

A BULLER

BACHOFEN

UND

NIETCHE

VERLAG DER

NEUBAUER BOBMEIZER RUNDSTADT

ZÜRICH 1909

8CB RIPTEN DER NIUEN BCITREI C E R R O N D B C B A 0
& ERA O8 G E G E B E H P O 2' D R. 6i A K R ¥ C H N E R

M AffDR UCK PROHIBITED
ALL' RIGHT'TE !hI BESOI-IDER IZ THE OF THE UBZ3RSEI'zLING
VORBEHALTEN

eg'moEndedesJ weel876erbiel*Nietmsoh
the MJ was staying in Sorrento, a letter from
Basel on his friend Oymbeck, in which he read the
following towards the end: "Yesterday, Bachofena
were with us and read that he wished Bacholen to
keep away all the untimely, as he put it." This
sentence is one of the few authentic transcripts that
tell us about the personal relationship between
Banholen and Hietzeche. First of all, it is unusual
that Nietzsche is given advice. I infer from this
that the great age difference between the two open
people (it was almost a sixth of an age, 29 years)
was expressed in personal dialogue.)With cheerful
superiority, the older man tries to guide and direct
the younger one even beyond the letter.

We can hardly imagine that his fatherly, jovial manner had a pleasing effect on the self-confident and **excitable young man**. We may rather assume the opposite. Nietzsche was not accustomed to being treated as an aole: the younger ones' favours attracted him, and the older ones, such as his teachers Ritschl and Burckhardt, treated him with distinction. We do not know what Burckhardt may have been thinking in his innermost soul during these interactions. In any case, the age difference between him and Nietzsche, although it was hardly less - it was 26 years - was less apparent to Bohon because Burckhardt was a young journeyman and the conversation between them was that of two lonely colleagues who shared common thoughts and interests. In his relationship with Bachofen, on the other hand, Nietzsche was not dealing with a lonely, hoarding eagle, which he could accompany on his flights and occasionally fly over, but rather he entered a spacious, cosy, comfortable bourgeois house, which was characterised by the will of the patriarchal, reverent husband. In the rooms of Bachofong's house on Münsterplatz, the guest entering was subject to a strict law and, if he violated it, to equally strict criticism. Now Nietzsche loved a

He was very much in favour of a certain pertinence of external manners, but between the privy councillor of Naumburg and the life of the Basel patricians, between the manners of middle German higher official circles and the strictness of the old bourgeois Basel tradition, there was obviously still a gap. Within the confines of the best education, Nietzsche was nevertheless accustomed to expressing his moods, and to finding notice, even admiration, from those around him. Especially when he sat down at the piano, he managed to forget time and circumstances. Such lyrical-orgiastic self-forgetfulness was unheard of in the Bachofen household, and we should not be surprised if a piano piece is mentioned here. On the other hand, despite all the joviality and humour of the master of the house, the discipline of Bachofen's noise must have had a repulsive effect on Nietzsche. This house was alien to him, a block thrown in the path of his life, which he skirted with surreptitious silence.

The name Bachofen does not appear in Nietzsche's works or printed sources. On 18 June 1871 Nietzsche borrowed Bachofen's first mythological work, *Die Träbersymbolik der Alten*, from the university library in Basel. To conclude from this fact that he had also read the work could only happen to those who have read the

habits of the Oaleixrten does not know. We know that Baohofen appreciated Niatzaohoa Neöürt der 2'r Edie; but we have no judgement by Nietzsche on Bachofen. Perhaps in those sentences (as Karl Joel has already surmised) in which **Nietzsche** combines the sound of a deep old voice with the idea that there could be women who are cur lferrahait iiber 3länner beati nnt aeien, a memory of conversations with Bachofen resonates. But then it would only be a suggestion of the most general kind. Oerade *in* the field, we find nothing in the field of ancient interpretation.

This silence is all the more strange as Nietzsche was virtually searching people who did not share the "progress mania" of the century. In addition to Schopenhauer, Wagner and Bürokhart, Bachotene also belonged to this group. Bachotena's pessimism - if one may say so, for it was not a philosophical conviction, and Bachotene was as little read by Baohofen as the other philosophers of more recent times - stemmed from his own depths, from the knowledge of a hopeless doom, of an abyss of doom from which neither the East nor the people were able to free themselves through their own Kraft . The history of the world is for him

a struggle between two principles, not an uninterrupted "**progress** in consciousness".

consciousness
of freedom",

whereby every stage of development is seen as a success and every success as a stage of development. On one point, however, Bachofen is also optimistic: he is convinced that Christianity has triumphed in the world once and for all. Despite all the setbacks, human development as a whole is moving upwards, from the lowest levels of the illusory right to ever higher levels of paternity - therefore the present is also good, because it belongs to Christianity, a paternal religion. Bachofen safe in the security of this religion. Sitting under the protection of the cathedral, he reads his Greeks and Romans, inspects his antique vases and clay larns. For him, Christianity and antiquity form two completely separate spheres that merge in him, as it were, into the same impersonal unity to which they appear linked in the history of mankind. Just as the ancient and the Christian epochs are clearly separated here in history, and yet they are the same history to which they belong, Bachofen unbiasedly separates and unites the ancient and the Christian in himself. There can no dispute.

Christianity iat one

clearly Sieger, but antiquity did perish with the highest honours, and its religious symbols remain the eternal signs of eternal struggles in the human breast.

How different is this with Nietzsche! He made the same intellectuals with whom he has to do exclusively: Antiquity and Christianity. But the letter quoted at the beginning gives us a clear idea of where the difference lies. Bachofen wishes the young Nietzsche well,

"as he would like to do", keeping his distance from everything inappropriate. So he saw Nietzsche in a completely different way to us today. We see in him the critic against a time, whereas Bachofen has an aversion to the "uncontemporary". Why? Bachofen lives as a contemplative nature, timeless as it were. For him, Christianity is something contemporary, while antiquity is alive in its symbols for the contemplative despite its demise. His gaze, which rests on the cues of the Xfittellandic bfeer, passes indifferently over the weight of contemporary ideas. Bachofen completely lacks an interest in proximity, in time. He felt that every minute spent on modern ideas was lost. The only modernity he recognises is ghriatism. For Nietzsche it is exactly the other way round: he also sees the Christian as the

Modernity, and in modernity essentially Christianity. But this Christianity is precisely that which he does not recognise. In Christianity he sees only the gloomy fog that hides the luminous landscape of antiquity from our view. He cannot look, contemplate, enjoy and realise. He wanders restlessly from the counter-value to the

present, and from the past again

back to the present. Because he wants to bring about a decision, he always asks the question anew: how are things healing *today* with antiquity and Christianity? What are we - Greeks or Goths? What *should* *Wn' zein* | Nietzsche's intellectual development can only be understood from the perspective of this urgent question. Of course, the mistake of assuming that a "battle" between paganism and Christianity had ever taken place in her own mind should be avoided. Christianity was the enemy for Nietzsche very early on - not because he

never would have been a semi-Christian or an octogenarian, but because he felt life in a pagan way, and because this pagan life had to go on the attack against modern Christianity. Already from the background of the *Geöuri* of *7'rapödie* and the *tfnzeitpcmüßen considerations, une* Nietzsche's unversöhnlicher Kampfstellung towards the

Christianity. For him, the problem of antiquity is inseparable from that of the modern Christian world. Above all, the most important of the unpublished *Inzeitpe- Jen reflections*, which bears the title: "We Philologists". In this treatise, Nietzsche wanted to look at the science of antiquity from the highest point of view, he wanted to seek out the "philosophical precondition of classical philology". He asks himself (precisely in the simplicity of this question lies its genius): How can antiquity be "classical", i.e. exemplary, on the soil of a so-called Christian culture? The answer is: because of the half-heartedness of modern man, especially because of the cowardice and hypocrisy of the scientific man. "Classical education! Yes, if only there were at least as much paganism as Goethe found and glorified in Winckelmann - it was not too much. But now all the untrue Christianity of our time with it or in the midst of it - that is too much for me and I have to help myself by venting my disgust about it." It is the "amalgamation" of classical philosophy with Christianity that Nietzsche is asking for. He places the real Greeks and the humanistic philologists each other **with each other:**

"The Greeks are in favour of the symbolic, possess free JYfiinnlichkøit and øen pure bliok in the \$\$"elt - the philologists bind untiihig against Symbols, *taatøøklaven with InbrunsL, and vørzwiokte Ohri-at0n." How "chrisLlioh" one must , he sneers against Weloker, the greatest authority of his Pachea, in order to consider the Greeks to be primordial monotheiøts! "Serious inclination towards antiquity is unchriøtic." He calls the famous philologist the invention of giving classical studies a non-harmful twist. This turn lies in the fact that he turned into a mere "scholar", otherwise he remains what he is. Everything can be combined in this mere statement, except identity and Christianity. If we also want to learn about what we feel and think, then the necessity of divorce comes to us. Nietzsche has made his decision. In the úøòurt *of the T'ropö4ie*, there was a hostile silence about Christianity. The I ms'úçemö§sn *Betraehtuuuqeu* øll now an øntique attitude of soul økLiv. The battle against time that they are waging is a battle against Christianity, which time has passed.

The "We Philologists" conference also includes presentations on the future of our educational institutions, the website.

in the winter of 1872 in Baael - those lectures, the historic significance of which I am not afraid to compare with Fichte's speeches to the German nation. Nietzsche says in the second of these lectures that once awakened, the feeling for the *ifeßeni-* ech becomes immediately aggressive.

"The antiquity makes us out of time", it says in "We philologists".

With this we have interpreted to the end the letter from which we started. Bachofen must sense in the "untimely" Nietzsche the anti-Christ who acted hostilely towards him, and Nietzsche must see in Bachofen's admonitions a misjudgement of his innermost being. Through the appearance of the *humanly universal*, Nietzsche's personal contact with the Bacholen family *was* broken off. This breaking off, however, is only a realisation of the always existing contrast. At the moment when Nietzsche became publicly visible as an enemy of Christianity, Bachofen withdrew from him. Given the character of the two men, no other solution was possible.

In the counterpart of these two, which have a deeply
ainniger coincidence half a century ago in Baael, the problems of modern culture appear more striking than anywhere else.

This culture is based on antiquity and Christianity, antiquity and earliest history are intertwined in the modern spirit, and are closely linked in the modern science of antiquity. The example of the classical philologist can be used to study the modern soul, and Nietzsche has used this example to study the independence and diversity, ambiguity and the "dialectic" of modern man. It is not without reason that I have introduced the term "dialectic" here: in the valley it is Hegel's dialectic that Nietzsche combats in the "Bildung of his century the ancient philosopher as a servant of the state - this is the realisation of the Hegelian system. Hegel had shown how "reconcile" antiquity with the Christian turn on a large scale. He was Hölderlin's friend, he really loved antiquity. He also wanted to be the philosopher of the Reformation. In this predicament, he invented the dialectic: the thesis of antiquity, which in logic corresponds to His Being, the pure position, is followed by the anti-thesis of Christianity, in logic the pure negativity. Out of positivity and negativity, out of idealised alter- turn and secularised Christianity, Hegel builds the thorn of Pure System. But it is only a thorn of illumination that is erected, it does not advise

true Gothic, it is New Gothic, Bildungsagotik. For only in the man of education can **antiquity** and Christianity be reconciled effortlessly, i.e. dialectically. The whole process only takes place in the sphere of concepts: the absolute spirit is "substance" - that is ancient thought. But it is also "subject" - that is Christian thought. To have united the system of **substance** with that of the subject was Hegel's pride. The philologist moved in the same discourse. philologist. On the one hand, one was a Christian, but on the other, antiquity is classical - only in matters of taste, of course! This is how a weak Christianity combined with a well-meaning aestheticism. One comforts oneself with the historical fact that antiquity "overcome" Christianity, which, once established, one could calmly indulge in the study of the ancients. In this way, the study of antiquity became a historical , but Christianity also a historical matter. Modern historicism is here, Hegel's system is its heralding lynn hril. Historicism, "education", means that neither paganism nor Christianity is taken seriously any more. This historicism makes the content of the "general penalisation" according to the Prussian model, that education

which Nietzsche was the first to write in his Basel Prefaces.
inertia hak

If we define 19th century Hiutorism in the way we have just done: as the neutralisation of Christianity by antiquity and of antiquity by Christianity, then we see Bachofen and Nietzsche united against their time as the real and deepest enemies of Hegelianising educational optimism. Bachofen and Nietzsche oppose the misleading combination of Alfianism and Christianity by separating the two spheres. Both the Hegelian synthesis from its point of view, and in this respect must be mentioned together with Kierkegaard, whose pseudonymous work is entirely dedicated to the task of redrawing the dividing line between identity and Christianity. And if the friends of antiquity had to find that in modern education Christianity corrupts all that is antique, then conversely a real Christian like Kierkegaard had to find that here, too, all that is Christian been corrupted by antiquity in the ground.

Nothing seems more paradoxical than the assertion that Bachofen was characterised by the link between paganism and Christianity. For his person, the

The elinheil between ancient symbolic research and Protestant faith is significant! The specialisation of the spheres is clearly visible in Miets- ache and Kierkegaard. For Nietzsche it is an ethical demand **from the outset**, a commandment of honesty. For Kierkegaard, the complete separation of everything pagan from the concept of the Christian is the act imposed on him by providence, which time requires. But Bacholen - is there a separation at all?

Yes, Baehofen must be mentioned in this context. His separation is **contained** in the nature of his *characterisation* of antiquity. Baehofen approached **antiquity** under completely different external and internal conditions than Nietzsche. He found his way back not as a philologist, but as a legal historian and archaeologist. Bachofen's view of antiquity developed independently of the modern aesthetic image of antiquity, nourished only by a profound experience, the love of food, and by the connection with historical legal scholarship and Reidelbergian Romanticism. It is a real *an-*ccfiauup, not just an ethical or aesthetic conception. Bachofen is **not** confronted **with texts** in which the aesthetic **point of view**

The most important thing is that he has to deal with laws and documents that lead directly into the lives of the ancients. Later, his eye was fixed on burial chambers and clay pots, always out of the visible and effective. Where did Nietzsche see his glories, but more in the discovery than in the freedom of reality. With daring exuberance, Nietzsche had a new and bold feeling for antiquity, which he had not been able to express without much preparation. Bachofen, on the other hand, among whose teachers the *anachauens* predominated, had to see the real ruins of the old world with his own eyes. One piece of advice for the characterisation of the two men is that Nietzsche never the desire to see the 'ruins of ifellaø øioh before his eyes. Not once did he set foot in Sicily. Bachofen, on the other hand, didn't rest until he had "drawn the 'blueprints' of the ancient world into the circle of his personal knowledge".

Dieøe from the point of view of philology aux
aehen dileŁtantenhaftø IJnbefangenheit
Bahnhofenø is only aekundär. There is also a much
deeper

and a more open lack of preference towards antiquity, which I initially characterise only negatively as independence from the idea of "Romanity". The idea of Romanity was the last and most effective result of the endeavour to unite pagan and Christian elements. The young Nietzsche was also reluctant to apply this idea to history "The cursed that the age shows us is not to be confused with the Zfa" i- " ("We philologists".) Or: "How can one only find the old people humane!" This desperate attempt is impossible with Bachofen. He never attempted to imagine the ancients according to the cluster of a classical humanity. From the very beginning, he saw the ancient world as the natural human being. He never distorted the image of this human being by entering ethical and value judgements. He knows nothing of a public acMechthin that would be mere spirit, mere personality, he does not start from an untrue, idealised conception of the iYfenachen, he does not dialectically suspend the animal, but sees the real man and the real woman. Uninfluenced by

that formalism, which is the natural everywhere to "Bachofen shows at a glance how deeply nature reaches into humanity. According to ancient usage, however, "nature" is gender. Bachofen's mythographical work is a single protection against the bourgeois moralisation of the forces of nature, against that well-meaning attempt to strip nature of its Xfanht . There is in the In the 19th century, there was no stronger anti-bourgeois power than Bachofen's symbolic view - even the realism of the second half of the century nowhere near the depth to which Bachofen uprooted the ethics of the bourgeoisie

I will now try to illustrate the disruption of the bourgeois synthesis brought about by Ba'ohofen's symbolism in the area of sexual life. According to popular opinion, the natural instinct is to a higher sphere in love, and even more so in marriage: it becomes ethical, it is directed towards the welfare of the other, it contributes to the preservation of the state. This ethicisation of the natural instinct corresponds to its psychologisation poetry: here the sphere sex becomes a sphere of sublime (or aublimated) "Erlebniaee". The ethicisation of the Zke and the Rozztao1iterature give birth to susazoozeo.

Baohofen overcomes ethical and psychological falsifications of the sexual sphere through a method by which he does not interpret reality prematurely, subjectively, based on ideas and desires, but which puts him in a position to see the facts, to absorb the real powers of natural life in all their strength and vigour. In the area of sexual life, marriage, it is not originally moral norms that are fulfilled, not values that are realised.

realised, Here appear cosmic powers - deities. These are not experiences of individuals, "sensations" that are left to the discretion of subjects, but recurring, deeply meaningful, universal phenomena. The relationship between feelings has a limited depth in itself. At diminutions in the relationship between man The world-historical upheavals in morality, in the legal and state coexistence of people, are linked to changes in the relationship between man and woman. Enlightened by this idea of the symbolic significance of the sexual relationship, Baeholen has the history of mankind in a completely new way. He was able to do this because he had an ear like no other for the mysterious language of the silent symbol. Not only that, what

What people say and think can be deduced from their inner being; what people know is not the deepest thing. The depth of reality is only revealed in what people themselves are unable to express, what is done and guarded wordlessly, without expression, in the cult and custom.

Living life can only be interpreted by those who understand the language of symbols into which it does not flow - with a symbolic power that is unrivalled.

Bachofen has *looked back into the past. Of the hundreds of symbols he has invented, I will only indicate here those that denote the various possibilities of cohabitation between man and woman. A series of symbolic crystals looks at the past. There is the indiscriminately producing fire, the fertility unconcerned about the father: a woman of the sumptuous. On the side of the Mithras, the unknown, nameless, equally valid producer speaks to him. - Dr. is the deity giving praise to the random comer: the symbol of the Apollonian. Ibsen the Tyrannist, the Euzoic, who has a night of the woman. (Ifaupte Mainly formed in the Orient,) - There is Werner the naiad, the dionysian voice, the raucous, the Miami **exciting** woman. And to her corresponds the one who desires the woman, but is allied to and subordinate to her.

walking 6fann: symbol of Dionyssoa. - Furthermore, the woman living in marital union: symbol of Ackera, Demeter. It corresponds to the a.pollini-married father, who bequeaths a name to the children. - Baehofen was particularly fond of depicting the masculine virgin, the Amazon. The final character is the JYfatrone of Rome, who is legally subject to the Hanrie, but also retains a high religious dignity. She is by the pater familiae, the ruler of the woman, the house and the state⁸.

Banhofen has created all these figures from the symbols and myths of the ancients and filled them with glowing life from his own passionate inner being. Above all, a view of the world in which the "miinnliohe potency appears only as a "blown leaf" is of unheard-of power: the world of the 3ftif/errecétr. Baehofen !honours us in a context of feelings and thoughts, cults and customs, religious and legal systems that revolve around the manht of the fertile earth and her image, the maternal woman. In the religion of the Earth Mother, ¥growth and death, life and ruin, lust and despair, jubilation and lamentation intertwine to form the same chord of lustful horror, one chord,

which Baehofen has never tired of suggesting. He calls the lost cultural period, which served the female earth deities, the g a- cocratic. He has excavated this "world age of independent imprinting" with its "more original life-sets" from the mother earth of ancient tradition ala erater.

Bachofen also found the ancient symbol for the ineffectual, non-physical being, for the **spirit**. The highest level of paternity is the Apollonian; it is no longer **affected** by death and decay. **In** the stripe of the feminine

"The Apollonian principle, which blindly pushes towards embrace and procreation and unceasingly towards lamentation, and the immaterial, pure, paternal principle, is the basis of all cosmic and human history according to Baoholen. And in the bridge of the Apollonian principle he finds deeper meaning in this story. Ai'th moment of the struggle between the maternal and the paternal, the material and the immaterial principle. It is that moment Greek history when the waves of the Dionysian frenzy outwit Rellas. Dionysus, the male **god**, is the **one** who excites women in particular. "Struck in the **seat** of a life, the woman storms through the silent mountain heights,

everywhere seeking the recognised God, who himself prefers to stride over the bumps, the girl finds pleasure in the still trembling flesh of the slain Zickleina, the conscious cruelty does not spare the fresh young life.... " This is how Bacholen describes the woman enthralled by Dionysus: in the orgasm mixed of religion and sensuality, in his opinion the woman is able to swing higher than the marble at times. In honour of Dionysus, she does not exalt herself,

"like the pure god of light PhoibOB Apollo, who is not subject to change, the addicted, well-ordered Paian, but the wild DitJiyramboa, after whom he himself is called Dithyrambogenes, full of emotion and obstruction, full of wanderings and digressions. He is the enigma god of the world to come, who is played with fables and gryphons in his honour, who does not combine with order and constant seriousness, but with jest, courage, frenzy, inequality, always deceptive through the change of colours, closely related to dualism, doomed to death with his creation and buried in the fissures of Delphi."

This description of the god Dionysus is the only passage in Bachofen's work that brings Nietzsche to mind. As a god who

Nietzsche's Dionysos portrayed the wanderings and riddles, the play and the grumpiness, deception and the becoming. For him, as for Bachofen, Apollo forms the antithesis to Dionysos. Nietzsche calls the oppositeness of Dionysos and Apollo within the Greek soul one of the great riddles, of which he speaks to the Greek being, to guess why the Greek Apollinism in particular had to grow out of a Dionysian underground, and he argued that Apollo could only become strong where Dionysos previously been powerful. Only as a victory over passionate arbitrariness does logic appear, only as a triumph over demonic ugliness does beauty appear, only as an overcoming of chaos does order appear, only after the defeat of the un-measured does the divine.

Nietzsche

Antithese: dionysisch-apollinisch gleich "Unmaß" sind "Hesiod" hat jedoch nichts mit dem Gegensatz, den die Symbole Dionysos und Apollon bei Bachofen ver-, zu tun. Dionysos and Apollo are juxtaposed in Bachofen: like immoderation and measure, like earth and mould, like shock-bound and shockless. The Dionysian-apollinisch in Bachofen coincides with that of chthonian-uraniach.

The scope and depth of the mythological show is based on Bachofen's *Stirke* and Puhm. The perfection of Hachofen's *\Verkes* becomes clear where it crosses over to *history*. Bachofen does not recognise a distinction between mythological and historical time, mythological and historical research. He blurs the boundary between here and historical time, which Üchelling drew with just as much profundity as prudence, in favour of the "continuity of human development". Beginning and end, myth and history are one for Bachofen. Anyone who wants to understand and enjoy Bachofen without at the same time lulling his critical consciousness to sleep must draw the line between myth and history in his work. This distinction, which I have made in Bachofeli's work following Schelling, is possible, and it shows the greatness and purity of its original conception. Plan can read Bachofen's work as a reiri mythologisohe - it is this circumstance that makes it possible to love this work even without a sacrificio dell' intelletto - a sacrifice that not all of Bachofen's interpreters have found it necessary to avoid.

Bachofen was only too familiar with the historical period.

The man of historical times himself offered no obstacle to his objective method. The man of historical times himself offered no support for his objective method.

It was not Bachofen's cup of tea to put himself psychologically in the shoes of a citizen of the Greek city-states. In the symbols he saw, something personal was alive. Through the people who train the cults and myths, general life works. In the historical bowl this impersonal-general was called the folk spirit. The world of the unconsciously creative folk spirit, the world of symbols and legends, is alien to Nietzsche. His home is the *closed* circle where the individual accomplishes his deeds with the impetus of genius. Not the mythical Greece of Theseus and Heracles, nor the philosophical Greece of Aristotle, but the early Greece, the Greece in the morning light of its historical deeds is the realm to which Nietzsche had direct access due to his intellect. You set your foot directly on historical ground, but at the place where this ground is still damp from the mythical night, where the first **dead** of individuals rose up with lush glances, conceivable, recognisable, but still nourished by the *hifythua*. Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, Empedocles - these are the favourites

Nietzsche. The decline begins with Socrates. The profundity of this alien judgement is not always understood. It is the natural consequence of the fact that Nietzsche was originally at home in a free, heroic Hellas. - Bachofen did not see this heroic Hellas, which already reaches into perceptible history, at all. Conversely, Nietzsche lacks an eye for the real religious symbol. For him, the myth is essentially a poetic and intellectual creation. His allusions to the mythical "womb of all things Aellenic" lying behind the Homeric world suffer from inaccuracy. The theogonical legends are the only thing he knows how to cite. In contrast, he reveals a peculiar genius in the psychological characterisation of the tragic Greek. Such ideas had never before associated with Greekness, never before expressed in such a way: the bliss born of pain, the mixture of lust and cruelty, the excess of suffering and pleasure, the becoming one with the primordial smoulder and the primordial bliss of the Seine. With words like these, Nietzsche tried to describe the experience of Wagner's youth. "Built up from nothing but premature, over-gritty experiences of the self, which are all hard on the threshold of the

The problem of the "halfway house", is how he later characterised Belber øsín Erøtliíngøwerf. He adds that the problem of wîaseship was one that he

die Geburt der Tragödie sei ein Erstlingsopfer, in came to realise at the time. But we did believe,

pious shyness offered to a Greek god, a sacrificial fire en Ebren of Dionysus T But no, it is about expressing an "opposition", an to sensuality, to morality, to Christianity. "Against the **Moral** alaø ketirtø øioh damsla, mil this questionable book, niein Inetinkt, alsø ein firsprøchendør Inøtinkt døøø Lebena, und invent øioh eine grundsätzliohe Gegenlehrø und Gíegenwertung dos Lebena, eine rein artiøtiøehe, eine antiGhriatliche. How can this be? Ala philologist and óten ch of the words tauítø ioh sic, oicht oline some freedom - for who knew the ceøhten namon dev anti-Christ t - out the name of a Greek god: I was called aiø the ~~dio~~-nyaische."

Dionysus: due is therefore only a misleading name, a name that is supposed to bøzeiohnen aboutø the highestø generalø end GøgenwäroLigøø - the Aulgabø Nietzøøchea ale Anti-Ghrist! flag in d8F 9&"H the S'røgödie at least the disciple of an unknown Godøa speak - a disciple of the qrs8cbiøefieii Godten

Dionysosifies nicht NießsoLesebstbekenz&:ioh
have invented Dionysoa. The words would have
sounded like a terrible fravel in Bachofena's ear. A
god cannot be invented or created i the gods ssnd,
and are looked at in fijrmbolsn by us.

In the more recent Nietzsche literature, the
discovery of the Dionysian phenomena appears at
the centre of Nietzsche's intellectual biography.
But does what Nietzsche says about the Dionysiac
Greeks really contain the key to his own essence
and the core of his achievement for the
interpretation of antiquity? That psychology of
the ecstasy of the solitary and its connection with
the Dionysoa myth, which contains the *birth of*
tragedy, will always remain one of the most
inebriating works that a young man has ever dared
to write. But what do the Greeks have to do with a
phenomenon that has its origins in a modern,
muoik- intoxicated soul *. From a 6fusion that is
alien to them. The fact that it was a 2'rismn
listener who described the "Dionysian
phenomenon" can be recognised on every page.
An enthusiasm for dissonance has consipated the
birth of the 2'ragd8ie from the spirit of Muaik. If
we take this work as a starting point: with its
refined psychology, with its rational mythological
approach, then **Niotz-**

The work done for the development of the Greek religion and art is not specific. The Gegan- saŁz Dionyaieøh apolliniach, as it is understood here, is a general one, not a specifically Greek one, and is used in this way everywhere today.

NieŁsaeheø Erøtling is a work that has grown quickly and matured rapidly under the tropical sun of Wagner's oenius. DeuŁ- ly, eø the spdŁer corrode is recognisable as a hasty product of necessity and friendship. It was Richard Wogner's Frøund, who aich the

The "grandiose Greek problem" was spoilt by the interference of "modern things", namely music, namely dissonance. The youthful and unbøding love of music and genius has

"Dionysiac phenomenon" first moved to the centre of the youthful work. If we look at all the material that lies before us in the treatises and fragments of the Bøal period, a completely different picture of Greece emerges. A new rivet stands before us. In the place of the muøical, dionysiSiSeh8n fichwärmørs mint a leidønschaftlicher Ringer, a male Kämp- ter; in the place of the øchwelgenden Mystikera steps the unerøehrockene Jüngling, the "UnzeitgemøÙe". There is no mention of Dio- nysos in the i7 sideways views. At no point does the

mood of *the birth of tragedy*. And then there was the third unfinished work, "Schopenhauer als Ersieher", the book by the young Nietzsche, in which he himself said that an inner *oeachichta*, his becoming, was inscribed and made a vow

"here every word is experienced, deeply, inwardly..." (Am *homo!*. \But how is it possible that in a work to which the title "Nietzsche as Educator" should be given, Dionysos does not even appear in disguise? It is only possible if "the Dionysos" was not at all the actual and deepest conception of the young Nietzsche, if the unconformist Nietzsche is primary over the Dionysian.

What Nietzsche saw, what accompanied him throughout his entire life and what fascinated him for a long time, was not the idea of the Dionysian, but of the heroic Greek. That which is so incomparably portrayed in "Schopenhauer as Educator", the heroic existence of the individual, reveals the innermost core of Nietzsche's organisation of Greekness. "To exist at all means to be in danger," that is Nietzsche. I am not saying that the lyrical-musical *bauchtant*, the ecstatic sweater, is not also true Nietzsche, but this lyricism, unduly pushed into the foreground by the mood of the times, is a

Ecstatic is only one side. It is the side of sensibility, the "abnormal heightened nervous and cerebral life", which Nietzsche also finds in his Greeks. In these Greeks, however, he also emphasises the other side of sense, which is just as absent in himself, the vehemence and passion of will. But, as the joyfulness of Hesiod teaches us, the will is the "Zeichen des Bewusstseins, das entscheidende Abzeichen der Selbstherrlichkeit und Kraft". This act is no less

"anti-Christian" like the Dionysian intoxication.

This factual side of Nietzsche's nature has proved fruitful in a first-rate discovery: in the discovery of the agon and its significance for Greek culture. To have uncovered the attitude of the victor in competition, the attitude of the normal Greek - this is Nietzsche's epoch-making achievement for our understanding of antiquity. As a student of philology he was occupied with the subject of "Homer's Wettkampf". It seems that his philological interest in the Greeks was ignited here. The Nachlass fragment on "Homer's Wettkampf" is one of Nietzsche's most important works. This short essay begins with a protest against the famous civilisation of that which separates man from nature and

is a rivet. There is no such separation, aagt **Niets-**ache. "The 'natural' characteristics and those actually called 'human' are inseparably intertwined." Man is entirely natural and has an uncanny dual character about him: his terrible abilities are precisely the fertile soil from which alone all humanity can grow. Thus the Greeks have in them a trait of cruelty, of tigerish lust for destruction, which is also visible in Alexander the Great, and dominates their entire history as well as their mythology, and which must frighten us who have come to them with the soft concept of modern humanity. In the Greek city-states, a completely different ethic than ours **prevails**. Fighting and the desire to win are recognised here. Nothing separates the Greek world from ours more than the high valuation of envy. The Greek does not perceive envy as an evil, but as the effect of a benevolent godliness.

"What a gulf of ethical judgement there is between us and him!" In Heraclitus' conception of the cosmos, which is filled with eternal conflict and governed by eternal justice, the young Nietzsche finds his soul again, and I dare say: not in the *birth of tragedy*, but

In what Nietzsche wrote about the *agon*, an inner world lives on. Heraclitus explained the good *eris* of Hesiod as a world principle: "It is the competition of the individual Greeks and the Greek state in the gymnasiums and schools, from the artistic agonies, from the struggle of the political parties and the cities with each other, transferred into the general, so that now the work of the cosmos turns within it." This metaphysics of competition is condensed into an image of mythological power: what we perceive has no actual existence, there are no "things", the world consists only of moments of the victory of one quality over the other. Things are only "the flashes and sparks of drawn swords, they are the gleam of victory in the battle of opposing qualities".

Nietzsche sees the fighting and elegant man in the foreground of Greek history. He rediscovered the will to win, the will to be the hero that inspired every Greek, in the depths of his heroic mind, and it was this that enabled him to make the concept of competition the centrepiece of Greek culture. The magic that the idea of competition had on

Nietzsche is based on the fact that the battle is interpreted entirely from the moment of victory. No sacrifice is too great **for** victory, no pain too strong. At this point, a connection between the agonal and the dionysian Nietzsche is indicated. Perhaps it is only Richard Wagner's music that is to blame for the fact that today we do not read the psychology of **ecstasy**, which contains the wholeness of *tragedy*, in connection a psychology of the agonal Greek. That lust for pleasure, which forms the core of the Dionysian phenomenon, is also found in the attitude of the victor's soul. "The cruelty of victory is the pinnacle of the exultation of life." Bound to deed and victory, **the "Dionysian phenomenon"** should be interpreted heroically, not mystically. The true expression of the **victory** would not be the intoxication that burns out alone or in twos, not a mystical fervour that sinks aimlessly into itself, but rather the penetrating **exultation** of the **victor**, shaken by the pain of battle.

"Dionysian" in Nietzsche's sense.

It is known that it was not Nietzsche but **Jakob Burckhardt** who discovered the importance of agonal instincts among the Greeks. Burckhardt's *Criechische Kullurgeschichte* contains a large chapter on competition. But the difference between Burckhardt and Nietz-

The concept of competition is not relevant in our context. Burckhardt only describes the agonal drive from the outside. He judges it as a peculiarity, as something that is associated with danger and death. Most expressive are his words about the athlete: "It was nothing positively happy if the whole life was geared to a moment of the most dangerous tension, in the meantime, the person concerned must have been seized by anxiety or deep concern for the future." To organise one's whole life for a moment of the most fearful tension, to stretch one's whole existence towards the moment of victory, precisely that which Burckhardt rejects with a shudder, precisely that seemed to Nietzsche to make life the only thing worth living! He could learn nothing about the agonal drive from Burckhardt, for he knew *Wn* from the inside out and portrayed him from the inside as bereft.*)

^) Perhaps in the fact that Nietzsche centred aeri image of Greekness around the concept of the Dionysiac, we have at best one footing of the Wettka.nipfes red. Burckhardt discovered the Agmal for the Greeks, but Nietzsche discovered the Dionysiac ... The Origin of the Dionysiac had in any case been often bar in the air. but the Dionysiac was gone. The Dionysiac bite, with your burck - bszdte EEndiguog vor Nietzsches Entdeckung i.a der Pö/zandümsung ta, had then not been able to be grounded. fsiabe

To expose competition from within, to justify envy, the good heaioda - that is to destroy the bourgeois world. Envy plays just as great a role in the structure of this world as in any non-bourgeois one, albeit a less pleasurable one, but the value system of the bourgeois excludes this basic instinct just like all other natural instincts. Not influenced by the humanity concept of bourgeois morality, Nietzsche at the real world, the world of man, not as a world of "values". But as a world struggle and victory, we see Baebafen and Nietzsche side by side: just as the one disrupts the bourgeois system of concealment in the field of gender life, the other destroys this same system in the field of the profession by applying Greek wisdom. "The potter resents the potter and the carpenter the carpenter, the beggar envies the beggar and the singer the singer." (ffnniers Weil&emp/.)

Objectively, in terms of content, Baob- above and Nietzsche moved closer and closer - even if neverh4 beyond the concept of Dionyaisohen. Waa Bachofen reveals in the district of symbols and the bfythus : deepest truth on the ab-

Nietzsche presents us with the basis of the past in the district of Geahichte: the possibility of an eroiaeh-waRhaitige Dmeinv Both were able to become true founders of antiquity, because they were immersed in the dark tgohieht of modern ideas back to the sources of humanity. **It is** the contrast hinders this meaningful common ground. This opposition lies first of all in the leadership: Raohofen is in sœinør attitude and according to his lifestyle he is seen as a citizen of the 18th century. This is how he descends into the world of myths - eø bliøb beini Sehauen. Baohofen bstrocbeitei of antiquity, **Nietzsche will** feben it. Dec' contrast iBtŁ d6F Itææ- liehe wie xzwischen Burckhardt And NietEaohe. Burckhardt speaks liberally of the agon as a world of, but suø deF Bïoheren Zelle dea Oelehrten. Nietzsche speaks of the agon as a mingling, which is a struggle and victory, but only out of this contemplative relationship to antiquity, Bschofenø Chri8tentum is changed. Baoh- ofen bøt the purple symbols of antiquityø calmly øøhaiien can, because he knew øhis inner as aøin external existence føst attached to the anchor ground of cbrisŁŁer reality. At the centre of this curiosity - to use Burckhardt's ambiguous expression - was this new, speci

fisch Bachofenache Sjrntheee is possible, which brings Christianity into agreement with antiquity in that it sees it as the completion of ancient Apollinism through a higher openness. **sätze**Such a reconciliation of opposites was only possible for the contemplator, not the -actor, and insofar as Baehofen brings the opposites to such a harmonious balance in his person and in his work, he is a citizen. Nietzsche arepresents the extreme opposite of theeea biirger, insofar as he acts - even if theaea action ahad to be limited to renouncing the honours of the biirgerial world and leading a pure life in the transparent air of self-chosen solitude.

But this contrast: the observer - the doer is not the last word. The names Bachofan and Nietzsche have truly symbolic power and depth because this opposition is cancelled out in a final, hidden layer. I can only hint at what this last layer is about. The decisive contrast between Banhofen and Nietzsche is determined by their relationship to the symbol (this is also the basis of the contrast between Bachofen and Burckhardt.) Banhofen is neither an erudite nor an aesthetic observer, he is neither a learned nor an aesthetic observer.

is an observer in a special sense. It is neither thoughts nor mere images that open up a **sense**, they are symbols. To **see** the symbol, however, a special ability is required: even a scholar of the highest artistic intuition cannot see a symbol. The one who sees symbols is no longer a practitioner in the ordinary sense of the word, nor is he an intuitive spiritualist - we must call him a sage. The wise man, the seer, there contemplating. He who looks at what has been opened up to him can no longer hide. There is a tie of the gaze that must be calmly. The tie of the gaze was Bachofen's own, which is the last reason for pure bourgeois life, and at the same time the one thing that makes every reproach against this life disappear.

What is the opposite of the seer, the psychologist. The white man stands to one side, his gaze sweeps his century and the centuries that have passed to immerse in the goals of the past. The psychologist looks a time and the times that surround it with an intense and greedy attention. Without a doubt, Nietzsche was the greatest psychologist of the last century. A good part of his fame, if not all of it, is based on the

Psychology. But what is psychology? I answer: external calm and security, "security". Whoever is in danger of his life, whoever has done a great deed, whoever forgets all psychology. Nietzsche's audacity as a psychologist, of which he was still proud, was only possible on the background of the bourgeois system to which he himself belonged as a protester. Consistent psychologism was the last attitude of mind to emerge from bourgeois identity. That is the tragedy of Nietzsche's life, that all his heroism could not completely redeem him from his century. The vision of the superman, the wisdom does not defy Nietzsche's tremendous restlessness that urges to action is the opposite of Bachofen's calmness. But only a subjective, a psychological act emerged from this restlessness, which in turn had only subjective, psychological consequences: the excitement of youth. But even today the youth is not free from the bourgeois century, just as Nietzsche was not free from it. Bachofen, however, was free of it. Whoever looks at the symbol is no longer a citizen, the bourgeois spirit is hostile to the symbol. And so the relationship is reversed: Nietzsche proves to be a psychologist.

the spirit of his century, the same spirit that he defied as an actor; as a symbolist, Bacholén overcomes the spirit of the 19th century, the same century to which he belonged without rest as an empirical man. Thus they stand before us: the looking old man, the wise man, and the fiery young man thirsting for the highest deed - the most beautiful, the most meaningful and the most fruitful contrast that the century of our fathers has to offer us.

NOTES

The correspondence between Nietzsche and Overbeck contains a second mention of Bachofen. On 2 January 1888, Overbeck informs Nietzsche of Bachofen's death on 6 November 1887 of Bachofen's death. "The old Bachofen died suddenly about a month ago ..." (comments on the Binterlin book follow).

The letters that Nietzsche's mother wrote to Overbeck during the first period of her son's illness are a valuable testimony to the relationship between Bachofen and Nietzsche. On 28 February 1881, she reported to Basel: A few days ago, I read to him from our price sheet that Prof. Dr Rudolf Bastian would be returning to Berlin. I asked him about all the personalities in order to his memory, and also saw how he the Naohricht with particular interest. He said: "Bastian used to live in Siberia (is that right?) and is the best expert on international law or customer t Prof. Bachofen in Basel, who is the best expert on mother law, was in correspondence with him and explained to me at my request what I meant by mother law.

I thought he was talking about an Englishman who had described eB and attached particular importance to the Oheimrechb. I asked him further: "You must have sometimes visited Prof Baehofen in Baael, and wasn't Prof Baohofen still a very pretty woman despite her grown-up children?" "Yes," he said, "she played the piano beautifully and once played me the and the Marech (I can no longer remember the name)." (C. A. Ber- noulli, J. *Ouerbeck and P. Nietzte*. 1ß08. II, 331.J

- It seems remarkable to me that Nietzsche seems to have remembered the Hutterrecht only as a matter for ethnologists. The Budolf Bastian mentioned at the beginning is, of course, the ethnologist Adolf Bastian. With the Englishman we may well think of L. JA. Morgan.

PU 9 E I T E 2 y

The passage in the T fzeadü "imerung reads: "I was the first to take seriously the marvellous phenomenon that bears the name of Dionysus in order to understand the older, still rich and even over-atmospheric Inatinkta: ea did only explainable from a 6ueief of Kratt. Whoever follows the Greeks, like that most profound expert on their culture who lives today, Jacob Burek-

hardt in Baeel, who immediately knew that something had been done: Burekhardt added a separate section on the aforementioned phenomenon to a loss of degrees.

The task of Burekhardt's lectures on the culture of the Greeks, which appeared in print, does not contain such a section. However, in various places (such as at one point in the *iPeftpescAic6tticfen &elracAfunpeii*) the reference to the *geburt of 7'rnpoäie* is clear. We must therefore assume that Nietzsche was informed by friends or listeners of Burckhardt that Burckhardt, in a lecture on Greek cultural history, space to Nietzsche's interpretation of Dionyaic phenomena. This him the idea that Burckhardt had devoted a separate chapter to this phenomenon.