

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition
 Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

*Sophocles: the state of play**Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall*

When Sir Richard Jebb sat down in 1900 to write the preface to the third edition of his commentary on Sophocles' *Antigone*, he wrote as Professor of Greek at Cambridge, a Member of Parliament, and a leading public intellectual. This was the year in which he was knighted for his services to education. He was, and knew he was, Britain's leading expert on Greek tragedy.¹ His writings on Sophocles have remained deeply influential, and for his generation he was an iconic figure, who embodied the summation of classical learning – his name could be readily cited in the *Times* as the authority to close any classical question. But his preface makes rather odd reading today. There is, he wrote 'no better example of ideal beauty attained by truth to human nature' than this tragedy. 'The Parthenon was slowly rising from the Acropolis', and Antigone herself 'bears the genuine impress of this glorious moment in the life of Athens'. She is 'the noblest, and most profoundly tender, embodiment of women's heroism', as the play itself is marked by the 'self-restraint' typical of Greek art.² To a modern ear, Jebb's words are strikingly and even paradigmatically Victorian – a term we use here quite without the sniffiness with which this era is so often dismissed by arrogant modernity.

'Ideal beauty' and 'truth to human nature', for example, reveal Jebb's intimate engagement with the German idealist philosophy of Hegel and the German literary critics who followed Hegel,³ just as this language also reflects the Oxford-led critical flair of Ruskin, Pater, and even the genial, prolific and extremely popular journalistic essays on character and nature written by his local colleague, A. C. Benson – who reveals how deeply such

¹ On Jebb, see now Chris Stray (2007a) with further bibliography. The title page specifies 'Sir Richard Jebb, Litt. D., Regius Professor of Greek and Fellow of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge, and MP for the University: Hon. DCL Oxford; Hon. LLD Edinburgh, Harvard, Dublin and Glasgow: Hon. Doct. Philos., Bologna.'

² Jebb (1900a) v–vi.

³ A useful introduction in Pinkard (2002); for detailed bibliography on nineteenth-century German literary criticism of Greek literature see Holtermann (1999), especially ch. 4.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition
 Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

ideas had penetrated into literary culture by 1900.⁴ The idealism and the beauty of tragedy – despite its destructive violence and horrific acts – were a commonplace of Victorian critical writing, and the proof of such values by the criterion of ‘truth to nature’ has roots in Pre-Raphaelite thinking about art as much as in pre-Freudian psychology.⁵ Jebb’s critical language spans the technical world of criticism and the general intellectualizing milieu with an easy familiarity.

The recognition of the ‘glory’ of Athens – no modern hesitations about Empire, slavery, or the treatment of women and foreigners here – slips without friction into the evaluation of Antigone herself as ‘noble’ and ‘tender’, two adjectives which are buzz-words for the evaluation of women in Victorian culture, but which find few echoes in modern discussion of the female virtues. This laudatory depiction of Antigone goes back a good way in Victorian writing. In 1845, Thomas de Quincey had extolled Helen Faucit in the role not just as an embodiment of Greek artistic ideals – ‘What perfection of Athenian sculpture! The noble figure, the lovely arms, the fluent drapery! . . . Perfect is she in form; perfect in attitude.’ – but also as ‘Holy heathen, daughter of God, before God was born . . . idolatrous, yet Christian lady’.⁶ ‘Noble’ and ‘tender’ bring Antigone firmly into the (Christian) value system of Victorian belief. Jebb’s words are acceptably traditional, that is, as well as authoritative. ‘Self-restraint’ too looks back to the tradition inaugurated by Winckelmann on Greek art, where ‘noble simplicity’ and above all ‘tranquillity’ are privileged evaluations.⁷ ‘Self-restraint’ connotes the classical in a pointed way, especially for readers who were not trained to regard torture, sexual abuse of slaves, and imperial exploitation as an expected part of their study of classical culture. Jebb’s words, as he reaches to express the universal value of tragedy in general and of *Antigone* in particular, mark him very much as a figure of his time.

It is an inevitable professional hazard for any scholar, and especially for literary critics, to remain blind to the moment of history at which they write. At one level, this blindness is a condition of social discourse.

⁴ On Ruskin’s criticism, see e.g. Landow (1971), Sherburne (1972) and Emerson (1993); on Pater, see Iser (1987), Evangelista (2003) and Osbourn (2005); A. C. Benson, the Master of Magdalene College, probably less well-known today than his brother the novelist E. F. Benson, wrote several volumes of essays collected from his writing for periodicals; *From a College Window* (1906), for example, went through at least four editions and fifteen impressions.

⁵ On the Pre-Raphaelites, see Prettejohn (1999) and (2005) each with further bibliography. It is revealing to find Zeuxis described as ‘the Millais of his day’ in a standard mid-Victorian introduction to Sophocles (Collins (1871) 2n.).

⁶ De Quincey (1863) 225; Marshall (1998) 204–5; both cited and discussed in Hall and Macintosh (2005) 328–30. For background see Hall and Macintosh (2005) 316–49.

⁷ See Potts (1994); Morrison (1996).

Every society has its tacit knowledge, that is, its assumptions, ideologies and deep beliefs that must remain opaque to its citizens. Tacit knowledge functions only in as much as it remains tacit, unrecognized. When such grounding becomes visible, it becomes open to contestation, worry, or mere discussion; and the very process of explicitly recognizing the formerly tacit will always cause disruption – like thinking about how to ride a bike while doing it, or pointing out, as you do it, exactly why you offer to buy a drink for someone in a bar. At this level, critics, like all of us, are children of a particular epoch.

At another level, most academic disciplines have a commitment to continuity: a recognized history is part of what constitutes a discipline as a discipline, after all. Despite the long influence of Thomas Kuhn's concept of paradigm shift, many scientists, especially mathematicians, seem to conceive the history of their subject as a continuing series of attempts to solve a set of problems, where technology and understanding advance, and new problems are added to old ones, which pass away when solved. Euclid and Ptolemy are recognizable and honoured predecessors of Stephen Hawking. (In the humanities, some philologists, for example, have often adopted a similar model in a self-interested appeal to the modern privilege of science.) The aggressive critical reaction to feminist scholars who have suggested that male bias affects science itself (and not merely the messy business of appointments or behaviour in the workplace) may indicate how deeply felt this sense of an unsullied continuity of a subject can be.⁸ This normative model of continuity – 'we are dealing with the same issues as faced our ancestors in the field' – can hide just how local, historically contingent and culturally specific a scholar's engagement is likely to be.

At a third level, the excitement and pressure of the here and now, with its infighting and obsessions and petty malices, all too often obscure a writer's place in history. What seems to be a pressing concern, a crucial point, a telling knock-down argument, emerges in the grand scheme of things as trivial, personally motivated, and wholly parochial. Who knows if the fate of their prose is to become a bizarre example of the oddity of the era for some future, even newer New Historicist?

There are barriers, then, to understanding the historical moment at which we write. (And this stricture applies to the authors of these words, however self-conscious they wish to be especially concerning the

⁸ Haraway (1989); (1991) on modern biology is particularly telling. Psychoanalysis has been a particular battle ground since Mitchell (1974) and Gallop (1982) – but also all aspects of medical ethics and practice on women's bodies: see e.g. Stanworth (1987); Keller (1985); Keller and Longino (1996); and the many studies of science and gender in history.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition
 Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

contemporary interest in self-reflexive criticism). But this has never stopped critics reflecting on the development of their subject, or trying to indicate what makes their time special or just different. And there are moments when such reflection seems particularly apposite. 1900 is one of those moments. It is apposite partly because the turn of a century is always likely to prompt reflections on times passed and time to come, and never more so than in 1900, when the Victorians were acutely aware of the ending of an era and a sense of transition (which the death of the queen the next year re-enforced). This was a year to make beginnings. Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* – symbolically – has 1900 on the title page, though it appeared in 1899; in Germany Max Planck published his study of quantum theory in 1900 and the first Zeppelin flight took place; in North America the first popular and available camera was produced by George Eastman; in Britain the Labour Party was founded – and, in classical archaeology, Arthur Evans bought the land in Crete which would reveal Knossos to the world. The Victorian age, and the end of the nineteenth century especially, was obsessed with progress, change and the advance of man. (The rapid expansion of the newly industrialized city brought a heightened sense of the loss of the old ways, much as science was proudly parading the triumph of the new ways: the nineteenth century was fascinated by its own self-awareness of modernity, and discussed it – performed it – in many arenas from Darwin or Marx's ideas of human development through science's challenge to religion to the railways' change of the countryside.) As many a Victorian noted, 1900 is in this sense a perfect moment to explore the change into modernity.⁹

But 1900 also seems to us a particularly good point to reflect on the sea changes in Western appreciation of Sophocles (and Greek tragedy in general). Of course, despite the importance of 1900 as a self-aware moment of change for the Victorians, there is bound to be a strong element of the arbitrary in choosing any one year to focus a discussion of so complex and diffuse an issue as the changing cultural and intellectual understanding of Sophocles. We could have begun in 1888 in the ancient Roman theatre at Orange, with Jean Mounet-Sully's first epoch-making performance as Oedipus in Lacroix's *L'Oedipe roi*, the realization of the role that influenced Freud, whose understanding of the Oedipus myth changed intellectual as well as theatrical history.¹⁰ We could easily have looked back to the 1870s and seen an instrumental figure in, say, Lewis

⁹ A huge bibliography on the Victorian understanding of the past could be given: ours would include Melman (2006), Stocking (1987), Turner (1981), Jenkyns (1980), Bann (1995), Burrow (1981).

¹⁰ See Macintosh (1997) and (2009); Goldhill (2002) 108–78.

Cambridge University Press
 978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition
 Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

Sophocles: the state of play

5

Campbell, whose involvement in stagings of tragedies in St Andrews town hall and a private theatre in Edinburgh, and whose championing of plays such as *Trachiniae* against the criticism of Schlegel could be seen to have turned the tide in favour of modern performance of Greek tragedy.¹¹ We could have chosen the 1880s and pointed to the importance of Sophocles in the movement for women's education as *Electra* and *Antigone* became staples of the performance repertoire in women's colleges such as Girton in Cambridge,¹² and the suffragist painter Evelyn de Morgan used Sophocles' Deianeira in one of her reconceptions of mythological figures from a woman's perspective.¹³

We could equally easily have looked forward to 1912 when the substantial papyrus fragment of Sophocles' satyr play *Trackers* was first published, and to the problems that scholars experienced when they tried to reconcile its ribald tone with the widespread view that Sophocles was 'a kind of enlightened bishop', as E. M. Forster put it.¹⁴ W. H. D. Rouse damned *Trackers* with faint praise as 'quite amusing' in *The Classical Review*,¹⁵ while the disappointed F. G. Kenyon concluded that 'the poet did not trouble himself greatly over this class of composition, but was content to produce a passable libretto'.¹⁶ On others, however, such as the high-minded Gilbert Murray, the poetry apparently made a properly Sophoclean 'impression of rare beauty',¹⁷ and trainee scholars were encouraged to argue that Sophocles had morally improved the character of the satyrs relative to their gross licentiousness in other poets.¹⁸ But although we could have entered the story of Sophoclean reception at any of these points, Jebb is an iconic figure of lasting influence whose work can stand as a symbol for the Victorian enterprise of Sophoclean scholarship – and there is consequently a particular rhetorical value at least in starting our reflections with Jebb in his study in Cambridge in 1900.

Jebb's position as an academic and as an intellectual could certainly be more fully explored. His reading of German scholarship ties him into a modernizing school in Britain. Classical scholarship, for all its influence within the education system and the culture of the country, was correctly perceived to be lagging behind the scholarly advancements in Germany.¹⁹

¹¹ See Hall and Macintosh (2005) 430–61. ¹² See Hall (1999).

¹³ See the cover of this book and Lawton Smith (1997–8) 5. ¹⁴ In *The Longest Journey* (1907).

¹⁵ Rouse (1912) 235. ¹⁶ Kenyon (1919) 6.

¹⁷ Murray (1917) 233. An experiment with performing *Trackers* was conducted in Germany as early as 1913, according to its first editor (Hunt (1914) 83).

¹⁸ Murphy (1935) 206. *Trackers* has been routinely ignored in book-length studies of Sophocles and his drama, as the indexes to e.g. Whitman (1951) and Winnington-Ingram (1980) demonstrate.

¹⁹ See Stray (1996) and (1998).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition

Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Jebb was a scholar who had strong personal and intellectual ties with Europe. A national perspective is formed in relation to other national traditions (especially at this time), and Jebb's commentary is making a particular claim about what great scholarship and a monumental work should look like: his commentary stands, self-consciously, on a cusp for British scholarship on Sophocles, moving it away from the torpor of the mid-century. Tragedy as a genre also played a particular role in the literary and scholarly imagination. George Eliot – say – or Thomas Hardy integrated tragic perspectives via their reading of Greek into the structure and moral expectation of their novels.²⁰ Matthew Arnold in his opposition of Hebraism and Hellenism, and in his defence of studying Greek as opposed to science, made a special place for Sophocles – the 'mellow glory of the Attic stage', who 'saw life steadily, and saw it whole'.²¹ Sophocles had a particular image. He was often termed 'pious'; his role as a general – a figure of public administration, like Jebb – was cherished. He had neither the craggy difficulty of Aeschylus, nor the cynical difficulty of Euripides. Sophocles was judged – as Aristotle was seen to encourage – the most perfect writer of the most perfect period of literature, the classic of the classical.²² To work on tragedy and on Sophocles was to go to the heart of the Victorian canon.

The very form of a commentary – the most authoritative and important form for classical scholarship at the time – put Sophocles' language into central focus. Knowing Greek was a badge of honour for the Victorian gentleman (and like most badges, it was tarnished, flaunted, flashed and mocked in multiform ways in practice).²³ Jebb's commentary not only aimed to take the understanding of Sophocles' Greek to a new level, but also, and quite shockingly, did so by writing in English and by including a facing-page English translation. It is hard now to recover how polemical this decision was. It moved away from the decent obscurity of Latin notes and the outsider's barrier of the Greek alphabet to what was correctly seen as a popularizing gesture (attacked and defended as successful/vulgar; accessible/letting down the side of real scholarship: the terms of the debate in Classics have barely shifted on this issue).²⁴ In 1900, however, the commentary on all the extant plays was now complete. It had been received and celebrated. Jebb's position was publicly marked by his knighthood that

²⁰ On Eliot see Easterling (1991a) as well as Jenkyns (1980) 112–32.

²¹ Phrases from Arnold's poem 'To a Friend'. See Anderson (1965), with Collini (1994).

²² See Jenkyns (1980) 87–111.

²³ See e.g. Vasunia (2005) and (2007) on knowledge of Greek as a requirement for the Indian Civil Service; Hall (2007b) 75–7 on gentlemanly translation; for less reverent attitudes see Hall and Macintosh (2005) chs. 12–15 and Richardson (2007).

²⁴ See Stray (2007b).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition

Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Sophocles: the state of play*

7

year. When he writes the new preface of the *Antigone*, he writes with the fullest weight of authority that Victorian institutional power could bestow. All of these forces – and more besides – would be necessary to locate Jebb's masterpiece within its cultural context.

But 1900 and Jebb's *Antigone* (third edition) mark a turning point also for what is about to happen. In 1901 Hugo von Hofmannsthal was reading Sophocles ('in a forest', he adds, with typical self-dramatization),²⁵ when he first conceived a plan for a new translation of *Electra*. His play *Elektra* was first staged in Berlin in 1903, and became an immediate *cause célèbre*. It was bought for twenty-two theatres in the first four days. Three impressions of the book sold out immediately (and more followed quickly). It was taken up by Strauss to form the basis of the libretto for his opera *Elektra*, which had no less success internationally, as the paradigm of new music, trendy, threatening, loud and dangerous. Hofmannsthal's credo was 'let shadows emerge from the blood'. He sought to tear down the white sheets and columns of the pious image of Greek tragedy, and set its violence, disturbance and horror centre stage. His play was profoundly successful in this aim. *Electra* is violent in her hatred of her mother; the play is set in a brooding Mycenaean palace full of images of corrupt and degenerate ritual led by Clytemnestra, a sallow, pale, bloated figure covered in talismans. *Electra* dances herself to death as her mother is brutally slaughtered.²⁶ Where Jebb could see 'the bright influence of Apollo' everywhere in Sophocles' play, all 'light and purity', where Orestes' confidence is 'as cheerful as the morning sunshine', and the vengeance 'a deed of unalloyed merit' (despite it being a matricide), Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*, the critics determined, was 'bestialized', his heroine 'erotically charged', a 'slave to brute reality', with the 'insistent psychology of lewd cruelty', a decadence and perversity formed by 'sadism', 'hysteria', 'epilepsy'.²⁷ In short, 'the noble, deeply suffering heroine is turned into a disgusting, hysterical, mad woman for a public of instinct wallahs'.²⁸ It was, worst of all, 'un-Greek'. For those who saw the celebrated performances of Fiona Shaw or Zoe Wanamaker in Sophocles' *Electra* in the last decade of the 20th century, the long influence of Hofmannsthal's aggressive rereading of Sophocles will be patent.²⁹

Hofmannsthal was a leading intellectual light in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna.³⁰ His new Sophocles was profoundly influenced by anthropology, psychology, and by new theories of dance and ritual – as well as by the fascination

²⁵ Hofmannsthal (1937) 383–4. ²⁶ Discussed at length by Goldhill (2002) 108–77.

²⁷ Quotes from introduction of Jebb (1894); and the critics of Hofmannsthal are cited with background and references in Goldhill (2002) 159–60.

²⁸ Schmid (1940) 501. ²⁹ For detailed discussions of these productions see Hall (1999).

³⁰ Schorske (1980) remains the best guide.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition

Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall

Excerpt

[More information](#)

with degeneracy and the ever-present tyranny of Greece over the German soul. Anthropology, a new discipline, had uncovered a deep and disturbing similarity between the myths of the savage races and the myths of the Greeks.³¹ The Greeks played a special role as the honoured forefathers of Western civilization, a genealogy designed to justify political and cultural hegemony, while the ‘savages’, without such a genealogy, deserved and benefited from the exploitation and dominance offered by Western, Christian powers. Anthropology – in the grand theories of McLennan, Main, Morgan, Tylor, Marx, Engels and others – shockingly suggested that since all human races developed along the same lines, there was no privileged race. (A best-seller such as Frazer’s *The Golden Bough* was hugely important in the spread of anthropological understandings of ancient myth, and the role of such anthropology in English classical scholarship on tragedy is best seen in the work of the Cambridge Ritualists and Gilbert Murray at Oxford, who also looked to Nietzsche’s writing for inspiration.)³² That Greek myths were as brutal, bloody and irrational as ‘savage’ myths threatened the self-definition of the cultured elite of Europe. Freud’s psychology too, with its recognition of sexual desire, violent feelings, and intrafamilial horrors (with women and children suddenly emerging not as ‘tender’ and ‘noble’ and ‘sweet’ as the ideal image would have it) was equally threatening to self-perception. (Mounet-Sully’s famous and long-running performance of Lacroix’s Oedipus in Paris subsequent to the Orange premiere thus provides a link between Freud and the next generation of theatrical innovation, as cultural models are woven between different intellectual and social events.)

For Hofmannsthal, Erwin Rohde, a student of Nietzsche, was a particularly influential figure in this area.³³ In Sophocles’ *Electra*, the Furies, divine figures of revenge, make no appearance, though they had played a leading role as the chorus of the *Eumenides*, the final play of Aeschylus’ great trilogy the *Oresteia*. Rohde argued that the Furies were now *inside* the soul of Electra (and Orestes). Her disturbed and profoundly aggressive feelings were the embodiment of the Furies. Hofmannsthal’s Elektra fully instantiated this new theory of psychological disturbance (and the actor who first played the role drew on images of the madwomen in Charcot’s clinic, the Salpêtrière).³⁴ This physical expressiveness was integrally tied in with new and interrelated concepts of dance, ritual and the failure of language. At the beginning of the twentieth century, dance was suddenly

³¹ See Detienne (1981), with the framework of Stocking (1987).

³² On the Cambridge Ritualists, see Ackerman (2002); Calder (1991). On Murray, West (1984); Stray (2007c).

³³ Rohde (1925). ³⁴ For pictures and discussion see Goldhill (2002) 108–77.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition

Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Sophocles: the state of play*

9

(again) a hot topic. Isadora Duncan's Greek dancing caused a sensation in London and in Europe.³⁵ In 1912, Nijinsky's dancing of *L'Après-midi d'un faune* caused a riot in Paris, as did Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring* in 1913 (where a woman devotee dances herself to death). Dance and ritual brought together in a heady mix anxieties about the sexualized body, the mechanized body, the irrational body. At the same time, a discomfort with language's expressive ability (the so-called Sprachkrise, paradigmatic of modernist poetics) led many artists to explore dance and ritual as a form of expression. So Reinhardt's celebrated production of Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*, which toured Europe for many years, was famous for its scenes of massive ritual, dark colours, and physical movement. Isadora Duncan, who also toured all of Europe, used Greek images as an inspiration and defence to challenge perceptions of gender, sexuality and the propriety of the body through her performances of free dance. Hofmannsthal's impassioned *Elektra*, dancing herself to death, captures these different strains of artistic and intellectual concern in one brilliant image.

There are many further ways the effect of the performance of Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* (and Strauss' opera) could be discussed. But enough has been said, we hope, to indicate first how an understanding of Sophocles, in scholarship as on the stage, is always formed within specific intellectual, artistic, social and political frames. If we want properly to understand Jebb's Sophocles, say, or Hofmannsthal's Sophocles, we need to explore their cultural and historical context. But we also hope that for all the obvious rhetorical opportunism in juxtaposing Jebb in 1900 and Hofmannsthal in 1901, and for all the insufficiencies of the brief history offered for each, it will also become strikingly clear how much of twentieth-century criticism has developed in response to the tensions we have been exploring by our juxtaposition of the two. (It is not by chance that Jebb explicitly engages with Wilamowitz, while Hofmannsthal, particularly through Rohde, turns back to Nietzsche. The argument between Wilamowitz and Nietzsche – an event of the previous generation – about the 'philology of the future' hangs over much of the later polemical development of classical scholarship.) The scholarly tradition of philological analysis has continued, of course, sometimes with Jebb's range and abilities, sometimes with a more restricted scope and ambition; Hofmannsthal's Sophocles in turn helps inaugurate a long line of criticism informed by psychoanalysis, anthropology, politics, and what is now called gender studies. One question provoked by our title *Sophocles and the Tragic Tradition* is precisely the degree to which

³⁵ See Daly (1995). For the impact of ancient drama on modern dance history, see Macintosh (2010).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-88785-4 - Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition

Edited by Simon Goldhill and Edith Hall

Excerpt

[More information](#)

IO

SIMON GOLDHILL AND EDITH HALL

contemporary criticism at the beginning of the twenty-first century relates to the criticism at the beginning of the twentieth. Can it, should it, will it escape the agendas established by nineteenth-century scholarship and its discontents?

In 1904, Karl Reinhardt joined Wilamowitz's seminar in Berlin. In 1933 he published his book *Sophocles*. Reinhardt, as Hugh Lloyd-Jones has pointed out, can be understood as the intellectual child of an (unholy) marriage of Wilamowitz and Hofmannsthal, with Nietzsche and Stefan George as godparents.³⁶ (We would want to add Heidegger into the mix, and note that since Nietzsche taught Reinhardt's father, there is also some unhealthily incestuous intellectual propagation here). Reinhardt was fascinated by the relation between god and man in Sophocles, and sought to escape 'the dryness and materialism into which the dominance of historicism had led German scholarship'.³⁷ His own statement of purpose, as is normal for the period, is lapidary but telling. His book is 'an attempt to examine Sophocles' work by means of comparisons, in order to rescue it from certain prevalent methods of interpretation which succeed only in obscuring it'.³⁸ He aims to read the plays to uncover 'the relationship between god and man and man and man . . . as it develops scene by scene and play by play'.³⁹ In this bare manifesto he is both setting himself against the fragmentation, the linguistic focus, and the historical approach of the most traditional commitments of the commentary, and also aligning himself with the more extensive statements of principle of the New Criticism in America. Reinhardt aimed not to explore the author's biography as a means of access to meaning, nor the reader's sentiments, but the work's structure, its 'objective form'. 'Coherence', 'integration' and 'form' became the watchwords, and Reinhardt's work helped establish the critical agenda for the next forty years.

H. D. F. Kitto, for example, in England in 1933 (with new editions in 1950 and 1960, and still in print), wrote trenchantly in his book *Greek Tragedy*: 'A book on Greek tragedy may be a work of historical scholarship or of literary criticism; this book professes to be a work of literary criticism. Criticism is of two kinds: the critic may tell the reader what he so beautifully thinks about it all; or he may try to explain the form in which the literature is written. This book attempts the latter.'⁴⁰ The oppositions of Kitto's prose are strongly articulated, as ever. He dismissed the historicism of a Wilamowitz, the sentiment of a Ruskin or Pater, in the name of 'form'.

³⁶ Lloyd-Jones in Reinhardt (1979) xv–xxviii. ³⁷ Reinhardt (1979) xvi.

³⁸ Reinhardt (1979) ix. ³⁹ Reinhardt (1979) I. ⁴⁰ Kitto (1960) v.