic! Yet no pain is more exquisite. These attempts to excite compassion by the representation of bodily pain may be regarded as among the greatest branches of decorum of which the Greek theater has set the example. 56

This is the very point that Lessing finds lacking in Seneca plays. These dramatic orations are sorely deficient in the portrayal of very genuine emotion. They may more properly be considered to be rhetorical harangues.

Lessing's final point in the Philoctetes is the role of the other characters in the overall development of the plot as a means to arouse the proper emotion. They have unique personalities which are conditioned, but not controlled, by Philoctetes' screams. They should personify emotional norms for the audience. Their reaction to the suffering of Philoctetes should be expressed in some form of human compassion. Lessing cites two major examples of this in Neoptolemas and the Chorus;

Neoptolem und der Chor haben den unglücklichen Philoctetes hingegangen; sie erkennen, in welche Verzweiflung ihn ihr Betrug stürzen werde; nun bekümmert er seinen schrecklichen Zufall vor ihren Augen; kann dieser Zufall keine wirkliche

sympathetische Empfindung in ihnen erregen, so kann er sie doch antreiben in sich zu gehen, gegen so viel Elend Achtung zu haben, und es durch Verrätherei nicht häufen zu wollen. 57

The chorus and Neoptolemus do not give Philoktetes additional reasons for despair. The Chorus is sympathetic to his plight while Neoptolemus' deceptiveness is only a result of his youthful folly. He is basically an honest man. The suffering hero would have tolerated Neoptolemus and his deception, Lessing feels, because Philoktetes is a man who is "ganze Natur". He sees the innocence of Neoptolemus and restores him to his human nature, which is motivated by a basic compassion. The tragic hero saves the young hero from his own tragic deception. This ironic reversal of roles is most important and even more moving because it arises out of Philoktetes' basic humanity. He has enough compassion to see that Neoptolemus should not suffer for his youthful folly.

Lessing thus sees the Philoktetes as a truly human tragedy which is so subtly contrived by Sophocles that in this natural plot development, another tragedy - that of human folly - is avoided in the character of Neoptolemus.

One last comment should be made with regards Lessing's brief treatment of the Trachiniae of Sophocles which reads in part:

Des nehmlichen Kunstgriffs, mit dem Mitleiden, welches das Geschrei über körperliche Schmerzen hervorbringen sollte, in den Umstehenden einen andern Affect zu verbinden hat sich Sophocles auch in den Trachinerinnen bedient. Der Schmerz des Herkules ist kein ermattender Schmerz; er treibt ihn bis zur Raserei, in der er nach nichts als nach Rache schnaubet. Schon hatte er in dieser Wut den Lichas ergriffen, und an dem Felsen herschmettert.

Der Chor ist weiblich; um so veil natürlicher muß sich Furcht und Entsetzen seiner bemeistern. Dieses und die Erwartung, ob noch ein Gott dem Herkules zu Hülfe eilen, oder Herkules unter diesem Übel erliegen werde, macht hier das Eigentliche allgemeine Interesse welches von dem Mitleiden nur eine geringe Schatterung erhält. 58

This play and its main character have the opposite affect on the audience from Philoctetes. Hercules does not suffer from an exhausting pain. His pain is a goad to his wrath which causes him to kill Lichas. This wrath may be a natural response from the semi-divine son of Zeus. Although Lessing does not make this observation because of his particular interests, it would be an interpretation consistent with the concept of the Greek hero as a man driven by a divine spark as we shall see expounded by Hölderlin. Lessing is more concerned, however, with the audience's reactions to the dramatic effect. He notes that the chorus consists of women who are more naturally overcome by fear and shock at the sight and action of Heracles. The reaction of the Chorus and the expectation that a god may come to Heracles' rescue are, according to Lessing, the general points of interest in this play for the audience. This evaluation seems too superficial to be justified. Lessing completely ignores the important role of Deianira in the development of plot and theme in the play. The element of compassion is only presented here in the most superficial way, according to Lessing, because the outcome is decided by the oracle (i.e. that Heracles was to die in suffering and in youth) and because Heracles finally accepts his fate. The audience's amazement at his decision to die supercedes all other emotions and thus

makes it a less edifying play.

Lessing makes one final interesting comparison between Heracles and Philoktetes. The former is a demi-god, the latter a man. Philoktetes is never ashamed of his complaints; Heracles is ashamed that his mortal nature has taken control of his divine nature. Although modern man does not believe in demi-gods, observes Lessing, the most restrained modern hero is supposed to feel and act like a suffering Heracles. As we have seen, this artificial restraint of emotion was to be avoided at all costs in genuine human tragedy.

III THE LIFE OF SOPHOCLES

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing intended to write a monumental work on the life of Sophocles which was to be ready for Michaelmas Day 1760. The work was to appear in two volumes.⁵⁹ However, the first printing of the first book was not published until thirty years later by Johann Eschenburg in Berlin. Eschenburg prefaces his edition with the following remarks:

Es sind jetzt gerade dreißig Jahr, als die sieben ersten Bogen der gegenwärtigen Schrift abgedruckt wurden. Was für ein Hinderniß das eigentlich gewesen sei, welches die Fortsetzung dieses Abdrucks, aber vielmehr die weitere Ausarbeitung des Werkes selbst, unterbrach, weiß ich nicht mit Gewißheit anzugeben. Vermuthlich war es Lessing's Entfernung von Berlin, der um diese Zeit nach Breslau zu dem preussischen General Tauenzien ging, in den nächsten Jahren darauf als Schriftsteller nur seine Uebersetzung des Diderotschen Theaters vollendete, und an den Litteratur griesen nahm... Des erst Buch hatte er, wie die Aufschrift des Ältern Titelblattes angibt, dem Leben des Dichters bestimmt; und dieses sollte vermuthlich eine kritische Zergliederung seiner Schauspiele, und eine deutsche Uebersetzung derselben in Prose nachfolgen. Dieß letztere läßt sich wenigstens aus dem Anfangsfragmente des Ajax schließen, welches ich dem Leser am Schluß dieses Bändchens mittheilen werde. 60

According to Eschenburg, Lessing intended to write a critical evaluation of each of Sophocles' plays in much the same manner as Hilderlin was to do 40 years later.⁶¹ As the work stands now, in both Eschenburg's edition and Lechman's compilation of the original outlines, fragmentation abounds. I used Eschenburg's edition as the primary reference because of its greater clarity and cohesion.

Lessing introduces his study of the life of Sophocles with a lament over Balle's failure to devote a special article in

his history of literature to Sophocles simply because no predecessor of his had done any similar work on this dramatist. Lessing comments that such an investigation must be made. His personal interest in Sophocles resulted from his earlier work on Aristotle's Poetics.

Man gewinne aber einen alten Schriftsteller nur erst lieb, und die geringste Kleinigkeit, die ihn betrifft, die einige Beziehung auf ihn haben kann, köret auf, uns gleichgültig zu sein. Seit dem ich es betraue, die Dichtkunst des Aristoteles eher studieret zu haben, als die Muster, aus welchen er sie abstrahiret werde ich bei dem Namen Sophokles, ich mag ihn finden, wo ich will, aufmerksamer, als bei meinem eigenen. Und wie vielfältig habe ich ihn mit Vorsatz gesucht! Wie viel Unnützes habe ich seinetwegen gelesen! 62

Lessing apparently investigated many sources before he began on his Life of Sophocles. He claims that his primary sources were Suidas and an unknown author who introduced his scholia on the Sophoclean corpus of plays with a Vita. Lessing notes that Suida's article on Sophocles is very short and used only indirectly as a basis of notes compiled by a certain Johannes Neursius⁶³ on whom Lessing draws heavily. The Scholiast, Lessing informs us, gains his information from three sources: Aristoxenus of Tarentum, the student of Aristotle; Iatea, the pupil of Callimachus; and Sartyrus, whose Life of Famous Men may have included Sophocles. Lessing was intent upon finding the most accurate and detailed account for his own Life of Sophocles. He wanted to discover the truth of Sophocles by properly orientating his study around the life of the historical man.

Lessing begins his work with a summary of the major events and details in Sophocles life;

Diesem zufolge war Sophocles von Geburt, ein Athenienser, und zwar ein Koloniate. Sein Vater lieb Sophilos. Nach der gemeinsten und wahrscheinlichsten Meinung, ward er in dem zweiten Jahre der ein und siebenzigsten Olympiade geboren.

Er genoß eine sehr gute Erziehung. Die Tanzkunst und die Musik lernte er bei dem Lamprus, und brachte es in dieser letztern, wie auch im Ringen so weit, daß er in beiden den Preis erhielt. Er war kaum sechzehn Jahr alt, als er mit der Leier um die Tropfen, welche die Athenienser nach dem Salamischen Siege errichteten, tanzte, und den Lobgesang anstimmte. Und das zwar, noch einigen, nackt und gesalbt; nach andern aber, bekleidet. In der tragischen Dichtkunst soll Aeschylus sein Lehrer gewesen sein; ein Umstand, an welchem ich aus verschiedenen Gründe zweifle. Ist er unterdessen wahr, so hat schwerlich ein Schüler das Übertriebene seines Meisters, worauf die Nachahmung immer am ersten fällt, besser eingesehen und glücklicher vermieden, als Sophokles. Ich sage dieses mehr nach der Vergleichung ihrer Stücke, als nach einer Stelle des Plutarchus.⁶⁴

Lessing's interpretation agrees basically with the $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ $\iota\omicron\upsilon\alpha\chi\iota\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ of the Oxford Classical text of Sophocles' plays. My procedure from this point on will be to highlight any major differences in the two versions or significant elaborations of a particular point.

The scholiast feel that Sophocles' father, Sophilos, may have been a man of high social position in Athens. Concerning Sophocles' father's occupation, Lessing agrees with the unknown author of the $\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ that Sophilos had slaves who were bronze workers or craftsmen or was himself a member of the social class. Lessing does not agree with the scholiast that, Sophocles, as a member of the class of skilled workers, would have been esteemed as a General, an honor which he was accorded the year after his Antigone appeared on stage. His birthright would still be too low for such a position which was usually reserved for the Aristocracy. The distinction of birthright was important in

ancient times, for it meant admittance to all functions and privileges of a family clan or city. The low birthright for some people was often a source of mockery by the comic poets, especially Aristophanes. Lessing feels that Aristophanes could not have passed up the opportunity of jibing Sophocles for his lowly background. Lessing relates, later, that Sophocles was given his generalship because of his personal skill, not his birthright.

Lessing presents with numerous citations his own view of Sophilos' position in the community as a "Mittelbürger", the equivalent of our modern middle income family. He bases this idea on the assumption of a mis-reading by Ister and Aristoxenus of "xolavoc", a term generally considered to be the name of Sophocles' *trupos* in Athens which is praised so significantly in the opening ode of Sophocles Oedipus Colonus. Lessing continues his reasoning on the points:

Auf dem zweiten xolavoc, welcher zum Unterschiede *xyxavoc* hieß, ließen sich alle diejenigen treffen, welche für Lohn arbeiteten, und hießen von diesem ihren Versammlungsarte *xolavvta*. Was ist nun leichter zu vermengen als *xolavvta* und *xolavvavnc*? Sophocles aber, und folglich auch sein Vater war ein *xolavvnc*. So fanden ihn Aristoxenus und Ister genennet, und lassen es für *xolavvnc* und machten ihn zu einem Manne, der für Lohn arbeitet. Meine Vermutung wird dadurch bestärkt, daß sie weder unter einander, noch mit sich selbst einzig sind, welches Handwerk Sophilos eigentlich getrieben habe. Denn ein *xolavvnc* konnte ein Zimmermann, ein Schmid, und ein Schwärdfeger sein. 65

Lessing definitely strains a linguistic chord in this exploration of the scholar's indecision. He cites a passage from the Chrietensthien of Helladius who claims that those who work

for others at a price are called ⁶⁶ *οὐκ* " Lessing claims that general usage allows for changes in a word and does not worry about the words' origin. As a result of this indifference, the Greek ending *της*, meaning worker, becomes a suffix denoting place of origin. Lessing's arguments here are very intriguing but I am not quite sure that they will stand up under close linguistic analysis.

The next major problem Lessing has with the scholiast text is the dating of Sophocles' birth. The Scholiast says he was born in the second year of the seventy-first Olympiad, while Suidas claims it was the first year of the seventy-third Olympiad. In modern chronological terms, Sophocles' date of birth would be 496/5 B.C. according to the Scholiast; 485/4 B.C. according to Suidas - a significant difference of eleven years. Lessing agrees with the scholiast's view and bases his evidence on a detailed analysis and comparison of the birth dates of the three Greek tragedians. ⁶⁷ Aeschylus is supposed to have been 17 years older and Euripides 24 years younger than Sophocles, but the uncertainty of the dating system is far too complicated to discuss at length here and is not really suited to my overall purposes.

Lessing, continuing his probe of Sophocles, the man, notes some interesting observations concerning the educational process of the Greeks:

Die Erziehung der Griechen ist bekannt. Grammatik, Musik, Gymnastik; hierinn, und nach dieser Ordnung, wurden ihre Kinder unterrichtet. Die Teile der Gymnastik waren *παλαίμαχος* und *παις* das Tanzen und das Ringen. Ich will ^{aber} das Wort Ringen hier in eben dem weitläufigsten Sinne genommen wissen, als das

griechische ^{gymnastische} Übungen, unter welchem nach viel andere
gymnastische Übungen, als das eigentliche Ringen,
verstanden wurden. 158

Lessing observes that the Greek educational system was based on three basic principles: grammar, music and gymnastics. This is a far different system from the traditional three R's in the American educational process. Greek education involved the intellectual, the aesthetic and physical aspects of the total person. The central position of aesthetics in this triadic arrangement is a significant sign of the deep aesthetic and physical aspects of the total person. The central position of aesthetics in this triadic arrangement is a significant sign of the deep aesthetic appreciation of all aspects of nature which the Greeks cultivated. Lessing, who, as we have seen, is preoccupied with the physical aspects of man in his relationship with nature urges the reader to accept the widest possible interpretation of the Gymnastik.

Musik, according to Lessing, was a more physical than aesthetic training. This discipline involved training in singing and in the technical skill of playing a musical instrument. Lessing discusses the remote possibility that the Lamprea who taught Sophocles these skills could be the same man who was Socrates' music teacher at a very old age. He also examines the whole tradition of Lamprea from Plato to Plutarch. 69

Music and lyric poetry are closely related genres. In an effort to examine Sophocles' lyric ability, Lessing discusses the story that Sophocles as a youth led a band of contempor-

aries in a Paean after the victory at the battle of Salamis in 480 B.C. Lessing prefaces his remarks by quoting Athenous as another source for this story:

Ἐποχλῆς δὲ πρὸς τῷ καλῷ γεγενησθαι τὴν ἔραν, ἣν καὶ ὀρχηστῆρην
 δεξιότατον καὶ μισοειρήνην εἶπε καὶ ἐν κερὰ Λακεδαιμόνων, μετὰ γούρου
 τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῶνι ναυμαχίαν καὶ τροπαιοῦ γυμνοῦ ἀηλιεμένου
 ἔχορρευσε μετὰ λύρας· οἱ δὲ ἐν ἰσχυρίῳ ἦσαν. 70

Lessing feels that Sophocles was not yet 16 years of age at the time of the battle of Salamis which occurred in the first year of the 75th Olympiad when Xerxes attempted to suppress Greek freedom. The Greek forces were traditionally conscripted from men in the age range of 20 and older. Eighteen year olds, called *ισοπύλοιοι*, were used merely for defensive purposes not aggressive combat duty. If Sophocles was at most 16 years old, how could he be at the scene of a major battle? The answer, Lessing discovers, is in Herodotus' account of the evacuation of the children of Athens upon Themistocles' advice, to three cities, Troezen, Aegina and Salamis.⁷¹ Lessing feels that this information also clarifies Sophocles' birth date as the second year of the 71st Olympiad.

The relationship between Sophocles and Aeschylus as tragic poets is of great interest to Lessing for its bearing on the successive stages of development in the art of tragedy. The battle of Salamis is the symbolic seat of the fusion of Greek tragic poetry, the scene of Sophocles' dancing was also the birthplace of Euripides. Aeschylus is associated with Salamis by his participation in the victorious battle with/against the Persians. This symbolic unity, however, does not establish any

direct relationship between Sophocles and Aeschylus. The possibility of Aeschylus' actual involvement in the education of Sophocles as held by Wieland and others is doubted by Lessing, who states his case as follows:

Ich werde also um so viel eher daran zweifeln dürfen. Und das aus folgenden Gründen. Ich will nicht untersuchen wie viel man überhaupt von der dramatischen Dichtkunst einen Lehren kann; ob es sich viel weiter als auf gewisse mechanische Kleinigkeiten erstreckt, die man durch die Intuition eines Meisters weit geschwinder und besser, als durch die allgemeinen Regeln eines Lehres begreift. Ich will nicht fragen, wie viel es dergleichen allgemeine Regeln zu den Zeiten des Aeschylus geben konnte, da noch so wenig gute Stücke vorhanden waren, aus welchem man sie hätte abziehen können? Ich will auch nicht fragen; konnte Aeschylus etwas Lehren, was er selbst nicht gelernt hatte? Nach dem eigenen Bekannnisse dieses Dichters war sein Talent zur Tragödie, mehr ein ihm vor dem Bacchus übernatürlicher Weise geschenkt es als erworbenes Talent." 72

Pausanias relates a story that Aeschylus gained the inspiration for tragic poetry from Dionysus, Lessing feels that the basic fact elaborated in this story is undeniably true: i.e., Aeschylus did not study the method of tragic art, his genius grasped the spirit of tragedy and gave it a meaningful form. Sophocles must have learned something of the dramatic technique by Aeschylus' production but was driven to exercise the technique by a very different spirit. Lessing bases his belief in a merely tangential relationship between Aeschylus and Sophocles on this difference of tragic spirit. This outstanding critic of the German enlightenment era was always searching for the spirit which motivated the form. Lessing knew that his surest means of analysis in this investigation was first hand observation of the form and not second hand commentaries.

Lessing does, however, begin his investigation with the famous passage in Plutarch dealing with Sophocles' criticism of Aeschylus:

Ἦσκαρ γὰρ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς εἶπε, τὸν Αἰσχυλοῦ κατασκευῆς, τρίτον ἦδη τὸ τῆς λέξεως μεταβάλλειν εἶδος, ὅσαρ ἐστὶν ἠδίκητατον καὶ βέλτερον· οὕτως οἱ φιλοσοφούντες, ὅταν ἐκ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν καὶ κατατεχνῶν, εἰς τὸν ἀποτρεμὸν ἠθὺς καὶ καθoύς λόγον, ἀρχοῦνται τῆν ἀληθῆ προκοπὴν καὶ στυφὸν προκοπεῖν. 73

Lessing feels that *οὐκον* should be translated as *Schwulst* - conceit - which is the result of Aeschylus all-too-frequent but fitting utilization of the most daring phrases. The imagery of Aeschylus was a completely new experience in dramatic literature which was well suited to his own age.

Sophocles was a man of his era, the Periclean age, a time when the emphasis was on the subtle power of the individual. Sophocles' plays are singularly devoid of any unnatural stage contrivances (except the Epiphany of Heracles in the *Philoctetes*) which would detract from this stress on the self-reliance in any way. Lessing interprets *οὐκον* as theatrical embellishment; i.e. costumes, masks and machines. Aeschylus, unlike Sophocles, employed all these devices to evoke the emotion of Schrecken in his audiences. The Furies, in Aeschylus' Eumenides are not only spoken of in vivid language but are also shown with their snake-*invest* hair. Lessing finds it ironic that Aeschylus could raise his expression of tragedy to sublime heights and yet lower it to the level of sheer fright with such techniques. This dramatic technique is far different from that of Sophocles

who could remain sublime without contrivance or banality in his plot or diction. Unfortunately Lessing does not concretize this view with the proof from the plays as he claims he will. He assumes that the reader will verify his claim based on personal exposure to the Sophoclean corpus.

The third point of comparison between Sophocles and Aeschylus is their diction. Lessing feels that Sophocles infused an entirely new spirit into the language of the drama:

Sophocles soll den ganzen Character der Rede umgeschaffen, und ihn so viel möglich, sittlich und moralisch gut gemacht haben? Das sieht dem Sophocles nicht "ähnlich. Dazu war er zu viel Poet, und verstand seine Kunst veil zu gut! Der wahre Tragicus läßt seine Personen ihrem Affekte, ihrer Situation gemäß sprechen, und bekümmert sich nicht im geringsten darum, ob sie lehrreich und erbaulich sprechen. 74

The spirit which Sophocles infused into his language was that of natural emotion and sentiment. His diction is not overburdened with moralistic tones as is the diction of Aeschylus, nor full of trite colloquialisms as is the language of Euripides. Sophocles allows his characters to speak according to their emotional inclinations and the conditions of their milieu. A perfect example of this is Sophocles' brilliant use of the stichomythia technique. Often one of two characters will be speaking at the other person, not with him in dialogue. They are on two different levels of awareness, e.g. Creon and Hannon in the Antigone.⁷⁵ Lessing again fails to cite concrete examples for generally sound observations about the poetic art of Sophocles. Perhaps the intended prose translations were to contain such references.

The next major area of interest in the Life of Sophocles is Lessing's attempt to chronologize the plays and speculate on the plots of some of the lost drama:

Sein erstes Trauerspiel fällt in die sieben und siebenzigste Olympias. Das sagt Eusebias, das sagt auch Plutarch; nur muß man das Zeug nicht dieses letztern nicht verstehen; wie ich denn beweisen will, daß man gar nicht nötig hat die vermeinte Verbesserung anzunehmen, welche Samuel Petit darinn angezeihen hat...

Die Zahl aller seiner Stücke wird sehr groß angegeben. Nur sieben sind daran bis auf uns gekommen; und von den andern ist wenig mehr übrig, als die Titel. Doch auch diese Titel werden diejenigen nicht ohne Nutzen studieren, welche Stoffe zu Trauerspielen suchen. 76

Lessing observes that the critics Eusebius and Plutarch agree that Sophocles' first production occurred in the second year of the 77th Olympiad, or approximately 471/470 B.C. This would make Sophocles 24 or 25 years old. The difficulty of this position, however, arises in the passage in Plutarch's Life of Cimon which claims a certain Aphepsion was archon the year that Sophocles first contested in the Great Dionysiac festival. 77
The story continues with Cimon's return from the victory over Scyros (476/5 B.C.) and his order to set up ten judges, one from each deme. These two occurrences are not chronologically compatible. As proof of this Lessing cites Samuel Petits' criticism of Plutarch's story

Corruption est Praetoris Atheniensis nomen Aphepsion Archon signovit Fastos anni tertii Olympiadis septuagesimae quartor. At vero, sive natales Sophoclis adscribamus secundo anno Olympiadis septuagesimae primus, ut pleraque veterum auctorum pars e vera, ut nobis quidem videtur scriptum reliquit, quæ annus Praetorem habuit Philippum, sive anno tertio Olympiadis septuagesimae tertias, ut alli volunt, per aetatem

fabulus docere non potuit Sophocles. Anno primo Olympiadis septuagesimae septimae primum drama a Sophocle commissum fuisse narrat Eusebius. Quod si Plutarchum verbis laudatis audimus, ut certe audiendus est, et assensum meretur, dicemus Sophoclem primum suum drama in scenam protulisse anno tertio Olympiadis Septuagesimae septimae, Demotione Athenis Praetom. ⁷⁸

After disproving with numerous facts and citations Petits' conjecture of Demotion as archon, Lessing presents his own candidate, Phaedon. The trophies which Petis discusses in the continuation of the above mentioned passage, were not those set up in Salamis but in Pamphylion. Lessing bases this correction on Cimon's inability to travel from Asia Minor to Athens in the same year. Diodorus Siculus, according to Lessing, names Phaedon as archon in the fourth year of the 77th Olympiad (468/67). The only doubt of the choice of Phaedon arises from a document called the Arendelion Marble which supposedly agrees with Plutarch in naming Anapsion as archon at the time of Sophocles' dramatic victory. ⁷⁹ It places Sophocles at 28 which would be inconsistent with Plutarch's statement that Sophocles was very young at the time of the victory. Lessing solves this problem by agreeing with a certain Palermias who feels that Plutarch considered Sophocles' birth to fall in the third year of the 73rd Olympiad (484/83 B.C.) ⁸⁰ At best, Lessing's attempts to chronologization are confusion and confused, but they do show his analytical attempt to put Sophocles in an historical perspective.

Another interesting factor related to Sophocles' first dramatic victory is the choice of judges.

"Die Sache verdient eine n here Erkl rung. Ich stelle mir es so vor. Der dramatische Wettstreit mu te notwendig seine Richter, habens; dieser Richter wurden

durch das Loos gewählt, und wie man mit ihrer Wahl bei der Komödie verfährt, so verfährt man auch bei der Tragödie damit. Nun erübnete sich itzt der Fall, daß die Zuschauer ausserordentlich uneinig waren,

; ein junger Mensch streitet wider einen alten versuchten Mann; der alte wird es gut machen, der Jungling nicht schlecht; dieser muß auf gemuntert, jener nicht verdrießlich gemacht werden. Was war zu tun? Sollte die Entscheidung einer so kitzlichen Sache, die mit so vieler Hitze getrieben ward, dem Glücke überlassen werden? Das Loos hätte auf Leute fallen können, die nichts weniger als fähige Richter gewesen wären. Itzt kom es nicht bloß darauf an, unparthesche Richter zu haben; man wollte einsichtsvolle haben." 81

Lessing observes that the common people who viewed the tragedies were too involved in the emotional aspects of the entire proceeding: the festive mood of the religious and state ceremonies connected with the contests, the profound emotional and psychological effect of the play, and the natural tendency to favor an old favorite and/or to encourage a promising newcomer. For these reasons, the people allowed their generals, - men chosen as leaders for their outstanding judgment and ability, to act as the representative judges of the people. The distinction of military service was a requirement for judgeship in a contest of tragedies, while no such distinction was made for the comic contests. The number of judges was also different; 10 for the tragic and 5 for the comic competitions. This stipulation indicates the importance of the military in the life of Athens. Although this practice may seem strange to modern sensibilities, it was quite a respected one in Athens where even the generals were picked only for a year - and on merit, not seniority.

I turn now to Lessing's discussion of the various plays of Sophocles beginning with the Triptolemus. Lessing does not commit himself on the number of Sophocles' plays. He merely mentions that Suida's lists 123, Aristophanes of Byzantium 130. 82

Das einstimmige Zeugniß des Plutarch und Eusebius wasd durch ein drittes bestätigt, das so viel ich weis, zu diesem Zwecke noch von niemandem angeführt worden. Ich meine eine Stelle bei dem Ältern Plinius. Er redet, in dem achtzehnten Buche seiner Naturgeschichte, von der verschiednen Ländern, und schließt: Hae fuere sententiae Alexandro magno regnante, cum clarissima fuit Graecia, atque in toto terrarum orbe potentissima: ita tamen ut ante mortem ejus annis fere Sophocles poeta, in fabula Triptolemo, frumentum Italicum ante cuncta laudarerit, ad verbum translata sententia: Et fortunatum Italiam frumento canere candido. 83

Lessing observes that Pliny's remarks do not give the dates of Sophocles' first play. The basic agreement of the probable time of the epoch of this first play, however, and the date given to the Triptolemus cause Lessing to feel that the Triptolemus must be the first play.

The next two non-extant plays of Sophocles which Lessing discusses are the Thamyris and the Nausikau. The Thamyris is related to the story of Sophocles' weak voice which caused him to give up acting and devote his entire life to the work of a playwright. Athenæus and the unknown Biographer are cited respectively:

τον θαμυριν διδασκων αυτος εκιθαρισεν. 84

and

φασι δε οτι και κιθαραν αναλαβων εν μονω τω θαμυριδι ποτε εκιθαρισεν. 85

This play by Sophocles is based on a myth about Thamyris which Lessing relates. He was a Thracian Virtuoso on the lyre who dared to challenge the Muses themselves to a contest. Thamyris

was defeated and suffered blindness as punishment for his fool-heartedness. Lessing speculates that Sophocles may have played the lead role, for Pliny tells us that Thamyris was the first to play the lyre without singing, a condition well suited to Sophocles' weak voice.

Lessing makes some further startling speculations about the staging of this play:

... daß die Bestrafung des Thamyris auf der Bühne geschehen; daß er vor den Augen der Zuschauer blind geworden. Ich gründe meine Mutmassungen auf eine Stelle des Pollux, in die sich seine Ausleger gar nicht zu finden gemüßt haben. Pollux gedenkt verschiedener tragischen Masken, die von einer besondern Art gewesen, und sagt unter andern, daß die Maske des Thamyris, zweierlei Augen gehabt habe; *τοὺς μὲν γλαυκὸν ὀφθαλμοὺς, τοὺς δὲ κελαινὰ*. Die alten Schauspieler, wie bekannt, spielten in Masken, welche nicht allein das Gesicht, sondern den ganzen Kopf bedeckten. Diese Masken hatten die Unbequemlichkeit, daß sie der Abänderungen nicht fähig waren, welche die abwechselnden Leidenschaften in den Zügen des Gesichts verursachen. Die kleinern von diesen Abänderungen waren ihre Zuschauer zwar ohnedem verloren. 86

The construction of the ancient masks is a matter of great dispute among scholars. ⁸⁷ Lessing ascribes to the theory of Quintilian, as does Pollux, that the ancient masks, which were used as megaphones in the open air amphitheater, were often constructed with the depiction of a different emotion or facial expression on each side of the mask-face. The great problem of distance precluded any effective facial emotional expression by the actors. The audience could only pick up such expression by vocal inflection and the shift of the actors' face. This last gesticulation indicated the change in the emotional, physical or psychological state of the actor.

Another speculation does not pertain directly to the play *Phamyris*, but to Sophocles himself. The unknown biographer claims that Sophocles was depicted in the Painted Stoa on which Polygnatus supposedly painted the picture of the Athenian Gods and Heroes. Lessing feels that Sophocles was too young to be so honored by Polygnatus. He does, however, think that Sophocles was so honored by Micon, the successor of Polygnatus.

Lessing deals with the Nausikaa in which Sophocles is supposed to have danced. This play is not extant and Lessing makes no attempt to date the play. The plot is obviously taken from Homer's beautiful account of the meeting of Odysseus and Nausikaa on the shores of Scheria.⁸⁸ While playing ball, the handmaiden of the princess discovers Odysseus naked amid the bushes. Lessing quotes the section describing Odysseus for its beauty and vivid simile:

Εν κυκνῆς δ' ὕλης κροθῶν κλάσσει χεῖρι παχεῖν
 φύλλων, ὡς ρυσσάιτο περὶ χροὶ μηδὲα φῶτος.
 Ἐν δ' ἔμην, ὡσεὶ λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, ἀλκι πέποιθως,
 ὅς' εἰς' ὑμένοσ καὶ ἀήμενος, ἐν δὲ οἱ ὄσσει
 ἄλειται· αὐτὰρ ὁ βούσῃν ἐκέρχεται, ἢ οἰεσσῆν
 Ἡε μετ' ἀγροτέρης ἐλαφούς· κἀλείται δὲ εὖ φάσῃ, 89

Odysseus is compared to a lion, sure of his own strength, who turns with desire for food. The glow in Odysseus' eye is stimulated by the beauty of the princess. He is a king and acts with the nobility of a kingly lion. Lessing can give no further comment other than "Welch ein Gemälde! Welch eine Vergleichung!"

Lessing feels that the nature of the subject is suited to a tragic-comedy or satire rather than a tragedy. Fabricius, in his notes on the last plays of Sophocles, says that it is a

satiric drama. But a certain Casaubonus, from whom Fabricus draws his information, does not make such a statement, according to Lessing.⁹⁰ Lessing makes an associative assumption as the basis of his own views on this point. He feels that the *Odyssey* of Homer was a great source of satyric plays, and that the Nausekoa of Sophocles would be from the same source as the satyric Cyclops of Euripides.

Lessing uses the term "satire" and "tragic-comedy" to interchangeably to describe these plays. This lack of distinction may be due to an incomplete knowledge of what a satyr play really is. It usually involved some type of buffoonery to offset the tragic mood set by the other plays which formed a tetralogy. The tragic comedy is more suited to the New Greek Comedy, noted for its romantic and stock themes.⁹¹ The texts of the plays of this period were unknown to Lessing and might have helped clarify his ideas in this area.

The next play Lessing discusses is the Antigone, one of the most favored plays of the Sophoclean corpus during the late 18th and early 19th century. Hegel and Hölderlin, as we shall see, dealt extensively with this play for its dialectic quotes. The Scholiasts claim that Sophocles was named general because of the people's high esteem of this play. This honor confronts us with the problem of dating, once again. The Biographer of the *Bios*, according to Lessing, claims that Sophocles was elected to the generalship at age 65, seven years before the Peloponesian War, in the campaign against Anha. The Oxford text says:

Και Ἀθηναῖοι δ' αὐτὸν ἔθ' ἑτῶν οὐκ ἄνω στρατηγὸν εἰλοντο πρὸ τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν ἑτασιν ζ' ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀναίους πολέμῳ.

Οὕτω δὲ φιλαθηναϊοτάτος ἦν ὥστε πολλῶν βασιλέων μετακτε-
 μένων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἠθέλησε τὴν πατρίδα καταλιπεῖν. 92

Lessing cites another unknown scholiast who claims that this generalship was bestowed in the third year of the 85th Olympiad (approx. 436 B.C.). In his effort to clarify the exact date of the play, Lessing dates the beginning of the Peloponesian War at 430/29 B.C., Seven years before this would be 437/36 B.C., or the third year of the 85th Olympiad. If we assume, with Lessing, that Sophocles was born approximately in 496 B.C., he would be at the most 60 years of age and probably closer to 55, allowing for the nebulous status of his birth date.

The problem of the Achaean war's coincidence with Pericles' generalship is also treated at length by Lessing. He feels that the war with Achaia was undertaken as a result of Athen's war with Samos, the ally of Achaia. Pericles was general of this campaign in the fourth year of the 84th Olympiad (440/439 B.C.). This date shows a two year discrepancy with the Biographer's dating. Samuel Petit holds for the ninth year previous to the Peloponesian War, and thus dates the Antigone 442/41 B.C. Lessing, however, feels that the biographer is referring to Pericles' second expedition against the Samians in the third year of the 85th Olympiad (437/36 B.C. As proof of this point, Lessing quotes a related passage from Strabo, the chronologer, who wrote:

Ἄθηναίοι δὲ πρότερον μὲν κερψάντες στρατηγὸν Περικλέα, καὶ
 σὺν αὐτῷ Σοφοκλέα τὸν κρητῆν, πολιορκία κακῶς διεθήκαν
 ἀκείθουντας τοὺς Σαμίους· ὕστερον δὲ καὶ κληρούχους ἐκέρψαν
 τρισχιλίους. ἐξ αὐτῶν, ὧν ἦν καὶ Νεοκλῆς ὁ Ἐπικούρου τοῦ
 φιλοσόφου πατὴρ. 93

Lessing feels that Stabo is referring to the second expedition against Samos which may be verified in a history of the three thousand cleruchs who were sent to Samos at this time. Lessing, unfortunately, does not elaborate on the Antiope - an undertaking which would be most enlightening as a comparative study with Hölderlin's interpretation of this play.

Lessing continues his survey of the non-exant plays with speculations on three in particular: the Athamas, the Brechtheus and the Thyestes.

Lessing states that Sophocles had two different tragedies entitled Athamas. Lessing speculates that the content of one may have been the madness of Athamas which Ovid describes in Bk IV of his Metamorphose: The goddess Juno in Ovid's version, turns Athamas into a madman who, with his two sons, is on a hunt for a lion. Ovid describes his hunt as follows:

Utque feræ sequitur vestigia conjugis æmens
 deque sinu matris ridentem et parvum Learchum
 Brachia tendentem rapit, et bis terque per aures
 Mors rotat fundas, rigidoque infantia saxo
 Discutet ossa ferox. 94

This description is quite similar to Sophocles' portrayal of Ajax in his mad rage against the Athenians with the role of reality and image reversed. Lessing speculates that Sophocles treated the plot as follows: Athamas is mad and hunts his wife Ino like a lion with the intent to kill her. His two sons accompany him but during the chase, Athamas turns on his sons and kills one. Ino flees with the surviving son, Melicertes,

and commits suicide with him by diving from a precipice into the sea. Lessing observes that it was common practice among the Greeks to portray the wrath of the Gods against great people and families on the stage. This was especially true of Aeschylus or Sophocles in this regard. He merely observes that nothing could indeed be more frightening than the "unversöhnliche Haß eines allmächtigen Wesens?"

The second version of Athamas is a bit more documented. The scholiast of Aristophanes' Clouds relates that it concerns the sacrifice of Phrixus. The plot was as follows. Athamos was married to Nephele before Ino. By Nephele, Athamos sired Phrixus and Helle. Juno in her vengeance against Athamos inspired Ino to kill these children. There was a great seance and the Delphic oracle was consulted. Ino bribes the messenger who was sent to the oracle and he tells her to sacrifice Phrixus. The father, of course, will have nothing to do with this, but the people press the point. Phrixus himself demands that he be the victim of the oracles' order. The courage of the prince moves the messenger, who unveils the betrayal. Athamos is furious and leaves Ino to Phrixus to do with her what he will. The noble Phrixus pardons her. Lessing observes that this is not exactly how Apolloneus and Hygin relate the story, but how he would port-
 95
 ray it. Although his plot line seems very sketchy and disjointed, Lessing apparently felt that it was a plot well suited to the emotional needs of the Greek audience, with an ending intended for moral edification.

Erechtheus, the next play discussed by Sophocles concerned the sixth king of Athens by that name. No mention of its plot is made in the ancient critics. Lessing, therefore, turns to a feature in Erechtheus' story which is "uncommonly tragic" and would lend itself to dramatic portrayal. Erechtheus, it seems, was involved in a war with the Eleusinians. He asked the oracle how he could assure himself of victory and received the order to sacrifice one of his daughters. He decided upon the youngest, but the other daughter wanted to share in this gruesome honor. The youngest was sacrificed and the other committed suicide. This plot seems to be a development of the confrontation between Ismene and Antigone after the sharing of the guilt of Polynices' burial. Creon, in the end, will lose all of his family as does Erechtheus.

The final play which Lessing discusses is the Thyestes. Here again Sophocles produced two different plays. One was entitled Θόρσος ο εν Πύρρονι. Lessing feels that its plot could have been one of the most frightful experiences of the Greek stage. After the disgusting meal which Atrius had prepared for his brother, Thyestes fled to Sicyon where he received the answer from the oracle to his plan for vengeance: he was to defile his own daughter. He tricked his daughter into sleeping with him and sired Aegiathus by this union. This son, of course, later kills Atrius. Lessing ends his commentary on this play with two short exclamations!

"Welche Situation! welche Scene!

Lessing was always looking for the most dramatic technique, plot and effect in a play. All plays had to follow Aristotle's guide-

lines of emotional arousal and purgation.

Lessing ends his Life of Sophocles with several miscellaneous anecdotes which include the story of Sophocles' death while reading the Antigone, the tale of how he calmed the winds for the Abderetans by writing a Paian,⁹⁶ and the story of his trial set up by his sons. This last story is well worth repeating, for it is connected with Sophocles' last play, the Oedipus Colonus.

Lessing prefaces his remarks about the trial with a list of Sophocles' sons: Iophon, Leosthenes, Ariston, Stephanos and Meneklides. Iophon was his legitimate son of whom Siudas says:

'Ιοφῶν, ἀθηναῖος τραγικός, υἱὸς Σοφοκλέους τοῦ τραγωδιοποιοῦ, γνησίος. ἀπὸ Νικωστράτης. γέγονε γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ νεθὸς υἱὸς Ἀρίστων Ἀρίστων ἀπὸ Θεοδωρίδος σικυωνίας. δράματα δὲ Ἰοφῶν ἐκίδαξε ν. ὠν 97
 Ἐστὶν Ἀχιλλεύς, Τηλέφος, Ἀκταίων, Ἴλλος, Περσὶς, Δεξιμένης, Βαχχαί,...

the father of Sophocles' the younger, who also became a dramatic poet. This younger Sophocles supposedly produced his first play in 396 B.C., approximately nine years after the death of Sophocles. Nothing else is known about the other sons.

The anecdote about Sophocles' trial by by sons is told by Cicero in Chapter 7 of his Cato Maior!

Manent ingenia sensibus; modo permaneat studium et industria: nec ea solum in claris et honoratis viris, sed in vita etiam privata et quieta. Sophocles ad summam senectutem tragoedias fecit: quod propter studium cum rem familiarem negligere videretur, a filiis in iudicium vocatus est: ut quemadmodum nostro more male rem gerentibus patribus boni interdicti solet, sic illum, quasi dissipentem a re familiari removerent iudices. Tum senex dicitur eam fabulam, quam in manibus habet et proxime scripserat, Oedipum Coloneum

recitasse iudicibus, quaesissique, num illud carmen
desipientis videretur. Quo recitate, sententia
iudicium est liberatus. 98

The sons of Sophocles were attempting to get power of attorney over their father's wealth, a situation which often arises even today. Sophocles, however, foiled their plans by reading from a text of Oedipus Colonos. This play is generally held to be a posthumous production of Sophocles. Cicero's story does not negate the veracity of that tradition, for his trial may have been in the year of his death, before the play could have been produced. The majesty and the import of this play's message must surely have impressed the judges. It is unfortunate that Lessing does not expound upon the dramatic value of this play.

An aspect of drama which Lessing discusses earlier in the Life is more suitable for discussion here, i.e. the chorus. Lessing develops his ideas on the chorus in his discussion of the dramatic innovations introduced by Sophocles. Sophocles apparently wrote a treatise on the nature of the chorus, but this work is no longer extant. The importance of the chorus in Greek tragedy cannot be minimized, for it forms the original basis of the dramatic art. Lessing discusses its importance in the development of Athenian tragedy!

Anfangs war die Tragödie nicht als Gesang verschiedener Loblieder zu Ehren des Bacchus. Damit der Chor, welcher dieser Lieder sang, manchmal ruhen und Atem schöpfen könnte, fiel Thespis darauf, eine interessante Begebenheit dazwischen von einem aus der Bunde erzählen oder vorstellen zu lassen. Aeschylus verwandelte diese Erzählung und Verstellung die von einer einzigen Person geschah, in ein ordentliches Gespräch, in dem er eine

zweite Person hinguffügte, unter die sich nunmehr die Geschichts vertheilte,.. Endlich fand Sophocles, daß auch dieses noch zu einförmig war. Er fügte also die dritte Person henzu, welche Tritagonistes heißt. 99

Lessing had a great interest in the historical trends of Greek tragedy as a theoretical and practical experience in the life of Athens. Sophocles played not only a significant, but also a pivotal, role in the development of this genre. Lessing's spirit, motivated by the enlightened desire for truth, guided him to a study of Sophocles which was far more encompassing and exact than was that of any other German of the Classic-Romantic Period. In his essay Beitrag zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theater (1750), Lessing attempts to delineate exactly what could be learned from dramatists like Sophocles and Euripides. He realized that the German Theater was basically, and rather shallowly, geared for the Wit. He hoped to promote the new spirit of genuine German drama. Lessing experienced the phenomena of a developing German theater at the time of its first birth pangs and explicitly calls his era "die Kindheit unsere guten Geschmacks". The ultimate purpose of this essay was to glean the values from the ancient and contemporary foreign authors so that the German people could be exposed to the spirit of the great dramas of all time. Lessing gives this procedure a more definite outline:

Was die Muster, die wir vorlegen wollen, anbelangt, so glauben wir uns in den Stand gesetzt zu haben en, daß wir aus dem Griechischen und Lateinischen, aus dem Französischen, Italiänischen, Englischen, Spanischen und Holländischen unsern Lesern von uns übersetzte Stücke werden lesen können, Auf die ersten zwei wollen

wir unsern Fleiß besonders wenden. Wir wollen zeweilen aus dem Sophokles, Euripides und Aeschylus ein Stück übersetzen; wozu wir allezeit ein solches wählen wollen, das von neuern Poeten ist nachgeahmet worden oder von dessen Inhalte wenigstens ein Ähnliches neueres Stück zu finden ist... Wir wollen dabei selbst untereinander vergleichen, und zu bestimmen suchen, was Sophokles vor dem Euripides, dieser vor jenem, beide vor den Aeschylus, und dieser vor beiden eigens habe...¹⁰¹

Lessing, like Herder and other men of the Enlightenment, investigated all possible sources for new inspiration in order to spearhead advances in genuine creativity. It is significant, I think, that Lessing chose the work of Sophocles as a model not only of form, but of spirit. Lessing was the man who gave the impetus to a German National Theater because of his dedicated search for the truth of tragedy - the suffering of mankind which should be viewed only as a means to a higher end: man's own moral edification.

The history of German tragedy and drama was to move forward from Lessing's preoccupation with the spirit of drama, its affect on the audience, and its vivid portrayal, especially in scenes of pain. With Goethe and Schiller, it was to reach the peak of achievement with their fusion of form and spirit. The decline of this classical unity could be detected in Holderlin's attempt, noble though it was, to infuse a new romantic and subjective spirit into a time worn form.

In summary, Lessing's interest in Sophocles centered around two focal points. First, his interest in the mechanics of tragic drama led him to a detailed analysis and revisionary interpretation of Aristotle's Poetics. Meaning and spirit were to take precedence over form. The interests of the audience were of prime

importance in the theater. All this led him to accept Aristotle's model, Sophocles, as his own model and sounding board for the development of general dramatic principle. Secondly, Lessing developed a great interest in historical veracity and perspective. He thus undertook a study of Sophocles, the man, in an effort to comprehend his peculiar dramatic spirit more fully. These two avenues of investigation, the theatrical and historical, are not innovations on Lessing's part. They merely represent his way of gaining insights into Sophocles' style. As we shall see, these two avenues of approach guided the interest of other authors in their own investigation of Sophocles, but the results will be remarkably different.

CHRISTOPH MARTIN WIELAND(1733-1813)

Christoph Martin Wieland was the revered old man of the Weimar Circle, the seat of German classicism in the 18th century. The influence of Sophocles on Wieland is tangential at best. There are few explicit references to either Sophocles or his corpus in Wieland's own works. The most interesting, although very indirect, analysis of Sophocles, the dramatist occurs in Wieland's satiric work Die Abderiten (1774-9). Here Wieland employs a classical setting in the town of Abdera, a city state at the time of Sophocles, noted for its provincialism, to attack the "stupidity, smugness, and ignorance of a typical small town" like Erfurt, Germany.¹ This novel was Wieland's major literary attempt to spread the gospel of enlightened cosmopolitanism in Germany. Unfortunately, for our purposes, Wieland chose the genre of the novel rather than the drama as his medium of expression. I wish to deal with Die Abderiten at some length, however, for Hölderlin entitles one section of the book "Euripides unter den Abderiten".

The Abderites, symbols of German traditionalism, were also noted for their peculiar lack of good taste. Wieland quotes Hyperbolus, their chief dramatist, on his theory of drama: "die Tragödie muß über die Natur gehen aber ich gebe nicht eine hohle Ruß darum".² Tragedy was not a heightening of reality for them, it was a type of distraction and relief from daily drudgery. Hyperbolus directs his attack on traditional drama to a criticism of Sophoclean characterization. He feels that no one, in Abdera at least, had ever appeared, felt thought, spoken or acted as the Sophoclean characters did. This may be so in Abdera, states Wieland mockingly,

for the people there acted in a completely unique way.

Tragedy is supposed to provide a means for recreating reality in a fictional setting for the purpose of reflection. This type of drama reached its acme in the Athenian tragedians and especially in Sophocles. The Abderites, however, were perfectly content without this vehicle for reflection, Wieland observes:

"Aber das wollten die Abderites eben - und daher kam es auch, daß sie unter allen auswärtigen Dichtern, am wenigstens, aus dem Sophocles machten.: 3

This criticism of the Abderites may be taken indirectly as Wieland's personal praise of Sophocles as the best of the Greek tragedians.

Hyperbolus continues his critique of tragedy by comparing Sophocles to "Aeschylus". He apparently held the belief that Aeschylus was the teacher of Sophocles, for he says:

Wenn ich aufrichtig sagen soll, wie ich denke...ich habe nie befragen können, was an den Oedipus oder an der Electra des Sophocles insonder hat, was an seinem Philoktet so außerordentliches sein soll? Für einen Nachfolger eines so erhabnen Dichters, wie Aischylos, fällt er wähehlich gewaltig ab! Nun ja. Attische Urbanität, die streit ich ihn nicht ab!... Aber der Feuerstrom, der welterleuchtenden Gedanken, die Donnerschläge, die hinreißende Wirbelwind - kurz die RieBenstärke, die Adlersflug der Lowensgrimm, der Sturm und Drang, der den wahren tragischen Dichter macht, wo ist der? 4

The key phrase for Sophocles' influence on the Germans of the 18th and 19th century is "attische Urbanität". In an era of enlightenment, tolerance and progress, Wieland preferred this cosmopolitan sense of urbanity and sophistication to the petty attitudes prevalent in provincial cities like Erfurt. Sophocles represents, for Wieland, the most vibrant and creative model of this attic urbanity and sophistication. He could deal with

characters of prestigious background in the most human fashion. Aeschylus presented his audience with tragedy based on divine intervention in human affairs, symbolized by thunder and lightning. Sophocles recreated the genuine tragic salvation of mankind with a heroic struggle to overcome self-doubts.⁶ He infuses the sentiment of human freedom into his characters in a new and fascinating manner, which appealed to the sensitivities of the Enlightenment.

In the third book of the Abderiten, "Euripides unter den Abderiten", Wieland criticizes the people of Abdera for their instinctive lack of taste;

Wenn sie zum Exempel die Antigone des Sophocles erwarteten, die Epigone des Phrynathus für lieb und gut nehmen mußten, woran es denn selten oder nie ermangeln ließen.⁷

Wieland cleverly employs the literary device of oxymoron to elucidate the perverted aesthetic sense of the Abderitern. The name of the unknown poet's play Epigone has a variety of meanings in the original Greek. Wieland exploits two in particular: First, it can mean "born for or in the favor of". This meaning is in direct opposition to Antigone which means "born against or hostile to". Wieland uses this opposition to develop the antithetical relationship of Athens and Abdera, Phrynathus and Sophocles. A second meaning of "epigone" is very significant for Wieland. The epigonal movement in literature is an attempt by members of a given literary era to imitate the glories of the preceding era in form without the depth of the original creative genius. Such a situation was to arise in 19th century Germany after the decline of the Klassik-Romantik period.

Wieland continues his cultural tirade against the Abderites:

Die große Verschiedenheit der athenienischer Schauspielerdichter und der Abstand eines Aklydamos von einem Sophocles etwas dazu beitragen sollen, ihren Geschmack zu bilden und ihnen den Unterschied zwischen gut und schlecht, vortrefflich und mittelmäßig...

Wieland was very concerned about the aesthetic education of the German nation. The fruits of the Age of Enlightenment could only be enjoyed with a full education, aesthetic, moral and practical. Wieland felt that a study of the classics could provide a valuable means to that end. The ancient Greek character with its stress on the individual could be effectively utilized as a model for personal achievement and independence. The personal trial, conflict and isolation of the Sophoclean hero could vividly concretize these ideals.

Wieland was a Greek scholar of considerable repute. In later life he undertook the momentous task of translating major authors including Aristophanes and Lucian.⁹ The latter author was Wieland's personal favorite because of his light moralistic qualities. Sengle, in his biography of Wieland characterizes Wieland in similar terms:

Der Spotter und Spieler Wieland hat sich mit der empfindsamen, sittlichen humanen Welt der Alcesten und Iphegenien ausgeglichen. Das Ergebnis dieses **Ausgleichs** nennen wir seine humoristische Klassik, dem wir wußten nicht zu sagen, welcher Klassiker unseren Dichtern in dieser Richtung übertroffen hatte.¹⁰

Wieland humorously considered men as a civilized and progressing "Classe von Affe" and at one point the Greeks appear to be "ein wahres luftiges Lumpengesindel".¹¹ He makes these satiric evaluations between 1775 and 1800, a time when classical restraint was vying with the wild emotionalism of the Sturm und Drang period.

Wieland warned against the "Wilde" of the Greeks which existed simultaneously with "ihrem lebhaften Gefühl für des sittlichen Schöne."¹² This observation on the dichotomy of rawness and tenderness, barbarity and humanity in the Greek spirit was a precursor of Nietzsche's and Hegel's 19th century dialectical interpretation of the themes in Classical Literature. Wieland unfortunately does not analyze these various strains of human emotion in Sophocles' plays.

A major factor contributing to Sophocles' insignificant influence on Wieland may be Wieland's decision to deal with the decline of Greek culture and not the Golden Age. Sengle observes that Wieland chose the figure of Dionysus, the tyrant of Syracuse, in his famous Agathon (1767) an example of decadent aristocratic rule for that very reason.¹³ Wieland also draws more heavily upon Euripides and his thematic material than on Sophocles or Aeschylus. This choice is consistent with Wieland's interest in satire and psychological problems.

This use of a classical or foreign milieu was prominent in the Klassik-Romantik period. Wieland, according to Abbe, had a great influence on Schiller and his "historical plays" because of his ability to create a fictional reality without a sense of artificiality. Wieland's success in employing classical motifs was probably due to the general classical education of his audience. No real problem of cultural shock was involved. Wieland was simply drawing on a long tradition as a means of expressing his modern ideas and insights.

Although Wieland was not primarily a dramatist,¹⁵ he did

try his hand at this genre. He wrote a musical drama Alceste (1773)¹⁶ which apparently drew Goethe from "his Herder-inspired love of modern and medieval history and reminded him of the harmony and color of the classical tragedy." Wieland's Alceste, presumably based on Euripides' play, was a milestone leading to Goethe's Iphigenie and to other "classical" dramas of the Weimar stage. Wieland's play Lady Jane Gray (1758), based on Nicolas Rowe's English version, was the first German iambic play. His Die Wahl des Herkules was a lyrical drama with music specifically composed for Karl August's 17th birthday. The play employed a classical setting for expounding the universal theme of virtue vs. vice.

A common practice among litterateurs of this period was to develop their own ideas on aesthetics. Wieland presented his views on the subject in an article "Gedanken über die Ideal der Alten" which appeared in the Teutsche Merkur. Wieland's own magazine of literary criticism, in 1779.¹⁸ Wieland's opinions about the Greeks were very aristocratic, as the views of most educated Germans. Wieland believed that important matters, such as art and politics, were the concern of a select few. This platonic attitude is similar to Winckelmann's belief that appreciation of beauty was rare even among the Greeks. There were the masters and the masses. Wieland also makes this distinction between the Greek nation and the artists- Homer, Sophocles and Socrates.¹⁹

Wieland realized that the recognition of the value of the ancient classics was a late development in German literature.

In reply to Frederick the Great's essay "De la litteratur allemand", Wieland observed that German literature was only experiencing a "schwacher Anfang" and that his work, as well as that of so many others was only "ein sehr kleine Licht" leading the way to a literary revival that would equal the Enlightenment in importance for Germany.²⁰ Wieland's role as a torchbearer and pathfinder was fulfilled in part by his interest in the Classics, in part by his concern for modern psychology. The synthesis of the two interests led to an interpretation of the classics quite similar to that of Hölderlin, the prime torchbearer for the classics in the early 19th century. Both men grasped for the meaning and sense behind the traditional forms of ancient works.

A most fitting tribute to the quality and vitality of the literature of the Greeks comes in Wieland's criticism of Goethe's play Götz von Berlichingen (1773) which significantly includes a comparison with Sophocles:

Wenn Götz von Berlichingen und seine wohl oder übel gerathenen Nachahmungen kein anderes Verdienst hatten, als daß sie uns durch die Erfahrung, die man von ihrer Wirkung gemacht hat, den Weg gezeigt hätten, auf welchen wir eine wahre Nationalschaubühne erhalten können, so wärees schon Verdienst genug. Männer von Genie, aber Männer nicht rohe ungebändigte, von Natur-, Kunst-, und Welterkenntnis gleich stark entblöbte Junglings, die, ohne es zu machen, alle Augenblicke von einer halb wahnsinnigen Phantasie über die Grenzen der Natur und des Schicklichen hinausgerissen werden - Männervon wahren Genie und Talent, sage ich, werden (wie uns das Beispiele des Verfassers von Götz und Iphigenia schon gezeigt hat) auf diesem Wege zuletzt unfehlbar selbst mit einem alsdann finden, das Formen der Griechen nicht alle anderen Formen ausschließen. 21

He became enveloped by the spirit of Greek culture and could,

as Sengle says, criticize Goethe's Qbzt von Berlichingen, despite the fact that its structure was "regelmäßiger als irgendeine französische Trauerspiel", in the full breadth of the "Geist des Sophokles."²²

Friedrich Hölderlin (1770-1843)

Perhaps Sophocles' greatest influence on German literature after the death of Lessing and Winckelmann manifested itself in the work of Friedrich Hölderlin. Although Hölderlin had a fine education in the Classics, the seeds of a deep interest in Sophocles first appeared in the 1790's. He attempted a translation of the Chorale Ode in praise of Athens (l. 668-694) from the Oedipus Colonus, which was published in 1796.¹ In this work, as in his translations of Pindar, Hölderlin, a master of the lyric technique, employs an interpretation of tonal quality and imaginative sense rather than a strict translation to achieve a harmony of language, mood and thought.²

Harmony is crucial for a proper understanding of Hölderlin's works. Harmony consists of the coordination of all parts of a literary piece to create a generic whole. As we shall see throughout this paper, Hölderlin considered Sophocles a master of harmony which arises paradoxically out of a sense of natural conflict and contrast. The value of Sophocles as an artist was enhanced for Hölderlin by Sophocles' ability to remain a man of his times. The Age of Pericles was an era of turmoil and harmony. With the tool of lyric beauty and dramatic effect, Sophocles recreated the social conflicts of his day with the keen awareness of a political scientist. Hölderlin strove to retain this dual aspect of life-turmoil and harmony - in his translation of Sophocles' works. This endeavor was conditioned, however, by Hölderlin's own need to be contemporary with German life.

The contemporary theater of Hölderlin's time was the theater of Weimar which, under the direction of Goethe and Schiller, strove to be a major part of the German educational process. Hölderlin, too, was influenced by the need for a reflective type of theater. For this reason, he chose to interpret certain parts of Sophocles' plays for the sake of relevance. Willi Flemming in his book Goethe und das Theater seiner Zeit stresses the value of such an interpretation.

Es was das große und einzige Mal in der Geschichte des deutschen Dramas, wo dieser organische, und wesensgemäße Lebenszusammenhang von Dichter und Schauspieler, von Drama und Theater waltete, der für Shakespeare und für Sophocles das Fundament ihrer Kunst ganz fraglos, und selbstverständlich bildete. 3.

Hölderlin's interest in Sophocles developed in two directions. The primary concern of Hölderlin was the treatment of Sophocles as a poet and dramatist. This aspect is the main area of investigation in this paper. An ancillary concern for Hölderlin was a philosophic evaluation of Sophocles, the man. Such evaluations came early in Hölderlin's Technical works. For example, in the essay "Über Die Geschichte der Schönen Künste unter den Griechen (1797) Hölderlin praises Sophocles' sensitivity to his era, the Periclean Age:

Er habe im Geist seiner kultivirten Epoche geschrieben. Ganz die Mischung von stolzer Männlichkeit, und weiche Weichheit. Der reine überdachte, und doch so warm hinreißende Ausdruck, der Den Perikleischen Zeiten eigen war! Überall Leidenschaft von Geschmack geleitet.

Contrast and Harmony are the hallmark of Sophoclean drama for Hölderlin. Sophocles' ability to blend male assertiveness and feminine passivity as consistent attributes of his characters contributes to the depth and reality of the entire drama. Even the

diction possessed this ambivalent quality. It could be subtly contrived to be as simple or naive as colloquial speech or complex as rhetorical harangue. In addition to contrast and harmony, the third major area of Sophoclean expertise which Hölderlin lauds is Sophocles' depiction of passion controlled by good taste. This is an essential trait of the Periclean age as well. A genuine effort was made to attain harmony in all aspects of life despite the turmoil caused by war, famine and human foible.

Hölderlin always recognized strife and misfortune as part of the human condition. His view on this side of life was best expressed in Hyperion (1797), his most successful prose work. A significant sign of Hölderlin's esteem for Sophocles even with respect to the discordant aspects of life can be seen in his choice of a caption for the second volume of the Hyperion.

μη φῦναι τον ἄπαντα νε-
κᾶ λόγον· το δ', ἐκεῖ φανῆ,
βῆναι κεῖσ' ὀκῶθεν κερ ἦ-
κει πολυ δεῦτερον ὡς τάχιστα.

5.

The traditional Greek sentiment as expressed in these lines underlies the seemingly futility of life for Hölderlin. Hyperion, as well as Hölderlin, strives for a harmony which is idealistic at best. All genuine efforts to reconcile their beliefs with their social milieu and personal self-image are thwarted. Hölderlin's interest in the plays of Sophocles may have been a last desperate attempt on his part to reconcile himself to the world to make some sense out of his life. For, shortly after his translations of the Antigone and the Oedipus Tyrannus, Hölderlin suffered a nervous breakdown. From that point on until his death in 1843, he was

plagued by increasing fits of insanity.^{6.}

At the end of the fragment Über den Unterschied der Dichtungarten (1797), Hölderlin presents Antigone and Oedipus as representatives of two differently directed intellectual views - the former genuinely naive, the latter rational to a fault.^{7.} Hölderlin's choice of these two plays and characters while expounding on such philosophical matters indicates a true insight into the broad scope of drama. The main characters are both punished for crimes that should not have happened. Oedipus is caught in a web of oracular games in which his honest effort to avoid defilement leads him to his own destruction (if only symbolically in his self-inflicted blindness). Antigone is forced to disobey civil law for the sake of her "eternal unwritten laws". Both act according to their own consciences as best they can, but they must still suffer the consequences.

Hölderlin, who was a remote student and former classmate of Hegel, apparently felt that these two plays most adequately encompassed the entire web of human existence and its series of continuous conflicts. God, or divinity, and the State or civil law, constantly vie with man in a subtle struggle to catch him off-guard and punish him accordingly. For Hölderlin, Sophocles was a paradigm because of his ability to treat dialectic conflict in a context of a harmonic dramatic plot.

Why does Hölderlin treat Sophocles from a philosophic point of view? Philosophy was a major component in the intellectual and literary life of Germany. Philosophers, such as Hegel, Schelling

and Nietzsche dealt with Sophocles from an aesthetic, moral and analytic approach. Since Schelling and Hegel were classmates of Hölderlin's, their views on Sophocles had some effect on Hölderlin's outlook as expressed in his early fragments. I wish to treat Schelling's work at some length here for his ideas on freedom and necessity in drama are important to our study of Hölderlin.

Friedrich Schelling (1775-1854) presented his theory of tragedy in a series of lectures on the Philosophy of Art in 1804. He considered the struggle between freedom and necessity as "das einzig wahrhaft Tragische in der Tragödie".⁸ Freedom of the will, he declares, is a mere peculiarity, an aspect of necessity. Schelling discusses this point further:

Die Freiheit als blöÙe Besonderheit kann nicht bestehen; dies ist möglich nur, inwiefern sie sich selbst zur Allgemeinheit erbet, und also über die Folge der Schuld mit der Notwendigkeit in Bund tritt... eine grosse Handlung konzentrisch gleichsam um einem und denselben Punkt geschehen zu lassen.⁹

Schelling felt that genuine tragedy raised itself to the level of the "general", i.e. an abstract ideal which can be conceptualized in the isolation of a dramatic form. Schelling's term "Allgemeinheit" is quite similar to Hölderlin's "Ganze", terms for the "whole" which may be considered as a divine element in the world. Human freedom can only be considered as an aspect of this generality or whole, as man's share in the divine. Once this abstract concept of the "whole" is grasped, the apparent paradox of necessity and freedom can be explained as seemingly conflicting parts united in the harmonious "whole".

This is the concentricity of tragic action which Schelling speaks of in the last line cited.

Schelling was a disciple of Fichte, a fellow student of Hölderlin and the chief romantic idealistic philosopher of the age. Fichte believed in the absolute freedom of the "Ich". Schelling attempted to relate this freedom to the dramatic necessity found in the greatest of all tragedies, Oedipus

Tyrannos:

Man hat oft gefragt, wie die griechische Vernunft die Widersprüche ihrer Tragödie ~~ertragen konnte~~. Ein Sterblicher-vom Verhängnis zum Verbrecher bestimmt, selbst gegen das Verhängnis kämpfend, und doch furchterlich bestraft für das Verbrechen, das ein Werk des Schicksals war! Der Grund dieses Widerspruchs, das, was ihn erträglich machte, lag tiefer, als man ihn suchte, lag im Streite menschlicher Freiheit mit der Macht der objectiven Welt.¹⁰

While Fichte felt that there was no objective world, Schelling conceives of it as a necessary invention by man's reason for the purpose of tragic art. Greek tragedy is still practical in the modern world in the battle against "fate through which freedom is honored", according to Schelling. The invented structure of the drama sets the objective limits within which the hero must submit to an opposing power. But how is freedom asserted in submission? For Schelling, it is not possible in the real order of things. He posits a solution on the intellectual level:

Es war ein Großer Gedanke, willing auch die Strafe für ein unvermeidliches Verbrechen zu tragen, um so durch den Verlust seiner Freiheit selbst eben diese Freiheit zu beweisen und noch mit einer Erklärung des freien Willens unterzugehen.¹¹

A willingness to bear the punishment for an unavoidable crime bears witness to an individual's freedom by the very acceptance of

and desire for that punishment. Thus, for Schelling, the reconciliation of Oedipus with the objective order of the play, i.e. the laws of the city and the curse of Laius' murderer, by means of his self-inflicted blindness will achieve the restoration of his freedom.¹² Schelling chooses a responsible freedom as a compromise between Fichte's absolute freedom and the Fatalism of Spinoza.

This responsible freedom, however, is further questioned by Schelling himself. In his Philosophie der Kunst, he wonders about the fate of Oedipus:

Wie kann man den (Oedipus) unglücklichen nennen, der so weit vollendet ist, der Glück und Unglück gleicherweise ablegt und in demjenigen Zustand der Seele ist, wo es für ihn keines von beiden mehr ist?¹³

Schelling believes that Oedipus has transcended all types of fate by his punishment and can now only act in one way. Once he is free from the paradox of freedom and necessity, he has gained genuine harmony with nature and is prepared for the action in Oedipus Colonus. Tragedy is an attempt to conceptualize the paradox of freedom and necessity (Glück und Unglück) in the real world. Hölderlin saw a great variety of solutions to this problem in the Sophoclean corpus.

What does all this mean to Hölderlin's interpretation of Sophocles? Hölderlin also sought a resolution of this apparent paradox of freedom and necessity. His answer was far more succinct than Schelling - harmony, Wöhrmann states that Schelling, and even Lessing, based their ideas of tragedy on the Philosophy of in which tragedy is the total expression and the highest experience that is good and unique. Schelling relates this to Fichte's

concept of the "Ich":

Im Ich hat die Philosophie ihr "Geweihtes" gefunden, nach dem die bisher als dem höchsten Preise des Sieges gerungen hat.¹⁴

This philosophy involves the total harmonious reconciliation of man with his milieu, and tragedy effectively dramatizes this harmony. This, this total harmony, is actually a relative concept, an ideal to be interpreted personally. Hölderlin admitted that the weakness of such an abstract concept must be investigated. The search for the resolution of such a concept in the real world forms the essence of tragedy. To prove his point, Hölderlin began to write a play about Socrates in 1794.¹⁵ After several diversions, however, he abandoned this original plan.

Hölderlin then began work on Der Tod des Empedocles. In 1797 Hölderlin wrote to his brother of his interest in the new subject:

"der freiwillige Sturze des sizilianischen Dichters und Philosophen Empedocles in den lodernden Atna. Dieser Tod soll einzig aus dem innersten Wesen des Helden folgen, der folgendermaßen charakterisiert wird...
... Durch sein Gemüt und seine Philosophie schon längst zu Kulturhaß gestimmt, zu Verachtung alles sehr bestimmtem Geschäfts alles nach verschiedenen Gegenständen gerichteten Interesses, ein Todfeind aller einseitigen Existenz, und deswegen auch in wirklichs ~~Selbst~~ Verhältnisse sind und nur im großen Akkord mit allem Lebendigen empfunden ganz inneerfüllen, bloß weil er nicht mit allgegenwärtigem Herzen innig, wie ein Gott, in ihnen leben und lieben kann, bloß weil er so bald sein Herz und sein Gedanke das Vorhandene umfaßt, ans Gesetz der Sukzession gebunden ist." ¹⁶

Empedocles leads a one-man crusade against the narrow limitations placed upon man by the structure of organized religion. He exhorts his people to return to the true spirit of religion, a

genuine adoration of god, not an idolatry of the rituals which are only a means to that end. The frustrations encountered along the way to this goal, including Empedocles' own self-deification, present the concrete difficulties involved in realizing total harmony. This sense of frustration and inability to break through to the harmonious "Ganze" was a problem which Hölderlin felt Sophocles had masterfully handled in the resolutions of his various plays. We will see this in greater detail in the Anmerkungen. Hölderlin grappled with this problem in terms of the very plot development of his Empedocles. He tried three ways to express the progression toward harmony in this drama. ¹⁷ None of them was fully completed, another sign of Hölderlin's personal failure to integrate his life and milieu.

Hölderlin took this problem of harmony very seriously and personally. In the same letter to his brother, Hölderlin laments:

Den meisten ist das leben zu schlüfrig. Mir ist es oft zu lebenig, so klein auch der Kreis ist, worin ich mich bewege... Laß Dein Leben immerhin so unbedeutend bleiben, wie es ist! Es wird noch Bedeutung genug bekommen. ¹⁸

Life for Hölderlin was very oppressive. Nevertheless, he felt that a meaningless life in a wide enough context could have genuine meaning in itself. The sentiment expressed here is similar to that developed in Schelling's affirmation of freedom by the desire for it. Both men felt that harmony could be achieved even in a very limited context, dramatic or real.

In the second version of Empedocles, Hölderlin sets the life-goal for his hero and himself:

"Uns mit der Natur zu vereinigen, zu einem unendlichen Ganzen, das ist das Ziel all' unseres Strebens, wir mögen uns darüber verstehen oder nicht". ¹⁹

Hölderlin and Empedocles both long to become like the gods, to live in unfettered harmony with the rest of nature as does Oedipus at Colonus.²⁰ Hölderlin labels this ability to reconcile oneself to nature and divinity as "die gewöhnliche Tendenz zur Allgemeinheit", as did Schelling.

Empedocles gradually becomes a tragic hero as he experiences the development of such a tendency in his dealings with the people. In the process of exhorting the people to draw closer to god in a more natural and intimate manner, he develops a personal sense of divinity through the conviction of his message. The Tragedy of such a process lies in the gradual separation of Empedocles from the people and nature. Through the help of the high priest, Hemocrates, Empedocles is rescued from the worst blasphemy of all, rejection of all divinity for the self.²¹

Hölderlin coins a word to describe this self-destroying process in man-Aorgisch. It encompasses the elemental drives in life which often force men to exceed rational bounds in an effort to make himself one with the whole of nature. These drives were vital mysteries to the naive Greeks. They were concomitant with the Apollonian urge for "edle Einfalt und stille Größe", as Winckelmann expressed it, although they represented the antithesis of rationality.

Hölderlin interprets these two trends of human nature in a slightly different manner than does Nietzsche. Hölderlin employs the term Apollonian to signify the drive in man which Nietzsche calls Dionysiac, while Hölderlin's concept of Junonian sobriety,

clarity and imaginative power is similar to Nietzsche's concept of Apollonian rationality. Sophocles serves as a norm for Hölderlin's interpretation of the Dionysiac. Hölderlin felt that Sophocles was a high point in Greek Humanität, not because he experiences a return to a wild Vorzeit, as Nietzsche said, but because he retraces in his dramas the progress of Greek culture from an orgiastic-passionate past to a stage of order, measure and form. The ability of the Greeks to remain flexible in their life style even as they progressed toward a more complex civilization influenced Hölderlin's desire to interpret the meaning rather than translate the form of the original Greek plays.

In order to clarify the distinctions of Hölderlin and Nietzsche with respect to the Apollonian and Dionysiac trends in Greek life, I cite an important passage from Nietzsche's "Willen zur Macht":

"Diese Gegensätzlichkeit des Dionysischen und Apollinischen innerhalb der griechischen Seele ist eines der großen Rätsel, von dem ich mich angesichts des griechischen Wesens angezogen fühlte. Ich bemühte mich im Grunde um nichts als um zu erraten, warum gerade der griechische Apollonismus aus einem dionysischen Untergrund herauswachsen mußte: der dionysische Grieche nötig hatte, apollonisch zu werden: das heißt, seinen Willen zum Ungeheueren, Vielfachen, Ungewissen, Entsetzlichen zu brechen an einem Willen zum Maß, zur Einfachheit, zur Einordnung in Regel und Begriff, Das Maßlose, Wüste Asiatische liegt auf seinem Grunde: die Tapferkeit des Griechen besteht in seinem Kampfe mit seinem Asitismus: die Schönheit ist ihm nicht geschenkt, so wenig als die Logik, als die Natürlichkeit der Sitte - sie ist erobert, gewollt, erkämpft - die ist sein Sieg.²²

The sentiment of this passage is amazingly similar to that expressed in Hölderlin's letter to Boehlendorff on 4 Dec. 1801:

"Wir lernen nichts Schwerer als das Nationelle frei gebrauchen. Und wie ich glaube, ist gerade die Klarheit der Darstellung uns ursprünglich so natürlich, wie den Griechen das Feuer vom Himmel. Eben DeBwegen werden diese eher in schöner Leidenschaft, die Du Dir auch erhalten hast, als in jener homerischen Geistes Gegenwart und Darstellungsgabe zu übertreffen sein. - Es klingt paradox. Aber ich behaupt es noch einmal, und stelle es Deiner Prüfung und Deinem Gebrauche frei, das eigentlich Nationelle wird im Fortschritt der Bildung immer der geringere Vorzug werden. DeBwegen sind die Griechen des heiligen Pathos weniger Meister, weil es ihnen angeboren war, hingegen sind sie vorzüglich in Darstellungsgabe, von Homer an, weil dieser Außerordentliche Mensch seelevoll genug war, um die abendlandische Junonische Nüchternkeit für sein Apollenreich zu erbeuten, und so wahr auch so gefährlich, sich die Kunstregeln einzig und allein von griechische Vortrefflichkeit zu abstrahiren. Ich habe lange daran laborirt und - weiss nun DaB auBser dem, was bei den Griechen und uns das höchste sein nuB, nemlich dem lebenigen Verhältniß und Geschik, wir nicht wohl etwas gleich mit ihnen haben dürfen. Aber das Eigene nuB so gut gelernt Nur werden wir ihnen gerade in unserm Eigenen, Nationellen nicht nachkommen können, weil, wie gesagt, der freie Gebrauch des Eigenen das Schwerste ist. 23

Both of these authors were steeped in the classical tradition and comprehend a basic dichotomy, a basic dialectic element in the ancient Greek nature. This dichotomy took the form of two natural human drives. The first, which Hölderlin calls Junonian, and Nietzsche Apollonian, is the desire for order, balance and creative regulation. In Greek literature there is a constant striving for such order, whether it be in the form of Homeric aretē, Aeschylean divine control, or Sophoclean reconciliation. The second drive innate in man is the Dionysiac. The wide scope of this drives' influence in life causes a justifiable ambivalence in interpretation. In its broadest sense, Dionysiac means pre-rational, i.e. a drive which dominated man's life at a time when his relation with all of nature was totally free from the

restraints of Society. There are two concomitant aspects of this force, the irrational and the natural. Nietzsche opted to emphasize the irrational aspect of man's Dionysiac drive. For Nietzsche, the wild forces in nature, the orgiastic passions in man, and the supernatural laws of the cosmos embodied powers intent upon the total release of man from his rational self.²⁴

Hölderlin chose to emphasize the natural aspect of the Dionysian drive. This natural state of man is also stripped of all artificial and social hindrances to man's total communion with the forces of nature. Unlike Nietzsche, who sees man's reason as an obstacle to his natural development, Hölderlin views reason as a useful but subordinate tool in man's search for harmony with nature. This drive toward natural harmony is far more inclusive than Nietzsche's drive for irrational power. Hölderlin's term - "aorgisch" - gives the Dionysiac drive a far more significant scope. It connotes an orgiastic and irrational aspect, as emphasized by Nietzsche, but the prefix "a" however, adds a new dimension to its interpretation. Hölderlin considers it as the free expression of the divine wrath or caprice in man which must be satisfied.²⁵

The resolution of this drive is best expressed in drama, as we have seen in Hölderlin's Der Tod des Empedocles. I find it difficult to understand why he failed to use Euripides' Bacchae as his classical model. Perhaps Hölderlin wished to elevate the struggle and resolution to a more rational level rather than the primitive violence of the Maenads.²⁶ Sophocles dramas provided

the best examples of this struggle for reconciliation with all aspects of Nature. This reconciliation or harmony is achieved in three different ways within the Sophoclean corpus: a reconciliation of man with a system of ideals in the Antigone, a reconciliation of man with divinity in Oedipus Colonus or a reconciliation of man with himself in Oedipus Tyrannos.

II Hölderlin's Theory of Drama

Hölderlin's theory of drama, and tragedy in particular, is expounded in his essay Über den Unterschied der Dichtarten (1797). His approach to the problem of tragedy is very idealistic and shows the influence of German philosophy prevalent at the time. His definition of tragedy is laced with the term "idealistic" and abstract philosophical phrases.

Das tragische, dem Schein nach heroische Gedicht ist in seiner Bedeutung idealisch. Es ist die Metapher einer intellektuellen Anschauung ... Das tragische, in seinem äußeren Schein heroische Gedicht ist, seinem Grundton nach, idealisch, und allen Werken dieser Art muß eine intellektuale Anschauung zu Grunde liegen, welche keine andere sein kann, als jene Einigkeit mit allem, was lebt, die zwar von dem beschränkteren, Gemüte nicht gefühlt, die in seinem höchsten Bestrebungen nur geahndet, aber vom Geiste erkannt werden kann und aus der Unmöglichkeit einer absoluten Trennung und Vereinzelung hervorgeht.²⁷

Hölderlin almost equates the heroic and the tragic types of poetry. The form, the plot and the characterization of drama is heroic in its proportions. Hölderlin thus follows Aristotle²⁸ in his interpretation of drama as well as in his use of Sophocles as a model.

The key phrase for a proper understanding of Hölderlin's interpretation of tragedy is "the metaphor of an intellectual view". The complexity of this phrase lies in its interweaving of two trains of thought - the poetic and the philosophical. Hölderlin, as a master lyric poet, deals with the beauty of concrete images and events. As a dramatist, he must reproduce reality but take it one step further. He must idealize it for the purpose of philosophic reflection. Thus, in a sense, he is making tragic drama a metaphor of a particular part of life, which is only one aspect of a whole philosophy of life, an intellectual view. A

metaphor is the attributing of certain characteristics of some object to another. It is not reality but an idealization of a real situation. Thus, tragedy is the idealization of Schelling's paradox of freedom and necessity. It is an attempt to reach the ideal harmony which transcends real life.

Holderlin says that this metaphor of a philosophic outlook on life must portray a unity of the tragic person and/or the poet to "all that lives". Tragedy arises from the ability of the mind to reach the heights of total unity and harmony and the concomitant failure of reality to achieve the same level. The tragic hero, for Hölderlin, desires harmony but cannot attain it in this world. The complicating factor in this dilemma is the need of the character to remain faithful to his ideals, his world view. This interpretation is amazingly similar to Whitman's theory on Sophoclean tragic heroes,²⁹ who possess the seeds of their own destruction in their very character. Their wisdom or "intellectuelle Anschauung" is a complete harmony with reality as they see it. When a hostile force or new system encroaches upon the Hero's milieu, there must be some type of resolution. Only one system can remain. This new order may take the form of the antagonistic force, the hero's view, or a reconciled synthesis of the two. The hero, however, rarely wins out as he does in Oedipus Colonus.

Hölderlin also recognizes the futility of the heroic ideal, although it can be concretized in the character and action of the dramatic person. The hero totally immerses himself in his private world without any limitations. The intruding system forces the

hero to isolate himself from his old order(e.g. Ajax from Nature, Empedocles from the people) until he suffers real or symbolic destruction. This isolation is a major feature of Sophoclean drama. Hölderlin recognized this, but added to his theory of tragedy the pessimistic fact that total separation was not possible. Death and destruction are the only solution. Whereas, Whitman makes the important observation that the defeated hero still has the last say in determining the new order. Hölderlin, a victim of German Romanticism, does not go that far in any of his explicit criticism. He does not see that the hero can live on in his ideals. The final irony of tragedy is that man must suffer total separation to gain his personal reconciliation.

Why does Hölderlin fail to see this after effect for the hero? Perhaps it is because of his strong philosophical distinction between reality and idealism. Hölderlin does see a lasting effect of the ideals in themselves, as a part of his harmonic "whole". As we shall see in Anmerkungen, Hölderlin allows for concrete effect, but only in the concept of time, not in action.

A major problem for any dramatist is how to create a plot which effectively reproduces the striving for an abstract concept like harmony of freedom and necessity. Just as Schelling conceives of an objective order as a context for tragedy, so Hölderlin constructs "die notwendige Willkür des Zeus".³⁰ Hölderlin attempts to realize the ideal milieu in terms of divinity. The necessary whim of divinity is a restraining force invented or abstracted from the divine "Whole" to assist in explaining the

tragic paradox of freedom and necessity. For Hölderlin, the divine is absolute and necessarily capable of "möglichst absoluter Entschiedenheit und Vereinzelnung".³¹ While the tragic hero in his humanity or semi-divinity can never be totally divorced from the world, the divine whole must extricate itself from the bonds of mortal reality. It must achieve an overview and maintain ultimate control of reality.

Hölderlin was confronted with the problem of reconciling the ideal of absolute freedom and the reality of limited freedom in a dramatic form. He reflects upon this problem in the essay "Verfahrungsweise" (1798):

Der Dichter wird nur zu leicht durch seinen Stoff irre geführt, indem dieser, aus dem Zusammenhang der lebendigen Welt genommen, der poetischen Beschränkung widerstrebt.³²

The poet's task is to conceive of his drama from several points of view, to create a conflict, and to resolve it into a harmonious whole. In a letter to Neuffer on 3 July 1799, he maintains that his guiding principle in attaining this triple goal is "das Ideal eines lebendigen Ganzen."³³ Hölderlin is still trying to reconcile both sides of this complex question of freedom. We shall see how Hölderlin feels Sophocles handles this problem in the Anmerkungen.

One final point concerning Hölderlin's theory of general drama is its purpose. Hölderlin, in the same letter to Neuffer, attempts to show that drama should support the prevailing attitudes. Hölderlin recognizes that the emphasis in Greek tragedy on personal fate is not suited to the more socially oriented conscience of his day. In the world of the Greeks, "wo jeder mit Sinn und

Seele der Welt angehörte, die ihn umgab, weit mehr Innigkeit in einzelnen Charakteren und Verhältnissen zu finden ist." ³⁴

Their way of life was such that all aspects of society could be in a more harmonious relation with nature. The role of the poet is to recreate this state for mankind. Once again, in the letter to Neuffer, Hölderlin states this purpose of dramatic poetry:

"Sie nähert die Menschen und bringt sie zusammen... Sie vereinigt sie, wenn sie echt ist und recht wirkt, mit alldem mannigfachen Leid und Glück und Streben und Hoffen und Furchten, mit all ihren Meinungen und Fehlern, all ihren Tugenden und Ideen, mit allem Großen und Kleinen, das unter ihnen ist, immer mehr zu einem lebendigen tausendfach gegliederten innigen Ganzen, denneben dies soll die Poesie selber sein, und wie die Ursache, so die Wirkung." ³⁵

The poet must unify all disparate elements of life in his drama with his personal harmonic world view. Hölderlin fails to find this harmony in modern drama and must turn to Sophocles for "die Bedeutung und den Eindruck des Ganzen." ³⁶

III Hölderlin's Anmerkungen

Hölderlin's early interest in Sophocles was only tangential to his theoretical treatment of drama. By the turn of the century, he had attempted to put his reflections to practical use in Der Tod Des Empedocles. As we have seen, Hölderlin tried three versions of his play but failed to complete any of them. His next step in his search for "das Ganze" led him to Sophocles. Hölderlin apparently decided that the only way to achieve the unity which the Greeks enjoyed with nature was to translate their work into German with the necessary interpretative changes. This ability to interpret the Greek imagery and to render it in a meaningful German equivalent is perhaps the single most important contribution of Hölderlin to Sophoclean studies.³⁷ Hölderlin was in a unique position to accomplish this. He was one of the best lyric poets of his era and was acquainted with the theory, if not the successful implementation, of drama. He was well prepared to approach Sophocles' plays with his all-important "intellectual view."

Hölderlin used his interpretative powers in drama for a definite purpose. He wanted to educate the German people to the values of the classics. Hölderlin was not alone in this desire. Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767 - 1835) had gone so far as to revamp the entire secondary school system in Prussia to insure the preëminence of classical studies in his Gymnasium.³⁸ Humboldt and members of the Weimar circle wanted to give the cultured populace educational and dramatic *Kultur* and Hölderlin also felt this urge to influence prominent people. In a letter to Princess Augusta he wrote:

Durchlauchtige Prinzessen. Ich schicke Ihnen den ersten Band der Übersetzung der Sophokleischen Tragödie. Er spricht darin von der Größe der Alten, aber auch von dem unbegreiflich Göttlicheren unserer heiligen Religion in seiner Originalität und dem Werth des Vergleichens der Antiken und unserer Zustände. 39

Sophocles was a paradigm for Hölderlin because of his ability to relate to his own times as well as future ages. In a letter to Neuffer dated 4 June 1799, Hölderlin mentions that Sophocles is to be included in an article in the monthly magazine Iduna. The essay was to include

1. charakterische Züge aus dem Leben alter und neuer Dichter, die Umstände, unter denen sie erwachsen, vorzüglich den eigentümlichen Kunstcharakter eines jeden. So über Homer, Sappho, Aschylus, Sophocles, Horaz, Rousseau and Shakespeare.
2. Darstellungen des Eigentümlichschönen ihrer Werke oder einzelner Parthien aus diesem. 40

These authors comprised the nucleus of the classical literature studied in Europe at the time. Their works were valued not only for their artistic beauty but also for the important insights they passed on about the contemporary world.

Hölderlin singled out Sophocles for special treatment.

Kohlhammer, in his critical edition of Hölderlin's complete works, says that this treatment can be classified into four stages:

1. ein freies Gestalten vom vorher erfaßten und überschauten Sinn her, wobei das einzelne Wort verhältnismäßig leicht wiegt und noch nicht eigentliches Element der Rede ist.
2. eine genauere Aufmerksamkeit auf die griechischen Silbenmaße.
3. Die "hinhorende Verfahrensart" die nach dem Experiment mit Pindar, die Wortfolge der Vorlage möglichst wahr.
4. eine späte Überarbeitung besonders der Antigoné, doch auch des Oedipus, im Herbst 1803. 41

Except for the last date, however, the editor gives no

chronological support for the arrangement of these stages. Even Michel, Hölderlin's biographer, mentions such stages of development⁴² but does not elaborate. The first three stages are actually different areas of emphasis in the poetic art. First, the sense and the form of the work must be properly formulated. Next, the meter must be considered, and finally the actual linguistic construction must be shaped according to poetic syntax. Evidence of all these can be found in the Anmerkungen, as we shall see shortly. I turn now to the problems involved in Hölderlin's attempt to translate the two plays, the Antigone and the Oedipus Tyrannus, for an investigation in this area will shed some revealing light upon Hölderlin's interest in Sophocles.

An attempt to date the actual writing of the two Sophoclean plays by Hölderlin is impossible. Hölderlin probably began work on them while in Hamburg in 1799 and finished them by 1802-3 in Stuttgart. A manuscript was prepared for publication in the fall of 1802 as Hölderlin began to look for a major publisher.⁴³ He was assisted in his search by Isaak von Sinclair,⁴⁴ one of Hölderlin's closest friends from Jena, Frau Charlotte von Kalb⁴⁵ and Bohlendorff.⁴⁶ Through their efforts, Hölderlin was able to secure Friedrich Wilman as publisher in Frankfurt am Main.

In the Intelligenzblatt der (Hallische) Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung of 14 July 1804, an announcement appeared:

Bei Friedrich Wilman in Frankfurt am Main ist erschienen
un in allen Buchhandlungen Deutschlands zu haben:

Die Trauerspiele des Sophocles,
aus dem Griechischen übersetzt
von
Fr. Hölderlin

Der Verfasser dieser klassischen Übersetzung, welcher

das Publikum schon aus seinem Hyperion zu seinem Ruhme kennt, hat 10 Jahre an denselben gefeilt, so daß sie als etwas Vollendetes in ihrer Art angesehen und empfohlen werden kann. Der Philolog, welcher sie mit dem Originle vergleicht, wird überall Treue, Präcision und den Geist der deutschen Sprache beobachtet finden. Der Gebildete wird, auch ohne die Kenntniß der Ursprache, beim Lesen dieses Werks den reinsten Genuß für Geist und Herz empfunden. Man kann mit Recht hoffen, daß diese Übersetzung in der Classe der Gebildeten sehr viele Leser finden wird. Der erste Band enthält den Oedipus Tyrannos, und der zweite die Antigone. Der Verfasser hat einen jeden Stücke sehr lehrreiche Anmerkungen beigefügt, welche zur Erklärung des Charakters der Tragodie interessante Vorstellungen enthalten.⁴⁷

Despite the obvious elements of propaganda in such an announcement (e.g. the ten years of preparation), the writer of the article was fully aware of Hölderlin's intent in the translations. He wanted to create an accurate translation which would appeal to the educated people of Germany. To achieve that end, Hölderlin had to remain faithful to the original while he interpreted certain parts to fit the level of awareness of his own era.

Hölderlin used two basic texts of the original for his work - the Junta text of 1555, and to a lesser degree, the Aldina text of 1502.⁴⁸ For some unknown reason, Hölderlin fails to use Brunk's significant recension of the text in Strassburg in 1786. An indication of this is the position of the choruses in each play. Hölderlin places each chorus at the end of each act in the Oedipus and at the beginning of each act in the Antigone.

Hölderlin, however, as a lyric poet was not as concerned about the textual problems as he was about the imagery in the plays. He had to convert the images of the Greek into German

with a feel for the essential form of an image and especially the idea behind it. Hölderlin's lyric sensitivity was very important in this area. His cardinal rule was to interpret the sense and the meaning rather than to reproduce the actual word form. [Michel, in his Biography of Hölderlin, feels that Hölderlin's lyric ability allowed him to outstrip Sophocles at times in his efforts to get at the basic flavor of certain images.⁴⁹ This may be true in rare cases but Hölderlin also falls short on some imagery. I cite here an example of both Hölderlin's superiority and inferiority to Sophocles. In the "Ode to Man" of the Antigone, Sophocles is describing the turbulence of the sea upon which a man is tossed: $\kappa\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\rho\upsilon\chi\iota\omicron\lambda\omicron\sigma\iota\nu$

$\kappa\epsilon\rho\omega\nu \dot{\upsilon}\pi' \omicron\dot{\iota}\delta\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu, \theta\epsilon\omega\nu$ Ant. 336-7⁵⁰

Hölderlin apparently misreads the word for waves, $\omicron\dot{\iota}\delta\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, as the word, $\omicron\dot{\iota}\chi\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$, meaning house, and proceeds to interpret it as a metaphor for a ship "In geflügelten sausenden HÄuBern (Ant 355),"⁵¹ an interpretation that is fully justified from the context of the Greek. The word "geflügelten" connotes the winged effect of oars on a ship, an intensification of image which may support Michel's claim. Thus Hölderlin transfers a land image - "house"- to the metaphor of a sea image - "ship". A brilliant bit of circular reasoning for effect!

Flat imagery, however, is all too frequent in Hölderlin's German Translation. He consistently fails to treat the image of the "ship of State":

Wenn auf dem Grund hier ein Verdreher ist
Den mir zum Freunde machen, denn ich weiß,
Der halt Zusammen, und so wir auf diesem
Recht fahren, mögen Freunde wir gewinnen.

Ant. 194-197

52

στέχουσεν ἀνοεὶς ἀντὶ τῆς σαρπηίδας,
οὐδ' ἐν πείλῳ κατ' ἄνδρα δυσμενῆ χέρονος
θεῖμην ἑμαυτῷ, τοῦτο γινώσκων ὅτι
ἦδ' ἐστὶν ἡ σάκουσα καὶ ταύτης ἔτι
κλέοντες ὀρθῆς τοὺς πείλους τοιοῦμεθα.

Ant. 186-190

53

"Recht fahren" is a more generic term which loses the flavor of κλέοντες ὀρθῆς "sailing upright". Granted that the Ship-of-State image is a time worn metaphor, it is very important to the play as a whole. Hölderlin apparently felt that the image would have no meaning for his audience, and chose to follow Sophocles as a man of his times rather than as a poet.

Perhaps the most obvious change of imagery for the sake of contemporary understanding is the famous line τί δὲ τί με χορεύειν (Oed. Tyr. 1. 896 p.24 "why should I dance") which Hölderlin interprets: "was soll ich singen?" Embodied in these two lines is the whole process of religious transformation in two millenia. This line is spoken by the chorus in the ode on Hubris. The whole religious situation in Athenian civilization is being questioned. Here Jocasta has just repudiated any faith in the oracle of Apollo, a symbol of divine influence in human life. The oracle, as well as the Greater Dionysiac festival in which the plays were performed and which the chorus took part, were institutions in the state religion. If the chorus were suddenly to stop dancing, it would be a sign that the state religion and the state itself had collapsed. The situation in Germany was far

different. The separation of Church and State was fairly well established and Protestantism had become dominant in most of Germany. An essential element in the religious experience of the 18th century was the communal singing of pious hymns. Hölderlin, the son of a Methodist minister and a man of his times, thus chose to interpret the Greek in terms of his own milieu.

Just as imagery was an important aspect of Hölderlin's translations, so the language which conveyed that imagery had to be handled with delicate precision. Hölderlin expressed his dissatisfaction with his work in this area in a letter to the publisher Wilman:

Die Sprache in der Antigone schien mir nicht lebendig genug. Die Anmerkungen drückten meine Überzeugung von griechischer Kunst und den Sinn der Stücke nicht hinlänglich aus. 54

The second sentence concerning the "sense" of the play expresses Hölderlin's main purpose of translating. The language must be lively enough to properly convey the message of the play. As we have seen in the "ship of state" image, Sophocles incorporates the shaky political situation into an image of the sea, the first love of the Athenians. Hölderlin, however, had to readjust this image to suit his own time. Despite these differences, both poets had something very important in common - a peculiar world view which could span two thousand years. They were both concerned with the problem of how man can best live in the face of adversity. This is the essence of tragedy, whatever form it may take, civil law vs. personal ideal, personality vs. personality or man vs. fate.

Fate is an extremely difficult concept to comprehend in reality, as our discussion of Schelling's philosophy indicated. Hölderlin accepts Schelling's premise that an objective order, contrived or natural, must exist in a tragic drama for the tragedy to be meaningful. Hölderlin acknowledges the need for a natural progression toward the resolution of fate in this objective order in his essay, Der Grund Zum Empedocles:

"Die Probleme des Schicksals, in dem er erwuchs, sollten in ihm sich scheinbare temporäre zeigen, wie mehr oder weniger allen tragischen Personen!"

The emphasis of this analysis rests in two words - "scheinbare" and "temporäre". First the solution of any dramatic problem of fate must be visible, i.e., the dramatic plot should have a natural progression leading to a peripeteia, a point in time, an action or a word which breaks the tension of a dilemma. Second the solution should be temporary, i.e., the conditions of a given tragedy do not present the final dictum on a particular problem for all time. They should be consistent with the attitudes and socio-political trends of the era. This temporal prerequisite of Hölderlin for effective drama may be an indirect result of Hölderlin's familiarity with Hegel's dialectic philosophy. Both men considered Sophocles as a master of technique in this area of dramatic contemporaneity.

To support this theory of tragedy, Hölderlin in his Anmerkungen cites the Antigone as a prime example of visibility and temporality. The two major Characters, Creon and Antigone, represent two opposing forces, civil authority and divine or cosmic law:

Beide, insofern sie entgegengesetzt sind... nur der Zeit nach verschieden, so daß das eine vorzüglich darum verlieret, weil es anfängt, das andere gewinnt, weil es nachfolget.⁵⁶

The superiority of one force or point of view is dependent upon time. Although the claims of both parties may be equally justifiable, as Hegel feels is the case in the Antigone, one is more compatible with the total situation of the times (i.e. the political control, the temperament of the people, the legal structure) than the other. Thus Antigone may suffer for her untimeliness, but her "unwritten laws" will ultimately win out over the more mundane force of Creon. This post mortem victory is the triumph of an ideal. Antigone has suffered her tragic end and does not reap the benefits of her ideal's victory. Despite Creon's belated attempt to rectify the situation caused by his own obstinacy, Antigone dies and thus achieves a reconciliation of her tragic relation with society.

Hölderlin, in his Anmerkungen to this play, lacks Whitman's and Schelling's optimistic insight that a personal victory is also possible in tragedy. According to Hölderlin, even if it is possible in a dramatic context, a tangible and visible victory is beyond the grasp of the defeated hero.

Hölderlin stresses the concept of time from the very beginning in the Anmerkungen. After citing the two lines which sum up the opposition:

Creon "Was wagst du, ein solch Gesetz zu brechen?"

Ant. "Darum, mein Zeus berichtet mirs nicht,
Noch hier im Haus das Recht der Todestötter..." 57

Hölderlin develops his theory of the essence of Greek tragedy: "sich fassen zu können".⁵⁸ The Greek hero must be able to grasp himself, i.e., he must comprehend, accept and defend his set of moral standards in the face of all obstacles. Hölderlin continues:

Der künste Moment eines Taglaufs oder Kunstwerks ist, wo der Geist der Zeit und Natur, das Himmlische, was den Menschen ergreift, und der Gegenstand, für welchen er sich interessiert, am wildesten gegeneinander stehen, weil der Sinnliche Gegenstand nur eine Hälfte weit reicht, der Geist aber am mächtigsten erwacht, da, wo die zweite Hälfte angehet. In diesem Moments muß der Mensch sich am meisten festhalten, deswegen steht er auch da am offensten in seinem Charakter. 58

He believes that there is an outside force, whether in dramatic fiction or reality, which controls man and blocks his attempt to attain the goal of an ideal. This force is thus on a level even higher than personal ideals: it is divine. Man searches for an ideal which is, at best, imperfect due to the limitations of reality. This ideal is a personal interpretation of the higher "Geist der Zeit und Natur". The tragic hero must adhere to this limited ideal because of its intrinsic worth to his total character. Hölderlin considers this ideal as an irreconcilable "Geist der ewig lebenden ungeschriebenen Wildnis und der Totenwelt." This is the "aorgisch" drive in man which drives him to his destruction. It must be satisfied as fully as possible even though it is for Hölderlin

.. nur Ein lebendiges Ganze... , das zwar durch und durch individualisiert ist und aus lauter selbstständigen, aber eben innig und ewig verbundenen Teilen besteht... Freilich muß aus jedem endlichen Gesichtspunkt irgendeine der selbstständigen Kräfte des Ganzen die herrschende sein, aber sie kann auch nur als temporär oder gradweise herrschend betrachtet werden. 59

Thus, Antigone's belief that the gods of the underworld must be honored is, in the time of Creon's dominance, a minority view. Although it is a genuine interpretation of the "Ganze" which must be maintained, Antigone's view must suffer the consequences of its untimeliness.

As can be seen from this discussion, Hölderlin elevates the tragic conflict from the level of two characters to the level of abstraction. Time and Nature oppose an object (presumably law, i.e. civil for Creon and Unwritten for Antigone). This opposition forms a symbolic or philosophic dialectic in which both characters are caught. They must maintain their self control as best they can for the nobility of tragic heroes lies in their ability to face insuperable odds resolutely. The inability of Antigone to reconcile her ideal with the existing order set up in the play recalls Hölderlin's claim that tragic separation of the hero from the real objective order is absolutely necessary for proper reconciliation to his ideal but impossible in the real world, except by death. It can be accomplished only on a metaphysical level. In a sense, Sophocles' Oedipus Colonus (in which Oedipus becomes deified through his reconciliation with and assumption into nature) is the final achievement of Hölderlin's futile search for harmony. Hölderlin's failure to choose this play for translation can be explained in two ways. First, Hölderlin may have felt that this solution to his problem was too transcendent and, therefore, unrealistic. Secondly, his personal life, which was constantly beset by fits of insanity, may have prevented him from translating a play which

could have no meaningful consolation for him.

At this point in the Anmerkungen Hölderlin shifts his point of view from a philosophic to a poetic one. He makes a comparison between the three Athenian tragedians in terms of emphasis:

Das Liebenswürdige, Verständige im Unglück. Das Träumerisch - Naive. Eigentliche Sprache des Sophokles, da Aeschylus und Euripides mehr das Leiden und den Zorn, weniger aber des Menschen Verstand, als unter Undenkbarem wandelnd, zu objektivieren wissen. ⁶⁰

Sophocles possesses three distinctive qualities in his poetry: the ability to evoke love, compassion in misfortune, and a naive-imaginative quality, while Aeschylus and Euripides emphasize the suffering and the wrath of man to the discredit of human reason's ability to cope with these problems. Sophocles, in Hölderlin's view, is able to harness the Dionysiac urges in his characters by asserting reason. He raises them above Aeschylus' fated puppets and the degenerate masses of Euripides. Hölderlin found the profound sensitivity of Sophocles suited to his own lyric inclinations. He attempts in his translations to preserve the truly human aspects of the characters. They must be consistent and yet have the capacity for growth.

Perhaps the most human relationship in Antigone is that between Creon and his son Haemon. Hölderlin cites the following excerpt from their dialogue to illustrate how natural and yet difficult human growth is:

Kreon Wenn meinen Uranfang' ich treu beistehe, lüg' ich?

Haemon Das bist du nicht, hältst du nicht heilig Gottes Namen (773-774)⁶¹

Tragic characters must remain faithful to their ideals. Although Sophocles has presented Creon in a generally unfavorable light, Creon heroically maintains his stance until it is too late. He loses Antigone, Haemon and even his wife, Eurydice - in short, his whole life - because of his own stubborn persistence. His tragic death or isolation is a symbolic one, and yet his suffering is very real.

In the underlined part of Haemon's speech, Holderlin finds one of the many images that call for interpretation. Haemon says, "you do not reverence God's name", according to Hölderlin's translation, while the original Greek reads:

Kreon ἀμαρτάνω γὰρ τὰς ἐμὰς ἀρχὰς σέβων; 62

Haemon οὐ γὰρ σέβεις, τίμῃς γε τὰς θεῶν κατῶν.

Hölderlin realizes that the last phrase of Haemon should have been translated "trittst du der Götter Ehre", or "you trample the honor of the gods". He then explains the reason for his interpretation:

Es war nötig, hier den heiligen Ausdruck zu ändern, da er in der Mitte bedeutend ist, als Ernst und selbständiges Wort, an dem sich alles übrige objektivieret und verklärt.⁶³

As we have seen in the line "why should I dance", Hölderlin had to change the image to suit the conscience of his own time. The Greeks believed in chthonic deities, and as in this play, in gods of the underworld. Thus, the image of Creon trampling upon the honors or allotted portions of deity would bring grasps of horror to the lips of Sophocles' Greek audience. Creon should expect to pay the dire consequences of his transgression. Hölderlin's audience, however, was raised in the Judeo-Christian tradition, in

which, from the time of Moses, it was taboo to call upon the name of the Lord in vain. God is not a locative deity; he is a personal deity whose name is an essential part of his character. To defile God's name is to defile Him. Thus Hölderlin sacrifices the vividness of the trampling imagery for the clarity of the sense behind it. Hölderlin's interpretation is a result of his personal intellectual view of the ideal of divinity. This is how he conceives of the force which objectivizes and exalts everything. Different relative interpretations of certain characteristics, however, will not change the essential power of the divine force.

Hölderlin relates this problem of relativism in interpretation to the peculiar curse of the prophet Teiresias upon Creon:

ἀλλ' εὖ γέ τοι κἀτίσθαι μὴ πολλοὺς ἔτι
τῶν δόχου ἀμειλλήτηρας ἡλίου τελευτῶν

ANT. (1064-65) 64

which literally means:

Know well that the sun will not have rolled its course
Many more days... 65

Hölderlin, however, personalizes the construction by shifting the emphasis from the action of the sun to Creon's boastful brooding of self-destructive ideas:

..... Nicht lang mehr brüttest
In eifersüchtiger Sonne. 66 (1106-7)

Hölderlin has Teiresias say "you will not much longer brood in (or under) the vain-glorious sun", Hölderlin retains the image of competition connoted in ἀμειλλήτηρας "strivings" by the sun's epithet "eifersüchtig", but expands the scope of the image to include Creon by use of the verb "brüttest". Hölderlin observes that the sun has a relative symbolic value, just as the sun in the real

order has relative or polar aspects as a source of growth or as a source of parched destruction. The sun thus becomes the symbol of the eternal divine power in the cosmic order which exacts vengeance for all transgressions of its system of order. Creon may have his day of glory in the sun, but that same sun will see the death of his entire family. Hölderlin's significant change from passive knowledge to active braggadocio on the part of Creon may be an indication of his personal attitude toward Creon. For Hölderlin, Creon's ideal of civil authority is inferior to Antigone's claim because her "eternal unwritten laws" are more closely related to the abstract ideal of Hölderlin's "Ganze".

Hölderlin's treatment of the Niobe story, which Antigone recalls in her Kommos with the Chorus, is of interest for its relationship to Creon's boastful brooding:

Ant. Ich habe gehört, der Wüste gleich sei worden
Die Liebensreiche, Phrygische,
Von Tantalos im Schoße gezogen, an Sipylos
Gipfel (852-5) 67

Hölderlin, relying on his knowledge of classical myths, connects the boast of Creon with that of Niobe. She was the wife of Amphion, king of Thebes, and had boasted that she had borne many children. Leto, who bore only Artemis and Apollo, sent her children to slay those of Niobe. As an added punishment for her boast, Niobe was transformed into a stone pillar.⁶⁸ While the connection of Niobe's and Creon's fate, destructive brooding may have been in the back of Sophocles' mind, his immediate purpose in alluding

to Niobe was to connect the fates of Antigone and Niobe.

Hölderlin's comment here supports the theory of a double tragedy in this play. Niobe, with her double punishment, serves as a link between Creon and Antigone. All three suffer a real or potential loss of children; each is symbolically stained with the blood of his or her family.

Commenting on the value of this allusion to the whole of the play, Hölderlin says:

"Wohl der höchste Zug an der Antigone. Der erhabene Spott, sofern heiliger Wahnsinn höchste menschliche Erscheinung, und hier mehr Seele als Sprache ist, übertrifft alle ihre übrigen Äußerungen: es ist auch nötig, so im Superlative von der Schönheit zu sprechen, weil die Haltung unter anderem auch auf dem Superlative von menschlichem Geist und heroischer Virtuosität beruht.⁶⁹

Antigone's ability to reflect upon the misfortune of a woman who suffered the same fate and to take solace in the fact presents, according to Hölderlin, the highest stroke of literary genius in the play. The "sublime ridicule" shown by Antigone for the Chorus' attempt to justify her punishment is the highest human equivalent of divine "madness". This madness can not be explained in the limited context of physical reality. Its divine element elevates the purpose of Antigone's punishment to the level of the cosmic order of fate. The chorus has claimed Antigone is the victim of her *autovouta*. The chorus does not understand that Antigone must act in a way consistent with her character, with her personal interpretation of the cosmic order. This insight on the part of Antigone comes not merely from her lips but from her

soul. Her heroic qualities allow Antigone to rise above the shallowness of the chorus' perception of the cosmic order. The divine madness in her soul is Antigone's link to the cosmic "Ganze". The chorus lacks this madness and thus fails to see her death as a natural means to attain harmony with the cosmos.

Holderlin establishes a relative hierarchy of suprahuman powers in his analysis of the Antigone. The highest order is the "Ganze", the cosmic order which serves as the ultimate judge and control of man and the universe.⁷⁰ The second order consists of the gods who are ethically colored historical personifications based upon a particular Greek interpretation of the "Ganze".⁷¹ The third order is the divine spark in man himself. This third order is important for a proper understanding of the tragic hero.

The conscious ability of the tragic hero, e.g. Antigone, to comprehend his or her role in the cosmic order is a manifestation of the divine in man. Hölderlin introduces the term "aorgisch" to explain the drive in man to reconcile himself with Nature, the concretization of the cosmic "Ganze". He compares the fate of Niobe and Antigone to the fate of Nature and Mankind:

... Wie überall Schicksal der unschuldigen Natur, die überall in ihrer Virtuosität in eben dem Grade ins Allzuorganische geht, wie der Mensch sich dem Aorgischen nähert, in heroischeren Verhältnissen und Gemütsbewegen. 72

Just as Nature is scorched by too much sunlight, so Mankind is singed by the harmful burn of intense adherence to an ideal on the godly or cosmic level while living in the real or dramatic-fictional world. The sheer intensity of the "aorgisch" drive in Man forces him to exceed the bounds of the real world. This excess appears to be madness to all who remain within the limits of the objective order of reality.

It is this divine madness which allows Greek heroes to confront the gods with apparently blasphemous arrogance.⁷³ Hölderlin incorporates this divine urge into his major dramatic character, Empedocles, who, in his attempt to bring the people closer to God, begins to conceive of himself as a god. Hölderlin thus raises man to the level of the gods. He can not elevate him to the cosmic level because modern man does not have the same intimate relations with nature as did the Greeks. The Romantic Tragedy rests in man's inability to attain this lost intimacy. Sophocles can take that extra step in Oedipus Colonus, for Oedipus has attained his reconciliation with Nature and the cosmic order. It is more than a conscious elevation: with Oedipus, it is a natural one, suited to his character.

The cosmic order is related to the concept of time by Hölderlin through the character of Zeus. Hölderlin considers Zeus as the father of Time, an interpretation which is the exact opposite to the traditional Greek idea that he was the son of Chronos, Time.⁷⁴ Hölderlin's analysis of the play breaks down at this point. He discusses the thunderbolts of Zeus as being symbols of human suffering and feeling dependent on the concept of time. His explanation of this symbolism, however, is too vague and tenuous for our purposes. Let it suffice to say that Hölderlin sees Time as a Deistic force which helps direct the universe although it is separate from all material aspects of the world.⁷⁵

Time's influence in the order of man's divine spark is more readily comprehensible and important for Hölderlin's interpretation of Sophocles' tragic heroes. Hölderlin conceives of time as a context for human action. It is, therefore, an integral part of the objective order. The suffering and emotional stress of the various tragic characters in Sophocles' plays ebb and flow with the passage of

dramatic time, which can be considered a slight variation of objective time. The dramatic problem arises when the tragic character's ideal or moral system comes into conflict with the broader historical progression of time. The total absorption of the person in the frozen reality of his ideal is suited only to a dramatic present which is fleeting at best. The tragic figure is neither attuned to the future nor equipped to handle all the pressing uncertainties of the situation. Thus, Antigone, in that much disputed passage⁷⁶ in which she laments the loss of her brother (904-20 in the original), feels the natural pain and emotional strain involved. She can not, however, achieve the actual reconciliation of her ideal to the existing objective order (i.e., Creon's authority) by performing the burial rites for her brother Polyneices. Antigone, like most Greek tragic heroes, is caught in a time lapse. She may be correct in adhering to her ideals but she is consequently out of tune with the prevailing philosophy. This inconsistency adds to natural suffering the tragic pain resulting from the person's inability to achieve reconciliation with the objective order.

Hölderlin feels that the only solution or reconciliation possible in the real and/or dramatic world comes on a lower level, that of the chorus:

Weil aber diese festeste Bleiben vor der wandelnden Zeit,
dies heroische Eremitenleben, das höchste Bewußtsein
wirklich ist, motiviert sich dadurch der folgend Chor,
als reinste Allgemeinheit und als eigentlichster Gesicht-
spunkt, wo das Ganze angefaßt werden muß. 77

The chorus has a dual role in the drama; it acts as a buffer or sounding board for the two or more opposing forces and it is the representative of the "Ganze". The members of the chorus live totally within the limits of the objective order of the play. Consequently, they possess the ability to make sweeping general observa-

tions on the conduct of the characters. Only the poet with his intellectual view and "das Ganze", if personified, could manifest such power. When the chorus makes these moral observations, they are directed usually to one of the antagonists. The degree to which the character reacts with self-control and deep conviction often indicates the relative value of his ideal to the cosmic order. Thus, a highly favorable evaluation of the hero's ideals in the objective order can be attained by a person's winning the chorus over to his ideal. The effect of the Chorus upon reality may be insignificant, but for Hölderlin the chorus stands as a symbol of possible harmony.

In the third section of the Anmerkungen, Hölderlin returns to the more philosophical ramifications of drama:

Die tragische Darstellung beruhet, wie in den Anmerkungen zum Oedipus angedeutet ist, darauf, da der mittelbare Gott, ganze eines mit dem Menschen (denn der Gott eines Apostels ist mittelbarer, ist höchster Geist) daß die unendliche Begeisterung unendlich, das heißt in Gegensätzen, im Bewußtsein, welches das Bewußtsein aufhebt, heilig sich scheidend, sich faßt, und der Gott in der Gestalt des Todes, gegenwärtig ist. 78

The divine spark in a tragic hero is an immanent god who is one with the particular person, according to Hölderlin. This interpretation of innate enthusiasm⁷⁹ is amazingly similar to the Greek concept of Daimon. A person's daimon could best be described as his conscience, the force in man which elevates him above animals and to a level almost equal to the gods. The tragic hero comprehends his role on this higher level and thus accepts death as the fulfillment of his ideal in the objective order.

The concept of immanence develops differently according to culture. Hölderlin observes that the Greek dialogue and chorus express immanence in the language employed. Sophocles and the other Attic playwrights used diction and imagery which employed sensual

objects as concrete similes, while the modern German language and thought processes utilize more abstract devices, especially metaphors. Hölderlin is drawing the same conclusions here about ancient and modern poetry as does Schiller.⁸⁰ For Hölderlin, Greek naïveté manifests a close relation to the physical world of nature; modern romanticism reveals an intimate feel for the spiritual or intellectual world.

Hölderlin's last point in this quote about the immanent force in man deals with the problem of death. Greek tragedy usually ends in the physical death of the hero because of the immanent relationship of the mortal and divine and nature in that culture. German tragedy, however, often ends in a type of spiritual or philosophical death. Modern tragic figures do not have ideals which are intimately related to all Nature. They must search for an ideal relationship to the Divine on the level of abstraction. The modern concept of the divine is not Nature itself or a force within Nature.⁸¹ It is an abstraction, a force which controls nature from without while relating to the tragic character. Despite the personal aspect of modern divinity, it is far less immediately comprehended by man because of the element of abstraction. Thus the modern tragic figure may suffer a spiritual death in despair lacking that ardently sought close relationship to nature, as did so many Romantics.

The particular way that a culture views the divine has a definite bearing on how that culture will treat the problem of fate. Hölderlin makes this following observation:

... verändern sich die griechischen Vorstellungen insofern, als ihre Haupttendenz ist, sich fassen zu können, weil darin ihre Schwäche lag, da hingegen die Haupttendenzen in den Vorstellungsarten unserer Zeit ist, etwas treffen zu

können, Geschick zu haben, da des Schicksallose, das
 , unsere Schwäche ist. 82

While the Greek tragic weakness arises out of their inability to comprehend themselves i.e., to define and defend their place in the cosmos; the German tragic weakness stems from an inability to define and fully comprehend the meaning of that very cosmic force, abstracted from nature. Hölderlin feels that the Greek hero suffers from excessively immanent pressure from Fate (i.e., Nature and the cosmos) 83 to conform to its guidelines or suffer the penalty for misinterpretation. The modern tragic figure suffers from his inability to clarify his relationship with a nebulous Fate weakened by its abstraction in the conscience. Hölderlin's distinction is not a denial of fate in modern tragedy. It is a clarification of the role of Fate in man's life which is consistent with the development and sophisticated complication of human comprehension. In keeping with this development, modern poetical imagery tends to be far more abstract.

Hölderlin thus ends his Anmerkungen zur Antigone on an interpretative note. The value of analyzing the plays of ancient Greece and especially of Sophocles lies in the resultant light cast upon modern society when contrasted with the mores and values of ancient Greece. Hölderlin's ability to interpret the plays of Sophocles and relate them to his own milieu gave them a new degree of esteem as classics for all times. The thought behind the form came alive again when applied to a new situation, as we shall see in the Anmerkungen to the Oedipus.

The problem of equality of ideals, which Hölderlin considers central to his interpretation of the Antigone, represents a modern influence in Hölderlin's thought. The cry of the French revolution had been "Liberte, Fraternite, et Equalite". Equality was a major tenet of the Enlightenment era, although usually interpreted as tolerance.⁸⁴ Hölderlin's intimate relationship with the ferment surrounding conflicting liberal ideas certainly must have had some effect on his work with Sophocles. Another, more literary, influence on Hölderlin's thinking in this area may have stemmed from the conflicts prevalent in historical dramas performed on the Weimar stage during this period; e.g., Schiller's Maria Stuart, Jacobinern and Wilhelm Tell.

Hölderlin feels that the equality of Antigone's and Creon's ideals was consistent with the national situation of Athens in the fourth Century B.C. Sophocles' ability to recreate this contemporary situation in an exciting dramatic plot was most cherished by Hölderlin. Hölderlin saw a great value in the nationalistic concerns of Attic drama as exempla for the contemporary German stage. The rise of the Bürger class in Germany created a more complex and tense balance of power and claims in the contemporary world. Schiller had masterfully idealized these problems in his dramas;⁸⁴ Hölderlin ought to analyze situations in the plays of Sophocles.

Hölderlin begins his Anmerkungen to Oedipus Tyrannus in much the same reflective tone as that in which he ended his Anmerkungen to the Antigone:

Es wird gut sein, um den Dichtern, auch bei uns, eine bürgerliche Existenz zu sichern, wenn man die Poesie, auch bei uns, den Unterschied der Zeiten und Verfassungen abgerechnet, zur $\mu\eta\tau\alpha\phi\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha$ der Alten erhebt.⁸⁵

As we have repeatedly seen, Hölderlin considers one of a poet's major roles to be a man of his times. He must be a genuine representative of the prevailing world view (bürgerlich) with the foresight to comprehend the possibility of change and conflict. He must have the $\mu\eta\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$, the skill to form a viable plot as a vehicle for expressing a universal problem. Such problems are most often concretized in political forms, dependent upon the temporal circumstances. It is this change in time which affects the external manifestations of a general problem.

While the Greeks conceived of their political, physical and moral conduct as a unity under the dual aegis of religious and secular mores, the modern Germans had become departmentalized in their conceptualization of the role of Church and State in their lives. Wallenstein acted in accord with his personal evaluation of a political situation. He was not compelled to act by a religious taboo as was Antigone, or by ethical considerations as was Oedipus. His lack of political power caused his destruction, but, like the Greek hero, Wallenstein accepts the inevitable consequences of his action. His attempted coup was unworkable in the given objective order and had to be avenged. Hölderlin praised a drama such as Wallenstein for its ability to realistically recreate such problems in a modern context; he valued the ancient drama more, however, for its ability to present such complex problems as the relative value of claims in the context of a cohesive whole ("Das Ganze"), not merely on a level of human willfulness.

Hölderlin prefaces his analysis of the Oedipus Tyrannos

with an explanation of the Greek rules for constructing a plot to convey this total cohesion of life. The major feature of these rules is "Zuverlässigkeit",⁸⁶ dependability. Greek tragedy was developed around a set of guidelines which enhanced the dramatic effect without becoming fossilized. These guidelines were not formalized until Aristotle, a century later, wrote his major treatise The Poetics using Sophocles as his Paradigmatic model.⁸⁷ The rules of good dramatic form, however, were handed down from generation to generation in much the same way as the epic formulae were transmitted orally until written down after the time of Homer. Such traditions did not exclude the possibility of creativity as the treatment of the Electra theme verifies.⁸⁸

Hölderlin laments the lack of this traditional dependability in modern drama"

Auch andern Kunstwerken fehlt, mit den griechischen verglichen, die Zuverlässigkeit; wenigstens sind sie bis ist mehr nach Eindrücken beurteilt worden, die sie machen, als nach ihrem gesetzlichen Kalkül und sonstiger Verfaßungsart, wodurch das Schöne hervorgebracht wird. Der modernen Poesie fehlt es aber besonders an der Schule und am Handwerksmäßigen, daß nämlich ihre Verfaßungsart berechnet und gelehrt, und wenn sie gelernt ist, in der Ausübung immer zuverlässig wiederholt werden kann. Man hat, unter Menschen, bei jedem Dinge, vor allem darauf zu sehen, daß es etwas ist, daß die Art, wie es bedingt ist, bestimmt und gelernt werden kann. Deswegen und aus höheren Gründen bedarf die Poesie besonders sicherer und charakterischer Prinzipien und Schranken.⁸⁹

Hölderlin employs a peculiar phrase "gesetzlichen Kalkül" to describe the viable guidelines which give structure and impetus to the development of plot. These rules or guidelines are important in their place. They are only tools or means by which the

overall meaning of the action should be enhanced. Thus, Hölderlin supports the theory of classical form but agrees with Lessing in the subordination of form to meaning. He understands that leeway must be granted for the inherent changes in social attitudes. Within such a flexible structure, Hölderlin maintains that the contents must form a cohesive entity in such a way that "der lebendige Sinn, der nicht berechnet werden kann, mit dem kalku-
laben Gesetze in Beziehung gebracht wird". 90

Hölderlin apparently felt that the art of poetry could be learned. A poet must have some lyric inclinations, but practice can perfect his craft. All Hölderlin wants in the finished dramatic package is a real sense of "Gleichgewicht", i.e., an inner harmony which gives true form to the action. Hölderlin expresses in this term his conception of Winkelmann's classical ideal of "edle Einfalt und stille Größe". Drama as a depiction of nature possesses great diversity within a subtle order.

Hölderlin esteemed Sophocles for his ability to recreate the subtleties of reality faithfully. Hölderlin himself employs just such a subtle order in his treatment of the two plays. Both Anmerkungen form triads. The first section deals with general poetic structure. The second part treats the specific problem of the plays, and the third returns to more general observations about drama. I have passed over the metrical analysis of both plays here for I do not consider it my area within my competency at this time. Let it suffice at this point to say that Hölderlin considered metrics an invaluable tool for expressing the meaning of the play.

Hölderlin, I believe, interprets Oedipus Tyrannus as a play about understanding and self-comprehension. He begins his analysis of the play by stating that comprehension of the play as a whole rests in the audience's ability to understand the scene in which Oedipus continually alludes to the oracle in his attempt to rid the city of its curse. Creon explains the order of the oracle:

Geboten hat uns Phöbus klar, der König,
 Man soll des Landes Schmach, auf diesem Grund genährt,
 Verfolgen, nicht Unheilbares ernähren (95-97) ⁹¹

Hölderlin realizes the ambiguity of the oracular pronouncements and feels this oracle could be interpreted as an order, to maintain a strong and pure court of law and good social stability. Oedipus, however, in his role as priest-king, interprets it ritualistically- "Durch welche Reinigung? welche Unglück ists?" (98) After Creon explains that the measure to be taken must be banishment or death, Oedipus becomes even more particular in his queries, asking if the oracle identified the man. Creon replies evasively:

Uns war, o König, Lajos vormals Herr ⁹²
 In diesm Land, eh du die Stadt gelenket. (103-102)

He relates the story of Laius' death to the curse of the city, a relationship which Hölderlin notes is not an expected or necessary one. The relationship made in the response seems to arouse a natural curiosity in Oedipus. Sophocles, in this scene, gives Oedipus the first clue for solving the murder mystery. In the following scene with Teiresias, Hölderlin peculiarly describes Oedipus as "alles wissend" in his pronouncement of the curse on the murderer. ⁹³ Perhaps Hölderlin means that Oedipus has full cognizance of the details of the oracle, not the total significance

of its message for himself. I think this interpretation is supported by Hölderlin's observation on the dialogue with Teiresias:

die wunderbare zornige Neugier, weil das Wissen, wenn es seine Schranke durchrissen hat, wie trunken in seiner herrlichen harmonische wissen, als es tragen oder fessen kann. 94

The characteristic need of the tragic hero to exceed his human limitations entices him to discover the full ramifications of his superficially complete knowledge. Such is the case with Oedipus and the oracle. Oedipus possesses a *ἀναρτία* an inconsistency between his nature and the conditions of his milieu. Teiresis, the symbol of divine reconciliation, is the spark which really ignites Oedipus' tragic wrath. This wrath is merely the total immersion of the tragic figure into his dominating harmonious ideal of self-dulfillment and harangue with the cosmos which always remains steadfast. The real flow in the drama is impersonal. It lies in the stubborn failure of the dramatic context to admit even the partial validity of ideals based not in the dramatic objective but in the order of the divine spark.

Hölderlin unfortunately loses much of the ironic tinge of the sight imagery in this scene, ⁹⁶ a device which gives amazing depth to Sophocles' portrayal of the search for self-knowledge. Hölderlin merely uses the very "wissen"

for his translation of sight verbs. Although the image of sight is almost universally implicit in verbs of knowing, Hölderlin consciously seems to be spelling out the concretization of Sophocles' imagery.

Hölderlin considers the next scene with Jocasta in Oedipus as subtle pause in Oedipus' search for self-knowledge. Jocasta's attempt to assuage Oedipus' fear of murdering his father is subtly exploited by Sophocles to serve as an impetus to Oedipus' curiosity. She achieves the opposite of the effect intended for she awakens his awareness of a "mitleidswerte naive Irrtum". This tragic pause is short lived for Oedipus is confronted with another interrogation with the Messenger.

The dialogue between Oedipus and the messenger comes at the beginning of the second half of the play as Hölderlin sees it. This verbal banter serves as an impetus to evoke the true nobility of Oedipus' motives. From now on in the play, Oedipus is acting, not as the king of Thebes, but as a man determined to clarify his own identity. He throws off the mantle of royal concerns and accepts the burden of self-knowledge. Oedipus fretfully boasts to Jocasta:

Wohlan! wer sollte nun, o Weib, noch einmal
 Den prophezeienden Herd befragen, oder
 Von oben schreiend die Vögel? deren Sinn nach
 Ich töten sollte meinen Vater, der
 Gestorben schlummert unter der Erde; hier aber
 Bin ich und rein ist meine Lanze, wenn er anders.
 Im Traume nicht umkam, von mir; zugleich nahm er auch
 Die heutigen Sehersprüche mit, und liegt nun
 Im Hades, Polybos, nicht weiter gültig. (964-72) 97

Oedipus' attempt to deny his involvement in the death of his supposed father, Polybos, is tainted by a significant phrase "wenn er anders Im Traume nicht umkam, von mir". Oedipus has not yet "sich fassen zu können". His self doubts are reflected in the loophole of the dream. Such behavior is quite natural for anyone who is experiencing what Hölderlin calls Oedipus' "desperate struggle, degrading, almost shameless striving, and foolishly wild longing"⁹⁸ for a genuine self-concept. The "naive mistake" of Oedipus had to be rectified in both the objective and cosmic orders. He has sought answers from divine oracles and human witnesses to no avail. Oedipus, armed with much knowledge, is still beset by doubts. Sophocles has portrayed a character of genuine human depth and complexity in Oedipus. The mere thought of an intentional defilement of his shreaded

self-image by patricide is almost too much for Oedipus.

Hölderlin shows his sensitivity to Oedipus' plight in his description of the mood in this section of the play a "geisteskrank". This term of spiritual illness or mental aberration is a peculiar epithet to attribute to a figure in a classical play. Hölderlin obviously was influenced in his choice of words by the prevalence of this term in Romantic literature of the late 18th and early 19th century Germany.⁹⁹ Hölderlin's personal battle with insanity adds even more depth to his understanding of Oedipus' anguish.

Hölderlin passes over the problem of the oracles' validity. He apparently felt that the doubts of Jocasta and Oedipus were the natural manifestations of human fear in a perilous situation. It is strange that Hölderlin, who praises Sophocles for being a man of his times, fails to observe the connection between the questioning of the oracles in 5th Century Athens and the challenge posed to organized religion in Greece by the Enlightenment in 18th century Germany. There are amazing parallels in both situations: both cultures were beset by the problems of martial turmoil- the Peloponnesian war and the rash of wars for national independence, - by the new awareness in the power of the individual, and by a radical change in life style, caused by war or economic conditions. Perhaps Hölderlin did not feel the situations were similar enough to warrant comparison along these lines.

Hölderlin's final observation in this section of the Anmerkungen concerns Oedipus' famous claim that Fortune was his mother;

Was soll, das breche. Mein Geschlechte will ich,
Seis auch gering, doch will ich es erfahren.
Mit Recht ist sie, denn Weiber denken groß,

Ob meiner niedrigen Geburt beschämt.
 Ich will aber, als Sohn des Glücks mich haltend,
 Des wohlbegabten, nicht verunehrt werden.
 Denn dies ist meine Mutter. Und klein und groß
 Umfingen mich die mitgebornen Monde,
 Und so erzeugt, will ich nicht ausgehn, so,
 So daß ich nicht ganz, was ich bin, erforschte. (1095-1104)

100

Oedipus casts his fate to the winds and will accept whatever the truth is concerning his origin. Hölderlin comments that the emotional outburst by this "allessuchende, allesdeutende" character manifests the complexity of his spirit. Oedipus rises to the heights of abstraction in claiming Tuche - "gluck" or "Luck" - as his mother in the very same breath that he plummets to the depths of the aphoristic speech of common servants - "Was soll, das breche". Hölderlin masterfully translates this passage into German without losing the spirit of Sophocles' brilliant intermingling of mundane diction with sublime imagery. Both poets successfully capture the divine and human nature of the total person, Oedipus. The tragic hero, for Hölderlin, embodies the idealization of man in the fullness of his paradoxical nature as a being of and above the world of every day reality.

As he did in the Anmerkungen to the Antigone, Hölderlin devotes the third section to a discussion of the portrayal of a tragedy:

Die Darstellung des Tragischen beruht vorzüglich darauf, daß das Ungeheure, wie der Gott und Mensch sich paart, und grenzenlos die Naturmacht und des Menschen Innerstes im Zorn eins wird, dadurch sich begreift, daß das grenzenloser Eineswerden durch Grenzenloses scheiden sich reiniget. 101

Tragedy is best depicted in the marvelous unifying of god

and man in the unrestricted fusion of the power of nature and man's innermost being in wrath. This wrath is a manifestation of this unlimited unification's purification by means of total separation. Once again Hölderlin's comments have become very elliptical. I think what he is trying to say is that the process of reconciliation for a tragic hero with the cosmic order can only be achieved in death. The process must be a total severing of ties with every aspect of life as it was really experienced. The role of wrath as the catalyst in this procedure can be understood more clearly if we recall Hölderlin's term "aorgisch". The tragic hero has this supranatural drive or instinct to transcend the limits of the objective order in the world by mysteriously uniting with the incomprehensible forces of Nature. Man possesses the paradoxical need and ability to break out of his self-imposed limitations. The pain and suffering resulting from this breakthrough is clearly depicted in the plot of a tragedy.

The Greek quote which ends this observation by Hölderlin is also very strange. It seems to be a paraphrase of the quote by Theophrastus . Literally, it means "the scribe of nature was the one to break off the well-intensioned reed!" Perhaps Hölderlin means that God or the Cosmos is the ultimate judge of a tragic character's action just as He is the original source of his life.

The tragic hero must overcome several obstacles to attain his final harmony with the cosmic order. The chorus and the dialogue with the other characters present the greatest obstacles

to the hero. Hölderlin feels that the chorus and other characters are too pure or simplistic. The one-sidedness of a given character is usually cancelled by an opposite effect in another character. The chorus, as we have seen, is capable of attaining a limited version of all-encompassing harmony. It expresses emotions of complaint, joy, religiosity, and piety and most important of all, compassion. Thus the chorus serves as an exponent of the prevailing mood in a given scene of the play. Hölderlin compares this predetermining role of the chorus to that of a judge in a trial of a heretic. There is no leeway for the tragic character to unite with the cosmic order as long as he is under the jurisdiction of the objective order.

Hölderlin maintains that the tragic figure forgets himself and the "Gott", his divine spark. He must, in a sense, betray his humanity for the sake of his role in the cosmic order. He must go against his "Gott", only in so far as it is conditioned by its relation to the objective order. As Hölderlin says, "In der äußersten Grenze des Leidens bestehet nämlich nichts mehr, als die Bedingungen der Zeit oder des Raums." Time and space are transitory aspects of reality. The tragic hero forgets his share in these effemeral conditions because he is suspended in an animated moment, in his ideal. The essence of genuine tragedy is man's attempt and failure to reconcile his isolated ideal or philosophy of life to the transient conditions of life.

Haemon in the Antigone and Oedipus in the middle of Oedipus Tyrannos represent two examples of men trapped in the incongruity of life and ideal. Haemon says that he will be faithful

to his father Creon. When Haemon realizes that his father will not heed his pleas for reason, his love for Antigone and her ideal force him to betray his father's confidence. Haemon must suffer because of his failure to convert Creon to his way of thinking. Creon is too caught up at this point with the prevailing mood, his own authority. Oedipus suffers a similar betrayal at the hands of the shepherd. The oracle had shown that Oedipus' birth was untimely. Contrary to orders, to leave him in the mountains to die, the servant yields to his simple ideal of the value of life and saves the child. Thus, from the very beginning Oedipus' whole existence has been at odds with the objective order.

In summary, Hölderlin's interpretation of Sophocles expounded in his Anmerkungen to Oedipus Tyrannos and Antigone assumes two levels. First, he treats the plays as part of the dramatic genre in which the conflict of time and character is developed and resolved in an artistic, harmonious unit. The Dialogue, chorus and major characters all contribute to the portrayal of universal themes on the concrete level as they attempt to resolve the dialectic conflict. Secondly, he analyzes the concept of the tragic hero. Hölderlin considers the basic problems of the Greek tragic character to be "sich fassen zu können". Just as the drama of the Greeks was an organic whole in which the religious, political and social problems of the day were integrally related, so the character of the Greek hero was totally incorporated into an ideal (e.g. Truth of Self for Oedipus and Unwritten laws for Antigone). The development of

the Greek figure depended upon his reconciliation of this ideal with the total milieu of his time in reality. Tragedy arises out of the impossibility of this task. Sophocles' unique ability to blend these two aspects of tragic drama moved Hölderlin to make a final judgement of Sophocles as a Man of his times:

Sophokles hat Recht. Es ist dies Schicksal seiner Zeit und Form seine Vaterlandes. Man kann wohl idealisieren, z.B. den besten Moment wählen, aber die vaterländischen Vorstellungsarten dürfen, wenigstens der Unterordnung nach, vom Dichter, der die Welt im verringerten Maßstab darstellt, nicht verändert werden. Für un ist eine solche Form gerade tauglich, weil das Unendliche, wie der Geist der Staaten und der Welt, ohnehin nicht anders, als aus linkerischem Gesichtspunkt kann gefaßt werden. Die vaterländischen Formen unserer Dichter, wo solche sind, sind aber dennoch vorzuziehen, weil solche nicht bloß da sind, um den Geist der Zeit verstehen zu lernen, sondern ihn festzuhalten, wenn er einmal begriffen und gelernt ist. 102

Sophocles was right for his time but his greater value lies in his ability to be right for the future generations of mankind who are plagued by basically the same problems. Each succeeding age seems to be gifted with men who gain deep insights into the plays of Sophocles. Friedrich Hölderlin was just such a man in the Germany of the Klassik-Romantik period. Hölderlin was able to interpret the valuable meaning as well as the form of Sophocles for the benefit of his era. The influence of Sophocles on Hölderlin is best summarized in the dedicated to Sophocles:

Viele versuchten umsonst, das Freudigste freudig zu sagen. Hier spricht endlich es mir, hier in der Trauer sich aus. 103

CONCLUSION

The influence of Sophocles upon the literature and dramatic theory in the Klassik-Romantik era was indirect but quite significant. Sophocles' plays were used as models for various types of modern drama. Each German critic or dramatist was able to extract a particular principle of dramatic technique from the art of Sophocles and apply it to his own work. Lessing considered Sophocles a master of aesthetic portrayal of pain for the dual purpose of arousing emotions and eliciting moral awareness in the audience. Sophocles achieved this dual goal by synthesizing the most sublime ideals with a most naturally constructed plot. His characters were able to become symbols of a theme or ideal, but only after they had experienced a tragic situation with all the intensity of true human emotion. Wieland considered Sophocles the embodiment of the Golden Age of Pericles, and Hölderlin viewed him as a man of his time.

Holderlin's interpretation of Sophocles as a poet of reconciliation is significant on two levels. First, Sophocles was held up to the Romantics as an ideal for which they could strive (but never attain). Hölderlin experienced the frustration of the Romantics in his own life as he grappled with insanity. I am inclined to believe that Hölderlin was using his translations and analysis of Sophocles as the last straw in his futile grasp for reconciliation with the reality of life. Hölderlin's own lyric and dramatic abilities were given a new impetus to achieve the heights of Sophocles by this urge for survival.

Hölderlin's intensity and creative spirit allowed him to rise above the abyss of empty formalism and to crystalize the ambivalent and complex spirit of the emerging Romantic era.

Goethe and Schiller, as well as the Schlegel brothers, Friedrich and August Wilhelm looked upon Sophocles as a model of Harmony. While Hölderlin considered Sophoclean Harmony as the goal of an evolving dramatic and creative process, Goethe and Schiller viewed it as a completed, synthesized dramatic whole. These two artists were able to achieve a synthesis of form and meaning unparalleled in German literary or dramatic history. Although they viewed Sophocles' work as a composite whole, Goethe and Schiller followed him as a creative and not a static model. Schiller, for example dealt with historical themes and plots but developed the subtle intricacies of his characterizations to a degree equal to that of Sophocles or Shakespeare. Both Goethe and Schiller, however, fell short in their attempts to recreate "classical drama". Schiller's Die Braut von Messina (1803) was an attempt to introduce strict classical form with a chorus and an oracle representing the element of Fate. The play is far too contrived to appeal to the consciences of modern audiences, though it was well accepted by German University students. Goethe and Schiller learned from experience that the only way to appreciate Sophocles and make him a part of themselves was to analyze his work for the spirit of truth which Lessing found in Sophocles, a man of his time.

Four main points have emerged from my study of the German criticism of Sophocles:

1. Sophocles was a model of excellence for the Germans because of his ability to synthesize ideals and reality in the genre of drama.
2. Sophocles was a man of his time who could reflect upon the conflicts of his age and raise them to a universal level of applicability and reflection.
3. Sophocles a personal model of total harmony in all aspects of life: political, social, religious and ethical.
4. Sophocles was a poet and a dramatist with whom the Germany of the Klassik-Romantik era could identify because of Dionysiac naturalness and Apollonian formalism in his plays.

Sophocles was a poet of great eminence in an age of profound achievement. He was able to reflect on the dying values of heroic ideals, face the conflicts of the present and look forward in hope to the promise of the future despite the obvious signs of decay. Sophocles' ability to coalesce these three aspects of the human condition in himself and his work made him a natural favorite of the entire period of Klassik-Romantik literature. The Enlightenment era looked back to previous ages for its origins and sources of inspiration. Lessing chose to examine the roots of drama in Aristotle and Sophocles. The Sturm und Drang era and its growing counterpart, the Classical Age, attempted in their peculiar and opposite ways to find a solution to the conflicts of the human spirit. Goethe and Schiller both expressed the spirit of these movements in their literature. The Romantic Movement looked forward to the dismal future with a feeling of frustration but also with a ray of transcendent hope.

Hölderlin embodies the spirit of this particular era.

The most significant conclusion which can be justifiably drawn from my investigation of Sophoclean influence in the German literature of the 18th and 19th century is that there exists a definite degree of parallelism between the time and works of Sophocles and the various trends, Apollonian and Dionysiac, which prevailed during this period in Germany. The Germans' ability to translate the form, meaning and spirit of Sophocles into their own milieu without destroying or distorting his essentially unique qualities bears witness to the genius of their age and the general claim that Sophocles is a "possession for all ages!"

APPENDIX I - DATES FOR THE ANTIGONE

- 442 B.C. 1st production of the Antigone of Sophocles in Athens
- 1502 1st printing of Antigone 1502 in Venice; 1522 in Florence; 1533 in Paris, 1544 in Frankfurt am Main, 1547 in Bern, 1579 in Antwerp
- 1636 1st German edition under the title: Des Griechischen Tragodienschreibers Sophoclis Antigone, deutsch gegeben durch Martinium Opitium, Dantzig, gedruckt bei Andreum Huenefeld Buchhandler in 1636 Opitz said that one could learn "ein gutes Schicksal sich zu erhalten und ein ungunstiges mit ruhigem und aufrechtem Geiste zu ertragen."
- 1760 - 1920 90 different translations of the Antigone in German
- Fall of 1803 Holderlin's translation ready for print
- 1804 Holderlin's translations of Oedipus Tyrannus and Antigone appear, published by Friedrich Wilman
- 1808 1st German production of Antigone as translated by Friedrich Rochlitz and directed by Goethe
- 1841 1st significant stage production of Antigone, directed by Ludwig Tieck, on 28 Oct. in New Palace, Potsdam 1839 (translation by Jacob Christian Donner. Music by Felix Mendelssohn)
- 1917 Antigone, tragedy in five acts by Walter Hasenclever in Berlin
- 26 June 1918 1st production of Holderlin's translation in Zurich
- 1942 Antigone by Jean Anouilh
- 15 Feb. 1948 Production of Antigone translated by Bertolt Brecht

Appendix II: Comparison of Chorus in Oedipus Colonus(668-94)

GERMAN

In des pferdereichen Landes
 Trefflichen Höfen,
 Auf Kolonos weißem Boden
 Bist du angekommen,
 o Fremdling dieser Gegend,
 Wo durchdringend klagt
 Die wiederkehrende Nachtigall
 Unter grünem Buschwald,
 Überwölbt von dunklem Efeu,
 Und von des Gottes unzugänglichem
 Geblättern,
 Dem fruchtevollen, sonnenlosen,
 Keinem Sturme bewegten.
 Wo immerhin der baccantische
 Dionys einhergeht,
 Wohnend unter den göttlichen
 Nährerinnen,
 Wo immerhin vom himmlischen Duft
 Die schöntraubigste Narzisse
 Aufwächst, von Tag zu Tag,
 Der großen Göttinnen
 Uralter Kranz,
 Und der goldglänzende Krokus.
 Noch mindern sich die schlummerlosen
 Quellen,
 Die in Wasser des Cephissus sich teilen,
 Sondern immer und täglich
 Kommt der schnellerzeugende über die Felder,
 Mit reinen Regengüssen
 über die Brust der Erde.
 Auch hassen die Chöre der Musen es nicht,
 Und nicht die goldene Aphrodite.

ENGLISH

The land Beloved of horsemen, fair
 Colonus takes a guest;
 He shall not seek another home,
 For this, in all the earth and air
 is most secure and loveliest.
 In the god's untrodden vale
 where leaves and berries throng,
 and wine-dark ivy climbs the bough,
 the sweet, sojourning nightingale
 Murmurs all day long.
 No sun nor wind may enter there
 Nor the winter's rain;
 But ever through the shadow goes
 Dionysus reveler,
 Immortal maenads in his train.
 Here with drops of heaven's dews
 at daybreak all the year,
 The clusters of narcissus bloom,

Time-hallowed garlands for
 the brows
 Of those great ladies whom
 we fear.
 The crocus like a little sun
 Blooms with its yellow ray;
 The river's fountains are
 awake,
 And his nomadic streams
 that run
 Unthinned forever, and never
 stay;
 But like perpetual lovers move
 on the maternal land.
 And here the choring Muses
 come,
 And the divinity of love
 with the gold reins in her hand.

This Chorus stems from the year 1796. It is earlier than the ode "Der Tod fürs Vaterlands which immediately follows in the Manuscript. Hölderlin only translates the first Strophe and Antistrophe of the ode. He is far more faithful to the lyric beauty of Sophocles' Greek than is Robert Fitzgerald in his English version for two possible reasons. First, Hölderlin was a lyric poet of the first rank who always attempted to capture the flavor as well as the meaning of the original Greek. Secondly, the vitality of the German language with its frequent use of present participles, enhances the possibility of grasping both the form and the meaning of the Greek. Hölderlin, however, as a man of his own time, had to alter the form somewhat. Kohlhammer observes that Hölderlin does not adhere to the original word order too strictly.⁴ For example, the address is switched from the first to the fifth verse. Other changes include a change of syntax which becomes a bit more syntactical rather than imitating paratactical combination of the Greek. Hölderlin also utilizes anaphora more frequently than does Sophocles (). Such external metrical devices are more common in the German. Sophocles, on the other hand, relies more heavily on internal rhyme as a cohesive element in his poetry. All these differences may simply be a sign of the unintentional and underlying difference between naive and sentimental poets.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter I: Gotthold Ephraim Lessing

1. "Bios", Sophoclis Fabulae, ed. A. C. Pearson (Oxford: University Press, 1961)
2. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "Laokoon", Sämtliche Schriften, ed. Karl Lachmann, vol. 9., (Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen, 1886-1924, rpt. 1968) IX, 6.
3. Ibid., IX, 6.
4. Ibid.
5. Chapter XIII, 2,3. Aristotles' Poetics, ed. Francis Fergusson, trans. S. H. Butcher (New York: Hill and Wang, 1961) pp. 75-76.
6. E. Schultz, Lessing, Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften (Berlin: Weidmann, 1899) p. 262ff.
7. Cf. "Briefe von Friedrich Nicolae an Lessing: 31 August 1756", Sämtliche Schriften XIX, 40.
8. Ibid., XIX, 41.
9. Ibid., XIX, 41.
10. Ibid., XIX, 42. Also cf. Holderlin's view of the tragic mistake in Greek drama, plll in this paper.
11. Lessing, Sämtliche Schriften, XVII, 65.
12. Ibid., XVII, 65.
13. Ibid., XVII, 66.
14. "Briefe an Moses Mendelssohn, Leipzig, 28 Nov. 1756" S. S. XVII, 73. (answer to XIX, letter no. 49.)
15. "Briefe an Nicolai" 2 April 1757. XVII, 78.
16. Lessing, S. S. XVII, 100.
17. Cf Holderlin's discussion of Creons Ideal, 197 in this paper.
18. Lessing, S.S. IX, 312.
19. Ibid., IX, 313.
20. Ibid., IX, 314
21. Ibid., IX, 314-15.
22. Sophocles' Ajax and Philoctetes seem to follow this pattern.

23. Lessing, "38th Stück: Die Hamburgische Dramaturgie (8 Sept. 1767) IX, 345.

24. Lessing, "74th Stück (15 June 1768) X, 100-101.

25. I shall discuss this play in further detail in the specific section dealing with the Laokoon.

26. The blinding of Oedipus, the murder of Agamemnon and Medea's slaughter of her own children are all events which take place off-stage.

27. Lessing, "80th Stück". Hamburgische Dramaturgie, (5 Feb. 1768) X, 123.

28. Ibid., X, 124. for Lessings German translation of the original French quote.

29. For further discussion of the problem of staging Greek drama cf. Peter Arnott, Greek Scenic Conventions in 5th Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

30. Lessing S. S. X, 130.

31. Ibid., X, 131.

32. Ibid., X. 179 - 180. Also cf. Ars Poetica vv. 310, 317-8.

33. Ibid., cf. Cicero's Orator

34. Lessing, "94th Stück" Hamburgische Dramaturgie X, 181.

35. Ibid., p. 182.

36. cf. p 19 in this section of the paper

37. "Electra" Euripidis Fabulae, ed. Gilbert Murray, Vol. II

38. "Electra" Sophoclis Fabulae.

39. Lessing, S. S. X, 185.

40. Lessing, S. S. IX, Vorrede Zum Laokoon, p.3.

41. Lessing, Laokoon, IX, 6.

42. Ibid., IX, 7.

43. Ibid., IX, 7. Lessing does not give specific names here but seems to be attacking Gottsched indirectly.

FOOTNOTES(Cont.)

44. Ibid., IX, 8.
45. Ibid., IX, 8 - 9.
46. Ibid., IX, 9. cf. my earlier comments (p.11) on Lessings View of Heroism as an inconsistency in the character of a tragic character.
47. Ibid., IX. 10.
48. Cf. footnote (1) Lessing, Laokoon IX, 16.
49. Ibid, IX, 23.
50. Ibid., IX, 24-25.
51. Ibid., IX, 25.
52. Ibid., IX, 28
53. Ibid., IX, 29.
54. Adam Smith, Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759: rpt. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1966), p. 29. Smith held the Chair of Moral Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh.
55. Cf. "Philoctetes" Sophoclis Fabulae op. cit. ll. 332-33 and ll. 622-25.
56. Smith. op. cit. p. 38.
57. Lessing, Laokoon IX, 32.
58. Ibid., IX, 32-33.
59. Lessing, S. S. XIV, 247., also cf. VIII, 262.
60. Lessing, S.S. VIII, 262 for Eschenburg's and Lachmann's full discussion of the problems which confront Lessing in his attempt to complete this work. Also cf. Briefe von Gleim, XIX, 401.
61. Cf. my comments on Holderlin's Anmerkungen.
62. Lessing S.S. VIII, 294 - 95.
63. cf. Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides sive de Tragodiis eorum Libri III Lugduni Batav 1619. pp. 87-94.

FOOTNOTES(Cont.)

64. Lessing, S. S. VIII, 294-95.
65. Ibid., footnote C, p. 305.
66. Ibid., 306.
67. Ibid., pp 306 - 7 I must summarize this section for the sake of brevity.
68. Ibid., p. 309.
69. Ibid., pp. 310-315.
70. cf. Athenaus Lib. I. P.M. 20.
71. Herodotus, Histories ed. Henri Stephani Bk VIII, p. 541.
72. Lessing, S.S. VIII, 317.
73. Ibid., VIII, 318-9.
74. Ibid., VIII, 323-24.
75. Cf. Discussion in Hölderlin Anmerkungen (p.110) for full significance of Stichomathy technique in drama.
76. Lessing, VIII. 295.
77. Lessing, S.S. VIII, 326. Also cf. Plutarch's Life of Cimon p. 344.
78. Ibid., p. 327 cf. Petit, Miscellaneorum, lib. Cap. 18.
79. Lessing, VIII, 334.
80. Ibid., 336.
81. Ibid., 335.
82. Ibid., 362.
83. Ibid., 341. cf. Pliny the Elder Natural History, ed. Hard. (Bk. 18 Sect. 12.) p. 107.
84. Ibid., VIII, 343. cf. Athenaus Lib. I, p.m. 20.
85. "Bios", Sophoclis Fabulae.
86. Lessing, VIII, 345.
87. cf. Quintilian, Instructio Orat, Lib. XI, 3. for full discussion of the problem.

FOOTNOTES (Cont.)

88. Homer, *Odyssey*, VI.
89. *Ibid.*, VI.
90. Lessing, VIII, 350. *ftnt.* 11
91. My information was taken from lectures in course entitled Roman Comedy given by William Fitzgerald, S.J.
92. "Bios", Sephoelis Fabulae *Op. cit.*
93. Strabo, Bk. XIV, 946. in Almelov Edition.
94. Ovid, Metamorphoses.
95. Lessing, VIII, 363.
96. *Ibid.*, 366.
97. *Ibid.*, 367.
98. *Ibid.*, 368. cf. Cicero, Cato Maior Chapter 7
99. *Ibid.*, 351 - 352.
100. Lessing, IV, 47 ff. Lachmann tells us that this work appeared anonymously in four installments (Stuttgart; bei Johann Benedict Metzler, 1750).
101. *Ibid.*, IV, 51-52.

FOOTNOTES (Cont.)

Chapter II. Christoph Martin Wieland

1. Derek Maurice Van Abbe, Christoph Martin Wieland 1733 - 1813: a literary biography. (London: Harrap, 1961) p. 43.
2. Ibid., p. 43.
3. Christoph Martin Wieland, "Die Geschichte der Abderiten? Wieland's Werke (Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen Instituts, 1870) III, 117.
4. Ibid., p. 117.
5. I do not think Wieland intends to discredit Aeschylus as a playwright. He is only a symbol of an old order which Wieland sought to replace.
6. cf. Holderlin's discussion of Sophocles. p.78ff.
7. Wieland, Die Abderiten, III, 108.
8. Ibid., III, 113.
9. Van Abbe, op. cit. p. 102.
10. Friedrich Sengle, Wieland (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuch, 1949) p. 322.
11. Ibid., p. 324
12. Ibid., p. 324.
13. Van Abbe, op. cit. p. 92.
14. Ibid., p. 55
15. Ibid., p. 68. Wieland wrote to a friend Fritz Jacobi in 1777; "Nichts ist gewisser, als daß ich für das Dramatische gar Keinen Sinn habe"
16. Ibid., p. 40.
17. Ibid., p. 37.
18. Sengle, op. cit. p. 326.
19. Ibid., p. 327. cf. also Winckelmann's views in his Die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums
20. Ibid., p. 378.

21. Ibid., p. 379 - 80.

22. Ibid., p. 380.

FOOTNOTES (Cont.)

Chapter III. Friedrich Hölderlin.

1. Friedrich Hölderlin, Sämtliche Werke ed. W. Kohlhammer (Stuttgart: Verlag - J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger 1954) Bd. V., 360. This critical edition of Hölderlin's works is the source of most of my future quotes.-- This Chorus will be considered in greater detail later in the paper. It is earlier than the first outline of Der Tod Für Vaterland. It is a translation of the Greek 1st Strophe and Antistrophe. The motif of love of Greece began in 1790. The Tübingen Hymns are filled with appropriate classical citations. Hölderlin's famous poem "Griechenland" appeared in 1793.
2. Cf. Wilhelm Michel, Das Leben Friedrich Hölderlins (Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1967) p. 325. This method is more appropriate for Sophocles than for Pindar translations. Hölderlin attempts an "Eindeutschung...", sondern zunächst auf eine Wiederholung des griechischen Textes im deutschen Sprachstoff, unter genaues Beibehaltung der vielverschränkten griechischen Wortstellung"
3. Willi Flemming, Goethe und das Theater Seiner Zeit (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968). This book gives a very good analysis of the development of the German theater.
4. Hölderlin, Sämtliche Werke, V. 465.
5. "Oedipus Colonus", Sophoclis Fabulae, ed. A. C. Pearson. C. F. II. 1224 - 27.
6. Michael., op. cit. Author has a detailed study of this era of Hölderlin's life. pp. 407 ff.
7. Hölderlin, V. 465.
8. Klaus-Rudiger Wöhrmann, Hölderlin's Wille Zur Tragödie (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967) p. 35. Cf Schelling's Werke, ed. Schroter (München 1959) III, 348 - 55.
9. Schelling, III, 355. The sentiment of these lectures is Amazingly similar to Goethe's famous essay "Zum Shakespeares Tag", a work which was lost until 1843, the year of Schelling's death.
10. Wöhrmann, op. cit., p. 37. cf Schelling, I, 260.
11. Wöhrmann, Ibid., p. 38. cf Schelling, I, 261.

FOOTNOTES (Cont.)

12. Ibid., p. 39.
13. Ibid., p. 45.
14. Ibid., 36. cf. Schelling, I, 117.
15. Ibid., p. 46.
16. Ibid., pp. 46-47. cf. Holderlin's Briefe (August, 1797) IV, 145.
17. Hölderlin's first Fassung of Der Tod Des Empedocles sets up the conflict between Empedocles and the people who were corrupted by Hermocrates. Second Fassung portrays Hermocrates on the side of Empedocles against the people.
18. Wöhrmann., op. cit., pp. 46 - 47.
19. Hölderlin, S. W., III, 236. Vorrede zum vorletzten Fassung. Also cf. Wöhrmann., p. 48.
20. "Oedipus Colonus", Sophoclis Fabulae 11.1 - 13. Oedipus settles in grove with full knowledge that it is the right place for him to be despite its sanctity.
21. Hölderlin, Der Tod Des Empedocles, ed. Paul Stapf (Berlin: Tempel Verlag, 1961) pp. 707ff.
22. Michel op. cit., p. 335. cf footnote.
23. Ibid., p. 334
24. Friedrich Nietzsche, Werke ed Kröner (Stuttgart: Kröner Verlag, 1964) Nietzsche's full treatment of this whole question of human drives. on pp. 683-4
25. Wöhrmann, op. cit., p. 103.
26. Nietzsche's interpretation of the Dionysiac trend is far more violent than Holderlin's.
27. Hölderlin, S.W. IV, 66-67.
28. Aristotle, Poetics, op. cit., V, 4,5, p.60.
29. Cedric Whitman, Sophocles (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951) Whitman's book analyzes the tragic inner drive of Sophoclean Heroes in a similar but more comprehensive manner than does Hölderlin.
30. Hölderlin S.W., IV, 268. Also cf. Wöhrmann, ftnt., p. 67. for Uno Noschler's discussion of the term "Willkur."

FOOTNOTES (CONT.)

31. Ibid., IV, 268. "Die Bedeutung der Tragodie" is also written from this point of view.
32. Ibid., IV, 245.
33. Ibid., VI, 340. Cf. Wehrmann, p. 68.
34. Hölderlin's Briefe an Neuffer 1 Jan. 1799. VI, 330 ff.
35. Ibid., VI, 330.
36. Hölderlin, Brief an Neuffer, 3 July 1799, VI, 339.
37. Werner Friederich, History of German Literature (New York: Barnes and Noble Inc. 1948) p. 49. The German tradition of Sophoclean translation dates back to Opitz (1597-1679) who translated the Antigone
38. Stuart Atkins, The Age of Goethe: An anthology of German Literature. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1969) p. 13.
39. Hölderlin, S.W. V, 466.
40. Ibid., 465.
41. Holderlin, S.W., V, 450.
42. Michel, op. cit. p. 325 ff. He speaks of these as important steps in Holderlin's intellectual, linguistic and poetic development.
43. Ibid. p. 324.
44. Holderlin S.W., V, 452. Sinclair had interested Franz Horn, a mutual friend of his and Hölderlin, to read the works. Hölderlin agreed to send the manuscript to Horn in Nutingen. Horn wrote to Sinclair: "Hölderlin hat mir sein Manuscript der Übersetzung des Sophocles übersandt, um den Verlag zu bemerk n. Unger hat ihn abgelehnt: er sei zu überhaufft."
45. Ibid. V, 453 Frau von Kalb advised Hölderlin to send his Sophocles to Göschen in Leipzig or Fromman in Jena. She also contacted a Prof. Mehnseh for help.
46. Ibid. V, 453. On Feb. 6, 1803 Sinclair wrote to Hölderlin: Gestern hat mir Böhlerdorff geschrieben, daß er mit dem Buchhändler Frohlich in Berlin deiner Übersetzung des Sophocles wegen gesprochen, und daß dieser nicht abgeneigt geschienen, wenn er es geschehen, sich auf einen Verlagscontract einzulassen. Du Mächst dem Böhlerdorff daher den Sophocles hinschicken, wenigstens dem ersten Band; auch was Du sonst fertig hättest, wollte er suchen einen Verlager zu geben." Also cf Schelling's letter to Hegel on this subject, 1 July, 1803.
47. Ibid., V, 450 - 51. Kohlhammer observes that the 10 year span is an exaggeration.

FOOTNOTES(Cont.)

48. Alexander Turyn, The Manuscript Tradition of Sophocles. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1952) pp. 84-95, for full treatment of the history of these texts. Also cf. S.W., V, 451 for Kohlhammers view of the text tradition.

49. Michel., op. cit., p. 337.

50. All future Greek references will be from Oxford text Sophoclis Fabulae and German quotes from Holderlin's translations S.W., V.

51. Hölderlin S.W., V., 453.

52. Ibid. V, 210.

53. Sophoclis Fabulae OP. cit.

54. Hölderlin S.W., V, 453.

55. Ibid., IV. 157. cf. also a letter to Sinclair, VI, 301, in which he says that all phenomena are only a part of "ein lebendiges Ganze".

56. Ibid., V, 268-69. Anmerkungen zur Antigone. Also cf. Wöhrmann, Holderlin's Wille zur Tragödie, p. 78.

57. Ibid., p. 266.

58. Ibid., p. 266.

59. Ibid., VI, 301.

60. Hölderlin, S. W., V, 266.

61. Ibid., p. 267.

62. "Antigone" Sophoclis Fabulae

63. Hölderlin, S. W. V, 267.

64. "Antigone" op. cit.

65. Sophocles I; The Complete Greek Tragedies, ed. David Grene and Richmond Lattimore (New York: Washington Square Press, 1967.) p. 200.

66. Hölderlin, V, 267.

67. Ibid., V., 267.

FOOTNOTES (Cont.)

68. M. A. Bayfield, The Antigone of Sophocles (New York: St. Martin's Press 1968) p.iii.
69. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 267.
70. Ibid., 267. An example of this control may be seen in Athena in Ajax
71. Cf. Schelling's discussion of this term "Ganze".
72. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 267.
73. Ibid., 267.
74. "Theogony" Opera Hesiodi (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1969) for detailed description of Greek hierarchy of Olympian Gods.
75. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 268-69.
76. Goethe considered this passage as spurious because of its distastefulness to modern culture. cf. Peter Eckermann, Gespräche mit Goethe (Berlin: 77. Ibid. V, 268.
77. Ibid. V, 268.
78. Ibid. pp. 268-69.
79. Friedrich Schiller, "Über Naive und Sentimentalische Dichtung", Werke, ed. Herbert Gopfert (München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1958) pp. 540-606. Schiller develops his theory of the close relationship between the Greeks and Natur (divinity) through a process of total communication with Nature. The Daimon for the Greek was "the God in him" - enthusiasm, a word which literally means in Greek "god within".
80. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 269.
81. Ibid., p. 269 - 70
82. Cf earlier discussion on these points. pp.25-27
83. Cf. Lessing, "Nathan Der Weise" Sämtliche Schriften op. cit., III, lff.
84. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 271 - 72.
85. Ibid., "Anmerkungen zum Ödipus", V, 195.

FOOTNOTES (Contd.)

86. Ibid., V, 195.
87. Aristotle, op. cit., Intro. p. 4., XVI, 8, p. 86.
88. cf. Aeschylus' Choephoroi, Sophocles' Electra, and Euripides' Electra for three different treatments of one basic theme.
89. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 195.
90. H. D. F. Kitto, Form and Meaning in Drama (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1956: rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960)
91. Hölderlin, S.W., V, 197.
92. Ibid., V, 197.
93. "Oedipus Tyrannos", Sophoclis Fabulae (ll. 224 - 243) for
 curse which Hölderlin translate in part:
 Wer runter euch dem Sohm des Labdakos
 Lajos gekannt, durch wen er umgekomen
 Dem sag' ich, daB ers all anzeige mir...
 ... um dieses Mannes willen
 fluch ich, wer er auch sei, im Lande hier
 Von dem die Kraft und Thronen ich verwaltet
 Nicht laden soll man nach ansprechen ihn
 zu göttlichen Gelübden nicht und nicht zu Opfer=
 Ihn nehmen...
94. Hölderlin, S. W., V, 197.
95. Kohlhammer in his Erläuterungen, V, 472 - 73. shows how
 this wrathfull curiosity is aroused by plays on words, e.g.
 "noch" in "Bist du noch eigenmächtig?" (1.413) shows that the
 tragedy of Oedipus is still to come.
96. Hölderlin, S.W., V. Hölderlin consistently uses "wissen"
 for verb of seeing.
97. Ibid., V, 199.
98. Ibid., V, 199.
99. Goethe, "Maxims and Reflections", Werke (Hamburg: G.
 Wegner 1961 - 64) XIV, 487.
100. Hölderlin, S.W., V. 201.
101. Ibid., V, 201.
102. Ibid., V. 272.
- 103., Ibid., I, 305.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Staiger, Emil. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe.
Stuttgart: Insel Verlag, 1966.
- Ferguson, Francis. Aristotle's Poetics. New York: Hill and
Wang, 1967.
- Bayfield, M.A. Sophocles' Antigone. London: St. Martin's
Press, 1968.
- Webster, T. B. L. Sophocles' Philoctetes. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1970.
- Lachmann, Karl. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing: Sämtliche Schriften.
Stuttgart: G. J. Göschen (1886 - 1924. 23 Vol. rpt.
Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1968)
- Sengle, Friedrich. Christoph Martin Wieland 1733 - 1813.
Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler Verlag, 1949.
- Van Abbe, Derek Maurice. Christoph Martin Wieland 1733 - 1813: a
literary biography. London: Harrap, 1961.
- Kurz, Heinrich. Wieland's Werke: Die Geschichte der Abderiten.
vol. 3. Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen
Institute, 1870.
- Hölderlin, Friedrich. Sämtliche Werke. 6 vol. in 9. Stuttgart:
J. C. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1946-58.
- Hölderlin, Friedrich. Sämtliche Werke. ed. Paul Stapf, Berlin:
Tempel Verlag, 1961.
- Michel, Wilhelm. Das Leben Friedrich Hölderlins. Frankfurt am
Verlag, 1967.
- Wöhrmann, Klaus-Rüdiger. Hölderlin's Wille zur Tragodie.
München: Fink Verlag, 1967.

- Miehner, Hans. Friedrich Schlegel. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970.
- Arnott, Peter. Greek Scenic Conventions in the 5th century B.C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Whitman, Cedric. Sophocles. A Study of Heroic Humanism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Tuyn, Alexander. The Manuscript Tradition of Sophocles. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1952.
- Keller, William. "Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers as revealed by his Works, Letters, Diaries and Conversations". University of Wisconsin Press, 1916.
- Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von. Werke in drei Bänden ed. Herbert G. Gopfert. München: Carl Hanser Verlag 1966.
- Von Wiese, Benno. Die Deutsche Tragedie von Lessing Bis Hebbel. Hamburg: Hoffman and Campe Verlag, 1958.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. Werke 14 vol. Hamburg: G. Wagner 1961 - 64.
- Sophocles I and II. The Complete Greek Tragedies. ed. David Grene and Richmond Lattimore. New York: Washington Square Press, 1968.
- Sophocles Fabulae ed. A. C. Pearson. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Fleming, Willi. Goethe und Das Theater Seiner Zeit. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1968.
- Atkins, Stuart. The Age of Goethe. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1969.

Bibliography (cont.)

- Friederich, Werner P. History of German Literature: College Outline Series. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc. 1968.
- Smith, Adam. Theory of Moral Sentiment. 1759 rpt. New York Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1966.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm. Kritische Schriften und Briefe 6 vol. ed. Edgar Lohner. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. Sämtliche Werke, ed. Kroner 14 vol. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1964.
- Brecht, Bertolt. Die Antigone des Sophokles: Materielen zur "Antigone". Frankfurt am main: Suhrkamp, 1965.
- Plutarchi Vitarum Parallelarum ed. Rieske. Lipsiae; In Libraria Weidnania 1880.
- Schmidt, Erich. Lessing: Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
- Kitto, H. D. F. Form and Meaning in Drama: A Study of Six Plays. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. 1956; rpt. New York: Barnes & Noble 1960.
- Eckermann, Johann Peter. Gesprache mit Goethe. ed. Otto Harnack. Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek 1910.