

**Adapting Antiquity: A Study of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Elektra in the Context of his Times.**

***By: Jason J. Berning***

**Abstract:**

Oftentimes it has been not antiquity itself but that which antiquity has inspired that reaches us. I would like to suggest that the *Elektra* of 1903 was written as a *Hofmannsthalean* characterization of the state of the turn-of-the-century intellectually climate in reaction to its recent follies and crises. I shall briefly sketch Hugo von Hofmannsthal's formative years, his transitional crises, and his philosophy of life thereby seeking to illuminate his reaction to *fin-de-siècle* Vienna. The *Elektra* is a work pivotal in Hofmannsthal's career. I then offer a critical examination of the text in the context of the secondary literature. I conclude that Hofmannsthal, like Sophocles and the tradition before his, wrote his *Elektra* with the intention of symbolizing the predicament of the day, and that he sought to speak out to the people of 1903 standing upon the shoulders of tradition having framed his message within the skeleton of the mythical House of Atreus in a way similar to that of Sophocles in 413 BC.

### ***Inheriting Antiquity...***

Greek antiquity stands illuminated as a pillar in the history of Western thought. Many thinkers and poets have been fascinated by its light. Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* was not seeking to capture the essence of the Greeks in any way, but to present a modern expression parallel in majesty. He said himself of the modern attitude towards antiquity, "*Wenn Philologen Alterthumskenner usw. für die unbedingte Erhaltung des Alten sorgen, so muss auch eine Instanz da sein, die unbedingt für das Lebendige sorgt.*" ("If Philologists, scholars of antiquity, etc. look after the unconditional preservation of antiquity, so too there must necessarily be an instance there looking out for the living")<sup>1</sup>. Although it was originally subtitled "*frei nach Sophocles*", many have since felt even this unnecessary. While Hofmannsthal closely adapted the Sophoclean structure in his drama, he all but forgot the content of the original. His modern reworking of the Electra-myth is entirely his own. Well, it is as much his own as any adaptation can be. It was Hofmannsthal's habit, and also a common practice of his day, to take up and rework the great material of the Western literary tradition. Hofmannsthal was looking back to the tragedies of Greek antiquity through the many lenses of his intellectual inheritance. His *Elektra* was primarily influenced by those of Goethe, Nietzsche, Freud, and Bahr. Although the *Elektra* was not his only Sophoclean adaptation and Sophocles not the only ancient tragedian from whom he drew inspiration, it is among his works, as we shall see, of special importance. I believe it to be useful to begin with a brief introduction to the *Elektra* material by which Hofmannsthal was inspired.

### ***The Myth in the Golden Age of Tragedy...***

The Electra myth is a tragic tale of accursed inter-familial murder stemming from the Athenian tragic tradition.<sup>2</sup> Sophocles' *Elektra* begins with Orestes having recently returned to Mycenae plotting to avenge his father and with Electra having mourned her father's murder daily for years awaiting the homecoming of her brother Orestes. It is a tale describing the last stages of the curses of the House of Tantalus of Mycenae.<sup>3</sup> Traditionally, Iphigenie had been sacrificed by her father Agamemnon in order that the Greek ships bound for Troy held at Aulis by Artemis might sail. To avenge her death Clytemnestra in her rage together with Aegisthus her lover and former king of Mycenae slaughtered Agamemnon in his bath on the eve of his homecoming from Troy. It is the playing out of the ancient understanding of justice as retributive. Essentially, the story is concerned with Electra's mourning, her oppression at the hands of her mother and step-father, her conflicts with her sister Chrysothemis and mother Clytemnestra, Orestes' return, and the fulfillment of the Pythian prophecy, which had said balance would be brought back to the House of Atreus through Orestes' deed. Before the Sophoclean version of 413 BC, upon which Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* is freely based, the story had been told by Aeschylus in his *Oresteia*, Euripides in his *Elektra* of 418 BC, and also (possibly) in the earlier tragic tradition.<sup>4</sup>

In the golden age of Athenian tragedy the poets Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles spoke through shaping already ancient myths into tragedies as was fitting to their themes and concerns. Sophocles adopted from the mythical tradition the characters Agamemnon and Clytemnestra; their four daughters: Iphigenie, Electra, Iphianassa (mentioned by Homer), and Chrysothemis; their son, Orestes; his companions, Pylades and Paedagogus; and Agamemnon's cousin and Clytemnestra's lover, Aegisthus. Sophocles is concerned primarily with retributive justice. Throughout there is a constant struggle for justification between Electra and Chrysothemis concerning the appropriateness of Electra's mourning, and between Electra and Clytemnestra concerning latter's justification for the murder of Agamemnon due to his having sacrificed her daughter. The death of Agamemnon's murderers brings balance to the House, but Sophocles does not concern himself with the moral consequences of the matricide.

Within the established plot and with the established characters, it is the responsibility of the poet to adapt the myth to his poetic expression. Sophocles was not as moralistically interested as Aeschylus had been fifty years earlier. He was speaking to a

different time. Aeschylus was speaking to Athenians having returned triumphantly from the battle of Salamis at the height of her glory. Sophocles had been on there as a boy of fifteen. His *Electra*, however, was written in the same year as the disastrous Sicilian expedition and just eight years before the collapse of the Athenian Empire. It has been argued that his *Electra* was written as a response to Euripides, who broke often and radically—especially in his *Electra*—from the established norms and interests of Athenian society. Sophocles personally exemplified the Athenian mold. He wrote his *Electra* at the ripe age of 82 in order to demonstrate his well-established abilities while expressing the correctness and importance of justice.<sup>5</sup> “I’ll see to it that your death is bitter pain./Such punishment should justly come to all/who carry on their lives outside the law./Kill them all!”<sup>6</sup> Throughout the next twenty-three centuries the main themes of the *Electra*, and occasionally the work itself, were adopted and adapted by poets and their historical currents.<sup>7</sup> Arguably the next poet after Sophocles to significantly and radically reshape the *Electra*-myth and its woes and concerns to those of his day is our primary interest. The 1903 *Elektra*, a reworking of the Sophoclean original by Hugo von Hofmannsthal—a work of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna and the flagship poet of *Wiener Moderne*.

Hofmannsthal turned to the Greek tragic tradition in his first attempt after his turn-of-the-century crisis of language to produce a drama for the stage. The fourth century in Athens had been an era during which he felt poets had fulfilled their social responsibility. Hofmannsthal hoped his *Elektra* would be for him and his time what the *Electra* of Sophocles had been for him and his—a poet speaking to his world. It was immensely popular and ran in several languages across Europe for several years. *Das Burgtheater* in Wien, which now runs a multitude of Hofmannsthal’s plays as exemplary of the Austrian cultural heritage, refused to produce the premiere of the *Elektra*. It was not on his Vienna that Elektra’s screams first fell. It was in Berlin, the cultural and political antagonist of Vienna, under Max Reinhardt *im Berliner Kleinen Theater* on the 30th of October, 1903 that it was first produced.

During the creation of his own *Elektra*, it seems that Hofmannsthal nearly forgot about Sophocles.<sup>8</sup> Except for the outer shell of the plot, Hofmannsthal is not interested in Sophocles’ intentions. Similarly, Sophocles himself had sought to distance himself from the content of the adaptations of Euripides and Aeschylus. There is a greater temporal distance between Hofmannsthal and Sophocles than there had been between Sophocles and Euripides and Aeschylus. Hofmannsthal spoke honestly of his relation to antiquity when he said, “*Wir behandeln die Antike als einen magischen Spiegel, aus dem wir unsere eigene Gestalt in fremder gereinigter Erscheinung zu empfangen hoffen.*” (“We use antiquity as a magic mirror out of which we hope to catch our own image in a foreign and cleansed appearance”)<sup>9</sup>. He is seeking an *Elektra* for his time. He sees himself and his peers (*die Spätgeborenen*) as standing at the end of an age—*fin-de-siècle*. “*Hofmannsthal schafft als Künstler, der weiss, was er der Tradition verdankt*” (“Hofmannsthal creates as an artist who knows what he has the tradition to be thankful for”).<sup>10</sup> He wrote his *Elektra* not pretending to offer an account of antiquity but for the spirit of his time—a time which esteemed Greek mythology (e.g. Freud’s *Ödipuskomplex*) and antiquity insofar as it could be made to speak to them and be spoken through.<sup>11</sup> In the course of reading Sophocles’ *Electra* a creative spark awoke him inspiring his own *Elektra*. An *Elektra* built on ancient ground out of modern material with modern concerns—*ein Überhistorisches*—an attempt at expressing the nature and importance of *Existenz* and discussing *das Lebensproblem*.<sup>12</sup>

### **Thesis:**

It is agreed that Hofmannsthal’s *Elektra* is the product of the atmosphere of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna and his modernity.<sup>13</sup> I would like to suggest that not only is it the product of this atmosphere, but that it was written as a *Hofmannsthalean* characterization of the state of the turn-of-the-century intellectual climate in reaction to its recent follies and crises.<sup>14</sup> Its characters are not intended to represent individual persons; but rather, they are statically portrayed as symbols of ideas and movements, which Hofmannsthal judged to be inadequate to accomplish the transition from what he termed *Präexistenz* to a genuine *Existenz*.<sup>15</sup> The House of Atreus as a whole, in its accursed and paralyzed state, stands for the state of Europe tense and confused in the light of recent epoch shattering progress. Elektra is the voice and memory of its noble past; in her concern for the past she loses her *Self*. Klytämnestra is the voice of its hysteric, aesthetic, and neurotic present. The responsibility for her lot weighs on her like a crippling disease.

Chrysothemis lives on as the voice of the (less noble) future of the House of Atreus. She represents those simply unwilling to acknowledge their abhorrent realities, neither responsible for the state of their realities nor existing in accordance with some or another code or school of thought. The atmosphere of the time is prevalent throughout. Three dominant aspects saturating the intellectual climate of the day, especially from Hofmannsthal's Viennese perspective, were the psychoanalytic theories of Drs. Breuer and Freud, the modern European acceptance of the Greek poetry as the norm of excellence with each generation continually seeking to re-conjure its greatness in its own new way,<sup>16</sup> and the schools of Symbolism and Aestheticism seeking a divorce of language, beauty, and life from reality. He saw the whole of the Western intellectual tradition as his bag of tricks to draw from. Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* is steeped in the intellectual discussions of his day. He, like many before him, was drawn to Greek antiquity. Adopting works and material from the literary tradition as they suited him and adapting them to his current concerns and positions was a habit of Hofmannsthal throughout his life.<sup>17</sup>

Specifically, I would like to examine the *Elektra* macroscopically focusing on Hofmannsthal's poetic expression as it was determined by his times. The time period from 1901-1903 as he was writing the *Elektra* was of significance to his development as well as to the development of the European intellectual community. The turn-of-the-century crises of language, cognition, and identity had been the catalytic spark in his transitioning from youthful *Präexistenz* to the genuine *Existenz*. Looking first at each of his *präexistentiell* characterizations in themselves and then most importantly in terms of their positioning and contribution to the dramatized state of the House of Atreus, I would like to suggest that Hofmannsthal is speaking poetically through the members and state of the House of Atreus to the educated populace of *fin-de-siècle* Europe concerning the existential insufficiency of their ways of life.

### ***The Poet's Life:***

In arguing that the *Elektra* is a characterization of the atmosphere of his day in reaction to aspects he found insufficient, it is important to establish an understanding of Hofmannsthal's understanding of his day, its insufficiencies, and that which Hofmannsthal understood (idealized) to be sufficient. This brief sketch of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's formative years, his transitional crises, and philosophy of life seeks to illuminate his reaction to *fin-de-siècle* Vienna as he emerged into a societally-minded maturity that would dominate his remaining life and energies.

Hugo von Hofmannsthal was born on the 1<sup>st</sup> of February 1874 directly in the wake of the 1873 Vienna Stock Market Crash, which may be seen as responsible for the "demise of political liberalism in Vienna" and a significant signpost of a dying empire.<sup>18</sup> Although his family would have suffered financially, the crash had little direct influence on his childhood. He was raised in an upper-middle class Viennese family with all of the according comfort, refinement, and *Ausbildung*. Werner Volke, Hofmannsthal's biographer, describes the von Hofmannsthal family saying: "*sie fühlten sich in der Provinz nie wohl, dort wehe die Wirklichkeit zu stark und deshalb hätten sie sich in Wien angesiedelt.*" ("They never felt comfortable in the Province; there reality ruled too strongly, and they therefore migrated to Vienna.")<sup>19</sup> Hofmannsthal's later life philosophy and poetic energies would seek at all costs to find a grounding in reality—a grounding from a Viennese perspective. Both the von Hofmannsthal family and *fin-de-siècle* Vienna were at home in an atmosphere freed of a terrible (considering the circumstances) rooted-ness. Vienna would be his home throughout his life, and he always remained in close correspondence with his parents. Hofmannsthal himself described his childhood in his autobiographical sketches *Ad me ipsum*, "*Kindheit: bis zum 10<sup>ten</sup> Lebensjahr. Vorfahren Stadt, Landschaft.—Dann die ersten Irrtümer und Komplikationen, aber das Kind noch bleibend. Die Kindheit als Spiegelung der Sehnsucht... Alles Vorbereitung, Hindeutung*" ("Childhood: until 10<sup>th</sup> year. Exemplary ancestry, city, landscape.—Then the first mistakes and complications, but still remaining a child. The childhood as a reflection of desire... Everything preparation, indication."<sup>20</sup> Hofmannsthal was born into a world feeling the wake of its crashing, a family hovering happily above reality, and very young he himself felt the gravity of his situation.

His literary career can be divided into three periods: his *Frühzeit* (1881-ca.1902) as a lyric poet associated with the circles

of the aesthetic French symbolists under Stephan George, his *Reifezeit* (ca. 1902-1919) under the guidance of Hermann Bahr during which he expressed a certain societal-interestedness first manifest in his dramas and later in his propagandistic political writings, and his *Spätzeit* (1919-1929) during which he struggled to find a place in a shattered world working to rebuild the foundations of an idealized Austrian cultural heritage. Between his *Frühzeit* and *Reifezeit* was a time of transition not only for Hofmannsthal but for the *literati* across Europe. The crises of language, cognition, and identity find their most universal expression in *'Der Brief' des Lord Chandos* (1902). Each of these four periods of his life are easily separated and characterized by the poet's attitude and expression. It is difficult to find a unity spanning his works, which vary drastically in genre, setting, attitude, and expression throughout his life, although Hofmannsthal himself wrote that he saw them as *"eine formidabile Einheit"* ("a formidable unity"). The best attempts assert that he is addressing the fundamental philosophic questions of human existence in the language of poetry throughout his life.<sup>21</sup> We are here concerned with the aesthetic symbolism of his youth and its divorcing of language from its referent reality for the sake of pure beauty, the resulting crises of language, cognition, and identity; and Hofmannsthal's emergence in the *Elektra* as a professional poet seeking to fulfill the social responsibility of the poet as mediator with the beautiful thereby fulfilling the transitioning in his own life philosophy.

In 1890 at the age of 16 writing under the pen name Loris, Hofmannsthal was introduced to the circle of *Junges Wien* congregating at the famous Café Griensteidl. It was through contact with the symbolist poet Stefan George that Hofmannsthal first became acquainted with the aesthetic school of French symbolism. He quickly found fame through the beauty of his verses and at the age of 17 was already established across Europe as a lyric poet, although he was always skeptical of aestheticism as a way of life as is easily seen in his early lyric dramas.<sup>22</sup> In spite of this skepticism, the mellifluous verses of his youth seeking to suckle the fountain of beauty are still what he is most famous for. Herman Bahr once said that in order to ensure himself a place among the greatest poets of all-time Hofmannsthal should have died at the age of 25.<sup>23</sup>

As beautiful and pleasurable as these verses were, "the Symbolist striving to divorce the language of the poem from everyday language, to make of poetic language an element more comparable to musical tones than to language used as a tool of communication...must be seen in retrospect as a dangerous enterprise."<sup>24</sup> The aesthetes of symbolism (as well as those locked away in other ivory towers) were divorcing their verses and their lives from the context of their societal and historical realities. The divorce continued in uncontrollable and catastrophic proportions. *"Es zerfiel mir alles in Teile, die Teile wieder in Teile, und nichts mehr ließ sich mit einem Begriff umspannen."* ("Everything fell into fragments for me, the fragments into further fragments, until it seemed impossible at all to contain anything at all within a single concept").<sup>25</sup> Language, words, sentences, abstract ideas, and beauty which had all been theirs to command slipped through their fingers. Hofmannsthal's *'Der Brief' des Lord Chandos* (1902) is seen as an epitomizing and universal expression these turn-of-the-century crises. *"Mein Fall ist, in Kürze, dieser: Es ist mir völlig die Fähigkeit abhanden gekommen, über irgend etwas zusammenhängend zu denken oder zu sprechen."* ("My situation, in short, is this: I have utterly lost my ability to think or speak coherently about anything at all").<sup>26</sup>

The turn-of-the-century crises of language, cognition, and identity are summed up in these words of Lord Chandos. Walter Jens clearly and starkly stresses the importance of the Chandos letter to German literature saying:

*Erst 1901 [1902!]<sup>27</sup> trennen sich "damals" und "jetzt", das "Ich" verliert vor dem Zugriff des "Ist" seine Macht, das Object entzieht sich dem Subjekt, der Gegenstand bestimmt die Person und beraubt den Autor seiner "Schöpfer"-Funktion, die Realität scheint nicht mehr mit der gewohnten Sprache zu bannen, die Einheit zerfällt...*

First in 1901 [1902!] is "then" separated from "now", the "Ego" lost its power through the intervention of the "Is", the object withdrew from the subject, the object determined the person and robbed the author of his "creative"-function, reality appears not to be captivated any more by common language, unity decayed...<sup>28</sup>

The Chandos letter marks the coming of a new age in German literature. After this crisis Hofmannsthal could not return to the language and verse of his youth. He wrote few poems and no more lyric dramas in his later life. The revelations of his youth concerning his own stance towards *Existenz* became urgent. His life and the focus of his career changed as we see in his *Elektra*.

The *Elektra* was the first dramatic work produced after this time of transition. The *Elektra* was written in reaction to the aestheticism of his youth and the continued brash *Sozialgleichgültigkeit*<sup>29</sup> of his contemporaries. At the age of twenty in 1894 serving a voluntary year in the imperial cavalry, Hofmannsthal had realized *eine komplexe, wortlose Lehre* (maxim) that would change the direction of his life and the focus of his works entirely. “*Ins Leben kommt ein Mensch dadurch, daß er etwas tut*” (“A man comes into life through doing something”).<sup>30</sup> Seven years passed between the revelation of his military days and *Elektra's* appearance. It has been asserted that this slow transition can be recognized progressively in *Der Märchen der 672. Nacht* (*The Fairy-tale of the 672<sup>nd</sup> Night*), *Der Reitersgeschichte* (*The Cavalier's Story*), *Berkwerk von Faulen* (*The Mine of Faulen*), and ‘*Der Brief*’ des Lord Chandos) (*The Letter*’ of Lord Chandos).<sup>31</sup> Hofmannsthal had gradually sought a shift in his focus from 1894-1902. The crisis of language was the catalytic stimulus, which awoke Hofmannsthal to the urgency of his transitioning. At the same time he wrote “*Die Worte zerfielen mir im Munde wie modrige Pilze*” (“*The words fell apart in my mouth like molding mushrooms.*”).<sup>32</sup> An age ended, a new one began, and it became clear to Hofmannsthal that the language of his youth was not sufficient to express the rooted essence of things.<sup>33</sup>

Hofmannsthal's philosophy of life consisted of two stages: un-genuine *Präexistenz* and genuine *Existenz*. It is a philosophy intimately connected to the concepts of the deed, memory, and self-definition and encompassed all aspects of selfhood. He said in his autobiographical sketches, “*Präexistenz. Glorreicher, aber gefährlicher Zustand*” (“*Präexistenz* a glorious but dangerous condition”).<sup>34</sup> People grow up in a preparatory state of *Präexistenz*. Some are never capable of transitioning. During this time they are capable of gloriously feeling the magnitude and overwhelming beauty of life. Their Selves, however, lack in the definition necessary to engage in life fulfillingly. Those trapped in *Präexistenz* lack in the rooted-ness necessary to engage the horrors and tragedies of themselves and their realities as well as the beauty. One trapped in an immature state of *Präexistenz* when bombarded by life is in danger of losing his own identity—a dissolution of Self. The *Elektra* is concerned throughout with a dissolution of the Self. In time the human faculty of memory and the ability to act consciously under the guidance of a well-intending and matured mind (for those *able and willing* to develop such) can combine so that an individual becomes grounded through a thoughtful deed, which contributes to the defining of the Self and to the community. Willing is of primary significance because the transition and its consequences (i.e. recognizing, admitting to, and being engaged in reality) are not easy. Additionally there are other deterrents. Speaking of his own situation and what he believed to be a universal condition of the transitioning Hofmannsthal said, “*Die magische Herrschaft über das Wort das Bild das Zeichen darf nicht aus der Prä-existenz in die Existenz hinübergenommen werden.*” (“*The magical command over the word, the picture, and the symbol may not be brought over out of the Prä-existenz into the Existenz.*”).<sup>35</sup> The Self's definition is bound to the faculties of language and expression. A transitioning from youthful frolicking through life irrespective of reality and consequence (especially the youth of Hofmannsthal) into the harsh realities of a world torn and suffering and seeing the depths of tragic disturbance within oneself is about as inviting as the House of Atreus of Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*. Yet *Elektra's* home is precisely as it is because each and every member of whom it consists has failed in this transitioning.

Hofmannsthal's own transition can be seen over the course of nearly a decade. Although he had realized the essential nature of the deed in the transitioning into genuine *Existenz* as early as 1894, he had required the turn-of-the-century crises as the catalyst leading to his realization that the language and style of his youth could not be carried over. His autobiographical sketches also highlight a revelation concerning the nature of the deed around this time and are intimately tied to the character of *Elektra*. “*Tun ist sich aufgeben durch Tat*” (“To act is to give oneself up through the deed into the whole”).<sup>36</sup> In order for one to act in an existential manner, one must give themselves up into the deed being performed. The dallying and doodling of the *präexistentiell* person is not action (*Tun*) due to the lack of self-awareness (i.e. the lack of giving of oneself), which can be found only in a rooted-self-defining deed. Any distancing (consciously or unconsciously) of oneself from the reality of struggles, pains, and crises (internal or external) is a dissolving of the Self's rooted bond to the world. The schools of symbolism and aestheticism of Hofmannsthal's youth had epitomized such a divorce from reality. Genuine *Existenz* consists not only in the active acknowledging of reality, but also of an engaged acting towards its betterment. Both the potato farmer and the creative writer can partake in *Existenz* through their

deeds so long as they each do so for the sake of their own self-definition and the community and are not avoiding the nature of their realities in the process of their undertakings.

### ***Hofmannsthal's Personal Transition & Society***

The *Elektra* was written as Hugo von Hofmannsthal was completing his own transition from *Präexistenz* to *Existenz*. The deed is the pivotal difference between *Präexistenz* and *Existenz* in that it is that which roots man to life. Only through acting and being rooted in life can one develop fully as a person and partake in *Existenz*. As a poet and nobleman, Hofmannsthal was not about to run out to the fields and ground himself in the meaningful and rooting activity of growing food, although through the voice of Lord Chandos he did express an idealized wonder and recognition of the sublime in the most simple.<sup>37</sup> Besides, Hofmannsthal the elitist would only consider performing the action of the most privileged perspective (i.e. that of the creative writer). Perhaps this is why Hofmannsthal unlike Chandos continued out of his crisis pen in hand.

It was in this spirit that Hofmannsthal developed his social ideology: *Das Soziale*. *Das Soziale* refers to the social dimension of human life, including the relation of the fully developed individual personality to others and the integration of the individual in the complex structures of the wider community (to which the creative writer stands in a relationship of special responsibility).<sup>38</sup> The creative writer is responsible for mediating between society and the Beautiful. *Das Soziale* is Hofmannsthal's programmatic interest in society for the sake of the poet's need to act and partake in life.

In order to understand Hofmannsthal's conception of *das Soziale*, it is important to keep in mind that he was a Platonist throughout his life. He believed that in art momentary glimpses of perfection were to be seen scattered like meteorites across this world which partook in the higher realm of spirit. He spent his youth in the endless pursuit of the sublime. Divorcing his mellifluous verses from reality, he had lived by the motto of the French symbolists and the Viennese aesthetics: *l'art pour l'art* among the privileged refusing to consider their societal context.<sup>39</sup> His Neo-Platonism was also a determinate in his societal-mindedness. He believed it was the poet's task, as mediator, to create for his audience, through his imaginative powers, a momentary vision of the spiritual world, the same spiritual world he had been fascinated by in his youth.<sup>40</sup> He was aware of the limited nature of his intentions. Hofmannsthal defined *das Soziale* as "*ein paar tausend Menschen, in den großen europäischen Städten verstreut*" who praised "*das Privilegium dieser geistigen Freimaurerei und ihre besondere Empfindlichkeit*" ("... a few thousand people spread across the great European cities" who praised "the privilege of this intellectual masonry and their special sensitivity.").<sup>41</sup> He saw these few thousand privileged and educated people as Europe. Since they went to the theater, the theater was the place to speak to Europe. He wanted to change the world on stage, to reach out to *das Soziale*.<sup>42</sup>

Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* is his own. He said of the revitalization of literature, "*Wir müssen uns den Schauer des Mythos neu schaffen. Aus dem Blut wieder Schatten aufsteigen lassen.*"<sup>43</sup> Hofmannsthal struggled to find material for his works. He said that the inspiration for his poetry came from an internal rhythm of life (*Lebensrhythmus*) ungraspable with words and that through a collision with external material the fog of inspiration crystallized into poetry.<sup>44</sup> It was not only from Greek antiquity, but from every period of European literature accessible to him that Hofmannsthal drew. He was exceptionally well read. In questioning the necessity of Greek tragedy to be the vehicle conveying the poetic expression of the 1903 *Elektra* Elisabeth Steingruber said, "*tätige Weltzugewandheit und Gebundensein und verpflichtende und schicksalsbestimmende Mächte, das sind..., die Hofmannsthal zur antiken Tragödie hinziehen*" ("A turnedness-towards-the-world and bounded-being and responsible and fate-determined powers are what pulled Hofmannsthal to ancient tragedy.").<sup>45</sup> Boundness to life and interest in the world were intimate concerns of Hofmannsthal at this time and played significant roles in his life-philosophy.

His *Elektra* is a modern reworking of the *Electra-material*, not a translation of Sophocles. In adapting Sophocles Hofmannsthal retained only the external scene progression.<sup>46</sup> However, he does so with an amazing consistency. The four main dialogues and the closing scene as well as the setting are Sophoclean. This implies a desire on the part of Hofmannsthal to be educated by Sophocles on the technique of constructing drama. The *Elektra* was the first drama written in the spirit of this changing

focus. Hofmannsthal, with his sense for constancy [*Treue*] and eye for the Enduring [*Bleibende*] seeks to learn from the greatest example available.<sup>47</sup> Drama became the new primary mode of expression for this renowned lyric poet after his transitioning into genuine *Existenz* and its corresponding societal-mindedness.

Hofmannsthal, like Goethe in his *Iphigenie* before him, adapts his *Elektra* to his day in an attempt to re-conjure the alluring and mystical powers of the revered ancient Greeks.<sup>48</sup> Whereas Goethe's had been an age of purity and humanism, Hofmannsthal's Vienna was a decadent metropolis, the center of a failing empire, and the nest of Freudian psychoanalytic theory. According to E.M. Butler, Nietzsche, appalled with the happy, pretty, noble interpretations of Goethe, the 18<sup>th</sup> century humanists, and *die deutsche Klassik* in general, had charged the up and coming German youth with the task of creating a new mythology for Germany. Butler sees Sigmund Freud as the primary Nietzschean myth maker of the day. Freud looked into the depths of Greek tragedy and saw the deepest, darkest, most horrible parts of himself staring back at him. Hofmannsthal kept abreast with Freud's work throughout his life. While he wrote his *Elektra* he had been reading *Studien über die Hysterie* and framing the context of the similarities between the psychoanalytic talking cure and Greek tragedy as cathartic. Goethe's interpretation<sup>49</sup> of the essence of Greek tragedy in his *Iphigenie auf Tauris*—that honesty is the best policy, the good and fully human king will do the right thing, and everything will work out wonderfully in the end—is outdated after Nietzsche, Freud, and Bahr. Hofmannsthal later wrote that he had sought to create in his *Elektra* something to counter balance Goethe's *Iphigenie*, something to which Goethe's words "*Verteufelt human*"<sup>50</sup> did not fit. Just five years earlier his 1898 adaptation of Euripides' *Alkestis*, an essay in adaptation, had been written in the spirit of Goethe's Greece. Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* is a more mature product of the atmosphere of turn-of-the-century Vienna.

The parallels between Goethe, Nietzsche, Freud, and Hofmannsthal offered by E.M. Butler, asserting that *Elektra* is an extension of the corpus of Freudian mythology, are reasonable and insightful. Unfortunately due to the inherent limits of early 20<sup>th</sup> century British classicism, he is unable to travel further down the path of Freudian mythology he has uncovered and discards the *Elektra* in the end as a specialist's work intelligible only to the minds of analysts and analysants living under the "black sun" of Viennese psychoanalytic theory and as a failure in adapting Greek tragedy—its universal roots having been severed, as he sees it. It seems odd that Butler, who was clearly in favor of the Nietzschean reinterpretation of antiquity, would discard the Freudian psychoanalytic myth, which he had asserted to be the fulfillment of the Nietzschean charge, as "a long, painful, humiliating treatment" [pointless is implied].<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, if we are willing to proceed a bit further, the gate Butler<sup>52</sup> opened in a clear and intelligent manner might lead us down an interesting and fruitful path through Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*, a *fin-de-siècle* conjuring of the spirit of ancient Greece.

There has been a reasonable amount of scholarship done in the investigation of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*. Like most strains of Hofmannsthal scholarship, the *Elektra* is most often looked at in the context of its genre within Hofmannsthal's writings (i.e. within the context his Sophoclean adaptations or ancient Greek tragedies or theatre in general).<sup>53</sup> These studies generally investigate each work separately seeking to draw a unifying thread throughout. Others have investigated a single theme throughout, the most common of these being the influence of Freud and psychoanalysis on the *Elektra*,<sup>54</sup> although there are also several insightful studies on the portrayal of the woman.<sup>55</sup> Other studies concerning Hofmannsthal are done generally independent of any specific work on his development as an author, his role in the historical context of literature, his writings expressing his turn-of-the-century crisis, his political writings, and his late writings concerned with the conception of the Austrian cultural heritage.

This paper seeks to combine the arguments concerned with the development of his life and his social context with those investigating a specific work or specific themes within a specific work. Hofmannsthal's life development and his literary development are inextricably bound. A turning to the specific and insightful interpretations of other scholars bearing in mind our thoughtful consideration of Hofmannsthal's life development, his life philosophy, and his societal mindedness will lead to an understanding of the *Elektra* rooted in the context of Hofmannsthal and his time.

Numerous studies have been done concerning each of the above mentioned trains of thought. Of specific interest to us here

are those of Elisabeth Steingruber, Walter Jens, and Lorna Martens. When Steingruber suggests the theme of *Elektra* is “*die Tat. Zwei Taten sind es, welche auf zwei Pole wirken, um die herum sich alles anordnet, und zwischen denen sich das ganze Drama erspannt...*” (“... the Deed. Two deeds, which act as two poles around which everything orders itself and between which the entire drama spans itself...”) <sup>56</sup>, we must inquire as to the significance of *the Deed* to Hofmannsthal at this time. It was the deciding factor in the transition of his own *philosophy of life* from *Präexistenz* to *Existenz*. When Walter Jens says that there is a connection between Hofmannsthal’s *Elektra* and antiquity because “*Hofmannsthal den antiken Mythos brauchte, um etwas anders nicht mehr Sagbares im Gleichnis dramatischen Spiels zu erklären...*” (Hofmannsthal needed the ancient myth in order to explain something else—no longer sayable—in the parable of the dramatic game”) and that “*Er hat lediglich die mit Aischylos beginnende Entwicklung zu Ende geführt, statt der Aufgabe, die bedrohte Welt wiederherzustellen, das Grundthema unterlegt: zu sich selbst zu finden*” (“He completed the development that had been begun with Aeschylus... rather than presenting the task to repair the threatened world, laying down the basic theme to find the way to the Self “), <sup>57</sup> we must ask if we agree with this and turn therein to an investigation of the state of the individual’s identification of Self in our reading of the *Elektra*. Hofmannsthal said himself that all of his Greek dramas were concerned with the dissolution of the self. Jens also suggests that Hofmannsthal has a role in the continuum of Western thought (i.e. at least in the progression of the Electra-myth). Steingruber and Jens were each considering the *Elektra* within the context of Hofmannsthal’s turning to Greek antiquity in their discussion of the *Elektra*’s main themes and Hofmannsthal’s place within the literary tradition.

In Lorna Martens’ discussion of *Repressed Memory* <sup>58</sup> we recognize the third element of our argument: repressed memory. We are confronted here by Hofmannsthal’s discussions with Herman Bahr concerning the interrelatedness of Freudian psychoanalysis and Greek tragedy with each seeking the cathartic release of bound up memories. It is most likely through Bahr that the Freudian and Nietzschean interpretations of antiquity were introduced to Hofmannsthal. Martens feels that the discussions between Hofmannsthal and Bahr during this time concerning the psychoanalysis and Greek tragedy to be extremely relevant in a reading of Hofmannsthal’s *Elektra*. Bahr too had produced a book, *Dialog vom Tragischen* (1903), during this time concerning precisely these themes.

In speaking to the people in a way which mediated between them and art, Hofmannsthal was *acting* as a poet fulfilling the responsibility of his rootedness in his genuine *Existenz* through speaking to *das Soziale* of the importance overcoming the imprisoning states of *Präexistenz* portrayed by Elektra, Klytämnestra, and Chrysothemis. His rooted societal interestedness is manifested in the message he is negatively expressing in his drama through his exaggerated portrayal of *Präexistenz* and its consequences. David Miles said that essentially Hofmannsthal is looking at, “what is to him life’s deepest moral dilemma: the problem of reconciling the need to remember with the need to forget”. <sup>59</sup> A struggle between remembering and forgetting is characteristic of humanity and bound up in both the ideas of constancy (memory) and action (requiring a degree of forgetting, i.e. disengaging from the past so as to engage in the present). For Hofmannsthal *deed* and *constancy* are the paradoxically combined elements fundamental to the state of genuine *Existenz*. An issue of centrality in the *Elektra* is the contrasting of memory and deed—Elektra and Orest. All of the contrasting pairs in Hofmannsthal’s *Elektra* stand fixed without flowing over into each other. Elektra does not give Orest the axe, and Orest does not consider the state of the House or his hatred of his mother as does Elektra. Each sees the other, but there is no fusion of the two.

Hofmannsthal himself struggled to put the *Elektra* in its place within the greater whole of his (in his opinion) unified works. He commented on the play “*im Tagebuch, in den ‘Aufzeichnungen zu Reden in Skandinavien’, im ‘Ad me ipsum’ und an vielen und anderen Stellen,*” <sup>60</sup> often offering different or conflicting interpretations. For our purpose one of the comments he made in ‘*Aufzeichnungen zu Reden in Skandinavien*’ is of special importance: “*Die drei Frauengestalten sind mir wie die Schattierungen eines intensiven und heimlichen Farbtones gleichzeitig aufgegangen.*” (“The three female figures appeared to me simultaneously as the shades of an intense and secrete color.”). <sup>61</sup> According to Hofmannsthal, Elektra, Klytämnestra, and Chrysothemis are all bound to one another. He was fond of speaking of things in terms of unities. These unities is easily recognized but difficult to describe. They

are each reactions to the same circumstance. The instant they are reacting to is concretely Agamemnon's murder. They are all three trapped in themselves and pinned down by each other. Chrysothemis says to Elektra:

*Du bist es, die mit Eisenklammern mich an den Boden schmiedet.*

You it is who have welded me to the ground with iron clamps.<sup>62</sup>

Elektra says to Klytämnestra:

*Ich weiß nicht, wie ich jemals sterben sollte—  
Als daran, daß du stirbst.*

I know not how, unless you die before me,  
I should have leave to die.<sup>63</sup>

And it is apparent throughout that if Elektra were not there as a reminder to Klytämnestra and Aegisth of their deed that they would sleep quieter at night. The three women are then bound to one another and binding each other in their places. Similarly the *präexistentiell* denials of reality represented by each figure, although different and seemingly independent of each other, are also bound to each other. The intensive and secretive color Elektra, Klytämnestra, and Chrysothemis shadow is the nature of the insufficiency of his contemporaries, which Hofmannsthal, seeing himself as having changed—grown-up, is reacting to.

Seeing the past as leading up to the present requires the empirical and objective past leading up to the present and also a subjective recalling and recognition of the past through memory. Acknowledging the agreement between the two is essential to *self-identity*. Nowhere in the *Elektra* does Hofmannsthal set the stage in such a way that is disruptive of the laws of time. Since the laws of time apply to the *Elektra*, all warping and misconstruing of time must take place in the subjective memories of the characters. Each subjective individual has the ability to recall to mind the past either as she remembers it having happened or as she wishes it would have been. The former is simply an honest but inaccurate recalling of past memory. The latter is (conscious) dreaming and if continued or intensified will be of dire consequences. Through seeking to deny any aspect of time, the self, which Hofmannsthal sees as the guiding and ordering entity of life, becomes confused, angry, tormented, and ultimately lost. Each of the three main characters stands in a different position concerning the recognizing of the roles of memory and the past in defining themselves. None of the three present what could be considered to be the proper placement of memory. None are capable of making the transition to *Existenz*.

Each of the three women recognize this and are frustrated in their attempts to keep thoughts in their heads (Chrysothemis and Klytämnestra) or to do anything (Elektra). Their constancy is tragic—but not human. The memory of the past and acknowledgment of that memory is essential to constancy. Accordingly Elektra is the only character in the *Elektra* (Orest included) who remains loyal to the memory of Agamemnon's death. She however cannot act because none of herself is dedicated to or loyal to her own Self. Without her Self she cannot act—a memory cut off from her own existence.

Elektra exemplifies Hofmannsthal's attitude towards antiquity. One cannot come into genuine *Existenz* or lead a fulfilled life through the recalling of past greatness. The memory of Agamemnon does not give Elektra his former strength; it is only a depleting of herself. For Hofmannsthal the memory of the past must be made to serve the present. To preserve the past for the sake of the past is to pour one's energies into an infinite and abysmal hole. He is seeking in his adaptation of Sophocles to be that instant in 1903 caring for and concerned with the present. His *Elektra*, as we have seen, was not intended to preserve the past faithfully. It is fitting then that his main character, Elektra, exemplify precisely the opposite of Hofmannsthal's intentions.

In the character Elektra we see the coming together of a variety of topics. In her the polarized deeds of the drama come together. She is her father in her constancy. She is her mother in her hatred. She is the memory of the binding atrocity and the forethought (*Vorausdenken*) of the coming vengeance. But she as herself does not exist. She gave up her place on the train following the tracks of time. She stands utterly alone, absolutely disconnected from time and self. She cannot act. Paralyzed she stands there, the essence and glue of the House of Atreus, and dies because not enough of herself remains to transform the wretched shell of her

body into life.

Elektra could not under any circumstance have been able to avenge in deed Agamemnon's murder because she has so removed herself from life in being the memory of her father's murder that she can no longer participate in life through deeds. Hofmannsthal said, "*Tun ist sich aufgeben*" ("To act is to give oneself up through the deed into the whole").<sup>64</sup> She has not a self to give, to transform. Although she is heroic constancy, she lacks the ability to act—to genuinely Exist. At this point one might raise the objection that in remembering her father's death in her cries of mourning and in arguments with her mother and sister Elektra is acting in the present. She is indeed in the present through the fact that she continues to exist as many exist in a state of *Präexistenz*, but she lacks the ability to effectively do anything at all.

Her entire existence consists in two moments of delusion. We see in her first monologue and throughout the drama that the only moment of her reality is the hour of her father's death. She stands there disconnected from time and self. Only the memory of her father is real. She is utterly alone. The coming of vengeance at which time she shall celebrate is her second moment of violent fantasy.

Vater!  
Ich will dich sehen, laß mich heute nicht allein!  
Nur sowie gestern, wie ein Schatten, dort  
im Mauerwinkel zeig dich deinem Kind!  
Vater! Dein Tag wird kommen! Von den Sternen  
Stürzt alle Zeit herab, so wird das Blut  
Aus hunderte Kehlen stürzen auf dein Grab!

Father! I will [sic]  
see you: O, leave me not to-day alone,  
Were it no more than yesterday, come back,  
A shadow in yonder corner, to your child!  
Father, your day will come. Time is cast down  
By the sure stars, so surely shall the blood  
Out of a hundred throats be cast down on your grave.<sup>65</sup>

Hofmannsthal's Elektra has so sacrificed herself in her constancy to her father that for her from her Self nothing remains. She laments to Orest her having come into this state.

*...Eifersüchtig sind  
die Toten: und er schickte mir den Haß,  
den hohläugigen Haß als Bräutigam.  
....  
...der mich zwang,  
alles zu wissen, wie es zwischen Mann  
und Weib zugeht. Die Nächte, weh, die Nächte,  
in denen ich's begriff! Da war mein Leib  
eiskalt und doch verkohlt, im Innersten  
verbrannt...*

...For jealous are the dead,  
And he has sent me hatred for a bridegroom,  
Hollow-eyed hatred...  
....  
...had I to take  
into my sleepless be, that it might teach me  
all that is done between a man and wife.  
The nights, woe's me, the nights when that I fathomed!  
Then was my body cold as ice, yet charred  
As if with fire, and burning inwardly...<sup>66</sup>

Through her constancy she is all that she is; in her constancy she is nothing. She is hatred. Hatred is nothing. In Elektra's tirade on hatred, love, and words the essence of Hofmannsthal's position towards words as contrasted with deeds rings clear:

...Haß ist nichts, er zehrt und zehrt sich selber auf, und Liebe ist  
noch weniger als Haß, sie greifte nach allem  
und kann nichts fassen, ihre Hände sind  
wie Flammen, die nichts fassen, alles Denken  
ist nichts, und was aus dem Mund hervorkommt,  
ist ohnmächtige Luft, nur der ist selig,  
der seine Tat zu tuen kommt!...

...Hate is nothing,  
It wastes and wastes itself away, and love  
Is lesser even than hate, it grasps at all things  
And can take hold on nothing, and its hands  
Are flames that take no hold on anything;  
All thought is nothing, and as the powerless air  
Is everything that comes out of the mouth:  
Blessed alone is he that does his deed...<sup>67</sup>

There is no one who can withstand her gaze, but she cannot lift an axe. She is hatred and everything that can pour out of a mouth are only words. She recognizes her nothingness—her own insufficiency.

Elektra's death, while triumphant, is symbolic of her ceasing to exist—it is her ceasing to exist. She had so long been the honorable memory of the House of Atreus. We do not know (or even care) how things will continue in Mycenae under King Orest. It is irrelevant. We do know that the one who for so long zealously honored the memory of the nobility of the House has passed. Critics have argued that her death was a triumph, *eine Fehlleistung*, due to the expiration of her psychological necessity, or a Dionysian release. It is ambiguous. Her death can reasonably be considered and explained by all of these. One thing is clear. Elektra is dead! With her dies constancy, memory, and the heroic. The noble House of Atreus lives on, but is Hofmannsthal saying that it does so at the expense of its nobility? It is certain that he saw very little nobility or genuine *Existenz* in the atmosphere of his day.

Elektra died. Elektra was *Treue* (constancy). However, she does not partake in genuine *Existenz* because she fails to act and lacks her own self-identity. The Deed is essential to *Existenz*. Self-identity is essential to Action. Without a self there can be no giving of self to self-defining deed. Hence, Elektra "stürzt zusammen...Stille. Vorhang."<sup>68</sup> There was no Elektra as Elektra. With her died the zealously sustained memory of the greatness of the House of Atreus. The past decade had so dragged her through the filth, beaten by the pirating Aegisth that her wretched body, the last reserve of the noble blood of King Agamemnon, is detestable to us. With her death the honorable blood of the House can be washed away in peace. Chrysothemis lives. Elektra's death was inevitable. The house will live on in one way or another. It is only relevant to Hofmannsthal that the embodiment of constancy, the memory that makes human, and the noble relentlessness of Elektra has passed. Elektra was the heroine. The House of Atreus slips slowly into the decline of forgetfulness, forgetting as 1903 Austria was already well on its way to having done.

Klytämnestra's most significant contribution to the *Elektra* is her hysteric voice. In examining this we will be directly concerned with the psychoanalytic atmosphere of turn-of-the-century Vienna, which was dominated by the research and writings of Drs. Breuer and Freud. The influence of Breuer and Freud and their psychoanalytic *Forschung* (especially *Studien über die Hysterie* and *Traumdeutung*) on Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* has been assumed by scholars from the beginning<sup>69</sup> and has been firmly established. Bernd Urban documented, in an extensive 1978 study entitled *Hofmannsthal, Freud und die Psychoanalyse—Quellenkundliche Untersuchungen*, all the passages of the Hofmannsthal's own copy of *Studien über die Hysterie* that had been marked. Urban believes that Klytämnestra is clearly a hysteric and that Elektra is an imperfect hysteric, although the primary intention of his work is the documentation of the influence the doctors' works had had on Hofmannsthal's rather than speculation into this influence's manifestations.<sup>70</sup> At this time Hofmannsthal had also edited Bahr's work *Dialog vom Tragischen* (1903), which dealt specifically with themes common to those of the *Elektra*: the interrelation of the ideas of psychoanalysis, mythology, theater, and Greek tragedy.<sup>71</sup> It had most likely been Bahr who had sparked Hofmannsthal's interest in psychopathology and with whom Hofmannsthal had drawn many of the parallels, especially that of catharsis, between the ancient tragedy and the psychoanalytic cure.<sup>72</sup>

Commonly critics have asserted that in his female figures Hofmannsthal is drawing on the doctors' descriptions of hysteria. Politzer sees all three female figures as hysterics.<sup>73</sup> In his opinion, Hofmannsthal was primarily interested in placing a multifaceted array of hysteric and hysterical conditions on stage. This is a difficult position to defend and one with which I do not agree. Politzer took up the theme of hysteria and tried to force each character of the *Elektra* into that box. As has hopefully been made clear through our discussion there are many themes, topics, and influences at work in the *Elektra*. Also, Elektra is not repressing her memory—as a hysteric would. She is preserving it. Yes, she does indeed have a disruption of the Ego and unstable Self, but there are ways of being unstable without being hysteric. She is unable to make the transition into genuine *Existenz*. All of Hofmannsthal's female figures are not able to make this transition, but this does not make them all hysterics. Hysteria is only one of the many ways Hofmannsthal sees as failing in the transitioning into *Existenz*. Worbs considers the Elektra to be a monodrama centered around Elektra who is fundamentally modeled after Dr. Breuer's famous patient Ann O.<sup>74</sup> Ann O.'s condition is diagnosed to have involved the traumatic loss of her father. However, it is also a fundamental part of the Elektra-myth that Elektra lost her father. As we have discussed above, Elektra is not a hysteric. It is clear that the drama is focused on its namesake Elektra. However, Hofmannsthal's Klytämnestra and Chrysothemis add significant contributions to the drama. Martens believes that the most basic influence of psychoanalysis on the *Elektra* is to be found not in the hysteric characterizations but in the critical portrayal of the analyst/patient relationship between Elektra and Klytämnestra.<sup>75</sup> It is in this relationship, which is utterly bound to failure, that we see Hofmannsthal's skeptical opinions of the effectiveness of the doctors' talking-cure. Breuer and Freud claimed to be able to treat illnesses and neuroses through words. Hofmannsthal's own life philosophy, fundamentally in conflict with this, was rooted in deeds.

In order to understand Klytämnestra as a hysteric, as many have asserted her to be, a summary of Dr. Breuer and Freud's explanation of hysteria, with reference to Klytämnestra's symptoms, is both useful and relevant. A hysteric is one suffering from mental illness, which is manifested in a variety of ways. At the turn-of-the-century it was often misdiagnosed. In his stage directions, Hofmannsthal describes Klytämnestra's appearance in detail:

*Ihr fahles, gedunsenes Gesicht... Sie stürzt sich...Die Königin ist über and über bedeckt mit Edelsteine unft Talismanen. Die Lider ihrer Augen scheinen übermäßig groß und es scheint ihr eine furchtbare Anstrengung zu kosten, sie offen zu halten. ...zitternd vor Zorn tritt sie ans Fenster und zeigt mit dem Stock auf Elektra."*

Her sallow and bloated face... She leans [for support]... The queen is bedecked all over with precious stones and talismans. Her eyelids seem unnaturally heavy, and she seems to keep them open with great effort. ...trembling with anger she goes to the window and points with her staff at Elektra.<sup>76</sup>

Klytämnestra believes herself to be sick.<sup>77</sup> As is stressed through her covering of talismans, she is desperately and superstitiously seeking a cure. Hysteria, according to Breuer and Freud, is caused by a *repressed pathogenic memory*. In the case of Klytämnestra this is clearly the murder of Agamemnon. We hear in her recounting of the moment:

*...Da stand er, von dem  
du immer redest, da stand er und da  
stand ich und dort Aegisth und aus den Augen  
die Blicke trafen sich: da war es doch  
noch nicht geschehn! und dann veränderte  
sich deines Vaters Blick im Sterben so  
langsam und gräßlich, aber immer noch  
in meinem hängend—und da war's geschehn:  
**dazwischen ist kein Raum!** Erst war's vorher,  
dann war's vorbei—**dazwischen hab' ich nichts  
getan.***

... There stood he, whom  
you speak always, there stood he and there  
stood I and there Aegisthus, and from our eyes  
our glances struck upon each other; yet  
nothing had come to pass, and then there changed  
so slowly and so horribly in death

your father's eyes, still hanging upon mine;  
and it had come to pass; **nothing between!**  
First it was coming, then it had gone by,  
And **I had done, between coming and going,**  
**Nothing.**<sup>78</sup>

She denies the moment's ever-having-happened. Freud says that traumatic memory, due to its severity, is repressed. "*Diese Erlebnisse fehlen dem Gedächtnisse der Kranken in ihren gewöhnlichen psychische Zustände völlig*" ("This experience is missing entirely from the mind of the sick in their habitual psychological state").<sup>79</sup> The analyst attempts to follow the pathogenic memory through its rapid and illogical course around the psyche of the hysteric. In this case Elektra is the analyst.<sup>80</sup> Klytämnestra makes explicit reference to this:

*Sie ist heute nicht widerlich. Sie redet wie ein Arzt.*

Today she is not so curst. She speaks like a physician.<sup>81</sup>

In theory, when the original repressed, pathogenic memory (i.e. *Fremdkörper*) is illuminated it will be purged from the psyche, and the hysteric will be cured. Hofmannsthal, however, is opposed to this idea. It requires the happening of Klytämnestra's death at the hand of Orest to solve the problem.

Here we see the closest parallel and most intense criticism of Hofmannsthal in his *Elektra* of the doctors and their psychoanalysis. Martens asserts "Elektra appears... as the caricature of the domineering psychoanalyst".<sup>82</sup> Elektra fails miserably in her destroying Klytämnestra's problem through her loquacious illumination of the problem. She brings the repressed memory to light for her mother (she is after all the memory). But Klytämnestra is not through this freed of her hysteria or repression. It is fair to object that her presence as both manifest repressed memory and psychoanalyst are tangled together in relation to Klytämnestra; thereby compromising the effectiveness of the treatment. Nevertheless, Hofmannsthal is speaking out against the fashionable vogue in Vienna, which claimed to have uncovered a way into our psyches and a cure to our psychological ailments through talking. The psychoanalytic talking-cure of Breuer and Freud, which seeks to free the hysteric through an act of verbal violence to the *Fremdkörper*, is, in Hofmannsthal's opinion, the equivalent of Elektra's attempts to remedy state of the House of Atreus with words alone.

Chrysothemis is the desire to be divorced from the difficult and painful reality of life. Chrysothemis stands for all those living and seeking to live a life divorced from the reality of their historical and societal present. She says:

*Kannst du nicht vergessen?  
Mein Kopf ist immer wüst...  
....  
Ich möchte beten, daß ein Gott ein Licht  
Mir in der Brust anstecke, daß ich mich  
In mir kann wiederfinden! Wäre ich fort,  
Wie schnell vergäß' ich alle bösen Träume...*

Can you not forget?  
My head is all a void [sic!]...  
....  
I would fain pray some god to set a light  
Within my breast that I might find myself  
Again within me. Were I but away  
How soon would I forget all these bad dreams!<sup>83</sup>

She fantasizes of a future divorced from the memory of her past. She is not haunted incessantly as is her mother by having murdered her husband. Chrysothemis is not responsible for the murder having been committed. She is not responsible for the horrors of the life and choking atmosphere around her. She represents the ordinary person seeking an ordinary desire to live:

*...Viel lieber tot,*

*als leben und nicht leben. Nein, ich bin  
ein Weib und will ein Weiberschicksal.*

..Better be dead  
than living and not living. No, no, I am  
a woman, and I would have a woman's lot<sup>84</sup>

Chrysothemis is not seeking anything unreasonable. She is only human. She does not possess the capacity to change her lot. She does not need to avoid the responsibility of her fate—the horrors of the House are not her responsibility. She is simply seeking to move along in life, and she dreams of the day when she can run freely under the open sun leaving behind the memory of that atrocious House in Mycenae. Hofmannsthal is saying through her that regardless of the roles one plays in the creation of her reality, each is bound by the responsibility inherent in existing rooted in his reality.

### ***In Closing...***

The *Elektra* is a work in a pivotal place in Hofmannsthal's career. He, like Sophocles and the tradition before him, wrote his *Elektra* with the intention of symbolizing the predicament of the day. He sought to speak out to the people in 1903 standing upon the shoulders of the tradition having framed his message within the skeleton of the mythical House of Atreus in a way similar to that of Sophocles in 413 BC. "*Hofmannsthal <...> Über sein Stück: Er sei überzeugt, es wirke nicht greller als Sophokles auf antike Zuschauer auch gewirkt habe.*" ("Hofmannsthal <...> About his piece: He was convinced that it was not more shrill to the modern audience than that of Sophocles had been to the ancients.").<sup>85</sup> Sophocles had been concerned primarily with the ancient idea of *retributive justice*. Each poet had sought to address issues concerning the society of his day. Hofmannsthal was emerging from a life and epoch changing crisis and transition and was seeking through the exaggerated portrayal of *präexistentiell* insufficiency in his three female figures to characterize the *präexistentiell* seeing of the world of his contemporaries.

Hofmannsthal sought to speak to the theater going populace of Europe through his *Elektra* about the importance of genuine *Existenz*. He did so negatively through a portrayal of the exaggerated insufficiencies rather than an idealization of fulfilled personalities. In *Elektra* he expressed the danger of living solely for the past and the inherent risk of dissolution in associating one's Self with anyone or anything else. Klytämnestra portrayed the insufficiencies of the Freudian talking cure (as a representative of their client) and the Aestheticists' and Symbolists' (superstitious) pretendings to be able to exist divorced from their harsh realities and their responsibility thereof. Chrysothemis lives as the curtain falls. However, she and those seeking to forget their past (or life) who she represented do not therefore meet with anymore of Hofmannsthal's approval. They are all living in an irresponsible state of *präexistenz* unable and unwilling to come to terms with and seek an active grounded relationship with reality. The avoidance of reality was a common phenomenon of his day (especially among the upper-echelon with which Hofmannsthal was concerned). In portraying the modern circles and movements he saw as insufficient in the *präexistentiell* characterizations in the three females of the House of Atreus Hofmannsthal made his first attempt (although far from his last) at writing a drama for *das Soziale* concerning their own insufficiency.

**Bibliography:**

- Baumann, Gehart. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Elektra." *Wege der Forschung*, vol. 183, ed. Sibylle Bauer. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchergesellschaft, 1968.
- Bahr, Herman. *Dialog vom Tragischen*. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag, 1904 (Spring 1903).
- Bennett, Benjamin K. "Hofmannsthal's Theater of Adaption." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp.97-115. Rochester, NY : Camden House, 2002.
- Bergstraesser, Arnold. *Hofmannsthal und der europäische Gedanke*. Kiel: Kommissionsverlag Lipsius & Tischer, 1951.
- Bernstein, Inna. "Die Europa Konzeption Hugo von Hofmannsthal's." In *Wir sind aus solchem Zeug wie das zu träumen....*, s.363-76. ed. Joseph P. Strelka. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 1992.
- Broch, Hermann. *Hofmannsthal und seine Zeit: Ein Versuch*. München: Piper Verlag, 1964.
- Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39).
- Elster, Hanns Martin. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal und seine besten Bühnenwerke: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Franz Schneider Verlag, 1923.
- Esselborn, Karl G. *Hofmannsthal und der antike Mythos*. München: Wihlem Fink Verlag, 1969.
- Goethe, Johann von. *Iphigenie auf Tauris*. s. 556-610. In: *Goethes Poetische Werke Vollständige Ausgabe bd. 5*. Augsburg: Weltbild Verlag, 1997 (1789).
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ad me ipsum." *Die Neue Rundschau*, 65 (1954).
- . "Ein Brief" und "Reitersgeschichte" mit Materialien. Ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Hans-Ulrich Lindken. Stuttgart, Ernst Klett Verlag, 1985.
- . *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908.
- . *The Lord Chandos Letter*. Trans. Russell Stockman. Marlboro, VT: The Marlboro Press, 1986 (October 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> 1902).
- . *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975.
- Hamburger, Michael. *Hofmannsthal: Three Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Heinemann, Karl. *Die tragischen Gestalten der Greichen in der Weltliteratur*. Leipzig: Dieterichische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.
- Janz, Marlies. *Marmorbilder: Weiblichkeit und Tod bei Clemens Brentano und Hugo von Hofmannsthal*. Königstein: Athenäum Verlag, 1986.
- Jebb, R.C. "Introduction." In Sophocles. *Electra*, ix-lxvii. Translated by: Sir Richard Jebb. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1924.
- Jens, Walter. *Hofmannsthal und die Griechen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1955.
- Kobel, Erwin. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970.
- Kovach, Thomas A. "Introduction: Hofmannsthal Today." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 1-25. Rochester, NY : Camden House, 2002.
- . "Hofmannsthal's "Ein Brief": Chandos and His Crisis." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 84-95. Rochester, NY : Camden House, 2002.

- Le Rider, Jacques. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal and the Austrian Idea of Central Europe." Translated by Rosemary Moris. In *The Habsburger Legacy*, ed. Ritchie Robertson and Edward Timms, pp. 121-35. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.
- . "Der Chandos Brief." *Littérature*, Nr. 95 (Oktober 1994).
- . *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Historismus und Moderne in der Literatur der Jahrhundertwende*. Translated by Leopold Federmair. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1997.
- Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's Elektra." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): pp. 38-51.
- Meyer-Wendt, H. Jurgen. *Der frühe Hofmannsthal und die Gedankenwelt Nietzsches*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1973.
- Michael, Nancy C. *Elektra and Her Sisters: Three Female Characters in Schnitzler, Freud, and Hofmannsthal*. Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag, 2001.
- Naef, Karl J. *Hugo von Hofmannsthals Wesen und Werk*. Zürich: Max Nihans Verlag, 1938.
- Nehring, Wolfgang. "Ödipus and Elektra—Theater und Psychologie bei Hofmannsthal." In *Wir sind aus solchem Zeug wie das zu träumen...*, s. 239-56. ed. Joseph P. Strelka. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 1992.
- Newiger, Hans-Joachim. "Hofmannsthals *Elektra* und die griechische Tragödie." *Arcadia*, 4 (1969), 153-157.
- Politzer, Heinz. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's 'Elektra': Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Psychopathologie." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, 47 (1973), pp. 95-119.
- Reinhardt, Karl. *Sophocles*. Trans. Hazel Harvey & David Harvey. New York: Harper Row Publishers Inc., 1979.
- Rey, William. *Welentzweigung und Weltversöhnung in Hofmannsthals griechischen Dramen*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1962.
- Richter, Andreas. *Elektra*. Mainz: Fürstner GmbH, 1995.
- Roe, Virginia Matilda. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*, *Oedipus* and *Alkestis* Compared with the Corresponding Dramas of the Ancient Greek Playwrights." Masters diss. University of Cincinnati, 1923.
- Seeba, Hinrich C. "Hofmannsthal and Wiener Moderne: The Cultural Context." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 25-46. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002.
- Schaeder, Grete. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Die Gestalten*. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1933.
- Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York, Random House, 1981.
- Sondrup, Steven P. *Hofmannsthal and the French Symbolist Tradition*. Bern: Herbert Lang Verlag, 1976.
- Sophocles*. *Electra*. Trans. Henry Taylor. In: *Sophocles*, 1. Ed.: David R. Slavitt & Palmer Bovie. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- . *Electra*. Translated by: Sir Richard Jebb. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1924.
- . "Elektra." In *Werke*. Translated. Georg Thudichum. Leipzig: Reclam Verlag, 1880.
- Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthals Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956.

*Adapting Antiquity: A Study of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Elektra in the Context of his Time*

- Schwarz, Egon. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal as a Critic". In *On Four Modern Humanist: Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, ed. Arthur R Evans, Jr. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Thomasberger, Andreas. *Hofmannsthal and Wiener Moderne: The Cultural Context*. In *A Companion to the Works of Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, 25-46. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002.
- Urban, Bernd. *Hofmannsthal, Freud und die Psychoanalyse—Quellenkundliche Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1978.
- Volke, Werner. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1967.
- Waldmann, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Ethos und Bildungswelt." Ph.D. diss. Die Badischen Rupert-Karls Universität zu Heidelberg, 1934.
- Weeks, Charles Andrew. "Hofmannsthal and the Myth of European Rebirth." In *Wir sind aus solchem Zeug wie das zu Träumen...Kritische Beiträge zum Werk Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Joseph P. Strelka, 377-88. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 1992.
- Whaley, Joachim. "Austria, 'Germany', and the Dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire." In *The Habsburger Legacy*, ed. Ritchie Robertson and Edward Timms, pp. 3-12. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Tycho von. *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH, 1996 (1917).
- Worbs, Michael. *Nervenkunst—Literatur und Psychoanalyse im Wien der Jahrhundertwende*. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- Wyß, Hugo. *Die Frau in der Dichtung Hofmannsthals: Eine Studie zum dionysischen Welterlebnis*. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag A.G., 1954.
- Yates, W.E. *Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theatre*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Zeugnisse. <Juni 1903>, Cortina d'Ampezzo, Aufzeichnungen: Vertheidigung der Elektra*. In: *Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 368.

<sup>2</sup> Homer makes no reference to Agamemnon's daughter Electra (Jebb, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Reinhardt).

<sup>3</sup> The House of Tantalus is deeply plagued with murder, curses, and atrocious acts. Tantalus the half-god murdered his son Pelops and fed him to the gods to test their omniscience. Pelops was returned to life, and Tantalus was condemned to eternal torment in Hades. Pelops then sought to win the hand of the daughter of King Oenomaus, Hippodamia, by deception. He defeated Oenomaus through sabotage in a chariot race that killed the king. He then killed Myrtilus his conspirator who heaped curses upon Pelops' house with his dying breath. His sons Atreus and Thyestes continued the family legacy. Thyestes seduced Atreus' wife Aerope. Atreus served Thyestes his own children for dinner. Thyestes killed Atreus and became king of Mycenae and was succeeded by his son and grandson Aegisthus, for he had raped his own daughter in siring him. Atreus' sons Menelaus and Agamemnon were of great renown. Agamemnon seized Mycenae from his cousin and uncle Aegisthus and married Clytemnestra after having slain her former husband and child. Upon his return from Troy Aegisthus and Clytemnestra murdered Agamemnon and his concubine Cassandra. Electra rescued the boy Orestes from the chaos, so that one day he would return to avenge his father's death. (Richter, p. 25)

<sup>4</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Tycho von. *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH, 1996 (1917).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Sophocles. *Electra*. Trans. Henry Taylor. In: *Sophocles, I*. Ed.: David R. Slavitt & Palmer Bovie. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998, (l. 1457-59).

<sup>7</sup> For a thorough study of each of these adaptations and the accordingly influential historical currents see: Heinemann, Karl. *Die tragischen Gestalten der Griechen in der Weltliteratur*. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.

<sup>8</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 93.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 94.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 102.

<sup>11</sup> It was neither on the traditional Athenian stage of Sophocles nor in the idealized Greece overlooking the sea framed in powerful marble that Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* was set. It was "ein düstere prägriechische Welt, in der man Griechenland kaum wieder erkennen wollte" (Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 94).

<sup>12</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 95.

<sup>13</sup> I feel confident in asserting this because in perusing the secondary literature anything even remotely related to Hofmannsthal or his *Elektra* consistently emphasizes the significance of his *fin-de-siècle*, Viennese, Austrian, German cultural surroundings.

<sup>14</sup> This is in no way meant to imply that this study or Hofmannsthal's conceptions of his historical and political situations ought to be taken as historic facts. There are serious flaws in his conceptions of which we have the privileged view of hindsight. It is simply to say that Hofmannsthal was speaking to a Europe as it was perceived by Hofmannsthal.

<sup>15</sup> As far as I have been able to discern this is Hofmannsthal's own personal life-philosophy.

<sup>16</sup> Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39), p. 164.

<sup>17</sup> Examples of this include, but are not limited to: *Alkestis* (1894), *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* (1900), *Elektra* (1903), *Geretteten Venedig* (1905), *Oedipus und die Sphinx* (1904), *König Oedipus* (1910), *Jedermann* (1911) (Naef, Karl J. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Wesen und Werk*. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag, 1938, s. 401-28).

<sup>18</sup> Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York, Random House, 1981 pp. 3-23. and Kovach, Thomas A. "Introduction: Hofmannsthal Today." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp.1-25. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002, pp. 1-4.

<sup>19</sup> Volke, Werner. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1967, s. 8.

<sup>20</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ad me ipsum." *Die Neue Rundschau*, 65 (1954), s. 371. *Ad me ipsum* was an autobiographical sketch in progress throughout Hofmannsthal's life. The first pieces of it were published in 1926.

<sup>21</sup> Kovach, Thomas A. "Introduction: Hofmannsthal Today." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 1-25. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002, p. 14.

<sup>22</sup> z. B.: Gestern (1890), *Der Tod des Tizian* (1892), *Idylle* (1893), und *Der Tor und der Tod* (1894) (Naef, Karl J. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Wesen und Werk*. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag, 1938, s. 401-28).

<sup>23</sup> Schwarz, Egon. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal as a Critic". In *On Four Modern Humanist: Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, ed. Arthur R

---

Evans, Jr. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970, p. 8.

<sup>24</sup> Kovach, Thomas A. "Hofmannsthal's 'Ein Brief': Chandos and His Crisis." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 84-95. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002, p. 88.

<sup>25</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *The Lord Chandos Letter*. Trans. Russell Stockman. Marlboro, VT: The Marlboro Press, 1986 (October 18th & 19th 1902) pp. 48 & 21.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 45 & 19.

<sup>27</sup> "Der Chandos-Brief wurde im August 1902 niedergeschrieben; zu dieser Zeit las Hofmannsthal Francis Bacon. Am 18. und 19. Oktober erschien der Brief in der Berliner Zeitung *Der Tag*, um dann 1905 in den Band *Das Märchen der 672. Nacht und andere Erzählungen* aufgenommen zu werden" (Le Rider, Jacques. "Der Chandos Brief." *Littérature*, Nr. 95 (Oktober 1994), s. 103)

<sup>28</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ein Brief" und "Reitersgeschichte" mit Materialien. Ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Hans-Ulrich Lindken. Stuttgart, Ernst Klett Verlag, 1985, s. 63-4. First published: Jens, Walter. *Der Mensch und die Dinge. Die Revolution der deutschen Prosa*. In: *Akzente*, 4, 1957, s. 25-6.

<sup>29</sup> "the societal-un-concerned-ness" The word is Broch's.

<sup>30</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ad me ipsum." *Die Neue Rundschau*, 65 (1954).

<sup>31</sup> Schwarz, Egon. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal as a Critic". In *On Four Modern Humanist: Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, ed. Arthur R Evans, Jr. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970.

<sup>32</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *The Lord Chandos Letter*. Trans. Russell Stockman. Marlboro, VT: The Marlboro Press, 1986 (1901).

<sup>33</sup> Jens, Walter. *Hofmannsthal und die Griechen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1955, s. 45.

<sup>34</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ad me ipsum." *Die Neue Rundschau*, 65 (1954), s. 359.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 360.

<sup>36</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 85.

<sup>37</sup> "Jeder dieser Gegenstände...plötzlich in irgendeinem Moment, den herbeizuführen auf keine Weise in meiner Gewalt steht, ein erhabenes und rührendes Gepräge annehmen, das auszudrücken mir alle Worte zu arm scheinen." ("Each of these...assume for me an aspect so sublime and so moving that it beggars all words.") (Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *The Lord Chandos Letter*. Trans. Russell Stockman. Marlboro, VT: The Marlboro Press, 1986, pp. 50 & 23.)

<sup>38</sup> Yates, W.E. *Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theatre*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992, p. 107.

<sup>39</sup> Broch, Hermann. *Hofmannsthal und seine Zeit: Ein Versuch*. München: Piper Verlag, 1964, p. 21.

<sup>40</sup> Schwarz, Egon. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal as a Critic". In *On Four Modern Humanist: Hofmannsthal, Gundolf, Curtius, Kantorowicz*, ed. Arthur R Evans, Jr. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970, p. 4.

<sup>41</sup> Seeba, Hinrich C. "Hofmannsthal and Wiener Moderne: The Cultural Context." In *A Companion to the Works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal*, ed. Thomas A. Kovach, pp. 25-46. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002, p. 33.

<sup>42</sup> (Yates, W.E. *Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theatre*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992, p. 113.) Yates continues this thought saying that Hofmannsthal over-stressed his dedication to theater and its importance to him at times when he wished to consider himself social-minded. It can also be seen later in his life in turning again to the theatre, particularly in portraying the world as a theatre (*Das Salzburger große Welttheater*), that theatre never lost its importance for him.

<sup>43</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Ad me ipsum." *Die Neue Rundschau*, 65 (1954), s. 368

<sup>44</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 95.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 97.

<sup>46</sup> Hofmannsthal said of this, "Worin ich dem Sophokles gefolgt bin, das ist das Scenarium, der Aufbau, und daher ist auch mein Stück ebensowenig wie seines eigentlich ein Stück, sondern eine Katastrophe, nicht ein Leib, sondern ein abgehauener Kopf auf einer Schüssel." (Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Zeugnisse*. In: *Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 376.)

- 
- <sup>47</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 100.
- <sup>48</sup> Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39), p.164, 167.
- <sup>49</sup> Goethe, Johann von. *Iphigenie auf Tauris*. s. 556-610. In: *Goethes Poetische Werke Vollständige Ausgabe bd. 5*. Augsburg: Weltbild Verlag, 1997 (1789).
- <sup>50</sup> "Demonically humane" This was written by Goethe to Schiller in a letter on 19. of January 1802.  
(Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Zeugnisse*. <Juni 1903>, *Cortina d'Ampezzo, Aufzeichnungen: Vertheidigung der Elektra*. In: *Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 368.)
- <sup>51</sup> Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39), p. 174.
- <sup>52</sup> Butler's handling of the material was concise and intelligent so long as his personal prejudice against the ideas of Freudian psychoanalytic theory did not cloud his way.
- <sup>53</sup> See: Baumann, Gehart. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Elektra." *Wege der Forschung*, vol. 183, ed. Sibylle Bauer. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchergesellschaft, 1968.; Esselborn, Karl G. *Hofmannsthal und der antike Mythos*. München: Wihlem Fink Verlag, 1969.; Heinemann, Karl. *Die tragischen Gestalten der Griechen in der Weltliteratur*. Leipzig: Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920.; Jens, Walter. *Hofmannsthal und die Griechen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1955.; Naef, Karl J. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Wesen und Werk*. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag, 1938. Newiger, Hans-Joachim. "Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* und die griechische Tragödie." *Arcadia*, 4 (1969), 153-157.; Rey, William. *Welentzweigung und Weltversöhnung in Hofmannsthal's griechischen Dramen*. Philidelphia: University of Philidelphia Press, 1962.; Schaefer, Grete. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal: Die Gestalten*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt Verlag, 1933.; Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956.
- <sup>54</sup> See: Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39).; Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): pp. 38-51.; Politzer, Heinz. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's 'Elektra': Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Psychopathologie." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, 47 (1973), pp. 95-119.; Urban, Bernd. *Hofmannsthal, Freud und die Psychoanalyse—Quellenkundliche Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1978.; Worbs, Michael. *Nervenkunst—Literatur und Psychoanalyse im Wien der Jahrhundertwende*. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- <sup>55</sup> Janz, Marlies. *Marmorbilder: Weiblichkeit und Tod bei Clemens Brentano und Hugo von Hofmannsthal*. Königstein: Athenäum Verlag, 1986.; Michael, Nancy C. *Elektra and Her Sisters: Three Female Characters in Schnitzler, Freud, and Hofmannsthal*. Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag, 2001.; Wyß, Hugo. *Die Frau in der Dichtung Hofmannsthal's: Eine Studie zum dionysischen Wlterlebnis*. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag A.G., 1954
- <sup>56</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 82.
- <sup>57</sup> Jens, Walter. *Hofmannsthal und die Griechen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1955, s. 74 & 68.
- <sup>58</sup> Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): pp. 38-51.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- <sup>60</sup> Nehring, Wolfgang. "Ödipus and Elektra—Theater und Psychologie bei Hofmannsthal." In *Wir sind aus solchem Zeug wie das zu träumen...*, s. 239-56. ed. Joseph P. Strelka. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 1992, s. 245.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, s. 246.
- <sup>62</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.70. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.18.
- <sup>63</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.76. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.28.
- <sup>64</sup> Steingruber, Elisabeth. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Sophokleische Dramen." Ph. D. diss. Universität Zurich, 1956, s. 85.
- <sup>65</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.67. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.14.
- <sup>66</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.102. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.70.
- <sup>67</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.105. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.75.
- <sup>68</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstatlet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer

Verlag, 1975, s. 110.

<sup>69</sup> Although E.M. Butler was uncertain if Hofmannsthal and Bahr even knew each other, he did not hesitate in his assigning the *Elektra* significant Freudian influence. (Butler, E.M. "Hofmannsthal's (sic!) *Elektra*: A Graeco-Freudian Myth." *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938-39), p.167 fn.2.)

<sup>70</sup> Urban, Bernd. *Hofmannsthal, Freud und die Psychoanalyse—Quellenkundliche Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1978.

<sup>71</sup> Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): 38-51, p.40.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>73</sup> Politzer, Heinz. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal's 'Elektra': Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Psychopathologie." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, 47 (1973), s. 95-119, s.108.

<sup>74</sup> Worbs, Michael. *Nervenkunst—Literatur und Psychoanalyse im Wien der Jahrhundertwende*. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1983.

<sup>75</sup> Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): 38-51, p.46.

<sup>76</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 74. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p. 25.

<sup>77</sup> "...wie die Kranken tun...". (Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 76.

<sup>78</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 82. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p. 38. Emphasis added.

<sup>79</sup> Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): 38-51, p.46. (Freud & Breuer. *Studien über die Hysterie*, p.12, 17.)

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46.

<sup>81</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 78. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p. 35.

<sup>82</sup> Martens, Lorna. "The Theme of the Repressed Memory in Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*." *The German Quarterly*, Volume 60, Issue 1 (Winter, 1987): pp. 38-51, p.45.

<sup>83</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 71. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, pp. 20-21.

<sup>84</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s.71. & Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Electra: a tragedy in one act*. Trans. Arthur Symons. New York: Brentano's, 1908, p.20.

<sup>85</sup> Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Zeugnisse*. In: *Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. Samliche Werke: kritische Ausgabe*. Bd. 4. Veranstaltet von Freien deutschen Hochstift. Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer Verlag, 1975, s. 385.