

TYCHO VON WILAMOWITZ- MOELLENDORFF ON THE DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE OF SOPHOCLES

No project lay nearer to the heart of Eduard Fraenkel¹ during his last years than that of promoting a reprint of the famous book *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, by Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, which was first published as volume xxii of *Philologische Untersuchungen* in 1917. Tycho Wilamowitz, the son of Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and the grandson of Theodor Mommsen, was killed fighting against the Russians near Ivangorod on the night of 14/15 October 1914. After his death the manuscript was prepared for publication by his friend Ernst Kapp, who has explained in the foreword of the book the nature of his services.

Fraenkel's long efforts to arrange for a reprint of this important book seemed at one time to have been successful, and he began work on an introduction, which would have been of great interest to scholars. At his death he left a number of notes intended for this introduction, most of which had clearly been carefully written and would have been inserted in the text. After Fraenkel's death on 5 February 1970, I was asked by a publisher—not the original publisher—if I would write an introduction. I did so, but after about a year heard from this publisher that owing to legal difficulties he would be unable to proceed with the reprint. In July 1972 I became aware that a reprint by the original publisher, bearing the date 1969, was on the market.

Tycho's book, like the whole series of *Philologische Untersuchungen*, had been published by the firm of Weidmann. 'Der Fortschritt der Forschung', wrote Wilamowitz (*Erinnerungen*, 1928, 2nd edn., p. 196), 'vollzieht sich ganz besonders durch Einzeluntersuchungen, die das Maß von Zeitschriftartikeln überschreiten und als Buch eine zu geringe Zahl von Käufern finden. Da wird einer vornehmen Buchhandlung, wie es die Weidmannsche zur Ehre Deutschlands immer war und ist, das Opfer durch Aufnahme in eine Serie etwas erleichtert.' This was not the only instance of what Wilamowitz called the 'großartige Opferwilligkeit' (ibid., p. 237) displayed by the firm of Weidmann under its then director, the enlightened Reimer, the friend of Mommsen and of Wilamowitz. All human institutions are subject to the law of change. Scholars will regret that Tycho von Wilamowitz's sister, Dorothea Freifrau Hiller von Gaertringen, who died on 24 March 1972 in her ninety-third year, did not see the book reprinted in the way she wished it to be.

In these circumstances it has proved impossible to use the introduction for the purpose for which it was composed. But Fraenkel's material should surely

¹ 'Dei tragici egli [il Fraenkel] aveva studiato soprattutto, negli anni della maturità, Eschilo ed Euripide; ma negli ultimi tempi, per un ulteriore bisogno di "classicità", la sua preferenza si era spostata su Sofocle, "più greco" nella sua serenità tragica. Di Sofocle si era occupato con

crescente frequenza, in articoli e in seminari (nel '68 aveva letto, a Roma e ad Oxford, il Filottete), e avrebbe certo continuato ad occuparsene se fosse ancora vissuto': Sebastiano Timpanaro, *Atene e Roma*, n.s. xv (1970), 97.

be given to the world; and as my introduction provides it with a framework, they may as well appear together. I apologize for my inability to provide an introduction such as Fraenkel would have written. At least I know from many conversations, as well as from Fraenkel's notes themselves, that though we differed over some of the problems discussed in Tycho's book, over the main features of his work we were in complete agreement. Nearly all the examples cited in the footnotes to what follows come from Fraenkel's notes, and all the parts of the introduction which Fraenkel had completed are reproduced verbatim.

'Es mag verwunderlich scheinen,' Fraenkel's introduction would have begun, 'daß das unvollendete Werk eines jungen Forschers nach über fünfzig Jahren wieder gedruckt wird. In der Tat ist es jedoch notwendig, dies jetzt nur noch in großen Bibliotheken zu findende Buch wieder allgemein zugänglich zu machen. Die Forschung ist selbstverständlich weitergeschritten und manches in Tychos Buch ist überholt, aber entbehrlich geworden ist es noch längst nicht. Das Vorwort zu dem Neudruck versucht an einigen Beispielen zu zeigen, warum das so ist.' Few doctoral dissertations have had so great an influence as this, and both the study of recent literature and the experience of teaching and discussion in several countries have convinced me, as they did Fraenkel, that interest in it is particularly lively at the present time.

The book's influence took some time to make itself felt; as late as 1932 a reviewer of one of the first books markedly affected by Tycho's ideas¹ could say with truth that most later interpreters had preferred to approach tragedy from the standpoint of *Geistesgeschichte*. But now the situation is altogether different.

Tycho was the first to apply to the Greek dramatists a particular critical attitude that was highly characteristic of the time at which he wrote. Towards the end of the nineteenth century and for long afterwards, even as late as the nineteen-thirties, students of drama, both ancient and modern, were accustomed to look upon character portrayal as one of the main elements, if not the main element, in dramatic art; and by character portrayal they usually meant a minute psychological analysis. Most of Tycho's examples of this attitude are taken from the respectable Sophoclean commentaries of Ludwig Radermacher and of Ewald Bruhn. But they abound also in the notable English edition of Sir Richard Jebb, in the most learned Sophoclean commentary of the age of Wilamowitz—the *Elektra* of Georg Kaibel—and in the works of Tycho's own illustrious father.²

¹ W. Schadewaldt, reviewing E. Howald, *Die griechische Tragödie*, at *Gnomon* viii (1932), 2 = *Hellas und Hesperien* i (1970), 238.

² 'In seiner 1923 veröffentlichten Skizze "Die griechische Tragödie und ihre drei Dichter" (*Griechische Tragödien* xiv) konnte Wilamowitz von dem Schlußteil der *Antigone* noch sagen: "Da vermißt man die liebenswürdige Ismene, die der Dichter als nicht mehr vorhanden behandelt." Das mag für uns, oder doch viele von modernen Lesern, zutreffen. Daß es aber für Sophokles und diejenigen seiner Zuschauer, die bereit waren ihm zu folgen, nicht zutrifft, das lernen wir, neben vielem noch Wesentlicheren, aus Tychos Buch.

'Tycho schreibt (S. 41): "Ismene als Mensch für sich ist Sophokles völlig gleichgültig, sie ist nichts als ein Werkzeug [weiter oben 'nur Folie für Antigone'], das er benutzt, wenn er es braucht, und wegwirft, wenn er es nicht mehr braucht." So in der Hauptsache schon der feinfühligste Schneidewin (Einleitung zur *Antigone*, S. 26), mit leichten Zugeständnissen an den Zeitgeschmack: "Die Nebenpersonen insgesamt dienen wesentlich zur Entfaltung des Charakters der Antigone . . . Ismene . . . steht, wie Chrysothemis zu Elektra, zur Antigone, um den Heroismus dieser durch den Gegensatz eines an sich edeln weiblichen Charakters zu heben: ist das erreicht

Tycho agreed with Aristotle that the characters are there for the sake of the plot, not the plot for the sake of the characters.¹ 'Für Sophokles', he wrote, 'ist die ausführliche, psychologisch genaue und konsequente Charakterzeichnung durchaus nicht, wie für die heutigen Ansprüche, die Hauptaufgabe des Dramatikers',² and he points to countless instances where modern critics had put forward a psychological explanation of a problem posed by Sophocles' text which was in the light of reason totally untenable.³ They took no account, he complained, of the conditions of performance or of the effect a given scene would have upon the audience, but tried to explain the actions of the play's characters as though they had been real people, often postulating hypothetical events off stage and assigning primary importance to things which were secondary for the poet;⁴ their explanations started from the supposed intentions of the characters, instead of from the legitimately inferred intentions of the author.⁵

so tritt sie ab, ohne daß weiter von ihr die Rede wäre." Allerdings ist "Ismene gar nicht, was wir einen Charakter nennen" (Tycho, S. 42): Fraenkel.

Karl Reinhardt, *Tradition und Geist* (1960), 236, gives a particularly amusing instance of this tendency in Wilamowitz. Yet only three years after writing as he did about Ismene, Wilamowitz wrote, 'Über die verfehlte Ausdeutung der Charaktere, z. B. von Herakles und Elektra, war ich längst hinaus' (*D.L.Z.* xlvii [1926], 854 = *Kl. Schr.* i. 466, in his review of Schadewaldt's *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*).

¹ *Poetics* 1450^a20-22; on the text, see R. Kassel, *Rh. Mus.* cix (1966), 10.

² p. 40. Cf. p. 78: 'Der Dichter will keineswegs irgendwelche Charaktere in einem durch sie selbst bestimmten Kampfe zeigen, sondern er will die, wenn man will, stoffartige Wirkung der dramatischen Situation so stark wie möglich herausbringen'; p. 145: 'Immer freilich ist festzuhalten, daß Sophokles auch hier nicht, um diesen einen individuellen Charakter [der Deianeira] zeichnen zu können, etwa das ganze Stück gemacht hat, sondern, als er den Stoff behandelte, mußte er die ihm gegebene Tat Deianeiras motivieren, und gab ihr, als sie ihm in den Mittelpunkt der Handlung rückte, den Charakter für diese Tat'; p. 154: '... die Forderung durchgehender, einheitlicher Charakteristik dem Sophokles ganz fremd ist'.

³ p. 31: 'Es ist natürlich leicht, sich das psychologisch irgendwie zurechtzulegen, aber nicht das ist die Aufgabe...'; p. 162: 'Das ist eine Erklärung, die ganz vergißt, daß man die Schöpfung eines Dichters und nicht das Verhalten wirklicher Menschen zu erklären hat'; p. 171 n. 1: 'Diese Erklärung ist bezeichnend dafür, wie völlig die Bedingungen der Aufführung und die Rücksicht auf das Verständnis des Zuschau-

ers vergessen werden können, wenn man nur irgendeinen Grund für das Verhalten der Personen zu finden sucht, ganz als ob man der Wirklichkeit gegenüberstände'; p. 281: '... wo man, statt die Angaben des Dichters unbefangen zu interpretieren, das uns unverständliche Verhalten seiner Personen auf eigene Faust zu rechtfertigen sucht'.

⁴ p. 20: 'Es kommt ihm nicht darauf, eine einheitliche Vorgeschichte für die Handlung zu gewinnen, vielmehr scheut er sich gar nicht — an ein Versehen ist hier unmöglich zu denken — über ein hinter der Szene und außerhalb der Handlung geschehenes Ereignis in zwei verschiedenen Situationen von derselben Person einander geradezu entgegengesetzte Angaben machen zu lassen'; *ibid.*: 'Die dramatische Wirkung der einzelnen Szene steht ihm also höher als die einheitliche Anlage der Fabel, und er rechnet damit, daß, da das jedesmal vor Augen des Zuschauers wirklich Geschehendes so zur stärksten Wirkung kommt, die auf vergangene und nebensächliche Dinge bezügliche Inkongruenz nicht bemerkt wird' ('Das Gleiche gilt für Aeschylus, wie schon Wilhelm von Humboldt, in betontem Gegensatz zu den üblichen Fragestellungen, klar erfaßt hat': Fraenkel); p. 33: 'Dies alles zeigt... daß der Dichter mit Absicht all diese Vorgänge im Dunkel gelassen hat und nach ihrem genauen Zusammenhang ungefragt bleiben will'; p. 34: '... durch Weglassung alles Nebensächlichen die Handlung so sehr wie möglich gespannt und konzentriert wird'; p. 38: 'In diesem Zusammenhang ist das Interesse auf ganz anderes gerichtet und man denkt nicht weiter an diese nebensächliche Angabe'; cf. p. 62 (on the *Ajax*).

⁵ p. 131 n. 1: 'Eine derartige Konstruktion eines psychologischen Vorganges, ohne daß man sich dabei auf eine Angabe

Sophocles, he concluded, cared nothing for consistency of character; the behaviour of his people was always determined by the situation of the moment.¹ Not only consistency of character, but consistency of fact were in his view disregarded. A motive could be exploited for its effect at a particular moment, only to be totally forgotten later; an oracle could be said to have demanded one thing at one time and another thing, inconsistent with the first, a little afterwards.

Again and again Tycho asks what will be the effect of the scene he is discussing upon the audience; again and again he ruthlessly flings out the accumulated rubbish of over-subtle psychologizing interpretation. He throws much light on Sophocles' dramatic methods. He was the first to appreciate the new effects made possible by experience in handling a third actor;² and with much acuteness he showed how in several instances the poet gained much by splitting up what might have been a unitary scene into two separate episodes.³ His historical importance as the initiator of the whole genre of detailed studies of various aspects of dramatic technique which have done such valuable work

des Dichters stützen könnte, ist aber immer von vornherein verfehlt, weil man sich damit erfindet, was man zur Erklärung braucht'; p. 193 n. 1: 'Darin zeigt sich eben, daß auf solche Konstruktionen nur der hinterher das Ganze analysierende Leser verfallen kann'; p. 194: 'Solche seltsamen Konstruktionen zeigen nur, wie sehr diese Szenen einem Beurteiler widerstreben müssen, der sie nicht vor allem als Zuschauer ansieht, und darum seine Kenntnis des Ausgangs und der wirklichen Situation niemals vergessen kann'; p. 144 (on the second report of Lichas in the *Trachiniae*): 'Die Absicht lag dem Sophokles völlig fern, darauf Rücksicht zu nehmen, daß man sich die hinter der Szene, vor Beginn der Handlung liegende Erzählung des Lichas auf der Wiese hieraus rekonstruieren könnte.' ('Im Falle des Aeschyleischen Agamemnons', Fraenkel writes, 'hätte ein Interpret, der sonst so viel aus Tychos Buch gelernt hat, sich nicht verleiten lassen dürfen mittels psychologischen Nachgrübelns herausfinden zu wollen, warum der König den heuchlerischen Bitten Klytaimnestras schließlich doch nachgibt und über das für einen Menschenfuß zu kostbare Purpurgewebe in das Haus geht, wo ihn der Mord erwartet'; see his *Agamemnon*, ii. 441-2.)

¹ p. 70 n.: 'Die verwandten Züge im Bilde des Königs Kreon in der Antigone und des Königs Oedipus sind gegeben durch die ähnliche Situation; man sieht aus ihnen gerade das, daß sich die Charakterisierung immer in gewissen Grenzen bewegt, daß bestimmte Motive, wie der Verdacht der Bestechung z. B., immer gern angewandt werden, und vor allem, daß immer die momentane Situation das Benehmen der

Person bestimmt, so daß in ähnlicher Situation Ähnliches herauskommt'; p. 222: 'wie . . . Motive lediglich momentanen Zwecken des Dichters dienen, und daß die uns selbstverständlich scheinende Forderung, sie mit der wirklichen Handlung des Stückes in Verbindung zu bringen, was an sich sehr wohl möglich wäre, für ihn so wenig Geltung gehabt hat, daß man bei weiterem Nachfragen sofort allen Boden verliert'; p. 39: 'Immer kommt es Sophokles darauf am meisten an, die momentane Situation so zugestalten, daß alles, was sie an dramatischer Wirkung hergeben kann, zum vollen Eindruck kommt, und dabei hat er bewußt damit gerechnet, daß der Zuschauer, den er mit der gegenwärtigen Szene faßt, den hinter der Szene inzwischen geschehenen Dingen nicht weiter nachdenkt, als der Dichter will, und daß er sogar Inkongruenzen und Widersprüche auch bei den auf der Bühne geschehenden Dingen nicht bemerkt und einen Mangel an Motivierung nicht empfindet, eben weil er ganz unter dem Eindruck dessen steht, was lebendig vor seinen Augen geschieht.'

² 'Daß erst Tychos Buch unsern Blick erfolgreich auf eine von Sophokles wesentliche Neuerung im dramatischen Aufbau gerichtet hat, darauf hat ein nicht zur Philologen-zunft gehöriger Literaturhistoriker mit Recht hingewiesen: John Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy*, London, 1962, 272 n. 2': Fraenkel. This important book has received less attention from classical scholars than it deserves, so perhaps I may be allowed to draw attention to my review of it (*Review of English Studies* xv, no. 58 (1964), 221 f.).

³ See pp. 34, 62, 67, 143, 224.

since is very great. But the importance of his work is far from being only historical, for his rigorous analysis still offers the best starting-point for the consideration of many Sophoclean problems.¹

Part of Tycho's results are nowadays generally accepted. Most scholars would now agree that Sophocles showed his minor figures 'only in silhouette'; most would concur in countless places where he had rejected a psychological explanation of a speech or action; few would deny that the action, not the characters, is the central element of Sophoclean drama. But like most daring innovators he in some places pushed his thesis too far. If character-drawing is held to imply an interest in individuals as individuals and in psychological peculiarities for their own sake, then indeed it is unimportant in Sophocles. But character-drawing in a different, but perfectly legitimate sense, is of very great importance in this author; idiosyncrasies may count for nothing, but the main qualities of the character considered as a human being count for a great deal. An anecdote which may be genuine makes Sophocles claim that during the third period of his career he has achieved the style which is 'the most expressive of *ethos* and the best'.² The Greek concept of *ethos* requires that the characters shall be represented as being the kind of people capable of the actions assigned them by the story, and this requirement Sophocles certainly fulfilled. To take an obvious example, no reasonable person would dispute that the contrast between heroic figures, like Ajax, Heracles, Antigone, the two Oedipuses, Electra, and Philoctetes, and ordinary human beings is a leading theme in Sophocles' work. Jebb once encountered George Eliot and, knowing her to be a close student of Sophocles, asked her how he had influenced her and was told, 'In the delineation of the great primitive emotions'.³ George Eliot put her finger on a central truth about Sophocles, which has been better understood since Tycho disabused people of the belief that Sophocles took great trouble about minor psychological complexities.

Some of Tycho's critics fail to bear in mind that he offers not a general treatment of Sophoclean drama, but a study of the poet's dramatic technique. The great difficulty of this enterprise, especially when it is undertaken at the beginning of a scholar's career, is that dramatic technique is the servant of poetical purpose, which often requires not only taste but experience to understand.⁴ Some men of taste have reproached Tycho with philistinism, and at

¹ His book also contains some valuable contributions to the criticism of the text. Fraenkel singles out his treatment of *Ant.* 933 f. (p. 49 n. 1); of *Tr.* 362-3 (p. 109 n. 1; Wunder and Blaydes anticipated Tycho here); of *Phil.* 671-3 (p. 284 n. 1, in support of Jebb); of *Phil.* 850 f. (p. 293 n. 1). On *Tr.* 46-8 and 901-3, see below, p. 222 and p. 223.

² Plutarch, *De profectibus in virtute* 7, p. 79B. See C. M. Bowra, *A.J.P.* lxi (1940), 385 f. = *Problems in Greek Poetry* (1953) 108 f. = *Sophokles*, ed. H. Diller (Wege der Forschung, Band XCV, 1967), 126 f. (German version) and Giuliana Lanata, *Poetica Preplatonica*, Florence (1963), 146 f.

³ See Caroline Jebb, *Life and Letters of Sir Richard Claverhouse Jebb*, Cambridge (1907),

156; cf. Gordon Haight, *George Eliot* (1970), 173. For recent treatments of character in Sophocles, see H. Diller, *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956), 70 f. = *Kl. Schr. zur antiken Literatur* (1971), 272 f. and *Antike und Abendland* vi (1957), 157 f. = *Sophokles*, ed. Diller (cited above), 190 f. = *Kl. Schr.* 286 f. and B. M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper*, Berkeley (1964).

⁴ 'In dem von ihm gewählten Rahmen konnte Tycho nicht darstellen, daß für Sophokles die dramatische Technik durchweg nur als Mittel dient zur Gestaltung von etwas viel Tieferem, etwas, das im Wesen seiner Kunst und seines Menschentums ruht. Aber um dazu vorzudringen, muß man sich erst mit der eingeschränkteren Betrachtungsweise dieses Buchs gründlich vertraut gemacht haben': Fraenkel.

least one arrogant philistine has claimed him as a predecessor. They are not wholly wrong, as a glance through the mentions of Tycho in the footnotes to Karl Reinhardt's *Sophokles*¹ will remind the reader. Repeatedly Tycho finds fault with the poet for departures from probability or consistency which simply go to prove what Tycho himself demonstrates, that Sophoclean technique is very different from nineteenth-century naturalism.² Modern readers, who are accustomed to more than one theatrical convention in which naturalism plays little or no part, find this unnecessary.

Reinhardt chose to treat of 'Sophokleischen Situationen, oder . . . vom Sophokleischen Verhältnis zwischen Mensch und Gott und zwischen Mensch und Mensch, und zwar wie es Szene für Szene, Stück für Stück, Stufe um Stufe sich entwickelt' (op. cit., p. 9). Starting from Tycho's results and using a similar method of close analysis, Reinhardt with his mature taste and judgement and his unusually fine feeling for poetry was able to show that the essential quality of the poet's art lies not in psychological refinements but in the depiction of the emotions which Sophoclean situations evoke from those involved in them.

Reinhardt's method is unlike that of those who approach tragedy from the standpoint of *Geistesgeschichte*, who usually proceed by extrapolating passages supposed to reveal the poet's thought. They have neglected Tycho's work, and their self-protecting instinct can easily be understood; for in the field of *Geistesgeschichte* also it had revolutionary implications. First, the sharp reminder that above all things a Greek tragedy is a play, written to be acted in a theatre and designed to have a particular effect upon its audience, could not fail to distress those who are accustomed to treat it as though it were an ethical or metaphysical treatise. People who took it for granted that the main element of a tragedy was its religious or metaphysical content, and that the poets wrote to recommend beliefs and opinions, sometimes new and 'original', were bound to resist an approach which was a step on the way to the revolutionary view that, at least in the case of early tragedy, traditional beliefs supplied a background against which the action of the play took place. Further, a challenge to the assumption that an ancient dramatist's aims and methods were like those of a modern dramatist was likely to strengthen the challenge to the equally prevalent assumption that the religion, ethics, and general world outlook of the

¹ 'Es wäre traurig, wenn nach Tychos Jugendwerk, und nicht zum wenigsten als Folge seiner aufrüttelnden Wirkung, unser Verständnis des Sophokles keine Fortschritte gemacht hätte. Die Fortschritte sind groß, vor allem dank Karl Reinhardts *Sophokles*. Das ist vielleicht das schönste Buch, das über den Dichter geschrieben ist, ein schweres Buch; seine Glut mag bisweilen einen keineswegs kaltsinnigen, jedoch auf kühleres Abwägen angewiesenen Betrachter zurückschrecken, so daß er sich dann aus einer höheren Sphäre gern einmal wieder von Tycho auf die wohlgegründete dauernde Erde zurückführen läßt': Fraenkel. Reinhardt's *Sophokles* first appeared in 1933; the latest edition is the third, of 1947. An English translation is to appear soon.

² 'Verfehlt, weil Tycho zur folgerichtigen Durchführung seiner grundsätzlichen Auffassung nicht mehr gekommen ist, sein mehrfach bezeugende Tadel (besonders in den *Trachinierinnen*, aber auch in der *Elektra* und sonst) des Dichters wegen flüchtiger oder nachlässiger Gestaltung einzelner Szenen oder Szenenteile, wofür oft Abhängigkeit von Motiven in früheren Dramen des Sophokles oder von Dramen des Euripides, bisweilen auch "ziemlich rasche Abfassung" verantwortlich gemacht wird. Anstatt sich an solchen Unvollkommenheiten zu stoßen, sollte der Leser versuchen, sie mit Hilfe von Tychos eigenen tieferen Erkenntnissen zu berichtigen': Fraenkel.

ancient Greeks were either very like those now fashionable or were of interest chiefly because they were such as to 'lead up to' them.

Tycho's treatment of the *Antigone* appeared in print during his lifetime (see Ernst Kapp's Foreword, p. v). It is encumbered by a lengthy polemic against a now deservedly forgotten theory of A. B. Drachmann¹ and it suffers from an undue insistence on the improbability of Antigone escaping capture on the occasion of her first burial of Polyneices. But it is none the less an important contribution to the understanding of the play; and, perhaps because it appeared before the rest, it contains many important statements of Tycho's principles, several of which have already been cited in the footnotes to this article.

Minor improbabilities concerning Creon's proclamation (18 f.), Antigone's claim to have buried Eteocles (19 f.), and Haemon's movements (21 f.) exist, but are not particularly significant; more important is Tycho's argument that Ismene has no importance except as a foil for Antigone (23 f.).² More interesting still is his handling of the problem of the 'double burial' (26 f.). He makes somewhat heavy weather of the question of how Antigone avoids detection on the first occasion (26-30); surely it is easy for the spectator to infer that she does so under cover of the darkness.³ He thinks that her return to the body is left unmotivated simply because it is inexplicable (34); but is one guilty of psychologizing unreasonably if one takes it for granted that she has heard of the desecration of the body and hastens to repair the damage? But Tycho made one important contribution to the solution of this problem; he saw why Sophocles found it necessary for Antigone to make two visits to the body. First, she has to triumph by cleverly eluding the guards and carrying out the burial, and Creon's reaction to the news had to be presented; then she has to be apprehended and brought before Creon. Only at that moment is the identity of the guilty person known; Antigone's appearance as a prisoner is a tremendous *coup de théâtre*. Tycho (33-4) correctly explained this.⁴ His view that Sophocles cared nothing for consistency of character enabled him to deal summarily with the celebrated problem of the speech in which Antigone protests that she would have made such a sacrifice only for a brother (45 f.); but few scholars now would be content with this.⁵

In the *Ajax*, Tycho showed that during the first stasimon Ajax and Tecmessa must be together in the tent (55 f.). But though he may be right in thinking the *ekkyklema* was used, one may doubt whether ll. 579-85 are there, as he maintains, simply to fill in the interval needed for the machine to be employed; the dramatic value of the dialogue here is obvious.⁶ Tycho's belief that Sophocles cared nothing for consistency of character allows him once more to take a short way with a celebrated problem, this time that of the 'deceptive speech' of Ajax at 646 f.; in his view Ajax means to deceive his companions, although the audience is not deceived, and simply acts as though the deception were the truth, with no attempt at psychological verisimilitude on the poet's

¹ 'Zur rechten Würdigung des von Tycho für das Verständnis der *Antigone* Geleisteten dürfte man S. 7 (ungefähr) bis 17 (vor dem zweiten Abschnitte) beiseite lassen': Fraenkel.

² See p. 215 n. 2 above.

³ See A. T. v. S. Bradshaw, *C.Q.* n.s. xii (1962), 201-4.

⁴ See p. 217 n. 3 above.

⁵ Reinhardt's (op. cit. 92-3) is the most notable discussion; more recent treatments (see H. Friis Johansen, *Lustrum* 1962/7, 198-9) do not add much.

⁶ See W. Kranz, *Sokrates*, N.F. vi (1918), 333 = *Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrem Nachwirken* (1967), 304.

part. For an understanding of the poetic purpose of the speech and an explanation of the pathos of its relentless but gentle irony, one must turn to Reinhardt.¹ One of Tycho's best achievements is his explanation of why Sophocles makes Teucer defend his brother's honour in two successive *agones* against Menelaus and Agamemnon (65 f.). Had there been only a single *agon*, settled in the end by the intervention of Odysseus, Teucer's unshaken resolution would not have received the emphasis the poet rightly wished to give it.²

Kranz in his review of Tycho's book³ rightly observed that the treatment of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is a good specimen of its author's methods. He shows convincingly that the justly famous plot, when closely scrutinized, reveals a number of small improbabilities and inconsistencies which a modern realistic writer would not allow himself. Creon's movements at the start are not quite consistently described (72–3). The Tiresias scene contains contradictions, but these do not justify the view of some modern writers that Tiresias is a 'sinister' figure, secretly hostile to Oedipus. The poet is not interested in Tiresias' character, and the contradictions are due simply to the requirements of the plot (73–89). Tycho truly says that the whole plot depends on the old Theban shepherd's incorrect statement that Laius was killed by more than one person. He must also be right in saying that the old man says this because it is essential to the poet's purpose; but is the old man's inaccuracy as motiveless as he supposes? Lines 758–64 make it clear that the old man chose deliberately to get himself out of the city, and it is not hard to imagine why he should have done so. Tycho observes that Iocaste's attempt to prove the uselessness of prophecy (707 f.) is not really relevant, but is introduced in order to lead up to her use of the report of Polybus' death to comfort Oedipus (80–3); he shows also that in reality Oedipus would have known all as soon as he had learned that Polybus was not his real father, but that he was given to the Corinthian shepherd on Cithaeron by a slave of Laius; not that either inconsistency troubles the audience during a performance (83–5). His concluding remarks on characterization in the play and the poet's lack of interest in the psychology of his persons are altogether to the point (85–8).

The chapter on the *Trachiniae* must be judged less satisfactory. Tycho is unduly severe about this play, which he regards as a hurried and careless piece of work; he devotes excessive space to the refutation of a once influential, but now deservedly forgotten treatment by Zielinski;⁴ and he is handicapped

¹ Op. cit. 31 f.; again, later interpretations add little (Friis Johansen, loc. cit. 177 f.).

² See p. 217 n. 3 above.

³ Loc. cit. (p. 220 n. 6 above), 332 = 303.

⁴ 'Überhaupt verstrickt das Buch sich oft in Polemik gegen irrige Deutungen, die uns heute, zum Teil gerade infolge der Wirkung von Tychos Buch, als gegenstandslos erscheinen. Das ist z. B. der Fall bei der zwar berechtigten, aber viel zu breit gewordenen Polemik gegen Zielinski in dem Kapitel über die *Trachinierinnen*. Überhaupt ist dieses Kapitel, das von ganz unsicheren Hypothesen ausgeht, unausgeglichen und darf nur als vorläufiger Versuch aufgefaßt werden; es gehört ja zu den Kapiteln die, nach Ernst Kapps Zeugnis, nur in einer

ersten Form in der Dissertation von 1911 vorliegen. Wer sich mit Tychos Betrachtungsweise vertraut gemacht hat, wird nicht zweifeln, daß er hier tiefgehende Änderungen vorgenommen hätte, wenn ihm Zeit für neues Durchdenken und Formulieren vergönnt gewesen wäre. Aber selbst so enthält dieses Kapitel nicht wenige Feststellungen von bleibendem Wert. Ein Leser, dem es auf ein vertieftes Verständnis der Sophokleischen Kunst ankommt, sollte sich bemühen, über die Niederungen polemischer Argumentation hinweg mit ungeminderter Aufmerksamkeit in die reichen positiven Erkenntnisse einzudringen, die sich jenseits der Polemik abheben': Fraenkel.

by his preoccupation with Dieterich's theory that the scene of Heracles' awakening shows the influence of the not dissimilar scene in Euripides' *Heracles*,¹ as well as by his own unverifiable guess that the character of Deianeira was derived by Sophocles from that of Penelope in his lost *Niptra*. His whole treatment of the obscure topic of the early treatment of the myth is not notably rewarding, though his conjecture that the false motive for Heracles' attack on Oechalia given by Lichas may represent a different version given in an earlier poem may quite easily be right.

Few would now agree with Tycho that the prologue 'ganz in der Weise des Euripides angelegt ist' (116),² nor that it displays 'eine Sorglosigkeit in der Motivierung und eine Mißachtung der Wahrscheinlichkeit, wie sie sich sonst nicht findet' (117). In real life Hyllus would have told Deianeira where his father was long before, but Sophoclean technique obviously requires that he must do it when he does, nor will the audience be disturbed at his getting to Heracles and back so quickly. Tycho in his treatment of the difficulties raised by the different mentions of the oracle given at Dodona draws attention to some serious problems (119-33). But as early as 1921 Kranz showed that if the various references to this oracle are considered each in its own context, no really grave inconsistency is found, but it becomes clear that each time the poet lets the audience know just as much about the oracle as the present situation of the plot requires.³ The obvious parallel is furnished by the oracle in the *Philoctetes*, which is far more freely handled.

The refutation of Zielinski's treatment of Deianeira's scene with Lichas (134-8) is followed by some good general remarks about the type of argument which Zielinski uses (138-42). Then comes an excellent explanation of Sophocles' reasons for arranging Deianeira's scenes with Lichas and the messenger as he did; the good news of the victory must come first and cause premature rejoicing, the bad news about Iole must follow after an interval, and the greatest possible dramatic effect must be obtained from both (142-5). Faced with Deianeira, whose character has charmed so many interpreters, not always to their advantage, Tycho concedes that there is hardly any other Sophoclean personage who comes so near to being a character in the modern sense (145); but even here he finds inconsistencies. He rightly rejects the interpretation of her words at 494-7 as a kind of Freudian slip revealing an unconscious malice (145-9); but he makes somewhat heavy weather of the alleged discrepancy between 436 f. and 531 f. After all, Iole is the first among his mistresses whom Heracles has actually brought to live in the matrimonial home (note 536 f.) (150-4). Surely he goes too far in arguing that Deianeira's use of the philtre is inconsistent with her words at 436 f.; the poet conveys with great delicacy how a wife who has sincerely uttered these sentiments might still, not knowing the real nature of the philtre, be tempted to make use of it. Like many others, Tycho complains that the play falls into two halves (154-5); this complaint seems to issue from his assumption⁴ that every play of Sophocles

¹ See Johanna Heinz, *Hermes* lxxii (1937), 289 f.

² See Heinz, loc. cit. 284 f.

³ Tycho had predecessors in Dobree, *Adversaria* iii. 36 and Wunder, *Sophoclis Tragoediae*, vol. ii, sect. iii (1841), 47 f.; the theory has now been revived in a somewhat

different form by M. D. Reeve, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* xi (1970), 283 f. See Kranz, *Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* xlvii (1921), 32 f. = *Studien* (see p. 220 n. 6), 283 f.

⁴ See John Jones, op. cit. (p. 217 n. 2), ch. 1.

must have one central character about whose fortunes it revolves. For him Deianeira is the central figure of the first half, Heracles of the second, and this seems to him perplexing. But need either be the central figure? The play is about the events that led to the death of Heracles; it shows the fulfilment of the plan of Zeus. Tycho shows much acuteness in his handling of the problem of Hyllus' movements in the later scenes and of the authenticity of ll. 901-3; only lately has a convincing solution of the difficulties he exposes been put forward.¹

The chapter on the *Electra* was left unfinished, though the first half had been revised (Ernst Kapp, p. vi); it is the least satisfactory of all. Here more than anywhere the reader is vexed by perpetual complaints of departures from naturalism which Tycho's own researches have shown to be typical of Sophocles' technique; and the long section on the play's chronological relation to Euripides' *Electra* (228-64), with the appendix on the *Helen* and *Iphigenia in Tauris* that follows, need not now be read.² The treatment of the *Electra* itself often leads to unacceptable conclusions; yet even here Tycho's arguments still deserve to be read carefully.

The lack of naturalism in the initial dialogue is hardly proof of carelessness (166-7); neither is the absence of a motive for the entry of the Chorus (169); on the other hand, the observation regarding the use of the *Choephoroi* at ll. 77-85 is excellent. It is in no way strange that the Chorus makes no reply to Electra's long speech after the parodos (171); a reply is not needed. Nor is it surprising, even after what has been said earlier, that after that speech the Coryphaeus should confirm the absence of Aegisthus and should inquire for news of Orestes. In terms of the technique of early tragedy, the repetition is not offensive, and it is important to the poet's purpose that both subjects should be recalled to the audience at this point. Equally in keeping with the poet's methods is the absence of motivation for the successive *agones* of Electra with Chrysothemis and Clytemnestra; however improbable it may seem that such scenes should take place at these particular moments, the plot obviously requires it. In his treatment of the first scene with Chrysothemis, Tycho insists that the threat to imprison Electra is a motive invented simply for the moment, and afterwards arbitrarily disregarded. Indeed it is disregarded later, but is there any further need for it to be mentioned? In the *agon* with Clytemnestra it is not required, and after that both Clytemnestra and, when he returns, Aegisthus have other things to think about.

It is hardly true that the first Chrysothemis scene is 'so sehr ohne Ergebnis, daß noch eine lange ruhige Unterhaltung folgen kann' (177-9); Electra's triumph in the *agon* is heightened by her success in forcing her sister to accompany the offering sent by Clytemnestra to the tomb with a prayer of Electra's

¹ By R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *B.I.C.S.* xvi (1969), 44 f.

² 'Auch der lange Abschnitt über das Verhältnis der Sophokleischen zu der Euripideischen *Elektra* (S. 228-268) geht von einem inzwischen widerlegten Zeitanatz des Euripideischen Dramas aus, ermüdet durch Polemik gegen jetzt Veraltetes, und, was hier vor allem hervorzuheben ist, enthält nur sehr wenig von Tychos eigentümlichsten und wertvollsten Gedankengängen. So mag der Leser, jedenfalls zunächst, diesen Abschnitt beiseite lassen,

ohne daß ihm dabei etwas Wesentliches entginge. Was sodann die chronologische Frage angeht, so tritt Tycho allerdings mit Recht für die Priorität der Sophokleischen *Elektra* ein, nur kann man das viel kräftiger begründen als er es tut': Fraenkel. See now the useful dissertation of Armin Vögler, *Vergleichende Studien zur sophokleischen und euripideischen Elektra*, Heidelberg (1967), reviewed by me at *C.R.* xix (1969), 36 f.; see p. 36 for the account of Tycho's treatment in his historical summary.

own dictation, and its effect will later be accentuated by a triumph over a more formidable antagonist in Clytemnestra herself.¹ To say that the first stasimon (473 f.) 'nur die im allgemeinen durch den Stoff nahegelegten Gedanken ohne die Absicht einer besonderen Wirkung in fast konventioneller Weise ausdrückt' (179) scarcely does justice to its significance; Dike and the Erinys have their significance in this play.² Sophoclean technique does not require that the debate between mother and daughter at 516 f. must be specially motivated (179-82); Tycho rightly dismisses the psychological explanations offered by modern critics, but fails to recognize that no motivation is required. He rightly insists that the main feature of the *agon* is the triumph of Electra; but while he justly discounts its alleged psychological significance (185), one may doubt whether its bearing on the moral issue is so slight as he implies.

Tycho has some good observations about the prayer of Clytemnestra at 634 f. (186-7), and about the partial sincerity of her grief at the announcement of her son's death (187-8). But he can hardly be right in maintaining that an audience which has seen the Paidagogos talking with Orestes during the prologue is so carried away by his convincing fiction that it actually shares the delusion of his hearers on the stage. Yet it is true that the main function of the speech is to enable the audience to imagine its effect upon Electra, who believes it (188-93). Tycho rightly draws attention (193) to the effect of contrast secured by the return of Chrysothemis, but in his insistence that everything must be seen from Electra's point of view he misses the full impact of the scene's irony. Chrysothemis, he says (194), is made to appear childish; but the audience knows that she is right and Electra wrong. Is the scene really there, as Tycho thinks, simply because the motive of the offerings at the tomb had to be worked in? His treatment of Electra's proposal that the sisters shall try together to kill Aegisthus is very like his treatment of the threat to imprison Electra; the suggestion is by no means so unreal as he supposes (195-202). While Electra is speaking, the audience will know that she means what she says; and Greek mythology offers several instances of actions such as she proposes. Naturally she makes no mention of her mother, for her aim is to persuade her sister; nor does Chrysothemis in her reply find it necessary to mention Clytemnestra. Considering what happens immediately afterwards, it is hardly surprising that we hear no more of this proposal.³

¹ So Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* (1926), 58 n. 2.

² See Winnington-Ingram, *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* clxxxiii (1954-5), 20 f. (German version in *Sophokles*, ed. H. Diller [*Wege der Forschung*, Band XCV (1967), 400 f.]).

³ Fraenkel strongly agreed with Tycho here. 'In der *Elektra*', he wrote, 'versucht Elektra ihre Schwester Chrysothemis zu überreden, mit ihr gemeinsam Aegisthus zu ermorden. Mit keinem Wort deutet Sophokles an, wie die beiden diesen Plan ausführen könnten. Die Sonderbarkeit des Verschweigens einer so wesentlichen Voraussetzung hat man schon im Altertum bemerkt und psychologisch zu erklären versucht: Elektra betont nur die Vorteile, die der Schwester aus der geplanten Tat

erwachsen würden, unterdrücke aber, da sie die ängstliche Natur ihrer Schwester kenne, jeden Hinweis auf die Gefahr, die ihnen bei dem Unternehmen droht (siehe das Scholion zu 975 und den in der Ausgabe von Jahn-Michaelis dazu gestellten Passus aus der *Rhetorik* des Apsines, *Rhetores Graeci*, ed. Spengel-Hammer, I, p. 302, 2 sqq.). Den wahren Grund eines so auffallenden Fortlassens macht Tycho klar, indem er (S. 197 ff.) zeigt, welche Funktion Elektras ganz unrealisierbarer Plan innerhalb des Dramas zu erfüllen hat. In diesem Zusammenhang macht er (S. 198, n. 1) die aufschlußreiche Beobachtung daß in Hofmannsthals *Elektra* "Chrysothemis gegenüber wird die Überlegung, wie der Mord auszuführen ist, und die Möglichkeit des Gelingens noch vor der Überredung geltend

The suggestion of the Coryphaeus that Electra as 'the nearest' shall introduce Orestes and his party is scarcely as surprising as Tycho finds it (202-4); the courts of the heroic age were not ceremonious in the manner of Versailles, and it would not have been unusual for the strangers to be conducted into the queen's presence by the only member of the royal family present at the moment of their arrival. Tycho conclusively refutes the view of Kaibel and others that Orestes really knows who Electra is at the moment when he orders the urn to be put into her hands (204-6); he seems to have convinced everybody. Less to the point are his complaints about the lack of verisimilitude in the actual *anagnorisis* (206-10). A conventional pattern is being followed, and naturalism is not in place; yet the scene is written with passion, so that the conventional element does not detract from the emotional effect. Tycho finds that the following scene (1233-1383) serves simply to present Electra's feelings; yet the warnings against indiscretion given her by Orestes and by the Paidagogos may serve to remind the audience that these feelings are shown against the background provided by a world inhabited by others. Like so many scholars, Tycho finds that Clytemnestra's murder gets very little of the poet's attention (215-16).¹ Certainly its representation occupies very few lines of print; but in performance the impression made by this episode, and in particular by Electra's horrifying cries of encouragement to her brother, is far greater than Tycho's words imply; as usual, he is concerned to insist that the real climax of the whole action is the recognition scene. For him Clytemnestra's murder is only an introduction and a means to the killing of Aegisthus (218); yet Sophoclean practice suggests that a final dialogue scene may be little more than a pendant to a preceding lyric episode. He finds the concluding dialogue between Orestes and Aegisthus 'almost incomprehensible' (217); it does not occur to him that this conversation, during which Aegisthus is allowed to get in at least one not ineffective retort (1500), may help the audience to see the phase in the history of the house of Atreus which it has seen enacted from a standpoint somewhat different from Electra's own.² Tycho's concluding remarks about the play's construction (219-28) suffer from the defects indicated by the preceding criticisms. They contain some just objections to the psychologizing interpretations current at the time when Tycho wrote; but Tycho's insistence that the play centres not upon Electra's character but upon the recognition scene is not well founded. Indeed Sophocles is not concerned with the idiosyncrasies of his heroine; but he is concerned with her heroic nature and its divergence from the human norm, and he has shown the drawbacks as well as the advantages attaching to such a character. In the sense of the word 'character' that corresponds with the Greek term *ethos*, Sophocles is interested in Electra's

gemacht, und der Plan in allen Einzelheiten anschaulich dargestellt wird". Das ist ein Musterbeispiel für den fundamentalen Unterschied zwischen dem, was ein moderner Leser oder Zuschauer für notwendig hält, und dem, was Sophokles auf der Bühne darstellen will und womit er und sein Publikum sich begnügen.'

¹ This opinion was evidently shared by Fraenkel, who in one of his notes has copied out the passage on p. 174 which contains the words, 'Den gegebenen Stoff, Orestes Muttermord, hat der Dichter für unser

Interesse ganz in den Hintergrund geschoben und an ein in diesem Stoffe liegendes sittliches Problem kann bisher überhaupt niemand denken.' For a different view, see H. Friis Johansen, *Classica et Mediaevalia* xxv (1964), 8 f.; C. P. Segal, *T.A.P.A.* xcvi (1966), 473 f.; H.-J. Newiger, *Arcadia* iv (1969), 138 f. (an important article).

² See Friis Johansen, loc. cit. 28-9. It is going too far to suggest that the justice of the revenge is doubted; but no attempt is made to minimize the horror of the matricide.

character; and the final scenes contribute hardly less than the justly famous anagnorisis to its depiction.

The chapter on the *Philoctetes* was written in 1913, and was more carefully revised by the author than any other part of the work; it is the best of all, and its excellence makes one keenly regret the absence of a chapter on the work nearest in date and method to the *Philoctetes*.¹

Tycho rightly concludes that it is not certain whether an account of how Philoctetes was persuaded to leave Lemnos for Troy figures in early epic, and briefly describes its treatment by Aeschylus and Euripides (269-75). He rightly recognizes that though in reality Neoptolemus would certainly have learned what was expected of him before reaching Lemnos, Sophoclean technique requires that he must be instructed by Odysseus during the prologue (274-5). Odysseus, he observes, outlines no definite plan; and in the prologue the important question of whether the bow alone is needed or Philoctetes with the bow is left vague. That is true, although l. 112 seems to indicate that Neoptolemus assumes that Philoctetes as well as the bow must come to Troy (274-7). Tycho argues that during the parodos and the scene with Philoctetes that precedes the entry of the supposed merchant, Neoptolemus and the Chorus behave not as if they are skilfully playing a part, but as if the fiction they were enacting were the reality (278-81); the merchant scene, he thinks, makes no sense if one remembers that Neoptolemus means to betray Philoctetes (281-3). To modern taste it must seem strange that nothing indicates that Neoptolemus and the Chorus are skilfully playing a part. But Tycho exaggerates the improbabilities of the scenes in question; Neoptolemus' plan to get Philoctetes on board the ship, bow and all, and Odysseus' effort to hurry on the proceedings by sending the merchant make perfect sense in the context. It is true that Odysseus' stratagem works out unfortunately for himself in that it warns Philoctetes that Odysseus is on his track; but that is necessary for the working-out of the plot, and is not in itself improbable or inconsistent. Tycho is surely right to insist that the dialogue of Philoctetes and Neoptolemus at 628-75 is intended to stress the importance of the bow, and not to illuminate the psychology of Neoptolemus (283-5). He observes that the stasimon that begins at 676 has every appearance of being a sincere expression of the sympathy of the Chorus for Philoctetes. His contention that the Chorus is here only the instrument of the poet (295-9) cannot be refuted by saying that the Chorus has misunderstood the real situation, and assumes that now that Philoctetes and Neoptolemus have made friends, they will easily reach an agreement;² the Chorus says that Philoctetes will be taken home, but nothing about his going to Troy. A more plausible answer would be that the Chorus is playing the part of deceiver all too well.³ Up till now, Tycho has insisted, attention has been concentrated on Philoctetes; during the scene that extends from 730 to 864 it is concentrated, he points out, on Neoptolemus, of whose ambiguous position the audience is now directly reminded. He shows how necessary it is to the poet's purpose that Neoptolemus shall not steal the bow, as he did in Aeschylus, but have it entrusted to him by its owner. While Philoctetes is sleeping, the Chorus urges Neoptolemus to make off with the bow. Tycho was the first to point out

¹ Fraenkel says of the chapter supplied by Tycho's father that 'es bildet keinen organischen Teil von Tychos Buch'.

² Thus Gerhard Müller, in *Sophokles*, ed.

H. Diller, pp. 213 f.

³ See Reinhardt's comments on the words of the Chorus at 391 f. and 507 f. (op. cit. 283 nn. 2 and 3).

the singularity of Neoptolemus' answer; instead of protesting that it would be dishonourable, Neoptolemus declares that the bow will be no use without its owner. And yet in the opening scene of the play Odysseus has by no means made this clear; and later, when Odysseus proposes to abandon Philoctetes and sail off with the bow, he declares that Philoctetes himself is not needed, and Neoptolemus and the Chorus do not contradict him (289-95). Before Tycho, the acute problem presented by these facts had not been faced; since his time it has been hotly debated, but the authors of the two most notable recent contributions both accept his general conclusion that Sophocles allows himself great freedom in respect of the content of the prophecy of Helenus.¹

When Neoptolemus finally decides to make a clean breast of it and tell Philoctetes the truth, that happens, Tycho argues, without warning; he strongly denies that the audience has been prepared for it by any delineation of Neoptolemus' psychology. This is surely true; but when he argues that Neoptolemus acts not out of pity, but because his intrigue is now bound to be discovered in the near future, he omits to mention the obvious signs of shame with which the revelation is accompanied (295-7). Sophocles, in Tycho's view, is unable or unwilling to represent a double situation² in which a character has to keep up a pretence; he makes Neoptolemus first act exactly as though the part he was playing were genuine and then suddenly reveal the truth to Philoctetes and betray his shame, without abandoning the mission entrusted to him by Odysseus (297-8). Tycho finds it surprising, and by the canons of naturalism it certainly is, that Neoptolemus makes no attempt to explain the whole situation to Philoctetes in the hope of persuading him to come voluntarily to Troy; neither does Philoctetes demand an explanation of Neoptolemus. But the poet could have replied that Philoctetes in his enraged state would neither have demanded nor listened to an explanation (298-300). Tycho shows most skilfully that it is the merchant's communication of the prophecy of Helenus and the expedition of Odysseus that render Philoctetes, being such as he has been presented as being in his first scene with Neoptolemus, so determined to avoid being taken to Troy (300-2).

Tycho clearly points out the contradiction between Odysseus' assumption that the bow only is needed, and not its owner, and Neoptolemus' words both earlier and later in the play, and deals decisively with the attempt of Radermacher to show that Odysseus is only bluffing. He shows how skilfully the exposition in the prologue is calculated to prepare for the vagueness about the prophecy necessary for the plot (302-6). If Odysseus were only bluffing, he points out (306-7), the lyric scene of Philoctetes with the Chorus (1081 f.) would lose all meaning. Tycho, who is so severe with the *Trachiniae* and the *Electra*, fully acknowledges the excellence of the scene during which Neoptolemus returns the bow (1218 f.); he acutely observes that if the volte-face had been

¹ D. B. Robinson, *C.Q.* xix (1969), 45-51 (against A. E. Hinds, *ibid.*, xvii [1967], 169 f.), and O. Zwierlein, *G.G.A.*, 222 Jahrgang, Heft 3/4 (1970), 206 f. (in a review of W. Steidle, *Studien zum antiken Drama*, Munich [1968]); cf. O. Taplin, *G.R.B.S.* xii (1971), 35 n. 24.

² Kranz writes (in the review quoted above [p. 220 n. 6], p. 332 = 303): 'Selbst Wilamowitz macht sich nicht völlig von dem

Fehler frei, das Können des Dichters als in irgendeiner Beziehung zu gering oder behindert darzustellen; so wird man z. B. nicht sagen dürfen, daß "die Darstellung einer gebrochenen Situation ganz außerhalb des für Sophokles Möglichen liegt" (S. 278), sondern außerhalb des Erstrebten, denn "die Kunst kann immer was sie will", und es kommt vielmehr darauf an, zu zeigen, warum sie dies oder jenes nicht gewollt hat.'

led up to by psychological preparation, the poet could hardly have achieved such an effect of surprise (307–8). It may be doubted whether Tycho is right in finding it implausible, although dramatically effective, that before returning the bow Neoptolemus should make an unavailing attempt to persuade Philoctetes to come to Troy (308–9). Tycho thinks it would have been quite possible for Sophocles to allow Philoctetes, after the discomfiture of Odysseus, to be persuaded by Neoptolemus to abandon his quarrel with the Atridae and go to Troy. Surely this would have been inconceivable for a Sophoclean hero, loving his friends and hating his enemies beyond the norm. He thinks Sophocles used the god from the machine to bring about the ending which the known myth required. In fact the poet's use of Heracles serves a deliberate poetic purpose; deeply distasteful as it is for Philoctetes to make his peace with the Atridae and Odysseus, the will of Zeus requires that he must do so, and only the command of Heracles can persuade him.¹

Christ Church, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

¹ On the appearance of Heracles in the Philoctetes, see A. Spira, *Untersuchungen zum Deus ex machina bei Sophokles und Euripides*, Diss. Frankfurt a. M., 1960, pp. 12–32, and Karin Alt, *Hermes* lxxxix (1961), 167–72 = *Sophokles*, ed. H. Diller, 448–55.

daß Neoptolemos' Beschreibung [der Höhle Philoktets] darum so ausführlich ist, weil sie dem Zuschauer schildert, was er nicht sieht, wobei durch die Lage erklärt wird, daß Neoptolemos herangehend in die Höhle hineinsehen kann, obwohl dem Zuschauer das Innere unsichtbar bleibt.' Cf. A. M. Dale, *Wiener Studien* lxi (1956), 104–5 = *Collected Papers* (1969), 127–9 = *Sophokles*, ed. H. Diller, 249–50 (German version).

Addendum. Here is an isolated observation of Fraenkel regarding p. 274 n. 1: 'Klar ist,