NAME OF STUDENT: Jonathan Asante Otchere

STUDENT NUMBER: 55783759

COURSE CODE AND TITLE: DPCHS02: 90041

Doctor of Philosophy in Languages, Linguistics and Literature

MADNESS IN GREEK TRAGEDY: A CRITIQUE OF SOME SELECTED EXTANT PLAYS OF AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES AND EURIPIDES

Supervisor: Dr. Liana (JC) Lamprecht

April, 2023

MADNESS IN GREEK TRAGEDY: A CRITIQUE OF SOME SELECTED EXTANT PLAYS OF AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES AND EURIPIDES

Abstract

Madness features prominently in Greek tragedy. Indeed, the theme of madness, its treatment and dramatic illustration contribute to the aim of this genre, which Aristotle identifies as the arousal and the purgation of pity and fear. In this thesis, the existence of two categories of madness: tragic and non-tragic madness, is proposed, and the argument is advanced that both are a consequence of the circumstances of the hero. In this regard, the view is put forward that whereas tragic madness is consistent with the *hamartia* principle, which accords no moral depravity to the madness that consumes the hero, the *hubristic* principle by contrast does indeed attach moral depravity to the calamity (madness) that befalls the hero, which is also consistent with non-tragic madness.

Based on this premise, the study supports a comparison of the tragedians' notion of madness and proposes a synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment in Greek tragedy. To achieve this, an integration is recommended of the psychoanalytic and the socio-psychological theories or methodologies in the interpretation and critique of the either tragic or non-tragic madness of Aeschylus' Orestes in *The Choephori*, Sophocles' Ajax in *Ajax* and Euripides' Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus in *Heracles*, *Orestes* and *The Bacchae* respectively. The integration of the psychoanalytic and the socio-psychological theories in the interpretation of the either tragic or non-tragic madness of the heroes mentioned seeks to prove that madness in ancient Greek tragedy may be appropriated from or for psychoanalytic and/or socio-psychological functions or purposes.

LA FOLIE DANS LA TRAGÉDIE GRECQUE : UNE CRITIQUE DE QUELQUES PIÈCES EXISTANTES SÉLECTIONNÉES D'AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLE ET EURIPIDES

Abstraite

La folie occupe une place prépondérante dans la tragédie grecque. En effet, le thème de la folie, son traitement et son illustration dramatique contribuent à la visée de ce genre, qu'Aristote identifie comme l'éveil et la purge de la pitié et de la peur. Dans cette thèse, l'existence de deux catégories de folie : la folie tragique et la folie non tragique, est proposée, et l'argument est avancé que les deux sont une conséquence des circonstances du héros. À cet égard, l'opinion est avancée que si la folie tragique est compatible avec le principe de l'hamartia, qui n'accorde aucune dépravation morale à la folie qui consume le héros, le principe hubristique en revanche attache en effet la dépravation morale à la calamité (folie) qui arrive au héros, ce qui est également compatible avec la folie non tragique.

Partant de ce postulat, l'étude soutient une comparaison de la notion de folie chez les tragédiens et propose une synthèse de la notion de folie et de son traitement dans la tragédie grecque. Pour y parvenir, une intégration est recommandée des théories ou méthodologies psychanalytiques et socio-psychologiques dans l'interprétation et la critique de la folie tragique ou non tragique d'Oreste d'Eschyle dans *Les Choephori*, d'Ajax de Sophocle dans *Ajax* et d'Héraclès d'Euripide, Oreste et Penthée dans *Héraclès*, *Oreste* et *Les Bacchantes* respectivement. L'intégration des théories psychanalytique et socio-psychologique dans l'interprétation de la folie tragique ou non tragique des héros mentionnés cherche à prouver que la folie dans la tragédie grecque antique

peut être appropriée à partir ou pour des fonctions psychanalytiques et/ou socio-psychologiques ou à des fins.

RASERNY IN GRIEKSE TRAGEDIE:'N KRITIEK VAN ENKELE GESELEKTEERDE, NOG BESTAANDE TRAGEDIES VAN AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES EN EURIPIDES

Opsomming

Raserny neem 'n belangrike plek in die Griekse tragedie in. Die tema van raserny en die verwerking en dramatiese toeligting daarvan strook met die doel van hierdie genre, wat volgens Aristoteles die opwekking en suiwering van deernis en vrees is. In hierdie proefskrif word twee kategorieë van raserny voorgestel, te wete tragiese en nietragiese raserny, en word betoog dat albei die gevolg van die held se omstandighede is. Daar word aangevoer dat tragiese raserny met die beginsel van *hamartia* ooreenstem, want dit heg geen morele ontaarding aan die raserny wat die held verteer nie. Die beginsel van *hubris*, daarenteen, heg inderdaad morele ontaarding aan die rampspoed (raserny) wat die held tref, en vind eweneens aansluiting by nietragiese raserny.

Op grond van hierdie premis word die treurspelskrywers se siening van raserny vergelyk, en word 'n samevatting van die verwerking van die rasernygedagte in die Griekse tragedie voorgestel. Met die oog hierop word aanbeveel dat die psigoanalitiese en sosio-psigologiese teorieë of metodologieë saamgevoeg word vir die interpretasie en kritiese beskouing van die tragiese of nietragiese raserny van Aischulos se Orestes in *Die Choephori*, Sofokles se Ajax in *Ajax* en Euripedes se Herakles, Orestes en Penteus in onderskeidelik *Herakles*, *Orestes* en *Die Bacchae*. Met die samevoeging van die psigoanalitiese en sosio-psigologiese teorieë om die tragiese of nietragiese raserny van die bogenoemde helde te interpreteer, word gepoog om te bewys dat raserny in die antieke Griekse tragedie toegeëien kan word met of vir psigoanalitiese en/of sosio-psigologiese funksies of oogmerke.

INSANGANO ENHLEKELELWENI YAMAGRIKHI: UKUHLAZIYWA KWEMINYE YEMIDLALO ESAPHILA KA-AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES NO- EURIPIDES

Okucashuniwe

Insangano ibuvelele kakhulu enhlekeleleni yamaGrikhi. Ngempela, indikimba yensangano, ukwelashwa kwayo kanye nomfanekiso omangazayo kunomthelela enhlosweni yalesi sigaba sombhalo, lapho u-Aristotle asikhomba njengokuvusa nokuhlanzwa kwesihawu nokwesaba. Kulo mqondo, ukuba khona kwezigaba ezimbili zensangano: insangano eyinhlekelele nekungeyona inhlekelele, kuyaphakanyisiwe, futhi impikiswano isithuthukisiwe ukuthi zozimibili ziyimiphumela yezimo zeqhawe. Mayelana nalokhu, kubekwa phambili umbono wokuthi insangano eyinhlekelele ihambisana nesimiso *sokukhombisa iphutha lomlingiswa elibuhlungu noma elibulalayo*, esingavumelani nokonakala kokuziphatha ensanganweni edla iqhawe, isimiso *sokwezethemba ngokweqile* ngokuqhathanisa sinamathisela ukonakala kokuziphatha enhlekeleleni (insangano) eyehlela iqhawe, nayo ehambisana nensangano engeyona inhlekelele.

Ngokuya ngaleli qophelo, isifundo sisekela ukuqhathaniswa komqondo wezinhlekelele zensangano futhi siphakamisa ukuhlanganiswa komqondo wensangano nokwelashwa kwayo enhlekeleleni yamaGrikhi. Ukufeza lokhu, kuphakanyiswa ukuhlanganiswa kombono wohlelo lwezengqondo nokwelapha ohlose ukwelapha ukuphazamiseka kwengqondo kanye nemibono yezenhlalo nezengqondo noma izindlela ekuhumusheni nasekuhlaziyweni kwensangano eyinhlekelele noma kwensangano okungeyona inhlekelele ka-Aeschylus 'Orestes ku-*The Choephori*, i*Sophocles*' *Ajax* ku-Ajax kanye ne-*Euripides 'Heracles*, *Orestes nePentheus* ku-Heracles, *Orestes neBacchae* ngokulandelana. Ukuhlanganiswa kwemibono yohlelo lwezengqondo nokwelapha ehlose ukwelapha ukuphazamiseka kwengqondo kanye nemibono

yezenhlalo nezengqondo ekuhumusheni kwensangano eyinhlekelele noma kwensangano okungeyona inhlekelele yamaqhawe okukhulunywe ngawo kufuna ukufakazela ukuthi insangano enhlekeleleni yamaGrikhi asendulo kungabiwa kusuka emibonweni yohlelo lwezengqondo nokwelapha ehlose ukwelapha ukuphazamiseka kwengqondo kanye noma emisebenzini noma ezinhlosweni zezenhlalo nezengqondo.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my mother, Janet Williams, my father Daniel Asante Otchere and my entire family, for their invaluable support, and my mentor, Dr. Fabian Opeku (deceased).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I praise and thank the almighty God for imbibing in me a determined spirit to complete the research successfully. Secondly, my immense gratitude goes to all who, through diverse and manifold ways, lent a hand to make this work a success.

I would like to also express my profound gratitude to my research supervisor, Dr. Liana Lamprecht, whose invaluable guidance, corrections and suggestions throughout my research has led to the success of this work.

I am also extremely grateful to Prof. Philip Bosman, formerly of the University of South Africa, whom I first discussed the idea of madness in Greek tragedy with and whose suggestions helped me to shape the focus of my topic. One cannot forget Prof. P.K.T. Grant who has been always supportive, a loyal friend and a senior colleague in the same department of the University of Cape Coast. In fact, he is more than a friend to me.

Let me also acknowledge Miss Rolanda Aboagye's persistent pressure and encouragement as I worked on my thesis. It encouraged me to work assiduously to complete my thesis successfully and on time. I am equally appreciative of the support, love, prayer and sacrifices of my parents and siblings throughout the nascent stages of my education career. To all of you, I say *gracias*.

Finally, I am eternally grateful to all the writers and critics whom I cited in my thesis. My research work would have been more difficult if I had not availed myself of their resources. Notwithstanding all the valuable corrections, suggestions and all other forms of assistance, I dare say that all errors in this thesis are mine.

Table of Contents

MADNESS IN GREEK TRAGEDY: A CRITIQUE OF SOME SELECTED EXTANT PLAYS OF AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES AND EURIPIDES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

5th century Attic tragedy treats different themes with the aim of arousing the emotions of pity and fear which have been identified by Aristotle[1] as the main object of tragedy. Two main ideas underpin the preceding statement: (a) Aristotle's prescription of the requirements of a tragic character[2] and (b) Aristotle's prescription of what is to be aimed at in order to achieve the objective of tragedy.[3] Is Aristotle justifiable in drawing these conclusions (from his *Poetics*) as far as tragedy and the aim of the genre are concerned? Or on what basis should Aristotle be cited as the standard as far as the tragic aim is concerned? This question is appropriately answered by Ekevere, F.O, *et al*. when they make this significant claim:

> In the *Poetics*, Aristotle approaches poetry with the same scientific exactitude with which he treats Physics and Biology. This of course, as we have noted is one of the telling influences of his science background on his works. He begins *Poetics* by collecting and categorizing data available to him, and draws conclusions while advancing certain theses

[1] *Poetics*: 1452[a] & 1452[b]

[2] That the portrayal of a tragic character should not only be good, appropriate or suitable but also be lifelike and consistent, even if inconsistency is their character trait; they must nevertheless be portrayed as inconsistently consistent. 1454[a] 15

[3] By this prescription, one should not only show virtuous men passing from good to bad fortune and bad men passing from bad to good fortune, but also should not show a wicked man passing from good to bad fortune, because they would not arouse pity or fear. To arouse the emotions of pity and fear it further prescribes that the man presented should not be pre-eminent in moral virtue, who passes to bad fortune (*κακὴ τύχη*) not through vice and depravity, but rather because of some *hamartia* (ἁμαρτία*)* or error; a man of high repute like Oedipus and Thyestes. 1453[a]. For further details, see Albert A. Sackey. (2010). "The Hamartia of Aristotle". *Legon Journal of the Humanities.* (21). pp 77ff.; Hilde Vinje. (2021). 'The Beauty of Failure: Hamartia in Aristotle's Poetics'. *Classical Quarterly*. pp. 1-19. & P. Jeyalakshmi. (2017). 'Aristotle: Hamartia and Catharsis'. *IJARIIE*. 3(3).

> in accordance with his analysis. From the classical era to date, the *Poetics* has arguably remained the hub around which most critical discourses on tragic drama rotate.[4]

Of course, this is not to suggest, from the preceding statements, that Aristotle's *Poetics* has not been criticised[5] or is a perfect treatise. However, its relation to and its position as far as the understanding and interpretation of tragedy as a genre is concerned is unrivalled. To add to this, the mere fact that out of twenty-six chapters of the *Poetics*, fourteen are dedicated to tragedy is equally instructive. This demonstrates the importance Aristotle attaches to the study of the tragic genre.

Historically, a philosophical inquiry into poetry had begun in the 4th century B.C. and this was spearheaded by Plato, who examined the phenomenon not only as part of his moral philosophy but also, virtually rejected poetry on moral and philosophical grounds. Plato espouses the view that poetry is immoral and imitative in nature. Aristotle, on the other hand, examines poetry as a form of art and evaluates its constituent elements based on its aesthetic beauty. He observed the then available forms of literature and analysed them and codified the rules out of which he has described tragedy in an elaborative manner like no other. Thus, Aristotle's *Poetics*, which provides a classic analysis of the form of tragedy that is based on the tragedies of Greek dramatists such as Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, is an indirect answer to Plato's as he

[4] F.O. Ekevere, *et al*. (2016). 'Aristotle's Poetics: A Critique'. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research* 1(4). p.85.

[5] See Angela Curran. (2001). 'Brecht's Criticisms of Aristotle's Aesthetics of Tragedy'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* 59(2). pp.167-184. See also Martha C. Nussbaum. (1992).'Tragedy and Self-Sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity' and Stephen Halliwell. (1992). 'Pleasure, Understanding and Emotion in Aristotle's *Poetics'* both in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. ed. Amelie Oskenberg Rorty. (Princeton University Press). pp. 261-290 & pp. 241-260, respectively. See also Gerald F. Else. (1957). *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.)

proved that poetry is not a servile copy or a blind imitation, but a process of creation.[6] Robert R. Sherman also adds:

> Both conceived that was an imitation, but an analysis of what was the function and limit of this imitation should show why each philosopher viewed the poets differently…Plato attacks and Aristotle defends the poets (and poetry) to the extent that the poets portray a view of reality that is the same as the philosophers' theories of truth. Specifically, poetry is imitation to both Plato and Aristotle, but one it is imitation of the "vulgar" world, while to the other it is imitation of "real" world.[7]

Melis Güven, in this vein, instructively adds:

> Plato concludes that poetry has a very bad influence intellectually, morally, and emotionally, on the contrary, Aristotle claims that poetry has to be praised in all these respects since it actually has a good and healthy influence on men by putting forward his theory of catharsis, meaning the point in a play where the hero understands and accepts his damnation.[8]

The preceding perspectives first underscore the view that Aristotle's analysis of tragedy is not an imaginary one, but scientific, hence its trustworthiness. Secondly, as response to Plato's unpalatable view or description of what constitutes poetry, it tends to justify the various concepts he espouses in his *Poetics*, though a 4th-century ideal in a 5th-century corpus, could not have been farther away from the identified objectives of the genre, hence its reliability over the centuries. Indeed, Aristotle's importance for the history of literary criticism cannot be understated. Few if any thinkers have had so enormous and long-lasting an impact on the tradition.[9]

---

[6] *Literary Criticism and Critical Appreciation*. (2015-16). (Kolhapur: Shivaji University). pp.2-6.

[7] Robert R. Sherman. (1966). "Plato, Aristotle and the Poets". *Educational Theory*. 16(3). pp. 250-261.
On the same issue see James Stillwagon. (2016). "The Indirection of Influence: Poetics and Pedagogy in Aristotle and Plato". *The Journal Aesthetic Education*. 50(2). pp. 8-25.

[8] Melis Güven. (2022). *Critical Art: Plato and Aristotle's Debate over Poetry*. Available @ https://www.byarcadia.org/post/critical-art-plato-and-aristotle-s-debate-over-poetry

[9] "Aristotle's Response to Plato— the Poetics". Available @ http://literature.clarkpdx.org/?page_id=24#_ftnref9
On the importance of Aristotle's *Poetics* in literary criticism and in the defence of poetry, see also Aristotle's Poetry Against Plato's Attack on Poetry @ http://literayenglish.com/aristotles-defence-of-poetry-against-platos-charge,

Moreover, despite criticism against the *Poetics*,[10] it has stood the test of time. This is because a quick glance through the western history of dramatic theory primarily serves to underline Aristotle's importance, not to say the sole dominance. Firstly, the influence of Aristotle's dramatic theory that was almost as widespread through the centuries is dominantly seen in Horace's *The Art of Poetry*, which was referred to with just as much reverence as Aristotle's and in which the latter's perspectives and thoughts are easily traced. Secondly, this influence also traverses through the Middle Ages where commentators mainly referred to Horace, until Aristotle's *Poetics* appeared — and then his words were the laws to which all thoughts on dramatic theory related. Aristotle's influence continues through the Christian Era, the Renaissance and beyond, where in the field of dramatic theory one stands out among the others, the introduction of Aristotle's *Poetics*.[11]

Additionally, the question of the importance of Aristotle's *Poetics* to the understanding of dramatic concepts pertaining to the 5th century Attic dramaturgy evinces a twofold answer —that it was intended to provide practical advice for poets or to rebut Plato's condemnation of poetry in the *Republic*.[12] On the basis of the foregoing, Ford makes an important pronouncement which emphasises or gives further impetus to the value and acceptability of Aristotle's *Poetics*:

> To ask what is the purpose of Aristotle's Poetics may seem naive or temerarious, as if the teacher of those who know had not made himself plain and as if five centuries of intense scholarly focus on the text had failed to settle such a fundamental question.[13]

"Plato and Aristotle on Poetry" (2022).@ https://askliterature.com/literary-criticism/aristotle/plato-and-aristotle-on-poetry/ James Stillwagon. (2016)

[10] Aristotle. *Poetics*. (Ed. with Notes & Intro., by D.W. Lucas). (Oxford: Clarendon Press); Stephen Halliwell. (1986). *Aristotle's Poetics*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press) & Elizabeth Belfiore's (1985). *Pleasure, Tragedy and Aristotle's Psychology*. *Classical Quarterly.* 35(2). pp. 349-361

[11] Stefan Stenudd. Aristotle *Poetics*: The Drama Theory and Influence of the *Poetics*. www. stenudd.com/aristotle/aristotle-poetics-followers.htm.

[12] Andrew Ford. (2015). "The Purpose of Aristotle's *Poetics*." *Classical Philology*. 110(1). pp. 1-21.

[13] *Ibid*.

Citing M. A. R. Habib's, *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory From Plato to Present*, P. Jeyalakshmi instructively notes:

> Aristotle's analysis of tragedy is by far the most well-known section of the Poetics. It remained influential for many centuries and was not seriously challenged until for many centuries.... It is in this treatment of tragedy that the connections between the foregoing notions – imitation, action, character, morality, and plot – emerge most clearly.[14]

From the foregoing, it seems appropriate to rely *inter alia* on Aristotle's *Poetics* in the application of the notion of *hamartia* and its related nuances in my interpretation and critique of madness forthwith in the selected Greek tragedies. Indeed, the stage is already set, Aristotle's outline of the drama has established itself, to the extent where little of its lines are crossed by later thinkers[15], and it has permeated throughout different epochs.

The theme of madness, its treatment and dramatic illustration, come with some sterling effect on the aim of tragedy, that is the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear.[16] By that I mean the tragic effect is quite intense when madness is the cause of the fall of the tragic hero. Consequently, the focus of this thesis is a critique of those extant plays that have madness as a central motif: Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Sophocles' *Ajax* and Euripides' *Orestes*, the *Bacchae* and *Heracles* respectively. By this it considers the madness of Aeschylus' Orestes, Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Orestes, Pentheus and Heracles respectively. It needs to be stated that because all the heroes mentioned are males, an erroneous impression is created that my study is gender insensitive and by that it is skewed against female heroes who suffer madness.[17] My choice of these plays is motivated by two key ideas. In the first place, the mode through which the madness of the tragic hero comes about and the characteristics they exhibit are quite

[14] P. Jeyalakshmi. (2017). "Aristotle: Hamartia and Catharsis." *IJARIIE*. 3(3).
[15] Stefan Stenudd. Aristotle *Poetics*: The Drama Theory and Influence of the *Poetics*. www.stenudd.com/aristotle/aristotle-poetics-followers.htm.
[16] cf. notes, 1.
[17] See the session labelled 'Limitations and Delimitations' for further details on the exclusion of Agave in my detailed analysis of each of the heroes mentioned.

intriguing: they see things that those around them are oblivious of. Secondly, the devastation that the tragic hero wreaks on close kin and at other times on themselves is worth investigating.

In the light of this, I will thoroughly critique the various dimensions, the cause(s) of the madness and its consequences, demonstrations and features of madness as treated by each of the tragedians. I will also do a comparative analysis of the plays as far as madness is concerned with the aim of establishing a synthesis between the selected plays. By synthesis I mean that some common threads seem to permeate through the selected plays: (a) that the gods are the agents of madness in the selected plays; (b) that in all cases, the madness that befalls the hero is temporary; (c) that for dramatic purposes they act strangely or irrationally and utter unintelligible words indicative of a mind demented; (d) that the afflicted mind of the hero could be non-tragic or tragic madness and it is either construed as a Psychoanalytic[18] or a Socio-Psychological[19] phenomenon or both.

Madness is largely a personality disorder phenomenon. When one is considered as such, it suggests that in relation to normal social activities, one is characterised as having gone *wayward*. The three basic modules which Freud believes contribute to personality development have to do with *Superego*, *Id* and *Ego*. Thus, the *Superego* which deals with the moral aspects of our actions disapproves of deeds that are unacceptable to society. The *Ego* makes one do things that conform to society. The *Id*, which is the pleasure-seeking aspect of our personality, when it surpasses or largely suppresses our *Ego*, makes us do things that please us but not things that conform to societal norms. That is, at any point in time that our *Id* is supreme or much stronger consciously

[18] The Psychoanalytic theory, as postulated by Sigmund Freud, is a notion that human behaviour is fundamentally shaped and influenced by the interplay between *Id, Superego* and *Ego*. (See the section 'Literature Review' and the 'Theoretical Framework' for further details).

[19] The Socio-Psychological theory posits that the individual's personality and behaviour are shaped and influenced by cultural values and social norms in the face of external situations or realities. (See the section 'Literature Review' and the 'Theoretical Framework' for further details).

or unconsciously than the other components of the mind, then, by implication, it means one is doing something that is not normal or acceptable to society, hence madness.[20]

Moreover, when Stefan Stenudd argues in his *Psychoanalysis of Mythology: Freudian theories on Myth and Religion Examined*, that Freud and several of his followers used psychological theories to ascertain the origin of myths and religion[21], it is by this an emphasis on the view that the study of how/what proceeds from the mind either consciously or otherwise is a function of Psychoanalysis. Vanda Zajko and Ellen O'Gorman in furtherance of the preceding perspective, assert in their abstract the inter-relationship of classical myth and psychoanalysis, debates about the reception of classical myth by modernity, the importance of psychoanalytic ideas for cultural critique and its on-going relevance to ways of conceiving the self.[22] The aim of the Psychoanalytic process as Andre Green notes, is not so much to make something conscious, as to recognise the unconscious.[23] The Socio-Psychological theory, which is a scientific study of how personal, situational, and societal factors influence the cognition, motivation, and behaviour of individuals and social groups,[24] appropriately helps my study to assess the conflicting challenges,

---

[20] For further details on the application of Freud's Psychoanalytic theory to madness, see Daniel Berthold-Bond. (1991). "Hegel, Nietzsche, and Freud on Madness and the Unconscious". *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 5(3). pp.193-213; Martha Merrill Umphrey*, et al.* (2003). *Madness and Law: An Introduction.* University of Michigan Press & William Sale. (2011). "The Psychoanalysis of Pentheus in the Bacchae of Euripides." *Yale Classical Studies 22*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 64-82.

[21]Stefan Stenudd. (2022). *Psychoanalysis of Mythology: Freudian theories on Myth and Religion Examined*. (Sweden: Arriba). pp. 1-232.

[22] Vanda Zajko and Ellen O'Gorman. (eds.). (2013). *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and Modern Stories of the Self*. (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press). For further readings on the relationship between myth, tragedy and Psychoanalysis, see Robert Segal. (2014). "Greek Myth and Psychoanalysis". *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Lowell Edmunds (ed.). (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press). pp. 409-455; Victoria Wohl. (2008). "The Romance of Tragedy and Psychoanalysis". *Helios*. 35(1). 89-110; Robert Eisner. (1987). *The Road to Daulis: Psychoanalysis, Psychology, and Classical Mythology.* (Syracuse University Press). pp. 1-316; M.B. Arthur. (1977). "Classics and Psychoanalysis". *CJ.* 73. Pp. 56-68 & Nadia Sels. (2011). "Myth, Mind and Metaphor: On the Relation of Mythology and Psychoanalysis". *Journal of the Jan Van Eyck Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique*. 4. pp. 56-70.

[23] Andre Green. Institute of Psychoanalysis, British Psychoanalytical Society, on https://psychoanalysis.org.uk/authors-and-theorists/andré-green

[24] Miles Hewstone, et al. (Eds.). (2007). *The Scope of Social Psychology*. (Hove and New York: Psychology Press). pp. 1-353.

demands and influences the tragic heroes undergo before the deed is committed, hence madness. It is upon the foregoing views that I have adapted the two Freudian theories. In effect, my reliance on the Psychoanalytic theory is motivated not only by the view that it is able to identify and interpret the cause(s) of the madness the hero suffers[25], but also it accounts for the various stages of madness or a pattern as I have identified in the works of the tragedians.

Having dealt with the basis for my reliance on the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories, we can now shift our attention to the main source of the tragic effect. Fundamentally, the main source of the tragic effect should emanate from the nature of the cause of the madness. In fact, there is no tragedy if the cause of the hero's madness is a wanton display of divine strength or power. It is upon these grounds that appropriately, madness in the ordinary sense[26] must be distinguished from tragic madness[27] and non-tragic madness[28]. Also, as Yulia Ustinova asserts:

> Any deviation from an ordinary baseline state of consciousness could be called mania, whether achieved voluntarily or involuntarily, deliberately sought or resulting from a disease, seen as a

[25] See the Theoretical Framework for further details.

[26] In general, *μανία* (Greek for "madness, frenzy, mad passion, rage, fury etc.") is the root word, which has other variants like *μαίνομαι* which translates in the adjectival sense as 'be frantic, mad, and frenzied: with mad fits of raving'; *μᾰνῐκός*, on the other hand, suggests the tendency to be inclined to madness, mad, and *μανικόν*, to look mad, hence *μανικῶς*, also used in an adverbial sense, involves a situation that is done 'in mad fashion', and 'madly'.
H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press) p.425.

[27] Tragic madness should be considered as a representation of the socio-psychological and psychoanalytic condition of the tragic hero who is gripped by some force or power greater than himself (usually a god making him mad), which impels him to say or behave for dramatic purposes abnormally or aberrantly though temporarily and which is not only consistent with *hamartia* but also in consonance with the aim or purpose of tragedy (i.e., the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear).

[28] Non-tragic madness in my thesis could also be considered as a representation of the socio-psychological and psychoanalytic condition of the hero whose mind has been afflicted by the gods albeit temporarily, which impels him to act or behave for dramatic purposes abnormally or aberrantly and which is consistent with the *hubristic principle* because his afflicted mind is construed as a deserving one or a punishment for a wrong done.

god-sent blessing or a curse. This variety of meanings reflects a wide range of experiences, from ecstatic prophesying to violent frenzy.[29]

Although Ustinova's description of madness in a general sense is edifying, it is equally important to note that my study excludes prophetic frenzy in the strictest sense of the word as constituting madness.[30] Generally, madness in Greek tragedy is a temporary affliction of the hero's mind by the gods for a certain wrong done with usually devastating consequences. This condition is more consistent with Homeric *Ate* that in my view attaches moral depravity to the fall of the hero and by extension the madness.[31] This is what I call the *hubristic* principle[32], that is, *koros-hubris-nemesis-Ate*. [33] I must intimate here that, because the *hubristic* principle generally attaches moral depravity to the madness, the consequent fall of the hero it is non-tragic. The simple reason is that by this principle the hero deserves the madness that the gods wrought on him. Typical instances include Aeschylus' Orestes, Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Pentheus, just to mention a few. Orestes is made mad by the Furies because he kills Clytemnestra; Sophocles' Ajax is made mad by Athena because he had wanted to kill Odysseus and the Atreidae and Euripides' Pentheus is made mad because he had obstinately opposed the worship of Dionysus.

---

[29] Yulia Ustinova. (2020). "Alteration of consciousness in Ancient Greece: divine mania." *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). p. 258.

[30] See Limitations and Delimitations for clarification.

[31] For further details see Homer's *Odyssey*, I: 30, 40, 298, III:306 and IV:546 about Orestes' revenge on Aegisthus and Clytemnestra and the consequences thereof; and, about the fate that befalls Ajax, see IV: 499-511. Homer. (1991) *The Odyssey*. (Trans; E.V. Rieu). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

[32] In brief, the *hubristic principle* operates upon the principle that a hero of *koros* (that is, a man of prosperity, surfeit or satiety, etc.) has the propensity or the predisposition to commit *hubris* (wanton violence, dishonouring of a victim, etc.) where the gods should intervene as a means of exacting justice or retribution of what is due (*nemesis*) by making him (the hero) demented (*Ate*).

[33] J. A. Otchere. (2010). *The Irrational in Greek Tragedy: Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean*. Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing (1-26). i. *Koros* is variously rendered as satiety, surfeit, or to have enough or too much of a thing, as a corollary of hubris. ii. *Hubris* could be rendered as wanton violence, from the pride of strength or passion, insolence, lewd, licentiousness or acts towards others, spiteful treatment, and an outrage or gross insult. iii. *Nemesis*, could be interpreted as retribution of what is due, but in common usage, it means retribution, especially righteous anger aroused by injustice; later, of the wrath of the gods; indignation at undeserved good fortune. iv. *Ate* is normally referred to as a mental aberration, or perhaps abnormality; infatuation causing irrational behaviour which leads to disaster.

However, for the same madness to qualify as tragic madness, certain requirements must be fulfilled or are needed. I prescribe here that first, tragic madness also operates on the principle that the affliction of the hero's mind is temporary; second, it is occasioned by the gods with usually devastating consequences either on the hero or close kin. Third and the most crucial part as far as this thesis is concerned, is where I advocate that the affliction of the mind of the hero is merely an exploitation of the weaknesses and the desires of the hero either consciously or unconsciously and not just a wanton display of divine strength. This is what makes the application of the Psychoanalytic theory more crucial to my study. For instance, it is appropriate to say Apollo exploits Orestes' desire for vengeance as the cause of his madness and is not a merely wanton display of divine power. It is on the account of this that I propose the application of *hamartia* (Greek for 'error'[34] or 'error of judgement'[35], which Ho Kim also construes from Aristotle's perspective as being 'ignorance of particulars'.[36] The relevance of the application of *hamartia* here is that it dispenses with moral depravity in the action of the hero which brings about the madness, and rather creates an atmosphere that allows one to appropriately explain their madness as an exploitation of their desires or weaknesses consciously or unconsciously by the gods. This is not to suggest that the hero/the heroine does not bear the consequences of his/her actions. On the basis of the foregoing argument, I agree in part with Jean-Pierre Vernant's perspective that the will can be described as the person seen as an agent, the self seen as the source .of actions for which it is held responsible before others and to which it furthermore feels inwardly committed,[37] but to some extent, it runs as counterproductive to the Aristotelian precept of the involuntariness of the agent; therein lies the tragic effect. It is upon this that this research

[34] *Poetics*: 1452ª & 1453ª
[35] J. Dawe. (1968). 'Some Reflections on *Ate* and *Hamartia*'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. (72). pp. 89-123
[36] Ho Kim. (2010). 'Aristotle's "Hamartia" Reconsidered'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. (105). pp.33-52
[37] Jeanne-Pierre Vernant. (1990). "Intimations of the Will in Greek Tragedy." *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (New York: Zone Books). p.49.

proposes Psycho-analytic and Socio-Psychological theoretical frameworks as the bases for analysing both tragic and non-tragic madness. The rationale for the choice of these theories will be appropriately explained in the theoretical framework and the methodology below.

It is therefore important to state here that it is upon these perspectives that I intend not only to distinguish but also to analyse tragic madness and non-tragic madness as well. The fact that we see the hero gripped by a force beyond himself, causing him to behave irrationally, does not just construe tragic madness. It would only be considered as such when it conforms to the elements as earlier given and which have the capacity to arouse the emotions of pity and fear. In my view, modern scholarship has not adequately brought this distinction to bear on the interpretation and understanding of 5th century Attic tragedy as far as madness is concerned. This undergirds my motivation for this study.

One striking thing about the selected extant plays of the Attic tragedians is their emphasis on the fact that the treatment of madness is attributable to divine orchestration or punishment for the wrong done. As earlier indicated, the fact is that if the source of the madness is punishment for a wrong done, then it is more of *nemesis* (retribution of what is due), which is a component of the *hubristic* principle, than of tragedy. What is interesting and invariably missing in modern scholarship is the fact that this lacuna has not been adequately treated, especially in situations where the madness was not the hero's fault but a capricious use of divine power. The exploitation of this would lead one to establish without equivocation the relationship or the distinction, possibly, first, between non-tragic madness and tragic madness, second, Aristotle's

concept of *hamartia*[38] and its relation to tragic madness, third, non-tragic madness and its relation to the *hubristic* principle, and fourth, the aim of tragedy.

It is important to note that although contemporary scholars have over the period dealt with the above scenarios from different perspectives with respect to the treatment of the theme of tragic madness, they have mainly focused on a selective critique of the individual plays of the Attic tragedians that have madness as its central leitmotif. This is not in any way an unfair criticism of their works, after all each writer has its focus, purpose and its targeted audience.[39] However, the new approach I have adapted considers a combination of the projection or the portrayal of non-tragic madness as distinct from tragic madness with relation to the *hubristic* principle and *hamartia* respectively, from and for Psychoanalytical and Socio-Psychological perspectives and purposes, which is not the only motivation for this study, but also to arrive at a synthesised view of madness by undertaking a comparative analysis of the theme from the perspectives of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. This in my view has not received much modern scholarly attention.[40]

Following the above, there is a vacuum which my research work intends to fill. Thus, it is to fill this gap that I am motivated to undertake this research study.

[38]In the *Poetics* 1453[a], Aristotle explains his concept of *hamartia* by using a certain scenario. He prescribes that the hero who commits the error or the hamartia is not pre-eminent in moral virtue, and who passes to bad fortune not through vice or wickedness, but because of some ignorance. In my view that is the more appropriate reason why I postulate that it is through the exploitation of the desires or the weakness of the hero either consciously or unconsciously that essentially brings about the tragic madness. Therefore, in the scheme of my thesis, *hamartia* should be construed as an error committed by the tragic hero emanating from his desires or weakness, which sets in motion a connected chain of events culminating in his fall.

[39] See Literature Review.

[40] See the Literature Review and the Theoretical Framework for further details.

1.2. Problem Statement

It is common knowledge that in Greek tragedy the gods are the orchestrators of the madness of the tragic heroes: Orestes, Ajax, Pentheus and Heracles. However, there is the human element of madness also occasioned by the gods' exploitation of the weakness or the desires of the hero. This then lays the foundation for a distinction between two categories of madness. The first issue that proceeds from the preceding statements is that if the madness of the hero emanates from a capricious use of divine power because a purported wrong has been committed then it is non-tragic — at best it is *nemesis*, which follows the *hubristic* principle. It therefore creates the impression that the madness that befalls the hero is as a result of his moral depravity and not just an error or error of judgement or even ignorance of the particulars borne out of some weakness or desires either consciously or unconsciously. Thus, for example, Ajax is gripped in madness orchestrated by Athena because he desires the deaths of Odysseus and the Atreidae hence a deserving misfortune. This situation or condition is problematic and uncharacteristic of the demands of the tragic genre. Now the question is: how do we construe the madness of Orestes, Ajax, Heracles and Pentheus so that it could fulfil the demands characteristic of the tragic genre—the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear? Further still, can we use the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories to construe the madness that befalls Orestes, Ajax, Pentheus and Heracles as constituting non-tragic or tragic madness in order to achieve a synthesised view of the notion? In other words, how can one exploit as opposed to/in addition to/as an alternative approach to language and dramatic studies or situate *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, constituting the Psychoanalytic theory, and the Socio-Psychological theory, which focuses on how the environment influences the thinking and the behaviour of the hero, in the interpretation of non-tragic and tragic madness?

1.3. Aims and Objectives

The aim of this research work is first and foremost to contribute to the existing body of knowledge of madness in Greek tragedy. Secondly, it is the aim of this thesis to provide a clear distinction between non-tragic madness and tragic madness. It is also my objective to investigate and state the purpose and the need for the distinction between the two concepts I have just mentioned. This would be done with the main aim of exploring non-tragic madness and tragic madness as Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological phenomena with the intent of achieving a synthesis of the notion. Furthermore, it is my aim to investigate among other things the portrayal of madness from the perspectives of each of the three Attic tragedians, namely: Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological purposes. By the same token, it is my aim to deduce how the madness of the heroes constitutes tragic madness or non-tragic madness from Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological perspectives. By these, I shall explore Aeschylus' distinctive portrayal of the madness of Orestes in the *Choephori*, Ajax in Sophocles' *Ajax* and Orestes, Heracles and Pentheus in Euripides' *Orestes, Heracles* and the *Bacchae* respectively. I shall conduct a comparative analysis of the notion with the intent of arriving at a synthesis of madness.[41] It is also my objective to identify divine orchestration of the affliction of the mind of the hero, first, as impulsive and wanton use of power as non-tragic madness, which is a demand of the *hubristic* principle, and second, to explore the exploitation of the weaknesses and the desires of the heroes by the gods in making them deranged as rather construing tragic madness, which is consistent with the demands of *hamartia*.

1.4. Hypothesis

My study is designed to assess the hypothesis that madness would be categorised in terms of tragic and non-tragic in my analyses of the selected plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and

[41] (Cf. p. 5.)

Euripides. It is also designed to assess the hypothesis that tragic madness has some relation with *hamartia* since moral depravity is not attributed as the cause of the hero's madness. It is also intended to evaluate the hypothesis that non-tragic madness has some relation with the *hubristic* principle. Furthermore, my study is also designed to consider the hypothesis that both non-tragic and tragic madness can be construed as either Psycho-analytic or Socio-Psychological phenomena or both. By this, I shall employ a combination of Psychoanalytic theory, which explores the interaction of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* in the determination of one's personality and behaviour, and/or Socio-Psychological theory, which also assesses the environmental influences on the personality and behaviour of the hero in order to achieve a synthesised interpretation of madness as an addition to the more frequent studies of these phenomena from language and/or dramatic perspective.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The significance of my research includes but is not limited to the fact that:

1. It establishes a clear distinction between the Aeschylean concept of madness from Sophoclean, Aeschylean from Euripidean and that of Sophoclean from Euripidean,
2. Madness in Greek tragedy comes in two categories: Tragic madness and non-tragic madness,
3. Non-tragic madness is related to the *hubristic* principle,
4. It makes clear the view that non-tragic madness attributes moral depravity to the madness of the hero,
5. Tragic madness is related to *hamartia*,
6. It makes clear the significance of the fact that tragic madness does not attribute moral depravity to the hero's madness,

7. It establishes a clear distinction between non-tragic and tragic madness,
8. It brings to the fore the import of both non-tragic and tragic madness,
9. It clearly establishes the foundation that non-tragic and tragic madness are portrayed for Psychoanalytic and/or Socio-Psychological significance,
10. It applies the significance of Psychoanalytic or Socio-Psychological theories or both to achieve a synthesis of the interpretation of non-tragic and tragic madness,
11. It brings to the fore the use of Psychoanalytic or Socio-Psychological theories in critiquing, analysing and interpreting both tragic and non-tragic madness,
12. It will help improve the discourse on the tragic plot, broaden the knowledge of students, classicists and scholars who are interested in the tragic genre in general and madness in particular.

1.6. Research Questions

The research questions include but are not limited to the following:

1. Can there be tragic and non-tragic madness that could be analysed from Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological perspectives with the aim of achieving a synthesis of the notion?
2. How does each of the tragedians portray the madness that befalls the hero in the selected plays?
3. Can there be a comparative analysis of the portrayal of madness in the selected plays to achieve a synthesis of the notion?
4. Are there two categories of madness in Greek tragedy: non-tragic and tragic madness?
5. What constitutes non-tragic madness?
6. How does non-tragic madness come about?
7. Is non-tragic madness different from tragic madness?

8. Does non-tragic madness have a relation with the *hubristic* principle?
9. Is non-tragic madness portrayed for dramatic purpose?
10. Is non-tragic madness portrayed for Psychoanalytic purpose or interest?
11. Is non-tragic madness portrayed for Socio-Psychological purpose or interest?
12. How can Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological approaches or theories or perspectives be integrated into the interpretation of non-tragic madness?
13. What constitutes tragic madness?
14. How does tragic madness come about?
15. Does tragic madness have a relation with *hamartia*?
16. Is the portrayal of tragic madness for dramatic purposes?
17. Is the portrayal of tragic madness for Socio-Psychological purposes or interest?
18. Is the portrayal of tragic madness for Psychoanalytic purpose or interest?
19. Can we integrate Psychoanalytic and/or Socio-Psychological theories in our interpretation, critiquing and analysis of tragic madness?
20. Can we reach a synthesis of madness in the selected plays from Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological approaches or perspectives?

1.7. Literature Review

It is a fact that various authors have written different treatises on the theme of madness either from neurological, psychological or particularly dramatic perspectives, that is, tragedy. Since I am dealing with tragedy and the focus is on madness, the reviewed literature mainly emphasises works of authors who have written on the said theme. To start with, Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Sophocles' *Ajax* and Euripides' *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* have been selected because they are the only extant plays of these Attic poets that have madness as their central leitmotif. I

need to also add that, my choice of Philip Vellacott's translations of *The Choephori*, *Heracles* and *The Bacchae*, E.F. Watling's *Ajax* and David Kovacs' *Orestes*, which form my main primary sources, sits well with my appreciation of the original language. This would be complemented side by side with *The Loeb Classical Library*'s versions of the plays as well Ian Johnston's *Oresteia* in Greek. This is to ensure in all cases, consistency, standardisation and especially, the reckoning of the lines.

It is equally important to reiterate the fact that treatises on the theme of madness have been varied because of the focus, intent and target of the respective authors. There are others who have chosen to write on the theme of madness in Greek tragedy from either the perspectives of Aeschylus or Sophocles or Euripides. In this vein, we can first cite the work of Gilbert Murray who discusses the madness of Aeschylus' Orestes[42]. A similar discourse can equally be seen in the respective works of Simon Goldhill[43] and Michael Simpson[44] who focus on the madness of Sophocles' Ajax. We further see an instance of this in the work of Hartigan who also concentrates mainly on the madness of Heracles and Orestes[45]. On the other hand, Emma Meador also focuses on Euripides' *Bacchae*[46] where we witness the transformation of Pentheus whose mind has been turned upside down by Dionysus. Antonietta Provenza[47] also emphasises the madness of Heracles in her work. What is missing in the works cited above which my study

[42] Aeschylus, & G. Murray. (1961). *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. (London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.)
Here Gilbert Murray gives us information about the condition of Orestes driven mad by the Erinyes in page 41, 46, etc.
[43]Simon Goldhill. (1986). 'Mind and madness' in *Reading Greek Tragedy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
[44] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa* (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 2(1). pp. 88-103.
[45] Karelisa Hartigan. (1987). 'Euripidean Madness: Herakles and Orestes'. *Greece & Rome*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). 34(2). pp. 126-135
[46] Emma Meador. (2008). *Masks of Madness: Contextualizing Euripides' Bacchae*. (Ohio: Miami University in Oxford. A paper presented at a Classics Conference at Ohio, Miami University in Oxford, focuses on the transformation of Pentheus from a purported personality sanity to insanity orchestrated by Dionysus.
[47] She focuses on the Bestialisation of the madness of Euripides' Heracles. Antonietta Provenza (2013). Madness and Bestialisation in Euripides' *Heracles*. *The Classical Quarterly*. 63. pp. 68-93

seeks to provide is the treatment of the notion of madness first as they have done by considering its (i.e., madness) portraiture either from Aeschylean or Sophoclean or Euripidean perspective, but second, which is my addition, by ensuring that a comparative analysis of the theme of madness from the three Attic tragedians is done to achieve a synthesis of the theme. Now, what Ruth Padel brings into the discussion is very valuable as she focuses on elements of tragic madness in her treatment of the issue.[48] As close as her focus may be to mine as far as my research is concerned, her work does not in any way propose two categories of madness let alone distinguish non-tragic madness from tragic madness and the relationship of the latter to *hamartia* as I have outlined above.

We can now shift our attention to the agents of madness in Greek tragedy. It is important to state here that the Attic tragedians take their inspiration from Homer. This view is accordingly corroborated by Ruth Padel when she argues that tragedy structured itself around an initially Homeric insight into the world-damage and what a damaged mind can do. In this regard, she proposes two roles of madness: it is both human—a permanent possibility, a hyperbolic presence against which tragic acts are judged—and divine, a sudden incursion, daemonic destruction of mind or life.[49] In Book XIX:72ff. of the *Iliad*, Agamemnon attributes Zeus, Fate and the Fury as those who blinded his judgement. He further alleges the cause of his temporary madness to a certain Power, *Ate*, who blinds us all by flitting through men's heads, corrupting them and bringing them down. The preceding incident as outlined is not a departure from the notion of madness that my study explores. This foregoing view is given further impetus by E.R. Dodds, who provides us with the nuances and workings of *Ate* as he uses Agamemnon's apology to

[48] See Literature Review for further details.
[49] Ruth Padel. (1995). *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness*. (Princeton). p. 239

achieve this objective.[50] Furthermore, that the gods are the agents of the madness of the tragic heroes is corroborated by many modern scholars including Simon Goldhill[51], Ruth Padel[52], Emma Meador[53] and Antonietta Provenza[54], to mention just a few. The actions of the gods outlined above are crucial since they provide information detailing the cause(s) of the madness of the heroes. However, what is important to note here as far as my research is concerned, is that their actions (the gods') should be consistent with what Aristotle identifies as the aim of tragedy (i.e., it should have the capacity to arouse emotions of pity and fear).

The conception and the treatment of madness from Socio-Psychological and Psychoanalytic approaches and perspectives feature prominently not only in my theoretical framework but also in the literature discussed below. From Socio-Psychological perspectives, my research mainly reviews the perspectives of Bennet Simon, and Richard Gross, a French philosopher, historian of

[50] E.R. Dodds. (1951). *The Greek and the Irrational.* (Berkeley: University of California Press). pp. 1-27.

[51] Simon Goldhill. (1986). 'Mind and madness'. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). pp. 168-198. On page 181 where this specific information is found Goldhill asserts that in *Ajax* the cause of Ajax's delusion is explicitly claimed to be Athene, but he goes further to acknowledge the role that Ajax himself plays in his madness which is consistent with my position of tragic madness.

[52] Ruth Padel. (1995). *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness*. (Princeton). p. 239. In Padel's establishment and acceptance of the madness that befalls the heroes as coming from the gods, she first traces the notion from Homer and firmly establishes the human role in the cause of the madness by claiming that that is the source upon which tragic acts are evaluated. The latter view expressed by Padel is not only consistent with that already expressed by Goldhill as I have earlier alluded to, but she stops short of elaborating on what constitutes tragic madness and non-tragic madness and the relationship thereof, which my study brings into focus.

[53] Emma Meador. (2008). *Masks of Madness: Contextualizing Euripides' Bacchae*. (Ohio: Miami University in Oxford). On page 13 of her article, Meador also acknowledges the role of Dionysus in driving Pentheus insane by making him do and say things he would not have done if he were sane. This view corroborates the views of Goldhill and Padel to the effect that the gods are the main agents of the madness of the hero. What is deficient here as far as my study is concerned, is Meador's neglect to account for the role of Pentheus in the madness that befalls him.

[54] Antonietta Provenza (2013). 'Madness and Bestialization in Euripides' *Heracles*'. *The Classical Quarterly*. 63. pp 68-93. In Provenza's assessment of Heracles' madness, she acknowledges the source of the madness as an inexorability of divine will and arbitrariness of divine power. This view is quite important to my study because it is consistent with the non-tragic aspect of madness but falls short when it comes to what I have classified as tragic madness. For further reading on the madness of Heracles, you can refer to the works of the following authors: B. Simon. (1978). *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry*. (Ithaca: NY and London). pp. 130–9; M.S. Silk. (1985). 'Heracles and Greek tragedy'. *G&R*. 32. pp.1–22; W.D. Furley. (1986). 'Euripides on the sanity of Heracles', in J.H. Betts, J.T. Hooker and J. Green (edd.), *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster* (Bristol). pp.102–13; K. Hartigan. (1987). 'Euripidean madness: Herakles and Orestes', *G&R.* 34. pp.126–35; R. Padel. (1992). *In and out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton); R. Padel. (1995). *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness*. (Princeton).

ideas, social theorist, and literary critic, Michel Foucault, Miles Hewstone, *et al*., Kanchan Bharati, *et al*. and Martin Gold and Elizabeth Douvan.

In summary, Simon's work (1978)[55] attempts to trace the classical roots of modern psychiatry, an achievement which is significant to my research. In general, Simon seeks to make certain in his book that our understanding of modern psychiatry could be more enhanced if we sort out the perplexing variety of ways in which we conceptualize the origins, nature and treatment of mental illness. In this regard, his book attempts to deal with this problem by exploring the thinking of Greek antiquity when he takes inspiration from the works of Homer, the tragedians, Plato and Hippocrates and pitches it against the origins and treatment of mental disturbance. The point where there is a marked departure from my research is Simon's treatment of madness as a mental illness.

Following Simon's inspiration, Richard Gross (2009)[56] also a psychoanalyst and a psychologist, treats abnormality not only from a socio-psychological perspective (where the environment plays a key part in the interpretation and the application of the term abnormality) but also considers abnormality as mental illness. In his treatment of abnormality as a mental illness, he gives us various definitions and classifications of abnormality, namely: Schizophrenia, depression, panic attack, and hallucination, just to mention a few. It is however important to point out here that the focus of my research differs partly from the perspectives of Simon and Gross. By that I do not intend to project tragic madness as mental illness but more from socio-psychological and

[55] Bennet Simon. (1978). *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry* (Ithaca: NY and London). 130–9

[56] Richard Gross. (2009). *Psychology*: *The Science of Mind and Behaviour* (5th Ed.). (Kentucky: Hodder Arnold) Gross' treatment of abnormality is found mainly in Chapter 43:756-774 of the same book as aforesaid. The chapter title is "Psychological Abnormality: Definitions and Classification."

psychoanalytical perspectives as demonstrated largely in the Theoretical framework and the Methodology.

In Foucault's *Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, which was translated by Richard Howard in 2013[57], the standard view is that in contemporary times we treat people with mental illness in so much a humane way than we did in the past. We put the mad people in hospitals and get qualified doctors to look after them. This situation is what Foucault attempted to demolish in his *Madness and Civilisation*. He argues that things way back in the Renaissance were actually far better for the mad than what they later became. In the Renaissance, the mad were felt to be different rather than demented. They were thought to possess a kind of wisdom because they demonstrated the limit of reason. They were revered in many circles and were allowed to wander freely. But in the mid-17th century, a new attitude was born that relentlessly medicalised and institutionalised mentally ill people. No longer were the demented persons allowed to live alongside the sane people; they were taken away from their families and locked up in asylums where they were seen as people they wanted to cure rather than tolerate for just being different.

In fact, the treatment of the theme of madness as a mental illness or from a medicalised perspective as we have seen Simon, Gross, Foucault and other scholars like (Kathleen Riley (2008)[58], Louise Cilliers and Francois P. Retief (2009),[59] and Elizabeth W. Mellyn (2014)[60] do, is not the focus of my thesis.

[57] Michel Foucault. (2013). *Madness and Civilization. A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. (Trans; Richard Howard). (New York: Vintage Books)

[58] Kathleen Riley. (2008). *The Reception and Performance of Euripides' Herakles: Reasoning Madness* (Oxford: University Press). p.1

[59] Louise Cilliers and Francois P. Retief. (2009). "Mental Illness in the Greco-Roman Era". *Acta Classica Supplementum III*. pp.130ff.

However, I also need to point out that one aspect of Foucault's work which I agree with, and which is consistent with one part of my theoretical framework, is his treatment of madness as a socio-psychological phenomenon. Jose Barchilon, the writer of the introduction to Foucault's work, espouses the view that Foucault contextualises folly (madness) as a complex social phenomenon which is not only part and parcel of the human condition but also it has common roots with poetry and tragedy. However, when it comes to Foucault's perspectives on Psychoanalysis, he is ambivalent. In one part he pessimistically opines that psychoanalysis has not been able, will not be able, to hear the voices of unreason, nor to decipher in themselves the signs of the madman; but on the other part, he optimistically claims that Psychoanalysis can unravel some of the forms of madness,[61] a view I share in because it is consistent with my study. Also, in furtherance of the preceding view, Amy Ellen surmises on one hand that Foucault credits psychoanalysis for its attempt to establish a dialogue with unreason, a view which is consistent with my study, and praises Freud's rejection of the racialised hereditary theory of neurosis; and on the other hand, he criticizes psychoanalysis for its normalising and confessional tendencies with respect to sexuality, its adherence to the repressive hypothesis, and its reliance on an overly simplistic juridico-discursive model of power.[62] Daniel Berthold-Bond also establishes a view that seeks to emphasise a connection between madness and tragedy or between madness and tragic action.[63] The preceding view is consistent with my study. Moreover, in furtherance of the Socio-Psychological perspective, the views of Miles Hewstone *et al*., are

[60]Elizabeth W. Mellyn. (2014). *Mad Tuscans and Their Families: A History of Mental Disorder in Early Modern Italy*. (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press)
http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/assets/image/bookheader-current.jpg

[61] Michel Foucault. (2013). *Madness and Civilization. A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. (Trans; Richard Howard). (New York: Vintage Books.) p. 278.

[62] Amy Ellen. (2018). "Foucault, Psychoanalysis, And Critique". *Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*.23(2) 170-18. For further details on Foucault's ambivalence regarding Psychoanalysis, refer to Mark G. E. Kelly. (2020). "Foucault On Psychoanalysis: Missed Encounter or Gordian Knot?" *Foucault Studies*. No.28. 96-119.

[63] Daniel Berthold-Bond. (1994). 'Hegel on Madness and Tragedy'. *History of Philosophy Quarterly*. (University of Illinois Press). p. 73.

also instructive. The understanding that Socio-Psychological theory is to be understood or considered as the scientific study of how personal, situational, and societal factors influence the cognition, motivation, and behaviour of individuals and social groups[64], fits perfectly into the conflicting challenges the tragic heroes undergo before the deed is committed, hence madness. Unlike Miles Hewstone, *et al.*, Kanchan Bharati, *et al*., provide not only a socio-psychological enquiry of the phenomenon of suicide but also add other dimensions like demystification of suicide, pathways to suicide, suicide actors and factors, all from a Socio-Psychological perspective.[65] It is important to add that the preceding perspective of the Socio-Psychological theory is significant because it brings into focus Ajax's suicide. However, I need to add that although the hero is caught in conflicting motivations and challenges, he commits suicide while sane. Moreover, citing Kenneth Ring's criticism of Social Psychology as being in intellectual disarray, on one hand, and Vallacher's and Nowak's condemnation that the Social Psychological approach lacks a conceptual coherence, with which I disagree, Martin Gold and Elizabeth Douvan postulate an integration, which primarily focuses on the interaction of the social and the psychological. They proceed with the view that the interaction of the social and the psychological has to do with persons and their environments and how the nature of both individuals and the social environment depends heavily on their encounters. In the final analysis, like Miles Hewstone, *et al*., both Martin Gold and Elizabeth Douvan define social psychology,

[64] Miles Hewstone, et al. (Eds.). (2007). *The Scope of Social Psychology*. (Hove and New York: Psychology Press). pp. 1-353.
[65] Kanchan Bharati, et al. (2021). *Revisiting Suicide from a Socio-Psychological Lens*. (London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group) pp. 1-231.

which is consistent with my study, as the study of the reciprocal influence of persons and their social environments,[66] hence madness.

The other theory or phenomenon which is crucial to my study is Sigmund Freud's Psychoanalytic theory. The application of the constituent of the Psychoanalytic (*Id, Superego* and *Ego*), first of all, fits so well the tragedians' notion of madness: the hero or heroine is consciously or unconsciously motivated by the *Id* to commit the deed, and madness follows, which is the characteristic function of the *Superego* and finally convalesces, the role of the *Ego*. This apart, the dynamism of the theory has elicited a wide range of scholarly critiques, interpretations and perspectives. To start with, although Carolyn E. Brown provides us with a history of the inception of the Psychoanalytic theory and Shakespearean Psychoanalytic criticisms from the 1970s to the twenty-first century,[67] she appropriately captures Freud's perspective of the Psychoanalytic. In her view, to which I subscribe, Freud divides the mind into three parts: the conscious (the mental functioning, including the memory, that we can contemplate and discuss from a rational viewpoint); the preconscious (memory that can come into consciousness when necessary); and the unconscious (thoughts, memories, desires and feelings—often inappropriate or undesirable—that are not a part of the conscious mind and influence us without our knowledge). Her critique or interpretation of the constituents of 'unconscious', that is, *thoughts, memories, desires and feelings—often inappropriate or undesirable* fits perfectly into the motivations, challenges and conflicting emotions that the tragic

[66]Martin Gold and Elizabeth Douvan. (1997). *A New Outline of Social Psychology*. (Washington: American Psychological Association). pp. 1-9.
[67] Carolyn E. Brown. (2015). *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory*. (Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc). pp. 11-91.

hero undergoes, hence madness.[68] Otto F. Kernberg joins the discourse by assessing and focusing on the contemporary controversies surrounding Freud's theory.[69] He categorises his assessment of Psychoanalysis into three parts/aspects, the first part of which is not significantly different from Carolyn E. Brown's perspective, is also fundamental to my study. Kernberg further considers Psychoanalysis as a personality theory that performs a psychological functioning which focuses principally on unconscious mental processes; whereas the second aspect considers the theory as a method for the investigation of an individual's psychological functioning based on the exploration of his or her free associations within a special therapeutic setting; the third considers the theory as a method for the treatment of a broad spectrum of psychopathological conditions, including the symptomatic neuroses (anxiety states, characterological depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, conversion hysteria, and dissociative hysterical pathology), sexual inhibitions and perversions ("paraphilias"), and the personality disorders.[70] Although my study does not focus on the medicalised perspective of madness, these broad characteristics, as Kernberg makes us aware, are sometimes dramatically exhibited by the tragic heroes in their demented minds. Moreover, and very instructively, André Green provides a stimulating overview of the principal theoretical and practical aspects of Psychoanalysis and analysis of the current state of the field, as he draws on the work of Freud and his followers, along with his own experience of the practice of psychoanalysis to explore subjects including, transference and countertransference, Psychoanalysis and psychotherapy modalities and results language–speech–discourse in psychoanalysis and the work of the

[68] Carolyn E. Brown. (2015). *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory*. (Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc). p.12

[69] Otto F. Kernberg. (2004). *Contemporary Controversies in Psychoanalytic Theory, Techniques, and their Applications.* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press). pp. 1-353.

[70] Otto F. Kernberg. (2004). *Contemporary Controversies in Psychoanalytic Theory, Techniques, and their Applications.* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press). p. 3.

negative recognition of the unconscious.[71] In David Naar's article[72], he brings a different dimension to the Psychoanalytic debate when he looks at the weaknesses and strengths of the theory. Before that, it is important to also state that David Naar's rendering of Freud's Psychoanalytic model largely agrees with Carolyn E. Brown's explication as earlier noted. In his view, Freud's Psychoanalytic model separates the mind into three sections: conscious, preconscious, and unconscious. What is significant about his interpretation of the model, which is equally crucial to my study, is his view of the *unconscious* mind, because in it, we store the mechanisms that drive our behaviour, including our inherent desires and instincts.[73] Finally, in the weakness inherent in the theory he points out the views of critics (Psychologists, Psychoanalysts, etc.) who posit, among other things, that Freud's Psychoanalysis is bad science, or not science at all or at best pseudoscience because it was not based on enough quantitative and experimental research; that Freud's theory of psychoanalysis neglects individual differences and by and large explores mainly a person's childhood and their potential repressed memories from that time, which may not always be the case and this would make psychoanalysis unhelpful for some. On the strength of the Psychoanalytic theory, it is more useful when one wants to dive deep into one's psyche to understand the motive of one's behaviour(s). In other words, Psychoanalysis provides a lot of insight into what drives a person's behaviour, a measure that is fundamental to my study. Without Freud's psychoanalytic theory, modern-day talk therapy would not exist and his groundbreaking contributions to the field of psychology are evident.[74]

[71] André Green. (2005). *Key Ideas for a Contemporary Psychoanalysis: Misrecognition and Recognition of the Unconscious.* (London: Routledge Taylor and other Groups). pp1- 342.
[72] David Naar. (2021). 'What Are the Strengths & Weaknesses of Psychoanalytic Theory?' as found in https://www.reference.com/world-view/strengths-weaknesses-psychoanalytic-theory.
[73] *Ibid*.
[74] *Ibid*.

Now when it comes to the conceptualisation of what madness or tragic madness is, the works of Karelisa Hartigan (1987), Ruth Padel (1995) and Antonietta Provenza (2013) are quite important and here reviewed. Hartigan conceptualizes tragic madness as external, it comes from without; it is a part of those circumstances over which one has no control. I must point out here that not only do I agree with Hartigan on this score but also her conceptualization of madness is mutually consistent with my study. Hartigan further demonstrates her conceptualization of tragic madness in her article by referring to the madness of Heracles. For Heracles, she notes, it is both a tragic and a unique situation, for he did not have to face things beyond his capabilities to overcome as he says when he awakens from his sleep following his delirium. What Hartigan further adds to the literature on tragic madness is equally insightful, although she basically treats the theme of tragic madness solely from a Euripidean perspective. She also emphasizes the importance of madness in tragedy. In her view, madness is a fundamental aspect of Greek tragedy, because the excessive act is committed when the tragic figure is in the grip of some passion larger than himself. However, the shortfall in Hartigan's perspective is the fact that she does not show the relationship between tragic madness and non-tragic madness and also focuses only on the madness of Heracles and Orestes and not Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, which in my view could have given a fair and a complete picture of the latter's notion and portrayal of madness. The significant difference as far as my thesis is concerned, is the fact that apart from the madness of Heracles and Orestes, my thesis also interrogates the madness of Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*.

In Chapter twenty-two of Padel's book titled *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness,* she gives a detailed conceptualisation of tragic madness and its various elements. In Padel's view, Greek tragedy in sum represents madness as something temporary,

coming from outside, which corroborates the view of Hartigan and Provenza[75]. Significantly, the view that madness in Greek tragedy is temporary is also consistent with my study, but the main point of departure is that they do not provide the condition under which tragic madness comes about. When Scodel was to review Padel's work a year later, the former, although unfairly and highly critical of the latter's work, agrees with the view of the temporariness of tragic madness, its source, that is, the cause of madness[76] and like Hartigan, she also affirms the importance of its prevalence in the tragic genre.[77] Moreover, when Scodel agrees with Padel and which is also consistent with one part of my study, that madness can be the cause of actions with terrible consequences, or itself the consequence of angering the gods,[78] they are only reinforcing the non-tragic aspect of madness. On this account, it is not out of place to now consider a scholarly review of the various dimensions of both *hubris* and *hamartia* in the space of non-tragic and tragic madness respectively.

To start with, Plato's rendering of *hubris*, as D.L. Cairns notes, as extreme over-valuation of the self, a failure to control disruptive forces within the personality, a refusal to accept one's place within a rational system, and an exaltation of the merely human at the expense of the divine,[79] is consistent with my study. Indeed, this is what we see as the cause of Ajax's madness in Sophocles' *Ajax*.[80] Besides, Aristotle's perspective that *hubris* construes doing and saying things

[75] Antonietta Provenza. (2013). 'Madness and Bestialization in Euripides' *Heracles'. The Classical Quarterly*. 63. pp 68-93. (Specifically, page 1ff.)

[76] 'Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness,' *American Journal of Philology* 117 (1996) 485-504 By the Johns Hopkins University Press as reviewed by Ruth Scodel.

[77] Karelisa Hartigan. (1987). 'Euripidean Madness: Herakles and Orestes'. *Greece & Rome*. 34(2). pp. 126-135

[78] 'Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness', *American Journal of Philology* 117 (1996) 485-504 By the Johns Hopkins University Press as reviewed by Ruth Scodel.

[79] Douglas L. Cairns. (1996). "Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big*"."*. *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* (Vol. cxvi). pp. 1-32. Plato's perspective of *hubris* is corroborated by M.W. Dickie. (1984). ' Hesychia and Hybris in Pindar', in D. E. Gerber(ed.). *Greek Poetry and Philosophy.* Studies...*L. Woodbury.* (Chico, CA,). 83-109.

[80] See Chapter Three for further details.

by which the victim incurs shame, not in order that one may achieve anything other than what is done, but simply to get pleasure from it,[81] is equally instructive and consistent with my study. Locating *hubris* within the framework of doing or saying things so that the victim would incur shame is also corroborated by Homer.[82] We witness a similar trend in the way Hera, by proxy, wantonly makes Heracles mad in Euripides' *Heracles*.[83] Adding his bit to the varying perspectives of *hubris*, D.M. MacDowell construes it as arrogant violence arising from passion, deliberate misconduct of a young man full of energy as well as of men who abuse their wealth and political power. Other characteristic manifestations, according to MacDowell, are eating and drinking, sexual activity, larking about, hitting and killing, taking other people's property and privileges, jeering at people and disobeying authority both human and divine. A person shows *hubris* (arrogance) by deliberately indulging in conduct which is bad, immoral, or at best useless because it is what he wants to do, having no regard for the lives or rights of other people.[84] MacDowell's perspective of *hubris* is consistent with the conduct of both Pentheus and Ajax respectively. Unlike Cairns and MacDowell, David Cohen probes into the historical development of *hubris* and settles on a general understanding of the word. In surveying all the usages of the words *hubris*, *hubrizein*, *hubristes*, and *hubrisma*, in the principal 5th and 4th-century Athenian prose authors, David Cohen discovers that more than fifty per cent of all occurrences refer in a general way to some unspecified kind of wrongful, insulting, insolent, or excessive behaviour.[85] It is once again instructive to appreciate the view that David Cohen's perspective of *hubris* fits

[81] *Rhetoric*: 1378^{b} 23-30
[82] *Iliad*, I: 217-221. Agamemnon seizes Briseis from Achilles so that the latter incurs shame and to prove to him that he is more powerful is a manifestation of *hubris*.
[83] See Chapter Four for further details.
[84] Douglas M. MacDowell. (1976). "Hybris in Athens." *Greece & Rome,* (xxiii). pp.14-31.
[85] David Cohen. (1991). "Sexuality, Violence, and the Athenian Law of Hubris". *Greece & Rome*. 38(2). pp.171-188.

very well the focus of my research. The foregoing varying interpretations and critiques of *hubris* underscore its consistency with the non-tragic aspect of madness.

What is equally critical to the thrust of my study is Aristotelian *hamartia* (*ἁμαρτία*) and its place in my thesis as far as tragic madness is concerned. To start with, Albert A. Sackey, in his abstract, surmises that there are two schools of thought when it comes to the interpretation or critique of *hamartia*. The first, in his view, attempts to explain it in terms of moral evil and proposes tragic suffering as the retributive consequence of a *tragic flaw* in the individual's character, the second school rejects this moral interpretation but is unable to find a suitable interpretation for the word. Sackey then states his position on this unending debate when he argues that careful scrutiny of the *Poetics* reveals that tragic flaw or moral weakness is not one of the requirements of tragedy and that a hero's misfortune is due, not to his nature, but to the wrong he has committed, either through ignorance or out of duty.[86] It is instructive to note that Sackey's perspective is not only in harmony with my study, but also fulfils the requirements of my notion of what constitutes tragic madness. Moreover, P. Burian's view that Aristotle's notion of *hamartia* denotes *tragic error*[87] is corroborated by J.M. Bremer, who further adds that the error is a wrong action committed in ignorance of its nature, effect, etc., which is the starting point of a causally connected train of events ending in disaster,[88] enhances my argument of the requirements of tragic madness. Bremer's view of *hamartia* is given further impetus by Philip Tonner, who also posits the view that in tragedy, the tragic hero falls into misery through *hamartia*, a mistake or error, that results in irreparable damage to the life of the protagonist

[86] Albert A. Sackey. (2010). "The hamartia of Aristotle." *Legon Journal of the Humanities*. (21). pp.77-98. It is equally important to note that Sackey's view is consistent with Ho Kim's, as earlier noted. Cf. p9

[87] Peter H. Burian. (2001) "Myth into Muthos: The Shaping of Tragic Plot." *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy.* (ed. P.E. Easterling). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). p. 181.

[88] J.M. Bremer. (1969). *Hamartia: Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy*. *(*Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert). p. 63.

and/or the lives of their loved ones.[89] Notwithstanding the skepticism of G.M. Kirkwood as to what Aristotle really means by *hamartia*, he settles on the meaning of the word to be *error*, for that appears to be an interpretation that enjoys favour currently.[90] Hilde Vinje also considers *hamartia* from three perspectives. First, she argues that after much-heated debate throughout the last century and a half, most modern scholars view ἁμαρτία as an error of judgement for which the tragic hero cannot be blamed, a view I subscribe to. Secondly, for Vinje, others still claim that *ἁμαρτία* refers to a range of failures so that it is up to the poet to decide how the hero comes to ruin. Thirdly, which as he notes is currently less widespread, the interpretation is that ἁμαρτία is linked to a flaw in the hero's moral character and that he is at least partially responsible for his misfortune.[91] H.N. Couch and R.M. Geer consider *hamartia* denotes "a great mistake," which the hero knowingly or unknowingly makes, and which sets in motion the inexorable laws of retribution to punish and correct the error.[92] Furthermore, Bremer's reference to Manns' perspective of *hamartia* as denoting a word that covers all kinds of flaws of character and that of Butcher, who establishes firmly that *hamartia* denotes an error due to inadequate knowledge of particular circumstances[93] are equally consistent with the focus of my research as far as tragic madness is concerned.

From the reviewed literature, the consensus is that madness is an orchestration of the gods. It is, however, temporary, which impels the tragic heroes to say or do things that finally culminate in a

[89] Philip Tonner. (2008). "Action and *Hamartia* in Aristotle's *Poetics*." *Electronic Journal for Philosophy*. pp. 1-23.
[90] "J.M. Bremer's *Hamartia*." *American Journal of Philology*. (1971). 92(4). pp. 711-715 as reviewed by G.M. Kirkwood.
[91] Hilde Vinje. (2021). "The Beauty of Failure: Hamartia in Aristotle's *Poetics*." *The Classical Quarterly*. pp. 1-19.
[92] H.N. Couch & R.M. Geer. (1973). *Classical Civilization*. (Connecticut: Greenwood Press). p.254.
[93] J.M. Bremer. (1969). *Hamartia: Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy*. *(*Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert). pp. 91-92. For further views on *hamartia* See also J.M. Kirkwood. (1971). J.M. Bremer's *Hamartia in the American Journal of Philology*. 92(4). pp. 711-715. For further details on Butcher's and Manns' perspectives on *hamartia,* see S.H. Butcher. (1920). *The Poetics of Aristotle* (London: Macmillan) & P. Manns. (1983). *Die Lehre Aristoteles von der tragischen Katharsis und Hamartia.* (Karlsruhe: Leipzig).

disaster either on themselves or close kin. Furthermore, I have also come to the supposition from the reviewed literature that scholars have either concentrated on some selected plays of Euripides that have madness as its central theme or Sophocles' or Aeschylus'. It is equally clear that modern scholarship on the treatment of madness has been lopsided. This is because they have rather focused, in my view, on the non-tragic aspect of madness which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle and not tragic madness which is consistent with the fundamental principle of *hamartia*. On the basis of this lacuna, my study proposes the use of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological approaches to the interpretation, analysis and critiquing of non-tragic and tragic madness to arrive at a synthesis of the notion of madness in Greek tragedy.

1.8. Theoretical Framework

My theoretical framework is a combination of Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories. The Psychoanalytic theory, postulated by Sigmund Freud, is based mainly on the fundamental notion that our personalities have memories, beliefs, urges, drives and instincts that influence our behaviour and emanate from our unconscious desires.[94] For Freud, human behaviour is shaped through an interaction between the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* which are the three essential components of the mind. The *Id* is the unconscious part of the mind that seeks immediate gratification of biological or instinctual needs without giving credence to what is wrong or right. The *Superego,* which relates to moral values that an individual inculcates as one matures, acts as an ethical constraint on behaviour and helps an individual develop his conscience to discern between wrong and right. *Ego* is the rational and the conscious part of the mind which mediates between the demands of *Id* and the *Superego*. In other words, it acts as an intermediary between

[94] *https://www.khanacademy.org/test-prep/mcat/behavior/theories-personality/v/psychoanalytic-theory*

the unconscious desires of *Id* and the moral value demands of the *Superego* in order to reach a compromise in the context of real-life situations.[95]

Identifying the reason or the cause of the madness the hero suffers in Greek tragedy is crucial because that is the basis upon which the effect of the demented mind could be rendered non-tragic or tragic and whether it is consistent with the *hubristic* or the *hamartia* principle. It is generally accepted that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness inflicted on the heroes in Greek tragedy. This notwithstanding, madness, as occasioned by the gods, is to be construed first as a dramatisation or a portrayal of a social phenomenon by the tragedians. Second, the dramatisation of madness on the Greek stage by the tragedians also underscores the belief of the people then, what they called the Sacred disease because they traced its origin to divinity.[96] How then do we account for it when the madness is not a capricious invasion of the psyche of the hero, like Heracles, but an exploitation of the desires or the weakness of the hero, like Orestes? It is on this account that I propose the use of Psychoanalysis and Socio-Psychological theoretical frameworks respectively. In other words, what is the purchase of Psychoanalysis and Socio-Psychological theories in the interpretation and critique of madness caused by the gods in Greek tragedy? Two or three reasons account for my reliance on the preceding view. First, when the hero's madness is a result of unconscious or conscious exploitation of the desires or the weakness by the gods, then it emanates from the due excesses of the *Id* over the other constituents of the mind. Secondly, the Psychoanalytic theory also identifies the cause of the madness that befalls the hero either for tragic or non-tragic reasons. Thirdly, it is also well

[95] https://positivepsychology.com/psychoanalysis/
For further details on Freud's Psychoanalysis see S. Freud. (1933). *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. (New York: Norton), S. Freud. (1938). *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. Vol. 15. (London: Penguin); S. Freud. (1949) *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. (London: Hogarth Press) and Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory on Instincts, Motivation, Personality & Development. (2013). Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/freuds-psychoanalytic-theory-on-instincts-motivation-personality-development.html.
[96] Hippocrates. *On the Sacred Disease*. (Trans., Francis Adams)

positioned to account for the pattern of madness as portrayed by the tragedians. Also, when the madness is a capricious entry of the psyche of the hero by the gods, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, it can be considered as the cause, effect and function of the *Superego*. Finally, the function of the *Ego*, which is the final stage of the pattern of madness in Greek tragedy as far as my study is concerned, manifests itself when it takes precedence consciously or unconsciously over the excesses of the hero's *Id* and the moral restraint of the *Superego* which is a corollary of the gods' infliction of madness, the hero/heroine becomes aware of his/her environment and real-life situations as he/she speaks and acts according to societal norms and acceptable values.

The second theoretical framework I intend to apply to the analysis of madness in Greek tragedy is the Socio-Psychological theory. The Socio-Psychological theory is also called Neo-Freudian because it differs slightly from the Psychoanalytic theory. The Socio-Psychological theory postulates that it is the social variables and not the biological instincts that are the key determinants in influencing one's personality. In other words, it is the society from where the individual inculcates the cultural values and the social norms that largely help in shaping one's personality and influencing one's behaviour in the face of external situations.[97] For instance, the madness that grips Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae* could be attributed to both Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological factors. First, Pentheus' rejection of Dionysus' godhead is influenced by the gratification of the demands of the *Id*; second, his attempted protection of Thebes is goaded by his avowed duty to the throne, which is a Socio-Psychological influence; and third, his madness can be construed as the cause and the effect of the function of the *Superego* occasioned by Dionysus.

[97] https://positivepsychology.com/psychoanalysis/

It has already been acknowledged that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness of the heroes in Greek tragedy. It is also a recognised fact that the tragedians sought to bring to the fore through their plays the socio-cultural and environmental dynamics that serve to influence the decisions and desires of the tragic heroes. Thus, notwithstanding the criticisms levelled against Freud's Psychoanalysis,[98] it could still admit unreason or the cause of some form of madness as Foucault postulates, into its fold. On the account of the foregoing perspectives and in order to establish whether the madness that a hero suffers in Greek tragedy is to be reckoned as non-tragic or tragic, my thesis, as my contribution, applies Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories, as opposed to a study of the language and dramatical aspects of the tragedies, as my framework in the analysis and the critiquing of the selected plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides that have madness as its leitmotif.

1.9. Methodology

To start with, certain pertinent questions arise from my thesis for which my methodology is designed to elicit the right answers. In the first place, by what peculiar circumstance does non-tragic and tragic madness come about? Secondly, how do we construe the madness of Orestes, Ajax, Heracles and Pentheus from the perspectives of non-tragic and tragic madness respectively in order to achieve the aim of tragedy? This I intend to do by using Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological methodological approaches to analyse, interpret and critique non-tragic and tragic condition(s) of madness identified in the selected plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.[99]

In consequence, my choice of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological methodologies is motivated by the fact that, first, the interplay of *Id, Superego* and *Ego* fits so well in the interpretation, critiquing and analyses of both non-tragic and tragic madness. In addition, the

[98] See Literature Review, especially Foucault's.
[99] See Limitations and Delimitations of Study for the justification of my choice of tragedies.

Psychoanalytic methodology situates the interpretation, analysis and critiquing of the madness (both tragic and non-tragic) that befalls the respective heroes from the perspectives of the roles, functions and demands of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*. To do this, it is important to import the view of Andre Green who proposes the view that the total theory (i.e., Psychoanalytic) is more important than any one of its parts because, for him, any of the terms may represent the whole, but the whole needs to be considered.[100] Therefore, to account for the cause(s) and the pattern of madness as observed in Greek tragedy, one would apply the Psychoanalytic approach or methodology. Second, the Socio-Psychological methodological approach also provides the appropriate grounds for the understanding, interpreting and critiquing of the madness that befalls the hero as being motivated by the influences and dynamics of their environment and the responsibilities demanded of them. The Socio-Psychological methodology employs the respective environmental dynamics and influences of the hero in the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the speeches and actions of the demented mind of the hero.

I shall follow this by using some selected plays to illustrate the applicability or the feasibility of my methodologies. We can, first, use the madness of Ajax to emphasise the workability of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological methodological approaches. It is Athena who makes Sophocles' Ajax mad. She does so because Ajax had intended to slaughter the Atreidae including Odysseus, when they were in slumber. Athena then confuses him by making Ajax mad as he turns his attention onto the flock at the camp thinking in his mad state that it was his enemies he was brutally assaulting and slaughtering.[101] Ajax's desire to avenge his shame is on one hand motivated by his desire to fulfil the demands of the *Id*, and on the other, the heroic society he

[100] Andre Green. Institute of Psychoanalysis, British Psychoanalytical Society, on https://psychoanalysis.org.uk/authors-and-theorists/andré-green
[101] Sophocles. (1987). *Ajax*. (Trans; E.F. Watling). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.). (50-65)

found himself in equally motivated his demand for revenge. Athena's role in making Ajax mad is an attribution to the function of the *Superego* as the act he had intended to commit was unacceptable in Greek society. When Ajax convalesces from his madness, the pronouncement or the speech he utters[102] could be attributed not only to the function and the demands of his *Ego* but also, it is expressive of what society demands of him. The madness of Ajax as has been situated in the interplay of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* appropriately illustrates the Psychoanalytic methodology. From the Socio-Psychological methodological perspective, Ajax is first, influenced by the Greek society's heroic code to restore his lost pride; second, to seek revenge, third, to cover his shame and finally, not only to maintain his status as a powerful hero among the Greeks but to equally send a warning to his other peers. Secondly, following the same trend as previously stated, Aeschylus' Orestes is made mad by the Furies because the former had committed matricide for which the latter had to pursue him with the intention of exacting like for like.[103] Situating the madness that befalls Orestes in the Psychoanalytic methodological approach, first, Orestes' desire to avenge the murder of his father should be construed as motivated by the demands and the function of the *Id*. Second, the madness wrought on him by the Furies is motivated by the function and the demands of the *Superego*, which is indicative of the society's abhorrence of that abominable act. It is instructive to state here that Orestes' recovery from madness occurs in the *Eumenides* and not in the *Choephori*. In his discourse with Apollo in the *Eumenides*,[104] he appears measured and sober, which is consistent with the demands and function of the *Ego*. Moreover, from the Socio-Psychological methodological perspective, Orestes' madness comes about because his society has obligated him to, first of all,

[102] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (646ff.)
[103] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1049ff.) For further information on Aeschylus' Orestes's madness, see the dialogue between the hero and the Chorus from 1051ff. of the same play.
[104] Aeschylus. (1959). *Eumenides*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (England: Penguin Books Ltd.). (64ff.)

avenge the murder of his father. Secondly, he considers it not only as the last honour he can give to his deceased father, Agamemnon, but also an honour due himself. The need to avenge the murder of his father is even given further impetus by the command he receives from Apollo himself.

Consequently, the application of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological methodologies will involve the process of analysing, comparing and critiquing the primary texts both in translation and in the original Greek as well as the secondary and tertiary material. Finally, my study applies the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological methodologies in order to situate the synthesised interpretation and critiquing of the selected plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides that have madness as its central leitmotif.

1.10. Limitations and Delimitations of Study

My thesis is not a study of all the extant plays of the three Attic tragedians because not all of them have madness as their central theme. Neither is it a study of all the tragic heroes, but a focus on Aeschylus' Orestes, Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Orestes, Heracles and Pentheus. The mention of Euripides' Pentheus also brings into sharp focus Agave, who also suffers from madness inflicted upon her by Dionysus.[105] It is a fact that when Dionysus inflicts madness on Agave including her sisters, the former exhibits characteristics such as foaming at the mouth, wild rolling eyes[106] and a mistaken view that the decapitated head of Pentheus is that of a young mountain-lion.[107] Agave, like all other heroes recovers from her madness.[108] However, the madness that she suffers cannot be treated in the same fashion as Pentheus or like the other

[105] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (31ff. Her madness continues until the time she realises through Cadmus' intervention that the so-called lion's cub, is in fact, the head of her son who in their possessed and demented minds they had killed (1270ff.).
[106] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (1121-1122)
[107] *Ibid*., (1140)
[108] *Ibid*., (1270)

heroes earlier mentioned. Some reasons account for this decision. In the first place, unlike the other heroes earlier mentioned, Agave is not the major character in the *Bacchae* and her incorporation would disrupt the pattern I have set out to develop in my study, as I have chosen the main hero in each of the selected plays for my analysis thereof. Secondly, Dionysus makes all Theban women mad including Agave and her siblings. Whilst it is feasible to identify the function of the *Superego*[109] and the *Ego*[110] in the madness that Agave suffers, it is a challenge situating the function of the *Id* in the pattern, hence its exclusion. Moreover, much as we can construe Agave's madness as punishment for a wrong committed, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, it also stands to reason that the absence of the function of the *Id* in the madness that she suffers also makes it improbable to identify the exploitation of the heroine's desires as corollary or condition precedent in making her madness consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Indeed, my study is a critique of some selected extant plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, namely: *the Choephori, Ajax, Orestes*, *Heracles* and *the Bacchae* because they have madness as their central theme. Moreover, it focuses only on plays in which the tragic heroes are demonstrably mad. It is on this account that actions or speeches which are construed as madness by one character or the other are excluded.[111]It also dismisses prophetic frenzy because it does not construe madness in the strictest sense of the word.[112] There are three main reasons behind this position and exclusion. First, in the strictest sense of madness in tragedy, the diction of the demented hero or the character for dramatic purposes becomes incomprehensible

[109] In this case, we are to construe her madness as punishment from Dionysus. (Lines, 32ff.)
[110] Refer to note 110, where Agave recovers from her madness.
[111] For more details see Sophocles' *Antigone*, where Creon accuses both Antigone and Ismene of being mad(561f.), Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, where the Herdsman in a dialogue with Iphigenia reports that he saw Orestes raving mad and demonstrably so as he (Orestes) lunged into the cattle and slaughtered them (238-339) and Io in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, (561-886).
[112] Check Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* for Cassandra's encrypted speech to the Chorus about the impending death of Agamemnon (1052-1333) and in Euripides' *The Women of Troy*, Hecabe instructs the Chorus to keep her frenzied child, Cassandra, indoors (169ff.) and Talthybius also alleges that Cassandra is a god-possessed although she has captured Agamemnon's heart. (257)

not only to the other characters concerned but also to the Chorus and the audience; this is not the case when it comes to prophetic frenzy. For example, Cassandra, in her possessed mind, appears deluded to the Chorus, but not to the audience because the latter has an appreciation of her message that seems encrypted to the former.[113] The second reason for the exclusion of prophetic frenzy is because it cannot be admitted into the Psychoanalytic theory as I have postulated. This is because prophetic frenzy or divine *mania*[114] cannot be construed either as punishment for a wrong done or the effect of the function of the *Superego* or an exploitation of the hero's *Id*. Finally, although prophetic frenzy or divine *mania* involves a possession of a mortal's mind by a god (*theoleptos* or *katochos*), which also implies the sensation of outside control and in this case, it is construed as inspiration (*epipnoia*)[115] as well as blessings of madness,[116] same cannot be said of tragic or non-tragic madness when the hero is demonstrably mad as my study professes. Besides, other forms of *mania* such as Bacchic ecstasy, Initiatory mania, Combat fury and battlefield apparitions, possession by the nymphs, Poetic mania, Erotic mania and the Philosopher's *mania* which are in the same league as prophetic frenzy/*mania* for similar reasons have been excluded for they do not typify madness as I have outlined in my study. It is on this account that the φρενο–compounds become more relevant to my study.

My study starts with summaries of each plot of the selected plays focusing on the period before the hero is made mad, the period of the hero's madness and when he regains sanity. The study of the primary texts of the selected plays will be in translation complemented by the original Greek when the need arises. My research study also critiques relevant primary, secondary and tertiary

[113] Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, (1052-1333).
[114] See Yulia Ustinova. (2020). "Alteration of consciousness in Ancient Greece: divine mania." *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). pp. 257-273.
[115] *Ibid*.
[116] Plato, *Phaedrus* 244AD as found in Yulia Ustinova's (2020). "Alteration of Consciousness in Ancient Greece: divine mania." *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). pp. 257-273.

texts. It is not a study of the history of madness. Furthermore, it dismisses the medicalisation of the perspectives of madness because that is not the focus of my study. That being said, one appreciates the view that the tragedians' portrayal of the heroes gripped in madness is sometimes reminiscent of the contemporary description and categorisation of medicalised madness. This has created an erroneous impression as though the tragic poets had once had a neurological background, but no evidence points to this assertion. On this account and for the purposes of my study, references to the medicalised treatment or perspective of madness would be seldom and would only be limited to passing comments when the need arises, because as earlier noted, it is not the focus of my research.

Furthermore, in my part of the world availability of key secondary materials is woefully inadequate. Worse of all, relevant secondary materials that are available are unnecessarily costly. In addition, although internet sources have currently improved at the university where I lecture, it is usually not stable.

1.11. Definitions of Terms

The definitions of terms do not appear in alphabetical order, rather related concepts follow each other. For example, the Components of the *Hubristic Principle* cannot be presented in any other form other than how I have done it, because one is a consequence of the other.

1.11.1. *Aidos*

Aidos is first a Greek goddess of shame, modesty, regarded with awe or reverence, august, venerable and bashful and second, a feeling of shame or reverence which restrains men from wrong. [117]

1.11.2. Components of the *Hubristic* Principle

1.11.2.1. *Koros*

Koros is the Anglicised form of the Greek *κόρος*, which is variously elucidated as satiety, surfeit, or to have enough or too much of a thing, as a corollary of *hubris*.[118]

1.11.2.2. *Hubris*

Hubris is the Anglicised form of the Greek *ὕβρις* which means wanton violence, arising from the pride of strength or from passion, insolence, lewd, licentiousness or of acts towards others, spiteful treatment, and outrage or gross insult.[119]

1.11.2.3. *Nemesis*

Nemesis could be interpreted as retribution of what is due, but in common usage, it means retribution, especially righteous anger aroused by injustice; later, of the wrath of the gods; indignation at undeserved good fortune. It is also associated with the impersonation of divine retribution, coupled with *aidos*.[120]

1.11.2.4. *Ate*

Ate is normally referred to as a mental aberration, or perhaps abnormality; infatuation causing irrational behaviour which leads to disaster. A hero's *Ate* is brought about through psychic intervention by a divine agency, usually Zeus, but can also be physically

[117] H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press) p.18.
[118] H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p. 388.
[119] *Ibid*., p. 723.
[120] *Ibid*., p. 461.

inflicted.[121] *Ate* could also be rendered as distraction, mischief, ruin, folly, delusion or judicial blindness sent by the gods.[122]

1.11.3. The *Hubristic* Principle

The *hubristic* principle in the scheme of my thesis espouses the philosophy that a hero in a state of *koros* (κόρος) or satiety has the natural tendency to commit *hubris*, which the gods, representing *nemesis* intervene to set right the wrong by either making him mad or bringing him to disaster (*Ate*).

1.11.4. *Hamartia*

In general terms, Aristotle employs *hamartia* in the sense of the English word 'error'[123]. In Liddell and Scott *hamartia* is rendered as 'a failure, error, sin'.[124] In furtherance of his conception of *hamartia* Aristotle uses a particular scenario: a kind of person who is not conspicuous for virtue and justice, and whose fall into misery is not due to vice and depravity, but rather to some error.[125] Usually, I must add, that the commission of this error sets in motion a connected train of events that finally leads to disaster. Admissible also into the interpretation of *hamartia* is the views of Dawe and Kim as already noted in the text.

---

[121] J.A. Otchere. (2010). *The Irrational in Greek Tragedy: Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean*. (Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing). pp. 1-26

[122] N.G.L. Hammond & H.H. Scullard (Ed.). (1970). *The Classical Oxford Dictionary*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p. 727. See also from H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press) p. 112.

[123] *Poetics*: Ch.13: 48

[124] H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p. 38

[125] *Poetics*: Ch.13: 48

1.11.5. The *Hamartia* Principle

The *hamartia* principle in the scheme of my study advocates the philosophy that the madness that the heroes suffer emanates from the gods' exploitation of their witting or unwitting desires or weaknesses to their detriment.

1.11.6. Madness

In general, *μανία* (Greek for "madness, frenzy, mad passion, rage, fury etc.") is the root word, which has other variants like *μαίνομαι* which translates in an adjectival sense as 'frantic, mad, and frenzied: with mad fits of raving'; *μᾰνῐκός*, on the other hand, suggests the tendency to be inclined to madness, mad, and *μανικόν*, to look mad, hence *μανικῶς*, also used in an adverbial sense, involves a situation that is done 'in mad fashion', and madly'.[126] Furthermore, the language of madness as expressed in the original Greek text varies and it is often motivated by context. Some of these are identified in Greek expressions such as *φρενοβλαβής*, to wit*, damaged in understanding*, in fact, *crazy, φρενοδαλής*, to wit*, impairing the mind, maddening, φρενόπληκτος*, to wit*, stricken in mind, smitten with madness, frenzied, φρενομόρως*, only found in phrase *φρενομόρως νοσεῖν,* to be diseased *in mind, φρενομανής*, to wit, frenzied in mind*, φρεναπατάω, to deceive the mind, deceive, hence φρεναπάτης, one who deceives the mind, a seducer,*[127] which is typical, for example, of the conflict between Dionysus and Pentheus. In fact, the language of madness or mania stretches far beyond what I have identified and could incorporate or admits elements such as prophetic frenzy/mania, which considers the inspiration the seer undergoes when he/she becomes *entheos* (literarily, be engodded) and displays a wide range of abnormal behaviour, from mere detachment to violent

[126] H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p. 425.
[127] *Ibid*., p. 767.

paroxysms as well as Bacchic ecstasy which describes Dionysus as 'mad' (*mainomenos*), either the ability of the god to make others mad, or his own madness.[128] Others include Initiatory mania, Combat fury and battlefield apparitions, possession by the nymphs, poetic mania, erotic mania and the philosopher's mania.[129] The consensus is that the cause of madness in my thesis is an orchestration of the gods, but it is temporary, which impels the tragic heroes to say or do things that finally culminate in a disaster either on themselves or close kin.

1.11.7. Non-tragic Madness

Non-tragic madness in my thesis could also be considered as a representation of the socio-psychological and psychoanalytic condition of the hero whose mind has been afflicted by the gods although temporarily, which impels him to act or utter unintelligible words which are consistent with the *hubristic* principle because his afflicted mind is construed as a deserving one or a punishment for a wrong done.

1.11.8. Tragic Madness

Tragic madness in my thesis should be considered as a representation of the socio-psychological and psychoanalytic condition of the tragic hero who is gripped by some force or power greater than himself (usually a god making him mad), which impels him to say or behave abnormally or aberrantly though temporarily and which is usually in consonance not only with the *hamartia* principle, but also with the aim or purpose of tragedy (i.e. the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear).

---

[128] Yulia Ustinova. (2020). "Alteration of consciousness in Ancient Greece: divine mania." *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). pp. 260-263.

[129] For further details, see Yulia Ustinova. (2020). "Alteration of consciousness in Ancient Greece: divine mania." *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). pp. 261-268.

1.11.9. Thyrsus

It was a light stick of reed or fennel, with fresh strands of ivy twined around it. Every devotee of Dionysus carried it, and the action of the play demonstrates the supernatural power that was perceived to reside in it.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE MADNESS OF AESCHYLUS' ORESTES IN THE *CHOEPHORI*

2.1. Introduction

The *Oresteia*, which consists of the *Agamemnon*, *Choephori* and the *Eumenides*, is Aeschylus's only extant trilogy. The *Choephori* is the only play that offers us an insight into Aeschylus' treatment of madness. In this play, Orestes, the son of the murdered king of Argos, Agamemnon, should return from exile after receiving the command of Apollo to avenge his father's death. Subsequently, Orestes comes to Argos, and murders first his uncle, Aegisthus, and second, his own mother, Clytemnestra, because the two orchestrated the murder of Agamemnon. It is on this account that the Furies wrought madness on Orestes. This chapter, therefore, discusses Aeschylus' notion of madness and, second, his portrayal of the madness of Orestes. In addition, it considers the characteristic features and the purpose of Orestes' madness. This would then be followed by a critique of Orestes' madness, first by establishing the non-tragic aspect of his madness, and second, by integrating the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Orestes. The penultimate part of this chapter also critiques not only the tragic madness of Orestes, but also integrates the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Orestes. The final part provides a summary of the chapter where key findings would be emphasised.

2.2. Aeschylus' notion of madness

Aeschylus' notion or perception of madness follows a prescribed pattern. It follows the notion that when a dreadful act is done, the Furies are brought in to make the hero mad, although temporarily, after which he recovers. In effect, Aeschylus reiterates the view that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls the hero. This comes about either through a divine

command that demands the hero to commit an abominable act or the divine exploits the desires or the weaknesses of the hero after which the Furies make the hero temporarily mad, and then the hero later recovers. The gods' exploitation of the desires or the weakness of the hero emanates from the latter's socio-cultural influences and his environment as represented by the views of the Chorus, Electra and Pylades (cf. Aeschylus' portrayal of the madness of Orestes for a detailed account or the documentation of Aeschylus' notion of madness).

2.3. Aeschylus' portrayal of the madness of Orestes

Having discussed Aeschylus' notion of madness above, let us now have a discourse on how the poet portrays the madness of Orestes, its characteristics and its purpose. By this, I shall use Orestes in the *Choephori*, the only extant play of the poet in which we see the hero demonstrably mad. Aeschylus portrays the view that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls the hero.[130] The actualisation of this display of madness is however preceded by the exploitation not only of the desires of the tragic hero, but also a divine command is involved. By this token Orestes creates the impression that he considers the murder of Aegisthus and his mother, Clytemnestra, as his duty and a right. On this account, he makes certain pronouncements to reinforce this position. Orestes considers the abominable deed of killing Clytemnestra and Aegisthus first as a sense of duty. This can be derived from several statements he makes: Great Zeus, O grant me vengeance for my father's death.[131] In furtherance of the earlier position Orestes claims:

> οὔτοι προδώσει Λοξίου μεγασθενὴς
> χρησμὸς κελεύων τόνδε κίνδυνον περᾶν,
> κἀξορθιάζων πολλὰ καὶ δυσχειμέρους
> ἄτας ὑφ᾽ ἧπαρ θερμὸν ἐξαυδώμενος,

[130] Aeschylus. (1959). *Choephori* (Trans; Philip Vellacott) (England: Penguin Books Ltd). (1049ff.)
N.B. (Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Greek in this Chapter are taken from Philip Vellacott's.)
[131] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (18)

εἰ μὴ μέτειμι τοῦ πατρὸς τοὺς αἰτίους.
τρόπον τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνταποκτεῖναι λέγων

The word of Apollo is of great power and cannot fail.
His voice, urgent, insistent drives me to dare this peril,
Chilling my heart's hot blood with recital of threatened terrors,
If I should fail to exact fit vengeance, like for like,
From those who killed my father.[132]

It is important we subject *χρησμὸς κελεύων τόνδε κίνδυνον περᾶν* (270) and *κἀξορθιάζων πολλὰ καὶ δυσχειμέρους* (271) to some ethical interrogation. It is usually this contest of competing interests which has persistently been the source of tension that characterises Greek tragedy. First, Apollo's command generates a contest of wills, where mortals are subservient to those of deities. Secondly, Orestes recognises the dangers associated with obliging such a command, but the insistent threats contained in the deity's order take away his free will. Moreover, Orestes' free will is not only taken away from him, but also, he is subjected to some psychological torture. Moreso, Apollo's *insistent* voice underscores the urgent nature of the deed to be committed. Jean-Pierre Vernant's view in this whole contest of will and tension is instructive as he asks:

> What is the significance, in a psychological history of the will, of this tension that the tragedians constantly maintain between the active and the passive, intention and constraint, the internal spontaneity of the hero and the destiny that is fixed for him in advance by the gods?[133]

Besides, when comparing the way Sophocles' Orestes reacts to Apollo's command with the way Aeschylus' Orestes does, Gilbert Murray asserts that the former's Orestes was resolute and shows no remorse in his murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus as he considers it an aspect of filial duty, unlike the latter's Orestes whose sense of duty is mainly predicated on Apollo's

[132] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (269-274)
[133] Jean-Pierre Vernant. (1990). "Intimations of the Will in Greek Tragedy." *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (New York: Zone Books). p.79.

instruction.[134] Other pronouncements of Orestes that give further impetus to his conviction of the murders of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra are found in lines 434ff., 456, 461, 479ff. and 925.

When Aeschylus' Orestes considers the murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus as a right, he says so on the account that first as an exile, who has just returned to his land, committing the deed should be construed as an inherent right.[135] Besides, Orestes is further motivated to do the deed because he considers the reigns of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra not only as a loss of his patrimony,[136] but also a restoration of his throne and kingdom;[137] a right which is not mutually exclusive.[138]

The hero's desire to exact his right and duty coupled with the divine command creates the atmosphere for the deed to be done. It must be acknowledged that the preceding view has some ethical or legal implications. In the first place, since the tragedians take some inspiration from Homer, it will not be out of place to juxtapose the conflicting interests Aeschylus' Orestes undergoes before the deed is done to that of the Homeric hero as Douglas Cairns fittingly posits:

> There is a strong self-assertive dynamic in Greek ethics that is particularly prominent in the heroic values that tragedy inherits from epic. The Homeric hero has a developed self-image that craves validation, and injury to this self-image regularly leads to a determination to restore prestige through retaliation.[139]

The second conflicting or ethical issue we need to avert our minds to with the portrayal of Orestes' desire to exact his right and duty coupled with the divine command is the justifiability or otherwise of the deed. Douglas Cairns' view of this unresolved competing interest is valuable:

---

[134] Aeschylus, & Murray, G. (1961). *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. (London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.). p. 46
[135] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (4f.)
[136] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (297ff.)
[137] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (479-80)
[138] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (497-499.)
[139] Douglas Cairns. (2005). "Values". *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. (ed. Justina Gregory). (Blackwell Publishing Ltd). p. 309.

> Aeschylus' Orestes firmly believes that his revenge is just; his spontaneous *aidos* (shame) at the thought of matricide in the same scene (Libation Bearers 899), however, is a sign that his act of justice is also traditionally shameful (*aischron*). This clash of values is not the problem's solution, but its essence.[140]

In addition, before the deed is done the intended victim (Clytemnestra) pre-empts the prospective assailant (Orestes) to be wary of the hounding Furies of a mother's curse.[141] Following the foregoing statement, it should be noted that apart from Apollo's sanction of the deed, there must have been other competing interests and motivations that could have compelled Orestes to desire to oblige the deed in the face of his mother's warnings and the obvious madness that was to be imposed on him by the Furies. The preceding scenario is ably corroborated by Cairns when he notes:

> There is also, however, a powerful social dimension to heroic ethics – not just in the sense that popular opinion matters, that the hero's self-assertive prowess (his areteˆ) requires others' recognition, but also in a sense that the Homeric hero (here some scholars would write ''even the Homeric hero'') has reciprocal obligations to his kin, his comrades (*philoi* or *hetairoi*), and his community.[142]

David M. Rein introduces an interesting dimension to Orestes' desire for the deed by analysing it from a Psychoanalytic perspective when he notes:

> The most important fact which Aeschylus revealed was simply this: Orestes was jealous of his mother, especially of the love she gave Aigisthus, and this jealousy was so violent it played an important part in impelling him to kill her. In presenting this jealousy Aeschylus was far ahead of the later professional scholars... These scholars, uninfluenced by Freud or recent psychiatry, did not expect to find a son jealous of his own mother, of her love for another man, and therefore could not readily see such a feeling even when it was enacted before their eyes.[143]

In sum, the competing interests and tensions that Aeschylus' Orestes undergoes are what Cairns and Rein have depicted. Meanwhile, in furtherance of the development of the plot, the

---

[140] *Ibid*.

[141] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (924)

[142] Douglas Cairns. (2005). "Values". *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. (ed. Justina Gregory). (Blackwell Publishing Ltd). p. 309.

[143] David M. Rein. (1954). Orestes and Electra in Greek Literature. *American Imago*. 11(1). p. 36. For further details of Rein's critique of Orestes' jealousy see the succeeding pages of the same article.

actualisation of the deed is then followed by the hero's display of guilt and some kind of remorse, but he assures himself of the necessity of that dreadful act by using Apollo as his guarantor and then leaves for exile.[144] At this juncture, the atmosphere is ripe for the avenging Furies to make Orestes mad. On this account, Peter N. Singer appropriately adds:

> Indeed, the most politically problematic or antisocial—even sociopathic—behaviour of mad heroes is in certain key cases performed *before* their affliction has started or *after* it has ended. In the former kind of case, the problematic behaviour may constitute part of the cause of the madness, which is sent as punishment by an enraged god. Such is the case with…Orestes's matricide.[145]

Here Orestes proclaims as he dialogues with the Chorus:

> δμωαὶ γυναῖκες, αἵδε Γοργόνων δίκην
>
> φαιοχίτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανημέναι
>
> πυκνοῖς δράκουσιν. οὐκέτ᾽ ἂν μείναιμ᾽ ἐγώ.
>
> Look, women see them, there! Like Gorgons, with grey
>
> cloaks,
>
> And snakes coiled swarming round their bodies![146]

Orestes continues to exhibit characteristics of a mind deranged as he proceeds into exile,[147] till the Chorus gives the Exode to the play.[148] For dramatic purposes, we are to realise that only Orestes sees the Furies because they are to be perceived by the audience and to be portrayed by the poet as abstract forces that psychologically hound the mind of the hero to make him mad; for therein lies the impact of the catharsis. However, what does it mean when the Furies are also seen by the audience in the *Eumenides*? Are they also mad? They are not mad like Orestes, but for the same dramatic purpose(s), the Furies, in my view, are no longer portrayed as an abstract

[144] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1021ff.)
[145] Peter N. Singer. (2018). 'The Mockery of Madness: Laughter at and with Insanity in Attic Tragedy and Old Comedy'. *Illinois Classical Studies*. 43(2). p. 303
[146] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1049ff.)
[147] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1061-1062)
[148] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1063-1064)

phenomenon by the poet throughout the *Eumenides* but as speaking characters played by the Chorus. The preceding view is corroborated by Thomas S. Szasz when he remarks:

> A "hallucination" is a self-reported imagining. Within the fiction of Aeschylus's play, are the demons Orestes says he sees real, or are they hallucinations? In Eumenides, the final play of Aeschylus' trilogy, the demons—more commonly called "Furies"—appear onstage as speaking characters.[149]

In continuation, it is instructive to state here that Aeschylus does not portray Orestes' recovery from the madness in the *Choephori* but in the *Eumenides*.[150]

The scenario outlined above gives the pattern of Aeschylus' notion and portrayal of madness: when a dreadful act is done, the Furies are brought into play to make the hero temporarily mad after which he recovers.

2.3.1. The characteristic features of Orestes' madness

Before Orestes does the dreadful deed followed by the purported harassment and visibility of the Furies, the hero's mind had not become demented because he had had smooth dialogues with Pylades, Electra, the Chorus and Clytemnestra at various stages in the development of the plot. However, from lines 1049ff. Orestes begins to display certain characteristics that are reminiscent of one who is mad. From this point till the end of the development of the plot Orestes begins to see beings that are only visible to him and not to the Chorus and consequently he displays certain characteristic features of madness. I am convinced that here we need to cite the dialogue between Orestes and the Chorus that depicts fully the former's deranged state of mind:

Ὀρέστης

[149] Thomas S. Szasz. (2017) "Schizophrenia, Then and Now: The Libation Bearers of Aeschylus". *The Man and His Ideas*. (eds. Jeffrey A. Schaler Henry Zvi Lothane Richard E. Vatz). (London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group). p. 173.

[150] Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, (85ff.). It must be said here that the *Eumenides*, the third play of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* produced in 458 B.C., is connected in theme to the Agamemnon and the *Choephori*.

ἆ, ἆ.

δμωαὶ γυναῖκες, αἵδε Γοργόνων δίκην

φαιοχίτωνες καὶ πεπλεκτανημέναι

πυκνοῖς δράκουσιν: οὐκέτ᾽ ἂν μείναιμ᾽ ἐγώ.

Χορός

τίνες σε δόξαι, φίλτατ᾽ ἀνθρώπων πατρί,

στροβοῦσιν; ἴσχε, μὴ φόβου νικῶν πολύ.

Ὀρέστης

οὐκ εἰσὶ δόξαι τῶνδε πημάτων ἐμοί·

σαφῶς γὰρ αἵδε μητρὸς ἔγκοτοι κύνες.

Χορός

ποταίνιον γὰρ αἷμά σοι χεροῖν ἔτι·

ἐκ τῶνδέ τοι ταραγμὸς ἐς φρένας πίτνει.

Ὀρέστης

ἄναξ Ἄπολλον, αἵδε πληθύουσι δή,

κἀξ ὀμμάτων στάζουσιν αἷμα δυσφιλές.

Χορός

εἷς σοὶ καθαρμός· Λοξίας δὲ προσθιγὼν

ἐλεύθερόν σε τῶνδε πημάτων κτίσει.

Ὀρέστης

ὑμεῖς μὲν οὐχ ὁρᾶτε τάσδ᾽, ἐγὼ δ᾽ ὁρῶ:

ἐλαύνομαι δὲ κοὐκέτ᾽ ἂν μείναιμ᾽ ἐγώ.

Χορός

ἀλλ᾽ εὐτυχοίης, καί σ᾽ ἐποπτεύων πρόφρων

θεὸς φυλάσσοι καιρίοισι συμφοραῖς.

Orestes

Ah, a!

Look, women, see them, there! Like Gorgons, with grey

cloaks,

And snakes coiled swarming round their bodies! Let me go!

Chorus

Most loyal of sons, what fancied sights torment you so?

Stay! You have won your victory; what have you to fear?

Orestes

To me these living horrors are not imaginary;

I know them - avenging hounds increased by mother's blood.

Chorus

That blood is still a fresh pollution on your hands,

Therefore your mind's distracted. What more natural?

Orestes

O Lord Apollo! More and more of them! Look

there!

And see-their dreadful eyes dripping with bloody pus!

Chorus

Go quickly then where cleansing waits for you;

stretch out

Your hand to Apollo, and he will free you from this torment.

Orestes

I know you do not see these beings; but I see them.

I am lashed and driven! I can't bear it! I must escape! [151]

The fundamental characteristic features that Orestes displays in his demented mind include:

i. He perceives and identifies these monstrous beings (the Furies) with the Gorgons[152]

[151] Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, (1048-1064)

ii. He perceives the Furies with grey cloaks and snakes coiled swarming round their bodies[153]

iii. He perceives the Furies with their dreadful eyes dripping with bloody pus[154]

iv. He sees certain beings that are invisible to others, especially the Chorus[155]

v. Finally, he perceives himself being lashed and driven by the Furies.[156]

Since I have already intimated in Chapter One[157] that the focus of my thesis and the treatment of the theme of madness is not from a medical perspective, I restrict my views of it to some passing comments. When Orestes becomes mad, his thought processes and behaviour change. Richard Gross cites Jahoda who identifies several ways by which one's behaviour could be construed as an abnormality. Two main ideas come to mind as far as Orestes' madness is concerned. The first view is that when one's mind becomes deranged, one lacks the ability to introspect, including one's lack of awareness of what one is doing and why. The second view is that the deranged person no longer sees the world as it is.[158] Again, when Gross cites Freud for similar reasons, Freud postulates that the person deranged lacks integration of all his/her processes and attributes which creates an imbalance between the *id*, *ego* and *superego*.[159] The preceding view is corroborated by Erikson as Gross notes when the former reiterates the view that the deranged mind lacks the ability to achieve ego identity.[160] The expression *hallucination* derives from Latin, and it means "to wander mentally" or the "perception of a nonexistent object or event". In

---

[152] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1049). The Gorgon was perceived to be a monster of fearful aspect and Hesiod names three of them, namely: Euryale, Stheino and Medusa, the most fearful who had a snaky head fixed on the aegis of Athena and all who looked at her turned into stone. H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press). (pp. 145)

[153] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1049f.)

[154] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1058)

[155] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1061)

[156] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1062)

[157] Cf. Chapter One, (pp. 21 & 25)

[158] Gross, R. (2009). *Psychology*: *The Science of Mind and Behaviour* (5th Ed.). (Kentucky: Hodder Arnold). p. 759

[159] *Ibid*.

[160] *Ibid*.

layman's terms, hallucinations involve hearing, seeing, feeling, smelling, or even tasting things that are not real.[161] In fact, it is noteworthy to state that the current condition of Orestes in his state of madness is reminiscent of our contemporary understanding of the term hallucination. The preceding statement makes it imperative for one to interrogate that aspect of Orestes' madness (1061) where he claims that the Chorus do not see the apparition, but the Furies are real, and they are after him. In response, the Chorus rather attribute the hero's hallucination to the fresh blood still on his hands. The preceding view is corroborated by Parker when he notes:

> That the blood of his victims clings to the hand of a murderer, and, until cleansed, demands a seclusion from society, is a belief attested in a bewildering variety of literary, oratorical, historical…[162]

Notwithstanding what the Chorus aver in (1055-1056, *ταραγμὸς ἐς φρένας*) as being a more rational cause or perhaps the guilt of shedding kindred blood as the source of Orestes' hallucination, we see from this stage onwards and until the hero is absolved of this pollution in the *Eumenides*, a dramatisation of the madness he suffers. Here, it is not out of place to cite the instructive view of Donald J. Mastronarde, which is a reinforcement, apparently, of the view that Orestes' madness is indeed suggestive of hallucination. Mastronarde notes:

> …the hint of hallucination present in *Choe*. 1048-1062 (where Orestes nevertheless maintains contact with the chorus in a distichomythia) and portrays a true onset of madness, with its beginning announced by Elektra in 253-254 and its end marked by the ἔα of recovery. The only indication of contact within the passage (οὔτοι μεθήσω ~ μέθες 262-264) serves only to confirm that Orestes is out of touch with reality.[163]

These hallucinatory characteristics need further interrogation. In the first place, it typifies that Orestes is demonstrably mad. Secondly, it affords the poet the opportunity to let the hero transit

---

[161] www.verywellmind.com/what-are-hallucinations

[162] Robert Parker. (1996). *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press). p. 104.

[163] Donald J. Mastronarde. (1979). *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. (Berkeley: University of California Press). p.76.

from one trajectory to another, as this underscores the Chorus' basis of rationally construing the hero's behaviour as out of the norm, madness to be precise. Furthermore, these hallucinatory characteristics which underscore Orestes' madness are for dramatic purposes. This is because it constitutes an artistic way of demonstrating madness on the stage. Besides, it also brings the audience into the dramatic performance as it marks not only the period where the audience distinguishes a demented Orestes from an undemented one, but also, it makes the audience have a vicarious experience, as they identify themselves with the fate that has befallen the hero; a catharsis,[164] of a sort, as Aristotle hypothesizes. Having discussed the characteristic features of Orestes' madness, it is important to now elucidate the purpose of the madness that befalls Orestes.

2.3.2. The purpose of Orestes' madness

The madness that befalls Orestes serves a variety of purposes. In the first place, it is obvious as Aristotle opines that the aim of every tragedian is to arouse the emotions of pity and fear.[165] Aeschylus succeeds in this as we are moved to pity by the fate that befalls Orestes as he is gripped by a force far beyond him when the Furies make him mad. Besides, Aeschylus succeeds in evoking fear in his audience because he establishes a principle that no one does such a dreadful deed and expects to be exculpated. For Aeschylus, the sinner does not go unpunished—a view that resonates well with the Chorus throughout the *Choephori*.

---

[164] Although Aristotle uses the term once (*Poetics*, Ch. VI) in his definition of tragedy and does not even explain it, the importance of catharsis to tragedy has been supported by many scholars. The term 'Catharsis' or 'Katharsis' is perhaps the most debated term in literary criticism worldwide. He used it in connection with the emotional effect of the tragedy on the spectators. Thus, for Aristotle, catharsis meant the effect or the function of tragedy. (Literary Criticism and Critical Appreciation, 2015: pp.8ff.) "Without doubt, katharsis is the most celebrated concept in the entire field of literary criticism, and its appeal is immense to the broad community of scholars critics and creative writers who concern themselves with tragedy." (Leon Golden. (1976). "The Clarification Theory of 'Katharsis'. " *Hermes*. 104(4). pp.437-452. "Catharsis is the *telos* of tragedy, the end towards which the formal artifacts are functionally directed." Eva Schaper. (1968) "Aristotle's Catharsis and Aesthetic Pleasure.*" The Philosophical Quarterly*. 18(71). pp. 131-143

[165] Cf. Chapter One, (p. 1.)

Secondly, Aeschylus projects Orestes' madness to further espouse his view on this unending philosophical perplexity of whether man is free or entirely not free or free but subtly controlled by the divine. Orestes receives a command from Apollo to avenge the death of his father, and he is threatened with terror should he decline.[166] This condition takes away Orestes' free will to determine the reasonability or otherwise of the divine command. This notwithstanding, Orestes at different times expresses his desire to see his right restored and therefore considers the intended deed as a duty—free will at play here. Tragedy's conflicting models of causation make it invaluable to here cite Vernant's view of this tension when he remarkably writes:

> Thus in Aeschylus the tragic decision is rooted in two types of reality, on the one hand *ethos*, character, and on the other *daimon*, divine power. Since the origin of action lies both in man himself and outside him, the same character appears now as an agent, the cause and source of his actions, and now as acted upon, engulfed in a force that is beyond him and sweeps him away. Yet although human and divine causality are intermingled in tragedy, they are not confused. The two levels are quite distinct, sometimes opposed to each other.[167]

These competing forces (both external and internal) virtually create tension subsequent to the hero committing the deed (the *error*), which intensifies the cathartic effect especially when the madness the hero suffers is the product of the error. Finally, we see in the act and the consequent madness an interplay between Apollo's command and Orestes' desire/motivations/will, especially when the hero expresses a momentary hesitation of not committing the deed.[168] In these conflicting demands, Aeschylus uses Pylades' censure[169] and Orestes' acquiescence[170] to show that the will of the gods hold sway and must always be assuaged even if it is at one's

[166] This view is variously stated in the *Choephori* which has been duly acknowledged. (*Passim*).
[167] Jean-Pierre Vernant. (1990). "Intimations of the Will in Greek Tragedy." *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (New York: Zone Books). p.77.
[168] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (899) *Πυλάδη τί δράσω; μητέρ᾽ αἰδεσθῶ κτανεῖν;*
[169] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (900-902).
[170] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (903-907).

detriment. This notwithstanding, if you so desire to avenge your father's death, then the divine would support you, but the consequence thereof is madness.

Furthermore, another purpose of Orestes' madness is to create a puzzle in the minds of the audience. Thus, the Aeschylean audience are left to ponder whether Apollo is to be absolved of what he makes Orestes do or the latter is to solely bear the perceived monstrous presence of the Furies who have made his mind become deranged. This puzzle was to be solved in the *Eumenides*, making Orestes' madness an integral part of the puzzle in the *Oresteia*.

In addition, Aeschylus establishes the fact that Orestes' commission of the horrible deed and the consequent madness that befalls him was not only needful, but also inevitable. On this account, Orestes seems to know beforehand that the consequence of that intended dreadful action was madness. This view is reaffirmed when Orestes appropriately says:

> λευκὰς δὲ κόρσας τῇδ᾽ ἐπαντέλλειν νόσῳ.
> ἄλλας τ᾽ ἐφώνει προσβολάς Ἐρινύων
> ἐκ τῶν πατρῴων αἱμάτων τελουμένας.
> τὸ γὰρ σκοτεινὸν τῶν ἐνερτέρων βέλος
> ἐκ προστροπαίων ἐν γένει πεπτωκότων,
> It mentioned other miseries as well—
> attacks by vengeful Furies, stemming
> from a slaughtered father's blood, dark bolts
> from gods below, aroused by murdered kinsmen
> calling for revenge, frenzied night fits.[171]

[171] Aeschylus. (2017). *Choephori*. *Oresteia*. (A Dual Language ed. Trans; Ian Johnston). (Oxford: Faenum Publishing). Lines 282-287.

Furthermore, Aeschylus uses Orestes' madness to underpin his notion of madness. Thus, the gods are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls Orestes after he commits that terrible deed, but his madness is temporary as he later recovers from his deranged mind.

Lastly, and equally important to the theme of my thesis is the fact that Orestes' madness tends to emphasise the notions of non-tragic and tragic madness respectively. Non-tragic madness because the madness that the Furies wreak on him is to be construed as punishment for the dreadful act he commits, and tragic madness because Orestes desires to restore not only his lost right to the throne but also considers the vengeance on Aegisthus and Clytemnestra as a duty he must accomplish. I must also intimate that the non-tragic and tragic madness of Orestes would be further interrogated in the course of this chapter.

2.4. A critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes

Generally, non-tragic madness operates upon the principle that the madness wrought on the hero by the divine or the gods emanates from a wrong done by the hero. In other words, the madness is construed because of a wrong done or a kind of punishment which the hero suffers because he deserves it. This phenomenon as earlier noted in Chapter One is consistent with the *hubristic* principle which attaches moral depravity to the madness that befalls the hero.[172] Therefore, how then does Orestes' madness become non-tragic or in what ways or under what condition(s) does the madness that befall Orestes be classified as non-tragic? Throughout the *Oresteia* and in particular the *Choephori* the refrain has been 'the sinner must not go unpunished'. This view is succinctly captured by Henry S. Scribner when he states:

> No sinner can escape, but wisdom may come through suffering, and character

[172] Cf. Chapter One, (p. 9)

may be refined in the fires of bitter trial.[173]

Thus, by the concept and the implications of the *hubristic* principle, Orestes deserves the madness that befalls him. If indeed Orestes deserves the madness that befalls him, then that is non-tragic. It all starts when Orestes makes certain pronouncements underpinning his motivation before the dreadful deed is done. These assertions have been cited below:

αἰνῶ δὲ κρύπτειν τάσδε συνθήκας ἐμάς,
ὡς ἂν δόλῳ κτείναντες ἄνδρα τίμιον
δόλοισι καὶ ληφθῶσιν ἐν ταὐτῷ βρόχῳ
θανόντες, καὶ Λοξίας ἐφήμισεν,
ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων, μάντις ἀψευδὴς τὸ πρίν.
It was treachery
They used to kill him - they shall find his price was high,
When treachery traps and kills them in the self-same snare,
According to the prophetic word of Loxias,
Of Lord Apollo, whose oracles never yet have failed.[174]

Orestes' use of the expression *in the self-same snare* is crucial for our argument for the non-tragic madness of the hero. The Greek *παγιδεύω* to wit, *to lay a snare for, entrap*[175] as contained in Orestes' utterance connotes the process of obtaining *talio*.[176] In essence, once Orestes intends to entrap his victims with the main purpose of killing them in retaliation for the murder of his father, then it is nothing other than a quest for justice, which is not only consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle, but also has Apollo's sanction. Moreover, when Orestes

[173] Henry S. Scribner. (1923). 'The Treatment of Orestes in Greek Tragedy'. *The Classical Weekly*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 16(14). pp. 105-109.
[174] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (555-559)
[175] H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press). p.510.
[176] Like for like; punishment in the same kind; the punishment of an injury by an act of the same kind, as an eye for an eye, a limb for a limb, etc. *TheLaw.com Law Dictionary & Black's Law Dictionary*. 2nd Ed. https://dictionary.thelaw.com/talio/

intends to pay his intended victims in equal measure then anything less than death would not only connote injustice for his murdered father, but also a possible loss of *timé* and *areté* before his people. In furtherance of the above Orestes once again makes us know of his predisposition to do the deed when he blatantly ignores the entreaties of Clytemnestra. Orestes' disposition shows one who is merely motivated by vengeance and hatred. He retorts:

> καὶ ζῶντα γάρ νιν κρείσσον᾽ ἠγήσω πατρός.
> τούτῳ θανοῦσα ξυγκάθευδ᾽, ἐπεὶ φιλεῖς
> τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὃν δ᾽ ἐχρῆν φιλεῖν στυγεῖς.
> I mean to kill you close beside him. While he lived
> You preferred him to my father. Sleep with him in death;
> For you love him, and hate the man you should have loved. [177]

He further demonstrates his readiness to do that terrible deed even in the face of the warning that his mother, Clytemnestra gives: "Beware the hounding Furies of a mother's curse." (924). This notwithstanding, Orestes seeks to justify and exculpate himself after the terrible deed had been done when he proclaims:

> κτανεῖν τέ φημι μητέρ᾽ οὐκ ἄνευ δίκης,
> πατροκτόνον μίασμα καὶ θεῶν στύγος.
> It was no sin to kill my mother, who was herself
> Marked with my father's blood, unclean, abhorred by the gods. [178]

It is quite clear from the above citations and references that Orestes is *purely* (my emphasis) motivated by vengeance, hatred, and denial of his right to the throne among others to do that dreadful deed. It ought to be noted that the preceding view is more consistent with the non-tragic argument of the madness of Orestes, which then makes Apollo's instruction a cover for the

[177] *Ibid*. (905ff.)
[178] *Ibid*. (1027-1028.)

hero's personal grievances and a rationalisation of his deed before man. Upon this, it is appropriate to accept the view that Orestes at this point considered both Aegisthus and Clytemnestra as enemies. The Orestes-Clytemnestra son-mother relationship evokes certain complexities that should be interrogated as far as the argument for the non-tragic madness of the hero is concerned. Orestes is Clytemnestra's son—she plays on the emotional bond that exists between a mother and a son— Orestes refers to her as his mother (989) — she carried him in her womb (992). The evocation of these *filial* complexities geared towards securing a reprieve for Clytemnestra's impending death is only short-lived because of a series of reasons or factors the hero considers: (i) that his mother is an adulteress (ii) that his mother is primarily the murderer of his father (iii) that he does not blame his father for the sacrifice of his own sister, Iphigenia, as his mother, Clytemnestra entreats him to (918) (iv) Clytemnestra is acting as a stumbling block to patriarchy[179] (v) and finally, that blood-guiltiness could only be wiped out by the death of the murderer.[180] This state of the hero's mind is what makes it possible for him to do the abominable deed. Aristotle corroborates this view when he opines in his *Poetics*:

> Now, if it is a case of two enemies, this arouses no particular pity, whether the one damages the other or only intends to; or at least, pity is felt only at the *pathos*[181] considered in itself. The same is true in the case when people are indifferent to each other.[182]

So now that the deed is done under the condition described above and with reference to the *hubristic* principle, it makes it imperative that *nemesis*, represented by the Furies, comes in to exact a befitting punishment or a kind of justice on Orestes, hence madness—his *ate* of a sort. At this juncture, since we perceive the madness that is wrought on Orestes by the Furies as a kind of

[179] Anne P. Burnett (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 110.
[180] Henry S. Scribner. (1923). 'The Treatment of Orestes in Greek Tragedy'. *The Classical Weekly*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 16(14). p.105.
[181] H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press). (p. 511)
Pathos (*πάθος*) means anything that befalls one, suffering, misfortune, calamity.
[182] *Poetics*: 1453:14

punishment for a wrong done, the dreadful deed of killing his mother, Clytemnestra, it is non-tragic. Consequently, when one critically assesses Orestes' state of mind before he does the dreadful deed and the consequent madness that the Furies inflict on him, one comes to the supposition that the hero did not consider Aegisthus either as his uncle or Clytemnestra as his mother, but his enemies, which he must exterminate. The preceding scenario creates a sort of conflict between ethical and legal conduct which one must interrogate. In my view the ethical implication or conflict is summed up by Burnett when she examines the son-mother relationship and the possible crime or otherwise of the deed as she rightly points out:

> The killing of Clytemnestra must remain viscerally appalling, while it is yet in this particular instance not ethically repellent, and Aeschylus achieves this contradictory effect with an appeal to the rules of reciprocity that governed parents and children. A child was not to harm a mother because that child owed the exact opposite, benefactions, as a return for the nurture she had given. If there had been no such nurture, then obviously the child was not bound to make beneficial return and might instead show loyalty to his other parent. Ritually speaking, the blood of an unnurturing mother would still pollute, but a crime against her would no longer have the ethical stigma of ingratitude.[183]

The ethical analysis and diagnosis of the deed have not brought this protracted puzzle to a definite conclusion—Aeschylus in his *Eumenides* introduces a legal dimension as a progression from the old ways of dealing with issues of homicide or a solution to puzzles of this kind.[184] Although it is usually difficult to tease out historical elements or antecedents from tragic motifs, there seems to be some consensus on this as far as Aeschylus' *Eumenides* is concerned. In this regard, K. J. Dover writes:

> But *Eumenides*, like much that Aeschylus wrote, is unusual, and one of its usual aspects is the clarity and persistence with which the hearer's attention is engaged in the political

[183] Anne P. Burnett. (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 111.
[184] Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, (590-565).

> present as well as the heroic past; one might almost say, directed away from the past and towards the present.[185]

We stand in a period of transition. In this regard, Azime Aydoğmuş gives an account of the different types of justice and their development:

> The first justice is followed by Furies who wanted to take the revenge for the murder of Clytemnestra. The second one is done by Apollo's instruction to Orestes by taking revenge for Agamemnon's murder. The last one is done by Athena at the court.[186]

Vernant, therefore, appraises the transition as he recognises the individual roles of each agent as he gives this legal rendition to the deed:

> With the advent of law and the institution of the city courts, the ancient religious conception of the misdeed fades away. A new idea of crime emerges. The role of the individual becomes more clearly defined. Intention now appears as a constitutive element of the criminal action, especially in the case of homicide. The divide between the two broad categories of *hekon* and *akon* in human behavior is now considered a norm. But it is quite clear that this way of thinking of the offender is also developed within the framework of a purely intellectualist terminology. The action performed fully of one's own volition and that which is performed despite oneself are defined as reciprocal opposites in terms of knowledge and ignorance.[187]

It stands to reason that since Orestes comes back to Argos with a premeditated mind of avenging not only the death of his father but also restoring his inheritance, wealth and his kingdom, his desire could not have been anything other than a quest for justice. Thus, since Orestes considers his action as a kind of justice of a sort, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, it is non-tragic.

---

[185] K. J. Dover. (1957). "The Political Aspect of Aeschylus's Eumenides". *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. See also G. Zuntz (1955). *The Political Plays of Euripides*, Manchester, pp. 58 *sqq*. for effective criticism of some common assumptions about historical allusions in Tragedy

[186] Azime Aydoğmuş. (2019). "Clytemnestra as a Nightmare to Patriarchy in Aeschylus Tragedy, The Oresteian Trilogy". *Sayfa*.pp.25-38.

[187] Jean-Pierre Vernant. (1990). "Intimations of the Will in Greek Tragedy." *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (New York: Zone Books). p.63.

2.5. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Orestes

The Psychoanalytic theory operates on the fundamental notion that our personalities have memories, beliefs, urges, drives and instincts that influence our behaviour and derive from our unconscious desires.[188] Thus, our human behaviour, to Freud, is shaped through an interplay between the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* which are the three essential components of the mind. Whereas the *Id* is the unconscious part of the mind that seeks immediate gratification of biological or instinctual needs without giving credence to what is wrong or right, *Superego* acts as an ethical constraint on behaviour to discern between wrong and right. The *ego*, on the other hand, acts as the rational and the conscious part of the mind which arbitrates between the demands of the *Id* and the *Superego*.[189] The Socio-Psychological theory comes with a supposition that one's personality is largely influenced or shaped rather by cultural values and social norms than biological instincts.[190] The question that proceeds from here is: how do we integrate these theories into the interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Aeschylus' Orestes?[191]

To start with, Orestes' desire to avenge the death of his father is influenced by his *Id*. This is because the idea of restoring his lost throne which he construes both as his right (*σωσιτέον, one must save*)[192] and duty (*καθήκω*)[193](my emphasis) should give him immediate gratification without giving credence to the possible consequences of the dreadful act of killing Aegisthus and

[188] www.khanacademy.org (Accessed on 07/07/2019)
[189] See Theoretical Framework in Chapter One for further details.
[190] https://positivepsychology.com/psychoanalysis/ (Accessed on 07/07/2019)
[191] It is an acceptable proposition in the scheme of my study that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness the heroes suffer. Thus far, it ought to be clarified that the role of Apollo in commanding Orestes to commit the deed does not perform either a *Superego* function or an ethical restraint, but serves as an impetus for Orestes' *Id*.
[192] H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p.688.
[193] In other usages *τὸ καιθῆκον* and *τὰ καθήκοντα*, that which is meet or proper, one's duty. H.G. Liddell & R. Scott. p. 339.

especially, Clytemnestra. On this account, he makes several assertions akin to his desire to avenge his father's murder and to go ahead to do the deed—a measure that is occasioned by the gratification, function and demands of *Id*.[194]

It is already an established fact that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness of the hero, a view corroborated by the likes of Goldhill, Padel and Provenza.[195] Consequently, the madness inflicted on Orestes by the Furies could be construed as the function of the *Superego*. This is because the Furies act as ethical restraint of Orestes' abominable action of killing his own mother, hence his madness. Besides, the Furies' action of making Orestes mad is indicative of society's censure of that behaviour, hence his madness. Claire Catenaccio aptly notes here that the Erinyes are both cause and symptom of Orestes' madness and further adds that as in a dream, an undesired window has opened between his mind and the usually unseen workings of the supernatural world.[196]

As far as my thesis is concerned, we need to once again reiterate the view that when the hero's madness emanates from a wanton display of divine power or divine punishment for a wrong done, it follows the *hubristic* principle and hence, it is non-tragic. In the case of Orestes, it is appropriate to suppose that his madness is a punishment inflicted upon him by the Furies for a wrong done —attributable to the function of the *Superego*. As part of Orestes' punishment, he expresses his madness in hallucination when according to him, he was visibly being haunted, beaten and lashed by the Furies, who were invisible to the Chorus—a condition expressive of a

[194] Cf. *Choephori*: (955-957), (905ff.) & (1026f.)
[195] See pages of the Literature Review for further details.
[196]Claire Catenaccio. (2011). 'Dream as Image and Action in Aeschylus' *Oresteia'*. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*. 51. p. 224.

mind demented. In Orestes' state of helplessness and madness, he is pursued by the Furies into exile[197] and escapes to seek refuge in Apollo's temple at Delphi.[198]

Typical of madness in Greek tragedy, the demented mind of the hero is temporary. The third stage of madness in Greek tragedy, which is *the recovery of the hero from madness* can be identified with the function of the *Ego*. *Ego* functions as the conciliatory between the demands of the *Id* and the moral or ethical restraint of the *Superego*. In fact, the action or pronouncement that proceeds from the hero after his recovery is what appears to be a behaviour accepted by society. This is what we are to witness in the *Eumenides*. Thus, it is important to once again note that Orestes' recovery from madness takes place in the *Eumenides*. Orestes' condition and behaviour now is quite different from the period when he was enraged and rancorous to do the deed and when he had become demented by the Furies in the *Choephori*. From lines 85ff. of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, Orestes, in a sober mind, addresses Apollo where he requests the assistance and the steadfastness of the latter, an indication of a mind that has just recovered and doing what the society considers as normal—a characteristic function of *Ego*. Thus, as far as my study is concerned, once Orestes' madness emanates from a purported wrong done and executed by the Furies, it is certainly fulfilling the demands of the *hubristic* principle, hence it is non-tragic.

It is now appropriate to turn our attention to the application of the Socio-Psychological theory in the interpretation and critiquing of Orestes' non-tragic madness. The question is how does the integration of the Socio-Psychological theory make Orestes' madness a non-tragic one? Orestes is in exile, a prince who has lost everything because his uncle Aegisthus and his mother, Clytemnestra have usurped the throne of his birth-right by extension. At this juncture, Orestes must display a kind of ardour that is required of a prince. As a prince whose father has been

[197] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1062ff.)
[198] This is depicted in the setting before the start of the plot of the *Eumenides*.

treacherously killed, the Argive society, represented by the Chorus, demands he avenges his father's murder. The preceding view is given further impetus by Anne Pippin Burnett when she remarks:

> Orestes was a secondary avenger, in that he responded to an outrage against his father, but since it was his mother who was author of that outrage, the supreme honor that he was expected to pay to his male parent meant destruction for the female.[199]

In the succeeding extract, the Chorus pontificates among other views that justice should not only be done, but also sanctions the perspective that Clytemnestra's misfortune has been *Fated*. They further espouse a stance that seeks to justify Clytemnestra's impending death and psychologically exculpates Orestes from any crime or guilt feeling when he does the deed. The Chorus, therefore, intimates:

> Δίκας δ᾽ ἐρείδεται πυθμήν.
> προχαλκεύει δ᾽ Αἶσα φασγανουργός.
> τέκνον δ᾽ ἐπεισφέρει δόμοισιν
> αἱμάτων παλαιτέρων τίνειν μύσος
> Justice plants her anvil; Fate
> Forges keen the brazen knife.
> Murder still will propagate
> Murder; life must fall for life.[200]

In effect, failure to exact like for like as the Chorus insinuates, would amount to cowardice and that would be uncharacteristic of a hero of the sort of Orestes. Orestes is supposed to exhibit a heroic temper imposed on him by the society typified by the aspirations of the Chorus. The Chorus virtually put some kind of psychological pressure on Orestes to avenge his father's death albeit the latter has had that underlying motive. The intention of the Chorus is for Orestes to relieve them from the bondage and misrule of both Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. For the Chorus, there is nothing wrong with killing those who in themselves have committed the said offence.

[199] Anne P. Burnett. (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 99.
[200] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (646-650)

The old form of justice per their prescription is to continue in perpetuity. The audience has no choice but to consider Orestes' decision to do the deed as just. These conditions make it compelling and imperative for Orestes to commit the dreadful act. Thus, motivated by these Socio-psychological conditions and factors Orestes commits the deed, which impels the Furies to make him mad. It, therefore, stands to reason that since the Furies or the avengers of kindred-murder construe the act as an *unpardonable* crime, they make Orestes mad—a condition, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence it is non-tragic.

2.6. A critique of the tragic madness of Orestes

Tragic madness operates upon the principle that the madness that the hero suffers is an undeserving one because it either emanates from the capricious or whimsical use of divine strength or a witting or unwitting exploitation of the hero's desires or weaknesses. This phenomenon as earlier noted in Chapter One is consistent with the concept of *hamartia* which does not attach moral depravity to the madness that befalls the hero and the consequent fall.[201] Therefore, how then does Orestes' madness become a tragic one or in what ways or under what condition(s) does the madness that befall Orestes be classified as tragic? To do this, I would start by giving a summary of the development of the plot and appropriately provide a critique on those parts of the plot where Orestes' actions or assertions give impetus to his madness as a tragic one. In other words, I would highlight his declarations or actions that make his madness an undeserving one—hence a tragic madness.

The plot of the *Choephori* begins with Orestes' invocation to Hermes as he mourns at his father's graveside; this is punctuated by the arrival of Electra and her entourage (1-33). Within this period, we get the first glimpse of Orestes' motivation for returning from exile. Orestes proclaims:

[201] Cf. Chapter One, (p. 10)

ἥκω γὰρ ἐς γῆν τήνδε καὶ κατέρχομαι.
τύμβου δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ὄχθῳ τῷδε κηρύσσω πατρὶ
κλύειν, ἀκοῦσαι ...
I seek my native right. Over this mound, his tomb,
Before my deed is in hand, I call on my dead father
To hear, to sanction.[202]

The impression one gets from the foregoing extract is that, although the hero's desire to do the deed is aroused, it depends upon a higher authority's sanctioning of it, which invariably makes the intended act an unwilling one. So here we see that the hero has availed himself to do the deed as he expresses his desire for vengeance which in itself is a quality of the hero's weakness exploited by an appeal to a higher order. Moreover, from the extract, Orestes seems to know what constitutes the deed but is unaware of the possible consequences—reminiscent of Ho Kim's rendering of Aristotle's concept of *hamartia*.[203] This is a conducive ground, as my thesis establishes, not to attach moral depravity to the intended deed and the consequent madness the hero is about to suffer or suffers.

Also, when Orestes adds Zeus to his invocation, it further gives motivation to the view that the hero needs to do the deed, not for himself but a higher authority, his deceased father—a mark of selflessness. In fact, as earlier noted, it is a preparatory ground for his exculpation from the deed, making Orestes' impending madness an undeserving one. He declares:

ὦ Ζεῦ, δός με τείσασθαι μόρον
πατρός, γενοῦ δὲ σύμμαχος θέλων ἐμοί.
Great Zeus, O grant me vengeance for my father's death;

[202] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (3-5)
[203] Cf. Chapter One, (p. 10)

Be gracious to me; fight on my side! [204]

The plot continues when the Chorus bemoans the state of affairs in Argos and expresses the need for vengeance[205] to atone for the sin committed by Clytemnestra (34-84). This is followed (85ff.) by Electra's dilemma as she requests the Chorus, who shares her pain, to assist her in taking a decision. The Chorus consequently advises her to pour the wine for those who are loyal. Subsequently, Electra (113ff.) prays by invoking Hermes and other deities to come to her aid and that of Orestes by restoring them to their lost inheritance—by avenging them. The Chorus come in and reiterate their demand for vengeance as they sing the praises of the sacred king, Agamemnon. In the interlude after the libation has been done (164ff.), Electra finds in excitement a lock of hair she identifies with Orestes but expresses some dilemma as to whether it is Clytemnestra's or her brother's. Her quandary is cleared when she later finds the footprints which in form were like hers (194ff.). Afterwards, Electra and Orestes unite (222ff.), where the latter bemoans their precarious condition, and they in unison entreat Zeus to once again come to their aid. The two siblings are admonished by the Chorus to exercise some restraint in their hour of unity and happiness (264ff.). Now what follows is perhaps the most impelling statement that Orestes makes, which puts before us not only the mission of Orestes commanded by Apollo, but also prepares the ground for the exculpation of the hero over the madness he is to suffer. In effect, it tends to create a situation where the madness that is to befall him becomes an undeserving one. Orestes asserts this as having come from Apollo:

οὗτοι προδώσει Λοξίου μεγασθενὴς χρησμὸς
κελεύων τόνδε κίνδυνον περᾶν,
κἀξορθιάζων πολλὰ καὶ δυσχειμέρους

[204] *Ibid*. (18-19.)

[205] The Chorus' desire for vengeance equally underscores the imminent arrival of Orestes from exile to do the deed and it is reechoed in (64-84).

ἄτας ὑφ᾽ ἧπαρ θερμὸν ἐξαυδώμενος,
εἰ μὴ μέτειμι τοῦ πατρὸς τοὺς αἰτίους.
τρόπον τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνταποκτεῖναι λέγων,
ἀποχρημάτοισι ζημίαις ταυρούμενον.
αὐτὸν δ᾽ ἔφασκε τῇ φίλῃ ψυχῇ τάδε
τείσειν μ᾽ ἔχοντα πολλὰ δυστερπῆ κακά.
τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ γῆς δυσφρόνων μηνίματα
βροτοῖς πιφαύσκων εἶπε, τὰς δ᾽ αἰνῶν νόσους,

Apollo's great oracle
surely will defend me. Its orders were
that I should undertake this danger.
It cried out in prophecy, foretelling
many winters of calamity would chill
my hot heart, if I did not take revenge
on those who killed my father. It ordered me
to murder them the way they murdered him,
insisting they could not pay the penalty
with their possessions. The oracle declared,
"If not, you'll pay the debt with your own life,
a life of troubles." It spoke a revelation,
making known to men the wrath of blood guilt—[206]

It needs to be said here that the above extract has had a huge appeal to classicists who seem to agree and appropriately refer to Apollo's command as having had a compelling impact on Orestes' desire to do the deed. R.P. Winnington-Ingram says: "Orestes is impelled towards

[206] Aeschylus. (2017). *Choephori*. *Oresteia*. (A Dual Language ed. Trans; Ian Johnston). (Oxford: Faenum Publishing). (269-278)

matricide by Apollo."[207] To this command, Simon Goldhill corroborates the view that Orestes has been expressly instructed by Apollo to kill Clytemnestra[208] and further explains how the deity is a direct controlling force for his action.[209] Helene P. Foley equally adds: "There can be no doubt that Orestes, in obedience to Apollo's command, has returned to Argos to carry out his revenge."[210] To subject Apollo's command to Orestes to proper scrutiny and critique, certain fundamental issues arise. First of all, one needs to avert one's mind to Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* on voluntary and involuntary acts. The focus here is what Aristotle considers as constituting an involuntary action and, in his view, it is upon it that pity and pardon are hinged. In his *Nichomachean Ethics* Aristotle clarifies an involuntary act as an act done in ignorance, or if not in ignorance, outside the agent's control, or under compulsion.[211] Aristotle further adds that it is when an agent acts on this account that pity and pardon are aroused.[212] It is prudent to state here that the conditions described and prescribed above by Aristotle make the madness that is to befall Orestes a tragic one, for he is in this case an involuntary agent. Secondly, Orestes is threatened with severe punishment should he neglect Apollo's command. The consequences are unfathomable should Orestes exercise any kind of cowardice—Apollo's command is simply non-negotiable. Furthermore, the extract above presents to us an impression that Orestes' very life is threatened should he decline to obey the command of Apollo. The voice of Apollo, according to Orestes, insistently harassed him, which did not only serve as a kind of mental torture but also a precarious condition one would not even wish for one's enemy. Finally, what could be more dreadful than knowing that not avenging your father's death has inevitable

[207] R.P. Winnington-Ingram. (1983). *Studies in Aeschylus.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). p. 136.
[208] Simon Goldhill. (2004). *Aeschylus: The Oresteia. Landmarks of world literature* (2nd ed.). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). p. 53.
[209] *Ibid*. p. 68
[210] P.H. Foley. (2001). *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press). p. 33.
[211] *Ethics*: *Nichomachean Ethics*: 1135a28-b18.
[212] *Ibid*. 1110b31.

consequences and doing so by shedding kindred blood could rouse the Furies to make you mad? It is upon these fundamental conditions and reasons that the madness that befalls Orestes becomes tragic. Anne P. Burnett also captures the precarious condition of Orestes thus:

> Here was an avenger who was at one and the same time the most proper agent of death, according to the commands of masculine society, yet also the most improper, according to a fundamental human tabu.[213]

Assessing the quandary both before and post the deed, Robert Parker instructively states in his introduction:

> Anyone who has sampled a few of the most commonly read Greek texts will have encountered pollution…while Orestes in the *Oresteia*, although he is driven to the matricide by the fear of one pollution, is seized by another after performing it.[214]

In effect, we cannot attribute, under these conditions, moral depravity to the deed Orestes commits and the madness he is to suffer because of his deed.

The plot progresses from 312-512 where the Chorus, Orestes and Electra converge at the graveside of Agamemnon and take turns to bemoan their condition, invoke the gods and the dead to come to their aid to exact justice on the wrongdoers. From lines 513ff. the tone of mourning now changes, where Orestes enquires from the Chorus why Clytemnestra has now sent them to pour a libation on the grave of the deceased king—the man she murdered. In the dialogue that ensues, it becomes clear that some kind of foreboding dream, Orestes imputes comes from Agamemnon, and impelled Clytemnestra to do so—he identifies himself with the snake who would bring destruction to the Queen. This is followed by the plan (553ff.) to actualise the murder of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Once again Orestes in lines 557ff. makes us aware that Apollo's oracle, which does not fail, has sanctioned the deed for which reason he had returned to

[213] Anne P. Burnett. (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 99.
[214] Robert Parker. (1996). *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press). p. 1.

Argos to execute. At the end of the plan, the Chorus gives a long ode (585-652) in which historical and mythological allusions are made. This long ode is punctuated by Orestes' arrival at the palace (654-667), where in a short dialogue between him and the Servant he demands to meet with the rulers of the palace. In consequence, Clytemnestra comes out to receive her so-called guests (668ff.) where she demonstrates her readiness to extend all available courtesies to them. Subsequently, Orestes devises a ruse where he spins a tale about his purported death to Clytemnestra (674ff.). The Queen shows concern upon hearing the news about the supposed death of Orestes (690ff.). Following this, Orestes and Clytemnestra exchange pleasantries—the latter instructs the servants to treat the former and his friend with decency—they both depart (700ff.). The Chorus as usual show their support for Orestes (718ff.) and are also expectant of what would happen. The nurse comes out of the palace (734ff.), and in a soliloquy, tells us of the pretence of Clytemnestra and also expresses the need to inform Aegisthus of the supposed death of Orestes—he demonstrates his unhappiness upon hearing such bad news. The Chorus then engages the Nurse (765ff.) in an intriguing conversation with the sole purpose of ensuring that Aegisthus does not come to the palace with armed escort when the tale of the alleged death of Orestes is delivered to him. The Chorus in separate prayers, first to Zeus, demand him to ensure victory for Orestes with a promise of thanksgiving and sacrifices; second, they request Apollo to also ensure that the house of Atreus is restored to the rightful owner; and third to Hermes, a request that he accompanies Orestes in his endeavour. They finally encourage Orestes to be bold when the time for the deed comes (784-837). Aegisthus then arrives at the palace (838ff.), engages the Chorus briefly and enters. The Chorus follows this with a prayer typifying their dilemma—whether Orestes will have victory over Aegisthus or not. From (873ff.) we hear of the death of the usurper, Aegisthus, as confirmed by the victim's Servant. Clytemnestra arrives on

the scene (887ff.), accepts that her doom is near and beckons the Servant to bring her a weapon. In the dialogue that ensues between Orestes and Clytemnestra (891ff.), the latter pleads for pardon from an unrelenting son. However, something curious happens when the Queen pleads for her life to be spared. This entreaty nearly gets to Orestes who ponders over the impending deed as a terrible thing to do, but was checked by Pylades who in a short dialogue with Orestes insists on the deed because of Apollo's command:

Ὀρέστης

Πυλάδη τί δράσω; μητέρ᾽ αἰδεσθῶ κτανεῖν;

Πυλάδης

ποῦ δὴ τὰ λοιπὰ Λοξίου μαντεύματα

τὰ πυθόχρηστα, πιστὰ δ᾽ εὐορκώματα;

ἅπαντας ἐχθροὺς τῶν θεῶν ἡγοῦ πλέον**.**

Orestes

Pylades, what shall I do? To kill a mother is terrible.

Shall I show mercy?

Pylades

Where then are Apollo's words,

His Pythian oracles? What becomes of men's sworn oaths?

Make all men living your enemies, but not the gods.[215]

The citation above presents to us Orestes' unwillingness to do the deed—reminiscent of Aristotle's prescription of an involuntary agent as earlier elucidated. It takes Pylades to drum Apollo's oracular pronouncement into his ears. Orestes' hesitancy here also presupposes that, notwithstanding Apollo's threatening and insistent command, he expresses that reluctance and even attempts to show mercy. This situation also goes to support the view that it would be

[215] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (899-902.)

inappropriate to attach moral depravity to the deed he commits. By this condition, it reinforces the view that the deed he commits is an imposition of Apollo, a stronger force, which makes the madness he suffers an undeserved one, in fact, a tragic madness because it arouses the emotions of pity and fear.

It is important to state here that the exchanges between Orestes and Clytemnestra continue as the latter pleads for her life to be spared and warns her son of the avenging Furies should he go ahead to do the deed (906-930). The Chorus (931-971) sings of the victory of Orestes and praises Apollo, for his word is always true—the house of Atreus and the throne of Argos once Aegisthus is no more is now free. In the next scene (972-1007), Orestes comes out of the palace and displays the corpses of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra—indicative of the actualisation of the abominable deed. Following this, Orestes attempts to justify his action to the Chorus and demonstrates his readiness to face trial. The Chorus' response after the preceding incident suggests that Aegisthus deserved his death (1008ff.). Orestes accordingly also offers a defence for the deed. The most important defence as far as his impending madness is concerned, is when he succinctly states:

> τὸν πυθόμαντιν Λοξίαν, χρήσαντ᾽ ἐμοὶ
> πράξαντι μὲν ταῦτ᾽ ἐκτὸς αἰτίας κακῆς
> εἶναι, παρέντα δ᾽—οὐκ ἐρῶ τὴν ζημίαν.
> I offer, in full warrant, Apollo Loxias,
> Who from his Pythian oracle revealed to me
> That if I did this deed I should be clear of blame;
> If I neglected it–I will not tell the penance[216]

Orestes further adds:

[216] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1030-1032)

καὶ μαρτυρεῖν μὲν ὡς ἐπορσύνθη κακὰ

τάδ᾽ ἐν χρόνῳ μοι πάντας Ἀργείους λέγω

ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἀλήτης τῆσδε γῆς ἀπόξενος,

ζῶν καὶ τεθνηκὼς τάσδε κληδόνας λιπών.

As to how I did this brutal act,
I call all men of Argos—be my witnesses
to Menelaus when he comes back home.

Remember me in years to come. Now I go,
wandering in exile from my country.
Whether I live or die, I leave with you
your memory of me.[217]

From the foregoing extracts, certain fundamental issues come to the fore as far as the tragic madness of Orestes is concerned. The understanding in the first citation is corroborated by Bennet Simon, who presents the view that Apollo has charged Orestes not only to execute his mother but also to avenge his father. If he fails to carry out the Delphic charge, he must suffer dire punishments.[218] This is probably where Pylades' advice to Orestes once again comes in handy.[219] By that Pylades meant Orestes cannot afford to disobey Apollo's command—the consequences are dire. Thus, as Orestes is highly motivated by a superior force, Apollo to be precise, who offers the young trifling hero no option or alternative to the commission of the deed, it is logical that the former should offer the latter as his defence. Besides, Apollo had promised Orestes that he (Orestes) would not be blamed for the deed. Furthermore, Orestes' reference to Apollo as his defence because the latter instructed him to do the deed makes the hero an involuntary agent, which is consistent with Aristotle's perspective of an involuntary agent. It also presupposes that when Orestes says that the act was not inflicted in mere ruthlessness, then it means, first, we cannot attach moral depravity to the madness he suffers.

[217] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (A Dual Language ed. Trans; Ian Johnston). (1039-1042)
[218] B. Simon. (1978). *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece*: *The classical roots of modern psychiatry.* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press). p. 103.
[219] Cf. Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (904): "Make all men living your enemies, but not the gods."

Secondly, Orestes does not wilfully commit the deed, making the madness he suffers an undeserved one, hence a tragic madness.

The plot continues (from 1049ff.) where Orestes begins to perceive the presence of the Furies who eventually drive him mad and so he must escape into exile. From lines 1064 to the end of the plot, the Chorus recounts the curse that had befallen the house of Atreus, which has witnessed one death upon the other, and bemoans when the whole feud would come to a closure.

2.7. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Orestes

The decision of Orestes to kill both Aegisthus and Clytemnestra[220] is influenced and motivated by Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological factors. I shall first set out to integrate the interplay of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, which constitute the Psychoanalytic theory, in the interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Orestes, and second, explain how Socio-Psychological factors do the same in the interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Orestes.

Before Orestes commits the deed, certain fundamental happenings create a condition for one to assess his madness as an undeserving one. Following the preceding statement, we see the exploitation of Orestes' weaknesses or desires or either consciously or unconsciously. In the first place, when Orestes says that he has returned to his homeland as an exile and implores both Hermes and his father to aid him in the task ahead (1-5), that is a display of a conscious desire for restoration, which is the characteristic function of the *Id*. However, when he adds that before he does the deed it must be sanctioned by his deceased father (6-7), it is unconscious exploitation of his desire for revenge, which is also the product of the *Id*. The appeal to his murdered father to

[220] But one ought to first avert one's mind to the Homeric account of Orestes' motivation for seeking revenge on Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. See further details on this in Homer's *Odyssey*, I.30, 40, 298, III.306, IV. 546 and XI. 461.

sanction the act before he does it is indicative not only of the hero's selflessness but also an appeal to a higher authority who should rather be held accountable for the deed. Thus, the psychology behind Orestes' appeal to his deceased father before he does the deed is to have his tacit approval and an expression of his acquiescence to the deed, which invariably exculpates him.

In addition, when Orestes says that he requests Zeus to grant him vengeance for his father's death (16f.), it is once again a product of the function or the gratification of the *Id*. Once again there is unconscious exploitation of his desire for vengeance. Besides, the psychology behind the appeal to a higher authority and the subsequent actualisation of the deed once again is suggestive not only of Zeus' acquiescence but also a selfless act done in honour of Agamemnon, the deceased king. This condition makes the madness inflicted on him once again a tragic one.

Furthermore, the famous command that Apollo gives to Orestes should be construed as exploitation or manipulation of the hero's weakness or desire or both, borne out of the fulfilment of the *Id*. Thus, when Apollo demands Orestes to exact fit vengeance on those who killed Agamemnon, it should be interpreted as an exploitation of the emotional weakness of the hero. Yet again, when Apollo cautions Orestes about *other miseries as well as attacks by vengeful Furies, stemming from a slaughtered father's blood*, it is a reinforcement of the preceding scenario. These conditions make it increasingly difficult not to exculpate the hero from the madness he suffers.

Additionally, when Orestes expresses a wavering desire not to do the deed since he considered it something terrible to do (903ff), Pylades first reminds him of the oath he had taken to avenge his father's death—a characteristic function of the *Id*. Secondly, we see unconscious exploitation of

Orestes' weakness when Pylades reminds the hero of the words of Apollo—that it would be better to make all living your enemies than the gods. This overbearing authority coming from Apollo as Pylades reminds Orestes leaves the hero no option but to form a desire to do the deed—an expression once again of the characteristic function of the *Id*. The scenario described above indubitably arouses our pity when the Furies wreak madness on him.

In furtherance of the above, we see once again a conscious manipulation of Orestes' weakness and desire for revenge, when Apollo first assures him of exculpation from the deed, and second, warns him of damning consequences should he renege (1029-1032)—a condition which is typical of the demands of the *Id*.

Finally, when Orestes requests all Argive men to bear him witness that the death Clytemnestra suffered was not done in mere ruthlessness (1039ff.), we recognise the characteristic function of the *Id* occasioned by the hero's desire or weakness exploited by Apollo, hence the deed. The scenario described above certainly makes the madness Orestes suffers an undeserving one, which is consistent with the principles undergirding *hamartia*.

In the view of Grace Hobbs, the Erinyes epitomise a facet of the justice of Zeus as they operate upon the principle that the doer not only is punished, but also the one who shirks vengeance is in violation of his sacred duty, and for this, he will equally be pursued by them.[221] Now the deed is done and as a consequence, Orestes has been made mad by the Furies or the Erinyes (1047ff.). As far as my thesis is concerned, it ought to be said here that the madness that is wrought on Orestes by the Furies is the characteristic function of the *Superego*. This is because the Furies act as ethical restraint on Orestes' conduct as they consider the deed as unacceptable, hence the

[221] Grace Hobbs. (2012). "Aeschylus' Tragedy of Law: Kinship, the Oresteia, and the Violence of Democracy". *English*. 9. pp. 34-35. https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/honorscollege_eng/9 (Accessed on 07/09/2020)

madness. Thus, it is appropriate to argue that Apollo's exploitation of Orestes' weakness and desires occasioned by the *Id*, which culminates in the deed comes into conflict with the *Superego*, represented by the Furies as they make the hero mad. It has already been established that the madness that befalls the hero is temporary. Orestes runs into exile where he recovers from his demented mind in Athens. From lines (85ff.) of the *Eumenides*, his pronouncements henceforth indicated a mind that has not only become sober but also bereft of hallucination as we had earlier witnessed. The change in behaviour and a mind no longer demented as typified by his pronouncements is an expression of the function of the *Ego* because that is what society accepts.

In a nutshell, the madness that Orestes suffers should not be considered merely a punishment for a wrong done. Yes, we may hold Orestes accountable for the deed, but as to whether he deserves the misfortune (i.e., madness) that befalls him, which is the source of the tragic effect, under the prevailing circumstances and the pieces of evidence adduced is doubtful. One acknowledges here the interplay between the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, from the doing of the deed—the consequence of the deed (madness), and the ultimate recovery followed by conduct that is accepted by society. It ought to be forcefully argued that the prevailing circumstances and the shreds of evidence surrounding the deed as I have earlier explained, make Orestes' madness a tragic one—a situation which is indeed consistent with the *hamartia* principle.

From the Socio-Psychological perspective, one recognises the psychological pressure that the society represented by the Chorus and at times Electra, bring to bear on Orestes for the deed to be done, which is an exploitation of the hero's desires or prey on his weakness. On this account, Orestes' desires or the exploitation of his weakness such as his craving to restore his native right (4ff.), loss of his patrimony (297), his lost kingdom (481,570) and his plundered inheritance (972ff.) are overwhelmed by the overbearing psychological pressure from the society represented

by the Chorus, for the hero to commit the deed. Thus, it ought to be argued here that the various pronouncements of the Chorus and Electra purport to make Orestes an involuntary agent as they stoke in the hero a desire for the deed to be committed. The following extracts culled from the *Choephori* serve as a societal pressure brought to bear on Orestes for him to do the deed:

> δι᾽ αἵματ᾽ ἐκποθένθ᾽ ὑπὸ χθονὸς τροφοῦ
> τίτας φόνος πέπηγεν οὐ διαρρύδαν.
> διαλγὴς ἄτα διαφέρει
> τὸν αἴτιον παναρκέτας νόσου βρύειν.
> The nurturing earth drinks blood, she drinks her fill. That gore,
> which cries out for revenge, will not dissolve or seep away.
> The guilty live in utter desperation—
> madness preys upon their minds
> infecting them completely.[222]

In a dialogue that ensues between Electra and the Chorus we see a reinforcement of this psychological pressure imposed on Orestes for him to do the deed:

> **Χορός**
>
> μέμνησ᾽ Ὀρέστου, κεἰ θυραῖός ἐσθ᾽ ὅμως.
>
> **Ἠλέκτρα**
>
> εὖ τοῦτο, κἀφρένωσας οὐχ ἥκιστά με.
>
> **Χορός**
>
> τοῖς αἰτίοις νυν τοῦ φόνου μεμνημένη—
>
> **Ἠλέκτρα**
>
> τί φῶ; δίδασκ᾽ ἄπειρον ἐξηγουμένη.
>
> **Χορός**

[222] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (A Dual Language ed. Trans; Ian Johnston). (66-70)

ἐλθεῖν τιν᾽ αὐτοῖς δαίμον᾽ ἢ βροτῶν τινα—

Ἠλέκτρα

πότερα δικαστὴν ἢ δικηφόρον λέγεις;

Χορός

ἅπλῶστι φράζουσ᾽, ὅστις ἀνταποκτενεῖ**.**

Ἠλέκτρα

καὶ ταῦτά μοὐστὶν εὐσεβῆ θεῶν πάρα;

Χορός

πῶς δ᾽ οὐ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς;

Chorus

Name in your prayer Orestes too,

Though he is far away.

Electra

Yes, a good thought; I will.

Chorus

Next, for the murderers: pray –

Electra

What shall I pray for them?

Tell me; I cannot think.

Chorus

– that justice of god or man

May find them out –

Electra May judge, condemn – or take revenge?

Chorus

Pray simply, ‘Let one come to shed blood for blood shed.’

Electra

Would not a prayer like that seem impious to the gods?

Chorus

Why? Evil for evil is no impiety. [223]

The issues of *condemnation of the perpetrators of the murder of Agamemnon, the desire for revenge, justice* and *the call on a god or man* (in this case Orestes) to exact their (Chorus and Electra) demand on the wrongdoers, serve as a tension between internal and external motivation for the deed. It is this constant tension between internal and external motivation for the deed that drives the object of tragedy: the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear. It is obvious from the above extract that, should Orestes have the desire to avenge the murder of his father, he would not be wrong, hence the madness that is to befall him would be an unjustifiable one. It sets the tone for the madness that is inflicted on Orestes to be a tragic one, which is consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Thus, the pressures of the society represented by the Chorus and Electra push Orestes to pursue an agenda that was in their interest, and which tends to make Orestes an involuntary agent.

Yet again we see the Chorus make another pronouncement that gives further impetus to the position earlier espoused. In other words, it creates an atmosphere that does not only affect the psyche of Orestes to be goaded on to do the deed, but it also presents the hero with no option but to do the deed. The Chorus forewarns:

λὰξ πέδοι πατούμένας, τὸ πᾶν Διὸς
σέβας παρεκβάντος οὐ θεμιστῶς.
Δίκας δ᾽ ἐρείδεται πυθμήν.
προχαλκεύει δ᾽ Αἶσα φασγανουργός.
τέκνον δ᾽ ἐπεισφέρει δόμοισιν
For none can long

[223] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (115-123)

Scorn regard for right and wrong,

Break the holy laws of Heaven,

And hope to find his deed forgiven.

Justice plants her anvil; Fate

Forges keen the brazen knife.

Murder still will propagate

Murder; life must fall for life.[224]

By the above extract, Orestes is psyched up not only to do the deed, but he is also made to believe that it is an ordained divine duty that is considered right when done. Once again, the societal pressure here is an exploitation of Orestes' desire or manipulation of his weakness for the deed to be done. It is on this account that I argue that the madness that befalls him is not only unjustifiable, but also from a Socio-Psychological perspective a tragic one. Finally, and equally important is that religion and the belief in the gods have always played and continue to play on our psyche concerning our decision-making processes as individuals on one hand and society on the other or both. On this account and representing society, the Chorus makes Orestes aware that the deed not only has Apollo's approval but also, they equally sanction it. By this, the potential inner conflict is settled. Bennet Simon corroborates this view when he succinctly states:

> I must reiterate that in Aeschylus these conflicts are located in the cosmos and in the society rather than in the individual. Orestes does not work through terrible inner conflicts to reach some sort of inner harmony. [225]

Thus, when Orestes says that Apollo has commanded him to do the deed—disobedience to it would come with dire consequences (266ff.); we are to unquestionably believe that, as earlier adduced, it formed part and parcel of the society's construction. To this command, the Chorus

[224] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (642-649)

[225] B. Simon. (1978). *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece*: *The classical roots of modern psychiatry.* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press). p. 108.

representing the society acquiesces to Apollo's demand as Orestes delivers and gives it a further impetus when they unambiguously respond:

ἀντὶ μὲν ἐχθρᾶς γλώσσης ἐχθρὰ
γλῶσσα τελείσθω. τοὐφειλόμενον
πράσσουσα Δίκη μέγ᾽ ἀυτεῖ.
'ἀντὶ δὲ πληγῆς φονίας φονίαν
πληγὴν τινέτω. δράσαντι παθεῖν,'
τριγέρων μῦθος τάδε φωνεῖ.
For Justice, as she turns the scales
exacting retribution, cries aloud,
"Hostile words for hostile words—
let it be done. One murderous stroke
is paid off by another lethal blow
The one who acts must suffer."[226]

From the foregoing, the right tone is set for the justifiability of the deed occasioned by the psychological pressure brought to bear on Orestes. This apart, it should be considered more as the exploitation of Orestes' weakness or desires as he seems to be ignorant of particulars and in consequence does not attract moral depravity to the deed—a measure that is consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Given these Socio-Psychological factors, the madness that befalls Orestes should be construed as tragic.

2.8. Summary

In summary, it has been established that the Furies are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls Orestes. We have also recognised that when Orestes' mind becomes demented, for dramatic purposes he exhibits certain traits that are quite different from a mind that is not

[226] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (Trans; Ian Johnston). (309-314)

deranged. We have also established that circumstances or the motivations leading to the commission of the deed make the madness that befalls Orestes either tragic or non-tragic. Thus, when Orestes' madness is construed as non-tragic, then it is following the *hubristic* principle, and tragic, when it follows the *hamartia* principle. Finally, whether the madness that befalls Orestes is interpreted as tragic or non-tragic, in view of the framework for my thesis it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological perspectives or purposes. This then introduces us to Chapter Three of my thesis, where I shall follow the trend in Chapter Two in my discussion of the madness of Sophocles' Ajax.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MADNESS OF SOPHOCLES' AJAX IN *AJAX*

3.1. Introduction

Ajax is the only extant play of Sophocles that has the madness of Ajax as its motif, a situation reminiscent of his older competitor and contemporary, Aeschylus. It is a play that Sophocles uses to portray the madness, the feat and the downfall of one of the redoubtable heroes of the Trojan War, Ajax. In Sophocles' Ajax, we are talking about a hero, who has become disillusioned because he has been denied the arms of Achilles. Achilles' arms and their possession[227] signifies authority, leadership, heroism and a redoubtable character among and over the rest of the Greeks. Consequently, he decides to avenge himself by killing the Atreidae and Odysseus. Athena intervenes on behalf of Odysseus and the Atreidae by making Ajax mad as the hero misguidedly turns his wrath on the animals at the camp, thinking they were his targeted enemies (i.e., Agamemnon, Menelaus and Odysseus) he was slaughtering. When Ajax recovers from his madness, he expresses outrage because he missed his target. Subsequently, he demonstrates remorse before the Chorus and Tecmessa and expresses his willingness to submit to the authority of the Atreidae only to commit suicide at their blindside. The Atreidae are unwilling to give Ajax a befitting burial because of Ajax's abominable deed. Teucer disagrees and expresses this in outrage against both Menelaus and Agamemnon. This impasse gets resolved through Odysseus, who entreats and impresses upon the Atreidae to yield to the request of giving Ajax a burial befitting of a hero. The Atreidae comply—Teucer calls on all to assist in giving Ajax a befitting burial and the Chorus give the Exode.

[227] For further details, the reader can refer to Homer's *Iliad*, book XVII, where the artistic impression of Achilles' armour, as fashioned by Hephaestus, is displayed. The evidence of the invisibility of the arms is seen when the feud between Agamemnon and Achilles ends and the latter joins the war from book XIX till the period when Hector is killed. Homer. (1950) *The Iliad*. (Trans: E.V. Rieu). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.). (XVII-XXII)

This Chapter focuses mainly on the madness wrought on Ajax by Athena. On this account, I shall first consider Sophocles' notion of madness and second, his portrayal of Ajax's madness as I outline under this the characteristic features and purpose of the hero's madness. This will be followed by a critique of Ajax's non-tragic and tragic madness, in which an integration of the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological theories in the interpretation and analysis of non-tragic and tragic madness would be explored. The final part of the Chapter provides a summary where key findings would be accentuated.

3.2. Sophocles' notion of madness

Sophocles' notion of madness, like his older contemporary, Aeschylus, also follows a prescribed design. Like Aeschylus, Sophocles presents to us the fundamental notion that seeks to affirm the view that the gods are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls the heroes. The principle is that the madness that is inflicted on the hero is occasioned by a terrible deed contemplated. In other words, when a terrible deed is contemplated the hero should suffer a kind of punishment—madness in this case, from which he later convalesces. In his *Ajax,* Athena is the deity that makes Ajax demented, occasioned by the hero's commission of a terrible deed. The dynamics of these have been outlined in the poet's portrayal of the madness of Ajax, which is the next sub-topic to be discussed.

3.3. Sophocles' portrayal of the madness of Ajax

Having discussed Sophocles' notion of madness, it is appropriate to consider how the poet portrays the madness of Ajax in his *Ajax*. I have already established that in Sophocles' view, the hero's madness wrought on him by a deity is contingent upon the commission of a terrible deed, which he later recovers from. Sophocles' portrayal of the madness of Ajax could be categorised into two aspects: the first being the wanton use of divine strength and the other being the exploitation of the hero's desires or weakness. In a dialogue that ensues between Athena and

Odysseus, the first category of Sophocles' portrayal of the madness of Ajax is succinctly described by the goddess:

> ἐγώ σφ᾽ ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ᾽ ὄμμασι
> γνώμας βαλοῦσα τὰς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς,
> καὶ πρός τε ποίμνας ἐκτρέπω σύμμικτά τε
> λείας ἄδαστα βουκόλων φρουρήματα·
> ἔνθ᾽ εἰσπεσὼν ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον
> κύκλῳ ῥαχίζων· κἀδόκει μὲν ἔσθ᾽ ὅτε
> δισσοὺς Ἀτρείδας αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν ἔχων,
> ὅτ᾽ ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλον ἐμπίτνων στρατηλατῶν.
> ἐγὼ δὲ φοιτῶντ᾽ ἄνδρα μανιάσιν νόσοις
> ὤτρυνον, εἰσέβαλλον εἰς ἕρκη κακά.
> It was I that baulked him
> Of that fell triumph, darkening his vision
> With a veil of phantasy, which overpowered him
> So that he turned his wrath upon the cattle,
> The sheep, and all the unassorted spoil
> That the drovers had in charge…This way and that
> He plunged demented; I was there
> To goad and drive him deeper into the pit
> Of black delusion.[228]

From the above extract, it is obvious that lines (57-60), where Athena claims that she goaded and drove Ajax deeper into the pit of black delusion, reinforce the view that Sophocles' portrayal of Ajax's madness is a wanton display of divine strength. The second part of the portrayal of

[228] Sophocles. (1987). *Ajax*. (Trans; E.F. Watling). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.) (51-60)
N.B. (Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Greek in this Chapter are taken from E.F. Watling's.)

Ajax's madness emanates from the exploitation of the hero's desires or weaknesses. This portrayal tends to further emphasise the cause or the reason for the infliction of madness upon Ajax. The first of this kind is when Athena says this about Ajax to Odysseus: "He was crazed with jealousy. For the armour of Achilles, which was given to you." (41f.). Furthermore, in a dialogue between Athena and Ajax, the second cause of the affliction of madness on Ajax is given as the manipulation of the hero's desire for the restoration of his wounded pride and his vengeance on the Atreidae:

Ἀθήνα

ἦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρείδαισιν ᾔχμασας χέρα;

Αἴας

ὥστ᾽ οὔποτ᾽ Αἴανθ᾽ οἵδ᾽ ἀτιμάσουσ᾽ ἔτι.

Athena

You broke a lance with the two sons of Atreus?

Ajax

And once for all. Those two will never again insult the name of Ajax.[229]

In addition, Sophocles portrays the madness that befalls Ajax as a punishment for a terrible deed that the hero intends to commit. It is on this account that Athena rightly cautions Odysseus with respect to Ajax's predicament:

τοιαῦτα τοίνυν εἰσορῶν ὑπέρκοπον
μηδέν ποτ᾽ εἴπῃς αὐτὸς εἰς θεοὺς ἔπος,
μηδ᾽ ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν᾽, εἴ τινος πλέον
ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει.
ὡς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν

[229] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (97-98.)

ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπειᾰ τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακούς.

Therefore beware of uttering blasphemy

Against the gods; beware of pride, puffed up

By strength or substance. Know that all things mortal

Hang in the scales; one day can tilt them up

Or down. The gods love goodness, and abhor

All that is evil.[230]

The Sophoclean portrayal of the cycle of Ajax's madness ends with the hero's recovery. This is evident in the dialogue between the Chorus and Tecmessa where the latter says this about Ajax:

κἄπειτ᾽ ἐπᾴξας αὖθις ἐς δόμους πάλιν,

ἔμφρων μόλις πως ξὺν χρόνῳ καθίσταται,

καὶ πλῆρες ἄτης ὡς διοπτεύει στέγος,

παίσας κάρα 'θώϋξεν: ἐν δ᾽ ἐρειπίοις

νεκρῶν ἐρειφθεὶς ἕζετ᾽ ἀρνείου φόνου,

κόμην ἀπρὶξ ὄνυξι συλλαβὼν χερί…

ἔλεξα πᾶν ὅσονπερ ἐξηπιστάμην.

ὁ δ᾽ εὐθὺς ἐξῴμωξεν οἰμωγὰς λυγράς

ἃς οὔποτ᾽ αὐτοῦ πρόσθεν εἰσήκουσ᾽ ἐγώ:

ἔπειτ᾽ ἐμοὶ τὰ δείν᾽ ἐπηπείλησ᾽ ἔπη,

εἰ μὴ φανοίην πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος,

Then he came stumbling back into the hut

And slowly, painfully, regained his senses.

Looking about him at the scene of havoc…

At last he challenged me—and with what threats—

[230] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (128-133)

To tell him all that had happened, where he was

And how he came there.[231]

Having considered the Sophoclean portrayal of the madness that befalls Ajax, its cause, punishment and subsequently his recovery, it is now appropriate to focus on or discuss the characteristic features of the hero's madness and its purpose.

3.3.1. The Characteristic features of Ajax's madness

In this sub-section, I shall consider Sophocles' portrayal of the characteristic features of Ajax's madness. The characteristic features of Ajax's madness include but are not limited to the following:

i. Athena is the orchestrator of Ajax's madness.[232]

ii. Ajax experiences darkened vision,[233] which obstructs his ability to clearly distinguish between reality and appearance.

iii. Ajax is overpowered by a veil of phantasy.[234] It is this situation which misguides him

iv. to unwittingly transfer his wrath unto the innocent animals.

v. Ajax turns his wrath upon the cattle as his deluded mind makes him take them for the Atreidae or some leaders of the Greeks.[235]

vi. Ajax suffers black delusion, which makes him rope up the cattle and marches them to his tent for further torture.[236]

vii. Ajax's deluded mind makes him take the animals for human prisoners.[237]

---

[231] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (305-313)
[232] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (47)
[233] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (48)
[234] Sophocles, Ajax, (49)
[235] Sophocles, Ajax, (54ff.)
[236] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (59f.)
[237] Sophocles, Ajax, (61)

viii. Ajax cannot perceive what normal or sane people do. Athena, in response to Odysseus' worry, makes us aware that Ajax will not see him, however close he may be.[238]

ix. Ajax experiences a deluded fancy, which makes him believe that his victims are the Atreidae and Odysseus whom he has killed.[239]

x. Ajax parleys with some phantom, talking widely against the Atreidae.[240]

xi. Ajax shouts of mocking laughter about his triumph.[241]

The portrayal of the characteristic features of the madness of Ajax has received widespread critical commentary and varied interpretations. First of all, it is an established view that the gods orchestrate the madness that befalls the heroes in Greek tragedy. In this regard, David Z. Bartolome notes: "It is evident in these tragedies that Athenians still believed that diseases of fury and depression originated not from the mind, but the gods."[242] Thus, in the case of Ajax, Athena is the deity who makes him mad. Athena does so, according to Michael Simpson, to foil the plans of Ajax who had intended to murder the Atreidae and Odysseus by magically disordering his eyes.[243] In addition, B.M.W. Knox corroborates this view when he argues that Ajax's madness, inflicted upon him by Athena consists only in his mistaking animals for men; in fact, the madness affects his vision more than his mind.[244] In furtherance of that, when Athena casts a veil of phantasy upon Ajax's vision, it makes the hero's mind deluded, who then mistakes the cattle for the Atreidae and unleashes his wrath upon the animals, by taking them as human

[238] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (86f.)
[239] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (100ff.)
[240] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (301)
[241] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (303)
[242]David Z. Bartolome (2017). "The Notion of Madness in Literature, Philosophy, and Tragedy: Evolving Conceptions of Mental Illness in Athens". *Young Historians Conference*. 3. p. 10 htp://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians/2017/oralpres/3 (Accessed on 06/16/2020)
[243] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa* (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 2(1). p. 91.
[244] B.M.W. Knox. (1961). "The Ajax of Sophocles". *HSCP*. 65. p. 5.

prisoners. The preceding perspective has also attracted the attention of Simpson who once again notes:

> In the present passage the statement that Athene cast ***gnộmas***[245] which are hard to bear upon Ajax's eyes would seem to mean that she affected adversely his ability to recognize objects for what they were, i.e., his brain misinterpreted the data his eyes gave to it.[246]

3.3.2. The purpose of Ajax's madness

Having dealt with the characteristic features of the madness that befalls Ajax, it will not be out of place to consider the purpose it serves. By purpose of the hero's madness, I argue that the poet focuses, among other things, on the significance of the theme, its import to the development of the plot in particular and the Greek society in general.

In the first place, Sophocles uses the madness of Ajax to espouse his notion of madness. By this, he affirms the notion that the gods are the orchestrators of madness that befalls the hero after he had intended to commit a terrible deed, but he finally recovers. Sophocles, however, presents first a sane Ajax who is conflicted either in accepting the judgement of his compeers based on certain fundamental, personal or societal factors or not for which the consequence is madness. Michael Simpson corroborates this view when he remarks:

> Ajax's experience of the Judgment of Arms told him that threatening his position in heroic society (since they denied him time due to him) the Atreidae and Odysseus were enemies whom he must attack in order to preserve himself and whom, moreover, the heroic code commanded him to hurt. The *gnome*-producing faculty within Ajax told him that those he was attacking were friends, whom he must not injure. The impulse to retaliate was thus opposed by the recognition that the victims of his wrath were friends. Ajax was thus presented with an unbearable contradiction. He then became the ground of conflict between two powerful elements, one the heroic imperative, on obedience to which depended the preservation of himself as a hero, the other the principle of order, the respecting of limits (the meaning of Athene) which would be sacrificed if he attacked

[245] Its basic meaning conveys the ability to recognise objects as themselves.

[246] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa* (The Johns Hopkins University Press) 2(1). p. 90.

> friends, but which must be observed if existence itself were not to fall into intolerable chaos.[247]

Simpson brings analysis of Ajax's conflicting motivation to closure when he notes:

> Neither element in the conflict within Ajax could be denied, nor could one prevail over the other. He retaliated with savage fury, but at the same time his *gnômê*-producing faculty, which perceives and classifies, rather than allow the chaos which would result from the realization of what was, nevertheless, a legitimate impulse, became itself disrupted to the extent that he suddenly saw in livestock his intended victims. That is, he went insane.[248]

Sophocles' Ajax, therefore, suffers this kind of madness after exhibiting this intention of committing a terrible deed from which he later recuperates.

Secondly, Sophocles uses the madness of Ajax to create irony. Unlike Aeschylus' Orestes, who is aware of the causative agents of his madness, Sophocles' Ajax is ignorant of the source of his madness. Ironically, the agent of his madness, Athena, is the very deity he considers his ally and even invites her to partake in his victory over his supposed victims being the Atreidae and Odysseus (91-93). This condition does not only intensify the tragic effect of Ajax's madness, but it also tends to attract the sympathy of the audience to Ajax as they identify themselves with his misfortune.

Furthermore, Sophocles' use of Athena as the orchestrator of the madness that is wrought on Ajax sends a cautionary message to the Greek audience and society. Athena serves as an ethical restraint on the intended action of Ajax, which was considered as a terrible one, hence the madness. It was to forewarn the Athenian audience in general and the Greek society in particular—that all who follow the path of Ajax would end up suffering a similar fate. In effect,

---

[247] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation.' *Arethusa*. 2(1). p. 92.

.

[248] *Ibid*.

the excesses in Ajax's deed are something the Greek society does not approve of, hence the madness. This view is further corroborated by Bartolome when he articulates in essence:

> If we consider that Greek religion was characterized in part by the tendency to anthropomorphize divinity we can say that Athene embodies the sense within men that limits must be drawn and then preserved if order in the world is to be maintained.[249]

In essence, humans are to know their limits, accept the order of things and comply with authority, for that is the surest way of maintaining and preserving orderliness in the world. This shortfall in the character of Ajax is what Sophocles averts the mind of his audience and the Greek society to.

One other significant purpose that Sophocles uses the madness of Ajax to teach the Athenian audience and the entire Greek society is the view that those who act on an impulse usually end in misery. Thus, Ajax's attempt at murdering the Atreidae and Odysseus just because he did not win the Arms of Achilles is not only goaded by impulse but also by an irrational decision. Was he per chance equating the lives of his supposed enemies to the Arms of Achilles? Now, owing to the non-commensurability of the importance of the Arms of Achilles to the lives of the Atreidae and Odysseus, his effort was foiled by the consequent madness wrought on him by Athena. In effect, because his intention to commit a terrible deed was driven by impulse and not rationally motivated, he suffered madness at the hands of Athena—a punishment for an action that was not deemed acceptable in Greek society.

Additionally, Ajax's madness, its portrayal and dramatisation serve as the fulcrum around which all the other elements of the plot evolve as we see from the *complication* to the *denouement* of

[249]David Z. Bartolome. (2017). "The Notion of Madness in Literature, Philosophy, and Tragedy: Evolving Conceptions of Mental Illness in Athens". *Young Historians Conference*. 3. p. 91 htp://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians/2017/oralpres/3 (Accessed on 06/16/2020)

the play. We see this from Odysseus' reconnoitring mission around the camp, Athena's intervention in preventing Ajax's intended abominable deed, the Chorus' philosophical reflections on the fate that had befallen Ajax, Tecmessa's encounter with the Chorus and her re-echoing of the misfortune that had befallen Ajax, etc. In effect, the tendency of Ajax's madness to have a cathartic effect on the audience cannot be overemphasised.

Finally, Ajax's madness is another illustration of an important part of my study—the tragic and the non-tragic madness of the hero respectively. Thus, when one interprets the madness that befalls Ajax as wanton use of divine strength, then that would be non-tragic. When it is construed as an exploitation of the hero's desires or weakness, then that would be tragic. The issue of the non-tragic and tragic madness of Ajax would be discussed in detail in the subsequent sub-topics of this Chapter.

3.4. A critique of the non-tragic madness of Ajax

It has already been established in my study that when the madness that befalls the hero is consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle, then it is non-tragic. One important question arises from the preceding notion. In what way(s) does Ajax's madness become non-tragic? To buttress this view, Athena's response in a dialogue with Odysseus does not only portray to us a vivid description of Ajax's madness, but also points to us the capricious use of divine strength when the deity pronounces:

> ἐγώ σφ᾽ ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ᾽ ὄμμασι
> γνώμας βαλοῦσα τῆς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς,
> καὶ πρός τε ποίμνας ἐκτρέπω σύμμικτά τε
> λείας ἄδαστα βουκόλων φρουρήματα·
> ἔνθ᾽ εἰσπεσὼν ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον

κύκλῳ ῥαχίζων· κἀδόκει μὲν ἔσθ᾽ ὅτε
δισσοὺς Ἀτρείδας αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν ἔχων,
ὅτ᾽ ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλον ἐμπίτνων στρατηλατῶν.
ἐγὼ δὲ φοιτῶντ᾽ ἄνδρα μανιάσιν νόσοις
ὤτρυνον, εἰσέβαλλον εἰς ἕρκη κακά.
κἄπειτ᾽ ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ᾽ ἐλώφησεν πόνου,
τοὺς ζῶντας αὖ δεσμοῖσι συνδήσας βοῶν
ποίμνας τε πάσας εἰς δόμους κομίζεται,
ὡς ἄνδρας, οὐχ ὡς εὔκερων ἄγραν ἔχων,
καὶ νῦν κατ᾽ οἴκους συνδέτους αἰκίζεται.
It was I that baulked him
Of that fell triumph, darkening his vision
With a veil of phantasy, which overpowered him
So that he turned his wrath upon the cattle,
The sheep, and all the unassorted spoil
That the drovers had in charge. On this horned host
He dealt his death-blows, hacking and slaughtering
To right and left; to his deluded fancy
Now it was the sons of Atreus he was mauling
And butchering, now some other of your leaders,
Striking at each in turn. This way and that
He plunged like one demented; I was there
To goad and drive him deeper into the pit
Of black delusion; till at last he paused,
And taking the beasts for human prisoners,
Roped up the cattle that were still alive
And all the sheep, and marched them to his tent,

Where he is now tormenting them, like captives

Bound to the stake.[250]

From the extract above, what Athena says in lines (57-60), where she claims that she was there to goad and drive him deeper into the pit of delusion, could not have been interpreted to mean anything other than the deity's delight in tormenting the hero—a form of punishment for the terrible deed the hero had intended to commit—a measure that is consistent with the *hubristic* principle. Besides, there are other pronouncements of Athena that give further impetus to the view that Ajax's madness is borne out of a wanton display of divine strength:

Ἀθήνα

ὦ οὗτος, Αἴας, δεύτερόν σε προσκαλῶ.

τί βαιὸν οὕτως ἐντρέπει τῆς συμμάχου.

Athena

Ajax! Do you hear? Must I call again?

Is this the way you answer your protectress?[251]

The above extract is instructive because it gives evidence of how Ajax, a redoubtable hero of the Greeks, is taunted by Athena as he is made mad—a situation that typifies not only wanton or capricious use of divine strength, but also indicates punishment for a wrong the hero had intended to commit. Now, by that impression Ajax deserves the madness that befalls him, which is characteristic of the requirement of the *hubristic* principle. The succeeding extracts further point to the madness of Ajax as being a punishment for a wrong intended or a wanton use of divine strength:

Ἀθήνα

ὁρᾷς, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὴν θεῶν ἰσχὺν ὅση;

[250] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (51-65)

[251] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (89-90)

τούτου τίς ἄν σοι τἀνδρὸς ἢ προνούστερος

ἢ δρᾶν ἀμείνων ηὑρέθη τὰ καίρια;

Athena

And there you see the power of the gods,

Odysseus. Is it not great? Here was a man

Supreme in judgement, unsurpassed in action

Matched to the hour. Did you ever know a better?[252]

Ἀθήνα

τοιαῦτα τοίνυν εἰσορῶν ὑπέρκοπον

μηδέν ποτ᾽ εἴπῃς αὐτὸς εἰς θεοὺς ἔπος,

μηδ᾽ ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν᾽, εἴ τινος πλέον

ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει.

ὡς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν

ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια· τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακούς.

Athena

Therefore beware of uttering blasphemy

Against the gods; beware of pride, puffed up

By strength or substance. Know that all things mortal

Hang in the scales; one day can tilt them up

Or down. The gods love goodness, and abhor

All that is evil.[253]

A number of other issues also come up from the foregoing extracts. First of all, it is obvious that Ajax suffers madness because of his dreadful act of wanting to kill the Atreidae and Odysseus. The Greek expression *τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας* as used in opposition to *τοὺς κακούς* in lines 132-133

[252] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (118-120)
[253] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (127-133)

also seeks to establish the hypothesis that there is a correlation between the essence of temperance and the avoidance of excess or malevolence, for, in the view of the gods, one is a consequence of the other. It brings disaster upon the one who indulges in a thing the gods detest and a boon for the one who abstains. The gods, per this principle, have made Ajax an example of this dictum. Moreover, when Athena says, "beware of pride puffed up by strength or substance," she is insinuating that Ajax's madness has come about because of his display of *hubris*. H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou cites R. Jebb's view to further elucidate Athena's capricious reason for making Ajax mad when he states:

> Athene's cunning outwitting of Ajax is explained by her desire for revenge, because of his arrogance. Ajax appears as one who has offended Athene by the presumptuous self-confidence with which he has rejected divine aid in war.[254]

Finally, it shows that Ajax's madness is nothing less than a show of divine strength or a punishment for the dreadful act intended—a *nemesis* because it is a justifiable one—hence it is non-tragic.

3.5. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Ajax

It is an established view that the fundamental rationale behind the Psychoanalytic theory is that the product of one's action is a characteristic function of the combination of the *Id-Superego-Ego,* and that of the Socio-Psychological by the environmental influences that one undergoes. The Greek tragic heroes were (albeit unwittingly) equally no exception to the requirements of the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological phenomena. It is on this account that the madness that befalls Ajax will be subjected to Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological analysis, critique and interpretation from the non-tragic perspective of the hero's madness.

[254] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*. (Sage Publications). 20(3). p. 317.

To start with, Ajax's desire to avenge himself (100ff.) goaded on by his unbridled anger, pride and jealousy (34f.) of the Atreidae and Odysseus is the characteristic function of the *Id*. In fact, it is the hero's attempted gratification of the *Id*, expressed in the form of unrestrained anger, pride, jealousy and his desire for vengeance that culminate in his madness. Perhaps it is instructive to cite here Raymond N. Novaco's psychological analysis of anger and its effect when he notes in the abstract of his *Anger and Psychopathology*:

> Anger has semantic, conceptual, and empirical links to psychopathology. It has long been associated with madness, a diseased mind, and behavioral dyscontrol; claims of temporary insanity and the "heat of passion" defense feature anger.[255]

He further adds:

> Anger is a turbulent emotion, and its eruptions are often troubling. Since the classical age, anger has been viewed as a mental disturbance and indicative of an unsettled temperament.[256]

The extract above fits perfectly the conduct of Sophocles' Ajax. Burnett succinctly remarks: *Furious madness drove Ajax to his death, and anger drove him to that madness*.[257] The madness that Athena wreaks on Ajax (50ff.) is also a typical function of the *Superego*. Since the *Superego* functions as ethical restraint on the hero's action(s), it presupposes that the hero's deed is considered repulsive to society and must not go unpunished—that is what Athena represents. In a dialogue between Athena and Ajax when his mind had already become demented (95-119), the goddess continually taunted the hero who was unaware that those he considered to be his captives (i.e., the Atreidae and Odysseus) were in fact animals. The foregoing view is equally intimated by Tecmessa when she expresses horror at what Ajax had done within the tent:

---

[255]Raymond W. Novaco. (2010). *Anger and Psychopathology*. (Irvine: University of California). p. 465.
[256] *Ibid*.
[257] Anne P. Burnett. (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 117

θανάτῳ γὰρ ἴσον βάρος ἐκπεύσει.

μανίᾳ γὰρ ἁλοὺς ἡμὶν ὁ κλεινὸς

νύκτερος Αἴας ἀπελωβήθη.

τοιαῦτ᾽ ἂν ἴδοις σκηνῆς ἔνδον

χειροδάϊκτα σφάγι᾽ αἱμοβαφῆ,

κείνου χρηστήρια τἀνδρός.

Our noble master is mad; Ajax struck blind

With madness in the night.

Look into the tent and see

His offerings, his victims bleeding,

His handiwork.[258]

Here, it is not out of place when we cite Simpson's view on the effect of the madness wrought on Ajax:

> This ability, the identifying and classifying process of the brain, is its most basic one and the loss of it is a sure sign of insanity. The madness thus affected his mind as well as his eyes and the fact that visual delusion occurred — and his madness became manifest — while he was carrying out the plan would seem to indicate that the plan itself was mad.[259]

By this condition, Ajax's madness should be construed as punishment for contemplating committing a dreadful deed—nemesis in fact—a condition that is consistent with the *hubristic* principle.

As already established, madness in Greek tragedy is temporal, so Ajax's condition would not be an exception. The knowledge of Ajax's recovery from his demented mind is deduced from a dialogue between Tecmessa and the Chorus when the former attributes the following to Ajax:

κἄπειτ᾽ ἐπᾴξας αὖθις ἐς δόμους πάλιν,

ἔμφρων μόλις πως ξὺν χρόνῳ καθίσταται,

[258] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (215-220)

[259] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa* (The Johns Hopkins University Press) 2(1). p. 90.

καὶ πλῆρες ἄτης ὡς διοπτεύει στέγος,
παίσας κάρα 'θώϋξεν· ἐν δ᾽ ἐρειπίοις
νεκρῶν ἐρειφθεὶς ἕζετ᾽ ἀρνείου φόνου,
κόμην ἀπρὶξ ὄνυξι συλλαβὼν χερί.
καὶ τὸν μὲν ἦστο πλεῖστον ἄφθογγος χρόνον:
ἔπειτ᾽ ἐμοὶ τὰ δείν᾽ ἐπηπείλησ᾽ ἔπη,
εἰ μὴ φανοίην πᾶν τὸ συντυχὸν πάθος,
κἀνήρετ᾽ ἐν τῷ πράγματος κυροῖ ποτέ.
Then he came stumbling back into the hut
And slowly, painfully, regained his senses.
Looking about him at the scene of havoc
That filled the hut, he uttered a loud cry
And beat his brow, tumbling to the ground
Over the tumbled carcases that strewed
The sheep-shambles, sat there with clutching fingers
Gripping his hair—sat for a long time
At last he challenged me—and with what threats—
To tell him all that had happened, where he was
And how he came there.[260]

What is more important and instructive about the above extract as far as my study is concerned, is that part when Ajax displays *piteous cries of anguish* when he hears from Tecmessa the terrible deed he had committed. The reason is that the hero's expression of piteous cries of anguish is the hero's realisation of an intended action gone wrong and a kind of transformation that is typical of the function of the *Ego*. Moreover, in a conversation with the Chorus, Ajax is

[260] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (305-314)

upset with himself for wreaking such havoc on the innocent beasts[261]—a manifestation of the function of the *Ego*. We further see the manifestation of the function of the *Ego* when the Chorus pay a visit to Ajax as the hero addresses them:

> ἰὼ
>
> φίλοι ναυβάται, μόνοι ἐμῶν φίλων,
>
> μόνοι ἔτ᾽ ἐμμένοντες ὀρθῷ νόμῳ,
>
> ἴδεσθέ μ᾽ οἷον ἄρτι κῦμα φοινίας ὑπὸ ζάλης
>
> ἀμφίδρομον κυκλεῖται.
>
> Good shipmates, my only friends,
>
> My only loyal comrades.
>
> The storm has broken over my head,
>
> I am tempest-tossed and drowned
>
> In a sea of blood.[262]

It is also noteworthy to add that from the period of Ajax's recovery from madness up to the moment when he gives his suicide speech, the hero was not mad. Indeed, it marks a period of transformation and reality of life lessons—once again a characteristic function of the *Ego*. On the issue of Ajax's transformation after his madness, which is a distinguishing function of *Ego*, Michael Simpson aptly captures:

> To put it most simply, Ajax transforms himself from a doer of deeds—a man of action—into a speaker of words—a man of thought. In the process of this transformation he appears in three stages of development, first as a man of violent action, then as passive and wailing after he recovers his sanity, finally as the Ajax who uses reason and discourse to achieve the vision of reality which justifies his suicide.[263]

[261] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (365ff.)
[262] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (348-352)
[263] Michael Simpson (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 2(1). p. 93.

The foregoing statement confirms not only the permanency of change in human affairs, but also an admission of our fallibility, a condition that has the potential of arousing the Sophoclean audience to achieve the needed catharsis.

Having dealt with the integration of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* (i.e., the Psychoanalytic) in the interpretation, critique and analysis of the non-tragic madness of Ajax, I now turn my attention to the Socio-Psychological perspective of the non-tragic madness of Ajax. It ought to be understood that, when Ajax was denied the Arms of Achilles, he incurred shame and lost honour, not only with respect of himself, but also before his family and his peers. Ajax thus bemoans:

> καὶ νῦν τί χρὴ δρᾶν; ὅστις ἐμφανῶς θεοῖς
> ἐχθαίρομαι, μισεῖ δέ μ᾽ Ἑλλήνων στρατός,
> ἔχθει δὲ Τροία πᾶσα καὶ πεδία τάδε…
> καὶ ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανεὶς
> Τελαμῶνι; πῶς με τλήσεταί ποτ᾽ εἰσιδεῖν
> γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ…
> προσθεῖσα κἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν;
> οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην οὐδενὸς λόγου βροτὸν
> ὅστις κεναῖσιν ἐλπίσιν θερμαίνεται·
> ἀλλ᾽ ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι
> τὸν εὐγενῆ χρή. πάντ᾽ ἀκήκοας λόγον.
> And now what must I do? Hated of gods
> Hated of all the Greeks, hated of Troy,
> And of this very soil—must I go home …
> How shall I meet my father, Telamon,
> When I come there? ...
> To huddle over the coals

Of flickering hope. Not I. Honour in life,

Or honour in death; there is no other thing

A nobleman can ask for.[264]

It is important to note that this conviction of Ajax emanates from Greek cultural influences, norms and certain cherished values. When a hero's honour is dented, in the view of M. Finkelberg, he must seek immediate redress, vengeance, penalty, or compensation.[265] In this regard, Greek nobles were motivated to compete among themselves for honour and to do better than their peers. Notwithstanding the demands of the heroic code, for Ajax to decide to murder his colleagues in the name of being denied the Arms of Achilles is by implication either equating or undervaluing the lives of his compeers (who are kings or men of influence in their respective cities) or overvaluing the worth of the sought-after prize[266] (the Arms of Achilles) he lost; a conflict and possibly devastating consequences are inevitable. Michael Simpson appropriately adds:

> For Sophocles, however, Ajax was more than a cautionary example of the contradiction inherent in heroic society from whose unhappy fate we are to learn a lesson. For the Ajax who became the victim of the intolerable conflict which demonstrates the fatal flaw in the heroic world view was also the one who worked his way through to and articulated the vision of reality which had to be accepted if existence were to continue: One must ever be open to change—or die.[267]

Undeniably, as much as the possession of the Arms of Achilles is significant, it is not commensurable or more important than the lives of the Atreidae and Odysseus as Ajax would want us to believe by his intended deed. A comparison, in my view, does not arise at all and any

---

[264] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (457-459, 462-464, 476-480)

[265] M. Finkelberg, (1998). "*Timé* and *Areté* in Homer." *The Classical Quarterly*. (Cambridge University Press) 48(1). pp. 14-15.

[266] Athena: They are dead?
Ajax: Dead! Yes, they are dead. Now let them show me
Whether they'll take away my prize, my armour. Sophocles, *Ajax*, (99-100)

[267] Michael Simpson (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 2(1). p. 92-93.

attempt to do so as Ajax does is tantamount to an imminent disaster. It is on this account that Ajax competes against Odysseus for the Arms of Achilles—which he loses, but according to him, the judgement was unfairly given in Odysseus' favour. This is the basis of Ajax's insistent desire to seek immediate redress. Simpson aptly contributes to this discourse when he adds:

> Ajax's experience of the judgement of Arms told him that by threatening his position in heroic society (since they denied him *timé* due to him) the Atreidae and Odysseus were enemies whom he must attack in order to preserve himself and whom, moreover, the heroic code commanded him to hurt.[268]

Charles Segal also adds another perspective when he duly acknowledges the undergirding motivation behind Ajax's conflicting and competing interest:

> Sophocles presents a figure who focuses some of the contradictions in the fifth-century polis, and especially the democratic polis: the tensions between loyalty to the group and commitment to personal honor, between the old aristocratic individualism of the warrior ethos, exemplified in Homer, and the democracy's need for compromise, negotiation, and the harmonizing of class differences.[269]

Thus, notwithstanding the demands of the heroic code imposed upon Ajax by the Greek society, which makes him endeavour to seek redress in the judgement of the Arms of Achilles, the compensation he seeks (i.e., the murder of the Atreidae and Odysseus) is not only preposterous, but also not commensurable with the supposed offence his enemies are purported to have committed. One or two reasons undergird the preceding statement. In the first place, it is an acknowledged fact that Ajax feels that he was swindled off the arms of Achilles, but that possession does not in any way measure up to the lives of the Greek leaders. Secondly, is Ajax suggesting to us, per his reaction, that he was going to kill the Atreidae and Odysseus if Athena had not deluded his mind? If that is the case then per Ajax's psyche, the arms of Achilles and the

[268] Michael Simpson. (1969). p. 92.
[269] Charles Segal. (1998) "Drama and Perspective in *Ajax". Sophocles' tragic world: divinity, nature, society*. (USA: Harvard University Press). p.17.

possession of it is more valuable than the lives of the Greek leaders[270]—a disposition I disagree with. For this reason, Athena makes Ajax mad, and by Greek societal values, it is a deserving one. Thus, it is clear from the foregoing argument that Ajax's desire to avenge himself by wanting to kill the Atreidae and Odysseus was motivated by Greek societal values like the quest for lost *timé* and the adherence to the heroic code. However, because Ajax's conviction to do harm to his peers is frowned upon by Greek society, Athena intervenes by making him mad. This condition, as earlier noted, makes Ajax's madness to be construed as a deserving punishment—a measure that is not only consistent with the *hubristic* principle, but also makes his madness a non-tragic one.

3.6. A critique of the tragic madness of Ajax

Tragic madness as already espoused comes about when the madness that befalls the hero is an undeserving one or when in the scheme of this study, we see unwitting or witting exploitation of the hero's desires or weaknesses. These are the means through which our emotions of pity and fear become aroused—a notion that is consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Therefore, under what circumstance(s) does Ajax's madness become a tragic one? That is what I intend to investigate in this section of my study. To do that, it would be appropriate to start by giving a summary of the development of the plot as I provide along the line a critique of the relevant aspects of it, as we focus on Ajax's actions or proclamations or what other characters say about him that make his madness a tragic one.

[270] Ajax: That I should be so cursed!
The devils, I had them in my hand
And let them go!
I let them go, and turned aside
To spill the rich red blood
Of these fine creatures. (Sophocles, *Ajax*, (372-376)

To start with, the plot of Sophocles' *Ajax* opens with Athena, who in a dialogue with Odysseus, accosts the latter for prying around the tent of Ajax, as though he was looking for an advantage (1-13). Odysseus accepts Athena's enquiry and query, but also adds that his presence at Ajax's camp is occasioned by a massacre on the previous night of their sheep and cattle—an act they trace to be the handiwork of Ajax, though not with certainty (14-34). Athena confirms that Ajax was the culprit (39ff.). Odysseus demands to know what could have possessed Ajax to commit such a horrendous deed (40); Athena responds that Ajax was obsessed with jealousy (41). When the dialogue between Athena and Odysseus continues (43ff.), it transpires that Athena deflected Ajax's intended massacring of the Atreidae and Odysseus by first darkening the hero's vision with a veil of phantasy whereupon Ajax turned his wrath on the animals at the Greek camp—killing them at random—deluded that these were his enemies he was butchering. The expression *deluded that these were his enemies he was killing* is reminiscent of the Greek *φρενοβλαβής*, to wit, *damaged in understanding*—that is exactly what Ajax suffers. Ajax is made mad by Athena as all his actions after Athena's intervention indicate so. From lines (72) onwards Athena capriciously orders Ajax about in the full glare of Odysseus, who even pities the fate that had befallen his bitterest enemy (75ff.). He would prefer to encounter his enemy sane rather than otherwise (82ff.). Athena continues to taunt Ajax whose mind at this juncture is demonstrably demented (94ff.). In fact, Odysseus' reaction towards the misfortune that befalls his bitterest enemy (74ff.) does not only have the tendency to evoke the emotions of pity and fear, but also a *katharsis*, which makes Ajax's madness a tragic one. This view of Odysseus' reaction is further corroborated by DJE Post when she aptly writes:

> On the contrary, whereas Athena believed that her protégé might take pleasure in his enemy's downfall (79), Odysseus specifically said that he felt 'compassion' for the great

warrior (ἐποικτίρω δέ νιν, 'I pity him', 121-2), even though the two men are indeed foes.[271]

From the foregoing notions, it is obvious that Odysseus' impression or perspective is that Ajax does not deserve the madness that has befallen him. Unlike Athena who views Ajax's madness as a deserving one because it is a kind of punishment for the hero, Odysseus' demeanour makes Ajax's madness an undeserving one—hence a tragic madness. This view is clearly elucidated in the dialogue between Athena and Odysseus:

Ἀθήνα:

ὁρᾷς, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τὴν θεῶν ἰσχὺν ὅση;

τούτου τίς ἄν σοι τἀνδρὸς ἢ προνούστερος

ἢ δρᾶν ἀμείνων ηὑρέθη τὰ καίρια;

Ὀδυσσεύς

ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν᾽ οἶδ᾽· ἐποικτίρω δέ νιν

δύστηνον ἔμπας, καίπερ ὄντα δυσμενῆ,

ὀθούνεκ᾽ ἄτῃ συγκατέζευκται κακῇ,

οὐδὲν τὸ τούτου μᾶλλον ἢ τοὐμὸν σκοπῶν·

ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν

εἴδωλ᾽ ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν ἢ κούφην σκιάν.

Ἀθήνα

τοιαῦτα τοίνυν εἰσορῶν ὑπέρκοπον

μηδέν ποτ᾽ εἴπῃς αὐτὸς εἰς θεοὺς ἔπος,

μηδ᾽ ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν᾽, εἴ τινος πλέον

ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει.

ὡς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν

[271] D. J. E. Post. (2018). *Choral Authoritativeness in Sophocles*. PhD thesis. The Open University. p. 57

ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια· τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακούς.

Athena

And there you see the power of the gods,

Odysseus. Is it not great?

Odysseus

Never. He was my enemy, but I'm sorry

Now, with all my heart, for the misfortune

Which holds him in its deadly grip. This touches

My state as well as his. Are we not all,

All living things, mere phantoms, shadows of nothing?

Athena

Therefore beware of uttering blasphemy

Against the gods; beware of pride, puffed up

By strength or substance. Know that all things mortal

Hang in the scales; one day can tilt them up

Or down. The gods love goodness, and abhor

All that is evil.[272]

It is equally obvious that from the extract above, Ajax's madness arouses both *pity* and *fear* in Odysseus as he acknowledges the fallibility of mortal fate. *Today it is your enemy but tomorrow it could be you*. This underscores his unwillingness to ridicule the misfortune that had befallen his enemy. This apart, Ajax's madness and Odysseus' reaction are also reminiscent of Aristotle's concept of *katharsis*. This is because the audience would identify with the fate that has befallen Ajax and consequently have their emotions of *pity* and *fear* vicariously aroused and purged. This situation makes Ajax's madness a tragic one. In the succeeding scene (91-119), there is a long

[272] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (118-133)

dialogue between Ajax and Athena as the latter continually taunts, ridicules and sadistically approves and enjoys the torment of a mind demented. In a short dialogue that ensues between Athena and Odysseus (118-133), the former makes us aware of the nothingness of mortals before the gods—they do as they please, but they love goodness and abhor or loathe evil. The Chorus come to settle at the orchestra with a *parodos* in which they bemoan the fate that has befallen Ajax, who has become a mockery at the camp. They express uncertainty as to which of the gods might have made Ajax mad for him to commit such a horrendous deed—they entreat Zeus to save them from ugly scandal and further urge Ajax to come out of his hiding and do away with his hatred (134-200). When the Chorus specifically express their sentiment about the fate of Ajax, namely that the raid on the beasts was no sane man's intention,[273] they succeed in arousing the audience's pity for Ajax's madness not only as an unfortunate incident, but also as an undeserving one. Their argument in essence is that it is an involuntary act (no sane man's intention), hence Ajax should not go through that suffering. In his *Nichomachean Ethics* Aristotle clarifies an involuntary act as an act done in ignorance, or if not in ignorance, outside the agent's control, or under compulsion.[274] Aristotle further contends that it is when an agent acts on this account that pity and pardon are aroused.[275] In effect, it makes Ajax's madness a tragic one because he is undeserving of his misfortune.

The plot continues when Tecmessa (201ff.) comes out of the tent, and in a sorrowful mood bemoans Ajax's fate and follows it with an address to the Chorus. The Chorus in response also shows concern for Ajax and demands from Tecmessa (captive-wife of Ajax) further details about the hero's condition (209ff.). Tecmessa, in response, provides evidence that is expressive of

[273] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (182)
[274] *Ethics: Nichomachean Ethics*: 1135a28-b18.
[275] *Ibid*. 1110b31

Ajax's madness (214ff.). In the continued dialogue between Tecmessa and the Chorus (221), the former gives a vivid description of Ajax mistaking the herd to be humans and massacring them with ruthlessness; an action that is indicative of a mind demented. The Chorus who earlier decided to desert Ajax in order to avoid the potential punishment that might befall them from the Atreidae, are now convinced by Tecmessa, who attests to Ajax's recovery from madness—they now in unison, share Ajax's pain (246-281). Tecmessa muses:

> ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ἡνίκ᾽ ἦν ἐν τῇ νόσῳ,
> αὐτὸς μὲν ἥδεθ᾽ οἷσιν εἴχετ᾽ ἐν κακοῖς,
> ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς φρονοῦντας ἠνία ξυνών·
> νῦν δ᾽ ὡς ἔληξε κἀνέπνευσε τῆς νόσου,
> κεῖνός τε λύπῃ πᾶς ἐλήλαται κακῇ
> ἡμεῖς θ᾽ ὁμοίως οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἢ πάρος.
> ἆρ᾽ ἔστι ταῦτα δὶς τόσ᾽ ἐξ ἁπλῶν κακά;
> While Ajax was distraught,
> He at least found happiness in his obsession;
> We, sane, were pained to see him. Now he is well,
> And free of his sickness, bitter grief torments him,
> And ours is none the less. Are there not here
> Two troubles in place of one?[276]

Tecmessa's expression of horror and dismay at the calamity that had befallen Ajax further evokes the emotion of pity in the audience for the undeserving madness that the hero suffers. This condition makes Ajax's madness a tragic one. The Chorus from 282ff. demands Tecmessa to apprise them of the cause of Ajax's trouble. Tecmessa in response (284ff.), explains how Ajax left his tent when the camp is asleep and returned with a leash of cattle roped like prisoners, oxen

[276] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (271-277)

and sheepdogs with their woolly charges; reminiscent of a man demented. She later assures the Chorus that Ajax has recovered from his demented mind; she further intimates that the hero (Ajax) had even demanded her to recount all that had happened when he became demented (308-331). Ajax's predicament as recounted by Tecmessa saddens the Chorus (331f.), who sympathise with him. The dialogue between Tecmessa and the Chorus continues, while we hear intermittent cries of Ajax, who bemoans his misadventure or misfortune (333ff.).

Subsequent to this, a conversation ensues between the Chorus and Tecmessa on one hand and Ajax and the Chorus on the other, where Ajax now in a sober mind reminisces about the abominable deed. He still expresses his hatred for the Atreidae and Odysseus and wishes them dead even at the peril of his own life (379-391). From lines 394 to 466, Ajax turns his frustrations on Athena and blames the goddess for his misfortune. He recounts how the Atreidae swindled him of Achilles' sword and concludes that he would prefer death before dishonour (481ff.). It is noteworthy here not only to analyse or interpret, but to also critique Ajax's murmurings against Athena, the Atreidae and Odysseus in our understanding and construing of the hero's madness as a tragic one. Ajax mutters:

> καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ᾽ ἐξεπίστασθαι δοκῶ·
> εἰ ζῶν Ἀχιλλεὺς τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ὧν πέρι
> κρίνειν ἔμελλε κράτος ἀριστείας τινί,
> οὐκ ἄν τις αὖτ᾽ ἔμαρψεν ἄλλος ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ.
> νῦν δ᾽ αὖτ᾽ Ἀτρεῖδαι φωτὶ παντουργῷ φρένας
> ἔπραξαν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ᾽ ἀπώσαντες κράτη.
> κεἰ μὴ τόδ᾽ ὄμμα καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι
> γνώμης ἀπῆξαν τῆς ἐμῆς, οὐκ ἄν ποτε
> δίκην κατ᾽ ἄλλου φωτὸς ὧδ᾽ ἐψήφισαν.

One thing is certain—had Achilles lived
To name the champion worthiest to receive
His weapons in reward for valiant service,
They never would have fallen to other hands
Than mine. Instead of that these sons of Atreus
Have filched them from me for a scheming rascal
And turned their backs on me and all my triumphs. [277]

The above speech of Ajax, as earlier espoused, is very crucial to our understanding of the hero's madness as a tragic one. It is worthy to note that certain fundamental issues emanate from Ajax's speech, as far as the argument for the tragic madness of Ajax is concerned. To begin with, the first part of Ajax's murmurings (441-447) underscores the hero's rationale to avenge himself. In furtherance of the preceding statement, R.C. Jebb coherently notes in his introduction to Sophocles' *Ajax*:

> Ajax is a rugged giant, towering above the Greeks by his head and broad shoulders,' the representative of sinew, and, owing to his solid power of resistance, emphatically 'the bulwark'' of the Greeks; characterised by sound good sense but apt to fare ill in a keen encounter of wits.[278]

Jebb further adds as he cites Homer's *Iliad* (III:229) that Ajax son of Telamon was only second in distinction to Achilles.[279] It is for these reasons that Ajax forcefully bemoans the injustice committed against him by the Atreidae. This apart, based upon the evidence provided (449), the presupposition is that the Atreidae might have connived against him, hence his attempted slaying of the Greek leaders. Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou also adds the view that Ajax's declaration to slay the Greek leaders for disgracing him is expressed in his wrath at not winning

[277] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (441-449).
[278] Sophocles. (1869). *Ajax*. (Ed.by R.C. Jebb). (London: Rivingtons).
[279] *Ibid*.

Achilles' armour, awarded to Odysseus.[280] Thus, it is prudent to argue that the predicament or the embarrassment Ajax suffers unjustifiably at the hands of the Atreidae in the issue of the determination of the Arms of Achilles achieves a cathartic effect on the audience. These conditions evoke our pity making the madness he suffers an undeserving one. By implication, it makes the madness wrought on Ajax by Athena unjustified and consequently tragic.

Furthermore, it ought to be established that the madness that Ajax suffers at the hands of Athena is motivated by the deity's willingness to protect her favourite (Odysseus), not because she acquiesces to the view that the hero (Ajax) was unfairly treated by the Atreidae for which he deserves to seek redress. In other words, Athena's decision to make Ajax mad without giving credence or heed to the hero's grievance makes her an accomplice to the master scheme of the Atreidae and Odysseus to unfairly deny Ajax the Arms of Achilles. This view is given further impetus in a Ghanaian local maxim thus:

> If an elderly person, who is supposed to know better, sits idle as kids at home misbehave or do the unthinkable, he/she is equally culpable.

On this account, Burnett Anne Pippin construes the indifference of Athena to the plight of Ajax when she rightly notes:

> It is an error that defies assessment, nor does Athena's intrusion instruct the audience as to her judgment, for Athena is not in the least interested in the justice or injustice of last night's attempt.[281]

Thus, the mere fact that Athena aids and abets in the swindling of Ajax with respect to the Arms of Achilles, the audience becomes sympathetic once again towards the madness that befalls him.

---

[280] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*. (Sage Publications). 20(3). p. 316

[281] Anne P. Burnett. (1998). "Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy". *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. p. 84.

The above view is given further impetus by Perdicoyianni-Paléologou who posits that Athene's cunningly outwitting of Ajax is explained by her desire for revenge, because of the hero's purported display of arrogance.[282] Consequently, as Athena acquiesces to the scheme of the Atreidae and Odysseus by making Ajax mad, the hero's misfortune does not only become undeserving but also becomes consistent with the *hamartia* principle—hence a tragic madness.

Finally, what makes Ajax's madness a tragic one and consistent with the *hamartia* principle is elicited from a conversation between Odysseus and Athena:

Ὀδυσσεύς

καὶ πρὸς τί δυσλόγιστον ὦδ᾽ ἦξεν χέρα;

Ἀθήνα

χόλῳ βαρυνθεὶς τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων.

Ὀδυσσεύς

τί δῆτα ποίμναις τήνδ᾽ ἐπεμπίπτει βάσιν;

Ἀθήνα

δοκῶν ἐν ὑμῖν χεῖρα χραίνεσθαι φόνῳ.

Ὀδυσσεύς

ἦ καὶ τὸ βούλευμ᾽ ὡς ἐπ᾽ Ἀργείοις τόδ᾽ ἦν;

Ἀθήνα:

κἂν ἐξεπράξατ᾽, εἰ κατημέλησ᾽ ἐγώ.

Odysseus

What can have possessed him

To do such a senseless thing?

Athena

He was crazy with jealousy

[282]H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, (2009). pp. 315-316

For the armour of Achilles, which was given to you.

Odysseus

But why should he vent his anger upon the beasts?

Athena

He thought he was dipping his hand in the blood of men.[283]

From the extract above it is quite clear that Athena exploits Ajax's weaknesses of *jealousy*, his wounded pride and his proneness to *anger* to his detriment; the basis upon which the deity makes him mad. Different writers have commented on the various aspects of Ajax's motivations. Mark S. Farmer asserts:

> Dishonored by failing to receive the arms of Achilles, Ajax attempts to kill the Greek commanders in their sleep, but is deluded by Athena for his excessive pride. In his madness he tortures and slaughters the Greeks' sheep and cattle.[284]

In furtherance of the above view and in assessing the motivation for Ajax's madness Ed Sanders also emphasises:

> But I believe a psychological approach indicates that jealousy (*phthonos*) is an additional motivation in Ajax's decision to torture specifically Odysseus before killing him.[285]

These views are further corroborated by Novaco when he cites Lansky (1996), who says this of Ajax: "Narcissistic rage has been portrayed since the Ajax of Sophocles, as infused with qualities of madness."[286]

---

[283] Sophocles. Ajax, (40-45).

[284] Mark S. Farmer. (1998). "Sophocles' Ajax and Homer's Hector: Two Soliloquies". *Illinois Classical Studies*. (23). p.19.

[285] Ed Sanders. (2014). *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens*: A Socio-Psychological Approach. (Oxford: Oxford University Press). p.122.

[286] Raymond W. Novaco. (2010). *Anger and Psychopathology*. (Irvine: University of California). p.482. (Cf. Lansky, 1996).

Besides, for Athena to respond that Ajax *was crazy with jealousy* shows that the deity knew beforehand what the hero was likely to do and consequently exploited it to his disadvantage, hence making his madness a tragic one.

The rest of the plot mainly focuses on the Chorus and Tecmessa's admonishment of Ajax not to commit suicide (484-526, 549-580, 581ff.), which he subsequently does (815-854) after giving a long deceptive ambiguous speech (646-692); his burial leads to an altercation first between Teucer and Menelaus (1047-1164) and second, between Teucer and Agamemnon (1223-1315) until a truce is brokered by Odysseus—Agamemnon agrees and the hero is given a befitting burial (1316-1418) and the Chorus give the Exode (1419-1421).

3.7. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Ajax

Ajax's predisposition to avenge himself by desiring the murders of the Atreidae and Odysseus is influenced or inspired by both Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological factors. The question is how we can apply the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories in the interpretation and critique of the tragic madness of Ajax. To accomplish this task, according to my methodology and within the theoretical framework explained in the Introduction, I shall integrate the interaction of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, which constitutes the Psychoanalytic theory, and the Socio-Psychological theory in the interpretation and the critique of the tragic madness of Ajax.

To start with, Ajax's decision to seek immediate gratification of his desire to avenge himself should be construed as a characteristic function of *Id*. It should further be interpreted as unwitting exploitation of his desire or his weakness, borne of his jealousy (34f.) and his unyielding pride (96ff.) because he was undeservedly denied the Arms of Achilles by the

Atreidae. This is perhaps my reason for partially disagreeing with Simon Goldhill[287], who acknowledges Athena's role in making Ajax mad, but attributes the cause of the hero's derangement mainly to his pride without considering the hero's grievances. This is perhaps the more reason why Perdicoyianni-Paléologou also notes:

> Sometimes a hero's resentful rage for having failed is reinforced by pathological hallucination instilled by a god as a penalty. Additionally, hallucination can be inspired by a goddess in order to satisfy her hostility.[288]

My main point of departure is the fact that when we construe Ajax's madness mainly from these perspectives then it will be a justifiable misfortune. In my perception, and as my study affirms, interpreting Ajax's madness as a cause of his unrelenting pride would not arouse the emotions of pity and fear. The source of the tragic element in Ajax's madness emanates from Athena's desire to protect her favourite (Odysseus) without much credence to the culpability or otherwise of the hero, and her acquiescence through her actions in the undeserved swindling and denial of Ajax of the Arms of Achilles.[289] The evidence of this undeserved swindling and denial of Ajax of the Arms of Achilles is replete in the plot and has been reiterated by the hero:

Ἀθήνα

χόλῳ βαρυνθεὶς τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων.

Athena

He was crazed with jealousy

[287] Simon Goldhill. (1986). 'Mind and madness'. *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). pp. 181ff.
[288] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). p. 315
[289] The view that Odysseus was unfairly awarded the Arms of Achilles is corroborated by James Taylor (1974) "Sophocles' Ajax and Sophoclean Plot Construction" *The American Journal of Philology*. 95(1). pp.24-42.

For the armour of Achilles, which was given to you.[290]

Αἴας

θανόντες ἤδη τἄμ᾽ ἀφαιρείσθων ὅπλα.

Ajax

Dead! Yes, they are dead. Now let them show me

Whether they'll take away my prize, my armour![291]

Αἴας

καίτοι τοσοῦτόν γ᾽ ἐξεπίστασθαι δοκῶ·

εἰ ζῶν Ἀχιλλεὺς τῶν ὅπλων τῶν ὧν πέρι

κρίνειν ἔμελλε κράτος ἀριστείας τινί,

οὐκ ἄν τις αὖτ᾽ ἔμαρψεν ἄλλος ἀντ᾽ ἐμοῦ.

νῦν δ᾽ αὖτ᾽ Ἀτρεῖδαι φωτὶ παντουργῷ φρένας

ἔπραξαν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ᾽ ἀπώσαντες κράτη.

Ajax

One thing is certain—had Achilles lived

To name the champion worthiest to receive

His weapons in reward for valiant service,

They never would have fallen to other hands

Than mine. Instead of that, these sons of Atreus

Have filched them from me for a scheming rascal

And turned their backs on me and all my triumphs.[292]

Χορός

οὐλίῳ σὺν πάθει.

μέγας ἄρ᾽ ἦν ἐκεῖνος ἄρχων χρόνος

πημάτων, ἦμος ἀριστόχειρ

[290] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (41)
[291] *Ibid*. (100)
[292] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (441-446).

.....ὅπλων ἔκειτ᾽ ἀγὼν πέρι.

Chorus

These sufferings
Sprang from their source
That pregnant day
When a sword became
The prize in a game
Of bravery.[293]

All these pieces of evidence point to the fundamental notion that Ajax was unduly denied the Armour of Achilles hence the madness he suffers is an undeserved one. These conditions make Ajax's madness a tragic one, a situation which is consistent with the *hamartia* principle.

Furthermore, it must be argued that the madness that is wrought on Ajax is a characteristic function of the *Superego*. Athena's role in making Ajax mad is to be interpreted as an ethical restraint on the hero, because his desire or intent to commit that abominable deed is disapproved not only by the deity, but also by the Greek audience—hence the madness. It must, however, be emphasised that those with this view, as earlier noted, tend to overlook the grievances of Ajax and how he was unfairly swindled of the Arms of Achilles—hence this is non-tragic. If they do, as I advocate, they would be sympathetic towards the undeserved madness that befalls Ajax—hence this is tragic madness.

Finally, like Aeschylus' Orestes, Sophocles' Ajax also recovers from his demented mind. The pronouncements that come from the hero are the expressive function of the *Ego* because it is

[293] *Ibid*. (933-935). See also lines 1239ff. where in the view of Agamemnon, Teucer is accusing them of thievery in the arbitration over the Arms of Achilles as well as 1337ff. where Odysseus admits his hatred for Ajax in the beginning because of the very issue in contention, but also agrees to the view that the latter was the bravest and the best to have come to Troy save only Achilles.

conduct that society approves of. Besides this, there are other declarations of Ajax that point to the hero's regaining of his senses:

ὁρᾷς τὸν θρασύν, τὸν εὐκάρδιον,
τὸν ἐν δαΐοις ἄτρεστον μάχαις,
ἐν ἀφόβοις με θηρσὶ δεινὸν χέρας;
ὤμοι γέλωτος, οἷον ὑβρίσθην ἄρα.
Here is the bold, the strong,
The fearless fighter in the line!
See his brave handiwork
Among these innocent dumb beasts,
And laugh, laugh at his shame![294]
He further declares:
νῦν δ᾽ ἡ Διὸς γοργῶπις ἀδάματος θεὰ
ἤδη μ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς χεῖρ᾽ ἐπεντύνοντ᾽ ἐμὴν
ἔσφηλεν, ἐμβαλοῦσα λυσσώδη νόσον,
ὥστ᾽ ἐν τοιοῖσδε χεῖρας αἱμάξαι βοτοῖς·
κεῖνοι δ᾽ ἐπεγγελῶσιν ἐκπεφευγότες,
Wheeled wide of my intention. I was foiled,
At the very instant when I raised my hand
To strike them, by the undefeatable,
The hard-eyed daughter of Zeus; she sent the plague
Of madness on me; and the blood of beasts
Is this that dyes my hands. *They* have escaped,
And laugh![295]

[294] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (364-367)
[295] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (450-454.) For further instances of this kind, typifying Ajax's recovery from his demented mind, the reader can check lines (646-692).

Ajax's decision to commit suicide after he had recovered from his demented mind has generated several scholarly treatises with different dimensions to the issue.[296] The most inspiring statement which underscores the hero's transformation and recovery from his madness, and which is a product of *Ego* is adduced by Simpson when he avers:

> In the process Ajax transforms himself from a doer of (often violent) deeds into a speaker of words, from a man of action into a man of thought. It is his ability so to change himself that his greatness as a tragic hero lies. His new vision gives him the intellectual conviction that he no longer has a part in the world. He then is justified in committing suicide and in doing so Ajax not only affirms himself, but also comes into harmony with reality.[297]

It ought to be stated here that my interest in the issue of Ajax's suicide is mainly its contribution to arousing our emotions of pity and fear as it is a corollary of the hero's incurred shame from the abominable deed, and most importantly as far as his tragic madness is concerned, being unfairly denied the Arms of Achilles.

In the integration of the Socio-Psychological theory into the interpretation of the madness of Ajax, one must consider how the societal imposed or imbibed values[298] and their belief systems impel the hero to act. It is now understood that when Ajax was denied or swindled of the Arms of Achilles, he incurred *aidos*. Ajax remarkably states:

> ἀλλ᾽ ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι
> τὸν εὐγενῆ χρή. πάντ᾽ ἀκήκοας λόγον.
> Honour in life,

[296] I am not sure if it would be appropriate to rehearse the writings of all scholars who have done some work on this, but a few such as Michael Simpson's *Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation*, (1969), Efi Papadodima's *Sea Imagery in Sophocles' Ajax*, Sarah H. Nooter's *Uncontainable Consciousness in Sophocles' Ajax*, Cedric H. Whitman's *Sophocles: A Study in Heroic Humanism* and John Esposito's *Seeing 'what Ajax is': identity, sight, and suicide in Sophocles' Ajax;* ought to be mentioned.

[297] Michael Simpson. (2009). p. 89

[298] The heroes of the time were always motivated and also quested after values like *Areté* (excellence or greatness), *Kleos* (everlasting fame or glory) and *Timé* (honour). *Aidos* (shame) was the worst fate that could befall a warrior. https://sites.google.com.site/thegreekhonorcode/the-honor-code.

> Or honour in death; there is no other thing
>
> A nobleman can ask for. That is all.[299]

Michael Simpson also adds:

> Yet Ajax was only attempting to obey the laws of heroic society. But when enemies and friends became identical, what then? His madness symbolizes the potential for chaos within the heroic world.[300]

Owing to these societal values as earlier alluded to, it was within Ajax's right to seek a restoration of the loss of his *time* to achieve his lost *areté*—hence the ostensible attack on the Atreidae and Odysseus. The motivation for this deed is summed up in Ajax's assertion in a response to Athena's question, thus:

> θανόντες ἤδη τἄμ᾽ ἀφαιρείσθων ὅπλα.
>
> Dead! Yes, they are dead. Now let them show me
>
> Whether they'll take away my prize, my armour![301]

The role of the Atreidae on one hand, and that of Athena on the other, is significant in my interpretation of Ajax's madness as tragic. The Atreidae and Athena represent authority in society. In as much as one agrees that Ajax's decision to restore his lost *timé* by the attempted murder of the Atreidae and Odysseus was a terrible one, the Atreidae's unfair resolve to swindle Ajax of the Arms of Achilles rather attracts the sympathy of the audience towards the madness that befalls the hero—the source of the tragic madness. Besides, Athena's readiness to make Ajax mad without giving heed to the grievances of the hero who had been unfairly wronged, makes Athena an abetter of the plot against Ajax—a significant means to attract the sympathy of the audience unto the hero's misfortune—this makes his madness a tragic one.

---

[299] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (479-480)
[300] Michael Simpson. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation'. *Arethusa* (The Johns Hopkins University Press) 2(1). p. 92.
[301] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (100.)

3.8 Summary

In summary, it has been established among other things that Athena is the orchestrator of Ajax's madness after which the hero commits a terrible deed. It is also recognised that Ajax exhibits certain features of a mind demented—he exhibits traits of delusions as he mistakes animals for the Atreidae and Odysseus. It is also an acknowledgeable fact that Ajax recovers from his derangement. It has also been demonstrated that based on the trajectory of the circumstances, Ajax's madness could be rendered as tragic or non-tragic. Thus, when Ajax's madness wrought on him by Athena is interpreted as punishment for a wrong he intended to commit, then it is non-tragic; it is a *nemesis*, which is in tandem with the requirement of the *hubristic* principle. By the same token, when Ajax's madness is construed as unwitting exploitation of his desires or weakness, his madness becomes tragic—a measure that is consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Thus, it has been demonstrated that Athena's exploitation of Ajax's desire for vengeance without a critical assessment of the genuineness of the hero's grievances (as earlier argued, in the swindling and the denial of Ajax of the Arms of Achilles) makes his madness a tragic one. Finally, the circumstances leading to the incorporation of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the interpretation and the critique of Ajax's madness could make it non-tragic or tragic. Therefore, whether Ajax's madness should be construed as non-tragic or tragic, it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological perspectives and purposes.

This then leads me to Chapter Four of my thesis, where I shall follow the same trend as in Chapter Three in critiquing the madness of Euripides' Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MADNESS OF EURIPIDES' HERACLES, ORESTES AND PENTHEUS IN THE *HERACLES, ORESTES* AND THE *BACCHAE*

4.1. Introduction

Unlike his older contemporaries and competitors, Aeschylus and Sophocles, Euripides has three extant plays, namely: *Orestes*, *Heracles* and the *Bacchae*, with madness as their central motif. In the *Heracles*, Heracles becomes mad through the remote machinations of Hera actualised by Madness,[302] whereas in the *Orestes* the madness of Orestes comes about because of the murder of his mother, Clytemnestra. In the *Bacchae* Pentheus' attempt at blocking the introduction of the rites of Dionysus makes the deity cause his madness. This Chapter therefore probes, critiques and provides analysis in sequential order of the madness that befalls Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus. To do this I shall first outline Euripides' notion of madness, and second, successively consider how he portrays the madness of Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus respectively. In each of the portrayals (the madness of Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus), the characteristic features of their madness as well as the purpose of their madness would be delineated. This would be followed not only by a critique of the non-tragic madness of Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus, and integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis and interpretation of the non-tragic madness of the heroes aforesaid, but I shall also do the same in their analysis and interpretation of tragic madness. Finally, I shall provide a summary of the findings derived from the chapter's body.

[302] Madness here is a deity, not a state of human mind.

4.2. Euripides' notion of madness

Like his older contemporaries, Euripides' notion or concept of madness also follows a particular pattern. Euripides presents to us the essential notion that seeks to uphold the principle that the gods are indeed the orchestrators of the madness that is wrought on the heroes. Euripides reaffirms the notion that the madness that befalls the hero should be construed as a punishment for a wrong done. In his *Heracles*, Heracles is made mad through the remote machination of Hera actualised by Madness, that of Orestes through the Eumenides or the Erinyes and in the case of Pentheus through Dionysus. What is noteworthy here is that, like in the tragedies of his older contemporaries, the madness that befalls these heroes is temporary.

4.3. Euripides' portrayal of the madness of Heracles

It is already established that in most cases, the gods are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls the hero, and Heracles is not an exception.[303] Hera is portrayed as the remote cause of Heracles' madness as Iris alludes, but the deed is actualised by Madness. Iris remarks:

> Ἥρα προσάψαι καινὸν αἷμ᾽ αὐτῷ θέλει
> παῖδας κατακτείναντι, συνθέλω δ᾽ ἐγώ.
> ἀλλ᾽ εἶ᾽, ἄτεγκτον συλλαβοῦσα καρδίαν,
> Νυκτὸς κελαινῆς ἀνυμέναιε παρθένε,
> μανίας τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τῷδε καὶ παιδοκτόνους
> φρενῶν ταραγμοὺς καὶ ποδῶν σκιρτήματα
> ἔλαυνε, κίνει, φόνιον ἐξίει κάλων
> Hera desires (and I am with her)
> To fasten on Heracles the guilt of kindred blood,

[303] On the cause of Heracles' madness see Peter N. Singer. (2018). 'The Mockery of Madness: Laughter at and with Insanity in Attic Tragedy and Old Comedy'. *Illinois Classical Studies*. 43(2). p. 307 and H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*, (Sage Publications). 20(3). p. 317.

Making him kill his children. Come, then, virgin child
Of murky Night, close your heart against all pity,
Send maniac fury on this man, distort his mind
With lust for his own children's blood, cut murder's cable
Rack him with lunatic convulsions [304]

The portrayal of Heracles' madness appears in twofold: the first is briefly described by Madness herself and the second is vividly portrayed by the Messenger. This is how Madness describes the madness that befalls Heracles to the Chorus at the beginning:

τέκν᾽ ἀποκτείνασα πρῶτον: ὁ δὲ κανὼν οὐκ εἴσεται
παῖδας οὓς ἔτικτ᾽ ἐναίρων, πρὶν ἂν ἐμὰς λύσσας ἀφῇ.
ἦν ἰδού: καὶ δὴ τινάσσει κρᾶτα βαλβίδων ἄπο
καὶ διαστρόφους ἐλίσσει σῖγα γοργωποὺς κόρας.
ἀμπνοὰς δ᾽ οὐ σωφρονίζει, ταῦρος ὡς ἐς ἐμβολὴν
† δεινός· μυκᾶται † δὲ Κῆρας ἀνακαλῶν τὰς Ταρτάρου.
Killing his children; he who is doomed
To be their murderer shall not know they are the sons
Of his own body, till my frenzy leaves him. Look!
See him – head wildly tossing – at the starting-point,
Silent, his rolling eyeballs full of maniac fire;
Breathing convulsively, and with a terrible
Deep bellow, like a bull about to charge, he shrieks
To all Hell's fiends…[305]

The second portrayal of Heracles' madness is embedded in the speech of the Messenger who virtually describes the characteristic features of the hero's madness (922-1015). This view or

[304] Euripides. (1964). *Heracles*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.). (831-837) (N.B. Unless otherwise stated, translations of *Euripides'* Heracles come from Philip Vellacott's).
[305] Euripides, *Heracles*, (865-870).

report by the Messenger which thoroughly describes the hero as demonstrably mad would be delineated under the 'characteristic features of Heracles' madness'. In the portrayal of the madness that is wrought on Heracles, we are to construe it as a capricious punishment from Hera. This is what Iris says:

> ὡς ἂν πορεύσας δι᾽ Ἀχερούσιον πόρον
> τὸν καλλίπαιδα στέφανον αὐθέντῃ φόνῳ
> γνῷ μὲν τὸν Ἥρας οἷός ἐστ᾽ αὐτῷ χόλος,
> μάθῃ δὲ τὸν ἐμόν· ἢ θεοὶ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ,
> τὰ θνητὰ δ᾽ ἔσται μεγάλα, μὴ δόντος δίκην.
> Over the river of death, he may perceive how hot
> Is Hera's anger against him, and learn my hate too.
> If Heracles escape our punishment, then gods
> Are nowhere, and the mortal race may rule the earth.[306]

The source of Hera's anger can be traced to the mythology about the birth of Heracles. In this regard, H.J. Rose essentially notes:

> Hera, who knew to what glory her husband's bastard was destined, was furious and did everything in her power to kill or at least hamper him; to her machinations, in the story as we have it, nearly all his misfortunes and trials are due. Before his birth, she robbed him of his true inheritance; for Zeus had meant him to be lord of the surrounding peoples.[307]

On the preceding view, Antonietta Provenza, in her assessment of Heracles' madness, also acknowledges the source of the madness as an inexorability of divine will and arbitrariness of divine power.[308] She further adds:

---

[306] Euripides, *Heracles*, (838-842)

[307] H.J. Rose. (1972). *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. (Great Britain: Methuen & Co.) p. 206. See also Bulfinch's *The Golden Age of Myth & Legend* (1993) for the source of Juno's hostility to the offspring of her husband, pp. 177ff.

[308] Antonietta Provenza. (2013). 'Madness and Bestialization in Euripides' *Heracles*'. *The Classical Quarterly*. 63. pp. 68-93.

> Since his early childhood, Heracles has indeed been an object of hatred for the divine spouse and now will have to suffer her extreme revenge. The victorious outcomes of the tests imposed on him are not enough to make him safe, and not even being Zeus's son serves to protect him from the goddess's wrath.[309]

What is significant as far as Heracles' madness is concerned is that like other tragic heroes who become demented and later recover, he also convalesces from his predicament. This is typified by the pronouncement he makes when he wakes up:

> ἔα·
>
> ἔμπνους μέν εἰμι καὶ δέδορχ᾽ ἅπερ με δεῖ,
>
> αἰθέρα τε καὶ γῆν τόξα θ᾽ Ἡλίου τάδε ...
>
> ὡς ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι
>
> πέπτωκα δεινῷ καὶ πνοὰς θερμὰς πνέω
>
> μετάρσι᾽, οὐ βέβαια, πνευμόνων ἄπο.
>
> ἰδού, τί δεσμοῖς ναῦς ὅπως ὡρμισμένος
>
> νεανίαν θώρακα καὶ βραχίονα
>
> I am alive, I breathe; I see all I should see,
>
> My mind feels drowned in waves of turmoil, and my breath
>
> Comes hot, unsteady, not calm as it should. –What's this?
>
> Moored like a ship! Ropes round my chest – me, Heracles![310]

In a succeeding dialogue between Heracles and Amphitryon, we further recognise that the former had indeed recovered from the madness that was wrought on him after the deed had been done.

> **Ἡρακλῆς**
>
> πάτερ, τί κλαίεις καὶ συναμπίσχῃ κόρας,
>
> τοῦ φιλτάτου σοι τηλόθεν παιδὸς βεβώς;

[309] Antonietta Provenza. (2013). 'Madness and Bestialization in Euripides' *Heracles*'. *The Classical Quarterly*. 63. p.70.
[310] Euripides, *Heracles*, (1088-1095).

Ἀμφιτρύων

ὦ τέκνον· εἶ γὰρ καὶ κακῶς πράσσων ἐμός.

Ἡρακλῆς

πράσσω δ᾽ ἐγὼ τί λυπρόν, οὗ δακρυρροεῖς;

Ἀμφιτρύων

ἃ κἂν θεῶν τις, εἰ μάθοι, καταστένοι**.**

Ἡρακλῆς

μέγας γ᾽ ὁ κόμπος, τὴν τύχην δ᾽ οὔπω λέγεις**.**

Ἀμφιτρύων

ὁρᾷς γὰρ αὐτός, εἰ φρονῶν ἥδη κυρεῖς.

Ἡρακλῆς

εἶπ᾽, εἴ τι καινὸν ὑπογράφῃ τὠμῷ βίῳ.

Ἀμφιτρύων

εἰ μηκέθ᾽ Ἅιδου βάκχος εἶ, φράσαιμεν ἄν.

Ἡρακλῆς

παπαῖ, τόδ᾽ ὡς ὕποπτον ᾐνίξω πάλιν.

Ἀμφιτρύων

καί σ᾽ εἰ βεβαίως εὖ φρονεῖς ἥδη σκοπῶ.

Ἡρακλῆς

οὐ γάρ τι βακχεύσας γε μέμνημαι φρένας.

Ἀμφιτρύων

λύσω, γέροντες, δεσμὰ παιδός; ἢ τί δρῶ;

Ἡρακλῆς

καὶ τόν γε δήσαντ᾽ εἶπ᾽· ἀναινόμεσθα γάρ.

Ἀμφιτρύων

τοσοῦτον ἴσθι τῶν κακῶν· τὰ δ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἔα.

Heracles

Dear father, why do you weep? Why do you veil

Your eyes,

Standing so far away from me? I am your son.

Amphitryon

My son! Yes, even abased and stricken, still

my son!

Heracles

Stricken? How stricken, father? Why this flood of tears?

Amphitryon

What you have suffered would bring groans

even from a god.

Heracles

So terrible? What is it? You have not told me

yet.

Amphitryon

You see yourself, if now your mind is sound

again.

Heracles

You hint at some disaster for me. Is it so?

Amphitryon

If you are no more a frenzied celebrant of

Death,

I'll tell you.

Heracles

Still these mysteries! I guess and fear.

Amphitryon

I am still doubtful if your mind is well restored.

Heracles

My mind was frenzied? How? I don't remember

it.

Amphitryon

Old friends, shall I unbind him? What ought

I to do?

Heracles

Unbind me; and say who bound me – he's my

Enemy.[311]

It is evidently clear that Euripides portrays Heracles' madness as emanating from a capricious desire of Hera to punish the hero. When the hero becomes demented, he exhibits certain characteristics or features (which form the body of the next sub-topic) that typify a deranged mind and like other tragic heroes that I have discussed, he later recovers from that state of insanity. This preceding view is corroborated by Z Theodorou, who in his conceptualisation of Euripides' notion of madness aptly summarises Heracles' madness thus:

> The external trigger in the form of a divinity, the attack of delusion that transports the madman to a world that exists only in his affected mind, the suicidal despair at the recover…[312]

4.3.1. The characteristic features of Heracles' madness

In this sub-section, I shall outline the conduct of Heracles that epitomizes a mind demented as described successively by Madness and the Messenger. The characteristic features of Heracles' madness include but are not limited to the following:

i. Hera is the orchestrator of Heracles' madness, but actualised through Madness[313]

[311] Euripides, *Heracles*, (1111-1125).

[312] Z. Theodorou. (1993). 'Exploring Madness in Orestes'. *The Classical Quarterly*. (Cambridge University Press). 43 (1). p. 33.

ii. Wild tossing of the head [314]

iii. Silence[315]

iv. Convulsive breathing [316]

v. A terrible deep bellow like a bull [317]

vi. A shriek to all Hell's fiends [318]

vii. A display of rolling eyeballs[319] and bloodshot eyeballs[320]

viii. A trickling of white froth[321]

ix. Maniac laughter[322]

x. Pacing back and forth without purpose in the house[323]

xi. Mimicking his arrival at Megara when he is actually in Thebes[324]

xii. Mistaking Amphitryon for Eurystheus' father[325]

xiii. Mistaking his children for Eurystheus'[326]

xiv. Displaying eyes of a Gorgon [327]

Z. Theodorou also provides an eight-point summary of the characteristic features of Heracles' madness.[328] In other words, he notes that in Euripides' *Heracles*, the protagonist exhibits the following physiological symptoms during his madness attack:

---

[313] Euripides, *Heracles*, (835)
[314] Euripides, *Heracles,* (867)
[315] Euripides, *Heracles*, (868)
[316] Euripides, *Heracles*, (869)
[317] Euripides, *Heracles*, (869f.)
[318] Euripides, *Heracles*, (870f.)
[319] Euripides, Heracles, (868)
[320] Euripides, *Heracles*, (931f.)
[321] Euripides, *Heracles*, (933)
[322] *Ibid*.
[323] Euripides, *Heracles*, (952)
[324] Euripides, *Heracles*, (953f.)
[325] Euripides, *Heracles*, (965f.)
[326] Euripides, *Heracles*, (967ff.) This is reminiscent of Sophocles' Ajax when he also mistakes the flock for the Atreidae and Odysseus.
[327] Euripides, *Heracles*, (930ff.)

1. Silence

2. Head thrown back, tossing

3. Rolling of the eyes

4. Heavy, irregular, hot breathing

5. Bloodshot eyes

6. Foaming

7. Making loud animal sound

8. Wild, insane laughter[329]

There is a consensus in scholarly commentaries that the madness that Heracles suffers is akin to our modern melancholic disorder. In the view of Teresa Encarnación Villalba Babiloni, Heracles should be conceptualised in the melancholic group because he is prone to extreme abnormality and suffers from this type of symptoms.[330] This view is also corroborated by Peter Toohey who cites Stanley W. Jackson:

> As far as the ancients are concerned melancholia describes a psychological state which, most authorities seem to agree, resembles modem notions of depression and melancholia.[331]

Perhaps the most instructive statement that captures the characteristic features of Heracles' madness is given by Perdicoyianni-Paléologou when he succinctly describes it thus:

> The progress of Heracles' madness is described from the initial physical symptoms of rolling, protruding, bloodshot eyes, foaming at the mouth and a hysterical laugh, to the mental illness including hallucination and a sudden sleep. Bewildered by

---

[328] This view is corroborated by Ann Arbor. (2004). "Sorrow without Cause: Periodizing Melancholia and Depression". *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*. (ed. Peter Toohey). p. 35.
[329] Z. Theodorou. (1993). 'Exploring Madness in Orestes'. *The Classical Quarterly*, (Cambridge University Press). 43 (1), p. 34.
[330] Teresa Encarnación Villalba Babiloni. (2016). 'Madness as Psychosocial Function in the Ancient Myth of Heracles'. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*. VIII.1. p. 39
[331] Peter Toohey. (1990). 'Some Ancient Histories of Melancholia'. *Illinois Classical Studies*. XV (1). p. 143. See also this assertion by Stanley W. Jackson. (1986). *Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times* (New Haven and London). On the issue of Heracles' melancholia see also Ann Arbor. (2004). "Sorrow without Cause: Periodizing Melancholia and Depression". *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*. (ed. Peter Toohey). pp. 15-58.

> this madness, Heracles kills each one of his children with arrows dipped in the blood of the hundred-headed hydra.[332]

Maria Gerolemou also aptly summarises the features of Heracles' madness as presented by the Messenger:

> Euripides, by underlining motion as a feature that signifies madness, describes Heracles' madness in this way: Heracles thinks that he undertakes a journey to Megara (954–955) where he joins a banqueting hall (955–957), then approaches the Isthmos (958) and ends his travels in Mycenae and in Eurystheus' palace (943, πρὸς τὰς Μυκήνας εἶμι).[333]

Having considered the characteristic features of Heracles' madness and the consequences thereof, it is now appropriate to outline the purpose of the hero's madness. Thus, the next sub-topic discusses the purpose(s) of Heracles' madness.

4.3.2. The purpose of Heracles' madness

It is appropriate to surmise that Heracles' madness did serve a variety of purposes in terms of the plot and its development, and the impact thereof on the psyche of the Greek audience. To start with, the madness that befalls Heracles espouses Euripides' notion of madness in which he advocates that the hero recovers from the madness he suffers. Through this perspective, Euripides establishes that the gods/goddesses are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls the heroes. In his *Heracles* as earlier established, Hera is the deity who machinates through Madness the madness of Heracles. Secondly, Euripides uses Heracles' madness to establish human fortune's mutability, precariousness and fragility. This view is ably corroborated by Thalia Papadopoulou when in her conclusion she establishes this view:

> The reversal of fortune, the fragility of life, and the way in which suffering can be dealt with are suitable elements for tragic treatment in general. Herakles' madness, in particular, provided both Euripides and Seneca with an appropriate subject for such

[332] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*. (Sage Publications). 20(3). p. 317

[333] Maria Gerolemou. (2019). *Representing the insane*. (De Gruyter). p. 280.

> treatment, as it made the superhuman and otherwise indomitable Herakles experience his vulnerability for the first time.[334]

In addition, Heracles' madness and the consequent destruction that accompanies it (that is, the murder of his children and his wife) could not have been more tragic. This view is affirmed by Aristotle when he says this about Euripides:

> That is why those who censure Euripides for doing this in his tragedies and making many of them end with disaster are making just the same mistake. For this is correct in the way I said. The greatest proof of this is that on the stage and in the contests such plays are felt to be the most properly tragic, if they are well managed, and Euripides, even if he is a bad manager in other points, is at any rate the most tragic of the poets.[335]

The preceding statement is a further testament to Aristotle's argument for the type or kind of *character* that ought to be presented to achieve the aim of tragedy; a requirement in his view that Euripides fulfils in his tragedies with finesse. Furthermore, Euripides uses Heracles' madness to teach the Athenian audience a moral lesson. Thus, if Heracles' madness is construed as punishment or capricious use of divine strength borne out of Hera's anger because of injustice done to her, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, then by this, one must appreciate the warning that Heracles' misfortune is a moral admonition not to incur the displeasure of any god/goddess because it comes with devastating consequences.

Furthermore, the dramatisation of the characteristic features that the hero suffers cannot be overemphasised. Thus, when the characteristic features of the hero's madness are used to serve dramatic purposes, it does not only heighten the goal of tragedy (i.e., the arousal of the emotions of pity and fear) but also depicts the creativity, inventiveness and originality of the poet as far as the phenomenon is concerned. For instance, in the case of Heracles' madness, its depiction is not only twofold, but its enactment also involves the use of secondary characters: Madness and the

---

[334] Thalia Papadopoulou. (2004). "Herakles and Hercules: The Hero's Ambivalence in Euripides and Seneca." *Mnemosyne*. (Brill). 4th Series. 57. Fasc. 3. p. 280

[335] *Poetics*: 1453[a]

Messenger. It takes a poet like Euripides with such artistic insight to be able to enact offstage the characteristic features of a hero's madness before the audience and still achieve the desired dramatic impact; Aristotelian *catharsis* comes to the fore.

Finally, Heracles' madness is a further illustration of an integral part of my thesis—the tragic and the non-tragic madness of the hero respectively. Thus, when we construe the madness that befalls Heracles as a malicious display of divine strength, then that would be non-tragic. When it is also interpreted as an exploitation of the hero's desires or weakness, then that would be tragic. In effect, Heracles' madness can both serve Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions and purposes.

4.4. A critique of the non-tragic madness of Heracles

It is an established principle that when the madness the hero suffers, is consistent with the requirements of the *hubristic* principle, then it is non-tragic. One significant question emanates from the prior view. In what way(s) does Heracles' madness become non-tragic? The first evidence of this comes from Iris' pronouncement in her instruction to Madness:

> μανίας τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὶ τῷδε καὶ παιδοκτόνους
> φρενῶν ταραγμοὺς καὶ ποδῶν σκιρτήματα
> ἔλαυνε, κίνει, φόνιον ἐξίει κάλων,
> ὡς ἂν πορεύσας δι᾽ Ἀχερούσιον πόρον
> τὸν καλλίπαιδα στέφανον αὐθέντῃ φόνῳ
> γνῷ μὲν τὸν Ἥρας οἶός ἐστ᾽ αὐτῷ χόλος,
> μάθῃ δὲ τὸν ἐμόν· ἢ θεοὶ μὲν οὐδαμοῦ,
> τὰ θνητὰ δ᾽ ἔσται μεγάλα, μὴ δόντος δίκην.
> Send maniac fury on this man, distort his mind
> With lust for his own children's blood, cut murder's cable,

> Rack him with lunatic convulsions; that when he
> With guilt-red hand has sent his crown of lovely sons
> Over the river of death, he may perceive how hot
> Is Hera's anger against him, and learn my hate too.
> If Heracles escape our punishment, then gods
> Are nowhere, and the mortal race may rule the earth.[336]

It is obvious from the preceding extract that Heracles' madness emanates from a capricious use of divine strength. When Iris retorts that *if Heracles escape our punishment, then gods are nowhere,* indicates that the hero is being punished with madness because the deity is merely angry with him. In this regard, Perdicoyianni-Paléologou aptly notes:

> In sum, divine madness possesses a double aspect. As a divine gift, it has a beneficial function of bestowing on the maddened person divinatory, creative and poetic faculties, as well as love, pleasure and happiness. When maleficent, divine madness is inflicted as punishment to a person hated by the gods.[337]

Since the foregoing condition is consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle, it makes Heracles' madness at this juncture a non-tragic one.

The second piece of evidence which illustrates the non-tragic aspect of Heracles' madness is taken from the speech of the Chorus, who in response to Madness' mission, bemoan the disaster that has befallen Heracles:

> ταχὺ τὸν εὐτυχῆ μετέβαλεν δαίμων,
> ταχὺ δὲ πρὸς πατρὸς τέκν᾽ ἐκπνεύσεται.
> ἰώ μοι μέλεος.
> ἰὼ Ζεῦ, τὸ σὸν γένος ἄγονον αὐτίκα
> λυσσάδες ὠμοβρῶτες ἄδικοι Ποιναὶ

[336]Euripides, *Heracles*, (835-842)
[337] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*, (Sage Publications). 20(3), p. 327

κακοῖσιν ἐκπετάσουσιν.

Swiftly doom has undone success;

Swiftly his sons shall die by their father's hand.

Oh, pity, pity! Zeus, do you hear?

Fiends of jealousy, mad for revenge,

Will fall like tearing wolves on your unhappy son![338]

The sentiments expressed by the Chorus in their description of the handiwork of Hera, Iris and Madness reinforce the view that the madness that Heracles suffers, is borne out of the whimsical use of divine strength, a condition which is also evocative of Athena's vengeance on Ajax. The manner or the condition under which Euripides' Heracles suffers madness is much like Sophocles' Ajax. We can identify in both cases remote and immediate cause(s) in furtherance of the argument for the non-tragic madness they suffer. In the first place, the remote cause of Heracles' madness is Hera's desire (borne out of her jealousy and her hatred for the hero) to avenge herself because she considers the hero's birth, as earlier noted, an injustice to her spousal rights; Athena does the same with Ajax because the hero had purportedly slighted her by rejecting the deity's assistance. A similar divine madness is the result of Hera's unappeasable hatred for her husband's bastard son Heracles.[339] R. Jebb succinctly adds:

> Ajax appears as one who has offended Athene by the presumptuous self-confidence with which he has rejected divine aid in war.[340]

Secondly, we need to acknowledge a clear difference when it comes to the immediate cause of the madness of Heracles and Ajax. Unlike Ajax whose attempted murder of the Atreidae and Odysseus was thwarted by Athena, Euripides does not directly or consciously prepare the minds

[338] Euripides, *Heracles*, (884-888)

[339] B. Simon. (1978) Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press). pp. 130-139.

[340] R. Jebb. (2004) Sophocles: Plays Ajax (London: Bristol Classical Press).

of his audience for the immediate cause of Heracles' madness. However, one would not be far from right when one surmises that since Heracles suffered madness after the murder of the usurper, Lycus, notwithstanding the identified remote cause, the immediate logical conclusion is that the hero's madness is borne out of the vengeance he wreaks on the former. In furtherance of the preceding view, Heracles angrily remarks:

> ἐγὼ δέ — νῦν γὰρ τῆς ἐμῆς ἔργον χερός —
> πρῶτον μὲν εἶμι καὶ κατασκάψω δόμους
> καινῶν τυράννων, κρᾶτα δ᾽ ἀνόσιον τεμὼν
> ῥίψω κυνῶν ἕλκημα· Καδμείων δ᾽ ὅσους
> κακοὺς ἐφηῦρον εὖ παθόντας ἐξ ἐμοῦ,
> τῷ καλλινίκῳ τῷδ᾽ ὅπλῳ χειρώσομαι·
> τοὺς δὲ πτερωτοῖς διαφορῶν τοξεύμασι
> νεκρῶν ἅπαντ᾽ Ἰσμηνὸν ἐμπλήσω φόνου,
> Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκὸν αἱμαχθήσεται.
> Now I must go; my hand has work to do. And first
> To level with the ground the house of this new king,
> Cut off his head, and throw it out for dogs to tear;
> Then, for the citizens of Cadmus—those I find
> Have paid my benefits with treachery, this club,
> Veteran of my victories, shall deal with them;
> Or with my feathered barbs I'll scatter them, and fill
> Ismenus full of corpses, make the limpid stream
> Of Dirce run red.[341]

It is obvious from the foregoing statement that Heracles' motivation for vengeance is reminiscent of Aristotle's interpretation or rendition of *hubris*.[342] Richard Seaford here argues that although

[341] Euripides, *Heracles*, (565-573).

Heracles' madness is imposed by Hera, the hero's frenzy is also clearly associated by Euripides with the state of mind in which Heracles killed Lycus;[343] his desire for vengeance cannot be excluded here. He further justifies his view as he cites G.W. Bond's Commentary (on 562-82), which protests that "Heracles' plans are reasonable by fifth-century, let alone heroic, standards".[344] Furthermore, if Heracles is intended not only to kill (as the extract above alludes) *the treacherous people of Cadmus for their association with Lycus*, but also to *deny their corpses proper burial by dumping them into the Ismenus*, intensifies the argument that the hero's action is borne out of ruthless desire for vengeance. Perhaps, it is also the more reason why the poet, for dramatic purposes does not give us a graphic account of Lycus' killing[345] as he does with the Messenger's description of Heracles' killing of his children.[346] This anterior view is reinforced by Aristotle when in the Chapter Fourteen of his *Poetics*, he tells us of deeds that would arouse pity and fear:

> Now if a man injures his enemy, there is nothing pitiable either in his act or in his intention, except in so far as suffering is inflicted; nor is there if they are indifferent to each other.[347]

Since Heracles' killing of Lycus is reminiscent of the preceding condition described by Aristotle, its dramatic importance is subordinated to that of the Messenger's. Thus, once Heracles is exacting vengeance or justice of a sort on Lycus, it makes the madness he consequently suffers a justifiable one, hence non-tragic. Thus, two factors occasion the madness that befall Heracles: on one hand, it is his desire for vengeance on Lycus and the actualisation of it in the killing of the

---

[342] For further details see the Literature Review in Chapter One.

[343] Richard Seaford. (1989). "Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice". *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-2014)*. Vol. 119. pp. 87-95.

[344] *Ibid*.

[345] ΛΥΚΟΣ (*within*): ἰώ μοί μοι.
LYCUS: O land of Cadmus, I am treacherously murdered.

[346] Euripides, *Heracles*, (922-1015)

[347] Aristotle. (1965). *Poetics*. (Trans., T. S. Dorsch). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books). Ch. 14.

king, and on the other, Hera's decision to impose madness on him as an exaction of *nemesis*, justice, in fact. These come together to fulfil the condition precedent of the *hubristic* principle and hence Heracles' madness is here non-tragic.

4.5. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Heracles

As already established, the essential principle underpinning the Psychoanalytic theory is that the product of one's action is a characteristic function of the interplay of the *Id-Superego-Ego* and that of the Socio-Psychological by the environmental influences that one experiences. Consequently, I shall subject Heracles' madness to Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological critique, interpretation and analysis from the non-tragic perspective of the hero's madness.

To start with, Heracles' desire to kill Lycus, which he actualises (750-814) out of vengeance (565ff.), is a characteristic function of the *Id*. After this incident, Heracles is made mad, provoked by Madness, upon the instigation of Hera and Iris. When we construe Heracles' madness as divine punishment from the deities earlier mentioned, then that is a characteristic function of the *Superego,* because the latter functions as an ethical constraint. So, notwithstanding the fact that Euripides only prepares the audience to appreciate the remote cause of Heracles' madness as Hera's machination, it can also admit to the immediate cause of the hero's madness as the heinous murder of Lycus, a characteristic function of the *Superego*. Thus, since Heracles' madness is to be understood as Hera's exaction of vengeance, which she construes as justice, then that is *nemesis*, which is more consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence it is non-tragic.

Besides, as earlier noted, the heroes recover from the madness that befalls them because the phenomenon in Greek tragedy is but a temporary one. This is exactly the case with the madness

that befalls Heracles. From lines 1088ff., Heracles' pronouncements are expressive of one who has recovered from his demented mind. He proceeds to engage in a dialogue with his father (1089ff.), which gives further impetus to the view that he has convalesced from madness. Heracles' ability to sanely engage his father in a conversation is a characteristic function of the *Ego*.[348]

Finally, from the Socio-Psychological viewpoint, Heracles' desire to wreak vengeance on Lycus is influenced by the psychological pressure and perspectives of Megara, Amphitryon and the Chorus who represent Greek society. Megara bemoans:

> ὦ φίλτατ᾽, εἴ τις φθόγγος εἰσακούεται
> θνητῶν παρ᾽ Ἅιδῃ, σοὶ τάδ᾽, Ἡράκλεις, λέγω:
> θνήσκει πατὴρ σὸς καὶ τέκν᾽, ὄλλυμαι δ᾽ ἐγώ,
> ἣ πρὶν μακαρία διὰ σ᾽ ἐκλῃζόμην βροτοῖς.
> Dear husband! If a word spoken on earth can reach!
> The ears of those below, I call you, Heracles!
> Your father and your sons are near to death; I too,
> Your wife, whom I called fortunate, am perishing![349]

We see the same pressure brought to bear on Heracles by Amphitryon in the former's determination to seek vengeance on Lycus. Amphitryon remarks:

> καὶ δὸς πατρῴοις δώμασιν σὸν ὄμμ᾽ ἰδεῖν.
> ἥξει γὰρ αὐτὸς σὴν δάμαρτα καὶ τέκνα
> ἕλξων φονεύσων κἄμ᾽ ἐπισφάξων ἄναξ:

[348]For further details on Heracles' madness from a Psychoanalytic perspective or interpretation of literature, see Mateusz Stróżyński' *(*2017). "Psychotic Phenomena in Euripides' *Heracles"*. *Symbolae Philologorum Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae*. XXVII/3. pp. 103-137 and by the same author, (2013). "Love, Aggression, and Mourning in Euripides' *Heracles*". *Eos C*. pp. 223-250.
[349] Euripides, *Heracles*, (490-493)

μένοντι δ᾽ αὐτοῦ πάντα σοι γενήσεται

Your face to your own home. The king will come himself

To drag your wife, your sons, and me away to slaughter.

Stay in the house, and all will fall into your hands;

You'll win in safety.[350]

The Chorus variously add:

δίκαια τοὺς τεκόντας ὠφελεῖν τέκνα,

πατέρα τε πρέσβυν τήν τε κοινωνὸν γάμων.

They are your sons: it is right to take revenge for them,

And no less for your aged father and your wife.[351]

καὶ γὰρ διώλλυς: ἀντίποινα δ᾽ ἐκτίνων

τόλμα, διδούς γε τῶν δεδραμένων δίκην.

You were a murderer; for all your wickedness

This is just revenge; you must endure it.[352]

These preceding extracts are given further impetus by Heracles himself when he corroborates the need for the deed to be done:

ἐγὼ δέ — νῦν γὰρ τῆς ἐμῆς ἔργον χερός —

πρῶτον μὲν εἶμι καὶ κατασκάψω δόμους

καινῶν τυράννων, κρᾶτα δ᾽ ἀνόσιον τεμὼν

ῥίψω κυνῶν ἕλκημα: Καδμείων δ᾽ ὅσους

κακοὺς ἐφηῦρον εὖ παθόντας ἐξ ἐμοῦ,

τῷ καλλινίκῳ τῷδ᾽ ὅπλῳ χειρώσομαι:

τοὺς δὲ πτερωτοῖς διαφορῶν τοξεύμασι

[350] Euripides, *Heracles*, (600-603.)
[351] Euripides, *Heracles*, (583f.)
[352] Euripides, *Heracles*, (755f.)

νεκρῶν ἅπαντ᾽ Ἰσμηνὸν ἐμπλήσω φόνου,

Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκὸν αἱμαχθήσεται.

Now I must go; my hand has work to do. And first

To level with the ground the house of this new king,

Cut off his head, and throw it out for the dogs to tear;

Then, for the citizens of Cadmus- those I find

Have paid my benefits for treachery, this club,

Veteran of many victories, shall deal with them;

Or with my feathered barbs I'll scatter them, and fill

Ismenus full of corpses, make the limpid stream

Of Dirce run red.[353]

From the foregoing extracts, it is evidently clear that Heracles' desire for vengeance on king Lycus is a result of Socio-Psychological influences and pressure from Megara, Amphitryon and the Chorus. Thus, since Heracles' motivation for vengeance on Lycus is Socio-Psychologically driven, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, it makes his madness a non-tragic one.

4.6. A critique of the tragic madness of Heracles

Having dealt with the arguments for Heracles' non-tragic madness, it is appropriate to now focus on the tragic aspect of the hero's madness. It is now a generally accepted view that tragic madness comes about when the misfortune or the madness that befalls the hero is an undeserving one or when we see a witting or unwitting exploitation of the hero's desires or weakness. Consequently, this part of my study explores the arguments or the circumstances under which Heracles' madness becomes a tragic one. I shall start this by giving a summary of the

[353] Euripides, *Heracles*, (566-574). For further details on Heracles' proneness to violence refer to what the Chorus say of him in lines (690ff.)565-573).

development of the plot as I provide along the line a critique of the relevant aspects or circumstances that make Heracles' madness a tragic one.

The plot of Euripides' *Heracles* starts with a prologue given by Amphitryon. He gives us a brief summary of his background, and that of Heracles and Megara (Heracles' wife); he makes us aware of the labours imposed on Heracles and questions whether they were borne out of hatred or fate's decree. Finally, he tells us of how Lycus became king of Thebes and how his family have become suppliants not only by the absence of Heracles, but also by the king's mistreatment of them (1-59). Their predicament is re-echoed by Megara (60-86). In a dialogue that ensues between Amphitryon and Megara, they bemoan their perilous condition and yearn for Heracles' return (87-106). In the parodos of the Chorus that follows, they also bemoan the fates of Heracles' family until it was punctuated by the arrival of king Lycus (107-138). Upon Lycus' arrival, he threatens the family of Heracles with death—ridicules the exploits of Heracles as unworthy—rationalises the basis for his desire for the death of Heracles' children (140-169). Lycus' outbursts receive equal vituperations from Amphitryon, who mounts a spirited defence of Heracles' exploits and further exposes the former by accusing him of cowardice. He further expresses his frustrations for his inability to defend the children of Heracles (170-235). Amphitryon's tantrums receive further rebuke and threats from Lycus—the Chorus are also not spared of the king's attacks and threats. The usurper King, subsequently, instructs his guards to fetch some wood that would be used to incinerate the children of Heracles (238-251). The Chorus give an appropriate response to the King's threats, and irrespective of their advanced age, vow to protect Heracles' children. When Megara joins the argument, she bewails their impending fate (252-311)—the Chorus identify with the plight of Heracles' family, but they are helpless because of their advanced age (312ff).

In order to tarry in their approaching death and that of the children, Amphitryon and Megara put forth requests before King Lycus—the latter obliges and subsequently exits the stage (316-335). Amphitryon chastises Zeus for having neglected them (339ff.). This is followed by a long stasimon in which the Chorus among other things sing of Heracles' exploits and their inability to assist the children of Heracles. This ode is interjected by the arrival of Amphitryon, Megara and the children, who have all garbed in robes of the dead (348-450). Upon their return, Megara bemoans the precarious condition of her children—the future envisaged for them by their father has come to naught because of their imminent execution—she calls on Heracles (even if he was a ghost) to save them (451-496). Amphitryon follows suit as he also bemoans their hopelessness and helplessness (497-513). Heracles suddenly arrives—it brings uncontrollable joy (523-530)—a dialogue ensues between him and Megara—she briefs him of the happenings in his absence—how Lycus had intended to kill them (531-561). Enraged by this ominous news, Heracles sets out to curb the excesses of King Lycus with the desire to kill him (562-582). This decision would later be assessed in the interpretation of the tragic madness of Heracles.

The Chorus support Heracles' intention to avenge his sons, but Amphitryon advises his son to proceed with caution (585-598). Subsequently**,** a plan is devised to trap Lycus to his death (599-609). In the interim, Amphitryon enquires from the hero if indeed he went to Hades; Heracles responds in the affirmative and further adds that he dragged to earth the three-headed monster. Heracles forthwith comforts his children as he promises to keep them safe and not desert them (610-635). This is followed by a long stasimon, where most importantly, they sing of the victory of Heracles and credit the peace they used to enjoy to the hero (637-700).

In the succeeding scene, Lycus' determination to exterminate the family of Heracles continues—the ruse to trap him is in force—Lycus' death is imminent (701-734). In the stasimon that

follows, the Chorus justifies Lycus' looming death as a deserving one (735-747)—they sing for joy as they believe Lycus' life has come to an end (748-814)—their joy is truncated by the apparition of Iris and Madness over the palace (815ff.)—their mission is to strike Heracles with madness so that he would unknowingly shed kindred blood (822-874).

Perhaps this is the crucial point which needs critiquing as far as our interpretation of the tragic madness of Heracles is concerned. We are already aware that the madness that is wrought on Heracles is remotely orchestrated by Hera out of mere hatred—a measure, as already noted, that makes the hero's madness non-tragic. However, the basis upon which Heracles' madness becomes a tragic one is first, the effect of Madness' (Lyssa's) reluctance to do the deed (i.e., by making Heracles mad) and her virtual defence of Heracles on the audience,[354] and second, the exploitation of his unwitting weakness or desires. In the first place, Madness' unwillingness to make Heracles mad is an indication that the madness the hero was about to suffer is undeserved, hence tragic. The preceding view is further corroborated by the deity when she touts the noble qualities and deeds of the hero. This predisposition of Madness has the tendency not only to make the madness Heracles suffers tragic, but could also have a cathartic effect on the audience. Secondly, we see the exploitation of Heracles' weakness (i.e., his desire for vengeance on Lycus) in his predisposition to protect his family in the face of imminent danger[355] as he expresses his decision not only to massacre Lycus and wreak havoc on other citizens of Thebes who in his view were the King's accomplices, but also to actualize it.[356] Moreover, Heracles has usually demonstrated a penchant for violence and the spilling of enemy blood as the main means of

[354] Euripides, *Heracles*, (843-853 & 858-874)
[355] Euripides, *Heracles*, (574-582)
[356] Euripides, *Heracles*, (754).

solving problems. It is this weakness or desire that is unwittingly exploited to his detriment. It is on this account that Amphitryon says this of his son:

> Ἠλεκτρύωνα· συμφορὰς δὲ τὰς ἐμὰς
> ἐξευμαρίζων καὶ πάτραν οἰκεῖν θέλων,
> καθόδου δίδωσι μισθὸν Εὐρυσθεῖ μέγαν
> And so, to end my exile, and himself return
> To the land of his fathers, Heracles undertook to cleanse
> The earth of brutal violence. This was the high price
> He offered Eurystheus for his own recall to Argos. [357]

Heracles' proneness to violence which is an unwitting weakness that is exploited to his detriment is given further impetus when the hero says this upon his arrival in Thebes:

> ἐγὼ δέ — νῦν γὰρ τῆς ἐμῆς ἔργον χερός —
> πρῶτον μὲν εἶμι καὶ κατασκάψω δόμους
> καινῶν τυράννων, κρᾶτα δ᾽ ἀνόσιον τεμὼν
> ῥίψω κυνῶν ἕλκημα· Καδμείων δ᾽ ὅσους
> κακοὺς ἐφηῦρον εὖ παθόντας ἐξ ἐμοῦ,
> τῷ καλλινίκῳ τῷδ᾽ ὅπλῳ χειρώσομαι·
> τοὺς δὲ πτερωτοῖς διαφορῶν τοξεύμασι
> νεκρῶν ἅπαντ᾽ Ἰσμηνὸν ἐμπλήσω φόνου,
> Δίρκης τε νᾶμα λευκὸν αἱμαχθήσεται.
> τῷ γάρ μ᾽ ἀμύνειν μᾶλλον ἢ δάμαρτι χρὴ
> Now I must go; my hand has work to do. And first
> To level with the ground the house of this new king,
> Cut off his head, and throw it out for dogs to tear;
> Then, for the citizens of Cadmus—those I find

[357] Euripides, *Heracles*, (17-19).

Have paid my benefits with treachery, this club,

Veteran of my victories, shall deal with them;

Or with my feathered barbs I'll scatter them, and fill

Ismenus full of corpses, make the limpid stream

Of Dirce run red.[358]

The last straw that breaks the camel's back is Heracles' tragic murder of his children and wife, Megara when his mind has become demented. It is this same unwitting manipulation of Heracles' proneness to violence that impels the hero to unknowingly (in his state of madness) heinously kill his three children and his wife —a measure which is not only consistent with the demands of the principle of *hamartia*, but also makes the hero's madness a tragic one. Juxtaposing the preceding scenario in the arena of law, madness and responsibility, Martha Merrill Umphrey, *et al.*, in their *Madness and Law: An Introduction* under the sub-heading "Varieties of "Madness" appropriately assert:

> If at the time of the crime as a result of mental disease or defect the defendant lacked the capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his or her conduct or to conform the conduct to the requirements of the law." Under either standard, decision makers do not condemn a person who cannot, for physiological or psychological reasons, stand in a responsive relation to law's commands—that is, one who cannot respond to reason, who can neither be deterred from, nor repent, wrongdoing.[359]

The Chorus then bemoan Heracles' misfortune and the imminent disaster to befall the hero's children (875-910). The Chorus' bewailing is punctuated by the arrival of the Messenger, who announces the death of Heracles' children at the hands of their own father. Subsequently, the Chorus demand from the Messenger to tell them the full story (911-921). In what can be construed in our modern drama as a flashback, the Messenger describes in detail how Heracles,

[358] Euripides, *Heracles*, (565-573). For further details on Heracles' proneness to violence refer to what the Chorus say of him in lines (690-700).

[359] Martha Merrill Umphrey*, et al.* (2003). *Madness and Law: An Introduction*. University of Michigan Press. pp. 3-4.

after he had killed Lycus became demonstrably demented, and subsequently killed his three sons and Megara, and would have killed Amphitryon had it not been for the timely intervention of Pallas, who hit him with a boulder—a situation that has caused the unblessed hero to sleep (922-1015). The Chorus bemoan Heracles' misfortune (1016ff.)—the palace door is opened—the scene is gory (1030-1040).

In the intervening time, as Heracles slumbers after the deed had been done, both the Chorus and Amphitryon bewail Heracles' misfortune (1041-1087). After a long slumber, the hero wakes up—the pronouncements he makes indicate that he had recovered from his madness. The function of his recovery or its purpose in the scheme of my study would be delineated in the next sub-topic.

Heracles demands to know what happened when his mind was demented. Amphitryon does as Heracles had requested. Embarrassed by this disastrous event, Heracles resolves to end his life (1088-1152). In the intervening time, Theseus arrives in the palace, he is apprised of what had transpired and he expresses his sympathy and gives psychological support to Heracles (1163-1228). Heracles takes the opportunity to recount the source of his misfortunes—from Eurystheus' imposed labours to Hera's jealousy—culminating in the unfortunate killing of his own children and his wife (1255-1310).

Here, apart from the fact that Hera makes Heracles mad because she has always hated him, a pattern which fundamentally makes the hero's madness a non-tragic one as already established, the exploitation of the hero's proneness to unbridled violence (cf. Heracles' execution of his labours and the planned murder of Lycus) is what is manipulated to impel the hero in his state of

madness to commit the abominable deed of killing his sons and his wife—a scenario which makes the hero's madness a tragic one.

Theseus, at the end of the plot, offers to take Heracles to Athens—after a little hesitation, the latter accepts and resolves not to end his life. Subsequently, Heracles philosophises about the value of having a good friend (1312-1426). The Chorus then give the Exode in which they do not only identify themselves with the misfortune that had befallen Heracles, but they also bemoan a friend they were about to lose (1427f.).

4.7. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Heracles

This sub-topic considers the interplay of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, which constitutes the Psychoanalytic, and the Socio-Psychological theory which focuses on the environmental influences that one experiences in the interpretation and analysis of the tragic madness of Heracles. In the first place, Heracles' vulnerability to and proneness to violence as the means of resolving issues, as earlier noted, emanates from the characteristic function of the *Id*. It is this weakness or desire that is exploited to his detriment. Thus, since the *Superego* functions as ethical restraint of our actions, then the madness that is wrought on Heracles should be interpreted as a punishment as Iris claims (840), which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence non-tragic. However, when we construe Heracles' madness from the perspective of unwitting exploitation of his proneness to violence, the madness he suffers, which is a characteristic function of the *Superego*, becomes an undeserving one—a scenario that is not only consistent with the *hamartia* principle but also makes his madness a tragic one. This preceding situation is given further impetus when Heracles convalesces from his madness. The

pronouncements that come from Heracles[360] when he recovers from his madness, which is a characteristic function of the *Ego,* show that the hero was an unwilling agent when the abominable deed was committed. It is under the conditions described above that Heracles' madness becomes a tragic one.

From the Socio-Psychological perspective, Heracles' madness, which derives from the unwitting exploitation of his proneness to violence and vengeance, originates from the social influences and the psychological pressure from Megara, Amphitryon and the Chorus. We are aware that in Heracles' absence, the usurper king, Lycus, had not only abused in turn Megara and Amphitryon but also ridiculed the Hero's achievement[361] as well as expressed his willingness to exterminate his family.[362] On this account, it is a matter of consequence that Heracles would have to not only save his family, but also restore his kingdom. Heracles emotionally remarks:

> χαιρόντων πόνοι·
> μάτην γὰρ αὐτοὺς τῶνδε μᾶλλον ἤνυσα.
> καὶ δεῖ μ᾽ ὑπὲρ τῶνδ᾽, εἴπερ οἵδ᾽ ὑπὲρ πατρός,
> θνήσκειν ἀμύνοντ᾽·
> Good-bye to all
> My famous labours! They're a waste of time, while I
> Neglect to help my own. These boys were to be killed
> For bearing my name; then in their defence I must
> Die, if need be.[363]

On this account, Amphitryon in a dialogue with Heracles passionately expresses this view:

[360] Refer to the conversation that ensues between Heracles and Amphitryon when the former recovers (1088-1152). You can also see lines (1153ff.) to the end of the plot for further understanding of Heracles' recovery.
[361] Euripides, *Heracles*, (140ff)
[362] Euripides, *Heracles*, (81ff., 240ff.301, 320ff., 453ff.545ff.)
[363] Euripides, *Heracles*, (575-578.)

καλῶς· παρελθὼν νυν πρόσειπέ θ᾽ ἑστίαν
καὶ δὸς πατρῴοις δώμασιν σὸν ὄμμ᾽ ἰδεῖν.
ἥξει γὰρ αὐτὸς σὴν δάμαρτα καὶ τέκνα
ἕλξων φονεύσων κἄμ᾽ ἐπισφάξων ἄναξ:
Good. Go in now; salute the gods of the
hearth, and show
your face to your home. The king will come himself
to drag your wife, your sons, and me away to slaughter.[364]

In furtherance of the above, it is important to also point out that in a dialogue between Megara and Heracles (531-561),[365] the sentiments expressed by the former are a testament of similar societal psychological pressure, which coerces the hero to commit the deed of killing Lycus—a decision which is not only a product of the unwitting exploitation of Heracles' susceptibility to violence, but it is a weakness that also predisposes the hero to unfortunately or unintentionally kill his sons and his wife when he was made mad. These conditions or circumstances, which are consistent with the *hamartia* principle, make Heracles' madness a tragic one.

4.8. Euripides' portrayal of the madness of Orestes

Euripides does not portray the madness of Orestes differently from other Greek tragic heroes. By this, the poet portrays his madness as having been orchestrated by the gods as a punishment for a wrong committed—a condition which he later recovers from. We get the first glimpse of the portrayal of Orestes' madness from Electra's speech:

ἐντεῦθεν ἀγρίᾳ συντακεὶς νόσῳ νοσεῖ
τλήμων Ὀρέστης ὅδε πεσὼν ἐν δεμνίοις
κεῖται, τὸ μητρὸς δ᾽ αἷμά νιν τροχηλατεῖ

[364] Euripides, *Heracles*, (599-602)
[365] Cf. Euripides, *Heracles*, (516-531)

μανίαισιν· ὀνομάζειν γὰρ αἰδοῦμαι θεὰς

εὐμενίδας, αἳ τόνδ᾽ ἐξαμιλλῶνται φόβῳ.

Ever since the poor

Orestes here, his body wasting away with a cruel disease,

Has taken to his bed, whirled in madness by the blood of his mother.

I shrink from naming the goddess, the Eumenides, who work to create this fear.[366]

From the above extract, it is clear that the orchestrators of Orestes' madness are the gods, though Euripides chooses to use the name *Eumenides* and at times Erinyes, instead of the infamous *Furies*. Like his counterpart in Aeschylus' *Choephori*, the madness that befalls Euripides' Orestes is portrayed as a punishment for the murder of his mother, Clytemnestra. The preceding view is corroborated by Simon when he construes Orestes' madness as one that was imposed on the hero because of matricide.[367] It is on this account that the Chorus sorrowfully remark:

ᾦ δάκρυα

δάκρυσι συμβάλλει

πορεύων τις ἐς δόμον ἀλαστόρων

ματέρος αἷμα σᾶς, ὅ σ᾽ ἀναβακχεύει

To you tears

Upon tears he brings,

That nameless avenging spirit dancing into the house

Who drives you to madness for your mother's murder.[368]

Once again, like all other heroes that I have earlier treated in this study, Euripides' Orestes also recovers from his madness. However, and quite uniquely, Euripides' Orestes' madness and his

[366] Euripides (2002). *Orestes*. (Trans. & Ed., D. Kovacs). (Cambridge: Harvard University Press). (34-38**)** (N.B. Unless otherwise stated, translations of *Euripides'* Orestes come from David Kovacs').

[367] B. Simon, *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry*. (Ithaca, NY and London, 1978). pp. 108-113.

[368] Euripides, *Orestes*, (335-338.) (cf. line (32) of the same play).

recovery seem to be unstable, where he intermittently appears at one point to have convalesced and at another to have become demented once again. The first evidence of this is given by Electra when she says this about Orestes' madness:

> χλανιδίων δ᾽ ἔσω
>
> κρυφθείς, ὅταν μὲν σῶμα κουφισθῇ νόσου,
>
> ἔμφρων δακρύει, ποτὲ δὲ δεμνίων ἄπο
>
> πηδᾷ δρομαῖος, πῶλος ὡς ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ.
>
> He lies covered in a blanket, and
>
> When his body finds relief from his malady, he is sane and
>
> Weeps, while at other times he leaps from the bedding and runs about like an unyoked colt.[369]

Electra once again remarks after Orestes is purported to have recovered:

> οἴμοι, κασίγνητ᾽, ὄμμα σὸν ταράσσεται,
>
> ταχὺς δὲ μετέθου λύσσαν, ἄρτι σωφρονῶν.
>
> Ah, ah, your eyes are becoming disturbed, brother! How
>
> Quickly you have fallen into madness, though you were just
>
> Now sane![370]

The third evidence of this intermittent madness and recovery phenomenon comes from Orestes himself when he exclaims:

> δὸς τόξα μοι κερουλκά, δῶρα Λοξίου,
>
> οἷς μ᾽ εἶπ᾽ Ἀπόλλων ἐξαμύνασθαι θεάς,
>
> εἴ μ᾽ ἐκφοβοῖεν μανιάσιν λυσσήμασιν.
>
> βεβλήσεταί τις θεῶν βροτησίᾳ χερί,
>
> εἰ μὴ 'ξαμείψει χωρὶς ὀμμάτων ἐμῶν.

[369] Euripides, *Orestes*, (42-45)
[370] Euripides, *Orestes*, (253-254)

οὐκ εἰσακούετ᾽; οὐχ ὁρᾶθ᾽ ἑκηβόλων

τόξων πτερωτὰς γλυφίδας ἐξορμωμένας.

ἆ ἆ·

τί δῆτα μέλλετ᾽; ἐξακρίζετ᾽ αἰθέρα

πτεροῖς· τὰ Φοίβου δ᾽ αἰτιᾶσθε θέσφατα.

ἔα·

τί χρῆμ᾽ ἀλύω, πνεῦμ᾽ ἀνεὶς ἐκ πλευμόνων;

ποῖ ποῖ ποθ᾽ ἡλάμεσθα δεμνίων ἄπο;

ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὖθις αὖ γαλήν᾽ ὁρῶ.

(*speaking to an imaginary attendant*) Give me my bow

Horn, gift of Loxias! Apollo told me to keep off the

Goddesses with it if they should frighten me with raving madness. Some

Goddess is going to be struck by a mortal hand if she

Doesn't move out of my sight! Aren't you listening? Don't

You see the feathered arrows darting from my far-shooting bow?

No, no! No more delaying! Mount up to the upper air

With your wings: it's Phoebus' oracles you should blame!

(*returning to sanity*) But what is this? 1'm raving and

Out of breath. Where ever have I leapt to from my bed?

After the storm waves I once more see calm.[371]

4.8.1. The characteristic features of Orestes' madness

Like his counterpart in Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Euripides' Orestes also exhibits certain characteristic features when he becomes demented. The characteristic features of Orestes' madness, though not in any particular order, include but are not limited to the following:

[371] Euripides, *Orestes*, (268-279)

i. Eumenides are the orchestrators of his madness[372]

ii. Perception of bloody-faced snaky maidens [373]

iii. Foamy around his mouth[374]

iv. Foamy in his eyes [375]

v. Unkempt hair[376]

vi. Continuous slumbering [377]

vii. Without food or bathing[378]

viii. Expression of hallucinatory characteristics[379]

ix. Engagement in self-neglect [380]

x. Intermittent sanity and insanity[381]

xi. Blurred vision [382]

4.8.2. The purpose of Orestes' madness

It is appropriate to intimate that Orestes' madness did serve a variety of purposes in terms of the theme of the plot and its development, and in terms of the psyche of the Greek audience. In the first place, Euripides uses Orestes' madness to espouse his notion of madness. By this, the poet advocates the view that Orestes, like other heroes, recovers from the madness that is wrought on him by the gods. The Eumenides are the cause of his madness. Secondly, Euripides uses Orestes' madness to instil in the psyche of the Athenian audience that matricide is an abominable deed

[372] Cf. (38)
[373] Cf. (255f.)
[374] Cf. (219)
[375] *ibid*
[376] Cf. (223)
[377] Cf. (133ff.)
[378] Cf. (40)
[379] Let me go! You are one of my Erinyes and have grasped me about the waist to hurl me into Tartarus! (Cf. (264f.), Euripides' *Orestes*)
[380] cf. (232f.)
[381] Cf. (41ff.)
[382] Cf. (222f.)

and advocates the view that the derangement the hero suffers is a consequence of that act of unnatural cruelty. Besides, Euripides exploits the theme of Orestes' madness as the main vehicle upon which the development of other dialogues (for example, Helen's interaction with Electra, Orestes' and Electra's dialogue, Menelaus' and Orestes' conversation and Tyndareus' and Orestes' dialogue) are all built. This invariably underscores the importance of Orestes' madness not only to the development of other themes, but also to the progress of the entire plot. In support of the preceding view is the dramatic importance of Orestes madness: it will have to take a genius of a poet (barring the audiences' knowledge of the traditional story) like Euripides to enact a madness in which the hallucinatory marauders (the Eumenides/Erinyes) are perceived by only Orestes with its concomitant effect of not only arousing the emotions of pity and fear but also to help the audience attain a *katharsis*. Furthermore, it is apparent that Euripides uses Orestes' madness first to ridicule the Greek myth surrounding Apollo's command that Orestes should retaliate against the murder of his father, and second, to satirise the deity's instruction virtually as an unreasonable one.[383] In comparison to Euripides' Heracles and in furtherance of the prior view, Brooke Holmes also notes:

> In *Heracles*, the dissonance that is characteristic of Euripidean tragedy reaches a new level. In turn, discussions of the play amplify the ongoing debate about the relevance of contemporary Athenian intellectual culture to Euripides' creative output: the tragedy is either a pious playwright's affirmation of traditional theology or a sophist's critique of the gods and myth.[384]

The import of the preceding view is given further impetus by David Kovacs when he avers:

[383] This perspective is exhibited in a dialogue between Orestes and Menelaus (410ff., (425) and refer also to Tyndareus' conversation with Menelaus, (491ff.) as well as Orestes' admission of it in a dialogue with Electra, (278ff. and 1073). The reader can also refer to Euripides' *Ion* in the prologue given by Hermes and in the dialogue between Ion and Creusa (234-361 and 218ff.); in the *Electra,* the poet makes Orestes refer to Apollo's command to murder his mother, Clytemnestra, as foolish. (962ff.).

[384] Brooke Holmes. (2008). "Euripides' Heracles in the Flesh." *Classical Antiquity*. 27(2). p.232

> To others it has seemed that Euripides was depicting a morally bankrupt world, where violence and treachery rule and where the gods, so far from bringing order, contribute to the disorder, a comment, perhaps, on the poet's own times.[385]

Finally, it ought to be understood that although Euripides does not use Orestes' madness to consciously advocate for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions/purposes, my thesis does and that for me is equally important.

4.9. A critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes

If the madness that befalls Orestes is construed as punishment for the murder of his mother, then it is non-tragic. Thus, once Orestes seeks to avenge himself, then it is more consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle, hence non-tragic. "But Orestes", notes David M. Rein, "was no mere puppet of the gods. He had his own reasons, too, for killing his mother."[386] In the first place, when Electra notes or states that Orestes is whirled in madness by the blood of his mother (36ff.), a measure that is orchestrated by the Eumenides, she is reinforcing the view that the hero's madness is a punishment for a wrong done. This view is further corroborated by Tyndareus in heated exchanges with Orestes when he retorts:

> ἓν δ᾽ οὖν λόγοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς ὁμορροθεῖ·
> μισῇ γε πρὸς θεῶν καὶ τίνεις μητρὸς δίκας,
> μανίαις ἀλαίνων καὶ φόβοις.
> One fact, at any rate, supports my argument: you are
> Clearly hated by the gods and are paying the penalty for
> Your mother's death by wandering about in fits of madness
> And terror.[387]

[385] David Kovacs. (2002). "Rationalism, Naive and Malign, In Euripides' *Orestes.*" In Miller, J.F.et al.(eds.) '*Vertis in Usum'.* Studies in Honour of Edward Courtney. p. 277.
[386] David M. Rein. (1954)." Orestes and Electra in Greek Literature". *American Imago*. 11(1). p. 36.
[387] Euripides, *Orestes*, (530-532) See also lines (533ff.).

When we subject the above extract to a strict critique, it is obvious that Orestes suffers madness as a punishment for killing his mother, a kind of *nemesis* that is wrought on him by the gods. This apart, it ought to be stated that Tyndareus's admonition and condemnation of Orestes after the deed has been done[388] has attracted a variety of legal or ethical commentaries, literary criticisms and judgments. J.R. Porter as cited by Adele C. Scafuro concludes:

> Tyndareus is neither the 'hypocrite' nor the 'reasonable old dicast' that earlier scholars have perceived; he is less a 'stern guardian of antique virtue' and 'more the sophistic rhetor.' Indeed, Porter reaches these conclusions from an analysis of Tyndareus' speech as a progression of rhetorical *topoi* that can be paralleled from the Attic orators of the fifth and fourth centuries. The heart of Tyndareus' case, he claims, is his 'reliance upon *nomos'*.[389]

Scafuro further cites Flashar who considers the legal undertones and implications of Tyndareus' vituperative against Orestes:

> If indeed Draco's law as we have it furnished provisions for both intentional and unintentional killers, then one could conceivably maintain…that Euripides anachronistically alludes to that law when Tyndareus identifies the procedure that Orestes should have followed (500–503).[390]

Following from the preceding view Scafuro herself discounts a charge of homicide against Orestes as irrelevant to the legal scenario of the play.[391] F. S. Naiden, in my view, presents a more compelling scenario, treason tried by *eisangelia* (impeachment) where Orestes is not charged with murder for the following reasons:

> (i) he is not likewise charged with the murder of Aegisthus (so we must infer a different charge); (ii) Pylades helped out with the murder and is not charged (so homicide is not an issue); (iii) there are two Assembly meetings: at the first (756, 884–887), Orestes is put under arrest but guilt and penalty are not decided until the second (unlike a trial for a dike *phonou*); (iv) he is not permitted to purify himself nor to flee into exile before the verdict

[388] Euripides, *Orestes*, (491-543)
[389] Adele A. Scafuro. (2019). "Justifying murder and Rejecting Revenge". *Poet and Orator. A Symbiotic Relationship in Democratic Athens.* (eds). Andreas Markantonatos and Eleni Volonaki. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH). p. 186.
[390] *Ibid*. (p. 187)
[391] *Ibid*.

> is given (as in a dike *phonou*) but is kept under arrest (as in cases of *eisangelia*); (v) he is not tried by a lawcourt but by an Assembly (as in some cases of *eisangelia*); and (vi) the speeches in the Assembly do not focus on any particular charge though one (depicted by Talthybius) claims that Orestes has established laws about parents that are not good (893–893). The charge is tantamount to 'taking the law into his own hands'.[392]

The latter part of Naiden's assessment of the charge makes Orestes guilty of committing such an abominable deed. Thus, if based upon the foregoing evidence Orestes should suffer madness then it is justifiable, a measure that is not only consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle, but also makes the madness he suffers based upon these prevailing circumstances non-tragic.

4.10. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes

Orestes' decision to commit the deed is influenced by both the interplay of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, which constitutes the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological phenomena, which focuses on one's environmental influences in one's personality development. It is on this account that this section of my study integrates the two phenomena in the interpretation and the critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes.

In the first place, Orestes' desire to avenge himself and his father is a characteristic function of the *Id*. Secondly, since the deed committed is construed as unnatural cruelty, the gods functioning as the *Superego* (an ethical restraint) come in to make Orestes mad. Finally, and as already observed, although Euripides' Orestes' recovery from his madness is an erratic one, he still demonstrates proof of full sanity in his subsequent dialogues and pronouncements. This is evidenced in his dialogue with Electra (221ff.), Menelaus (356ff.) and Tyndareus (544ff.), where he demonstrates a stable mind devoid of the imaginary harassment of the Eumenides. Thus,

[392]F.S. Naiden. (2010), 'The Legal and Other Trials of Orestes', in: E.M. Harris/D. Leão/P.J. Rhodes (eds.), *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece*, London, 61–76. For further details on the preceding view, see Francis M. Dunn. (1989). *Comic and Tragic License in Euripides' Orestes* (California: The Regents of The University Of California). pp.239-251.

Orestes' demonstration of a stable mind in a dialogue with the preceding characters is a typical function of the *Ego*. Therefore, once the interplay of the *Id, Superego* and *Ego* in the critique of Orestes' madness indicates that the hero's misfortune is a deserving one, it makes his madness a non-tragic one.

From the Socio-Psychological perspective, the view ought to be accepted that the societal influences which form part of Orestes' orientation, motivate the hero to commit the deed. This view is substantiated by Z. Theodorou when he succinctly captures:

> Madness and emotion could be said to share, to a certain extent, their definition as kinds of human response to influences from their environment… Both tragedians handled their material in such a way as to demonstrate how the strong pressures of familial or social influences can lead to mental disturbance.[393]

This first evidence to buttress the preceding view is seen in the Chorus' response to Electra when Orestes had committed the deed: "It was Justice."[394] The second evidence derives from Orestes himself, when he passionately claims:

> πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ δ᾽ ἔτικτε παῖς,
> τὸ σπέρμ᾽ ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦσ᾽ ἄλλου πάρα·
> ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ᾽ ἄν.
> ἐλογισάμην οὖν τῷ γένους ἀρχηγέτῃ
> μᾶλλόν με φῦναι τῆς ὑποστάσης τροφάς.
> My father engendered me, and my mother, plough-
> Land receiving the seed from another, gave me birth.
> Without a father there could never be a child. I reckoned
> That I should come to the defence of the author of my begetting

[393] Z. Theodorou. (1993). "Subject to Emotion: Exploring Madness in Orestes". *The Classical Quarterly*. (Cambridge University Press). 43(1). p. 32.
[394] Euripides, *Orestes*, (194)

Rather than of her who gave me nourishment.[395]

The third view which motivates Orestes to revenge comes from the Messenger, who in his report to Electra on the verdict of the assembly attributes the following speech to Orestes:

πάλαι Πελασγοί, Δαναΐδαι δεύτερον,
ὑμῖν ἀμύνων οὐδὲν ἧσσον ἢ πατρὶ
ἔκτεινα μητέρ᾽. εἰ γὰρ ἀρσένων φόνος
ἔσται γυναιξὶν ὅσιος, οὐ φθάνοιτ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἂν
θνήσκοντες, ἢ γυναιξὶ δουλεύειν χρεών·
It was in defence of you
No less than my father that I killed my mother. For if it is
Allowable for women to kill their menfolk, you had better
Hurry up and die or you must be slaves to women.[396]

In effect, because Orestes' desire to avenge himself was motivated by certain social influences and considerations without credence to the effect or the appropriateness of the deed, it makes the madness that is wrought on him a deserving one—hence non-tragic.

4.11. A critique of the tragic madness of Orestes

Having advanced arguments and evidence for Orestes' non-tragic madness, it is now imperative to turn our attention to the tragic aspect of the hero's madness. As already argued, tragic madness comes about when the misfortune or the madness that befalls the hero is undeserving or when we see a witting or unwitting exploitation of the hero's weaknesses or desires to his or her detriment. Accordingly, this part of my study explores the arguments or conditions under which Orestes' madness becomes tragic. To execute that, I shall start by giving a summary of the development

[395] Euripides, *Orestes*, (552-556)
[396] Euripides, *Orestes*, (933-937)

of the plot as I provide along the line a critique of the relevant conditions under which Orestes' madness becomes a tragic one.

The plot of Euripides' *Orestes* opens with a prologue delivered by Electra. She gives the various generations of their lineage up to their time, describes how Orestes is pining away with madness after he had killed their mother and recounts how Argos had decreed their death as they wait in earnest for Menelaus' intervention (1-70). Electra's musings are punctuated by Helen, who empathises with the two siblings, but also impresses upon Electra to offer libation on her behalf on Clytemnestra's tomb. Electra declines Helen's entreaties, and Hermione (Helen's daughter) is made to undertake that task (71-124). At the end of the dialogue, Electra chastises Helen—the Chorus then engage Electra in a conversation with the sole purpose of ascertaining the state of Orestes' madness. Electra and the Chorus sympathise with the misfortune that had befallen Orestes (125-190). From lines 191ff. Electra accuses Apollo of compelling them to commit the abominable deed of killing their mother.

What is important about this claim as far as my study is concerned, is the view that it sets the tone for the exculpation of Orestes, hence undeserving of the madness that befalls him. Meanwhile, the Chorus oppose the view of Electra by arguing that what Orestes did should be construed as justice (194)—a view we have already admitted under the non-tragic perspective of the hero's madness. As the expression of these opposing views on the murder of Clytemnestra continues, Orestes who had been slumbering all this while as a result of the effect of the madness, awakes—a dialogue ensues between him and Electra—his speech smacks of one who has recovered from a mind demented (211ff.). Unfortunately, Orestes' recovery is short-lived as he exhibits traits of madness once again (255ff.). Orestes appears to convalesce again from his

madness (277ff.)—a dialogue ensues between the two siblings—they pledge their support to each other and express the value of remaining alive (280-315).

In the intervening time, the Chorus sing a stasimon in which they first reiterate the role of the goddesses of madness in making Orestes mad and second, entreat them to put from the hero's mind his raving madness (316-347). By the end of the stasimon, the Chorus behold the arrival of Menelaus, who without hesitation demands to see Orestes; Orestes identifies himself; a dialogue arises between the two; the hero's uncle chastises him for having committed the abominable deed; Orestes lays the blame on Phoebus Apollo (348-426). It is important to critique Orestes' response: "…is Phoebus, who ordered me to murder my mother."[397] Apollo's command to Orestes is a testament to the hero's involuntariness in the actualisation of the deed. This further tends to reinforce Aristotle's view that such agents act out of compulsion.[398] It is therefore instructive to cite beforehand Menelaus' statement: "The intelligent regard all actions done from compulsion as slavish".[399] In the same dialogue between Menelaus and Orestes, the latter utters an important response to the former's question, which furthers the tragic madness argument:

Μενέλαος:

τί χρῆμα πάσχεις; τίς σ᾽ ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος;

Ὀρέστης:

ἡ σύνεσις, ὅτι σύνοιδα δείν᾽ εἰργασμένος.

Menelaus

What is wrong with you? What malady is destroying you?

Orestes

[397] Euripides, *Orestes*, (416)

[398]This situation is what Aristotle considers as constituting an involuntary act and is the basis upon which pity and pardon are hinged. He clarifies an involuntary act as an act done in ignorance, or if not in ignorance, outside the agent's control, or under compulsion. (cf. Chapter Two, p.71, Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics,* (1135a28-b18)

[399] Euripides, *Orestes*, (488)

Understanding: the awareness that I have done dreadful things.[400]

In E. P. Coleridge's[401] and David Konstan's[402] translations, *σύνεσις* is used to connote Orestes' *conscience* that was pricked after the deed had been done, an indication or an affirmation of the tragic madness argument. It is on this account that I argue that the madness that is wrought on Orestes is an undeserving one—a condition which is not inconsistent with the *hamartia* principle. In the next half of the dialogue between Menelaus and Orestes, an attempt (as Euripides noted) is made on both sides to impute unreasonableness as a kind of condemnation to Apollo's command—Orestes requests Menelaus to intervene on his behalf as the city desires to stone him to death (417-455). During this conversation, Tyndareus bursts onto the scene, Orestes expresses timidity and remorse for having killed his mother, Clytemnestra; Tyndareus rather demands to see Menelaus (459-475). In furtherance of the argument for the tragic madness of Orestes coupled with the hero's display of remorse due to the heinousness of the deed at this juncture makes John R. Porter's observation of Euripides' portrayal of Orestes in contrast to his predecessor, instructive:

> Euripides takes up the tale from this point, contemplating it from the perspective of his own day (in contrast to the Homeric stance adopted by his predecessor) and with his own particular sensitivity to psychological processes. The result is an examination of the hero's emotional state once the initial flush of success has faded and he is forced to reflect on the nature of his deed.[403]

Subsequently, a dialogue ensues between Menelaus and Tyndareus in which the former sympathises with Orestes' misfortune, the latter condemns the hero's deed and holds him squarely accountable not only for his impending doom (stoning to death), but also the fits of

[400] Euripides, *Orestes*, (395-396)
[401] Euripides, *Orestes*, (Trans., E. P. Coleridge). (Line, 396).
[402] David Konstan. (2016). "Did Orestes Have a Conscience?" Another look at *Sunesis* in Euripides' Orestes", (eds.) Poulheria Kyriakou and Antonios Rengakos. *Wisdom and Folly in Euripides.* (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter). pp. 229-240.
[403] John R. Porter. (1994). *Studies in Euripides' Orestes*. (New York: E.J. Brill: Leiden). p.9.

madness that had befallen him (476-540). After a short ode by the Chorus, Orestes rises to give a fitting response to Tyndareus by providing an appropriate defense for committing the deed (544-604). Orestes' poignant response to Tyndareus demands our attention because it borders on the argument for the tragic madness of the hero. He proclaims:

> τί χρῆν με δρᾶσαι; δύο γὰρ ἀντίθες δυοῖν:
> πατὴρ μὲν ἐφύτευσέν με, σὴ δ᾽ ἔτικτε παῖς,
> τὸ σπέρμ᾽ ἄρουρα παραλαβοῦσ᾽ ἄλλου πάρα:
> ἄνευ δὲ πατρὸς τέκνον οὐκ εἴη ποτ᾽ ἄν.
> ἐλογισάμην οὖν τῷ γένους ἀρχηγέτῃ
> μᾶλλόν με φῦναι τῆς ὑποστάσης τροφάς.
> My father engendered me, and my mother, plough-
> Land receiving the seed from another, gave me birth.
> Without a father there could never be a child. I reckoned
> That I should come to the defence of the author of my begetting
> Rather than of her who gave me nourishment.[404]

> Αἴγισθος ἦν ὁ κρυπτὸς ἐν δόμοις πόσις.
> τοῦτον κατέκτειν᾽, ἐπὶ δ᾽ ἔθυσα μητέρα,
> ἀνόσια μὲν δρῶν, ἀλλὰ τιμωρῶν πατρί.
> Aegisthus was her secret husband in the house.
> Him I killed, and after that made a sacrifice of my mother,
> Doing an unholy act, to be sure, but avenging my father.[405]

> πρὸς θεῶν — ἐν οὐ καλῷ μὲν ἐμνήσθην θεῶν,

[404] Euripides, *Orestes*, (551-556)
[405] Euripides, *Orestes*, (561-563)

φόνον δικάζων· εἰ δὲ δὴ τὰ μητέρος
σιγῶν ἐπήνουν, τί μ᾽ ἂν ἔδρασ᾽ ὁ κατθανών;
οὐκ ἄν με μισῶν ἀνεχόρευ᾽ Ἐρινύσιν
In the gods' name—it is untimely of me to mention the
Gods, who sit in judgment over murder, but still—if I had
Acquiesced in my mother's actions, what would the dead
Man have done to me? Would he not hate me, and would
Not *his* Erinyes be making me leap about?[406]

ὁρᾷς δ᾽ Ἀπόλλων᾽, ὃς μεσομφάλους ἕδρας
ναίων βροτοῖσι στόμα νέμει σαφέστατον,
ᾧ πειθόμεσθα πάνθ᾽ ὅσ᾽ ἂν κεῖνος λέγῃ·
τούτῳ πιθόμενος τὴν τεκοῦσαν ἔκτανον.
Do you see Apollo, who dwells in his sanctuary at the
Earth's navel and gives utterance most reliable to mortals,
And whom we obey in all he says? It was in obedience to
Him that I killed my mother.[407]

The above extracts elicit three fundamental bases upon which Orestes' madness becomes a tragic one. In the first place, we see an exploitation of the hero's weakness that is borne out of his desire for vengeance. In the scheme of my thesis, this exploitation comes about as the deity only gives an imprimatur or endorses a notion the hero would have perceived in the subconscious as a result of Psychoanalytic gratification (especially, the *Id*) and certain Socio-Psychological influences. Secondly, the rationale behind the actualisation of the deed is a selfless one; he does it to honour his late father: Agamemnon had been brutally murdered by the hero's

[406] Euripides, *Orestes*, (579-580)
[407] Euripides, *Orestes*, (591-594)

mother and her paramour, Aegisthus. Finally, he acts in obedience to Apollo who is a superior potentate; disobedience of him could yield devastating consequences for the hero. It is on these accounts that the madness wrought on him by the Eumenides is an undeserving one, hence his madness becomes a tragic one.

Meanwhile, when Tyndareus exits the scene, Orestes persistently entreats Menelaus to save his life from the city's intended desire to stone him to death. Menelaus agrees but cowardly advises that that could not have been done by the force of strength (630-716). Menelaus' disposition attracts vituperation from Orestes (717ff.); Pylades arrives, and a dialogue ensues between the two friends; both condemn Menelaus' cowardice and pledge support to each other as Orestes expresses his readiness to meet his fate before the Argives (729-806). In the intervening time, the Chorus give a stasimon in which they first recount the ill-omened story of the house of Atreus, and second, tell us how Clytemnestra admonished her son not to kill her and finally, inform us of how the deed led to Orestes becoming mad (807-843). At the end of this ode, the dialogue that arises between Electra and the Chorus is punctuated by the arrival of a Messenger, who brings the report of the ill-trial of Orestes, who has been condemned to death (844-955). When the Messenger's speech comes to an end, the Chorus give a stasimon in which they sympathise first with the fate of Electra, and second, express the precariousness of being human. Electra does the same as she bemoans her fate and recounts also how disaster have run through their family (956-1012).

In the meantime, Orestes arrives, a dialogue ensues between Electra and the hero; both bemoan their misfortune of death penalty imposed upon them by the Argives; they resolve to kill themselves—the atmosphere is sombre (1013-1068). Pylades joins the two as they bemoan their misfortune—he shows his readiness to identify with Orestes' misfortune (1069ff.). This solemn

atmosphere takes a new turn when they plan to harm Menelaus by killing Helen, since he did not advocate for the acquittal of Orestes (1099); they provide the rationale for their decision (1131ff.). Orestes does not only express his desire to kill Helen, but also shows his desire to live if that were possible (1155ff.). It was on this account that Electra joins the conversation—they all plan and agree that Hermione be taken hostage and threaten Menelaus to intervene on their behalf, else she would be killed (1177-1352). When Electra leaves the scene, the Chorus engage a Phrygian in a dialogue; the Barbarian spins a winding tale about the intrigues that transpire between Helen and Orestes leading to her abduction and subsequent vanishing; the abductors then turn their wrath on Hermione (1353-1500). At the end of this episode, Orestes comes out of the house, he engages the Phrygian; threatens to kill him, but finally allows him to go scot free (1505-1545). It was at this time that Menelaus arrives at the house, he accosts Orestes with the sole aim of rescuing his daughter, Hermione from Orestes and his accomplices. Subsequently, heated exchanges transpire between them; Orestes demands Menelaus to intervene on their behalf; the latter declines; the former threatens to raze the house to the ground (1554-1624). Amid this misunderstanding, Apollo emerges unto the scene via a *deus ex machina* and resolves all the problems confronting Orestes, Menelaus, Pylades and Electra. The Chorus give the Exode (1625-1693).

4.12. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the tragic madness of Orestes

This section of my study considers not only how the interaction of the Psychoanalytic theory, which constitutes the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*, plays up in the interpretation and critique of the tragic madness of Orestes, but also how the Socio-psychological theory does the same in the interpretation and critique of the tragic madness of the hero. To start with, it is important to understand that when Orestes expresses a desire to avenge his father (546ff., 576ff.), that was the

characteristic function of the *Id*. Orestes' desire should be construed as a weakness that is exploited by Apollo to the hero's detriment. However, because the Eumenides interpret the deed as unnatural cruelty and functioning as moral restraint, they make Orestes mad, which is the typical function of the *Superego*. It also ought to be understood that, when Orestes recovers from his madness, the pronouncements he makes (211ff., 275ff., 380ff., 459ff.) indicate that he is no longer demented, and this is the typical function of the *Ego*.[408] Finally, the fundamental argument is that Orestes' desire to avenge his father is not only Apollo's exploitation of the hero's weakness, but also an uncompromising order that he must obey. It makes the madness that is wrought on him an undeserving one hence, tragic.

Orestes belonged to a society that believed that a son's duty to avenge a murdered father, much more a king, was a divine obligation (194) that one reneged at devastating consequences (575-580). This situation did not exclude the people's belief in their gods and the reliability of their utterances in the socio-religious lives of the society (584ff.). Consequently, Orestes, on one hand, claims that it was on the account of his father that he suffers unjustly (1225). On another, Apollo's proclamation that Orestes' relation with the city shall be set to rights, since he is the one who compelled the hero to kill his mother (1660-1665), then it is nothing more than a reinforcement of the preceding views. Thus, since Orestes commits the deed under these Socio-Psychological factors and influences, the madness that he suffers is not only an undeserving one, but equally a tragic one.

4.13. Euripides' portrayal of the madness of Pentheus

The Bacchae is the only extant play of Euripides that deals with the adventures of Dionysus. The protagonist, Pentheus, comes into conflict with Dionysus because of ideological differences,

[408] For further details on Orestes' madness from a Psychoanalytic perspective see David M. Rein, (1954), "Orestes and Electra in Greek Tragedy". *American Imago*. 11(1). pp. 33-50.

which culminate in disaster for the hero. This dramatic tension between internal and external motivation (Pentheus not an exception) is the rationale behind Anna Lamari's definition of madness in tragedy as she notes:

> In Greek tragedy madness is symbolic, transient, relating to the mad person's connection to the community or the gods, and deriving from specific actions performed either by the suffering character or by others.[409]

It is upon this protracted conflict that Euripides develops not only his plot, but also the character and most importantly, the portrayal of the madness of Pentheus.

To start with, as in his *Heracles* and the *Orestes*, where the gods are the orchestrators of the madness of the heroes, Euripides portrays Dionysus as the cause of the madness that Pentheus suffers. Dionysus thus announces to the Chorus of Oriental women:

> τεισώμεθ᾽ αὐτόν. πρῶτα δ᾽ ἔκστησον φρενῶν,
> ἐνεὶς ἐλαφρὰν λύσσαν· ὡς φρονῶν μὲν εὖ
> οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν,
> ἔξω δ᾽ ἐλαύνων τοῦ φρονεῖν ἐνδύσεται.
> Let us be revenged on him! And first
> Fill him with wild delusions, drive him out of his mind.
> While sane, he'll not consent to put on woman's clothes;
> Once free from the curb of reason, he will put them
> on.[410]

Besides, when Dionysus befuddles the mind of Pentheus for him to put on a woman's garb, the hero's mind becomes fully demented, and he demonstrates it:

---

[409] Anna Lamari. (2016). "Madness Narrative in Euripides' *Bacchae*". *Wisdom and Folly in Euripides.* (eds.) Poulheria Kyriakou and Antonios Rengakos. (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter). p.242.

[410]Euripides. (1964). *The Bacchae*. (Trans., P. Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.). (850-853)
(**N**.**B**. Unless otherwise stated, translations of Euripides' *Bacchae* come from Philip Vellacott's.)

καὶ μὴν ὁρᾶν μοι δύο μὲν ἡλίους δοκῶ,

δισσὰς δὲ Θήβας καὶ πόλισμ᾽ ἑπτάστομον·

καὶ ταῦρος ἡμῖν πρόσθεν ἡγεῖσθαι δοκεῖς

καὶ σῷ κέρατα κρατὶ προσπεφυκέναι.

ἀλλ᾽ ἦ ποτ᾽ ἦσθα θήρ; τεταύρωσαι γὰρ οὖν.

Why, now! I seem to see two suns; a double Thebes;

Our city's wall with seven gates appears double.

You are a bull I see leading me forward now;

A pair of horns seems to have grown upon your head.

Were you a beast before? You have become a bull.[411]

It is worthy to add that Euripides portrays the madness that Pentheus suffers as emanating from the machination of Dionysus, and construes that as a punishment for a wrong committed. This is variously portrayed in the speeches of Dionysus and the Chorus. Dionysus strongly states:

χρήζω δέ νιν γέλωτα Θηβαίοις ὀφλεῖν

γυναικόμορφον ἀγόμενον δι᾽ ἄστεως

ἐκ τῶν ἀπειλῶν τῶν πρίν, αἷσι δεινὸς ἦν.

I long to set Thebes laughing at him, as he walks

In female garb through all the streets; to humble him

From the arrogance he showed when first he threatened

me.[412]

To buttress the preceding extract which construes Pentheus' madness as punishment for a wrong committed, the Chorus in an Antistrophe also strongly make this claim:

ὁρμᾶται μόλις, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως

πιστόν τι τὸ θεῖον

[411] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (918-922)

[412] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (854-856)

σθένος· ἀπευθύνει δὲ βροτῶν
τούς τ᾽ ἀγνωμοσύναν τιμῶν-
τας καὶ μὴ τὰ θεῶν αὔξον-
τας σὺν μαινομένᾳ δόξᾳ.
κρυπτεύουσι δὲ ποικίλως
δαρὸν χρόνου πόδα καὶ
θηρῶσιν τὸν ἄσεπτον.
Slow, yet unfailing, move the Powers
Of heaven with the moving hours.
When mind runs mad, dishonours God,
And worships self and senseless pride,
Then Law eternal wields the rod.
Still Heaven hunts down the impious man,
Though divine subtlety may hide
Time's creeping foot.[413]

Like Euripides' Heracles and Orestes, who convalesce from their madness, Pentheus also recovers from his demented mind. This is evidenced in the Messenger's report to the Chorus:

ὑψοῦ δὲ θάσσων ὑψόθεν χαμαιριφὴς
πίπτει πρὸς οὖδας μυρίοις οἰμώγμασιν
Πενθεύς· κακοῦ γὰρ ἐγγὺς ὢν ἐμάνθανεν.
πρώτη δὲ μήτηρ ἦρξεν ἱερέα φόνου
καὶ προσπίτνει νιν· ὃ δὲ μίτραν κόμης ἄπο
ἔρριψεν, ὥς νιν γνωρίσασα μὴ κτάνοι
τλήμων Ἀγαύη, καὶ λέγει, παρηίδος
ψαύων· Ἐγώ τοι, μῆτερ, εἰμί, παῖς σέθεν

[413] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (882-890)

Πενθεύς, ὃν ἔτεκες ἐν δόμοις Ἐχίονος·
οἴκτιρε δ᾽ ὦ μῆτέρ με, μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμαῖς
ἁμαρτίαισι παῖδα σὸν κατακτάνῃς.
Then from his high perch plunging,
crushing
To the earth Pentheus fell, with one incessant scream
As he understood what end was near.
His mother first,
As priestess, led the rite of death, and fell upon him.
He tore the headband from his hair, that his wretched
Mother
Might recognize him and not kill him. 'Mother,' he
cried,
Touching her cheek, 'It is I, your own son Pentheus,
whom
You bore to Echion. Mother, have mercy; I have sinned,
But I am still your own son. Do not take my life![414]

Thus, it ought to be understood that all this while, when Pentheus' mind had become demented, he was not conscious of his environment as he was being led surreptitiously by Dionysus to the slaughterhouse. The moment he becomes conscious of his environment was the exact time he was about to be killed by his own mother. The emotional pleadings he puts before his mother are indicative of a recovered mind, because as the Messenger claims, his assailants had all become demented by Dionysus as they commit the deed.[415]

[414] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (1111-1121)
[415] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (1122ff.)

4.13.1. The characteristic features of Pentheus' madness

Like his counterparts Heracles and Orestes in *Heracles* and *Orestes* respectively, Euripides' Pentheus also exhibits certain characteristic features when his mind becomes demented. The characteristic features of Pentheus' madness, though not in any particular order, include but are not limited to the following:

i. Panted with rage[416]

ii. Dripping with sweat and biting of lips[417]

iii. Filled with wild delusions[418]

iv. Garbed in women clothes[419]

v. Perceives two suns, a double Thebes and a double seven gates of Thebes.[420]

vi. Perceived Dionysus as a bull[421]

vii. Perceived Dionysus with a pair of grown horns on his head[422]

viii. Mimicked the standing posturing of Ino and Agauë [423]

ix. Tossed head up and down[424]

x. Held thyrsus in his hand[425]

xi. Intended to carry Mount Cithaeron on his shoulders[426]

xii. Processed through the central streets of Thebes demented[427]

---

[416] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (620)
[417] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (621)
[418] Euripides, *The Bacchae,* (851
[419]Euripides, *The Bacchae,* (852)
[420] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (919)
[421] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (920)
[422] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (921f.)
[423] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (925)
[424] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (930f.)
[425] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (941f.)
[426] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (946f.)
[427] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (961f.)

4.13.2. The purpose of Pentheus' madness

It is an undeniable fact that Euripides' portrayal of Pentheus' madness serves a variety of purposes, with regards to the main theme of the play, the development of the plot and the psyche of the Athenian audience in particular, and the Greek society in general. To start with, Euripides uses Pentheus' madness to reinforce his notion of madness. By that, the gods are the orchestrators of Pentheus' madness and like his counterparts in *Heracles* and *Orestes*, he also recovers. He further uses it to espouse the principle that the madness that the hero suffers, should be construed as a punishment for a wrong committed, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle. Furthermore, Euripides uses Pentheus' madness to implant in the psyche of the Athenian audience in particular, and the Greek society in general, the view that it is imprudent for a mortal to challenge the course of a god, because that would certainly have devastating consequences. Moreover, Euripides uses Pentheus' madness to advocate the principle that those who abet in wrongdoing (Agauë and Ino) are not only partakers in the wrong committed but are also to suffer similar punishment (madness). Moreover, Euripides' use of Pentheus' madness for dramatic purposes cannot be overemphasised. Unlike Heracles' madness which is enacted by Madness and the Messenger, Pentheus dramatises his madness. To perceive *two suns*, *Dionysus as a bull* and with *a pair of grown horns on his head* could not have been more dramatic; such dramatic scenes enhance the tension as far as the object of tragedy is concerned: the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear. Finally, it ought to be understood that although Euripides does not use Pentheus' madness to consciously advocate for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions/purposes, a possible foundation had been laid for its application to my thesis.

4.14. A critique of the non-tragic madness of Pentheus

The principle undergirding the non-tragic aspect of Pentheus' madness is the view that his madness is among other things, a punishment for his obstinacy, his unbridled pride and his unreadiness or unwillingness to accept the godhead of Dionysus. By this, he deserves the madness that befalls him. These views are validated by Pentheus himself, the Chorus and Dionysus. Pentheus first angrily reacts:

> γυναῖκας ἡμῖν δώματ᾽ ἐκλελοιπέναι
> πλασταῖσι βακχείαισιν, ἐν δὲ δασκίοις
> ὄρεσι θοάζειν, τὸν νεωστὶ δαίμονα
> Διόνυσον, ὅστις ἔστι, τιμώσας χοροῖς
> Our women, it seems, have left their homes on some
> pretence
> Of Bacchic worship, and are now gadding about
> On the wooded mountain-slopes, dancing in honour of
> This upstart god Dionysus, whoever he may be.[428]

Pentheus' persistence in not acknowledging the divinity of Dionysus is embedded in the hero's various tirades and his use of certain derogatory remarks about the deity:

> καὶ σφᾶς σιδηραῖς ἁρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσιν
> παύσω κακούργου τῆσδε βακχείας τάχα.
> Once they're fast in iron fetters,
> I'll put a stop to this outrageous Bacchism.[429]
> ἐκεῖνος εἶναί φησι Διόνυσον θεόν,
> ἐκεῖνος ἐν μηρῷ ποτ᾽ ἐρράφθαι Διός,

[428] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (217-220.) For further detail on Pentheus' reaction that incurs Dionysus' anger and the consequent madness the hero suffers, refer to lines (251ff.), (240ff.), (345ff.) and (790f.)
[429] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (231-232)

ὃς ἐκπυροῦται λαμπάσιν κεραυνίαις

σὺν μητρί, Δίους ὅτι γάμους ἐψεύσατο.

ταῦτ᾽ οὐχὶ δεινῆς ἀγχόνης ἔστ᾽ ἄξια,

ὕβρεις ὑβρίζειν, ὅστις ἔστιν ὁ ξένος.

He's the one—this foreigner—

Who says Dionysus is a god; who says he was

Sawn up in Zeus's thigh. The truth about Dionysus

Is that he's dead, burnt to a cinder by lightning

Along with his mother, because she said Zeus lay with

her.

Whoever the man may be, is not his arrogance

An outrage? Has he not earned a rope around his neck?[430]

The foregoing view is further corroborated by Dimitra Kokkini when he remarks:

> Pentheus rejects Dionysos as a false god, a foreigner, someone that makes women give in to their passions under the false pretences of piety.[431]
>
> Now King Pentheus was the one who, with the utmost determination, had resisted every thought and notion of the worship of the new god. When he was informed that a stranger from the east had appeared in the city, who was preaching for the new god, he immediately had him arrested and imprisoned.[432]

Pentheus' ignorance or persistence in not acknowledging Dionysus' divinity is further seen in his response to Cadmus when he snaps:

οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα, βακχεύσεις δ᾽ ἰών,

μηδ᾽ ἐξομόρξῃ μωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἐμοί;

τῆς σῆς δ᾽ ἀνοίας τόνδε τὸν διδάσκαλον

keep your hands off! Go to your Bacchic rites, and don't

[430] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (242-247)
[431] Dimitra Kokkini. (2010). *Euripidean men Revisited*. (London: University College London). p. 208.
[432] Nirvanic Insights (2021). *The Myth of Pentheus and the Vengeance of Dionysus,* https:/www.nirvanicinsights.com

Wipe off your crazy folly on me. But I will punish

This man who has been your instructor in lunacy.[433]

Teiresias, in furtherance of the above view, gives a fitting response to Pentheus' ignorant rantings or persistence in not acknowledging Dionysus' divinity:

ὅταν λάβῃ τις τῶν λόγων ἀνὴρ σοφὸς

καλὰς ἀφορμάς, οὐ μέγ᾽ ἔργον εὖ λέγειν·

σὺ δ᾽ εὔτροχον μὲν γλῶσσαν ὡς φρονῶν ἔχεις,

ἐν τοῖς λόγοισι δ᾽ οὐκ ἔνεισί σοι φρένες.

θράσει δὲ δυνατὸς καὶ λέγειν οἷός τ᾽ ἀνὴρ

κακὸς πολίτης γίγνεται νοῦν οὐκ ἔχων.

When a good speaker has a sound case to present,

Then eloquence is no great feat. Your fluent tongue

Promises wisdom; but the content of your speech

Is ignorant. Power and eloquence in headstrong man

Spell folly; such a man is a peril the state.[434]

The Chorus also give their befitting reaction to the misfortune or the madness that befalls Pentheus in their response to Dionysus:

ὃς ἀδίκῳ γνώμᾳ παρανόμῳ τ᾽ ὀργᾷ

περὶ σὰ Βάκχι᾽, ὄργια ματρός τε σᾶς

μανείσᾳ πραπίδι

παρακόπῳ τε λήματι στέλλεται,

τἀνίκατον ὡς κρατήσων βίᾳ,

γνωμᾶν σωφρόνα θάνατος ἀπροφάσι-

στος ἐς τὰ θεῶν ἔφυ·

[433] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (343-345).

[434] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (266-271).

βροτείως τ᾽ ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος.

See! With contempt of right, with a reckless

rage

To combat your and your mother's mysteries, Bacchus,

With maniac fury out he goes, stark mad,

For a trial of strength against *your* invincible arm!

His proud purposes death shall discipline.

He who unquestioning gives the gods their due,

And knows that his days are as dust, shall live untouched.[435]

The disposition of the Chorus as far as the madness or the disaster that befalls Pentheus is concerned, deserves some discussion. In the first place, I share the view that it is *folly* (μωρία)[436] for a mortal to try its strength against a god. Besides, there are unimaginable consequences, he/she could either be struck by madness *φρενόπληκτος* or be struck to death as punishment for unbridled pride. Moreover, for the Chorus, the gods reward those who submit to the will of the gods. Finally, for the Chorus, there is a correlation between unbridled pride and madness as punishment from the gods.

Furthermore, Dionysus also sets the tone for Pentheus' madness as a befitting punishment emanating from his unbridled pride, when he proclaims:

Κάδμος μὲν οὖν γέρας τε καὶ τυραννίδα

Πενθεῖ δίδωσι θυγατρὸς ἐκπεφυκότι,

ὃς θεομαχεῖ τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ καὶ σπονδῶν ἄπο

ὠθεῖ μ᾽, ἐν εὐχαῖς τ᾽ οὐδαμοῦ μνείαν ἔχει.

ὧν οὕνεκ᾽ αὐτῷ θεὸς γεγὼς ἐνδείξομαι

[435] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (997-1004.)

[436] Also, (μωρία) Silliness, folly, absurdity. H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford Clarendon Press). p. 456.

πᾶσίν τε Θηβαίοισιν.

Now Cadmus has made over his throne and kingly

honours

To Pentheus, son of his eldest daughter Agauë. He

Is a fighter against gods, defies me, excludes me from

Libations, never names in prayers. Therefore I will

Demonstrate to him, and to all Thebes, that I am a god.[437]

Underscoring the extract above is the wanton use of divine power, which is not only characteristic of the *hubristic* principle, but also further makes the madness that befalls the hero a kind of a deserving one. Thus, Pentheus suffers madness because he has committed a wrong against the gods, and in particular Dionysus. Furthermore, in addressing the Chorus, Dionysus angrily retorts:

γυναῖκες, ἀνὴρ ἐς βόλον καθίσταται,

ἥξει δὲ βάκχας, οὗ θανὼν δώσει δίκην.

Διόνυσε, νῦν σὸν ἔργον· οὐ γὰρ εἶ πρόσω·

τεισώμεθ᾽ αὐτόν. πρῶτα δ᾽ ἔκστησον φρενῶν,

ἐνεὶς ἐλαφρὰν λύσσαν· ὡς φρονῶν μὲν εὖ

οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν,

ἔξω δ᾽ ἐλαύνων τοῦ φρονεῖν ἐνδύσεται.

χρήζω δέ νιν γέλωτα Θηβαίοις ὀφλεῖν

γυναικόμορφον ἀγόμενον δι᾽ ἄστεως

ἐκ τῶν ἀπειλῶν τῶν πρίν, αἶσι δεινὸς ἦν.

Women, this man is walking into the net. He will

Visit the Bacchae; and there death shall punish him.

Dionysus! – for you are not far distant – all is now

[437] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (43-48)

In your hands. Let us be revenged on him!

Fill him with wild delusions, drive him out of his mind

While sane, he'll not consent to put on woman's clothes;

Once free from the curb of reason, he will put them

On.

I long to set Thebes laughing at him, as he walks

In female garb through all the streets; to humble him

From the arrogance he showed when first he threatened

me.[438]

The preceding views are also corroborated by H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou when he explains the rationale behind Pentheus' madness:

> Dionysos exacts revenge on…his cousin Pentheus for not believing his mother Semele's claim she had been impregnated by Zeus and for denying his own godhead and therefore not worshipping him.[439]

From the foregoing extracts, it is obviously an acceptable view that Pentheus' madness is to be construed as punishment for a wrong done, either borne out of obstinacy, unbridled pride or his denial of the godhead of Dionysus. Since the evidence and the argument adduced indicate that the madness Pentheus suffers is a justified one, *nemesis* in fact, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, it makes the hero's madness a non-tragic one. On this account, the next sub-topic discusses the circumstances under which the integration of the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological theories make Pentheus' madness a non-tragic one.

[438] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (847-856.)

[439] H. Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. (2009). 'The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι.' *History of Psychiatry*. (Sage Publications). 20(3). p. 316

4.15. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critiquing of the non-tragic madness of Pentheus

It ought to be argued here that Pentheus' desire to be obstinate, display unbridled pride and to oppose the godhead of Dionysus is a characteristic function of the *Id*. Dionysus' decision to make Pentheus mad is also a typical function of the *Superego*. Thus, since the *Superego* functions as ethical restraint, it means Pentheus' madness is a punishment for a wrong committed. Like his counterparts in *Heracles* and *Orestes* respectively, Pentheus also recovers from his madness. The pronouncement that proceeds from the hero before he is killed by his own mother is also a characteristic function of the *Ego*. In other words, the emotional pleadings Pentheus puts before his mother, which are indicative of a mind that has recovered from madness, is a typical function of the *Ego*. Thus, if we interpret Pentheus' madness wrought on him by Dionysus as a wrong committed by the hero, though he recovers, then it is a kind of justice, a *nemesis* in fact. On this account, the madness that Pentheus suffers is not only a deserving punishment but also consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence it is non-tragic.

Moreover, Pentheus' decision to oppose the worship of Dionysus in Thebes because of its indecency[440] and also being at variance to their values[441] as he alleges, makes him exhibit unbridled pride and overstep his bounds as he, unprovoked, abuses and ridicules not only the deity but also his adherents. The underlisted fragments reinforce the foregoing view. Pentheus furiously charges on the Bacchants as he censures:

> ὅσαι δ᾽ ἄπεισιν, ἐξ ὄρους θηράσομαι,
> Ἰνώ τ᾽ Ἀγαύην θ᾽, ἥ μ᾽ ἔτικτ᾽ Ἐχίονι,
> Ἀκταίονός τε μητέρ᾽, Αὐτονόην λέγω.

[440] "Sir, I am ashamed to see two men
Of your age with so little indecency". (Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (251ff.)
[441] Euripides, *The Bacchae,* (215ff.)

καὶ σφᾶς σιδηραῖς ἁρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσιν
παύσω κακούργου τῆσδε βακχείας τάχα.
On the mountain I am going to hunt out; and that
Includes my mother Agauë and her sisters
Ino and Autonoë. Once they're fast in iron fetters,
I'll put a stop to this outrageous Bacchism.[442]

Pentheus further angrily charges:

ἐκεῖνος εἶναί φησι Διόνυσον θεόν,
ἐκεῖνος ἐν μηρῷ ποτ᾽ ἐρράφθαι Διός,
ὃς ἐκπυροῦται λαμπάσιν κεραυνίαις
σὺν μητρί, Δίους ὅτι γάμους ἐψεύσατο.
Who says Dionysus is a god; who says he was
Sewn up in Zeus's thigh. The truth about Dionysus
Is that he's dead, burnt to a cinder by lightning
Along with his mother, because she said Zeus lay with
her.[443]

Pentheus, in giving instructions to his Herdsmen, declares:

ἤδη τόδ᾽ ἐγγὺς ὥστε πῦρ ὑφάπτεται
ὕβρισμα βακχῶν, ψόγος ἐς Ἕλληνας μέγας.
ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ὀκνεῖν δεῖ· στεῖχ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Ἠλέκτρας ἰὼν
πύλας· κέλευε πάντας ἀσπιδηφόρους
ἵππων τ᾽ ἀπαντᾶν ταχυπόδων ἐπεμβάτας
πέλτας θ᾽ ὅσοι πάλλουσι καὶ τόξων χερὶ
ψάλλουσι νευράς, ὡς ἐπιστρατεύσομεν

[442] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (228-232)
[443] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (242-245)

βάκχαισιν· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ᾽ ὑπερβάλλει τάδε,

εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεσθ᾽ ἃ πάσχομεν.

This Bacchic arrogance advances on us like

A spreading fire, disgracing us before all Hellas.

We must act now. Go quickly to

The Electran gate;

Tell all my men who carry shields, heavy or light,

All riders on fast horses, all my archers with

Their twanging bows, to meet me there in readiness

For an onslaught on these maniacs. This is beyond

All bearing, if we must let women so defy us.[444]

From the foregoing extracts, it is evidently clear that Pentheus' desire to obstinately oppose the worship of Dionysus in Thebes is motivated by these Socio-Psychological factors. In this regard, Schoor once again adds:

> … the isolated Pentheus, a king whose role it is to "hold together the house" and the polis, finally a body torn apart and a destroyer of his own household, vividly realize the consequences of the negative of that ideal. Dionysus makes manifest the problem of human desire in the spectacle of resistance and its gradual dissipation.[445]

Since Dionysus construes Pentheus' conduct as a wanton display of unbridled pride, of course, borne out of Socio-Psychological factors as earlier outlined, he punishes him with madness—a measure that is not only consistent with the *hubristic* principle, but also makes his madness a non-tragic one. In effect, owing to these fundamental factors I have discussed, Pentheus is deservedly punished with madness by Dionysus.

[444] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (778-786)

[445] David Jude van Schoor. (2016). *Binding Dionysus: agent person in Euripides' Bacchae*. (University of Zurich).p 19.

4.16. A critique of the tragic madness of Pentheus

This sub-section of my study discusses the conditions or the circumstances under which Pentheus' madness becomes a tragic one. Once again, it is not out of place to forcefully state the conditions or the fundamental circumstances upon which tragic madness arises. The tragic madness comes about when the misfortune or the madness that befalls the hero is not only an undeserving one, but also when we see a witting or unwitting exploitation of the hero's weaknesses or desires to his or her detriment. Consequently, this part of my study also explores the arguments or conditions under which Pentheus' madness becomes tragic. To accomplish this task, I shall start by outlining a summary of the development of the plot as I provide alongside a critique of the relevant circumstances under which Pentheus' madness becomes a tragic one.

To start with, the plot of Euripides' *Bacchae* commences with a prologue given by Dionysus, who refreshes the mind of the audience first, about his bizarre birth. He tells us how Hera tricked her mother as she was consumed in fire and further recounts the numerous journeys he has undertaken. Subsequent to that and most importantly, he tells us of the two main reasons for coming to Thebes: the first being the denial by his mother's sisters that he was not the child of Zeus for which he has been made mad; the second, and most importantly is to demonstrate to Pentheus and the entire Theban population that he is a god (1-63). This is the first time we get a glimpse into the deity's desire to exploit Pentheus' unwitting obstinacy not only to his worship, but also his godhead in Thebes to the detriment of the hero. Dionysus, on this account, says this about Pentheus:

> Κάδμος μὲν οὖν γέρας τε καὶ τυραννίδα
> Πενθεῖ δίδωσι θυγατρὸς ἐκπεφυκότι,
> ὃς θεομαχεῖ τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ καὶ σπονδῶν ἄπο

ὠθεῖ μ᾽, ἐν εὐχαῖς τ᾽ οὐδαμοῦ μνείαν ἔχει.

ὧν οὕνεκ᾽ αὐτῷ θεὸς γεγὼς ἐνδείξομαι

πᾶσίν τε Θηβαίοισιν. ἐς δ᾽ ἄλλην χθόνα

And I must vindicate my mother Semele

By manifesting myself before the human race

As the divine son whom she bore to immortal Zeus.

Now Cadmus has made over his throne and kingly

honours

to Pentheus, son of his eldest daughter Agauë. He

Is a fighter against gods, defies me, excludes me from

Libations, never names me in prayers.[446]

This unconscious manipulation undergirds Lillian Feder's definition of madness as:

> A state in which unconscious processes predominate over conscious ones to the extent that they control them and determine perceptions of and responses to experience that, judged by prevailing standards of logical thought and relevant emotion, are confused and inappropriate.[447]

It is on account of this unwitting exploitation of the hero's weakness that makes the madness he suffers a tragic one. This condition is quite significant because it is consistent with the demands of the *hamartia* principle.

In Strophe I-III and Antistrophe I-III given by the Chorus, who are devotees of Dionysus, they first offer their unwavering support to Dionysus (64-68) and entreat everyone to observe the rites in absolute quietude; they invoke blessings on the adherents of the rites of Dionysus; offer us the myth of the birth of Dionysus; implore all Thebans to join in the worship of Dionysus—a feast that delights the heart of the deity (69-134). In the Epode that follows, we are to know certain rites of Dionysus that pertain to the mountains (135-172). At the end of the Epode, we witness

[446] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (43-48)

[447] Lillian Feder. (1980). *Madness in Literature*. (Princeton University Press). p. 5.

the arrival of Teiresias unto the scene—a dialogue ensues between him and Cadmus. Both express their readiness to join the rites of Dionysus and partake in his worship. This dialogue is truncated by the arrival of Pentheus unto the stage, who in the view of Cadmus, appears agitated (173-214).

From lines (215-327), Pentheus expresses outrage at the presence of the unruly Bacchants, who appear to have taken over his city for which reason he has caused their arrest. Subsequently, he vituperates both the adherents and Dionysus. Pentheus' posturing receives the Chorus' rebuke. After the Chorus' reproach of Pentheus, Teiresias strongly admonishes the hero to submit to the rites of Dionysus. The blind prophet virtually concludes that Pentheus' obstinacy is borne out of a sick mind and that he must be insane to desire a prevention or the obliteration of the celebration of the Bacchic rites. The Chorus applaud Teiresias' admonition to Pentheus (328ff.)—Cadmus also cautions Pentheus not to oppose the rites due to Dionysus as he considers that to be foolishness. Pentheus rejects these rebukes, instructs his guards to destroy Dionysus' fripperies and causes Dionysus' arrest (330-357). It is important to add that both Teiresias' and Cadmus' admonishment and Pentheus' hardened heart are testament to the unwitting exploitation of the hero's desires as earlier alluded to. It is under these conditions that the madness Pentheus suffers becomes a tragic one. The two old men depart the scene and join the celebration of the Bacchic rites (358-369).

This is followed by the Chorus, who sing Strophe I & II and Antistrophe I & II in which they draw the audience's attention, on one hand to Pentheus' blasphemy and the benefits one derives from being a Bacchant, and on another, to sing the deity's praises and to warn of the consequences of unbridled tongue and pride (370-433). The latter part of the Chorus'

proclamation is significant to the analysis and the critique or the interpretation of the tragic madness of Pentheus:

ἀχαλίνων στομάτων
ἀνόμου τ᾽ ἀφροσύνας
τὸ τέλος δυστυχία·
ὁ δὲ τᾶς ἡσυχίας
βίοτος καὶ τὸ φρονεῖν
ἀσάλευτόν τε μένει καὶ
συνέχει δώματα· πόρσω
γὰρ ὅμως αἰθέρα ναίον-
τες ὁρῶσιν τὰ βροτῶν οὐρανίδαι.
τὸ σοφὸν δ᾽ οὐ σοφία
τό τε μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν.
βραχὺς αἰών· ἐπὶ τούτῳ
δέ τις ἂν μεγάλα διώκων
The brash unbridled tongue,
The lawless folly of fools, will end in pain.
But the life of wise content
Is blest with quietness, escapes the storm
And keeps its house secure.
Though blessed gods dwell in the distant skies,
They watch the ways of men.
Pride more than mortal hastens life to its end;
And they who in pride pretend
Beyond man’s limit, will lose what lay

Close to their hand and sure.[448]

The preceding extract is significant because, it marks the second time Pentheus' desire to oppose Dionysus' worship in Thebes, borne out of his unbridled pride, is unwittingly exploited to his detriment. The Chorus' admonishment *τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία* (395), which purports to draw not only a quasi-paradoxical distinction between cleverness and wisdom, but also portrays the view that pride rather hastens mortal life to its end, contextualises Pentheus' action as unwise and a cause of the tragedy that befalls the hero. Suffice it to say that Pentheus is unaware of Dionysus' mission in Thebes. Henceforth, we see an exploitation of the hero's weakness (his opposition to Dionysus) to his detriment. Thus, he has become a pawn in the hands of Dionysus, who intends to make an example not only of him and his mother's sisters, but of all those who oppose his rites. It is this condition that makes the madness that is wrought on him a tragic one.

In the intervening time, some of the guards bring Dionysus as an arrested prisoner to Pentheus' palace (434ff.); he is handed over to the king—a long foreboding and intriguing dialogue ensues between Dionysus and Pentheus (451ff.). In this conversation, Dionysus coaxes Pentheus to anger as he exploits the hero's weakness. Dionysus is consequently incarcerated. In the Strophe, Antistrophe and the Epode given by the Chorus (519-575), they generally question the rationale behind the rejection of Dionysus in the holy ground of Thebes, they question Pentheus' anger and the possible consequences of his action on Dionysus and finally, they call on Olympus to bring the king's violence to a sudden end. It is instructive to argue that Pentheus' proneness to anger is exploited to his detriment. The Chorus are the first to refer to this deficiency of Pentheus and explain how it has been the basis of the hero's opposition to the worship of Dionysus. The Chorus thus react:

[448] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (386-398)

ἔτι σοι τοῦ Βρομίου μελήσει.

οἵαν οἵαν ὀργὰν

γένος ἐκφύς τε δράκοντός

ποτε Πενθεύς, ὃν Ἐχίων

ἐφύτευσε χθόνιος,

ἀγριωπὸν τέρας, οὐ φῶ-

τα βρότειον, φόνιον δ᾽ ὥσ-

τε γίγαντ᾽ ἀντίπαλον θεοῖς·

ὃς ἔμ᾽ ἐν βρόχοισι τὰν τοῦ

Βρομίου τάχα ξυνάψει,

τὸν ἐμὸν δ᾽ ἐντὸς ἔχει δώ-

ματος ἤδη θιασώταν

σκοτίαις κρυπτὸν ἐν εἱρκταῖς…

ἄνα, θύρσον κατ᾽ Ὄλυμπον,

φονίου δ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ὕβριν κατάσχες.

Oh, what anger lies beneath

Pentheus' voice and sullen face-

Offspring of the dragon's teeth,

And Echion's earth-born race,

Brute with bloody jaws agape,

God-defying, gross and grim,

Slander of his human shape!

Soon he'll chain us limb to limb-

Bacchus' servants! Yes, and more:

Even now our comrade lies

Deep on his dark prison floor...touch this murderous man,

And bring his violence to a sudden end![449]

In a response to the request of the Chorus, Dionysus appears in the next scene, what has been called the *palace miracle scene*. Several questions emanate from this important scene of Euripides' *Bacchae* bordering on uncertainties, possible stage ambiguities and even the state of mind of the Chorus. This perspective has been appropriately captured by Raymond K. Fisher when he notes:

> There is a range of opinion on this escape scene, and a number of unresolved questions. The main questions which we need to address, all of which have been answered differently at different times, are: Should we think of the palace miracles as being simply reported or as being physically depicted on stage (and if so how?)? Should we interpret the miracles as being in any sense symbolic, and if so of what? Should we think of the miracles as an illusion (i.e., the chorus are themselves under the influence of Dionysus and describe what they think they see but what is not there)?[450]

Subsequently, Dionysus beckons his worshippers (the Chorus) after razing Pentheus' palace to the ground to rejoice and reassured them not to vacillate in their adherence to the deity (576-611). Subsequently, they demand to know how Dionysus escaped, according to them, from the clutches of the wicked king. In Dionysus' response, he makes us aware, among other things, that he deluded the mind of the king (612-641)—a measure that is reminiscent of the madness that befalls Sophocles' Ajax. Pentheus rages in his delusion as he tries unsuccessfully to kill Dionysus (642-659). In the Herdsman's dialogue with Pentheus (660-771), the former expresses this hesitancy in telling the truth about the amazing things involved in the Bacchic rites, because he feared Pentheus' anger. Once again, it is important to note here that Dionysus is exploiting Pentheus' proneness to anger as a ruse and a convenient conduit for the hero to oppose his worship in Thebes. Suffice it to say that Pentheus is just a pawn in Dionysus' mission to

[449] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (536-549, 554-555)
[450] Raymond K. Fisher. (1992). "The "Palace Miracles" in Euripides' Bacchae: A Reconsideration." *The American Journal of Philology.* 113(2). p. 170.

establish his Bacchic rites in Thebes. It is this condition that makes the hero's madness a tragic one.

In what follows, Pentheus demonstrates his desire and his readiness to deploy people bearing arms to invade the abode of the Bacchants (778-786). Dionysus talks him out of that decision (787-810), Pentheus agrees. As far as my study is concerned, this agreement between Pentheus and Dionysus is crucial, because it marks the commencement of the deity's exploitation of the hero's curiosity, which leads inevitably to his tragic destruction. For a better illustration of Dionysus' exploitation of Pentheus' curiosity to his detriment or to the point where he makes the hero mad, a brief citation of this conversation would not be out of place:

Διόνυσος

ἆ.

βούλῃ σφ᾽ ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας ἰδεῖν;

Πενθεύς

μάλιστα, μυρίον γε δοὺς χρυσοῦ σταθμόν.

Διόνυσος

τί δ᾽ εἰς ἔρωτα τοῦδε πέπτωκας μέγαν;

Πενθεύς

λυπρῶς νιν εἰσίδοιμ᾽ ἂν ἐξῳνωμένας.

Διόνυσος

ὅμως δ᾽ ἴδοις ἂν ἡδέως ἅ σοι πικρά;

Πενθεύς

σάφ᾽ ἴσθι, σιγῇ γ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἐλάταις καθήμενος.

Διόνυσος

ἀλλ᾽ ἐξιχνεύσουσίν σε, κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ.

Πενθεύς

ἀλλ᾽ ἐμφανῶς· καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τάδε.

Διόνυσος

ἄγωμεν οὖν σε κἀπιχειρήσεις ὁδῷ;

Πενθεύς

ἄγ᾽ ὡς τάχιστα, τοῦ χρόνου δέ σοι φθονῶ.

Dionysus

Ah! Do you want to *see*

Those women, where they sit together, up in the hills?

Pentheus

Why, yes; for that, I'd give a weighty sum of

gold.

Dionysus

What made you fall into this great desire to see?

Pentheus

It would cause me distress to see them drunk

with wine.

Dionysus

Yet you would gladly witness this distressing

sight?

Pentheus

Of course – if I could quietly sit under the pines.

Dionysus

They'll track you down, even if you go there

Secretly .

Pentheus

Openly, then. Yes, what you say is very true.

Dionysus

Then shall I lead you? You will undertake to

go?

Pentheus

Yes, lead me there at once; I am impatient. [451]

Moreover, Jene A. LaRue takes the subject of Pentheus' curiosity and the role it plays in his destruction to the next level. In her view, it is morbid sexual curiosity that leads Pentheus to his destruction. It is on this account that she says that Pentheus is possessed of a: "*Libidinosa spectandorum secretorum cupido."*[452] In furtherance of LaRue's argument about Pentheus' sexual curiosity and how it leads to his doom, she cites Dodds' succinct remark that Pentheus:

> Is the dark puritan whose passion is compounded of horror and unconscious desire, and it is this which leads him to his ruin.[453]

Taking inspiration from Dodds' perspective, LaRue further adds:

> We must emphatically add that this leering comment cannot be considered merely as an unfortunate slip of the tongue, for Pentheus has been obsessed with the sexual aspects of the Bacchic mysteries ever since his first entrance.[454]

David Jude van Schoor also remarkably avers:

> The irresistible god makes manifest the absolute, determining importance of the quality of human desiring, its great power and terrible weakness.[455]

When one evaluates LaRue's and Dodds' perspectives on Pentheus' sexual curiosity as a desire that leads to the hero's fall, it feeds into the argument of my study. Thus, from the onset, Dionysus exploits Pentheus' unwitting curiosity or his unwitting sexual inquisitiveness to know

---

[451] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (810-820)

[452] Jene A. LaRue. (1968).'Prurience Uncovered: The Psychology of Euripides' Pentheus.' *The Classical Journal*. (The Classical Association of the Middle West and South). 63(5). p. 209

[453] *Ibid*.

[454] *Ibid.*

[455] David Jude van Schoor. (2016). *Binding Dionysus: agent person in Euripides' Bacchae*. (University of Zurich.) p. 19.

more about the Bacchants to the king's detriment. It is on this account that the madness Pentheus suffers becomes a tragic one. Moreover, when we reconcile Dionysus' view in 810(*Ah! Do you want to see those women, where they sit together, up in the hills*?) with what Pentheus says in 813 (*It would cause me distress to see them drunk with wine*), certain implications come to the fore, which need to be explored as far as the madness the king suffers is concerned. In the first place, it presupposes that the *sexual curiosity* allegation has not been the prime motivation of the hero in his desire to *see*. Following from the preceding view, it stands to also reason that Dionysus' leading question could be construed as an entrapment aimed at dissuading the king from his original mission as inferred in his response (813). Finally, Dionysus' use of *ἆ.* (810) comes out to me as an imposed wish on Pentheus aimed at dissuading the king from his genuine commitment to expel, in his view, the immorally driven Bacchic orgy from Thebes. The foregoing reasons make the madness Pentheus suffers an undeserving one.

By the end of this dialogue between Dionysus and Pentheus (810-846), the former makes us aware of the madness that he has now wrought on the hero (847-861). In a Strophe, Refrain and an Antistrophe, the Chorus tell us in essence that the god punishes those who dishonour him by making them mad (862-911). In the speech that follows, we see another testament of Dionysus' exploitation of Pentheus' sexual curiosity to the hero's doom. Dionysus proclaims this Pentheus:

> σὲ τὸν πρόθυμον ὄνθ᾽ ἃ μὴ χρεὼν ὁρᾶν
> σπεύδοντά τ᾽ ἀσπούδαστα, Πενθέα λέγω,
> ἔξιθι πάροιθε δωμάτων, ὄφθητί μοι,
> σκευὴν γυναικὸς μαινάδος βάκχης ἔχων,
> μητρός τε τῆς σῆς καὶ λόχου κατάσκοπος·
> πρέπεις δὲ Κάδμου θυγατέρων μορφὴν μιᾷ.
> Come, perverse man, greedy for sights you should not

see,

eager for deeds you should not do – Pentheus! Come

out

Before the palace and show yourself to me, wearing

The garb of a frenzied Bacchic woman, and prepared

To spy on your mother and all her Bacchic company.

You are the very image of one of Cadmus' daughters.[456]

The extract above provides further impetus to the view that there is unconscious exploitation of Pentheus' weakness, namely his sexual curiosity, which inevitably leads to his misfortune. This situation is not only consistent with the *hamartia* principle, but it also makes the madness he suffers a tragic one. From lines (919-976), Pentheus is demonstrably mad as Dionysus exploits the hero's sexual curiosity to his doom. He seems to see two suns, double Thebes and sees double of the seven gates of the city. He has become delusional as he perceives Dionysus at some point as a bull, at another a pair of horns growing on his head, and finally, perceives the deity as a beast. In the succeeding Strophe, Antistrophe and an Epode, the Chorus attest to Pentheus' madness as they outline Pentheus' weaknesses such as his pride, his lawlessness and his reckless rage, as the fundamental reasons for the misfortune that has befallen the hero (977-1023).

In the ensuing scene, a Messenger reports of Pentheus' death in a dialogue with the Chorus (1024ff.). The Chorus rejoice upon the news of Pentheus' death (1031)—a gesture the Messenger repudiates (1032ff.)—the Chorus demand the Messenger to give a full narrative of how the king died (1041f.). The Messenger's response further provides evidence of Dionysus'

[456] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (912-917)

exploitation of Pentheus' sexual curiosity to the hero's ruin. The Messenger quotes Pentheus as having said this to Dionysus before the latter brings the king to his ruin:

> ἔλεξε τοιάδ'· Ὦ ξέν', οὗ μὲν ἕσταμεν,
> οὐκ ἐξικνοῦμαι μαινάδων ὅσσοις νόθων·
> ὄχθων δ' ἔπ', ἀμβὰς ἐς ἐλάτην ὑψαύχενα,
> ἴδοιμ' ἂν ὀρθῶς μαινάδων αἰσχρουργίαν.
> 'My friend, from where we
> stand
> My eyes cannot make out these so-called worshippers;
> But if I climbed a towering pine-tree on the cliff
> I would have a clear view of their shameful practice'.[457]

In the rest of the plot, the Chorus rejoice upon Pentheus' death (1153ff.); Agauë's mind is still disillusioned, and she is unaware of the identity of her victim (1168-1215); Cadmus arrives at the palace with the dismembered body of Pentheus (1216ff.); meets with her daughter, whose mind is still possessed (1229ff) and finally through some ritual assists her daughter to recover from her madness (1269-1279). Upon her recovery from the Bacchic orgy, Agauë demands to know what happened—she is briefed by her father—Cadmus mourns the misfortune that has befallen his household (1280-1326). The Chorus reiterate the justifiability of Pentheus' death (1327ff.). Agauë and Cadmus mourn Pentheus' fate (1329-1320). In the midst of this misadventure, Dionysus comes as a *deus ex machina*, explains among other things, the deservedness of Pentheus' fate and imposes exile on Cadmus and Agauë as punishment for denying him as a god (1325-1351). As Cadmus and Agauë bemoan their fate, they then proceed into exile (1352-

[457] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (1059-1062)

1386)—the Chorus give the Exode, where they philosophise about the unpredictability of the workings and the ways of the gods (1387-1392).

4.17. An integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the analysis, interpretation and critique of the tragic madness of Pentheus

This section of my study investigates, first, the interplay of the Psychoanalytic theory, which consists of the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego* in the interpretation and the critique of the tragic madness of Pentheus, and second, examines the Socio-Psychological phenomenon in the analysis of the tragic madness of the hero. In the first place, Pentheus' desire to be prideful, to oppose the worship or the godhead of Dionysus and his expression of sexual curiosity are characteristic gratification of the *Id*. Secondly, these unconscious weaknesses of Pentheus that are exploited by Dionysus as he makes the hero mad are a characteristic function of the *Superego*. Since the exercise of the *Superego* undertaken by Dionysus is through the unwitting exploitation of Pentheus' desires or weaknesses, the madness that is wrought on him is not only consistent with the *hamartia* principle, but also makes it a tragic one. Finally, Pentheus also recovers, like his counterparts Heracles and Orestes, from his madness. The pronouncement that comes from the hero when he convalesces (1110ff.) is a typical function of the *Ego*.

It is now appropriate to turn our attention to the interplay of the Socio-Psychological theory or factors in the interpretation and critique of the tragic madness of Pentheus. Kings, generally, are the embodiment of the tradition or the value system of the communities or the societies they preside over. The preceding statement does not exclude Euripides' Pentheus. This conferred on Pentheus the responsibility to safeguard not only these values, but also to prevent their erosion of them. Consequently, Pentheus' desire to prevent the worship of Dionysus and his godhead is motivated not only by Socio-Psychological factors but also by Socio-Psychological purposes.

These are clearly stated by Pentheus. The first of this evidence is given by him upon his arrival in Thebes:

πλήρεις δὲ θιάσοις ἐν μέσοισιν ἑστάναι
κρατῆρας, ἄλλην δ᾽ ἄλλοσ᾽ εἰς ἐρημίαν
πτώσσουσαν εὐναῖς ἀρσένων ὑπηρετεῖν
Amidst these group of worshippers, they tell me, stand
Bowls full of wine; and our women go creeping off
This way and that to lonely places and give themselves
To lecherous men.[458]

Also, Pentheus' reaction to the Herdsman's report is not only driven by a Socio-Psychological purpose, but it is a further reinforcement of his function as a king duly mandated by the people to curb the excesses of the Bacchants. Pentheus duly reacts:

ὅσῳ δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃς δεινότερα βακχῶν πέρι,
τοσῷδε μᾶλλον τὸν ὑποθέντα τὰς τέχνας
γυναιξὶ τόνδε τῇ δίκῃ προσθήσομεν.
The more dreadful your story of these Bacchic rites,
The heavier punishment I will inflict upon
This man who enticed our women to their evil ways.[459]

Finally, we need to accept the view that it is the same Socio-Psychological factor which motivates the king, Pentheus, to act on behalf of his people when he appropriately responds to the Chorus:

ἤδη τόδ᾽ ἐγγὺς ὥστε πῦρ ὑφάπτεται
ὕβρισμα βακχῶν, ψόγος ἐς Ἕλληνας μέγας.

[458] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (221-223.)
[459] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (674-676)

ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ὀκνεῖν δεῖ· στεῖχ᾽ ἐπ᾽ Ἠλέκτρας ἰὼν…

οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ᾽ ὑπερβάλλει τάδε,

εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεσθ᾽ ἃ πάσχομεν.

This Bacchic arrogance advances on us like

A spreading fire, disgracing us before all Hellas.

We must act now…

This is beyond

All bearing, if we must let women so defy us.[460]

Moreover, what Iulia Ruxandra Minulescu says about the manner in which Pentheus comes to a disaster reinforces the Socio-Psychological perspective of the tragic madness of the hero:

> Pentheus is killed (a scapegoat elected from within the community), while Dionysus leaves Thebes as a god. Pentheus becomes an ideal (eminently sacrificeable) leader, who values order and rationality, and who suffers to make these a possibility.[461]

Motivated by these Socio-Psychological factors and for which purpose Pentheus selflessly acts on behalf of his people in his bid to safeguard their value system, Dionysus' decision to inflict madness on the hero is unjustifiable. Therefore, it is under these conditions that the madness that Pentheus suffers becomes a tragic one.

4.18. Summary

In summary, Chapter Four has discussed among other things the three plays of Euripides, namely *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* that have madness as their motif. It has been established that Hera, the Eumenides and Dionysus are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus in the *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* respectively. In all cases, they exhibit certain traits of a mind demented, but delusion permeates through the madness they

[460] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (778-780 & 785-786)

[461] Iulia Ruxandra Minulescu. *The monster within: between the onset and resolution of the oedipal crisis.* (Birkbeck: University of London) p. 69. Unpublished.

suffer. It is also a recognisable fact the three heroes recuperate from their demented minds, underscoring the conviction that the madness that the tragic heroes suffer is indeed temporal. It has also been confirmed that, based on the trajectory of the circumstances, the heroes' madness could be rendered as tragic or non-tragic. Thus, it has been established that when we construe the madness that befalls Heracles as capricious punishment from Hera, then it is not only *nemesis* but also non-tragic, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle. On the other hand, it has also become apparent that when we interpret Heracles' madness as Hera's exploitation of the hero's weakness of proneness to violence and vengeance, then not only is it consistent with the *hamartia* principle, but also it makes his madness a tragic one.

In the same vein, it has been affirmed that when the Eumenides make Orestes mad because he had committed an abominable deed of killing his mother, then that is consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence a non-tragic madness. In reverse, it has been affirmed that Apollo's command to Orestes makes him an involuntary agent whose desire for vengeance is unwittingly exploited by the deity—hence the madness that befalls the hero is a tragic one—and consistent with the *hamartia* principle.

In addition, Dionysus' decision to inflict madness on Pentheus as a punishment for opposing his worship and his godhead, as has been established, is a characteristic feature or demand of the *hubristic* principle, hence the hero's madness is a non-tragic one. By the same token, it is also acknowledged that when Dionysus inflicts madness on Pentheus through the exploitation of the hero's unwitting weaknesses of pride, anger and sexual curiosity, it aligns with the distinctive demand of the *hamartia* principle, and this makes Pentheus' madness a tragic one.

Furthermore, it has been realised that when the characteristic features of the hero's madness are used to serve dramatic purposes, it does not only heighten the goal of tragedy (i.e., the arousal of the emotions of pity and fear) but also depicts the creativity, inventiveness and originality of the poet as far as the phenomenon is concerned. It takes a poet like Euripides with such artistic insight to be able to enact both onstage and offstage the characteristic features of a hero's madness before the audience and still achieve the desired dramatic impact; Aristotelian *catharsis* comes to the fore.

Finally, the circumstances leading to the integration of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the interpretation and the critique of Heracles', Orestes' and Pentheus' madness could make it non-tragic or tragic. Consequently, whether Heracles', Orestes' and Pentheus' madness should be construed as non-tragic or tragic, it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological perspectives and purposes.

This then leads me to Chapter Five of my thesis, where I will not only offer a comparative critique of the notion and pattern of madness as employed by the three tragedians in the relevant plays, but also provide a synthesis of the phenomenon.

CHAPTER FIVE

A SYNTHESIS OF AESCHYLEAN, SOPHOCLEAN AND EURIPIDEAN NOTION OF MADNESS

5.1. Introduction

Having dealt with the madness of Orestes in Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Ajax in Sophocles' *Ajax*, Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus in Euripides' *Heracles, Orestes* and the *Bacchae* respectively, it is now fitting to consider whether the tragedians' notion of madness intersects or differ; to ascertain whether there is a recurring pattern in the madness that afflicts the heroes, and finally, to demonstrate my notion of synthesis and its essence or treatment. This is what Chapter Five of my study seeks to establish.

5.2. A comparative critique of Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean notion of madness

To start with, it is an established fact, as far as my study is concerned, that in the analysis of all the extant plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides which have madness as their motif, the gods are the source of the madness that befalls the heroes. It is important to add that this is one instance where the three tragic poets' notion of madness intersects. However, the tragedians differ in some respect in the case of the specific divine agents of madness. The Furies, for example, are the cause of Orestes' madness[462] in Aeschylus' *Choephori*; in Sophocles' *Ajax*, Athena is the cause of Ajax's madness[463] and in Euripides' *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae*, Madness, the Eumenides or at other times the Erinyes and Dionysus are the cause of Heracles',[464] Orestes'[465] and Pentheus'[466] madness in *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* respectively. Secondly, the tragedians project the madness that befalls the heroes as punishment

[462] Aeschylus. (1959). *Choephori* (Trans; Philip Vellacott) England: Penguin Books Ltd. (1049ff.)
[463] Sophocles. (1987). *Ajax*. (Trans; E.F. Watling). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd. (50-60)
[464] Euripides. (1964). *Heracles*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd. (30-36)
[465] Euripides (2002). *Orestes*. (Trans. & Ed., D. Kovacs). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (30ff.)
[466] Euripides. (1964). *The Bacchae*. (Trans., P. Vellacott). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd. (850ff.)

for a wrong done. In Aeschylus' *Choephori*, Orestes is made mad because he committed an abominable deed of killing his own mother.[467] Sophocles' Ajax suffers the same, because of his abominable motive of wanting to kill the Atreidae and Odysseus.[468] Euripides' Heracles' madness is also construed as a punishment from Hera, because of the deity's hatred, anger and vengeance on the hero.[469] Also in Euripides' *Orestes*, the madness Orestes suffers is reminiscent of his compeer in Aeschylus' *Choephori*—a madness that is borne out of the hero's decision to kill his mother, Clytemnestra, in revenge for his father's death at the hand of his mother.[470] In Euripides' *Bacchae*, Pentheus is punished with madness because he not only displayed pride, anger and arrogance, but he also opposed the worship and the godhead of Dionysus in Thebes.[471] When one considers the tragedians' notion of projecting the madness that is inflicted on the heroes as punishment for having committed a wrong, then it is nothing more than *nemesis*—a measure that is consistent with the demands of the *hubristic* principle. By this, they (i.e., the tragedians) espouse the principle that the heroes deserve the misfortune that befalls them.

Moreover, the tragedians also uphold the notion that the heroes recuperate from their madness. In other words, the tragedians espouse the view that the madness that befalls the heroes is temporary. Thus, for example, both Aeschylus' and Euripides' Orestes recover from their madness. Whereas Aeschylus' Orestes' recovery from madness takes place in the *Eumenides*[472],

[467] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1020ff.)
[468] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (50-60)
[469] Euripides, *Heracles*, (834ff.&986ff.) Hera's apparent hatred, anger and vengeance on Heracles emanates from the fact that he is the son of Zeus out of wedlock. Thus, since Heracles is a testament to Zeus' unbridled promiscuous habit, Hera expresses her disgust not on Zeus, but on a product of his, Heracles, hence the madness. See also, H.J. Rose. (1972). *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. (Great Britain: Methuen & Co.) p. 206. See also Bulfinch's *The Golden Age of Myth & Legend* (1993) for the source of Juno's hostility to the offspring of her husband, pp. 177ff.
[470] Euripides, *Orestes*, (30ff.)
[471] Cf. Euripides, *The Bacchae*, Ch. 4, (notes: 403, 404 & 405)
[472] Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, (85ff.).

Euripides' Orestes' recuperation from his madness takes place in the same play[473]. However, unlike Aeschylus' Orestes, whose recovery from madness is outright, Euripides' Orestes' recovery from madness is intermittent.[474] In the same vein, Euripides' Heracles and Pentheus recuperate from their madness.[475] In the case of Pentheus, his recuperation from madness is brief[476] because he is not granted the opportunity to give elaborate speeches like Heracles and Orestes.

5.3. A deduction of the recurring pattern in the madness of the tragic heroes

This sub-section of my study discusses the recurring pattern in the madness of the heroes. By this, I undertake a comparative analysis of the characteristic features of madness each hero exhibits as represented by the three tragedians. In other words, it ought to be stated that although each hero, as portrayed by the three tragedians, exhibits peculiar characteristics when he becomes mad, some of these features intersect. This perspective, as earlier noted, is the thrust of this sub-section of my study.

In the first place, I observed that when Aeschylus' Orestes, Euripides' Orestes and Pentheus become mad, they exhibit certain hallucinatory characteristic features. This is not only seen when Aeschylus' Orestes perceives certain beings that are visible only to him and invisible to the Chorus,[477] but it is also observed in Euripides' Orestes and Pentheus when in their demented minds the former perceives the Eumenides as bloody-faced snaky maidens[478] and the latter also

[473] Euripides, *Orestes*, (42-44)
[474] Euripides, *Orestes*, (42ff. & 253f.) For further details, the reader can check Ch.4, pp. 158 & 165.
[475] Euripides, *Heracles*, (1088ff.) & *The Bacchae*, (1118ff.). For further details on Heracles' and Pentheus' recovery from madness, the reader can refer to Ch. 4, pp. 153, 154 & 155; 178 & 203 respectively.
[476]Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (1118ff.) Because the hero suffers death at the hands of his mother immediately upon his recovery from madness.
[477] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1061)
[478] Euripides, *Orestes*, (255f)

perceives Dionysus first as a bull[479] and second as having grown a pair of horns on his head.[480] Thus, the dramatisation of these misperceptions as consequences of the madness of the heroes tends to have a sterling effect not only on the objective of the phenomenon, but also intensifies the *katharsis* the audience experiences.

Secondly, the characteristic features that Heracles exhibits when he becomes demented are parallel to that of Pentheus in two main ways. Firstly, when Heracles engages in a wild tossing of the head,[481] his counterpart, Pentheus, also tosses his head up and down when he becomes mad.[482] Secondly, Heracles' imitation of his arrival at Megara when he is actually in Thebes,[483] is also reminiscent of Pentheus' when he likewise impersonates the standing posture of Ino and Agauë when he exhibits his characteristic features of a mind demented.[484] In the preceding description, both heroes exhibit delusional characteristics. This perspective of madness in ancient Greek tragedy is appropriately summed up by Daniel Berthold-Bond when he cites Bennett Simon:

> Madness in metaphorical terms ... is extremely common in the plays of the three great tragedians ... but frank clinical madness, complete with hallucinations and delusions ... is also rather common.[485]

Furthermore, the delusional characteristics that Sophocles' Ajax exhibits are like those demonstrated by Euripides' Heracles and Pentheus. Thus, just as Ajax in his deluded mind mistakes the animals for the Atreidae and Odysseus,[486] Heracles also mistakenly perceives

[479] Euripides, Orestes, (920)
[480] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (921f.)
[481] Euripides, *Heracles*, (867)
[482] Euripides, *Bacchae*, (930f.)
[483] Euripides, *Heracles*, (953f.)
[484] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (925f.)
[485] Daniel Berthold-Bond. (1994). 'Hegel on Madness and Tragedy'. *History of Philosophy Quarterly*. (University of Illinois Press). p. 73
[486] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (54ff.)

Amphitryon as Eurystheus' father[487] and his children as those of Eurystheus'.[488] In the same vein, Pentheus, in his deluded mind, perceives Dionysus first as a bull and second, as having a pair of grown horns on his head.[489] It is on these distinctive or characteristic portrayals that Theodorou appropriately surmises:

> Madness is presented by Sophocles as a disorder of the human mind, which leads the individual into a world that does not exist but in his own affected mind. This cue is picked up and developed further by Euripides … The external trigger in the form of a divinity, the attack of delusion that transports the madman to a world that exists only in his affected mind.[490]

Moreover, the characteristic account that Athena gives about Ajax's madness is also fascinatingly present in Dionysus' description of Pentheus' in his demented mind. Athena recounts:

> ἔνθ᾽ εἰσπεσὼν ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον
> κύκλῳ ῥαχίζων· κἀδόκει μὲν ἔσθ᾽ ὅτε
> δισσοὺς Ἀτρείδας αὐτόχειρ κτείνειν ἔχων,
> ὅτ᾽ ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλον ἐμπίτνων στρατηλατῶν.
> ἐγὼ δὲ φοιτῶντ᾽ ἄνδρα μανιάσιν νόσοις
> ὤτρυνον, εἰσέβαλλον εἰς ἕρκη κακά.
> κἄπειτ᾽ ἐπειδὴ τοῦδ᾽ ἐλώφησεν πόνου,
> τοὺς ζῶντας αὖ δεσμοῖσι συνδήσας βοῶν
> ποίμνας τε πάσας εἰς δόμους κομίζεται,
>
> He dealt his death-blows, hacking and slaughtering
> To right and left; to his deluded fancy
> Now it was the sons of Atreus he was mauling

[487] Euripides, *Heracles*, (965f.)
[488] Euripides, *Heracles*, (967ff.)
[489] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (920ff.)
[490] Z. Theodorou. (1993). 'Exploring Madness in Orestes'. *The Classical Quarterly*, (Cambridge University Press). 43 (1), pp. 32-33.

And butchering, now some other of your leaders,
Striking at each in turn. This way and that
He plunged like one demented; I was there
To goad and drive him deeper into the pit
Of black delusion; till at last he paused,
And taking the beasts for human prisoners,
Roped up the cattle that were still alive
And all the sheep, and marched them to his tent,[491]

In support of the above scenario, Dionysus also aptly characterises Pentheus' madness:

ταῦτα καὶ καθύβρισ᾽ αὐτόν, ὅτι με δεσμεύειν δοκῶν
οὔτ᾽ ἔθιγεν οὔθ᾽ ἥψαθ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἐλπίσιν δ᾽ ἐβόσκετο.
πρὸς φάτναις δὲ ταῦρον εὑρών, οὗ καθεῖρξ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἄγων,
τῷδε περὶ βρόχους ἔβαλλε γόνασι καὶ χηλαῖς ποδῶν,
θυμὸν ἐκπνέων, ἱδρῶτα σώματος στάζων ἄπο,
χείλεσιν διδοὺς ὀδόντας· πλησίον δ᾽ ἐγὼ παρὼν
ἥσυχος θάσσων ἔλευσσον. ἐν δὲ τῷδε τῷ χρόνῳ
ἀνετίναξ᾽ ἐλθὼν ὁ Βάκχος δῶμα καὶ μητρὸς τάφῳ
πῦρ ἀνῆψ᾽· ὃ δ᾽ ὡς ἐσεῖδε, δώματ᾽ αἴθεσθαι δοκῶν,
ᾔσσ᾽ ἐκεῖσε κᾆτ᾽ ἐκεῖσε, δμωσὶν Ἀχελῷον φέρειν
ἐννέπων, ἅπας δ᾽ ἐν ἔργῳ δοῦλος ἦν, μάτην πονῶν.
διαμεθεὶς δὲ τόνδε μόχθον, ὡς ἐμοῦ πεφευγότος,
ἵεται ξίφος κελαινὸν ἁρπάσας δόμων ἔσω.
κᾆθ᾽ ὁ Βρόμιος, ὡς ἔμοιγε φαίνεται, δόξαν λέγω,
φάσμ᾽ ἐποίησεν κατ᾽ αὐλήν· ὃ δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦθ᾽ ὡρμημένος
ᾔσσε κἀκέντει φαεννὸν αἰθέρ᾽, ὡς σφάζων ἐμέ.

[491] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (55-63)

There I made mockery of him. He thought he was
binding me;
But he neither held nor touched me, save in his deluded
mind.
Near the mangers where he meant to tie me up, he
found a bull;
And he tied his rope round the bull's knees and hooves,
panting with rage,
Dripping sweat, biting his lips; while I sat quietly by and
Watched.
It was then that Dionysus shook the building, made the
flame
On his mother's tomb flare up. When Pentheus saw this,
he supposed Made
The whole place burning. He rushed this way, that
way, calling out
To the servants to bring water; every slave about the
place
Was engaged upon this futile task. He left it presently,
Thinking I had escaped; snatched up his murderous
sword, darted indoors.
Thereupon Dionysus—as it seemed to me; I merely
guess —
Made a phantom hover in the courtyard. Pentheus flew
at it,
Stabbing at the empty sunlight, thinking he was killing

me.[492]

The delusion the two heroes suffer elicits or produces a three-fold sequence of madness: (i) that they both suffer, of course, through the gods, what we call in Greek expression *φρενἄπἄτάω, to deceive the mind, deceive, hence φρενἄπάτης, one who deceives the mind;* (ii) that they degenerate into *φρενοδαλής*, that is, they suffer an impairment of the mind when they are smitten with madness, *φρενόπληκτος* and finally, (iii) the second sequence leads to *φρενοβλαβής*, to wit, *damaged in understanding*, a phenomenon which in the view of Z Theodorou transports the madman to a world that exists only in his affected mind.[493]

In addition, both Heracles and Orestes in Euripides' tragedies display a trickling white froth[494] and foam around the eyes during their state of madness.[495] In the same vein, Heracles' display of bloodshot eyeballs when his mind becomes demented,[496] is reminiscent of Orestes' when he also exhibits foamy eyes.[497] Finally, Aeschylus' Orestes' perception and the identification of the Furies with the Gorgons[498] is akin to Euripides' Heracles as the hero displays the fearful eyes of a Gorgon[499] when his mind becomes demented.

Furthermore, the characteristic features of madness as portrayed by the tragedians intersect. Three main ideals come to the fore as far as my study is concerned: (i) that the dramatic importance of a hero gripped by madness cannot be overemphasised; for the circumstances undergirding the dramatisation of the hero's madness is crucial to our understanding of the

[492] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (616-631)
[493] Z. Theodorou. (1993). 'Exploring Madness in Orestes'. *The Classical Quarterly*. (Cambridge University Press). 43 (1). p. 33.
[494] Euripides, *Heracles*, (933)
[495] Euripides, *Orestes*, (219)
[496] Euripides, *Heracles*, (931f.)
[497] Euripides, *Orestes*, (219)
[498] Aeschylus, *Choephori*, (1049)
[499] Euripides, *Heracles*, (930ff.)

deranged mind as either tragic or non-tragic; (ii) that whether it is the hallucinatory Orestes of Aeschylus or Orestes and Heracles of Euripides or the delusional Ajax of Sophocles and Pentheus of Euripides, *misperception* is at the core of the tragedians' dramatisation of the madness that befalls the hero (iii) that it seems plausible to speculate that the three tragedians based their tragedies on the same pool of well-known myths and that they, albeit unknowingly, have been guided by Psychoanalytical and Socio-Psychological factors and purposes in their portrayal of the madness of their individual heroes.

This perspective then leads me to the last section of this Chapter, which discusses a synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment.

5.4. A synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment

The idea of a synthesis operates upon the following principles: (a) that the gods are the agents of madness in the selected plays; (b) that in all cases, the madness that befalls the hero is temporary; (c) that they act strangely and utter unintelligible words indicative of a mind demented; (d) that the afflicted mind of the hero could be non-tragic or tragic madness and it is either construed as Psychoanalytic[500] or Socio-Psychological[501] phenomenon or both.

The first part of the synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment, advocates a common view that the deities or the gods are the agents of madness that befalls the hero.[502] The second part of the synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment, advances the view that each hero

[500] The Psychoanalytic theory, as postulated by Sigmund Freud, is a notion that human behaviour is fundamentally shaped and influenced by the interplay between the *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*. (See the section 'Theoretical Framework' for further details).

[501] The Socio-Psychological theory posits that the individual's personality and behaviour are shaped and influenced by cultural values and social norms in the face of external situations or realities. (See the section 'Theoretical Framework' for further details).

[502] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'A comparative critique of Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean notion of madness' for further details.

convalesces from his madness.[503] This is because the tragedians have projected the notion of madness as a temporary phenomenon. The third part of the synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment also advocates the view that the hero acts and utters unintelligible words when his mind becomes demented. This is evident in the conduct and speeches of Aeschylus' Orestes when the hero becomes mad. The hero does not only perceive the Furies as constantly harassing him, but also creates the impression that they are lashing him as well.[504] We also see a similar trend in the conduct of Sophocles' Ajax, when the hero becomes mad. This happens when the hero in his deluded mind mistakes the animals he was mauling and killing for the Atreidae and Odysseus.[505] Moreover, Ajax exhibits a mind clearly demented in a dialogue with Athena.[506] In Euripides' *Heracles*, the hero in his deluded mind kills his children and his wife and behaves like an untamed beast.[507] Furthermore, in Euripides' *Orestes*, the hero in his demented mind perceives the Eumenides as harassing him; wears unkempt hair; experiences a blurred vision and utters unintelligible speeches.[508] Finally, in Euripides' *Bacchae*, Pentheus in his demented mind utters unintelligible speech as he perceives two cities of Thebes; a double of the seven gates of the city walls and even perceives two suns.[509] Pentheus, in his demented mind, garbed in female

[503] *Ibid*.
[504] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'The characteristic features of the madness of Orestes' in Chapter Two for further details.
[505] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'The characteristic features of the madness of Ajax' in Chapter Three for further details.
[506] Sophocles, *Ajax*, (185ff.)
[507] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'The characteristic features of the madness of Heracles' in Chapter Four for further details.
[508] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'The characteristic features of the madness of Orestes' in Chapter Four for further details.
[509] Euripides, *The Bacchae*, (919.)

clothing, held a thyrsus; he intended to carry mount Cithaeron on his shoulders and even processed through the streets.[510]

The fifth and final part of the synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment, advances the view that the afflicted mind of the hero could be non-tragic or tragic madness and it is either construed as a Psychoanalytic or Socio-Psychological phenomenon or both. In the first place, as long as the madness that Aeschylus' Orestes suffers in the *Choephori* is construed as a punishment for killing his mother Clytemnestra, then that is non-tragic.[511] In the same vein, once Apollo's command to Aeschylus' Orestes and other factors are construed as an exploitation of the weaknesses or the desires of the hero, it makes the madness that befalls the hero a tragic one.[512] Secondly, once Sophocles' Ajax suffers madness because of an abominable deed he commits, then it is also non-tragic.[513] By the same token, when one interprets the madness of Ajax as Athena's exploitation of the hero's desire for vengeance or desire for the restoration of the arms of Achilles, which was unfairly denied him, then his madness becomes an undeserved one, hence tragic.[514] Furthermore, in Euripides' *Heracles*, Iris makes us understand that the madness that Heracles suffers should be construed as punishment for a purported wrong committed against Hera.[515] And just as we are to view Orestes' madness as punishment for committing an abominable deed of killing his own mother in Euripides' *Orestes*[516], we are also

[510] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'The characteristic features of the madness of Pentheus' in Chapter Four for further details.
[511] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'A critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes' in Chapter Two for further details.
[512] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'A critique of the tragic madness of Orestes' in Chapter Two for further details.
[513] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'A critique of the non-tragic madness of Ajax' in Chapter Three for further details.
[514] The reader can refer to the sub-topic, 'A critique of the tragic madness of Ajax' in Chapter Three for further details.
[515] Refer to the sub-topic 'A critique of the non-tragic madness of Heracles' in Chapter Four for further details.
[516] Refer to the sub-topic 'A critique of the non-tragic madness of Orestes' in Chapter Four for further details.

to construe Pentheus' madness as punishment for opposing the worship and godhead of Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae*.[517] In all three scenarios described above, the hero's madness ought to be construed as non-tragic. On the other hand, when we interpret Heracles' madness as Hera's exploitation of the hero's proneness to violence and vengeance; that of Orestes as Apollo's exploitation of the hero's weakness or desire for vengeance and Pentheus' madness as Dionysus' manipulation of the hero's unbridled pride and obstinacy, then their madness is tragic. Thus, whether the hero's madness is to be construed as non-tragic or tragic, it is a function and a product of either Psychoanalytic (i.e. *Id*, *Superego* and *Ego*) and/or Socio-Psychological perspectives or frameworks. In other words, whether the madness that the hero suffers is interpreted as tragic or non-tragic, the integration of the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological theories makes it apparent that the notion of madness and its treatment by the tragedians is for and from Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions and purposes.

5.5. Summary

In summary, it has been established that the tragedians' notion of madness develops along similar lines: the gods orchestrate the heroes' madness—usually as punishment for a wrong committed—they recover from their madness. Besides, while each hero exhibits peculiar characteristic features of madness, they intersect in most cases, hence a pattern, as earlier established, emanates from their projected characteristics of madness. It is also established that the heroes in their demented minds act or utter unintelligible words. Thus, the integration of Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories in the interpretation of madness—be it tragic or non-tragic—in the tragedies studied, reveals similar patterns and outcomes as portrayed by the three tragedians in question.

[517] Refer to the sub-topic 'A critique of the non-tragic madness of Pentheus' in Chapter Four for further details.

CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

6.1. Brief summaries of the previous chapters

In Chapter Two, I established the view that the Furies are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls Orestes after the hero commits an abominable deed. In his demented state of mind, he utters certain unintelligible words. However, he later recovers from his deranged mind. It has also become apparent that the circumstances or the motivations leading to the commission of the deed make the madness that befalls Orestes either tragic or non-tragic. Thus, when Orestes' madness is interpreted as non-tragic, then it is following the *hubristic* principle, and tragic, when it follows the *hamartia* principle. Furthermore, it is apparent that much as Aeschylus' notion of madness and its dramatisation guides us to understand the perception of the phenomenon at the time (either from a neurological or historical perspective), the dramatic importance of Orestes' madness cannot be overemphasised; thus, the circumstances undergirding the portrayal and its dramatisation makes the madness the hero suffers tragic or non-tragic. Finally, it is evidently clear that whether the madness that befalls Orestes is interpreted as tragic or non-tragic, it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions or purposes.

In Chapter Three, it has been established among other things that Athena is the one who inflicts madness on Ajax upon which the hero commits a terrible deed. It is also recognised that Ajax exhibits certain features of a mind demented—he exhibits traits of delirium as he mistakes animals for the Atreidae and Odysseus. It is also an acknowledgeable fact that Ajax recovers from his derangement. It has also been demonstrated that based on the trajectory of the hero's circumstances, his madness could be rendered as tragic or non-tragic. Thus, when his madness is construed as punishment from Athena for a wrong, he commits, then it is non-tragic; it is *nemesis*, which is in tandem with the requirement of the *hubristic* principle. By the same token,

when Ajax's madness is interpreted as the unwitting exploitation of his desires or weakness, his madness becomes tragic—a measure that is consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Thus, it has been demonstrated that Athena's exploitation of Ajax's desire for vengeance without a critical assessment of the genuineness of the hero's grievances makes his madness a tragic one. It has also been revealed that the circumstances surrounding the portrayal or dramatisation of Ajax's madness have the tendency to have a cathartic effect. Finally, the conditions surrounding the incorporation of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the interpretation and critiquing of Ajax's madness could make it non-tragic or tragic. Therefore, whether Ajax's madness should be construed as non-tragic or tragic, it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions and purposes.

In Chapter Four, it has been clearly affirmed among other things that Hera, the Eumenides (Erinyes) and Dionysus are the orchestrators of the madness that befalls Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus in the *Heracles*, *Orestes* and the *Bacchae* respectively. In all cases, they display certain traits of a mind demented, but delusion pervades through the madness they suffer. It is also a recognisable fact the three heroes recuperate from their demented minds, underscoring the conviction that the madness that the tragic heroes suffer is indeed temporal. It has also been confirmed that, based on the prevailing circumstances, the hero's madness could be rendered tragic or non-tragic. Thus, it has been confirmed that when we interpret the madness that befalls Heracles as punishment from Hera, then it is not only *nemesis* but also non-tragic, which is consistent with the *hubristic* principle. On the other hand, it has also become apparent that when we construe Heracles' madness as Hera's exploitation of the hero's desire for vengeance and his susceptibility to violence, then not only is it consistent with the *hamartia* principle, but also it makes his madness a tragic one. In the same vein, it has been recognised that when the

Eumenides make Orestes mad because he had committed a detestable deed of killing his mother, then that is not only consistent with the *hubristic* principle, but also a non-tragic madness. On the other hand, it has also been acknowledged that Apollo's command to Orestes makes him an involuntary agent whose desire for vengeance is unsuspectingly manipulated by the deity—hence the madness that befalls the hero is a tragic one—and also consistent with the *hamartia* principle. Furthermore, Dionysus' decision to wreak madness on Pentheus as a punishment for opposing his worship and his godhead, is a characteristic demand of the *hubristic* principle, hence the hero's madness is a non-tragic one. By the same token, it is also acknowledged that when Dionysus inflicts madness on Pentheus through the exploitation of the hero's unwitting weaknesses of pride, anger, obstinacy and sexual curiosity, it is in consonance with the distinctive demand of the *hamartia* principle, which makes the hero's madness a tragic one. Also, it has been established that the circumstances surrounding the dramatic portrayal of the madness Heracles, Orestes and Pentheus suffer is an important conduit in rendering their misfortunes tragic or non-tragic. Finally, it has also been clearly established that the application of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories into the interpretation and the critique of Heracles', Orestes' and Pentheus' madness could make it non-tragic or tragic. Accordingly, whether Heracles', Orestes' and Pentheus' madness should be construed as non-tragic or tragic, it is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions and purposes.

In Chapter Five, a comparative tendency of the tragedians' notion of madness has been established: (a) the gods orchestrate the heroes' madness; (b) usually as punishment for a wrong committed; (c) each hero exhibits peculiar characteristic features of madness, but they intersect in most cases, leading to a pattern that emanates from their projected characteristics of madness; (d) that for dramatic purposes the heroes in their demented minds act strangely or irrationally or

utter unintelligible words; (e) all the heroes recover from their madness. The final stage of the synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment has established the view that the integration or the incorporation of the Psychoanalytic and the Socio-Psychological theories in the interpretation and critique of madness, be it tragic or non-tragic, is from and for Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological functions and/or purposes.

6.2 Findings

It has also become apparent that over the years, many scholars have approached the study of madness in Greek tragedy from a variety of perspectives, either from philological, historical, neurological, dramatical or sparsely Psychoanalytic or Socio-Psychological perspectives. Thus, notwithstanding the criticisms and challenges associated with the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theories, their application to the interpretation and critique of the notion of madness in Greek tragedy cannot be overemphasised. Thus, identifying the cause or the source of the madness the heroes suffer is crucial to the understanding and interpretation of the misfortune as either tragic or non-tragic. The preceding view is what my thesis has mainly done with the application of the Psychoanalytic and Socio-Psychological theoretical frameworks respectively.

In sum, my study has firmly established that there are two categories of madness in Greek tragedy: tragic and non-tragic. It has been recognised that the prevailing circumstances or the motivations make the madness that befalls any hero tragic or non-tragic. Thus, when the source of the madness that affects the hero is a whimsical or wanton use of divine strength or punishment for a wrong committed, then it is more consistent with the *hubristic* principle, hence non-tragic. On the other hand, when the basis of the madness is an exploitation of the weakness

or the desires of the hero to his detriment, then it is consistent with the *hamartia* principle, hence tragic.

Furthermore, it has been recognised that the circumstances surrounding the portrayal and the dramatisation of the characteristic features of the hero's madness are the conditions precedent to the achievement of the arousal and the purgation of the emotions of pity and fear (especially the cathartic/*kathartic* effect), a further testament to the non-tragic and tragic hypothesis.

It has also become apparent that the Greek tragic characters' enactment of the deed is either motivated consciously or unconsciously out of which they suffer one misfortune or the other, (in this case madness) imposed on them by the gods (an implication that society considers their deed reprehensible) though temporary. This pattern has successfully been encapsulated by the Psychoanalytic theory when considered as a composite notion as Green[518] proposes. Moreover, it has also been discovered that, based upon the circumstances or the motivations of the hero, the integration of the Psychoanalytic and/or the Socio-Psychological theories or phenomena make the madness that befalls the hero a tragic or a non-tragic one. In addition, it has also been ascertained that a comparative tendency of the tragedians' notion of madness establishes the basis of a synthesis of the notion of madness and its treatment in Greek tragedy. Finally, it ought to be stated that the integration of the Psychoanalytic (which is able to account for the pattern of madness[519] as I have identified in Greek tragedy) and/or the Socio-Psychological theories into the interpretation of either tragic or non-tragic madness, has proven that madness in ancient

[518] Refer to Chapter One under the caption 'Methodology'.

[519] As variously explicated in the thesis: the hero suffers madness for one reason or the other orchestrated by a deity and later convalesces. This pattern is what I have used the constituents of the Psychoanalytic (i.e., the *Id*, (the hero's quest for gratification either consciously or unconsciously, the *Superego* (advocacy for ethical restraint, i.e., the punishment (madness) imposed on the hero, and the *Ego*, a sieve/filter between the two extremes, indicative of what society accepts, that is, the hero's pronouncements or deeds when he/she convalesces from the temporal madness he/she suffers) to account for.

Greek tragedy may be appropriated from or for Psychoanalytic and/or Socio-Psychological functions or purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Aeschylus. (1959). *Agamemnon*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (England: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aeschylus. (1959). *Eumenides*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (England: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aeschylus. (1959). *The Choephori*. (Trans; P. Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aeschylus. (1961). *Prometheus Bound*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (England: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aeschylus, & Murray, G. (1961). *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. (London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Aeschylus. (2017). *Oresteia*. (A Dual Language ed. Trans; Ian Johnston). (Oxford: Faenum Publishing)

Aristotle. (1979). *Ethics*: *Nichomachean Ethics,* (Trans; J.A.K. Thomson). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aristotle. *Poetics*. (1968). (Ed. with Notes & Intro., by D.W. Lucas). (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Aristotle. (1974). 'Poetics'. In *Classical Literary Criticism.* (Trans; T. A. Dorsch). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Aristotle. (1991). 'Poetics'. In *Classical Literary Criticism*. (Trans, D. A. Russell & W. Winterbottom). (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Aristotle (1998). *Poetics*. (Trans., S. H. Butcher). Available @ www.leeds.ac.uk/classics/resouces

Aristotle. (2003). "*The Art" of Rhetoric,* (Trans., J.H. Freese) cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary,* (Eds. S.H. Hornblower & A. Spawforth). (Oxford: University Press).

Euripides. (1898). *The Bacchanals*. The Loeb Classical Library. (Trans., Arthur S. Way). (London: William Heinemann).

Euripides. (1898). *Madness of Hercules*. The Loeb Classical Library. (Trans., Arthur S. Way).

(London: William Heinemann).

Euripides. (1929). *Orestes*. The Loeb Classical Library. (Trans., Arthur S. Way). (London: William Heinemann)

Euripides. (1963). *Heracles.* (Trans., P. Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Euripides. (1964). *The Bacchae*. (Trans P. Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Euripides. (1974). *Iphigenia in Tauris*. (Trans; Philip Vellacott). (England: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Euripides. (1964). *The Trojan Women*. (Trans; P. Vellacott). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Euripides (2002). *Orestes*. (Trans; & Ed., D. Kovacs). (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Homer. (1950). *The Iliad.* (Trans; E.V. Rieu). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Homer. (1991) *The Odyssey*. (Trans; E.V. Rieu). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Sophocles. (1869). *Ajax*. (Ed.by R.C. Jebb). (London: Rivingtons)

Sophocles. (1987). *Ajax.* (Trans., E. F. Watling). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Sophocles. (1974). *Antigone*. (Trans., E.F. Watling). (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.)

Secondary Sources

Aeschylus. (1961). *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. (Trans., G. Murray). (London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd.)

Arbor, A. (2004). “Sorrow without Cause: Periodizing Melancholia and Depression”. *Melancholy, Love, and Time: Boundaries of the Self in Ancient Literature*. (ed. Peter Toohey). pp. 15-58.

Arthur, M.B. (1977). “Classics and Psychoanalysis”. *CJ.* 73. Pp. 56-68.

Aydoğmuş, A. (2019). “Clytemnestra as a Nightmare to Patriarchy in Aeschylus Tragedy, The Oresteian Trilogy”. *Sayfa*.pp.25-38.

Babiloni, T. E. V. (2016). ‘Madness as Psychosocial Function in the Ancient Myth of Heracles’. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*. VIII. (1). pp. 39-46.

Bartolome, David Z. (2017). "The Notion of Madness in Literature, Philosophy, and Tragedy: Evolving Conceptions of Mental Illness in Athens". *Young Historians Conference* htp://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians/2017/oralpres/3

Belfiore, Elizabeth (1985). *Pleasure, Tragedy and Aristotle’s Psychology*. *Classical Quarterly.* 35(2). pp. 349-361

Berthold-Bond, D. (1991). “Hegel, Nietzsche, and Freud on Madness and the Unconscious”. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 5(3). pp.193-213

Berthold-Bond, D. (1994). ‘Hegel on Madness and Tragedy’. *History of Philosophy Quarterly*. (University of Illinois Press)

Bharati, K. et al. (2021). *Revisiting Suicide from a Socio-Psychological Lens*. (London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group) pp. 1-231.

Bremer, J.M. (1969). *Hamartia: Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy*. (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert).

Brown, C.E. (2015). *Shakespeare and Psychoanalytic Theory*. (Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc). pp. 11-91.

Bulfinch. T. (1993). *The Golden Age of Myth & Legend*. (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.)

Burian, P. (2001) “Myth into Muthos: The Shaping of Tragic Plot.” *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy.* (ed. P.E. Easterling). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Burnett, A.P. (1998). “Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy”. *Sather Classical Lectures*. Vol. 62. pp. 1-387.

Butcher, S. H. (1920). *The Poetics of Aristotle* (London: Macmillan).

Cairns, D.L(1996). "Hybris, Dishonour, and Thinking Big.*" Journal of Hellenic Studies.* (cxvi). pp.1-32.

Catenaccio, C. (2011). 'Dream as Image and Action in Aeschylus' *Oresteia'*. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*. 51. p. 224.

Cilliers, L., & Retief, F. P. (2009). 'Mental Illness in the Greco-Roman Era'. *Acta Classica Supplementum III*. pp. 130-140

Curran, A. (2001). 'Brecht's Criticisms of Aristotle's Aesthetics of Tragedy'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* 59(2). pp.167-184

Cohen, D. (1991). "Sexuality, Violence, and the Athenian Law of Hubris". *Greece & Rome*. 38(2). pp.171-188.

Couch, H.N. & Geer, R. M. (1973). *Classical Civilization*. (Connecticut: Greenwood Press).

Dawe, J. (1968). 'Some Reflections on *Ate* and *Hamartia*'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. (72). pp. 89-123

Dickie, M.W. (1984). ' Hesychia and Hybris in Pindar'. in D. E. Gerber(ed.). *Greek Poetry and Philosophy.* Studies...*L. Woodbury.* (Chico, CA,). 83-109.

Dodds, E.R. (1951). *The Greek and the Irrational.* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Dunn, F. M. (1989). *Comic and Tragic License in Euripides' Orestes* (California: The Regents of The University of California). pp.238-251.

Eisner, R. (1987). *The Road to Daulis: Psychoanalysis, Psychology, and Classical Mythology.* (Syracuse University Press). pp. 1-316

Ekevere, F.O, et al. (2016). "Aristotle's Poetics: A Critique." *Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research* 1(4).

Ellen, A. (2018). “Foucault, Psychoanalysis, And Critique”. *Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*.23(2) 170-18.

Else, G. F. (1957). *Aristotle’s Poetics: The Argument*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.)

Esposito, J. (2010). *Seeing ‘what Ajax is’: identity, sight, and suicide in Sophocles’ Ajax* (Buffalo: NY). @uncg.academia.edu. Unpublished.

Farmer, M. S. (1998). “Sophocles' Ajax and Homer's Hector: Two Soliloquies”. *Illinois Classical Studies*. (23).

Feder, L. (1980). *Madness in Literature*. (Princeton University Press).

Finkelberg, M. (1998). ‘Timé and Areté in Homer.’ *The Classical Quarterly,* (Cambridge University Press). 48(1). pp. 14-48.

Fisher, R. K. (1992). “The "Palace Miracles" in Euripides' Bacchae: A Reconsideration.” *The American Journal of Philology.* 113(2).

Foley, P.H. (2001). *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ford, A. (2015). “The Purpose of Aristotle’s *Poetics*.” *Classical Philology*. 110(1). pp. 1-21

Foucault, M. (2013). *Madness and Civilization. A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. (Trans; Richard Howard). New York: Vintage Books.

Freud, S. (1933). *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. (New York: Norton).

Freud, S. (1938). *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. Vol. 15. (London: Penguin).

Freud, S. (1949) *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. (London: Hogarth Press)

Furley, W.D. (1986). ‘Euripides on the sanity of Heracles’. In J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker & J. Green (Ed.). *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*. pp. 102 – 13. (Bristol).

Gerolemou, Maria. (2019). *Representing the insane*. (De Gruyter). pp. 271-282.

Gold, M. & Douvan, E. (1997). *A New Outline of Social Psychology*. (Washington: American Psychological Association). pp. 1-9.

Goldhill, S. (1986). 'Mind and madness'. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). pp. 168- 198.

Golden, L. (1976). "The Clarification Theory of 'Katharsis'. " *Hermes*. 104(4). pp.437-452.

Goldhill, S. (2004). *Aeschylus: The Oresteia. Landmarks of world literature* (2nd ed.). (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Green, André (2005). *Key Ideas for a Contemporary Psychoanalysis: Misrecognition and Recognition of the Unconscious*. (London: Routledge Taylor and other Groups). pp1-342.

Gross, R. (2009). *Psychology*: *The Science of Mind and Behaviour* (5th Ed.). Kentucky: Hodder Arnold.

Güven, M. (2022). *Critical Art: Plato and Aristotle's Debate over Poetry*. Available @ https://www.byarcadia.org/post/critical-art-plato-and-aristotle-s-debate-over-poetry

Halliwell, Stephen. (1986). *Aristotle's Poetics*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina

Halliwell, Stephen. (1992). "Pleasure, Understanding and Emotion in Aristotle's *Poetics."* *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. (ed.) Amelie Oskenberg Rorty. (Princeton University Press). pp. 241-260.

Hammond, N.G.L. & Scullard, H.H. (Ed.). (1970). *The Classical Oxford Dictionary*. (Oxford Clarendon Press).

Hartigan, K. (1987). "Euripidean Madness: Herakles and Orestes." *Greece & Rome*, 34 (2). pp. 126-135. Cambridge University Press.

Hewstone, M. *et al*. (Eds.). (2007). *The Scope of Social Psychology*. (Hove and New York:

Psychology). pp. 1-353.

Hippocrates. *On the Sacred Disease*. (Trans., Francis Adams).

Hobbs, G. (2012). "Aeschylus' Tragedy of Law: Kinship, the Oresteia, and the Violence of Democracy". *English*. (9). pp. 34-35. https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/honorscollege_eng/9

Holmes, B. (2008). "Euripides' Heracles in the Flesh." Classical Antiquity. 27(2). pp.231-281.

Jackson, S. W. (1986). *Melancholia and Depression: From Hippocratic Times to Modern Times*. (New Haven and London).

Jebb, R. (2004). *Sophocles: Plays Ajax* (London: Bristol Classical Press).

Jeyalakshmi, P. (2017). 'Aristotle: Hamartia and Catharsis'. *IJARIIE*. 3(3).

Kelly, M. G. E. (2020). "Foucault On Psychoanalysis: Missed Encounter or Gordian Knot?" *Foucault Studies*. No.28. 96-119.

Kernberg, O.F. (2004). *Contemporary Controversies in Psychoanalytic Theory, Techniques, and their Applications.* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press). pp.1-353.

Kirkwood, G.M. (1971). "J.M. Bremer's *Hamartia*." *American Journal of Philology*. 92(4). pp. 711-715.

Kim, H. (2010). 'Aristotle's "Hamartia" Reconsidered.' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. (105). pp. 33-52.

Knox, B.M.W. (1961). "The Ajax of Sophocles". *HSCP*. 65.

Kokkini, D. (2010). *Euripidean men Revisited*. (London: University College London).

Konstan, D. (2016). "Did Orestes Have a Conscience?" Another Look at *Sunesis* in Euripides' Orestes". *Wisdom and Folly in Euripides.* (eds.) Poulheria Kyriakou and Antonios Rengakos. (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter). pp. 229-240.

Kovacs, D. (2002). "Rationalism, Naive and Malign, in Euripides' *Orestes.*" '*Vertis in Usum'. Studies in Honour of Edward Courtney*. (eds.) Miller, J.F.et al. (De Gruyter). pp. 276-

286.

Lamari, A. (2016). “Madness Narrative in Euripides’ *Bacchae*”. *Wisdom and Folly in Euripides.* (eds.) Poulheria Kyriakou and Antonios Rengakos. (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter). pp.241-255.

LaRue, J. A. (1968).’Prurience Uncovered: The Psychology of Euripides’ Pentheus.’ *The Classical Journal*. (The Classical Association of the Middle West and South). 63(5). pp. 209-214

Liddell, H. G & Scott, R. (1966). *Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

MacDowell. D.M. (1976). “Hybris in Athens.” *Greece & Rome*, (xxiii). pp.14-31

Manns, P. (1983). *Die Lehre Aristoteles von der tragischen Katharsis und Hamartia.* (Karlsruhe: Leipzig).

Mastronarde, D. J. (1979). *Contact and Discontinuity: Some Conventions of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Meador, E. (2008). *Masks of Madness: Contextualizing Euripides’ Bacchae*. (Ohio: Miami University in Oxford)

Mellyn, W. E. (2014). *Mad Tuscans and Their Families: A History of Mental Disorder in Early Modern Italy*. (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press). Available @ http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/assets/image/bookheader-current.jpg (Accessed on 07/25/2019).

Minulescu, I.R. *The monster within: between the onset and resolution of the oedipal crisis.* (Birkbeck: University of London). Unpublished.

Naar, D. (2021). ‘What Are the Strengths & Weaknesses of Psychoanalytic Theory?’ as found in https://www.reference.com/world-view/strengths-weaknesses-psychoanalytic-theory

Naiden, F.S. (2010), 'The Legal and Other Trials of Orestes'. *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece*. (eds.) E.M. Harris/D. Leão/P.J. Rhodes. (London). pp.61–76.

Nooter, S. (2019). *Uncontainable Consciousness in Sophocles' Ajax*. (University of Chicago: Routledge Press).

Novaco, R. W. (2010). *Anger and Psychopathology*. (Irvine: University of California)

Nussbaum, M. C. (1992).'Tragedy and Self-Sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity." *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. (ed.) Amelie Oskenberg Rorty. (Princeton University Press). pp. 261-290.

Otchere, J.A. (2010). *The Irrational in Greek Tragedy: Aeschylean, Sophoclean and Euripidean*. (Berlin: Lambert Academic Publishing). pp. 1-26.

Padel, R. (1992). *In and out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self.* (Princeton).

Papadodima, E. (2017). 'Sea Imagery in Sophocles' Ajax'. *Rosetta*. (21). pp. 23-34. http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue21/Papadodima.pdf

Parker, R. (1996). *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Padel, R. (1995). *Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness.* (Princeton).

Papadopoulou, T. (2004). Herakles and Hercules: The Hero's Ambivalence in Euripides and Seneca. *Mnemosyne*, (Brill). 4th Series. 57(3). pp. 257-283.

Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. H. (2009). "The vocabulary of madness from Homer to Hippocrates. Part 1: The verbal group of μαίνομαι." *History of Psychiatry*, (Sage Publications). 20(3). pp. 312-339.

Porter, J. R. (1994). *Studies in Euripides' Orestes*. (New York: E.J. Brill: Leiden).

Post, Doris Juliane Elisabeth (2018). *Choral Authoritativeness in Sophocles*. PhD thesis. The Open University.

Provenza, A. (2013). "Madness and Bestialisation in Euripides' Heracles". *The Classical Quarterly*. 63(1). pp. 68-93.

Rein, D.M. (1954). Orestes and Electra in Greek Literature. *American Imago*. 11(1). pp.33-50.

Riley, K. (2008). *The Reception and Performance of Euripides' Herakles: Reasoning Madness* (Oxford: University Press).

Rose, H.J. (1972). *A Handbook of Greek Mythology*. (Great Britain: Methuen & Co.)

Sackey, A.A. (2010). "The Hamartia of Aristotle." *Legon Journal of the Humanities.* (21). pp. 77-97

Sanders, E. (2014). *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens*: A Socio-Psychological Approach. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Scafuro, A. A. (2019). "Justifying murder and Rejecting Revenge". *Poet and Orator. A Symbiotic Relationship in Democratic Athens.* (eds). Andreas Markantonatos and Eleni Volonaki. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH). pp. 181-230.

Schaper, E. (1968) "Aristotle's Catharsis and Aesthetic Pleasure*." The Philosophical Quarterly*. 18(71). pp. 131-143.

Schoor, V.J. D. (2016). *Binding Dionysus: Agent Person in Euripides' Bacchae*. (University of Zurich.)

Scodel, R. (1996). 'Whom Gods Destroy: Elements of Greek and Tragic Madness'. (Padel, R.). *American Journal of Philology*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). (117). pp. 485-504.

Scribner, H. S. (1923). 'The Treatment of Orestes in Greek Tragedy'. *The Classical Weekly*. (The Johns Hopkins University Press). 16(14). pp. 105-109.

Seaford. R. (1989). "Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice". *Transactions of the American Philological*

Association (1974-2014). Vol. 119. pp. 87-95.

Segal, C. (1998) "Drama and Perspective in *Ajax". Sophocles' tragic world: divinity, nature, society*. (USA: Harvard University Press).

Segal, R. (2014). "Greek Myth and Psychoanalysis". *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Lowell Edmunds (ed.). (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press). pp. 409-455.

Sels, N. (2011). "Myth, Mind and Metaphor: On the Relation of Mythology and Psychoanalysis". *Journal of the Jan Van Eyck Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique*. 4. pp. 56-70.

Sherman, R.R. (1966). *Plato, Aristotle, and the Poets.* Educational Theory, 16: 250-261. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1966.tb00265.x

Silk, M. S. (1985). 'Heracles and Greek tragedy. *Greece & Rome.* 32. pp. 1–22.

Simon, B. (1978). *Mind and Madness in Ancient Greece: The Classical Roots of Modern Psychiatry*. (Ithaca: NY and London).

Simpson, M. (1969). 'Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation.' *Arethusa*. 2(1). pp. 88-103.

Singer, P. N. (2018). "The Mockery of Madness: Laughter at and with Insanity in Attic Tragedy and Old Comedy". *Illinois Classical Studies*. 43(2). p. 303.

Stenudd, S. (2022). *Aristotle Poetics: The Drama Theory and Influence of the Poetics.* www. stenudd.com/aristotle/aristotle-poetics-followers.htm.

Stillwagon, J. (2016). "Indirection of Influence: Poetics and Pedagogy in Aristotle and Plato". *The Journal Aesthetic Education*. 50(2). pp. 8-25.

Stróżyński, M. (2013). "Love, Aggression, And Mourning in Euripides' *Heracles*". *Eos C*. pp. 223-250.

Stróżyński, M. (2017). "Psychotic Phenomena in Euripides' *Heracles". Symbolae Philologorum*

Posnaniensium Graecae et Latinae. XXVII/3. pp. 103-137.

Szasz, T. S. (2017) "Schizophrenia, Then and Now: The Libation Bearers of Aeschylus". *The Man and His Ideas*. (eds. Jeffrey A. Schaler Henry Zvi Lothane Richard E. Vatz). (London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group).

Taylor, J. (1974) "Sophocles' Ajax and Sophoclean Plot Construction" *The American Journal of Philology*. 95(1). pp.24-42.

Theodorou. Z. (1993). "Subject to Emotion: Exploring Madness in Orestes". *The Classical Quarterly*. (Cambridge University Press).

Tonner, P. (2008). "Action and *Hamartia* in Aristotle's *Poetics*." *Electronic Journal for Philosophy*. pp. 1-23.

Toohey, P. (1990). 'Some Ancient Histories of Melancholia'. *Illinois Classical Studies*. XV (1). pp. 143-161.

Umphrey, M. M. *et al.* (2003). *Madness and Law: An Introduction.* University of Michigan press

Ustinova, Y. (2020). "Alteration of consciousness in Ancient Greece: Divine Mania". *History of Psychiatry*. 31(3). pp. 257-273.

Vernant, P-K. (1990). "Intimations of the Will in Greek Tragedy." *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (New York: Zone Books).

Vinje, H. (2021). "The Beauty of Failure: Hamartia in Aristotle's Poetics." *Classical Quarterly*. pp. 1-19.

Whitman, C. H. (1951). *Sophocles: A Study in Heroic Humanism*. (Cambridge: Mass).

Winnington-Ingram, R. P. (1983). *Studies in Aeschylus.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wohl, V. (2008). "The Romance of Tragedy and Psychoanalysis". *Helios*. 35(1). (Texas: Texas Tech. University Press). pp. 89-110.

Zajko, V. & O'Gorman, E. (eds.). (2013). *Classical Myth and Psychoanalysis: Ancient and*

Modern Stories of the Self. (Oxford/New York: OUP).

Zuntz, G. (1955). *The Political Plays of Euripides*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Internet Sources

Green, A. Institute of Psychoanalysis, British Psychoanalytical Society, on

https://psychoanalysis.org.uk/authors-and-theorists/andr**é**-green

https://www.khanacademy.org/test-prep/mcat/behavior/theories-personality/v/psychoanalytic-theory

https://positivepsychology.com/psychoanalysis/

Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory on Instincts, Motivation, Personality & Development. (2013). Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/freuds-psychoanalytic-theory-on-instincts-motivation-personality-development.htmlwww.verywellmind.com/what-are-hallucinations

www.khanacademy.org

https://positivepsychology.com/psychoanalysis/

TheLaw.com Law Dictionary & Black's Law Dictionary. 2nd Ed. https://dictionary.thelaw.com/talio/

Nirvanic Insights (2021). *The Myth of Pentheus and the Vengeance of Dionysus*, https:/www.nirvanicinsights.com

"Aristotle's Response to Plato—the Poetics". Available@ http://literature.clarkpdx.org/?page_id=24#_ftnref9

Aristotle's Poetry Against Plato's Attack on Poetry @ http://literayenglish.com/aristotles-defence-of-poetry-against-platos-charge

"Plato and Aristotle on Poetry" (2022).@ https://askliterature.com/literary-criticism/aristotle/plato-and-aristotle-on-poetry/