

AESCHYLUS

INTRODUCTION

The history of literature explains the development of the drama through the polishing of its style, the improvement of the chorus, the increase in the number of actors, from 1 or 2 to 3, through the ever increasing importance given to the dialogue and the skill of focusing the action. Yet, all this progress cannot touch the inner process manifesting in Greek tragedy. For *the tragic*, such as it is revealed in the works of the two great tragedians Aeschylus and Sophocles, is not a psychological state, which would develop spontaneously in any natural tendency. The tragic is the hero's life pattern within the dramatic act¹. For those who see in art just an accomplished copy of nature, this statement seems ungrounded, for sure. Yet, the tragic hero is a new type of man, acting within the history of culture as a vivid reality and not only as a fictional, illusory one. Up to the appearance of tragedy, until its dramatic act, the tragic feeling was just suffering, and the man who "tragically" aches, far from being any different from the rest of the human beings, is, on the contrary, merged, alongside with the others, into the cosmic mechanism. The epic or the lyric hero, Dionysos himself, praised and extolled in dithyramb are nothing but *projection* and *waiting* or *longing* for and *lan-*

guish. It is only the tragic hero that *actualizes* himself as a real entity of the Cosmos, for he, in the moment of his deed, proves to be self-reliable.

The real drama is born at the moment of the first dialogue between god and the Bacchic chorus. It is not only a random poetical variant of the lyric, but a cultural event, proving a totally new state of spirit. Indeed, the dithyrambic chorus, made up of 50 members at first, was nothing yet but a group of passionate beings, each of them calling, according to his power, for the saving god. The prayer, whether shouted, exclaimed or sung, remained an individual strive, charged with the pains and hopes of each chorus member. But when languish became ardent, the voice of the god was there to answer the call; he was embodied by the coryphaeus in front of the astounded eyes of the chorus members. Now, in the presence of god, the souls were, in a drunken elation, merging into a unique feeling: the savior was revealing himself in the entire splendor and beauty of his human appearance. Even if we took into consideration the hypothesis that some of the chorus members, under the influence of music, dance and wine, would fall in an ecstasy and have visions, the dramatic phenomenon still could not be explained, since it takes place at another level. It only starts when the lonely languish that had powerlessly and sadly struggled inside the chest of that poor being with a human face, but with the body of a wild creature, springs out in the act of a common longing for god.

Drama only starts when the dramatic act appears, that is, when the lonely, individual feelings of the chorus members merge into a single act of consciousness and the multiple chorus turns into a single actor. Tragedy is not born simply out of the lyric chorus, but out of the dramatic chorus, which is a new character, feeling and acting as one. The soul of the Satyr – chorus member – clears up through this change of register. The rush of savage outbursts is calmed down. He no longer calls divinity with the turbid scream of animal life. Out of the Satyr's dialogue with god, there comes up man. The garment of the beast falls off him. Instead of the hopeless lament, there resound the first accents of triumphant human consciousness, making its way to god, through an enthusiastic impetus. Actually, it was only such a call that god could answer to. It was only such languish, which is more than yearning, for it becomes a deed, that god could show his face to! And not by his own will, but by the endeavor, longing and creative hope of man. How far we are from the old form of the primitive cult in which god was surrounded by gestures and magic dances! For the soul support of magic is nothing but the need for power, and command over the mysterious forces, while the act of the dramatic chorus is homage to the hope that overflows the cup of transitoriness towards its never-ending start.

The act of the first tragic dialogue is at the same time the first religious act. For when god comes onto the stage (as a coryphaeus) he is not compelled to show himself, like in magic, through means that overthrow the world's order. Here, it is he who makes *the miracle, the deed through which*

he reveals to human consciousness, just awoken from animality, another order of this world, a more accomplished one. And when Bacchus was replaced at Sykione by Adraste, the hero, or later on, in Athens, by Orestes, Prometheus, Oedipus or Antigona, then the real religious character of tragedy showed up. For then, the tragic hero would be man himself; *the miracle of a perfect order* would be born in his consciousness. But, from the very beginning, from the very first dialogue between the coryphaeus and the chorus, in god's meeting the Satyr, the real image of man was being shaped out of the soaring towards life's mystery and the interiorization through enthusiasm² of the immortal god within the perishable heart.

The new conception about man and the universe – a typically dramatic one – found its final expression only in the Greek tragedy. However full myths might be of men and god's sufferings under the blows of fate and irrespective of the attempts at rebellion, the mythic consciousness had not escaped yet the passive stage. Even the Epos showed man assuming his lot, although, contrary to all the other beings, he recognized it, and was able to give it a name. The Greek myth and the entire Greek culture up to the tragedy were dominated by the consciousness of an implacable fate. Even if thinkers like Solon were preoccupied by the idea of justice and through it, by an individual responsibility³, up to the appearance of the tragedy, the Greek soul felt at the mercy of a ruthless Destiny, thus integrating in the cosmos like any other being.

This is the explanation for the multiple metamorphoses, which we find not only in poetry, but also in Greek thinking. Metamorphosis is undoubtedly the expression of an experience and of a primitive thinking, noticing a continuity in nature's forms. But before finding the scientific, philosophical explanation of the evolution⁴, the belief that the passage from one form to another could be done without any restriction, was felt like a miscellany of forms, a chaos, in which man entered with the whole of his being.

The tragedy, the development of the *initial act within the dithyrambic dialogue*, shows man elevated to a position where he can no longer feel lost in the cosmos; it creates a new man in the *dramatic act* that *no longer subdues him*, but *opposes him* to destiny. Of course, the tragic hero can not elude fate, can not escape its blows, on the contrary, he receives them, but he also opposes to fate the new world of his wake consciousness, the Ego that is the source of the free act. The tragic act proper consists in this very deepening of the *self-consciousness* up to the release of the Ego from the blur ways of the cosmos. The tragic suffering, the so-called pathetic character of Greek tragedy, which literary historians consider as its main trait, is actually, nothing but the sensitive reflection of this purely spiritual act. It is not suffering, that we consider to be the characteristic of the tragic man, but the drama, that is the fight, the dynamic element, through which the hero opposes destiny, revealing itself as a mystery in front of another mystery. With respect to the physical cosmos and to destiny, all Aeschylus' heroes represent a new cos-

mos, a spiritual one, governed by its own laws. This is the novelty of the Greek tragedy and the dramatic style it grows from. The tragic character eludes the universal determinism, as he freely accepts to be dominated by an ideal aim. He is not a natural phenomenon, not even just an ethic aspiration, he is a complete reality, the Ethos integrated into the Cosmos. *The tragic man is an aesthetic creature*. If suffering, as physical phenomenon, were the essence of the tragic, the tragic character would be not any different from natural man: like the latter, he suffers and dies. Yet, the tragic character is forever different from the natural man, due to that absolute *self-consciousness* which is based on *the responsibility for one's own guilt* in a world governed by destiny. The difference lies not only in the degree of consciousness, but also in its own nature. In a myth, like in life, man, considering himself a part of his kinship, and, through the blood of his kinship, a part of the cosmos, governed by a law, will always stay impure, however he would raise to the ethic sense of guilt. It is because man, considering himself a product of heredity or nature, finds his achievement only as a flesh and soul being, being unable to touch his spiritual entity, that is a free existence. His consciousness, whether it is just coming out of his underground inherited instinctive impulses, or raises up to the aspiration towards an ideal, can only live under an ethical projection. Until the free consciousness is not really turned into account in time and space within a pure act, despite the vanquishing of chaos in heavens or on earth, he will still hide the darkness of the unintelligible inside that volcanic kernel, which the cosmos or the established world is carrying in itself, and which is nothing but the human soul. Here, inside the human, we will find all the powers fighting one another; it is nowhere but inside man that the other cosmos, the spiritual one, is being created. If destiny and gods keep this poor creature in darkness it is because they know what lies in it! It is out of man that the creative power of the Ego – the world of freedom – is born.

But this Ego was only born in the Greek tragic art, where man was not living a free experience ideally only, but *really, within the space and time of the stage*. Although the hero dies, although he is defeated as a cosmic being, his ego, the tragic one is still victorious and founds a new world: the free consciousness.

2

The epopee used to take man for a demigod. The drama creates man as a man. The somersault done by man from passion into act, from determinism into liberty, the achievement of the Ethos, the risky act of setting out from a pure beginning, from the Ego, is the very tragic act. This wonder, which never comes true within the dimensions of natural life, not even in the ethic projection, is only achieved in the reality of the dramatic art. That is why we dare say that *the tragic is an aesthetic phenomenon*.

Here, in Greek tragedy, a change of registers is being operated: suffering is no longer imposed by destiny, but actively accepted, like a mission. Greek tragedy offers the show of a world in which man comes back to a life with-

out death within the consciousness of his mission, that of fighting destiny, blind destiny, in order to accomplish an ideal. And this ideal is neither the sub-human being that "has eyes but cannot see, has ears but cannot hear" (*Prometheus Bound*), nor the demigod. It is *man*, whose consciousness, carrying him towards liberty, rids the cosmos of blind determinism.

The tragic feeling that stays at the basis of the entire Greek culture and that searches for fulfillment in all poetic forms – epos, didactic epic, lyric – comes really true only in the dramatic form of Greek tragedy. It is here that Greek consciousness reaches a climax, not only in its poetic creation, but also in its Ethos, for the age of spiritual maturity, the one that will found the philosophical culture, is to be attained in tragedy alone. One should notice that the original dynamics of this people is manifest both in the artistic field and in their philosophical thinking. But the moment of the drama is an essential one, for all the Greek ways meet and crystallize at that level. With Greek tragedy, European culture consciously and definitively focuses upon man. The entire philosophical research of the pre-Socratics aims at knowing the cosmos, while after Aeschylus, the sophists, Socrates and Plato, philosophy will concentrate on *human* nature and fate. If the idealism of these people is primarily proved by their artistic achievements, if the Greek culture carries in all its manifestations the imprint of beauty, this is the sign of a mission. Beauty matches the sensitive with the unintelligible, matter with spirit. It is the only school in which feeling is being cultivated, where consciousness is cleared into being capable of giving birth to the pure act of spirit. One can say that in Attica man was humanized down to his vital roots.

After having reached a climax in Aeschylus and Sophocles' tragedies, the enthusiasm of humanizing idealism seems to have grown tired. It finds a deviation in Euripides's tragedy; here, the tragic is again identified with suffering, its creative power is lost in blind impulses, in paroxysmal feelings, in sensations, departing continuously from the new man brought up by the heroic act of the spirit. One can say, however paradoxical it may seem, that the tragic spirit takes refuge in Aristophanes' comedies. For the liberty of the spirit, born in the tragic struggle, is more manifest in the free laughter of the great comedian than in Euripides's acutely pathetic style. The roar of laughter is the sign of a victorious spirit. Above mockery, above the warning cry that tries to re-awaken the endangered Greek consciousness, Aristophanes's roar of laughter sounds like the herald of a world that has been rid of any fear! Here, the Greek spirit reaches the limits of human power; if just a little more detached than it is in *The Birds*, it would no longer be an earthly one.

The artistic trajectory of the Greek tragic spirit closed with Aristophanes. From then on, the tragic spirit would manifest on the realm of philosophical speculation. The process of idealization accomplished within dramatic art moved into the Socratic and Platonic idealism. The tempting voice of sophism is the voice of laziness, which, not being able of creation, denies the sense of the effort. The enthusiasm of creative consciousness is thus men-

aced to break down into skepticism and nihilism⁵. But Socrates fought with teeth and all for the salvation of human liberty by releasing the objective thinking from the chains of subjective opinion. The tragic character, born in the dramatic act, consolidated and justified to himself his right to live, by objective thinking, by real thinking. Socrates struggled and died like a tragic hero for the liberation of man from the chaos of ignorance, by a correct thinking. His method of research, through questions and answers, which Plato would take to perfection in the elevated style of his dialogues, was in itself, nothing but the dramatic expression of that tragic act, leading to a creative thinking.

Greek culture reached the climax of its spirit in Plato's dramatic dialogues, as it did in *Oresteia* and in Oedipus' tragedy. It is from this peak that the far-off horizon of any culture is open – it is from here that the Greek spirit shines its guiding light over the centuries.[...]

THE EUMENIDES

[...] Not only that *Oresteia*'s tragical character proper is not dimmed by Orestes' being acquitted, but it is even brought into relief by the mystical end of the trilogy. And not only that *Oresteia*'s hero is not crushed by fate, but he even comes out of the fight triumphantly. Yet, the changing of the Erinyes into the Eumenides, the turning of the sterile mechanism of revenge into the fruitful dynamism of love – this mysterious process, taking place beyond man, is like a never-ending substance that his being is feeding on. It is only out of this plasma of mystery that man can be embodied as a unique and free being of the Universe. This plasma alone makes possible the tragic existence proper which, far from being just suffering and defeat, is mostly man's unequal but heroic fight with destiny. Max Scheler⁶ says that the tragic appears only where a superior value is overthrown by an inferior one, namely, not by a personal fault, but out of an essential guilt that passes beyond the hero's will and consciousness. The tragic thing is that the hero turns faulty just because he is pure. That is why, as soon as the hero's death has an explanation – be it biological or moral – i.e. his deed has a motivation, it escapes the tragic register. It therefore has an intelligible cause or motivation. This is what is happening in *Oresteia*. The hero's deeds stem from beyond his will. Aeschylus does not content himself to put this repeatedly into Apollo's mouth but in the end, he even shows us how the mysterious world seems to flow underneath the intelligible world. Whoever may be looking for the real sense of the tragic can find it defined in *Oresteia*, where it appears neither as a useless suffering, nor as the fault of the guiltless, as one might think, if the other fragments of tragedies left were taken into account. *Oresteia* is a whole: one can find in it the real character of Aeschylus' tragic. One should

also notice that Orestes's deliverance is not an exception in Aeschylus' conception, for Prometheus too was delivered in the finale of the trilogy, as Hypermnestra was in the trilogy of the Danaides. Even in *The Persians*, Xerxes is forgiven. Therefore, it is not *the death* of the hero and particularly *not* what death stands for, i.e. the defeat of the hero, that characterizes the Aeschylian tragic, but its essence that has to be looked for elsewhere.

It is obvious that what designates Orestes as the hero of *Oresteia* is the fact that it is in him that the dramatic conflict is born. But what does the tragic proper of this dramatic figure consist in? Is it in the fact that he, the pure one, is pushed by Fate to do the crime? We do not think so.

We have pointed out at the right moment that the author adds, alongside with the motif of the divine order, the personal outbursts of the hero, as decisive factors. But, whether he followed God's order, or the urge of his own character, Orestes would still be passive, a painful victim. But in Aeschylus' theatre the characteristic of the tragic state is *the act, not the suffering*. Orestes is, undoubtedly, the hero whose evolution enables us an easier understanding of the real sense of Aeschylian tragic, both because we have the entire text and because the author's conception is obviously a mature one. In the beginning, Orestes is a tool in God's hands, as in the myth, but the question that thrilled his soul gives birth to a personal consciousness, which acquires the shape of a conflict. Indeed, whatever Orestes lives under our eyes, since the first question: "Am I allowed to kill a mother?"⁷ until the other question: "Has she struck or hasn't she?"⁸ and up to the last question, in front of the tribunal, "Enlighten me, Apollo! Have I justly killed her? I do not deny the deed, but according to your judgement, is this killing justified or not?"⁹ everything proves an active bewilderment, a scrutinizing doubt and, therefore, a disruption of the inner balance, in one word, *the conflict*. Obviously, one could object that the conflict explains Orestes' dramatic figure, but under no circumstance could it characterize his tragic character, which should be sought beyond his consciousness. For tragic is man's fate in itself, as man depends of an abstruse will. *Man's incapacity of eluding this unfathomable will* is, beyond any doubt, the reason of the tragic vision in the myth. But the tragedy surpasses the myth, *exactly by deepening the relation between man and the unsoundable will*. What makes Aeschylus' Orestes tragic is not so much suffering, as in the legendary Orestes, but the new face of the human being in him. The Orestes of the legend would suffer – bearing the will of fate – and would accomplish it blindly, like a programmed mechanism. The Orestes of the tragedy, due to his inner conflict, resists the outside will and defines himself as an independent entity that takes the whole responsibility of his act; yet, he commits the crime, but neither impulsively, nor directed from the outside; he does it *freely*. This is because he fulfills the mysterious command with the clear consciousness that he has a task to carry out and, although he does not understand it, he agrees to do it. The relation between man and mystery is completely changed. Man turns from passive

into active; his responsibility is no longer imposed, but freely accepted. Thus, the tragic feeling of the myth, which consists in the realization of the fact that man is the innocent victim of fate, changes into *the consciousness of his own responsibility*. It is therefore evident that between the man of the myth and the man of the tragedy there is a fundamental difference; his willing participation in the devise that is taking place above his head, and his agreement with an order that he actually does not understand. This explains why the tragic hero, although apparently defeated, is victorious through what destiny accomplishes within himself, yet by his own will.

The conception according to which the hero of the tragedy is an innocent victim seems to us insufficient. On the other hand, the active acceptance of guilt, as one element of an abstruse order, is in our opinion the characteristic attitude of the Aeschylus hero. So that the death of the hero, his biological defeat is not absolutely necessary; instead, his suffering is essential to the tragic. But not any suffering is tragical; just the one that appears when the only alternatives are either the despondency that throws him into nothingness, or the mortal risk of hopefulness that tears him from everything he is, in order to throw him into what he is not yet, into what is being born out of his creative impulse alone. The tragic suffering appears only at the border where man hesitates between "to be and not to be" and where there is a risk of losing himself into animality rather than be reborn within undying spirit. It is only man *fighting* his Destiny that is tragic. The tragic only appears alongside with the creative consciousness, with the spirit. Orestes' tragic suffering consists in his bewilderment, denying his quietness. With him, *the question* means suffering, thrusting into his own self, which is stirred to restlessness. Orestes' consciousness is born in the travail of questioning and the remorse underlined by the myth when leaving Orestes prey to the Erinyes falls in the tragedy on a second plan. Here, the torment comes from uncertainty. The tragic character proper of *Oresteia* is by no means diminished or removed by Orestes's absolution, on the contrary, it is brought into relief by the mystic finale of the trilogy.

It is true that *Oresteia's* hero, far from being crushed by fate, finishes the struggle triumphantly. And yet, there is no man more tragic than the one who suffers the spiritual awakening of the poor human, being a never-ending, vivid example for the ages of culture. But the tragic is achieved in *Oresteia* through the very confrontation, as dangerous as it is, between Man and mystery. The turning of the Erinyes into Eumenides, the changing of revenge into good will – the sterile mechanism of hatred becoming the fruitful dynamism of love, represent a mysterious process taking place beyond man, and is like an infinite substance which his being is feeding on. For this mystery is not only a background for the process inside human consciousness – it is the living plasma out of which man will be shaped as the one and only free being in the Universe. The tragic, as Aeschylus shows it, does not only consist in the sterile suffering of the poor innocent, but in the will of the powers out-

side him. He is harassed, tormented and doomed to an unforgivable sin; the tragic is, above all, the fruitful suffering of the one who meets mystery and, fighting it, defeats it through the light inside his consciousness.

If the hero, although innocent, falls into sin, if a superior value is unreasonably crushed by an inferior one, without any intelligible aim¹⁰, if the tragic means, in its very essence, gratuitous suffering, then its consequence is not only the hero's death – causing pity and terror – but it is also *the consciousness of an essential relationship between the tragic man and the mysterious powers*, kindling in us a sense of a mission. If, later on, Euripides marks the tragic with the imprint of a philosophical pessimism, we cannot say the same thing about religious Aeschylus. It is nowhere else that we can find more clearly than in *Oresteia* the specific character of the Aeschylian tragic, although Orestes' redemption is not an exception. For even Prometheus was liberated at the end of the Promethean trilogy, as well as Hypermnestra in the trilogy of the Danaides or even Eteocles, in *The Seven Ones*, falls but saves Thebes. Therefore it is neither the hero's death nor his defeat that characterize the Aeschylian tragic, it has to be sought for elsewhere. Orestes is probably the most revealing figure in this respect both because the tragedy has come down to us in its entirety and since it is the maturity work of the great tragedian.

Orestes is from the very beginning, like in the legend, a tool in the hands of Destiny. His tragedy resides in suffering, as in fact the whole introduction points out, expressed in regrets and lamentation. But there is the doubt flashing through himself and giving birth to a conflict that reshapes his consciousness – creating a unique physiognomy. Whatever Orestes lives in front of us, that is whatever constitutes his dramatic personae can be solved in questioning – in the dynamics of the conflict that has seized him altogether.

“Am I allowed to kill a mother?”

“Has she struck, or hasn't she?”

“Enlighten me, Apollo, have I rightfully or unjustly killed her?”

“I do not deny the deed but, according to your judgement, is this killing justified or not?”

Here is a series of questions that shake the characters down to his deepest roots and lead him to the edge of the precipice where consciousness can be lost – forever – in the darkness of unconsciousness.

Orestes' tragic consists in the deadly fight of his consciousness with the darkness of the mystery. And his triumph does not reside in his staying alive but in his gaining a personal responsibility, as well as the consciousness of a mission, through carrying out the decree of fate, not blindly, impulsively, but as a free man.

Of course, such a fight with fate implies suffering – but it is just this suffering alone that is tragic.

With Orestes, the tragic suffering appears in its very essence – as spiritual suffering. For Orestes is tormented by the pain of the question, the wake, the sleepless watch.

Whereas the legend brings into relief the passive suffering of remorse firstly, Aeschylus underlies especially the active, ethic bewilderment. His Orestes is not suffering for having punished his mother, but because he does not know whether he has done it rightfully. The tragic is concentrated in *Oresteia* as an essential torment of the consciousness that is forced to stagger from bewilderment to bewilderment on the difficult way leading to truth. But this absolute suffering is the only way of healing man from the passivity that threatens him in any moment of security. It is the only way of taking man out of his animalistic condition and awakening him to fulfilling his task.

The Eumenides are entirely a sequel to the *Choephores*, where the dramatic act proper was carried out. In the *Eumenides* the action takes place outside the hero. It is a dialogue between the author and the audience, an answer to the confusion raised inside the spectator. It is a pedagogical clearing up of things, and yet, it is more than that: *it is the peace brought by beauty*, the only one that makes reality perfect. That is why the *Eumenides* are much more than a simple epilogue, since this part of the trilogy is also moving within a tragic atmosphere. It is after all the fate of human consciousness at stake. It has been born in tragic suffering, but it cannot just float within the Universe without any direction. The integration of this new shape within the ensemble of existences, this is what Orestes stands for in front of the immortals. But Aeschylus is neither a philosopher, nor a theologian; he is an artist. For him, living reality cannot be anything but harmony. Orestes' forgiveness in the *Eumenides* as well as the taming of the fierce Goddesses are nothing but the religious consequences of this aesthetic achievement.

The Eumenides are in the first place an hymn of glory addressed to the reconciliation among all the registers of the universe. For, if the Greek myth has revealed the frightening contrast undermining existence, Greek tragedy points out to the future universal harmony, whose glorious kernel resides in man's wake consciousness.

CONCLUSIONS

Aeschylus' work, imbued with the creative spirit of the 5th century of the old world, dominated by an implacable determinism, brings into being a new universe, governed by a moral law.

Aeschylus is the poet of a century in which not only that a new political and social order is founded, but a new human type is forged, whose illustrative force for the whole European culture lasted for two milleniums.

The new man, making his appearance in Aeschylus' works is *the tragic man*, the man who dares fight the mysterious power of Destiny. One can say that in Greek tragedy, whose style is Aeschylus' creation, a free consciousness appears for the first time in a determined universe.

If the work of the first Greek tragedian is still actual today, this is due to the fact that its dashing enthusiasm bears in it the very living power of the essential aspirations of the whole Greek kin. The tragedy holds a prominent place in the culture of the 5th century, as it corresponds to the very process of ascend and culmination of the Greek public assembly.

The concept of tragedy is different with the three great Greek tragedians; the specific note given by Aeschylus is heroism. Belonging to the generation of the fighters of Marathon, Salamis and Plataea, he is, like all his contemporaries, characterized by a strong aspiration towards liberty.

All Aeschylus' heroes are people born in the spirit of liberty.

If it is true that the new Greek consciousness "has developed out of victory, not from the constitution", then it is no less true that it was only the belief in liberty and justice that supported the heroic resistance of the little Greek people against their powerful Asian enemy.

But this belief had long been inside the Greek soul; if preceded by far the young democracy of the 5th century since it generated even the oldest myths. Thus, Prometheus' myth brings down us from the prehistoric darkness the rumor about this primary tendency of Greek culture, and it also reveals that really organic need for organizing the disorder of the occurrence by a norm, by a law. And it is a significant fact that the first mythical embodiment of order is goddess *Némesis* herself, who, in her various manifestations symbolizes the primal tendency towards *justice*¹¹.

Aeschylus is the poet of the glamorous epoch in which not only that Man comes to be the center of any philosophical issue, but also the European ethos gets to a climax.

What is characteristic for Aeschylus' hero is the fact that his endeavor is not directed towards any exterior target, for, above everything, he aims at overcoming his own consciousness. He does not strive, like Homer's heroes, for an ideal of chivalry perfection, through courage in fighting and defying death, nor does he seek his own fulfillment by the noble character of work. Aeschylus' man is the hero whose consciousness is awake for the truth, he is the founder of a moral world based on clear thinking, the glamorous and immortal world of Greek idealism.

If the epic heroes used to face death, to fight nature and even the powerful Gods, the hero of the Greek tragedy fights Destiny itself, because his call is to conquer not the world, but the liberty of human consciousness.

The style in which the new human consciousness is born is called the *dramatic* style. It is neither suffering and nor the pathos that lead to a tragic attitude, but *the act* of suffering, its *dramatism*. Obviously, not any movement, however vigorous, may be a deed or a dramatic gesture – as not any struggle

is tragical. Greek Tragedy, through Aeschylus, has defined the tragic as a supreme deed of man in the fight for the freedom of his own consciousness. And since this can not be dominated by death, life, or even Gods, but by dark destiny alone, tragedy raises man to the peak where the only risk is the somersault of consciousness, the deadly fight with Destiny and the In-intelligible. Thus, Greek tragedy shapes the essential aspect of human essence on the background of the Absolute alone. It is only the encounter with the Absolute – for this is Destiny – that gives the relative being, which is Man, his reality, his own place in the Universe. An existence that has not tragically faced Destiny, has not reached yet a typically human form, and thus is lost among the mute multitude of things and beings in the Universe.

That is why we consider that *the tragic*, as we find it achieved in Greek tragedy, is *the very constitutive category* of human essence itself.

Aeschylus' tragic is triggered by his belief in the presence of the mysterious power governing the whole Universe, from the Gods' will, to the tiniest happening.

Aeschylus' conception about the world is a religious one. This made the great scholar Werner Jaeger say that in Aeschylus' tragedy "it is not people who act, but the superhuman powers" concluding that the hero of this tragedy is not Man, but *Fate* itself¹².

If Aeschylus's tragedies are, undoubtedly, an hymn of glory dedicated to superhuman powers, it is no less true that their main characteristic is the keen interest in the fate of the human individual. To disregard the humanism that is specific to Aeschylus' conception seems to us to disregard the very dramatic character of his work, for his tragedies are not founded on the sufferings man is subject to, but on the *active* pain of his heroes. He accepts the popular belief in a hostile Destiny only as a premise but by his heroic, robust conception about man he comes to the conclusion that builds the dynamic world of creative tragic upon the ruin of the passive, defeated, mythical man. His deep religious character is not pliant to the inherited myth, it is a power that gives life to the mythical motif, transforming it and drawing from it a new world of values. The measure of Aeschylus' religious depth is given by the purity of his moral values and particularly by the bringing of *Fate* close to the moral ideal of *Justice*.

The conception about a Destiny that ruins whatever is great and noble, helping the inferior powers to triumph over superior values and making the hero pay an enigmatic debt to a blind necessity¹³, is not the one prevailing in Aeschylus or Sophocles' tragedies. This is only to be found in popular feeling, as the pessimism of the myth proves it. Taking the atmosphere of Greek tragedy for the dim, elementary feeling that is inherent to life, seems to us a disregard of the purifying character of Greek tragedy, for this is what cleared things up, thus delivering the ancient consciousness from fear and despair.

One too often forgets that the tragic hero risks the jump from determinism into liberty, and therefore, the active, heroic sense of Greek tragedy is

lost, being replaced by pathos. It is as if Aristotle had not warned culture against a false, pathetic interpretation of the tragic when he was pointing out catharsis as the culminating point of tragedy! Could that purification of the spectator's feeling from fear and pity be alien to the purification and transfiguration of the hero himself along the dramatic act?

In fact, it is obvious that Aeschylus' tragic is an immediate consequence of his dramatic vision. One can definitely say that Aeschylus's tragedy is the work of the playwright, not that of the theologian. For it is not his belief in an impervious Destiny, but his dramatic power, i.e. the power to actualize the conflict between man and Destiny that can boost this conflict up to the essential opposition between relative and absolute, up to a tragic attitude. Actually, in his work, one can notice the tragic developing as the dramatic act clears up the very sense of human essence. Therefore, the exact shape of man himself does not come out on the psychological plan of suffering, but at the ethic level of the action.

The confusion between the tragic and the pathos is yet to be explained by Euripides' position at the top of Greek tragedians. Undoubtedly that Aristotle is the one who, by calling Euripides "the most tragic" of the tragedians caused this interpretation along the following centuries, even if it does not correspond to his own conception about the tragic. Indeed, Euripides, in his endeavor to reveal particularly human misery, falls back into the pessimism of popular wisdom and lowers the level of the tragedy on the psychological realm. He depicts man in his natural dimensions, the cosmic man, while Aeschylus and Sophocles were creating the man of culture, thus turning into account the new dimension that appears only when the human being, transcending its earthly nature, manifests its spiritual essence through a free act of consciousness. Euripides' conception lent a purely pathetic character to the tragic, turning it into an inheritance for the dramatic decadence. Aeschylus' tragic, the tragic in its original shape is on the contrary, active, heroic, creative and proves to be, as we were saying before, the very category in which the notion of human essence is accomplished. For, similarly to the sensitive *object* that would not take shape for our knowledge without the forms of pure sensitivity: time and space, the *tragic tension*, the intimacy, the subjectivity of a changing and unstable consciousness would not be achieved within the firm uniqueness of one *Ego*.

The tragic is the form in which the living unity of personality is achieved. Without the tragic risk expressed by Shakespeare in his famous "to be or not to be" and lived by the ancient heroes in the supreme moment of their act of consciousness liberation, man will remain a superior stage of animality, without crossing the threshold separating nature from culture.

If Aeschylus is considered a religious poet, then it is his active dramatism that justifies it, because the relation between man and God, which religion is trying hard to establish, is achieved here, in the tragic moment. For, while this relation is changing and can be spoiled even in the most pious soul, the

human ego being either lost within divinity or, falling out of the living Unity with the divine, and re-entering the opposition between the body and soul, in the dramatic act this relation is, on the contrary, saved from the passing of time and fixed within a perpetual actuality, due to the other perfect relation, which is *the artistic form* itself.

The art of the tragic, far from just being a casual and relative clothing for the religious feelings, is, on the contrary, the only accomplished expression of the supreme religious moment, such as antiquity lived it. For it is only the language of art that can express the meeting of the individual with the absolute. Whatever other attempt, it is nothing but sighing, screaming, babbling betraying a still bound mystic state, similar to the howl of the animal, proof of a still undifferentiated form of consciousness. The vague, shapeless, dim feeling born within the myth is only cleared up in a really religious form in Greek tragedy, thus acquiring a culture-making power. And the *ego* that until then was floating like an ethical desideratum over the turmoil of the individuals' biological and physical states finds the really absolute unity here, within the tragedy. One can say that *the tragic*, as a category of the human essence, is an aesthetical category. However daring this statement might seem, it has its grounds. For the Ethos of the epoch, aside from its embodiments within the perfection of a work of art, as the final form of beauty, is not a cultural reality proper yet, but just an aspiration, a quality, unable to leave the realm of determinism.

If Greek tragedy has such an overwhelming importance in the development of human culture, it is because all the tendencies and aspirations of an epoch acquired reality in it. The poets, philosophers, as well as the political figures of the preceding centuries had enriched Greek consciousness with some new ideal, enhanced it by some new virtue, but this ethic consciousness was still an ideal norm, as long as it had not been embodied for real, within an act. It is the act performed by Aeschylus' hero, who actualizes the infinite norm within the dimensions of a finite figure, creating the *typical man*. All the cultural tendencies focus and merge into him – from the politically ethical, up to the philosophically religious one, thus reaching the living and yet normative entity of the tragic Ego. Aeschylus does not invent new myths or unusual heroes, and not even a new ideal of life. Not even *justice*, the virtue that gives life to his tragic heroes and also gives destiny a decisive direction, is an invention of his genius. What he creates is the Individuality that bears in itself the whole cultural dowry of the community and history: the tragic Hero, the typical Ego that accomplishes the infinite law within the dimensions of the finite and that lives within his own self the sense of the eternal which is the achievement of the integral human essence. When they say that Aeschylus is the last theologian of the Greek poets, this cannot mean that his work is a theological explanation of the world. Its religious value consists in the power of his poetical intuition which, achieving the human type, has accomplished at the same time the image of pure divinity.

Later on, Plato's philosophy, through a new artistic intuition, but in the same dramatic form of the dialogue, would succeed once again to actualize the living relation between the uniqueness and the everything, between the Ego and the Universe. Actually, the organic continuity between the poetic process of Aeschylus' tragedy and the process of superior intuition of the idealist philosophy is proved by an aspect which is characteristic for both: *the Ethos is based on the Logos*. In all Aeschylus's tragedies, the value of life is based on the liberating mind and not on senses; all his heroes are characterized by a daring mind and the lucidity of their consciousness.

Starting with Orestes' heroic doubt, going through the decision taken by hot-headed Eteocles and up to the act of revolt of the highly emotional Danaides, the consciousness of these characters is penetrated by the clear light of judgement. Aeschylus moves to this level even the supreme moment of human consciousness, the moment of facing destiny. If he is the religious tragedian by excellence, this is exactly because he does not approach the relation between man and mystery at the level of a dim and imprecise feeling, but he reveals their organic connection even within reason, in whose light, the mystery, instead of vanishing away gets the precise shape of a super-rational sense.

The power, richness and ampleness of Aeschylus' work stem from the root of this mystic. But the soundness of his characters, their undying reality will always be granted by Aeschylus' art, for he possesses the rare gift of turning the ethical values into sensitive shapes. Even if the tragic hero grows out of the mysterious root of Destiny and his life develops according to the hidden law of Fate, his dramatic personae still grows organically, according to the laws of nature and social moral order. Heredity, with its implacable causality, entangles the hero within the indestructible web of cosmic determinism and custom and law absorb him into the super-personal order of the social. Aeschylus' power to construct dramatic individuality on three levels at the same time, visibly and invisibly simultaneously, gives his hero that quality which made Goethe say that the heroes of antique tragedy possess "a devilish solidity".

An aesthetic phenomenon, Greek tragedy is the most accomplished expression of Greek culture, as all the tendencies of the Greek spirit found their achievement in it from sensible and rational knowledge to the purest religious intuition, merging into the forging of a human type that has become a norm for human culture. Aeschylus's tragedy creates man out of the heroism of the consciousness, establishing once and for all that the human spirit implies the power of renewal and rebirth on ever-higher levels. In this way, he abolishes for ever, a priori, the right of any kind of *superman*, which the barbarism of the ages to come would invent. Aeschylus' tragedy founds culture upon the respect for humans, as man is conceived in his perfection, *not as an exception*, but as a type.

So, the novelty of Aeschylus' tragedy within the 5th century does not consist in the simple exterior dramatization, that is, in the staging of mythical

and legendary events; his outstanding creation is the birth of the tragic man out of the dramatic fight with Destiny. For *dramatism* itself is his very invention, the new style in which Aeschylus shapes man as a type.

The evolution of the dramatic process (an aesthetic process, but including the whole horizon of physical and spiritual reality) can most easily be traced in the variation of the relation between the tragic Chorus and the spoken dialogue.

Aristotle writes: "Aeschylus has reduced the part of the Chorus and turned the dialogue into the main character" (*Poetics*, ch. 4).

This statement can only be interpreted as Aeschylus' having given more importance to the dramatic element proper. By no means could he pretend that the Chorus had been reduced as extent, since the author's impetuous inspiration is expressed through the very flood of the choral song, which sometimes goes as far as sixteen stanzas (see *Agamemnon*).

By analyzing the seven tragedies left, we could notice that the voice of the chorus is the voice of the community consciousness, made up by tradition, as well as by the needs of Nature and collectivity. The hero, by the endeavor of his spirit, stands out upon this background that represents the established scale of values. As the hero distinguishes through his uniqueness, we witness an accomplishment of the dramatic process itself. And with Aeschylus, the Chorus is an active character, not just a simple rejoinder, since it makes the connection between the episodes, which it also prepares and explains.

In spite of the impression that Aeschylus' tragedy is still a lyric and epic expression, very often, in fact most often, his dramatism appears in the very lyric character of his choruses. The consciousness of the Chorus is pervaded by worries and torments that prepare the dramatic crisis.

Quite often, in order not to entangle the pure line of the hero's tragic awakening, Aeschylus develops the capricious meanders of soul movements within the score of the Chorus. In fact, the violence of the passions, the fear, the obsession, states which prove the primitivism of the consciousness, find a better expression in a song than in verse, so that Aeschylus speaks them out through the Chorus, turning it into the basic emotional background for the upspring of the Hero's clear and essential consciousness. Yet, the dramatic tendency is felt with him even in the troubled waters of his choral lyricism, because even the sometimes purely vital level of the Chorus is penetrated by the spiritual thrill.

34

Thus, in *Prometheus*, the hero's revolt enflames the Chorus as well, in *Seven Against Thebes*, the Chorus passes from fear and dread to recollection and decision. In *Oresteia*, the Chorus loses its traditional confidence and ventures, following the hero, on the way of doubt. In *Eumenides* the light of the hero's consciousness penetrates the inert consciousness of the Chorus.

Thus, there exists between the dramatic action of the hero and the attitude of the Chorus an organic correspondence; the adventurous act of the hero finds solid ground in the simple but massive reaction of the Chorus, that seems to have its roots in the very unchangeable laws of nature. Again, the

Chorus is removed in its turn, pushed out of its ways by the daring gesture of the hero, who snatches consciousness from the inertia of habit and compels it to the adventure of aspiration.

In Aeschylus' tragedies, this reciprocal stimulation between the chorus and the hero, which is no longer to be found with Sophocles and Euripides, is the sign of an organic interdependence of the two elements, inside of which the dramatic act is performed.

The disproportion between the length of the chorus parts and the spoken ones betrays the playwright's hesitation and lack of confidence, as he is still searching for the means of his trade, attentively waiting at the same time for the appearance in his own self of a guiding light.

In his groping with respect to technique, Aeschylus is looking for the very dramatism itself; if hesitation, which is inherent to any beginning, does not impair a bit of the power and greatness of his work, monumental in its primitive architecture, this is to be explained by the authenticity of an overwhelming inspiration continuously finding its way to perfection.

The sovereignty of Aeschylus's art is granted by the confidence of the genius, who directs all the hesitating attempts towards the aim he believes in.

The state of the Chorus is always to feel. Even when clad in reflection it remains the emotional being with earthly roots. It is the sturdy base, the primitive consciousness that supports the impetus of a liberated consciousness. Level-headed element (*Prometheus*, *The Suppliants*) or instigator (*Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*) the feeling of the Chorus always prepares the heroic action and sometimes, like in *Eumenides* even completes it.

Due to the living dynamism in the soul of the Chorus, the hero, the tragic man is no longer an arbitrary phenomenon, he imposes himself as a vital moment in the evolution of human spirit. The deed of the tragic hero, the step forward which human consciousness dares to take through him, is not lost in the arbitrary, but finds its roots in the massive, universal consciousness. The tragic adventure gains in this way its great sense; it is no longer circumstance – it is a new, superior necessity.

This is why, in Aeschylus' tragedy, the Chorus supports the whole weight of the dramatic construction. Aeschylus achieves the individual consciousness within the protagonist, but it is only with the choruses that he can develop his extraordinary poetic intuition, evoking the mysterious powers at work in the Universe.

Aeschylus' titanic inspiration can only be turned into account within the great procession of rich stanzas and anti-stanzas that flow now quietly, then roughly or even savagely, just like a never-ending life torrent. As the heir of the great lyrical poets of the 6th century, he develops within the large musical compositions, represented by the choruses, the creative power of his poetic genius, supported by a real instinct of the rhythm.

Actually, it was only a control of the lyrical rhythms that could prepare him for the vigor of his dramatic expression. The movement of the soul changes is marked by the changing rhythms of the choral stanzas, and alongside with it, the beginning of the dramatic relief. For the various lyrical

rhythms express the different states of spirit, underlying the differences until the contrast is created and sometimes deepened up to the crisis. Thus, the Chorus makes the atmosphere out of which the dramatic act is going to burst – it is the source of the drama.

Musicologists are trying hard to rediscover the music accompanying the choral rhythmic constructions, which is lost for us down to these days. Yet, the lyrical architecture is so obvious with Aeschylus that it can be noticed by looking at the proportions between the lines and the stanzas. The skill of this great master of rhythmical combinations generates the most varied effects out of the combination of well-known and long-established rhythms.

About the musical modes used in the tragedy we only know that “the two modes of tragical lyricism were, by excellence, the Dorian and Mixolydian ones, the former grave and majestic, the latter, pathetic” (Plutarch, *Musica*, 16)

Aeschylus, independent from these fundamental modes, also used, exceptionally, the weeping, almost languishing Ionian mode, meant to achieve special effects. The characteristics of his art, with respect to the rhythmic expression, is on the one hand a permanent, prolonged uniformity, masterfully calculated, leading to most grandiose effects. For instance, by the repeated, prolonged use of the same rhythm – the Ionian one – in the long enumeration of the armies and Persian leaders fallen during the battle, he wakes in the soul of the spectator a feeling of monotony growing up to turning into an obsession. On the other hand, the deliberate repetition of the same effects is obtained by a strict symmetry, as for instance in the wonderful *Parodos* – the introductory chorus – of the tragedy *Agamemnon*, where varied rhythms of different expressiveness succeed one another in an order built on symmetry. Yet, maybe the most characteristic way of Aeschylus’ rhythm is the abolishing of the strict rules established by the great lyrical poets with respect to the stanza, anti-stanza and the epode, the setting free of inspiration and the delivering of its impetus.

Aeschylus’ obscurity, humorously pointed out by Aristophanes, is due to his closeness to the dithyramb, but mostly to the fact that his lyricism corresponds to the difficult, organic process through which clear consciousness wakes from the darkness of the vital impulse.

The dialogue starts with Aeschylus by being a lyrical dialogue between the protagonist and the chorus – a dialogue revealing the sentimental outburst of both. It is only when the second actor is introduced on the stage – this being Aeschylus’ innovation – that dramatic style proper makes its appearance. At this moment, the dim feelings make way for the clear judgement. It is here that the lucid Ego is forged, the Ego of the drama, whose consciousness is normative. Aeschylus excels in stichomythia, that short dialogue in which, through the brisk rhythm of direct retorts and the logic acuteness of the correspondence between the questions and the answers, he eliminates altogether any trace of sentimental outburst and concentrates the movement of rational dialectics until the pure act of consciousness, the dramatic act springs out.

If they call Aeschylus the father of tragedy, he well deserves this title not for having introduced the dialogue on the stage, but because he discovered that it is in the dialogue, in the rational act of lucid consciousness that the kernel of dramatism lies and not in feelings.

The passage from lyricism to dramatism is a slow and intricate process. It is to this process that the style of the *trilogy* corresponds and it is maybe Aeschylus who invented it, too. The trilogy is the organic form of tragedy itself for Greece's first tragedian, while with Sophocles and Euripides it is just an exterior, unimportant order.

Werner Jaeger invokes the structure in the trilogy as a decisive argument for the idea that the main character in Aeschylus' work is fate and not man. Since the repeated blows of fate fall upon successive generations of a kin, it is not the individuals that matter, but the *fate* of the kin. The trilogy would therefore be a dramatic form, enlarged according to a mythical conception and, under no circumstance, the adequate expression of the ethic Humanism.

Yet, contrary to the opinion of the great Hellenist, we wonder whether the large rhythm of structure within the trilogy would nor correspond to the slow and difficult humanization process of primitive consciousness which, painfully leaving racial homogeneity, finds it hard to turn into an individuality. For, if the multiplication of situations, favored by the dimensions of the trilogy allows the author to do develop the long-lasting action of Fate, as perseverant and implacable as it is, couldn't we also say that the trilogy is the enlarged framework meant to cover the tough and indomitable impetus of consciousness towards light and liberty? Wouldn't the organic construction of the three tragedies correspond to the efforts of human consciousness to touch personal responsibility? Wouldn't it mean time and ardent endeavor for human species to achieve accomplishment within the clear uniqueness of its ethical and individual consciousness, by overcoming the inherited impulses?

It is beyond any doubt that Aeschylus, as a great follower of Solon, is haunted by the problem of individual moral responsibility. This is what he looks for in *Orestes*, in the *doubt* he opposes to Destiny's command. He looks for it in Eteocles, the damned hero who, giving up life, *freely* accepts destiny's decisions and, finally, he sees it triumphing in Prometheus, in his power of foreseeing that beats the darkness of the unknown. It is true that Aeschylus subordinates man to Destiny, but his heroes appear to be not so much the victims of a mysterious fate as of their own *Hybris*, their lack of limits. Fate is shaped as a moral law that haunts the sinner, but it only reveals this aspect as the hero's consciousness clears up and becomes the bearer of this new ethical sense.

Undoubtedly, Aeschylus' heroes think of, and believe in, Destiny in an archaic, mythical way, but what counts in the tragedy is the change operated in them. They think first like the myth does, but the dramatic phenomenon accomplished in themselves, inside their own being, not outside, promotes them on a tragic level. Here, within the tragic, man is entirely active – his suffering is active and his self is creative – his deed is free, so that at the end of the tragedy a victory is revealed, belonging to Fate, but no less to man.

The intention of the religious author may well have been to reveal the power of Destiny over the mortal man, but for him, Destiny is no longer the dark, cosmic force, but the very law of Justice.

Actually, the *Hybris* itself, the lack of limit, which Aeschylus pinpoints as man's fundamental sin, however much punished by Fate, is not defeated by anything, except the sinner's consciousness, in the tragic moment. So that, if Fate is the great moral power that punishes, the miracle of harmony, of accomplishment is still achieved in man, and only by the effort of his own consciousness. Could we then doubt the fact that man is the main hero in Aeschylus' tragedy, that his work is the supreme proof of the fundamental Greek humanism?

But the form of the trilogy also has a technical explanation. The inherited epical material is so rich and detailed that it was extremely difficult to concentrate from the very beginning within the close unity of a single tragedy. The former lyrical and epic poets had long before started to ordinate and concentrate this mythical and legendary material. It was up to the tragedy to round up the process, by pointing out the latent, essential moment in these stories and songs.

The example of the Shakespearean historical tragedy, which we have entirely in front of our eyes, allows us to witness the complex process of dramatizing an epical material. Thanks to Shakespeare, we can understand that if this process is really conditioned by the evolution of the idea of kin (understood by Shakespeare as a historical continuity, whereas with Aeschylus it is a biological one), it is no less evident that the dramatism proper does not reach its aim and sense except within the individuality of the hero, who is a creation of Art.

Obviously, the trilogy – style is the expression of an intermediate stage of the aesthetic process, accomplished in the evolution of the Chorus, from the dithyramb to the tragedy proper. The organic succession of three tragedies, along which we have, in fact, the same action under development, is nothing but the primitive, unskilled form of the playwright, still uncertain about his means and who is still hesitating between the objectivity of the story and the lyrical outburst, in search of that concentration called dramatic *actualization*. Of course, *actualization* will be accomplished with Sophocles and Euripides more closely, more briefly and more promptly, whereas with Aeschylus, it passes through different stages and is accomplished in a larger tempo. But it could not have been otherwise since within Aeschylus' hero a whole universe had to be actualized and this new creature concentrated in itself the infinite horizon of a culture above the bottomless depths of nature! Aeschylus' hero grows out of the dark of an endless past, in order to soar towards the dawn of an infinite future.

In Aeschylus' tragedy we witness a great discovery. Of course, the concentration process is not only a technical one; it corresponds, as shown above, to an ethical process, for the real motive that causes aesthetic concentration is nothing than spiritual maturing, which forces human consciousness to aspire towards the ever more essential unity of perfection. What makes dramatic tendency overcome lyricism and epic is nothing else

than the *new moral sense* itself, trying to pervade through the sensitive cover placed by the myth, the cover of a biological and sensualist conception.

This interference between the *aesthetic* process and the ethical-religious-social one is the characteristic of all great cultural epochs, and is always announced by an original dramatic creation, revealing new values. We can therefore believe that the moment the dramatic style overcomes in a culture, we witness the appearance of the epoch's mature consciousness, the complete vision of its spiritual horizon.

This helps us understand how Aeschylus' tragedy, overcoming the typical problems of each age, has imposed itself for two milleniums, with the authority of a permanent actuality. Its dynamism surpasses the power of any intellectual and social revolution, Aeschylus' tragedy being in itself the expression of the most essential revolution: *the act* of the spirit.

Aeschylus' tragedy also means the birth date of European spirit, for it is in it that, for the first time, individual consciousness identified itself with the needs of the people, which he purified in the light of the spirit, tore them out of the pragmatic finality, directing them towards the gratuitous finality of the Ideal.

(1946)

NOTES

1. The birthplace of the tragic hero is the ideal space and time of the scene, raising the consciousness of the audience to its own level.
2. Enthusiasm comes from *ενθεος*, meaning to be inspired by divinity.
3. "innocent children and the future generations are to pay their parents' debts" Dr. 13, 1 – 32. Quotation from Giraud by Ion Coman, in *L'idée de la Némésis chez Eschyle*.
4. Even the beginnings of philosophy prove the levelling of the vital phenomenon with any material phenomenon, for, despite the intention of making a distinction between the soul *ψυχή* and the blur matter meaning soul, the confusion is obvious. It was only Anaxagoras, Euripides' contemporary who distinguished the spiritual function within the *νοῦς*.
5. In spite of the important role played by the sophists in stressing human individuality, and despite their merit of having placed the psychological problem in the foreground, it is no less relevant that they denied the objectivity of truth, by reducing it to a subjective opinion.
6. Max Scheler: *Vom Umsturz der Werte*, vol. I, *Zum Phänomen des Tragischen*.
7. *Choeophores*, v. 899.
8. *Idem*, v. 1010.
9. *Eumenides*, v. 609–610.
10. Max Scheler: *Vom Umsturz der Werte*, vol. I: *Zum Phänomen der Tragischen*. Volkelt: *Aestetik des Tragischen*.
11. Werner Jaeger: *Paideia*, p. 311.
12. Werner Jaeger: *Paideia*, The chapter about Aeschylus.
13. Max Scheler: *Zum Phänomen der Tragischen*.

(A. B.)