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INTRODUCTION

0.1. The Problem

0.1.1. As recently as April, 1976 Douglas MacDowell wrote that the question ' "What did the Athenians mean by *hybris*" still needs answering.' (MacDowell, 1976:14). As to what is meant by it in Greek Tragedy, the (what I shall call) 'traditional' answer has been: 'pride', 'arrogance' or 'insolence'. (This, at least, is what especially older English translations render in the majority of instances.) In this school there are several general writers on Greek Tragedy: Murray (1940:128) defines *hybris* as 'pride'; Lesky (1967:95) has 'the uncurbed pride of human will' and at 1966:247 'overweening ambition'; Bowra (1944:380) says that any attempt by man to cross the gulf between gods and men is hybristic, i.e. 'overweening' - so also Pohlenz (1954:212) - elsewhere Bowra (1957:89) has 'arrogance'. Writers on Greek religion, too, speak of the 'special Greek sin of *hybris*', which is the 'transgression of the boundary line [between men and gods]', when '[man is] so presumptious as to strive to raise himself above the mortal lot' (Nilsson, 1972:227, 230). Concordances to Aeschylus and Sophocles enter as the main senses of *hybris*: *superbia* and *audacia mentis* (Ellendt, 1965:ad loc., and Italie, 1955:ad loc.). Lucas (1959:66) defines *hybris* as the 'insolent pride', or 'confidence' engendered by success. Del Grande (1947:1) defines *hybris* as 'tracotanza', i.e. 'arrogance', and Lehns (1875:35-70) renders 'Ueberhebung'. Payne's monograph (1960:20-31) is misleadingly popularized: 'There is no end to the theme of Greek pride. The Greeks understood the pride of Hubris' (p.20)...'the arrogant heart' (p.24)...*hybris* linked with the Aristotelian *megalopsychos* (p.31). Apart from extensive treatments like the above three, similar definitions of *hybris* turn up in more general works on tragedy: e.g. Conradie's (1968:31) 'oormoed' ('excessive self-confidence') or 'self-verheffing' ('self-exaltation'); and the 'self-exaltation' of
Brooks and Heilman (1948: 578), which is said to be the 'full expression' of Oedipus' hybris. To North (1966: 32), hybris is 'heroic areté unrestrained by any Divine or human sanction'. The non-specialist is normally first introduced to this notion of hybris: 'human pride which goes beyond the bounds which the gods will allow' (Starr)²; 'insolence' or 'arrogance', such as invites disaster' (Chambers Dictionary)³. To sum up, the 'traditional' view of what hybris 'means' — always or generally — is:

(a) That it means 'pride' or 'arrogance';
(b) That it is irreligious (a transgression of the boundary between men and gods, or even excessive self-confidence to the degree of disdaining help from the gods — Conradie, 1968: 31);
(c) That it is an attitude of mind, or trait of character, an abstract concept, and not a concrete thing or action.

In direct opposition to the 'traditional' view is Lattimore's (1964: 23-28) 'brief digression on the meanings and non-meanings of the word', wherein he follows the essential meanings in LSJ's⁵ entry: 'assault and battery', 'rape', 'foul play', 'plain physical disaster without motivation'; 'the activity of wild animal spirits', 'rapacity and greed', 'sexual lust'; in general, 'violence'; 'violent or criminal behaviour'; 'insolence ...'; 'bullying, the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead'; 'the mockery of the sorrowful'; 'mutiny or rebelliousness in an inferior toward a superior'; 'and so, rather rarely, ordinary insolence'. For each of these meanings he gives in his notes (pp. 80-84) instances in Greek Tragedy⁷, finding that 'nowhere in Greek Tragedy does hybris mean "pride" or "arrogance". Lattimore is closely followed by Vickers (1973: 31), adding as further testimony to Lattimore's view T.M. Gould's (1970: 108) gloss of hybris in Oedipus Tyrannus 873 as 'the will to violate'. (Gould also notes that 'Hybris is a general word for violence, outrage, and immoral insubordination'.) Vickers also mentions Winnington-Ingram's (1948: 18) translation of hybris as 'cruel and violent
outrage' and his later note (1948:34-5) that 'hybristic' implies 'aggressive' and 'violent'. Apparently independently from Lattimore, Kaufmann (1969:64-8) found mainly 'waxing wanton', 'running riot', 'wanton violence', 'lust and lewdness', 'animal violence', and 'outrage, violation, rape', attested for hybris in Greek Tragedy, and violently attacks the 'popular' (p.64) or 'traditional' view. In a less sketchy survey, MacDowell (1976:21) after following Lattimore's attack on the 'traditional' view, defines hybris as 'having energy or power and misusing it self-indulgently'. Although he himself offers no more than a 'general survey' (1976:14) of the Greeks' use of the word both inside and outside of tragedy, he departs from LSJ's categories and attests connotations of sex, koros, wealth, fighting and doing physical harm to people, taking from someone else a thing which belongs to him, disobedience to the gods - rarely - and to mock, taunt or be rude. An important observation is that hybris is not, as a rule, a 'religious matter' (MacDowell, 1976:22), in spite of the fact that in some passages (e.g., most well-known, of the Agamemnon, the Oedipus Tyrannus, and the Persae), hybris is linked with divine retribution or punishment. This concurs with Whitman (1951:254): 'The Christian conception of pride differs from hybris in that it directly relates one's attitude toward God... But hybris has far more to do with how a stronger man treats a weaker. If a Greek boasted that he was better than a god, it was folly, impiety, and presumption. It was also very dangerous, but it was not hybris.' To the same effect, and even earlier, is J.J. Fraenkel's (1941:28,30) finding that hybris, as applied to Prometheus and Ajax, no longer means 'hoogmoed' ('pride') or 'overmoed' ('excessive self-confidence') as it did in pre-tragic literature, according to him, but 'hooge moed' ('heroic courage'). Lastly, and most recently, Fisher's (1976:177-93) view of hybris is modern in that he agrees with MacDowell that it is not necessarily a religious offence, but approaches the 'traditional' notion in that hybris is characterized as the state of mind in which pleasure is derived from the
shaming or dishonouring of a victim.

What I call the 'modern' view of hybris is, to sum up:
(a) That it does not mean 'pride';
(b) That it denotes violence, aggression, insult, and insolence (on the human plane);
(c) That it is not necessarily a religious term (hybris is far more often directed at a human victim)\(^9\);
(d) That it involves an action, rather than an attitude of pride or 'mere arrogance of opinion'(Lattimore,1964:24)\(^10\);
(e) That it means the same in tragedy as in 5th Century Athenian legal literature.(MacDowell,1976:24, Fisher,1976:177)\(^11\)

0.1.2. Concurrently with the problem of the meaning of the word hybris runs the problem of the rôle (if any) that hybris plays in the plots of the extant Greek tragedies. Is hybris a master-theme of Greek Tragedy, a key to the interpretation of the tragic rationale? Is it identifiable with the Aristotelian tragic flaw/error? Is it the 'moral' of (the majority of) the extant Greek tragedies that the hybris of the tragic hero is punished by the gods? Here, at least, only a (qualified) Yes or a qualified No can be answered. And this is the watershed. The affirmative answer, that hybris is crucial to the meaning of Greek Tragedy in general, I shall call (again) the 'traditional' view (being older and more widespread), and the negative answer, that hybris has little or nothing to do with the meaning of Greek Tragedy in general, I shall call the 'modern' view.

'It is the inevitable lesson of Greek tragedy, that pride\(^12\) leads to downfall'(Murray,1940:128). 'His [Sophocles'] work reveals that he was aware of its [the life of the Classical Age] two aspects: the uncurbed pride of human will and the powers that lie in wait to destroy man's hybris'(Lesky,1967:95). '... that basic sin which the Greeks called hybris...Zeus punishes overweening ambition.'\(^13\) (Lesky,1966:246-7) The theory that the world order of Sophocles involves two realms, the world of men
and the world of the gods, and that an attempt to cross this barrier is punishable because it is 'hybristic', and that from this 'man may draw a salutary lesson', is propounded by Bowra (1944:380) and Pohlenz (1954:212ff.). The latter finds a scheme of universal justice, similar to that of Aeschylus, inherent in this design (Pohlenz, 1954:235). Webster (1936:29,30) interprets the Sophoclean message as: 'Man becomes too proud and commits an act of hybris; god sends ate upon him...then he falls and learns sense by suffering', since 'Sophocles' own view is stated by the chorus of the Antigone.' Another generalization from a single play (The Persae): 'The commonest cause of the invasion of Ate is success, the sequence of successes which makes men take success for granted, the prosperity which produces insolent pride, or hybris.' (Lucas, 1959:66). Del Grande (1947:131-48) detects 'Aeschylean' hybris, arising from inherited guilt, in Ajax and Antigone, and a 'personal hybris in Oedipus - 'Tragedy represents the παθη of the hero, by means of which the gods inculcate the lesson of being pious and not transgressing human limits.' Adams (1952:120-4) likewise stresses the importance of the idea of hybris, along with the justice of the gods. Wolf (1952), in his chapter on Sophocles, sees hybris everywhere: in Ajax, Antigone, Creon, Heracles, Odysseus, Philoctetes, Oedipus and Jocasta. Man by maintaining his own human dike and scorning the metron 'sins against divine justice', i.e. commits hybris and is punished by the gods. It is precisely against this type of 'untenable extension of the original sense [of hybris]' that Conradie warns when quoting - but not necessarily subscribing to - the theory that the Greek tragedians meant by hybris 'that the hero, often as a result of too great prosperity, starts to rely exclusively on his own powers and feels that he is no longer in need of help from the gods...an attitude heavily punished by the gods.' Not necessarily in the same pietistic interpretative vein, but equally sensitive to the importance of the idea of hybris, is the notion that 'the opposition between hybris and sophrosyne
lies at the heart of tragedy’ (North, 1966:33). According to Schadewaldt (1960:231-47), the Sophoclean dramatic crises 'change the hero's hybris into sophrosyne'. Kitto (1961:vii) is strangely non-committal about what hybris means: 'δόξα is hybris' - but feels confident of the 'moral law' of tragedy: 'The doer must suffer; δόξα leads to Ἀτέ' (Kitto, 1961:141). The Oedipus Tyrannus is then interpreted: 'Therefore', says Sophocles, "seek purity and avoid hybris". Kitto (1961:178). Woodard (1966:10) feels sure that 'such notions as hybris (pride, violence, excess)' will no longer be important since the advent of the humanistic school of Whitman, Knox, et al. However, he includes in his collection an essay by Seth Bernadete, where we read that (p.121) 'Oedipus...seems to have discovered in his hybris the non-human genesis of man.' To further show that it does not necessarily take a pietistic interpreter of Greek Tragedy to stress hybris as a key concept, I quote the following:

"Hubris is not "sin". It is the mysterious dynamic of all tragic action, dangerous because it involves a challenge to the powers that be, but not (in the tragic view) morally good or bad. It may lead to destruction...but without it, no man acts or suffers or learns.' 'The old hard doctrine of hubris' is somehow present in all tragedy. (Sewall, 1959:34-6)

"In its most elementary form, the vision of law (dike) operates as lex talionis or revenge...the original act provoking the revenge sets up an antithetical or counterbalancing movement, and the completion of the movement resolves the tragedy...the great majority of tragic heroes do possess hybris, a proud, passionate, obsessed or soaring mind which brings about a morally intelligible downfall. Such hybris is the normal precipitating agent of catastrophe.' (Frye, 1957:208-10)

"The palpitating unease of Greek Tragedy springs from a world in which to be sure your hands are clean is to convict yourself of hybris.' '...it is very difficult, so the Greeks believed, to excel and still to avoid hybris.' (Jones, 1962:92,212)
Literary critics who are not classical scholars often accept the 'traditional' view a priori:—

"it [hybrizein] is cognate with the tragic name (hubris) for man's eruption out of his proper sphere." (Wimsatt and Brooks, 1957:50,55) — They then go on to quote W.H. Auden on hybris as a tragic flaw sent by the gods to punish the hero.

—Brink(1962:2) regards as Aristotle's the view that the tragic hero's 'hubris' causes his eventual downfall!

That hybris is 'traditionally' seen as a technical term with full tragic dimensions, is illustrated by the fact that many commentators see hybris implied when the word does not appear in the text. A few examples would be:

— of Agamemnon's treading of the red carpet (Agamemnon,918ff.): Payne(1960:26); North(1966:46); Murray(1952:234).

— that the Suppliants of Aeschylus' play are 'hybristic': North(1966:38) and Miss H. Spier20.

(The question is: why is not mega phronein, hamartia, asebeia, authadia, thrasos, cholos, kakia, or aphrosyne taken to be 'implied' by the poet, or any other term denoting pride, wrongdoing or impiety, for that matter? It seems to be very often taken for granted that a misdeed with tragic consequences must be termed hybris. When the poet has failed to do so explicitly, it cannot be an oversight: he has therefore implied it!)

What I call the 'modern' view21, i.e. that hybris has little or nothing to do with the meaning of Greek Tragedy, is best represented by Lattimore(1964). The pattern hybris — nemesis ('the proud challenger of the gods must be brought low')...'has not been followed in any surviving plays', with the (unqualified) exception of the Persae; and the (qualified) exceptions of the Hippolytus and the Bacchae of Euripides, according to Lattimore (1964:25). Following Lattimore, Brian Vickers, in his attack on the 'traditional' view that hybris is one of the 'special keys to unlock Greek Tragedy', finds that 'hybris' in the traditional and erroneous sense — is seldom important in the structure of
action and reaction, though the chorus moralizes on it from time to time' (Vickers, 1973:29, 30n28). 'Stories of pride and punishment are often alluded to in passing, a by-theme for mere pathos.' - Lattimore, 1964:26). 'The popular notion that the central theme of Greek tragedy is that pride comes before a fall is very wrong and depends upon projecting Christian values where they have no place. For Aristotle and the Greek poets, pride was no sin but an essential ingredient of heroism' (Kaufmann, 1969:73). Whitman, too, attacked the view that the 'moral' of Sophoclean tragedy is the formula: 'he who crosses certain limits of behaviour...is guilty of hybris...and justly doomed.' (Whitman, 1951:245). Whereas e.g. Webster and Kitto of the 'traditional' school treat references to hybris in Sophocles' choric odes as explanatory to the general purport of his plays, Whitman sees the choruses as representative of the 'safe' morality of the un-heroic, 'little people', unfavorably contrasted with the bold, heroic nature of the chief characters of his plays. The warnings against hybris should therefore not be regarded as the 'meanings of the different plays, according to Whitman (1951: e.g. 67-9). In this regard, Vickers (1973:29) speaks of 'reducing Sophocles to the banality of some of his choric utterances'.

J.J. Fraenkel's position is a little equivocal. He laments Euripides' use of the word hybris in a 'pasmunt' (i.e. 'common-place', 'trivial') and 'untragical' sense, as opposed to the 'tragical hybris' in Aeschylus and Sophocles. However, he already detects the 'historical' switch in Aeschylus' Supplices and in the majority of Sophocles' tragedies. According to him, hybris in its 'sublime', 'pregnant' and 'tragical' sense, is only attested in the Oresteia, the Prometheus Vinctus and the Ajax. (J.J. Fraenkel, 1941:27-31).

Regarding my division of scholarship on the matter of hybris into a 'traditional' and a 'modern' school, I would like to remark the following: -
- Firstly, that the 'modern' view of the function of *hybris* in Greek tragedy seems to be associated with the humanistic school of Sophocles-interpretation. (It is possible that, if one wants to minimize the guilt of the tragic hero, one would attempt to 'play down' the importance of references to *hybris* - which does, whatever it may mean, have a negative connotation.)

- Secondly, that there seems to be a methodological error in the abovementioned attacks on the 'traditional' view. Judging that *hybris* does not mean 'pride' - the 'traditional' sense - they proceed to show that the 'pride and punishment pattern' is not generally found in Greek tragedy. One would have expected an inquiry into the question of whether *hybris* as 'violence' or 'aggression' or 'insolence' has any tragical import.²³ The idea of Oedipus' 'tyrannical *hybris*' (Kitto, 1966:225), or that Ajax' ruin is due to his *hybris*, is clearly not dependant on a translation of *hybris* as 'pride'.²⁴

- Lastly, that I would not like to create the impression that I regard all 19th and 20th Century scholarship on Greek Tragedy of non-humanistic strain as following the 'traditional' view of *hybris*. Indeed - with the exception of his interpretation of the Oedipus Tyrannus - Kitto does not generally state it explicitly, nor do, e.g. Kirkwood (1967) and others. In fact, in a bibliography on Sophocles which was widely accepted by the scholarly community, both Del Grande (1947) and Adams (1957) were severely chastized for overstressing the importance of *hybris* in Sophocles. (Friis Johansen, 1962:103,153).

In the light of the above, then, it seems clear that there is a need 'that someone will in due course publish a detailed study of the evidence' (MacDowell, 1976:14). There is a need to know how *hybris* is used in all its occurrences in extant Greek tragedy (and not only the 'important' instances like Oedipus Tyrannus, 873). Furthermore, an inquiry into the legitimate interpretative rôle of the concept *hybris* could help to clarify the present 'chaos' (Kitto, 1966:1) in classical scholarship on tragedy - e.g. the pietist - humanist controversy on Sophocles.
0.2. Method

0.2.1. With respect to the problem of the meaning of the word *hybris* in Greek Tragedy, I intend to examine the contexts of each individual occurrence of *hybris* and its cognate nouns, verbs and adjectives. Fortunately the elaborate language of poetry (in contrast with, e.g., the difficult prose context of *hamartia* in Aristotle's *Ars Poetica*) offers many repetitions—parallelistic and antithetic—chiasmi, definitions, etc. in the immediate contexts of individual instances. As intermediate context in every case, I take the *rhesis*, group of *stichomythia*, *stasimon*, or whatever is the larger unity within which our word occurs. The final context, of course, is the play as an artistic unity, within the framework of the specific tragedian's oeuvre, as well as the mythological and philosophical background of the whole of Greek Tragedy.

The etymological evidence I shall ignore, not only because it is a discredited method, but also because it is not of any help: both the 'traditional' and the 'modern' notions of what *hybris* means may be substantiated etymologically. (βνηρτ for the former, and βπειγκ for the latter.) Evidence from the fragments is not taken into account (the final contexts being obviously lacking), neither is, of course, evidence from outside Tragedy.

No distinction has been made methodologically among the cognates as 'different parts of speech', since, as will be seen in chapter 4 below, 'Conclusion', p. 107, no corresponding differences of sense can be grouped. Neither is any distinction made between the simple verb and its prepositional composites—which, if I am not mistaken, are here treated for the first time comprehensively and on an equal footing as evidence to *hybris*.

The cognate accusative construction (βπειν βπειξειν or ββεις βπειξειν) is treated as one instance of *hybris*, as it denotes only one act of committing *hybris*.

The intention is not to eventually formulate a 'definition' of
hybris, nor to make any statement about the 'meaning' of the word hybris. Translation equivalents (cf. Louw, 1976:34) are proposed in every case, according to what seems most fitting in each particular context, and ultimately - in the summaries at the end of each chapter, and, in the Conclusion - similar usages are grouped together by way of conclusion.

0.2.2. Guided by available commentaries, I have attempted to determine to what extent the concept hybris is germane to the tragic rationale. To furnish complete 'expositions' of all 31 surviving plays is, naturally, well outside the present scope. As a (hopefully useful) indicator, however, the percentage of instances where hybris refers to the chief character or characters (as far as this is determinable) compared to the total number of hybris-instances has served to test the 'traditional' hypothesis that 'a/any Greek tragedy dramatizes the effects of an act/actions of hybris or an attitude/character-trait of hybris on the part of its chief character(s)'. A high percentage would tend to substantiate this hypothesis, whereas a low percentage would tend to invalidate it.

0.2.3. Irrespectively of how hybris is actually used in particular tragedies, there remains the question of the tragic function of the 'traditional'idea of what hybris means. In other words, is the pride/arrogance/irreligious insolence of its hero always or generally the precipitating factor in the reversal of fortune in a Greek tragedy? Inasmuch as these attitudes or actions are not referred to as hybris in particular cases, the question cannot be discussed here - the tragic significance of only those attitudes and actions which are actually referred to as hybris in a particular play are considered. (A case in point is the article of Robertson (1967:373-82). It does not
fall in the present scope to attempt to evaluate his thesis that the main theme of Aeschylean tragedy is that Zeus punishes the wrongdoer. But the article does not exclusively concern the 'hybristes' in Aeschylus. It is really about kakia, asebeia, and all 52 terms denoting wrongdoing (with which Robertson groups hybris on p. 374). What we are concerned with here is, then, not the question whether the lesson of Greek Tragedy is that 'pride comes before a fall' but the question whether what is explicitly termed hybris in a particular play is significant in the dramatic structure of that play.

0.3. Hybris before Tragedy

Justice cannot, of course, be done to this topic here, but it would be useful at this stage to point out a pre-Classical usage of hybris which is particularly relevant to the present problem.


Solon, fr. 5.9 D

Similar passages are Theognis 153; Pindar Ol. I, 55-7, Ol. II, 95, Isthm. III, 2.

To MacDowell (1976:16) hybris thus connected with koros means no more than 'eating and drinking too much'; Fisher (1976:193) denies the religious connotations to this usage of hybris in the case of Solon, Solon being responsible for the legal graphê hybreos.
which relates only to the human and social level. But, in the case of Pindar, at least, 'continual stress is laid upon the connexion between guilt and punishment...wealth and surfeit lead to wantonness; thus man commits a misdeed and meets with disaster as a heaven-ordained punishment.' (Bremer, 1969:115) 'It belongs to traditional thought that *hubris* is followed by disaster.' (Winnington-Ingram, 1971:124) A distinct pattern emerges: *olbos - koros - hybris - atē*. This pattern I shall call the Pindaric-Solonic notion of *hybris*, an essentially religious notion, since *hybris* is seen as invariably followed by divine retribution (*atē*).

0.4. A note on the English word 'insolence'

As 'insolence' is often used by translators as the equivalent of *hybris*, it is necessary to digress briefly on the 'meanings and non-meanings' of this word as well. Dictionaries enter two distinct senses: 1. 'pride', 'arrogance', contumacious or overbearing behaviour in a superior toward an inferior; 2. 'presumptuously impertinent', 'saucy', 'insulting' behaviour, esp. in speech, in an inferior toward a superior. The two senses seem incompatible, and, indeed, both the Shorter O.E.D. and the World Book Dictionary clearly designate the former sense as obsolete. (This was also confirmed by consultation with several professional teachers of English.) For the former sense both dictionaries quote John Gray's 'How insolent is upstart pride' and Baxter's 'God will not gratifie their insolent demand' - Miton's 'sons of Belial, flown with insolence and wine', too, fits this sense. It is apparently this (obsolete) sense of 'insolence' which is intended when *hybris* is translated as 'insolence' in, e.g. Aeschylus' *Suppllices* (passim), *Agamemnon* 764, and Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 873, where *hybris* refers to contumacious or overbearing behaviour in a superior toward an inferior. I suggest that there is no real discrepancy between the two senses of 'insolence': Insolence of the proud, arrogant
and overbearing kind is merely 'insulting behaviour, contemptuous of authority' in that it is seen as a challenge to God or the gods, who forbid and punish this kind of behaviour. Thus, a man who ill-treats an inferior (i.e. behaviour which the modern English speaker would not call 'insolence'), when seen in a religious light, is insulting or contemptuous toward his Superior (the accepted current sense), in that it shows that he holds the laws of God/the gods in contempt.

Although it might be tempting to render 'insolence', covering both the religious and social spheres of the term *hybris*, I think that - because of the ambiguity of the word - one should be careful to use as translation equivalent only the current English usage of 'insolence'.

0.5. **Texts used**

I have adhered faithfully to the *Oxford Classical Texts* (O.C.T.) of Page, Pearson and Murray, except in the case of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 873.
NOTES TO "INTRODUCTION"

(1) In chapters 1, 2 and 3 below, the various translations of the instances at issue are discussed. For the English word 'insolence as an equivalent for hybris, see p.13 below.
(4) That hybris is traditionally regarded as an abstract noun, is illustrated by Owen(1939:106), and Bayfield(1968:74), where they describe usages of hybris as 'abstract for concrete', whereas in the senses used in the relevant passages, hybris is, in fact, concrete. But see the discussions of the relevant passages, below (Antigone 309, and Ion 506).
(6) My emphasis.
(7) What Lattimore calls the 'modern' concept of hybris (1964:87), both the passage of time and the fact that it is more wide-spread have caused me to prefer to term the 'traditional', referring to his as the 'modern' view of hybris.
(8) His argument is: '...if one holds a religious belief, such as Aiskhylos perhaps held, that all wrongdoing is punished by the gods, then it follows that the gods punish hybris along with all other wrongdoing, because hybris is wrong. But that does not mean that the word itself is a religious one. One may see this by comparing a word for some other kind of wrongdoing, say theft. If a man in myth steals something from a god ...and if one believes that the gods punish all wrongdoing, then one will believe that all thieves are punished by the gods. But that does not mean that 'theft' is a religious word or that it is generally regarded as a religious offense. So it is with hybris...' (MacDowell,1976:22).
(9) Most probably because 'men are not normally in a position to commit hybris against the gods'(Lattimore,1964:24). Lattimore further argues (e silentio) that 'the term hybris is not
regularly applied to the human member of the pride and punishment pattern (p. 23). What is more, of course—as we shall see later—in Euripides' Bacchae, and Hippolytus, it is a god who commits *hybris* against a human victim.

(10) But both MacDowell's and Fisher's definitions (see above) include the element of a 'state of mind'. At any rate, it is not certain whether the distinction between an action and the state of mind in which it is done, can be consistently maintained.

(11) This is as tacitly assumed by Lattimore (1964), Vickers (1973) and Kaufmann (1969), in their acceptance of the LSJ entry, as it is tacitly denied by holders of the 'traditional' view in their departure from it. See also J.J. Fraenkel (1941:34-7).

(12) The *hybris* of Aeschylus' Persae, 808, 821.

(13) Again, a generalization from the Persae, loc. cit.

(14) The latter two as quoted by Whitman (1951:245)

(15) My emphasis

(16) Jaeger (1939:168, 442n18, 257n84) rightly contrasts *hybris* with *sophrosyne*, without drawing a similar generalizing conclusion. (*Hybris* is certainly not the only word that can be contrasted with *sophrosyne*.) North has great difficulty to rationalize her hypothesis—see below, chapter 1, passim.

(17) At one stage, he seems to contradict himself: 'phrases... indicate that Oedipus is not the man they [the chorus] are describing' (Kitto, 1961:165) — or, at least, Kirkwood (1967:213) understands him as saying that 'the moral comments in this ode [the second stasimon of the O.T.] quite clearly do not refer to Oedipus and Jocasta.' But in his later book he repeats the 'traditional' interpretation: 'The modesty of Creon is a better example than the towering self-confidence of Oedipus.' (Kitto: 1966:242) Nevertheless, Kitto does not present the 'traditional' theory as explicitly (except in the case of the O.T.) as other commentators. — But see the discussion of the O.T., chapter 2.

(18) From Vickers (1973:29-30)

(19) Finding, according to the method of Discourse Analysis, a 'hidden' reference in the simile, he reproaches those who do not. But there is some confusion here. The question is whether
there is a reference to Agamemnon's slaying or not; and whatever is referred to here, is not called *hybris* by the poet. This shows clearly that the 'traditional' preconception about *hybris* may also intrude into scientific linguistic analyses.


(21) Again I must warn that Lattimore calls the interpretation which he attacks the 'modern', whereas I refer to it as the 'traditional.' (see above, note 7)

(22) See above, pp.5,6.

(23) The same unfair treatment of the 'traditional' view of *hamartia* is dealt out by Bremer(1969:118-97), in spite of frequent denials that he consistently follows Else's(1965:378-85) exposition of *hamartia*.

(24) cf. Lattimore's own unhappy interpretation of the second stasimon of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*: that Oedipus' ruin is due to his lust (=*hybris*) after his mother! (Lattimore, in The Poetry of Greek Tragedy,1958)

(25) In the studies mentioned, either generalizations from one or a few well-known instances have been given, or 'clusters' of 'main' senses grouped together. Seldom (except, in some cases, by MacDowell,1976) have reasons for assigning specific senses in specific contexts been offered.


(28) With ideas of violence: Boisacq, Dictionnaire Etymologique, 3 ed.

(29) From a transformational-generative point of view, one could, of course, argue that, in any case, ἃμπος = τίς ἄμπους, and so, too ἄμπους ἄμπους = τίς ἄμπους ἄμπους, etc.

(30) Euripides' *Hesper* not included (see below, chapter 3, p.106n8)

(31) The genealogy of *hybris* and *koros* is reversed in Pindar, Ol. XIII,10 by way of exception, as in Herodotus VIII,77.

(34) See under Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, respectively in the Bibliography.
(35) See below, chapter 2, p. 70.
1. HYBRIS IN AESCHYLUS

1.1. The Persae

[808] - ὁ νομος αἰσχρὸς κακῶν ὑpsi στ' ἐπαμμένει παθεῖν

[821] - ὡς ὁδὸς ὑπέρφευ θυητὸν ὄμηρα κρη τρονεῖν

-- 'Irreligious pride' in both cases.

-- So Murray (1952:59-60) and Vellacott (Aeschylus, 1973:145), but Podlecki (1970:95) retains 'hybris', paraphrasing it as 'the attitude of mind and the actions which resulted from it by which a human indulged his "delusions of grandeur", refusing to accept the limits of his mortality and so risking divine "jealousy" '.

There are two elements here: the fact that the hybris is irreligious and the fact that it consists in an attitude of proud expectations and self-reliance. The former is made abundantly clear by the close juxtaposition, almost in a synonymical repetition, of κακῶν φρονημάτων in line 808, and the stress on θυητῶν ὄμηρα in line 821. To further accentuate the religious element, the two references surround a description of, not merely violent, but specifically sacrilegious actions on the part of the Persians. The latter element is strongly suggested in line 808 (φρονημάτων - mega phronein is the usual phrase in tragedy for 'pride' or 'proud self-reliance'). A virtual definition is given in line 820: ὑπέρφευ φρονεῖν (by means of the explanatory γὰρ of 821). It is the old, Pindaric-Solonic sin of proud self-reliance, to the (disastrous) exclusion of the gods. Odd voices in the wilderness, disregarding the immediate context, disagree: 'The Persians had run riot, like a river that floods its banks, and the violent outrages they had committed bears no resemblance to proud self-reliance' (Kaufmann, 1969:75); 'jeugdige overmoed' is the sense
here, according to J.J. Fraenkel (1941:30), relying exclusively on lines 782-3.2

--- It is said by the ghost of Darius, whose appearance is a dramatic highlight, making the accusation of hybris all the more effective. Though line 808 perhaps strictly refers to the Persian army, Xerxes is identified with them to such an extent that it is safe to say that 'the term is applied to both Xerxes and his army' (Podlecki, 1970:95).

At any rate, there seems to be universal agreement that lines 820-1 represent the 'moral of Xerxes' story, succinctly stated' (Podlecki, 1970:95), that irreligious pride is punished by the gods, and that that 'pride' is the hybris of lines 808 and 821. (Lattimore, 1964:25; Lucas, 1959:65; Murray, 1940:128; Lesky, 1967:63; Bremer, 1969:118; Groeneboom, Persae, 1966:12; North, 1966:33; Kitto, 1966:74ff.; Jaeger, 1939:254ff.) Mortal man becomes too proud, he 'comes into conflict with a great, essentially divine order, which reveals to man his own limitation and gives meaning to his downfall.' (Lesky, 1967:63) The 'traditional' notion of hybris is the key to the tragic rationale of the Persae: Had Xerxes and his army not been proudly disdainful of the divine order, they would not have been destroyed (atê - 822)

1.2. The Supplices

[30] - ἐρασενοπληκήθ' ἅ' ἐμὸν ὑβριστὴν Αἴγυπτογενῆ
- 'Male sexual lust'
-- The chiasmus: ἐρασεν - ἐμὸν ὑβριστὴν

closely links ὑβριστὴν with 'male' (cf. MacDowell, 1976:17). Said by the chorus of Supplicants, of the Aegypti: It is the fact that the sons of Aegyptus wish to marry them, and not mere 'pride' or 'arrogance' which the Danaids are so desperately seeking refuge from. (But Murray, 1952:32, has 'Proud man and man's outswarming lust'; Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1973:55,'the male pride of the violent sons of Aegyptus', and Garvie, 1969:62, says 'they are
arrogant') The fact that both Murray and Vellacott have to over-translate (in the former, both 'proud' and 'lust' serve to translate ὑβριστήν; and in the latter 'pride' and 'violent' together correspond to ὑβριστήν), further proves the irrelevance of 'pride', which is superfluous: 'lust' is operative in the context.

[81] - ...Δειοι γενέται...
ηβαι μη τέλεσι δόντες έχειν παρ' αλλαν,
ὑμνίν δ' ετυμως στυγιοντες
πέλοιτι αὐν ευδικοι γάμοις.

--'Sexual lust'

Again, not 'pride' or 'arrogance', but the wild amorousness which is associated with youth (ηβαι). Opposed to ευδικοι γαμοις (where the Danaids would consent): where there is no consent, there is no 'just marriage', merely 'lust' on the part of the male. (But Murray, 1952:36 'Nor let man's pride be above God's ruth.../Only by loathing lust / Can ye to love be just'; and Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1973:57 'Let wild youth not accomplish its wicked lust; /Let pride be quelled by your abhorrence') Again, 'pride' is superfluous and wrong in both translations: 'lust' gives the necessary sense here -- why drag in 'pride'? (It cannot be intended as anything but a translation of ὑμοιν in this context.)

[90] - ἵδεσθω δ' εἰς ὑμοиν πρότειναν
οία νεάτει πυρμην
δι' ὁμον γάμον τεθάλως...

--'Sexual lust'

The same context as the preceding. It is ὁμον γάμον that the Δεηγυτι are after, they are therefore 'lusting' from the point of view of the unwilling Danaids. According to the chorus of Danaids, the ἄμωροι of the sons of Δεηγυτι 'springs into bloom like a young stem' (πυρμην) – cf. line 80, ἐβαι: a comparison with the nascent sexuality of the adolescent.
(But Murray, 1952: 38) 'Let him look now upon this ungodliness / of man: it groweth strong as a green tree / ...hot to possess this lovely flesh of me'; and Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1973: 57 - 'So let Zeus look on human arrogance / and mark how lusting for our flesh makes an old stock grow young / Bloom...') Why 'ungodliness' and 'arrogance'? If we were to cut out these two offensive (because dragged in under the influence of the 'traditional' notion) words, the translations would aptly render the imagery of youthful, blooming sexual desire.

[426] μηδε ἰδονεομεν ἐκ ἐδρῶν
πολυθέων ὑμοιασθείσαι
...γνώθι β' ἐδρῖν ἀνέρων
καὶ φιλαξία κότων

-- '(Male) lust'

-- The chorus is here entreating King Pelasgus not to allow them to be dragged away from the shrines - where they are seeking refuge - by the Aegypti. As in line 30, linked with a stem indicating 'male' (ἀνέρων) exclusiveness and the one-sidedness of the sexual desire. (MacDowell, 1976: 17) But is there not a tinge of irreligiosity here? (The violation of the shrines of the gods (ἐδρῶν πολυθέων) - and the warning to beware of the wrath of Zeus (ψιλαξία κότων). The answer is No. In the first place, the (potential) wrath of Zeus will be directed against Pelasgus (according to the Danaids), if he fails to protect the shrines against violation (μηδε ἰδονει), and not against the Aegypti. In the second place, the fact that the shrines are a place of refuge to the Danaids from the Aegypti has much more to do with the dramatic situation than the fact that they are shrines of the gods. This is borne out by lines 429-432, immediately following, and in sense a repetition of lines 423-427: μηδε τι ταλάξας...εἰ σοι δέειν...πέπλων τ' ἐπιλαβᾶς ἐμῶν. It is patent that what the Suppliant wish to evade is not so much violation of a religious shrine, but rather the
grasping hands of the unrequited suitors on their dresses.\(^4\) (Note the sensuous suggestivity of the grasping hands.) Certainly it is 'vileness' (Murray, 1952:56), certainly it is 'wickedness' (Vellacott, *Aeschylus*, 1973:67) — but that it is 'proud wickedness' is certainly not in the text.

Strangely enough, line 426 has been adduced to prove the aversion of the Danaids to men in general (cf. Garvie, 1969:221). But they are here fleeing a concrete danger, a definite body of men, the son of Aegyptus, who are — here and now — threatening to drag them away with πέπλων ἐπι λαβάς.

\[487\] — ἡδών τάδε ὑβρὶς ὑπὲρὶ μεν εὐθηρεῖεν ἀρσενος στόλου...

—'Male lust'

—Again the linking with male (ἀρσενος) exclusiveness, as in lines 30 and 426 (MacDowell, 1976:17). If anyone sees τάδε, he would identify it as ὑβρις. And what is τάδε? Maidens seeking refuge from a bunch of men. Here Murray (1952:58) — 'The sight of these may stir Pity and wrath against the ravisher' — is on the right track, but Vellacott, *Aeschylus*, 1973:71, sticks to 'arrogant men'. Again said of the Aegypti, but this time by King Pelasgus.

\[528\] — ἀλευσον ἀνδρῶν ὑβρὶς ευ στυγήσας

—'Male lust'

—See lines 30, 426, and 487 for the connection with 'male'. The context is still unchanged, and everything said of the total dramatic situation above, applies here as well. That it is said that Zeus hates ὑβρις, as the θεοὶ γενέται do in line 80, does not mean that ὑβρις has here a religious connotation. (It is well to remember MacDowell's argument (1976:22) that if one believes that the gods punish any wrongdoing — as the Danaids obviously do — one would believe that they also punish ὑβρις — or theft, or arson, for that matter; but 'that does not mean that "theft" [or ὑβρις] is a religious offense') At this stage of his translation, Murray (1952:62) has already realized this: 'The lust of man' ; but Vellacott, *Aeschylus* (1973:71) refuses to budge from his 'male arrogance'.\(^5\)
Lines 528ff. have, like line 426, been taken as proof of the Danaids' general aversion to men and marriage: Garvie (1969:221). This seems improbable (a) because subsequently (531-581) they approve of, and do not censure, Zeus' relationship with Io, and (b) because of the dramatic situation: the Danaids are not engaged in an armchair debate on the pros and cons of marriage. After the exit of the timid Pelasgus they are without succour and appeal to Zeus to ward off an imminent and concrete danger, viz. the male (ἄνδρῷν) lust of the Aegypti. Furthermore, 'A girl pressed to marry an unwelcome suitor usually says that she does not wish to marry at all.' (Murray, 1952:17)

---

[817] - γένος γαρ ἀγύπτιον ὑβρεὶς
δύσφορον [ ] ἀροενογενεῖ.

--- 'Male lust'
--- If ἀροενογενεῖ qualifies ὑβρεῖς, there is no doubt that hybris is here again used in the same sense as in lines 30, 426, 487 and 528 (see above). (but Murray, 1952:75 - 'pride' and Vellacott, 1973:79 - 'arrogance')

[845] - θεσποσίωτε ξεν ὑβρεὶς
--- 'Lust'
--- '...the lust of thy master' (Murray, 1952:77), and 'outrageous masters' (Vellacott, 1973:79). The context is similar to all of the preceding instances, the chorus this time addressing the Aegyptian herald.

[880] - Νείλος ὑβρίζοντά σ' ἀποτρέπε
[881] - ψεῖεν ά' στεν ὑβρίν
--- 'Gusting', 'lust'
--- Neither Murray (1952:79) : 'May thine own god, who sees thee, the great Nile, / Sweep thy proud deeds to darkness evermore : ', nor Vellacott (1973:81) : 'May the mighty Nile, that sent you
forth to wickedness, / Record your wickedness as lost for nothing', are very helpful. We must understand this as a cognate accusative construction: ὑβριστοντά ὑβρίν, which really only expresses one action - 'lusting'. The construction is used in order to accommodate αὐτοῦ ('unseen')12 Their lusting is as yet unseen by the Nile god13, but the Danaids are expressing the wish that the Nile, when he sees it, will turn them back, i.e. not accept them: in other words, that they may shipwreck before reaching Egypt. (Thus, a repetition of the shipwreck-wish immediately preceding - lines 867-871.) Therefore we may render 'lusting' - which is what the Aegypti will still be doing (Present Participle: ὑβριστοντά) when they return with the Danaids and perhaps not 'committing an act of violence' (which they will have then completed).

1.2.1. My conclusion is then that ὑβρις and its cognates are used in a sense equivalent to 'sexual lust'14 in all 9 instances in the Supplices - concurring with Lattimore (1964n24), MacDowell (1976:17), and even Murray (1940:104)! Smyth15 translates in 8 of the 9 cases 'wantonness' (which is probably a Victorianism for 'lust'). Italie (1955:ad loc.) has superbia, insolentia; and Friis Johansen (1970, Vol.I) consistently translates ὑβρις with 'insolence' - but this does not tally with the modern sense of the English word. Fisher (1976:192), in a too short note, objects to 'lust', and proposes 'forced marriage'. But as a translation equivalent, this would hardly be satisfactory: e.g. (line 104) 'Let Him look now upon this forced marriage of man: it groweth strong as a green tree...hot to possess this lovely flesh of me!16

1.2.2. None of the 9 references are to the chief character of the play, the chorus of Danaids - all of the references being to Aegyptus' sons (as has been shown above). Especially lines 426 and 528ff. have been taken by commentators to indicate the Danaids' general aversion to men, which makes them guilty of ὑβρις:17 In any case, whether the Danaids are guilty of 'excess' in this
regard or not (e.g. Lucas, 1959:84)\textsuperscript{18}, their fault is not called hybris by Aeschylus, and the fact that commentators use the word in this context shows the length to which misapplications can go, under the influence of the 'traditional' view. In short, the 'traditional' notion of the tragic rôle of hybris is not attested in the Supplices ('hybris aldaar [i.e. in the Supplices] heeft geen tragisch accent' - J.J. Fraenkel, 1941:30).

1.3. The Septem contra Thebas

[406] - εἰ γὰρ θανόντι νῦξ ἐπ' ὀφθαλμῶις πέσοι
   τῷ τοι φέροντι οὕμ' ὑπέρκομπον τὸδε
   γένοιτ' ἄν ὀρθῶς ἐνδίκως τ' ἐπώνυμον,
   καθὼς κατ' αὐτῷ τὴν ὕβριν μαντεύσεται

-- 'Violence', 'deed of violence'

-- Lines 375-670 form a close structural unity, the so-called 'seven pairs of speeches'\textsuperscript{19} The spy reports, one by one, the seven Argive chieftains at each of the seven gates, the devices on their shields and their violent, irreligious boasts. Eteocles answers each report, one by one, with a discussion of the enemy's blazon, the name of the Theban who is to oppose him, and the appropriateness of the match. Each of the blazons contains an omen which Eteocles cleverly converts into an inauspicious portent for the enemy champion. Tydeus, the first champion, bears on his shield the starry heavens with the full moon, the eye of the night (νυκτὸς ὀφθαλμάς), in the centre. In the passage cited above, Eteocles turns the phrase around: 'if the night of death should fall on his eyes' (403), then - and here comes the punch-line - 'he will have prophesied a violent end (τὴν ὕβριν) against himself' (406). (So Murray, 1952:46: 'and himself his darkening has decreed'; and Lattimore, 1964:81n22, who (tentatively) groups this instance under LSJ's entry 'physical disaster without motivation'.) This interpretation is consistent with the general trend in the seven pairs of speeches - 'The Argive chieftains unknowingly prophesy their own defeat' (Cameron, 1971:37).
Another interpretation, in the 'traditional' sense, is, however, equally probable for line 406: "...and his pride become a prophecy against himself' (Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1973:100): 'en (zoo) zal hij dit overmoedig orakelteken (den nacht op den schild) tegen zich zelf keeren' (Groeneboom, Zeven, 1966:157).

Groeneboom's text is καυτός καθ' αύτοῦ τὴν ὑβρίν μαντεύσεται, and he interprets τὴν ὑβρίν as an accusative of the internal object = τὴν ὑβριστικὴν μαντείαν'. Against this one may argue that, in the first place, the dreadful anachronism ὑβριστικὸς is not attested in Greek tragedy, and, in the second place, 'violence'/'violent death' fits in perfectly well without philological gymnastics. However, his point is clear (we can take the τὴν ὑβρίν of Page's text as, perhaps, an adverbial accusative, to read: he shall have prophesied proudly / in his proud boasts against himself - if we should not then have expected, perhaps, (τὴν) ὑβρεῖ, as in the Supplices of Aeschylus, 817. But I shall defer an attempt to refute this interpretation to an analysis of the intermediate context (the 'sieben Reedepaare') below, after considering line 502.

[502] - Ἀδράρα Ἀλεξά...  ἀνδρᾶς ἐχθαῖ δουνο' ὑβρίν.

--'Violence'
-- The context is similar in structure to the preceding, Eteocles this time responding to the spy's report of the fourth Argive champion, who is raging at the gate of Onca Pallas. In support of 'violence' here: '...Onca Pallas.../...in righteous hate of madness'Murray, 1952:51); LSJ's category of 'violence in general'Lattimore, 1964:82n25); 'als magdelike godin gevoelt zij des te eer afkeer van eens mans hybris'(Groeneboom, Zeven, 1966:171) - the latter an important observation, since the link here with ἀνδρᾶς serves to confine the sense of hybris to a narrower sphere than the 'traditional' notion of proud, irreligious self-reliance' which may, of course, be applicable to a woman. But see above, on Aesch. Suppl. 528, and
On the contrary, the 'traditional' sense of *hybris* is more widely held as attested here: 'man's arrogance' (Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1973:103); 'The emphasis is laid on the impious defiance of the gods by six of the attackers... The *hybris* of the Argives resides mainly in their failure to "think mortal thoughts" and their confidence that the gods cannot stop them... Athene will ward off Hippomedon because she hates his *hybris*. ' (North, 1966:42)

An analysis of the 'sieben Reedepaare' in terms of proud boasting and the word *hybris* reveals the following:

1. Tydeus - boasts \*\*\* - *hybris* (406)
2. Capaneus - boasts irreligiously \*\*\* - NO *hybris*
3. Eteocclus - boasts irreligiously \*\*\* - NO *hybris*
4. Hippomedon - boasts \*\*\* - *hybris* (502)
5. Parthenopaeus - boasts irreligiously \*\*\* - NO *hybris*
6. Amphiaraus - does not boast - NO *hybris*
7. Polynices - boasts \*\*\* - NO *hybris*

\*\* By 'boasting irreligiously' I mean a direct, defiant challenge to the gods - in the case of Capaneus: 'God willing, God unwilling, he will sack this town, / Says he; and not the counterblast of Zeus himself, / Cast at his feet, will stop him...' (lines 427-429); and similarly Eteocclus' "'Ares himself shall not repulse me from their walls!" (Line 467); and Parthenopaeus' boast '—that he'll destroy the city of Cadmus / Even in spite of Zeus' (lines 729,30). *Hybris* is not applied to these three.

\*\* By contrast, Tydeus and Hippomedon, the two champions with whom *hybris* is associated, do not utter such godless challenges. The fact that Tydeus wears a διψαφρον ζηλα (line 387), and that Hippomedon's shield bears the Typhon inimical to Zeus (lines 409-10), have been adduced as indicative of their irreligious *hybris* (North, 1966:40-42, and Murray, 1940:139). But the former is true of all the Argive champions, and the latter is only a 'happy accident, attributed to Hermes' (Cameron, 1971:39). It is also not true that 'Amphiaraus reproaches Tydeus and Polynices
for their hybris' (North, 1966:41 - another example of interpretative misapplication of the term where it does not even appear in the text - 571ff.)

Some form of the root kompein ('to boast') is used with reference to each of the attackers (except, of course, Amphiaraurus). All of them are boastful - Capaneus, Eteocles and Parthenopaeus irreligiously so. Why, then, is hybris only used of Tydeus and Hippomedon? Tydeus is violent: 'lusting for fight,/ Like a fierce chariot-horse that snorts against the bit'(393-4); exceedingly so is Hippomedon: 'Ares has entered into him; / A Bacchant, drunk with lust of war - his eye strikes terror'(497-8)

By contrast, in the cases of Capaneus, Eteocles and Parthenopaeus, they are not characterized as especially violent, and in the place of the descriptions of violence in the cases of Tydeus and Hippomedon, the formulaic reports of character and behaviour in the spy's speeches which bear on them contain exclusively their irreligiously challenging boasts (427-9; 467; 729-30 respectively). Clearly, Aeschylus has used hybris in the 'sieben Reedepeare', not to indicate irreligiously proud boasting, but associated it, instead, with violence. This substantiates the interpretations given above of lines 406 and 502, which seemed at least just as probable as the 'traditional' in their immediate contexts. (Regarding line 502, one should again bear in mind MacDowell's argument that, because hybris is said to be hated by a god, this does not necessarily make hybris a religious offense.)

1.3.1. 'Violence', then, is most probably the sense of the two occurrences of hybris in the Septem contra Thebas.

1.3.2. While the term is applied to two of the Argive chieftains, it never is used of the chief character, Eteocles. At least, that Eteocles is the tragis hero around which the action centres, is generally accepted (Lesky, 1967:66, Murray, 1940:143, Lucas, 1959:73ff., Bremer, 1969:133, Kitto, 1961:45 ('The play is all Eteocles')).
All these scholars are also in complete agreement as to the reason for Eteocles' tragic downfall: the family curse, and more especially Oedipus' curse on his two sons. (The only discordant note is struck by North, 1966:42, where she implies Eteocles' change from *sophrosyne* to *hybris* after his decision to fight Polyneices - ignoring the simple fact that *hybris* is never used of Eteocles.)

The usage of the word *hybris* in the *Septem contra Thebas* is, then, not applicable to the 'traditional' view of the role of the concept *hybris*, whether the latter is important in the play or not (see p. 11 above).

1.4. The *Prometheus Vinctus*

[82] - ἐνταῦθα νῦν ὑβριζε καὶ θεῶν γέρα
     οὐλὸν ἐφημέροις προσίθει.

--'to be rebellious'

-- Prometheus has just been nailed firmly to the rock as punishment by Zeus for his rebellious disobedience in helping the race of mortals. It is Kratos who mockingly enjoins: 'Now rebel, there (where you are nailed fast - ἐνταῦθα), and plunder the prerogatives /privileges of the gods and give them to mortals.' *Hybrizein* is clearly something which one cannot do when nailed to a rock - 'Prometheus is not in a position to *hybrizein*'. On the contrary, one can, in Prometheus' position, 'swell with upstart arrogance' (Vellacott, *Aeschylus*, 1973:23), hanging 'there in all thy pride' (Murray, 1952:24). Certainly, the attitude of proud defiance is not meant, rather an *act* of rebellious disobedience (or 'insolence') -Grene in Grene and Lattimore, 1960:Vol I:68. The sense of 'mutiny or rebelliousness in an inferior toward a superior' is given by Lattimore (1964:84n30). Kaufmann's (1969:79) 'run riot' is too general a sense.) The religious element in the 'traditional' notion of *hybris* is problematic here, Prometheus himself being a fully immortal god - but see below, p.47.
Prometheus, in his account of the future sufferings of Io, incidentally mentions this river. Why is it rightly (οὐ ψευδώνυμον) called Ηybristēs? 'Its wild torrent justifies its name' (Vellacott, Aeschylus,1973:41 - it is uncrossable (718). Lattimore (1964:23) enters under LSJ's heading 'the activity of wild animal spirits'. That a too keen awareness of the 'traditional' sense can prove fatal to a translator is shown by the attempt to render Italie's (1955) Insolentia - 'Insolence' seems a strange name for a river (Grene, Grene and Lattimore, 1960, VolI:90) - and Murray's (1952:53) attempt: 'a lordly river, named of wrath' likewise seems forced.

-- 'Violent'

[970] - ὅτως ὑπρίζειν τοὺς ὑπρίζοντας χρεῶν.

-- 'to mock', in both cases.

The line is obelized in Page's text, apparently because of (1) uncertainty as to the assignment of speakers in lines 968 and 970, and (2) 'non intellegitur; lacunam unius versus, ut postulat symmetria, statuit Reisig' (Aeschylus, 1972:235). But for lines 968-70:-

'Hermes: It is better, I suppose to be a slave
to this rock, than Zeus' trusted messenger.
Prometheus: Thus must the insolent show their insolence'
(Grene, 1970:100)

or,

'Hermes: Being bondslave to this rock is preferable, no doubt,
To being the trusted messenger of Father Zeus.
Prometheus: You use the fitting language of the insolent'
(Vellacott, 1973:49)

seem to make good sense. Though 'insolence' is perhaps not quite sharp enough, if line 970 is seen as Prometheus' retort to the immediately preceding jibe of Hermes. λατρεύειν τῷ δὲ πέτραι (968)
is a nasty way of putting Prometheus' predicament. This scornful jibe of Hermes may well be described with LSJ's entry 'the mockery of the sorrowful' - so Kaufmann(1969:79) and Murray(1952:66) - 'Here I can meet my mockers scorn for scorn' for line 970.\(^{33}\)

(Lattimore's 'bullying, the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead' is a little off the mark.)

1.4.1. 'Rebelliousness'(82) ; 'violence'(717) ; and 'mockery' (970) - twice - are then the different senses in which \textit{hybris} is used in the \textit{Prometheus Vinctus}.

1.4.2. As we have seen, in only one of the four cases - i.e. line 82 - \textit{hybris} is applied to Prometheus - and there can be no doubt that he is the dominant figure in the play. There have been attempts to interpret the \textit{Prometheus Vinctus} as a \textit{hybris}-orientated drama -

'In Prometheus Bound the pride[=\textit{hybris}] of Zeus and the pride [=\textit{hybris}] of Prometheus wage pitiless war' (Payne,1960:22)

'the traditional antithese to \textit{sophrosyne} are about equally divided between Zeus and Prometheus...among which \textit{hybris} is especially prominent' (North,1966:43)

'Aeschylus, die naar ik meen in zijn Prometheus Vinctus deze \textit{hybris} het zuiverst stelt' : ['deze \textit{hybris} is defined as] - hij maakt zich schuldig, overschrijdt de wetten en de normen en draagt de straf zijner overtredingen op heldhaftige wijze ...

Het was inderdaad de \textit{hybris}, die Prometheus dreef tot het werk dat hij deed...vs. 82' (J.J. Fraenkel,1941:31)

But these attempts have not been successful, as one would expect from the low ratio of \textit{hybris}-references to Prometheus (1:4).Nowhere, of course, is \textit{hybris} used of Zeus.)\(^{34}\) But furthermore, in the case of the \textit{Prometheus Vinctus}, the 'traditional'conception of the importance of \textit{hybris} founders on the following considerations :-

(1) Zeus is not here the omnipotent, omniscient guardian of a
divine ethical order, the punisher of transgressors of that order. Most scholars agree that the part played by Zeus is that of a crude and villainous tyrant.  

(2) Indeed, Prometheus is 'haughty' (Murray, 1940:32), stubborn and proud. In fact, the whole play revolves around his resilience in the face of Zeus' violent threats, which eventually results in his being 'punished' for his obstinacy. But again we are faced with the fact that this attitude of Prometheus is never said to be hybris in the play. The hybris of line 82 refers to his previous act of rebellion in stealing fire from the immortals and giving it to the mortals. (It is perhaps relevant to note that the accusation of hybris is made by the hostile Kratos, whereas Hephaistos - whom we should have expected to be a 'hostile witness' - in this context; and the Chorus, almost throughout, are sympathetic towards Prometheus.) But his initial rebellion is not what the play is about. As is well demonstrated by Kitto (1961:53-61), the play is a dramatization of Prometheus' stubborn resistance to Zeus, subsequently to the original act of rebellion. Whereas the 'traditional' concept of hybris might well, then, be inherent in the Prometheus Vinctus, the word hybris itself is not used on this pregnant sense in the play.

1.5. The Agamemnon

[764] - φιλει δὲ τίκτειν ὑβρις μὲν παλαιὰ νεά-
       ξουσαν εν κακοῖσ βροτῶν

[766] - ὑβριν τὸ τὸ τὸ τὸ...

--(A) 'crime', 'misdeed', in both cases
-- (1) Judging from the immediate context alone (764-766 only), the 'traditional renderings in translations of hybris as 'pride' or 'insolence', do not seem adequate equivalents here:
'But Pride ageing is made / in men's dark actions / ripe with the young pride / late or soon...' (Lattimore, Grene and Lattimore, 1960, Vol I:28);
'But ancient insolence is used to / beget an insolence that has
its youth / among the woes of mortals, soon or late...' (Lloyd-Jones, 1970:58)

'Pride or Sin the Elder will / In the man who chooses ill, /
Breed a younger Insolence...' (Vellacott, Aeschylus, 1971:69)

'but Old Sin loves, when comes the hour again,/ To bring forth New, /
Which laugheth lusty amid the tears of men.' (Murray, 1952:66) - Murray's pericope heading reads: 'It is Sin, it is Pride and Ruthlessness, that beget children like themselves...

'Old Insolence is like to breed young Insolence, among men that are evil, sooner or later...' (Denniston-Page, 1957:137)

(a) It is difficult to see how an attitude or character-trait of pride or insolence can engender (τικτειν), be the cause of, a subsequent attitude of similar nature, unless the process is highly metaphysical. But Aeschylus need not always be obscure. If we understand hybris here as 'act of violence', 'misdeed', the meaning is perfectly clear. A preceding (παλατ) action can be the logical cause of a subsequent (νεάσωσαι) action or deed, i.e. a murder being followed by a revenge-murder. This is why both Murray and Vellacott vacillate between 'Pride' and 'Sin': the former being adhered to in deference to the tradition (cf. Italie, 1955, ad loc.), the latter being sensed as more fitting in the context. (Though perhaps it is better to avoid confusion with the Christian concept of 'Sin', and render 'crime'. The latter has the further advantage of being restricted to the field 'act of violence', whereas 'sin' is too general, and could also include non-violent attitudes.) Lattimore's translation of 'Pride' (quoted above) was apparently made before he himself realized that 'neither "pride" nor "arrogance" is attested in Liddell and Scott. In his later work he - rightly, it seems - takes LSJ's entry 'violent or criminal behaviour' as the sense of hybris in this context. (Lattimore, 1964:85n41;23).

(b) Page says of κακὸς, 'neuter or masc. preferably the latter' (Why preferably masculine? Because attitude, a 'state of being arrogantly proud' (Denniston-Page, 1957:ad 757-62) is likely to flourish (νεάσωσαι) among evil men, rather than in the mis-
fortunes of men. Crimes, especially revenge-murders, on the other hand, are to be expected to arise from 'the tears of men' - κακοῖς taken as neuter. Both Murray, in his translation, and Ed. Fraenkel (1950, ad loc.) take κακοῖς as neuter - 'misfortunes (of men)' - both, unfortunately 'doing the right thing for the wrong reason' when they adduce the usage ὑβρίζειν ἐν κακοῖς for 'rejoicing in the misfortunes of others' ('Which laugheth lusty amid the tears of men' - Murray). This is, indeed, the usage in Agamemnon 1612, but certainly not in this context. I understand the cited passage: 'Often an old crime is the cause of a subsequent crime, amid the woes of men.'

(c) Both Kaufmann (1969:78) and MacDowell (1976:20), rather disappointingly, regard the present passage as too vague and textually corrupt to allow of understanding. But Denniston-Page (1957: ad loc.) and Ed. Fraenkel (1950: ad loc.) agree that (i) our immediate context (764-6) is certain and that (ii) although lines 766-79 are corrupt, we can make out that, in some way, ἀτέ is a result of ὑβρίς (line 770).

(2) It is precisely this connection of ὑβρίς with ἀτέ which can be misleading. Fortunately, Aeschylus has made quite clear what he means by ἀτέ in this context, by saying that (a) ὑβρίς brings forth ἀτέ μελαθροῖν, i.e. 'for the house' (Ed. Fraenkel, 1950, ad loc.) The ἀτέ is visited on a whole house, the Atreidae, and not on an individual. From this we can infer: (a) That ἀτέ is here 'destruction'/'ruin' (Bremer, 1969:125) and not 'blindness' 'delusion'. The latter would rather befall an individual, the former can, and does in the Oresteia, apply to a house - cf. Agamemnon 1575 and Choephoroi 1065. (b) That the ὑβρίς of 764-6 does not exclusively apply to Paris' abduction of Helen (as Bremer, 1969:125, wrongly understands), for the resulting ἀτέ is not the ruin of a city (Troy), but that of a house (the Atreidae). (Ed. Fraenkel, 1950:350n3, speaks of the 'mistake of referring it to the conquest of Troy, whereas the words are used in a quite general sense'.) Both these inferences strengthen the suggestion above (p.34) that ὑβρίς could refer to successive
crimes committed in the house of the Atreidae. To be quite cer-
tain, however, we should place lines 764-6 against their imme-
diate background, lines 750-770, as well as against the final
context of play and trilogy.

In 750-763 the chorus quotes the belief that olbos ('wealth')
is the cause of (τεκνούθαι) misery (διζυν). It rejects this doc-
trine (διχα δ' άλλων μονόφρων είμι), and believes, on the contrary,
that it is the impious act (το δυσεβές γάρ έργον) that is the
cause of (τίκτειν) further similar acts. (Lines 764-6 contains,
then, a repetition of this sentiment.) This, of course, calls
to mind the sequence olbos - koros - hybris -...atê of Solon,
fr. 5.9 D, Theognis 153,175, Pindar, Ol. I,55-7, Pyth.II,25ff. 40
The habit of parallel-quoting has resulted in scholars generally
equating the hybris of 764-6 with koros :-
'Koros...is sometimes almost synonymous with hybris'(Lloyd-Jones,
1970:38n - on lines 764-6 !);
'koros equals hybris' (Winnington-Ingram,1971:124n28 - on Aga-
memnon 382 );
'koros leads to hybris, the state of being arrogantly proud, self-
willed, contemptuous of duty towards gods and men...the idea that
the blame falls not on prosperity in itself, but on the sinful
acts of over-prosperous men' (Denniston-Page,1957:136n)
This facile identification is, indeed, a grave error,
(a) because the Pindaric-Solonic notion is, of course, exo tês
tragôdias, and
(b) because the chorus takes pains to disavow the koros - hybris
genealogy, pressing (through repetition) instead its conviction
that it is a crime, a misdeed (hybris) which results in a subse-
quent crime(hybris), eventually leading to the destruction (atê)
of a house. That line 381, where hybris does not occur, is ad-
duced in this context, is likewise incorrect.
(3) An erroneous reading of lines 764-6 could lead to imputing
hybris as a fault of character to Agamemnon, e.g. 'One hybris
begets another, and Agamemnon is excessive in his revenge upon
the Trojans' (Lloyd-Jones,1971:7). But it is not a character-
trait that *hybris* refers to here. It is 'actions that are "instrumental in bringing about catastrophe" : these actions are, in order of time,
A. Thyestes' adultery, and Atreus' horrible revenge,
B. Paris' abduction of Helen away from Sparta,
C. Agamemnon's sacrifice at Aulis,
D. Clytaemnestra kills her husband (and Cassandra),
E. Orestes kills his mother (and Aegisthus)' (Bremer, 1969:123)

- It is not *koros* which is indicated, but rather (and let us give the last word to Gilbert Murray) it is that 'Strong creatures, following their own lusts, do *hubris* everywhere to weaker things... But the accumulated tension of wrong becomes unbearable... and inevitable the storm bursts. It is difficult in the *Agamemnon* to isolate one particular wrong for which the King is punished, or one particular motive which leads Clytaemnestra to her crime... Behind the wickedness or blindness of this or that particular son of Atreus there is the Daemon of the House, which cannot rest because of all the innocent blood that has been shed, and tries madly to find peace through more blood.' (Murray, 1952:8).

[1612] - Αὖγιοθ', δῆριζοντ' ἐν κακοίοιν ὀδὸδέβω.

-- 'Rejoicing (in the misfortunes of others)'

-- Translation that have been given for *hybrizein* are: 'insults' (Vellacott, 1971); 'to insult' (Murray, 1952); 'strong vaunting' (Lattimore, 1960); 'insolence' (Lloyd-Jones, 1970); 'to triumph' (Ed. Fraenkel, 1950); and 'triumph insolently' (Denniston-Page, 1957) - all ad loc. 42 The context: the chorus' disapproval of Aegisthus' rejoicing (lines 1577-1611) after the murder of Agamemnon. Once again, Italie's (1955) *insolenter se gerere* is unimaginative and misleading. 43 Also, Aegisthus was not merely triumphing, he was 'crowing over someone else's misfortune' (MacDowell, 1976:21), 'wallowing' in his neighbour's miseries' (Kaufmann, 1969:78). The fact that he calls it a 'happy (εὐφρον) day
(line 1577); 'his constant use of the tritest cant sayings' (Lloyd-Jones, 1972:102n) (lines 1623-4); puns (lines 1591 and 1629-30); and 'bombastic grandiloquence' (Denniston-Page, 1957: ad loc.) - these all make him come close to 'mockery' (Lattimore, 1964:23). The sense is akin to hybrizein in Sophocles: 'triumphing, rejoicing mockingly (in misfortunes)' - the apt German word is 'Schadenfreude'.

1.5.1. Thus, **hybris** is used in the *Agamemnon* to signify 'a (violent) crime' - twice (lines 764, 766); and once to indicate 'mocking triumph (in the misfortunes of others)' - line 1612.

1.5.2. As to the tragic significance of **hybris**, line 1612 may of course be safely ruled out. Next, what about the red carpet scene (lines 915-974)?

'-he had previously walked δ' Ψβριν[sic] on a very long crimson embroidered robe..."And why did he deserve death?" No doubt he had trampled with impious feet on broderies fit only for the gods" (Murray, 1940:234,5). NO **hybris**- word is used with reference to the red carpet scene, neither can any other **hybris**-reference in the *Agamemnon* by any means be stretched to refer to it - applying as they do to Aegisthus' 'Schadenfreude' and to successive crimes in the house of the Atreidae. Payne (1960:26), too, unlike Aeschylus himself, sees the 'Pride of Hubris' in the treading of the carpet. Likewise does North (1966:46) - 'where [in the *Agamemnon*] the **hybris** is chiefly that of Agamemnon himself and is symbolized by the blood-red carpet'. Amazingly, even Denniston-Page (1957:151n), specifically referring to lines 922 and 925, explicitly call the treading of the carpet 'the act of Ψβριν which he knows to be sacrilegious'! This astounding faculty of the scholars to be able to see things where they are not, can only be ascribed to (a) the force of the 'traditional' notion of **hybris**, and (b) the desire to impute ethico-
religious culpability to the chief character of the play. What, then, is the significance of the double mention of hybris in lines 764-6 for the rest of the play? The answer is: the crimes which logically follow the one after the other are not metaphysically connected, but flow the one from the other through the natural human process of revenge. Thus Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia is made with the intention to avenge the abduction of Helen by Paris, and in Clytaemnestra's murder of Agamemnon she is taking revenge on the former (παλατί) hybris. As a side-motif Aegisthus' complicity in the crime is justified by himself in lines 1577-1611 (see above, p. 37) as 'just' revenge on Atreus' ancient crime. This is also how we should understand the link of hybris with eventual atê 'for the house' (line 769). Atê is not so much here 'divine Retribution' for the 'Sin of Pride', but rather the actual physical destruction which would inevitably (φιλατί δὲ) result from (τικτεῖ) the successive revenge-orientated murders. The danger is concrete: If the revenge murders continue, there would ultimately be no more Atreidae left! This seems to be the single dramatic problem of the play. And lines 764-9 express the problem in a nutshell - despite the prominence of religious and moral overtones, they are secondary to the main dramatic situation: a horrible chain of revenge-murders is threatening the very survival of a royal house... where will it end? (Fortunately, we have the trilogy to see what the upshot will be - see below, on the Eumenides).

Hybris, then, understood as referring to successive crimes, applies to both Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra. The question of which of the two is the chief character of the Agamemnon need not concern us here - 'Aristotle has remarked that "tragedy is a representation not of people but of a praxis, of life, of prosperity or ruin" (Poetics, 1450α15).... We do not, in fact, debate anxiously whether the "hero" of the Agamemnon is Agamemnon or Clytaemnestra or possibly Cassandra - we see at once that this play is about "something" rather than "somebody"...' (Kitto, 1966:156). Therefore, for the purposes of testing the validity of the 'tradition-
al' hypothesis (see Introduction, p.11 above), I shall assign two out of the three hybris-references in the Agamemnon to the 'chief character. (Line 1612 is ruled out as irrelevant to the main action, whereas the double mention of hybris in lines 764-6 states precisely the main theme and problem of the play, i.e. the continuous process of crime and subsequent reveng-crime, in which both chief characters participate.) However, it is not hybris in the 'traditional' sense of 'pride' as a flaw, but hybris in the 'modern' sense of 'violence'/ 'deed of violence' which is operative as the precipitating factor of calamity.

1.5.3. Whether or not 'pride' - as 'traditionally' understood by the concept hybris - is an important dramatic idea in the Agamemnon cannot be discussed here: hybris is at any rate not used in this sense in the Agamemnon.

1.6. The Choephoroi

Although no form of the word hybris occurs in the Choephoroi, both J.J. Fraenkel (1941:31) and North (1966:46-7) seem to sense an implication of hybris in Orestes' murder of Clytaemnестra. This is not without some justification, as the murder of Clytaemnестra is one of the successive revenge-murders indicated in Agamemnon 764-6.

1.7. The Eumenides

[534] - δυσσεβίας μὲν ἡγής τέκος ὡς ἐτύμως
-- 'misdeed', 'crime'
-- So Vellacott (Aeschylus, 1971:165), but the 'traditional' sense is rendered by both Murray (1952:228): 'Pride of Man, and Pride's excess' (where the whole phrase is intended as a translation of the single word hybris); and Lloyd-Jones (Eumenides, 1970:43):
'insolence'. Payne (1960:22) has 'overweening pride' as the equivalent of hybris in 534. But, 'in such a context, hybris has no specific technical meaning that can be pressed' (Lattimore, 1964:83n26). Judging from the immediate context alone, one can only say that the sense of hybris lies somewhere in the field: 'something akin to, but not identical to 48 , and resulting from irreligiosity'. It is therefore natural to turn to the broader context of play and trilogy to try to understand the sense in which hybris is used here. Lines 750-769 of the Agamemnon immediately come to mind (see above, pp. 35-6). Scholars have again not hesitated to associate the hybris of line 534 of the Eumenides with koros, and indeed to identify it with koros so as to mean 'excess' or 'overconfidence' or 'pride' (e.g. Lloyd-Jones's (Eumenides, 1970:43) note: 'lack of reverence for the gods and for the divine law leads to the brutal insolence (hybris) that brings a man or his descendants to disaster; we recognize this doctrine whose fullest statement is at Agamemnon 750-81 '); Murray's translation 49 ; but especially Lebeck's (1971:162) interpretation.). Lebeck understands the ως ἐτύμως of line 534 as indicative of etymological word-play, and reads the line to allude to koros : hybris is understood to be truly (=κατά τὴν ἐτυμολογίαν) the off-spring (koros) of koros. ('ὑβρις is a synonym for one meaning of koros , τέκνος for the other'). It is to be doubted whether this interpretation is valid, (a) because the etymon itself occurs in neither the passage in the Agamemnon nor the passage in the Eumenides, and (b) because it is doubtful whether ἐτύμος and ἐτύμως always indicate a play on words, 50 and (c) in spite of the fact that the koros - hybris - ἐτε genealogy was well-known at the time of the production of the play—as Lebeck argues—Aeschylus seems to have done his utmost to differentiate his notion of hybris from the Pindaric-Solonic koros-genealogy, especially in Agamemnon 757-8, 51 which makes it rather unlikely that his audience would have misunderstood him, as his latter-day critics have, in this matter. (Rose 52 goes as far as to phrase his explanation of line 534 : 'Hybris is not the child
of koros').

The only viable alternative is to consider the possibility that hybris here refers to Orestes' murder of Clytaemnestra. (So J.J. Fraenkel, 1941: 31 and North, 1966: 46-7) It would then indicate, as it does in the Agamemnon 764-6, a deed of violence, or 'crime'. That this interpretation is consistent with the trilogy-encompassing choric utterance in the Agamemnon about successive crimes leading to ruin, is certainly in its favour. For, if the chorus were claiming that Orestes, or anyone else in the trilogy had been 'proud' or 'excessively self-confident', they would either be irrelevant or guilty of a misjudgement. And irrelevance is what the Erinyes can least afford at this stage, their last chance of presenting their case to Athena's court of the Areopagus. Furthermore, it is indeed the revenge-crimes which they themselves chiefly attend to throughout the Oresteia.

One should note that, in the case of this interpretation, the idea of até as resulting from this hybris should be regarded as implied. (It is necessary to counterbalance the olbos of the next line as opposite state, resulting from the opposite of dyssebia, i.e. ὑπερήφανος. (Até (ruin) as resulting from hybris as 'crime' is, of course, stressed in the important utterance of Agamemnon 764-6.)

1.7.2. But the play is certainly not about Orestes' murder of Clytaemnestra. That is the subject of the Choephoroi. The Eumenides is concerned with the evaluation of that deed, subsequently to it. Hybris cannot, therefore, be said to play an important rôle in the dramatic movement of the Eumenides.

1.7.3. On the other hand, the Oresteian trilogy, as a whole may be said to be a drama of hybris. Hybris is the word used to refer to the continuous chain of revenge-murders, which, in addition to the evaluation thereof, constitutes the sole action and dramatic problem of the play. Hybris relates to the ethico-religious
overtones of the trilogy, in that it is said to be the result of
impiety (Agamemnon 750 ff., Eumenides 534). The trilogy is a state-
ment of a social problem (that of the blood-vendetta) and its
solution (divine grace, albeit βασιλεύοντα). 55 Certainly the trilogy
does not exhibit a 'primitive Zeus', punishing mortals out of
φόνον, or forcing them deterministically into ruinous acts —
as Page(Denniston-Page, 1957:xv) or Lloyd-Jones (1956) would have
it. Our hybris-references make it clear that the sufferers suf-
fer because they themselves have committed crimes, the effects
of which would have been disastrous had it not been for the
divine solution of forgiveness (cf. Kitto, 1966:39ff.) Thus the
action of the trilogy is doubly motivated, on both human and
divine levels (cf. Saayman, 1975:202-3; and Bremer, 1969:120) —
with mortals committing hybris and Zeus, in reaction, administer-
ing justice and grace.

1.8. Summary

1.8.1. The senses in which the family of hybris-words is used in
Aeschylus are, in order of frequency, the following :-
-'lust' - 9 times (Supplices 30, 81, 104, 426, 487, 528, 817, 845, 880-1)
-'violence' - 6 times (Septem 406, 502; Prometheus 717; Agamemnon
/violent deed' 764, 766; Eumenides 534 )
-'mocking' - 3 times (Prometheus 970(twice); Agamemnon 1612)
/'triumphing mockingly'
-'(irreligious) pride' - twice (Persae 808, 821)
-'rebelliousness' - once (Prometheus 82)
/'disobedience'
1.8.2. Out of the 21 references to hybris in the tragedies of Aeschylus, only 5 refer to the 'chief characters' of the different plays. (Persae 808, 821; Prometheus 82; Agamemnon 764, 766)

The ratios of hybris-references to 'chief characters' compared to total hybris- instances for the different plays are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplices</td>
<td>0 : 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persae</td>
<td>2 : 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septem</td>
<td>0 : 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prometheus</td>
<td>1 : 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agamemnon</td>
<td>2 : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choephoroi</td>
<td>0 : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumenides</td>
<td>0 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The hybris-hunter reaps a scant reward! Of the seven plays, only the Persae and the Agamemnon revolve dramatically around hybris as one would expect from the ratio analysis above. (The Oresteian trilogy, as a whole, too, has hybris as a central motivational factor.) The 'traditional' Pindaric-Solonic sense of hybris as 'pride' /'arrogance' is only encountered in the Persae, Aeschylus' earliest play. Whereas hybris in the 'modern' sense is operative in the Agamemnon, and in the Oresteia as a unity.
NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

(1) cf. Introduction, pp.12-13, above, and also ad Aeschylus Agamemnon, below, and Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus, chapter 2, below.

(2) Lattimore (1964), in his attack on the 'traditional' notion about the meaning of hybris, is safely silent about Persae 808, 821.

(3) My colleague, Mr. F. Saayman, agrees with me in this. (But J.J. Fraenkel, 1941:30, understands hybris in line 426 as 'het schenden van het altaar'.

(4) cf. also the similar situation in Oedipus Coloneus, p. 83 below. The thought occurs that, apart from the refugee-at-religious-sanctuary situation in Greek tragedy being indicative of religious overtones or being merely a mythological convention, it also has distinct advantages from the point of view of dramatic situation. It is easier, (i) for the audience to see the refugee, (ii) for the refugee to speak to the violator, and (iii) for the violator to remove the refugee - if he/she takes refuge in an open sanctuary rather than in, say, an impenetrable fortress.

(5) If it is at all necessary to drive home the point further, one may ask, 'What is the difference between male arrogance and female arrogance?' The difference between the male's and the female's sexual experience can be, however, clearly felt, e.g. (as in this context) when there is desire on the part of the male, but refusal on the part of the female. It is then when the male experience is called 'lust'.


(7) cf. line 82, where they speak of ἐνδίκοι γάμωις, as opposed to the hybris of the Aegypti, implying that it is not all men or marriage in general that they abhor.


(9) Page's conjecture.
(10) The MSS. have ἀρενογενὲς and ἔβρειν respectively, when the construction either does not make sense - 'Aeschylo vix dignum' (Friis Johansen, 1970, Vol I:120) - or has to be taken as a sort of accusative of the internal object, when it would be in sense not different from the quoted text.

(11) This much is apparently certain, but Page (Aeschylus, 1972:124) and Friis Johansen (1970, Vol I:124) differ on the assignment of the surrounding strophes.


(13) This interpretation is contrary to the conjecture ἐπάθα (apparently followed by Murray) which is in any case not accepted by Page (Aeschylus, 1972:124).

(14) Kitto's (1966:226) categorical statement, in another context, 'Hybris is not lust, and would not suggest lust to a Greek', is interesting.

(15) Smyth, H.W., Aeschylus, Heinemann, London, 1922, pp. 5-105

(16) With apology to Murray's translation above.

(17) 'One may argue that they [the maidens] have one frequent attribute of the protagonist: Hubris. Their Hubris is their claim to virginity.' (Miss H. Spier, Classical Journal, LVII (1962), 316. See also North (1966:38); and Lesky (1967:69) - 'to scorn Aphrodite is Hubris.'


(20) For Hubris in this sense, see Sophocles Trachiniae 888 (of Deianeira's suicide).

(21), (22), (23) and (24) My emphasis in all these cases.

(25) As in, e.g. Euripides Hippolytus, 446; Bacchae, 1297. In the wider, 'traditional' sense of 'irreligious pride'/'failure to think mortal thoughts, we should have expected a linking with, e.g. ἐπιοτικός or θυμός.

(26) Velacott's (Aeschylus, 1973) translation, as of lines 467 and 529-30 following.

(27) Amphiarau, in fact, reproaches Tydeus for his violent, war-
mongering nature (τὸν αὐδροφόντην, τὸν πόλεως ταρακτόρα| μεγίστον Ἀργεῖ τῶν κακῶν διάσειλον - 572-3)

(28) Vellacott's translation in both cases.
(29) The fact that Capaneus' irreligiously proud boasts are called *hybris* in Euripides' *Phoenissae*, 179; and *Supplices*, 495-9 is, of course, irrelevant here. Aeschylus did not call the proud boasts *hybris* in the *Septem*.
(30) See above, p. 15, note (8).
(31) Harry, J.H., _Aeschylus: Prometheus_, New York, 1905, on line 970.
(32) Quoting Sir John Mandeville, 'For the water runneth so rudely and sharply, because that it cometh down so outrageously from the high places above.' (p. 81n22).
(33) It is possible to underestimate Gilbert Murray's tremendous sensitivity as translator. Despite the fact that he labours heavily under the 'traditional' notion of *hybris* as 'pride' (cf. his mistranslations of *Suppl.* 30, 81, 104, 817, 880-1; *Prom.* 82; *Agam.* 764-6) he breaks through prejudice and comes up with something entirely different AND fitting, as in *Suppl.* 528; *Sept.* 406, 502. (See the various instances ad loc.) However, I think he here wrongly takes the first *hybrizein* of line 970 as referring to Prometheus.
(34) North(1966:43) is utterly unjustified in speaking of 'the *hybris* ("violence, lust") which he [Zeus] displays towards Io'.
(35) This raises two issues which are too problematic to be treated here:
   (a) That the *Prometheus Vinctus* is not by Aeschylus (because of his cruelty in this play being seemingly incompatible with the Zeus of the other plays) - cf. Grene (1960, Vol1:62), Lesky (1967: 87), Lucas (1959: 106ff.). But the problem is often resolved by a reconstruction of the trilogy, in which Zeus and Prometheus are ultimately reconciled - cf. North (1966:43). The trilogy cannot be considered here.
   (b) That the 'traditional' notion of *hybris* is not applicable here, Prometheus being a fully immortal god (so Grene (1960:62). But it may be just as probable that Prometheus is a symbolic Everyman, when then the 'traditional' notion would be valid,
were it not for the actual usage of *hybris* in the *Prometheus*, which does not tend to validate the 'traditional' hypothesis. (36) One supposes that Page is influenced by the Pindaric-Solonic notion of *hybris* resulting from *koros* or *olbos*. (But see below, on lines 755ff.)

(37) As always, when generalizing, Murray leans heavily on *idées recues* (*Hubris*, a word generally translated 'insolence' or 'pride': 1952:6), but, when coming to grips with the actual plays, displays unsurpassable sensitivity in belying them: 'In the Agamemnon... Strong creatures, following their own lusts, do *Hubris* everywhere to weaker things' (1952:8—two pages later!) See note (33) above, and also cf. Kitto's introduction to Murray (1965).

(38) And also, e.g. *Ajax* 367, 304, 971, 1088; *Antigone* 840; Soph. *Electra* 790; 794, 881.

(39) *μελάθροιαν* understood as a genuine dative, as do Nagelbach and Wecklein, contra Headlam (E. Fraenkel, 1950: *ad loc.*)


(41) My emphasis

(42) Page's emendation of the codd. *ὑρπις εἰν* does not alter the sense.

(43) But see, on 'insolence', Introduction, p. 13.

(44) Rather than "well-intentioned" in this context' (Page, *ad loc.*

(45) But see below, p. 42, on the rôle of *hybris* in the Oresteia


(47) If *hybris* is taken too abstractly, it is difficult to see how the logical connection stressed by *τικτειν* is actually effected in practice, e.g. in the case of Lesky's (1967:77) 'recurring guilt, and subsequent disaster' (my emphasis).
One might argue that A cannot cause / give birth to A; A must cause B,C,D...a different entity. An individual cannot cause/give birth to its very self. Therefore, one could say, at least, that hybris is here not 'irreligiousness/impiety' but 'something (probably) irreligious'. This point is well brought out in Vellacott's translation: 'the heart's impiety /Begets after its kind the hand's misdeed'.

See p.41 above. Note the painful paraphrase, sacrificing aptness to the desire to incorporate the idea of koros.

This seems to have been Verral's contention, apparently refuted by Headlam, *On Editing Aeschylus*, London,1891,pp.138 -159,'who objects that Aeschylus uses these words with no more special sense than other words for "truly" or "fittingly" ' (Lebeck,1971:213n5)

See p.36 above.


There is another remote possibility, that hybris refers to the violence to be inflicted upon the irreligious by the Erinyes as agents of divine retribution. This thought is suggested by an analysis of the structure of the choral ode. In a thrice-repeated sequence, the Erinyes threaten violent punishment of irreligiousness:-

1. [534] - δυσσεβίας
   - ὑβρις

2. [540] - ἀδέω τολί
   [543] - ποινά

3. [553] - τὸν αντίτολον
   [555] - βιαίως ἐν χρόνωι καθήσειν | λαῖφος

-All these are an expression of their main theme, stated at the beginning of the *Oresteia* : *Agamemnon*, 182 - διωμόνιων δὲ πον χάρις βίας . Similarly, in Eur. *Bacchae*,9, and *Hippolytus* 446 hybris-words
indicate divine violence. (This, however, does not necessarily validate the interpretation in this context.)
The objections to this interpretation seem unanswerable: (a) It is incongruous that the subjects of δυσφης and ὑβρις should be different, i.e. 'man' of the former, and the Erinyes of the latter. (b) Aeschylus' piety probably would prohibit him from using ὑβρις - after all, a negative term - of divine agents.

(54) See on Choephoroi, p. 40 above.
(55) That the council of the Areopagus - i.e. man - is powerless to solve the problem (successive revenge-murders would continue ad infinitum) is stressed by the fact that Athena casts the decisive and liberating vote.
(56) See Conclusion, for a summary in fuller detail.
2. **HYBRIS IN SOPHOCLES**

2.1. The *Ajax*

[153] -- 'mocking', 'crowing (over someone's misfortunes)' ('Schadenfreude')

The chorus of Salaminian sailors is reacting to rumours of Ajax' deluded slaying of cattle. Odysseus, especially, is telling these specious tales (134-151). And now, all who hear these rumours, are crowing (152) mockingly over Ajax' miseries (153).

The hybris-verb in line 153 is rendered as 'mocking' by Watling (1971:23) and as 'despitefully (exulting)' by Jebb (1967:35). Closely linked with 'crowing', exulting (χαίρει) in line 152 ('καθυβρίζων stands in close relation to χαίρει ("nom. cum partic.")' - Kamerbeek, 1963:50): it is modified by τοίς σοίς ἄχεσιν ², indicating the sphere in which this type of hybris is active.

[196] -- 'mockery'

Still the same context. Jebb (1967:39) translates 'insolence' and Watling (1971:25) 'malice'. 'Mockery' would have been more to the point. For what are the enemies actually doing? They are καθαξόντων - Kamerbeek glosses: 'Hesych. καγχαζει. ἀταύτως γελά, ἀμένως, ἀθρώς. Lat. cachinnari' (1963:60). The fact that the noun is used here does not make any difference: it refers to exactly the same mockery as that of line 153. Also, the hybris of his enemies is said to spreading unchecked (like a fire) over windswept fields. It is difficult to see how 'insolence' can do
this, whereas the metaphor becomes clearer if we understand
hybris as the mocking laughter accompanying the spreading rumour.
Lattimore (1964:84) includes this usage under the category of
'mockery'.

[304] - "...συντιθείς γέλων πολύν;
δόην κατ' αὐτῶν ὑβρίν ἐκτέισαι...'...

"mocking triumph"

"ὑβρίν is plainly that which he inflicts, not that which he
punishes; though the latter would be suggested by the usual
sense of ἐκτίνευσαι ...("avenge")' (Jebb, 1967:56). 'One is tempted
to read in this line "how he had served the Atreidae and Odys-
seus out for their hybris". But κατ' αὐτῶν is against it. δόην ὑβρίν
is acc. of the internal object and the ὑβρίν is the violence with
which Ajax takes vengeance on them.' (Kamerbeek, 1963:76). But why
does Ajax laugh? Because he has had a laugh (ὑβρίν) at their
expense (κατ' αὐτῶν). Watling (1971:28) brings out both the in-
ternal (or adverbial) accusative and the mocking triumph of Ajax:
'With shouts of mocking laughter about his triumph / and the
trick he had served them in this escapade.'; as does Jebb (1967:
57): ' - with many a mocking vaunt of all the despite he had
wreaked on them in his raid'3 He has made fools of them (at least,
so he thinks) or had a good laugh at them. I do not think that
Ajax would have said of himself that he has 'inflicted violence'.
This interpretation is further strengthened by the fact that 'the
laugh of Ajax (303) is noteworthy - that scornful laugh which
Ajax laughs in the midst of his frenzy and fears for himself, but
which Odysseus rejects, is a leitmotif of the drama (cf. also
957 and esp 383).'(Kamerbeek, 1963:87)4. Moreover - though this
is not necessarily proof - hybris as a 'trick', a 'making fun
of someone' is found in Euripides Bacchae 616 and Plato, Symposi-
um 175E. Ajax' mocking vaunt is, ironically, the one which boom-
erangs on him in, e.g. lines 153, 196 and 367.
--‘to be mocked’

Ajax has come to his senses, and now realizes that it is not he who has had a 'laugh' (hybris, line 304) on his enemies and that the 'joke' is on him - ύβρίσθην : 'I was made a fool of', or 'shamed' (Jebb, 1967:65, and Watling, 1971:30). Kaufmann (1969:77) renders 'mockery'. Though Kamerbeek (1963:87, see above on line 304) is right on Ajax' laugh being redirected at him in line 367, he connects this hybris wrongly with that of line 560, where the word is used in a perceptibly different sense (see below). He also wrongly understands γέλωτος as a 'genit. causae' - the shaming seen as a consequence of his own previous laugh. But, if we take γέλωτος as a genitive of exclamation (as Jebb, 1967:65, does), the hybris of line 367 is not only connected, but identical to gelos. This is, of course, the same identification of derisive laughter with hybris - by means of o' ιοι here, compared to o' ιος in the other case - as in line 304, to which line 367 harks back ironically.

[560] - ο’τοι α' Ἀχαιῶν, ο’δ’α, μ’ τις ύβρίσθη
στυγματιζε λόβας, ο’δ’ε χωρίς ὅντ’ εμοῦ.
--‘harm’, ‘ill-treat’/‘outrage’

Ajax has resolved to commit suicide after his shaming experience, and, preparing to leave Tecmessa, assures her comfortingly that she will not be harmed ( ύβρίσθη) by the Achaean when he will no longer be there, because his brother Teucer will look after her. λόβη is contumelia here, according to Kamerbeek (1963:121) - 'in suit' or 'outrage'. 'There's not a Greek will dare to lift a finger / To hurt or shame you!' (Watling, 1971:37); 'No fear, I wot, lest any of the Greeks assail thee with cruel outrage...' (Jebb, 1967:91). ύβρίσθη on its own can have the general significance of 'harming' or 'ill-treating', i.e. the force of ἐκβαλεῖν λόβας, line 1392, especially in the sense of 'abusing superior strength...' (Lattimore, 1964:23). It is λόβας in both cases
which modifies a word for 'harming someone' into the sense which fits Fisher's (1976:177) definition of causing shame or dishonour or 'outrage'.

[955] — Ἡ ρα κελαινάταιν ὑμὸν εφυβρίζει
   πολύτλαις ἄνηρ
   γελά δε τούδε μανυμένοις ἀχεσαν
   --'to mock', 'crow' (over another's misfortune)'
   -- 'εφυβρίζει: here denotes, not words or deeds of insult, but secret exultation...κελαινάταιν ὑμὸν...is an acc. "of the internal obj."...i.e.(with) dark malignity'\(^5\) It is translated with 'laugh' by Watling (1971:50): 'The 'much-enduring man' /Will laugh to his black heart's content...' Again ὕβρις is synonymical with γελάν, as in lines 153, 304 and 367. Said by the chorus, when they have realized what has happened, of the scornful laugh of — again — Odysseus. (The sense of 'mockery' is attested for this passage by MacDowell, 1976:30n18)

[971] — πρὸς ταῦτ᾽ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐν κενοῖς ὕβριζέτω.
   -- 'to triumph mockingly', 'crow' (Schadenfreude)
   -- Tecmessa is answering the chorus’s lament (lines 955-60) on the mocking triumph which follows Ajax' suicide, ἐν κενοῖς is here parallel to κακός in Agamemnon, 1612, and to ἀχεςαν in Ajax 153 and 957, as used with ὕβριζέτω. Again it is almost synonymically linked with 'laughing' — γελώντων 961; ἐπεγελάδε ν 969. It is rendered 'triumph' by Jebb (1967:149) and Watling (1971:51). Kamerbeek's laboured effort — 'Then let Odysseus indulge in an overbearing attitude for which there is no ground' — shows that the 'traditional' notion of ὕβρις is less fitting than 'triumphing mockingly' here. (So, too, MacDowell, 1976:30n8).
--'violent attack'

--'But, as it happened, the god drew off the assault, so that it fell upon our sheep and cattle' (Watling, 1971:54). Jebb's (1967:161) 'outrage' is too vague (the violence of Ajax' attack is stressed in lines 53 and 184). Used, of course, of Ajax' deluded attack, as commented on by Menelaus.

[1061] - μῶν δ' ἐνήλλαξεν θεὸς
tῆς τοῦδ' ὦβρεν πρὸς μῆλα καὶ ποίμνας πεσὲν.

[1081] - ὅποι δ' ὦβρίζειν δράν θ' ἀ βούλεται παρῇ.

[1081] - 'to be rebellious, disobedient'

--'Where there is licence to insult and act at will' (Jebb, 1967:165); 'where licence reigns / And insolence' (Watling, 1971:55).

'Insolence' and 'insult' are not incorrect, but perhaps less fitting, as they indicate a verbal action, whereas Teucer had crossed Menelaus' and Agamemnon's will in attempting to bury Ajax (lines 147-51), in addition to being insolent (verbally) to his superior. On the other hand, insofar as Ajax' disobedience to Menelaus is alluded to - μὴ ἄνυπνημεν κρατεῖν (1067); μηδὲν δὲ ἕκκια ὃν τῶν ἐφεστῶν κλείειν (1072) - it was certainly not mere insolence but violent rebelliousness in the form of physical attack. Lattimore (1964:84n30) lists the usage here under LSJ's category 'mutiny or rebelliousness in an inferior toward a superior'. According to Kaufmann (1969:78) Menelaus uses the term (hybrizein) here 'to warn Teucer that if he does not obey, there will be anarchy'. That we can pinpoint a precise sense of 'rebellious disobedience' here is due to the many antonyms for hybris in the immediate context: it is contrasted with φόβος (1076) αἰδώς (1076) αἰσχύνη (1079); and ἀδός (1084). ('This is said from a point of view of a person to whom ὅς (and reverence for authority, discipline, etc.) essentially means everything' - Kamerbeek, 1963:211). Said by Menelaus, it may either retrospectively allude to Ajax' rebelliousness, or prospectively and hypothetically be said of Teucer (Kaufmann, see above), or refer to both (Lattimore, 1964:84n30).
-- 'rebellious'

-- 'Pride' may, perhaps be suggested _megas prônein_ is regular for 'to be proud'/'arrogant'/'boastful' ('This was a man once proud and full of fire; now I'm the one to boast'—Watling, 1971:55). But _ai'thôv_ ('burning', 'passionate') modifies _vbriостhēs_ to mean something more violent than 'pride', and, in fact, alludes to the _pêlpa_ (attempt) of Ajax to murder the Achaeans (Kamerbeek, 1963:211). (In line 1057 of the same speech in which the two previous _hybris_-occurrences feature, Menelaus says that Ajax' _pêlpa_ was 'quenched' (_e'pasev_) — the _pêlpa_ seen as arising from Ajax' 'burning' _hybris_.) Jebb's (1967:165) translation: 'This man was once hot and insolent, now it's my turn to be haughty', shows that he, too, regards this _hybris_ as similar to the 'rebelliousness' of line 1081, where he also translates 'insolence'. (Kaufmann's 'running riot'—though a little eccentric—similarly betrays the interpretation that 1088 and 1081 both refer to Ajax' 'rebellion'—1969:78). Likewise Lattimore (1964:84n30). 'Pride' is perhaps a little out of place, seeing that Menelaus had previously spoken; —not of Ajax' pride, but of his violent attack (1057, 1061) and his insubordination (1067, 1072), and vaguely of disobedience and licence (1080-1). Also, in his answer to Menelaus' speech, Teucer says nothing about an allegation of 'pride', but spends lines 1093-1117 in denying the allegation of insubordination.

[1092] — _Mênela, mi' gnavôs úpoosthâs soyôs_

_ôtôs e'n thánois úvbriosthê_ génh

-- '(of a nature to) commit outrage (on the dead)'

-- So both Watling (1971:55) and Jebb (1967:165), and also Lattimore (1964:84n30). Kaufmann (1969:78) lapses badly in sticking to 'running riot' here. Jebb notes: 'Menelaus has rightly condemned the _hybris_ which defies human laws.' But his own _hybris_ menaces
the laws of the gods.' The chorus is reacting to Menelaus' immediately preceding threat of refusing burial to Ajax (1063-6 and 1089-90). When thus modified by ἐν γαροῦν or similar phrase, ἡμίν always means the outrage by the living on the dead - here the offence is not directly against the gods, but against the honour of the victim (cf. MacDowell, 1976:17; Fisher, 1976:177) - in refusing burial.

[1151] - ὃς ἐν κακοῖς ὑβρίζει τῷ σι τῶν πέλαγος...
-- 'to triumph mockingly' ('Schadenfreude')
-- So Watling (1971:57) : 'Mocking his friends' misfortunes'; and Kaufmann (1969:78) : "to wallow" in one's neighbour's misfortunes', though Jebb (1967:173) does not include the notion of 'mockery': 'who triumphed in his neighbour's woes'. (Jebb, Kaufmann, and Kamerbeek (1963:222) quote this usage as similar to Agamemnon 1612 - see above, ad loc). The κακοῖς of the neighbour need not be the death of Ajax, in the same way as 1092 above (in respect of which the outrage of burial-refusal is indicated). On the contrary, it is more probable that the πέλαγος whose miseries are being exulted in by Menelaus, is Teucer himself (Lattimore, 1964:84n28), who is here addressing Menelaus. Though it is true that in line 1154 immediately following μὴ δρα τούς τεθνηκότας κακοῖς is a warning not to outrage the dead, line 1092 may just as well be seen as a reaction to Menelaus' immediately preceding jibe in lines 1142-9: 'A bully with his tongue ... you'd always find him / Speechless, hiding his head beneath his cloak...'(Watling, 1971:57) directed at Teucer by Menelaus.

[1258] - θαρσῶν ὑβρίζεις καξελευθεροστομεῖς...
-- 'to be insolent' (=disrespectful, of an inferior toward a superior)
-- Agamemnon, having entered, in a long speech (1226-63) addresses Teucer, and, reacting to Teucer's verbal attack on the Achaeans (1226, 1250), harps on the fact that he is his inferior (1235, 1260-2) Both Jebb (1967:187) and Watling (1971:61) use
'insolent' as equivalent to *hybris* here. Lattimore's (1964:84 n30) 'mutiny or rebelliousness in an inferior toward a superior' is not incorrect, but does not quite bring out the verbal aspect of Teucer's insolence (in the eyes of Agamemnon); that it is purely verbal, of course, is stressed by *κάξελευθεροσταμείς* with which *ὑβρίσεις* combines in a sort of hendiadys to form the idea of *παρρησιάξομαι*. ('The free-born man has a right to do this, but Agamemnon looks down upon Teucer as little more than a δουλος ... a slave could not plead his own case in a law-court ... Agamemnon therefore demands the coming of a *προσατης* (line 1262)' - Kamerbeek, 1963:239). If *ἄνδρος οὐκέτ’ ὁντος, ἀλλ’ ἡν σκιάς* (line 1257) is not a genitive absolute - as Kamerbeek tentatively suggests - then it would mean that Teucer is being insolent to Ajax, which does not make sense at all. But Jebb (1967:187) is certain that it is 'gen.abs.'

---

[1385]° ... ὀδη ἔτης παρών
θανόντι τῷ δέ ζών ἐφυβρισαί μέγα,

--'to commit outrage (upon the dead)'

--So Watling (1971:66) - 'Refusing to be a party to gross outrage offered by the living to the dead. (Teucer is commending Odysseus for opposing the Argives' design to refuse burial to Ajax, and taking the initiative in his burial.). Strangely enough, Jebb (1967:205) translates 'insults of the living to the dead', and - stranger still - likens θανόντι to the dative with ἐπεγγέλαν. Surely, it is not a verbal act that is indicated: λωβητοῦ (1388) and λῶβαις (1392) stress the fact that that it is the outrage of refusing burial to Ajax that is meant in line 1385.

2.1.1. The senses in which *hybris* and its cognates are used in the Ajax - the play (with Euripides' *Bacchae*) most abundant in *hybris* in all of Greek Tragedy: there are 14 occurrences in all - are, in order of frequency:
(a) By far the most frequent, 'Schadenfreude', 'mocking', 'crowning triumphantly (over the misfortunes of others)' - always in close connection with,gelôs (but in line 153 modified by χαίρειν) - Lines 153, 196, 304, 367, 955, 971 and 1151. Thus this sense is attested in one-half (7 out of 14) of the instances of hybris in the Ajax.
(b) Thrice, 'the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead' (Lattimore, 1964: 23) - twice (lines 1092 and 1385) of the outrage to the dead by refusing burial (modified by ἐν τῷ θαυμάζειν and θαυμάζει: respectively); and once (line 560) causing dishonour/shame to a living person.
(c) Thrice, 'insolent or disrespectful behaviour in an inferior toward a superior': twice (lines 1081 and 1088) actively rebellious behaviour; and once (line 1258) verbal insolence.
(d) 'Violence' is attested only once (line 1061) - of Ajax' violent attack on the cattle and sheep.

2.1.2. In assessing the tragic function of the concept hybris, we note, first of all, that out of the 14 instances of hybris in the Ajax, only 4 refer to, or are said of, its chief character (lines 304, 1061, 1081, 1088). It is interesting to note that in three of these four cases the force of the hybris-reference is rather equivocal:

(i) line 304: Here it is Ajax himself who imputes hybris to himself, the 'laugh' which he thought he had had at the expense of his enemies. Ironically enough, it is precisely this mocking 'Schadenfreude' which rebounds upon him in lines 153, 196, 367, 955 and 971, where he is made the laughing-stock of his enemies. So insignificant is Ajax' own deluded triumph made by the overwhelming preponderance of the triumphing of his enemies, that one may say, with Kamerbeck (1963: 87): 'The scornful laugh is a leit-motif of the drama' (cf. on line 304, above). Indeed, the laugh of Ajax is the laugh directed at him by his enemies.
(ii) lines 1081, 1088: Here Menelaus uses hybris to refer to Ajax' rebelliousness. However, the accusation lacks validity, because of Sophocles' unsympathetic treatment of Menelaus (Kaufmann, 1969:77) says he is 'unattractive', and Kamerbeek, 1963:211 mentions the 'satirical touch to the picture of Menelaus'). Moreover, especially line 1081 seems to refer generally to Ajax' supposed intractability before the eris hoplôn, which accusation is adequately refuted by Teucer in lines 1093-1117. Indeed, the fact that Menelaus himself is called hybristes directly after his accusation of Ajax as a hybristes, certainly mitigates the charge against Ajax. If Ajax is said to be θ' hybristes by one who is himself judged to be hybristes, the charge itself - being made in hybris - becomes invalid.

- Ajax being the chief character of the play, and the proportion of hybris-references to him being small and ambiguously insignificant (the term is applied 10 times to his enemies), one would not expect the 'traditional' concept of hybris to be vital to the tragic make-up of the Ajax.

- Yet the play has been consistently regarded as a hybris-drama in the 'traditional' application of the concept. 'The Ajax is "Aeschylean" in the prominence given to the conflict between hybris and sophronyne...[where] hybris is the failure to think mortal thoughts...and sophronyne the respecting of limits, Divine and human.' (North, 1966:58). '...against the omnipotence of the gods, who rule the universe by guarding the bounds set to man, even the greatest hero, when he exceeds these bounds in hybris, is powerless (cf. 127-133)' (Kamerbeek, 1963:6). 'Offence and greatness in the hero spring from the same root. The impassioned intensity for which we admire him [Ajax] is indeed ὑβρίς'(Kuhn'12). These impressions are apparently gained from (i) lines 129ff. where Ajax presumptuously challenges Athena13, and (ii) lines 764-9 and 770-5, where Ajax blasphemously disdains the help of Athena. The astounding (for the 'traditional' interpretation) fact is that 'the term hybris is not...applied to Ajax scorning Athene...where the nature of the offence is specified and
general conclusion drawn, 127-33; 756-77. The omission of ὑβρίς here is the more notable in that the word, in one form or another, occurs fourteen times in the play.' (Lattimore, 1964: 23; 85 n33). Had it been true that Sophocles calls irreligious pride ὑβρίς, here was the ideal opportunity for doing it!

The outline of the play from the point of view of ὑβρίς may be summarized as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(153)</th>
<th>Ajax challenges Athena (12θff.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(196)</td>
<td>The scornful laugh of Ajax' enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(304)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(367)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(560)</td>
<td>Ajax' enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ajax scorns Athena (750-777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1081)</td>
<td>Ajax' supposed ὑβρίς, but actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1088)</td>
<td>outrageous behaviour toward Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1092)</td>
<td>(false accusations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1151)</td>
<td>refusing of burial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1258)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1385)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that: (i) The passages mentioned above in which appear definitive instances of ὑβρίς in the 'traditional' senses correspond to the gaps in the continuity of actual occurrences of the word (0-153; 560-955). (ii) It is the ὑβρίς of Ajax' enemies, and not his own, which dominates the play. (iii) ὑβρίς becomes most prominent after Ajax' death, 955ff. — in the section which occupies no less than one-third of the length of the play.

One can only conclude that ὑβρίς, in the senses in which it occurs in the play, has little or nothing to do with the 'traditional' notion of what ὑβρίς means, nor its dramatic function.
2.1.3. That the 'traditional' concept of hybris - as irreligious pride which transgresses the limits or boundary between the mortal and the divine - is absent in the Ajax, has often been suggested. (Frankel, J.J., 1941:32, feels that hybris in the Ajax, unlike - according to him - in Aeschylus, does not signify a conflict with the divine kosmos: merely a secular opposition of conflicting rights on a human level. Lesky (1966: 279) judges that 'one constantly finds the simple view stated that the hero's hybris is atoned for by his sufferings... The hybris of Ajax is not to be denied, but how strikingly marginal it is as a theme!... the hybris of Ajax was a theme already supplied by epic poetry; Sophocles merely took it over and included it in his Ajax.' Similarly, among others 14, the humanistic school of Whitman (1951) and Knox (1964) 15, who feel that it is not the punishment of Ajax' hybris, but rather his glorification as a hero, which is to be taken as the 'meaning of the play. This seems to be suggested by the structure of the play - see above: nevertheless, this question - the tragic function of the 'traditional' sense of hybris (as opposed to the tragic function of hybris in the sense(s) of the actual occurrences of the word) - is outside the scope of this study.

2.2. The Antigone

[309] -

\[\text{κύντες κρεμαστοί τάνδε δηλώσοι, ὑβριν.}\]

- 'crime'/ 'outrage'

--- Creon is violently reacting to the news of the sentry (223-77) that the body of Polyneices, the enemy of the state, has been symbolically buried - against his express orders. In venting his spleen on the sentry, he utters the threat quoted above, which is to be taken 'as if merely οὐ διετέθη has preceded. "(You shall not die,) until you have first been hung up alive, and revealed (the authorship of) this outrage" '(Jebb, 1906: 66). For hybris,
Wyckoff (Grene and Lattimore, 1960, Vol. I: 191) renders 'crime', whereas most translators use 'outrage' as equivalent (Jebb's (1906: 67) translation; Watling (1971: 137) - so, too Kaufmann (1969: 76)). The context is not quite precise enough for either 'crime' or 'outrage' to be pressed. What is an outrage? Something which causes an outcry, shock, indignation. Creon is certainly blustering indignantly in this speech. But then again, so may a crime cause great indignation. The following considerations only just seem to weigh the scales in favour of 'crime' as equivalent of *hybris* here:

(i) Both Bayfield (1968: 74) and Jebb (1906: 66) note that ἁβρὶν is used in 'concrete' sense. 'Crime' seems somehow more concrete than 'outrage'.

(ii) 'Crime' seems to co-operate better with ἰηλώσεις, than 'outrage' - if only to the modern ear. One may reveal a crime, or clear up a crime; but with 'outrage' some sort of paraphrase seems to be required, as Jebb's 'reveal the authorship of this outrage' (see above).

(iii) After all, technically, the burial of Polyneices is a crime, Creon having officially proclaimed a decree forbidding it (194-210). In the speech under discussion, he does stress the political aspects of the misdeed. ('Outrage' is perhaps rather a personal affront.)

---

[480] - ἀνὴ ὡ ἁβρὶζειν μὲν τὸ π ἐξηπίστατο,  
    νόμος ὑπερβαϊνουσα τοὺς προκειμένους.

[482] - ἁβρὶς ὡ, ἐπὶ δέδρακεν, ἔδε δευτέρα,  
    τοῦτοις ἐπακεῖν καὶ δεδρακύιαν γέλαν.

--- 'insolence', in both cases.

--- The key word in this context, which determines how the two *hybris*-words should be translated, is δευτέρα (line 482). Antigone having revealed that it was she who had performed the ritual burial of Polyneices, Creon upbraids her, saying that her crowing triumph over her misdeed (483) was her 'second' *hybris*. This
naturally implies that the hybrizein of line 480, i.e. her breaking the law forbidding the burial of Polyneices (481), is to be regarded as her first hybris. Thus, says Creon, there were two instances/examples of hybris: one, criminal disobedience, and another, mockingly vaunting over the misdeed. The passage is very valuable for our understanding of hybris, as it clearly explains two manifestations: 'rebelliousness' (Lattimore, 1964: 84n30) or 'disobedience' (MacDowell, 1976:19); and 'mocking triumph'. (Both these two senses are among the most frequent usages of hybris—see Conclusion, p. 107). But neither of these two specific senses will do as equivalents in this context, a more general sense, comprising both notions, being obviously required. Such a word is 'insolence', in the acceptable usage of the English word (see Introduction, p.14 above), as this word encompasses both the element of 'disrespectful behaviour toward a superior' (480) and the element of verality (482). (Jebb, 1906:95, and Wyckoff, Grene and Lattimore, 1960: Vol.I:197, render 'insolence' in both cases.)

[840] - οἴμοι γελωμα, τί με, πρὸς θεῶν πατρὼν, 
οὐκ ὀιχαμέναν ὑβρίτεις, 
ἀλλ' ἐπιφαντον;

--'to mock'

--Antigone, in answer to the chorus's attempted consolation of lines 834ff. answers that they are mocking her. Hybris is again identified with gelós (as in Ajax 153,196,304,955,971). For hybrizein here: 'Must you make me a laughing-stock' (Watling, 1071:149); 'taunt' (Jebb, 1906:155); and 'affront' (Wyckoff, Grene and Lattimore, 1960, Vol.I:210).

2.2.1. Hybris is used in the Antigone in the senses of:
(i) 'insolence' (twice) – lines 480,482;
(ii) 'mocking' – line 840;
(iii) 'crime' (or 'outrage') - line 309.

2.2.2. Of the four instances, three refer to Antigone (lines 309, 480 and 482) - the first of her crime or disobedience in burying Polyneices, and the last two of her insolent behaviour toward Creon subsequent to the act. Line 840 refers to the chorus, and *hybris* is never used of Creon.

For the purposes of testing the 'traditional' hypothesis in terms of the ratio of *hybris*-references to the chief character, compared to total *hybris*-references (see Introduction, p. 12 above), it is necessary to consider the much-debated problem of the chief character of the *Antigone*. Those who hold the view that Sophocles expresses in his plays a pious reverence to the gods, and that the sufferings of the heroes constitute punishment for their *hybris*, feel that Creon is the tragic hero of the play. E.g. Lesky (1966:280): 'his [Creon's] progress from *hybris* to disaster is not merely a moral paradigm but a piece of true tragedy'; Webster (1936:30): Man becomes too proud and commits an act of *hybris*; god sends *atê* upon him and he becomes infatuated; then he falls and learns sense by suffering...Creon is a dramatization of it [this doctrine]. His decree was an act of *hybris*...' By contrast, those who see in the plays of Sophocles a glorification of heroic human nature, regard Antigone as the chief character. E.g. Knox (1964:74-5): because Creon is un-heroic, and 'gives in'; Linforth (1961:252): '...she is the dominant figure.'

But it is a sterile question. It is quite possible to regard the play as simply having two chief characters, i.e. both Creon and Antigone. Both are equally involved in *hybris* as it is used in the *Antigone*. For the *hybris* of lines 309 and 480 is certainly 'tragic'; (Fraenkel, J.J., 1941:31 says it represents the conflict between one 'rechtvaardig recht' and another 'rechtvaardig recht') because her disobedience to Creon is the cause of her downfall. And Creon's downfall is likewise due to his confrontation with
the heroic individual, Antigone. Thus the word *hybris* indicates the one central deed (i.e. Antigone's burial of Polyneices) that precipitates the tragic end of both Creon and Antigone. *Hybris* is also used to indicate her 'insolence', which is the attitude that makes a tragic end to the conflict of interests between her and Creon inevitable: her intractability leads to a *μεταβολή εἰς δυστυχία* for both of them.

Commentators often regard Creon, too, as 'hybristic' (cf. North, 1966:38). So, too, Bowra (1944:114): 'Creon is lavish in his accusations of pride against Antigone (309, 480, 482), but it is his pride in speech and action which the chorus condemn.' If we were to substitute 'insolence' for 'pride' in the case of Antigone, and 'outrageousness' (Kaufmann, 1969:77) for 'pride' in the case of Creon, this statement would not be far from true. Although *hybris* is never used of Creon, it belongs to the tragic irony of Sophocles that *hybris* in an accusation may rebound upon the accuser (cf. *Ajax* 1081, 1088).

In the sense in which *hybris* is used in the *Antigone*, then, the play does, in fact centre around *hybris*. It is not, however, the traditional sense of *hybris* as, e.g., a 'transgression of the boundary line between the human and the divine which constitutes the focal point of the tragedy, but *hybris* in the sense of 'rebelliousness' and 'insolence'. The tragic conflict is on a human plane, insofar as the conflict between Creon and Antigone revolves around *hybris* as it is used in lines 309–480 and 482.

2.2.3. Whether Creon and/or Antigone are guilty of *hybris* in the traditional sense — for which the word is not employed, of course — is a different question, and one that cannot now be discussed.
2.3. The Trachiniae

[280] - ἐὰν γὰρ ἐμφανῶς ἰμάντατο,
    Ζεὺς τῶν συνεγών ἔνν δίκη χειροπέδων,
    ὑβρὶν γὰρ οὐ στέργοντι υἱὸς δαίμονες.

"insulting" (i.e. 'injurious speech')

Both Kaufmann (1969:76) and Lattimore (1964:81n20) are probably wrong when they attribute this hybris-reference to Heracles (the former - 'outrageous murder' and the latter - 'foul play'). Kamerbeek (1959:84) says of ὑβρὶν in line 280 : 'this, of course, refers to Eurytus' misconduct'. (In the lines preceding the passage quoted above, (262-73) Lichas related the incident which led to Heracles' punishment by Zeus in being sold as bondslave in Lydia. Eurytus had reviled him : "You with your charmed infallible arrows !", he said / My sons could give you points at archery./You're nothing better than a down-trodden slave, a free man's property !" (Watling's, 1971:128, translation of lines 265-7). Heracles had retaliated by hurling him over the edge of a precipice when his thoughts were wandering (lines 269-73). As a result, Zeus punished Heracles for having killed a man in treachery (274-8). The passage quoted above reads : 'Had he wreaked his vengeance openly, Zeus would surely have pardoned him the righteous triumph ; for the gods, too, love not insolence' (Jebb, 1962:47). Watling, 1971:128) translates similarly. In other words, Zeus would not have minded Heracles killing Eurytus, it would have been just revenge. Why ? Because Eurytus had insulted Heracles, and it is this very injurious speech of lines 265-7, i.e. ὑβρὶν (line 280) which the gods, too, hate. 'Insults' or 'injurious speech' is perhaps preferable to 'insolence' here - not only because of lines 265-7, where the nature of the hybris is specified - but also because of lines 281-2 which immediately follow the statement that the gods, too, do not like hybris : κεῖνοι δὲ υπερχαίνουσι εἰκ γλώσσας κακῆς / αὐτοὶ μὲν ἅπαντες εὖ' οἴκητομεν, referring still to Eurytus, where ἐκ γλώσσας indicates that the hybris had been verbal contumely. In connection with this passage, we note :-
As North (1966:50) observes, 'The remark in the Trachiniae (280) that the daimones also hate hybris is significant, for it implies that naturally and primarily hybris offends mortals.'

(ii) The fact that they do not like hybris does not, of course, make hybris a technically religious offence. (Cf. MacDowell, 1976: 22)

[888] - ἐπείδης, ὑματαία, τάνδρ' ἕβριν;
— 'violent deed' (OR 'outrage')
— Referring to Deianeira's suicide, the chorus asks the nurse whether she had seen it. 'The meaning is "violent deed", not implying moral condemnation,' according to Kamerbeek (1959:193), agreeing with Campbell, whom he quotes as calling the use of hybris as applied to suicide 'catachrestic'. So, too, Jebb (1962: 133), referring to Electra 864, where λάβα is 'merely a fatal accident', glossing τάνδρ' ἕβριν as 'this deed of violence', translating 'Sawest thou that violent deed?' 'Self-violence' is given by Lattimore (1964:81n18), under the general heading 'assault and battery'; and MacDowell (1976:19) says that Deianeira's suicide was an 'act of violence'.

Kaufmann's (1969:76)'horror' of Deianeira's suicide; and Watling's (1971:48) 'outrage', on the other hand, leads to Fisher's (1976:191) argument that this hybris denotes not so much the violent act in itself, but the shame and dishonour on the house, which the deed will effect. I offer two objections to this interpretation:

(i) Fisher's definition of hybris as an action causing shame/dishonour does not fit into the context as a translation equivalent as well as 'violent deed' does. The chorus is asking the nurse whether she saw the hybris, to which she replies that she did - ἐπείδηδων (889). Granted that the act of Deianeira's suicide results in shame for her house, in this context hybris refers to something that can be seen or witnessed, i.e. the actual violent deed itself. The chorus cannot be asking the nurse whether she had seen/been an eye-witness to the shame on the house.
(ii) One should not confuse the result (nor the cause) of an act with the act itself. In many cases, of which this is a clear example\(^2\), **hybris** results in shame or dishonour, but the word denotes the actual cause of the shame, the deed itself, and not its result. (cf. also **Antigone**, 309)

[1096] - διψη τι ἤμεικτον ἱπποβάμωνα στρατὸν
    θηρῶν, ἱβριστῆν, ἀνομον, ὑπέροχον βιγ. --'violent'
--Said of the Centaurs, hybristès being translated 'violent by both Jebb (1962:159) and Watling (1971:154). ἀνομον, ὑπέροχον βιγ gives a noteworthy explanation of hybristès in this sense. Lattimore (1964:82n24) says that hybristès 'would probably hint at their lustfulness', but there is nothing in the context to justify this. There is no allusion to the Centaur, Nessus', behaviour towards Deianeira here. Heracles is reminiscing: recounting, the one after the other, his various labours, among which the contest with the Centaurs features here.

2.3.1. To sum up: twice (lines 888 and 1096) in the **Trachiniae** **hybris** is used to indicate 'violence'; and once (line 280) it signifies 'insulting' behaviour.

2.3.2. Of these three instances, only one (line 888) applies to one of the chief personages (Deianeira), the other two referring to Eurytus' misconduct (280) and the Centaurs' violent nature (1096). And the **hybris** of Deianeira (her self-violence) occurs when the δυτυχία of both Deianeira (obviously) and Heracles is already a fact. Thus, **hybris**, as it is used in the **Trachiniae**, does not have a causal force in the unfolding of the plot. Nor is the suffering of Deianeira or Heracles said in the play to be punishment of an attitude of **hybris** on their part. (The problem
of whether Deianeira or Heracles is the chief character of the play need therefore not concern us. In any case, as Conradie (1958:77ff.) has shown, the unity of the Trachiniae consists in the fact that their respective fates are interdependent upon each other. We may just as well accept that the play does not revolve around a single hero(ine), but that the focus is directed on the inexorably intertwined fates of both Deianeira and Heracles.

Whether or not the outcome of the Trachiniae depends upon Heracles' arrogance or pride - hybris in the 'traditional' sense - cannot be considered here. At any rate, Conradie (1958:100) rightly protests against Murray's 24 imputation of tragic hybris to Heracles: 'the all-admired grabber-smiter and conqueror, who is stronger, hardier, greedier than other men...triumphant ύβρις and strength and violence, swollen by the general praise, made more selfish by the devotion of others.' The simple but inescapable fact is: hybris is never used of Heracles in the Trachiniae.

2.4. The Oedipus Tyrannus

[873] - ύβρις 25 ψυχεύει τυραννίς. ύβρις, εἰ
    πολλών ύπερπληθυντὶ μόταν,
    ὅ μὴ 'πίκαιρα μηδὲ αυρφέροντα,
    ἀκρότατα γείον, ἀναβάον,
    ἀνότομον ὄρονεν εἰς ἀνάγκαν
    ἐνθ' ὃν πολί χρησίμω
    χρήσαι.

--(Irreligious) 'pride'/'insolence'

--'Pride' or 'insolence' is generally rendered by translators - e.g. Jebb (1966:119), Greene (1960, Vol. I:148) : 'insolence'; and Watling (1971:49) : 'pride'. But the 'modern' notion is attested here by Gould (1970:108) : 'the will to violate'. The MSS. reading is so vague and difficult that writers on hybris in general tend not to commit themselves to specific meaning for hybris here.
(MacDowell, 1976:20; Kaufmann, 1969:77n41) - Lattimore (1964) does not mention this passage. But if Winnington-Ingram's (1971:126) suggested emendation is accepted, as quoted above, the text makes sense. The emendation has, apart from this consideration, also in its favour: (i) That τύραννος has to be understood in a bad sense (as 'tyrant') if the Mss. reading is accepted. Winnington-Ingram (1971:126) points out that nowhere else in Greek poetry does it have this sense, and - what is more important - elsewhere in the O.T. (Oedipus Tyrannus) τύραννος always means 'king' and τυραννία 'kingship' in a quite neutral sense. In Ellenb (1965: ad loc.) 'this sense is given a separate entry with this single example' (Winnington-Ingram, 1971:126). (ii) 'The corruption can be accounted for by the influence of the following ὑβρίς.'(Winnington-Ingram, 1971:126n38).

If the above reading is accepted, we recognize the archaic Solonic-Pindaric sense of ὑβρίς here, i.e. as 'irreligious insolence or arrogance', resulting from ολbos ('wealth') or κόρος ('fulness' or 'satiety'). (The locus classicus for this sense of ὑβρίς is Solon, fr. 5.9 D: τίκτει γαρ κόρος ὑβρίν, ὅταν πολύς ὀλβος ἔπηται ἀνθρώπων οὐκ οὖν μὴ νόσος ἄρτιος ἔσται.)26 The similarities of the usage of ὑβρίς in O.T. 873 with the Pindaric-Solonic usage are striking:-

(i) It is a king (τυραννία), above all, who is attended by material prosperity (ολbos). The notions have been linked in O.T.380 (大洋εῖ καὶ τυραννία).
(ii) The metaphor of procreation (ψυκτεία), as in the passages of Pindar and Solon (τίκτει), is used to express the causal link between ολbos and ὑβρίς.
(iii) The κόρος-element is given by εἰ πολλοὶ ὑπερπληθημέναι μάταν, ἀ μὴ

τίκαμεν ἀνεφέροντα, ἀκρότατα γειοί ἀναβαίνειν in our passage - cf. Solon's ὅταν πολύς ὀλβος ἔπηται ἀνθρώπων οὐκ οὖν μὴ νόσος ἄρτιος ἔσται.
(iv) The final element of atē (ruin) as engendered through the process ολbos(κόρος) - ὑβρίς - atē, follows: ἀπότομον ὠρονουν εἰκ ἀνάγκαιν ἐνθ' ὅτι πολί κληρονόμῳ χρήσκειν.
(v) The irreligious element is stressed in the rest of the strophe. One may add that it would be entirely in character for a chorus of
old men - as here - to recall an archaic usage of *hybris*: one which only survives in our earliest extant play, *The Persae* (lines 808, 821), and which is already rejected by Aeschylus in the *Agamemnon* (750-70).  

Thus relationship of *hybris* in O.T. 873 to its immediate context no longer presents a problem: it denotes 'irreligious pride /arrogance/insolence'.

But the relationship between this *hybris* reference and the rest of the O.T. has always vexed scholars. Is Sophocles saying here that Oedipus is guilty of irreligious pride, and that that is the cause of his downfall? (So Jebb, 1962: ad loc.; and Kitto, 1966: 225, 242 - 'what led him to act like a tyrant was his excessive reliance on his own...inferences'. [the 'moral' of the play is] 'The modesty of Creon is a better example than the towering self-confidence of Oedipus'. That the *hybris* of line 873 is the rational cause of Oedipus' downfall, also Lucas (1959: 150); Pohlenz (1954: 219-20); Webster (1936: 45), who identifies the sentiments of the chorus with Sophocles' own ideas.). Can it be said with certainty that line 873 refers to Oedipus? Kirkwood, 1967: 213, feels that the moral comments in this ode quite clearly do not refer to Oedipus and Jocasta', following Kitto, 1961: 165 - but later on in the same book Kitto interprets the second stasimon to mean: 'Therefore', says Sophocles, 'seek purity and avoid *hybris*!' (Kitto, 1961: 178-84). The allusion seems vague, and, moreover, many have felt that the punishment - if he is indeed punished because he is high-handed towards Creon - is disproportionate. (But Bowra, 1944: 380; and North, 1966: 48 feel that a 'salutary' lesson may be drawn from such apparent immoderate cruelty on the part of the gods.) Dodds (1966: 37-49) rightly denounces the *hybris*-hunting which is associated with this view.

A solution to this problem is to say that the choric utterances here are irrelevant to the dramatic situation. (Whitman, 1951: 178, regards the chorus as representing 'the somewhat confused morality of the bourgeoisie', and Vickers, 1973: 29, criticizes the reducing of Sophocles 'to the banality of some of his choric utter-
It has also been suggested that the chorus is a character, with its own peculiar personality, and what it says here is not necessarily a valid reflection on what has occurred beforehand in the play, but merely in character (e.g. Errandonea, 1958: passim). If this view of the Sophoclean chorus is accepted, it may be said that the hybris of line 873 does not necessarily apply to Oedipus.

However, if the preceding episode (512-862) is analysed in detail, especially the closing dialogue, it reveals that the chorus's remarks about hybris are, in fact, relevant, though hybris as 'pride' is not explicitly said of Oedipus. Both Kamerbeek (1963:172-81) and Winnington-Ingram (1971:119-22) excellently show the connection between the hybris of line 873 in the second stasimon, and the dramatic situation in which the chorus finds itself: The chorus is here airing its concern that Oedipus will disregard the oracle, as Jocasta has suggested (857-8), in the immediately preceding scene. It warns fearfully against the consequences of disregarding the divine laws in general, and oracles in particular. What it says is therefore relevant, dialectically counterbalancing 'the scepticism of Jocasta which carries a taint of impiety and so threaten the religious world' (Winnington-Ingram, 1971:122) - on the other hand preparing for and motivating the important rôle of the oracle. (The eventual fulfilment of the oracle coincides with the unravelling of the mystery of the murderer of Laius, which is the central dramatic motif of the O.T.)

'Its[hybris] is contrasted with ἐνθετος ἀγνεία λόγου ἔργων τῶν πάντων and since this consists in observing the divine laws ὕβρις means disregard for these', concludes Kamerbeek (1963:175). Actually, hybris does not specifically denote 'disregarding divine laws', but rather the attitude of irreligious pride/insolence from which a disregarding of divine laws may flow. Thus hybris is not used to refer directly to Oedipus or Jocasta. In fact, its use here implies that Oedipus is not guilty of hybris. (The term is used in order to warn Oedipus not to disregard divine laws or to express their anxiety that he might disregard
the oracle - 'In die koorlied wat op hierdie toneel [i.e. the second episode] volg, spreek die Koor hul verontrustings uit oor die ongeloof in orakels wat uit Jokasta se woorde gespreek het. As die orakels nie vervul word nie, wat word dan van die godsdiens?CDF. (Conradie,1976:20). In fact, Oedipus does not intend to, nor ever does, disregard the oracle.

To conclude :-

(i) Hybris denotes 'irreligious pride/insolence', in the Solonic-Pindaric sense, in O.T.873, a double mention.

(ii) Hybris does not apply to Oedipus. (Merely the fear that it may apply to him subsequently - a fear which is not realized - is expressed in the second stasimon.

(iii) We cannot, therefore, say that hybris, as it is used in the play, is a conceptual key to the meaning of the O.T. (Whether or not Oedipus' ruin is due to a characteristic which is 'traditionally' - and uncritically - associated with hybris, cannot be discussed here.)

2.5. The Electra

[271] - ἢδιω δὲ τούτων τὴν τελευταίαν ὑβρίν,
 ὑπὸν αὐτοφόνητα ὡμίν ἐν κοίτῃ πατρὸς
 ξὺν ὑπο ταλαιόνη μητρί... --'insult'/ 'outrage'

--Electra is complaining about the outrages she is forced to endure since the murder of her father by Aegisthus and her mother. She 'describes how Aegisthus sits on her father's throne, wears his robes, pours libations at the very hearth where he had killed Agamemnon (257-70), and, "to crown his outrage" - or "the ultimate insult" - "lies, having killed him, in my father's bed, beside my miserable mother" (Kaufmann, 1969:77). So, too, with either 'insult' or 'outrage': Watling (1971:76); Jebb (1962:44); and Grene (1960, Vol.II:58). It is only Lattimore's (1964:84n28) 'lustful' in 'Electra 271 (combined with lustful and generally outrageous behaviour), which strikes a discordant note in an otherwise
generally agreed upon interpretation. The life of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra, utterly unmindful and disrespectful of her father's memory, which Electra must witness, is keenly felt by her as a personal insult/outrage on her own sensitivity, an outrage on the memory of her father.

[293] _ τάδ’ εξυρρίζετι..._

--- 'to insult'

--- 'Such is the tone of her insults' (Grene, 1960, Vol. II: 58); 'Thus she insults' (Jebb, 1962: 47). 'Nagging like that' (Watling, 1971: 77) is not precise enough - _τάδ’, instead of _τάυτ’, referring to the words just quoted' (Jebb, 1962: 47). Still in the same speech the previous occurrence above, Electra has quoted her mother's terrible insults: ὁ δίσθεον μύσα, σοὶ μοῦν παίηρ τέθνηκαν; ἄλλος δ’ οὕτις ἐν πένθει βροτῶν; κακῶς ὅλοις, μηδὲ σ’ ἐκ γόνων ποτὲ τῶν νῦν ἀπαλλάξειαν οἴ καίωθεοί. It is interesting to note that _εξυρρίζει_ appears interchangeable with _εξονειδίζει_ in line 288: _φωνοῦσα τοιάδ’ εξονειδίζει κακά._

[522] _ ἄρχω, καθυβρίζοισα καὶ σὲ καὶ τὰ σά_.

[523] _ ἐγὼ δ’ ὅβριν οὐκ ἔχω, κακῶς δὲ σὲ λέγω κακῶς κλύουσα πρὸς σέθεν θαμά_

--- 'to insult', in both cases.

--- _κακὸς λεγεῖν_ is the operative idea. 'to insult' is rendered by Watling (1971: 84), Jebb (1962: 77) and Grene (1960: 67) for the _hybris_ verb in line 522. Indeed, in lines 521-2 Clytaemnestra is describing exactly what Electra was doing in line 293, i.e. saying that she (Clytaemnestra) _insults_ her.

--- 'to insult' is the sense in which the phrase _ὁβριν ἔχω_ is used, i.e. with exactly the same force as _καθυβρίζειν_ in line 522. _ὁβριν_ οὐκ _ἔχω_: _cp. Ant. 300 πανοργίας... ἔχειν (n.)_. 'Jebb (1962: 77). Thus Watling (1971: 84) correctly renders _ὁβριν ἔχω_ as 'I do not _insult_ anybody'. But Jebb (1962: 77) strangely enough, in the light of his
note, and Grene (1960, Vol.II:67) translate: 'I am not guilty of insolence' and 'there is no insolence in myself', respectively. Whether or not there is an etymological connection between 'to insult' and 'insolence', it is wrong to render 'insolence merely because the noun, and not the verb, occurs in 523. The line of Clytaemnestra's argument goes astray in the last two translations, I think, because of the irregular usage of 'insolence'—see above, Introduction, p.14. What she is trying to say is: 'You say I insult you. I do not insult. I speak harshly to you, because you speak harshly to me.' (Inexplicably, Lattimore (1964:84n28) includes the *hybris*-terms of lines 293, as well as 522–3 under the heading 'bullying, the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead'.)

[613] — ἡτίς τοιαῦτα τὴν τεκούσαν ὑβρίσεν.  
--'to insulting'  
--'who so insults her mother' (Grene, 1960, Vol.II:71) ; 'who hath thus insulted a mother' (Jebb, 1962:91) ; 'If this is the language she uses to her mother' (Watling, 1071:86). Lattimore (1964:23) includes this usage under the heading 'insolence', remarking that 'in Electra 613, Electra had merely spoken disrespectfully to her mother'. Incidentally, this is one case where I think, translators might have used 'to be insolent', rendering both elements here—(a) the disrespectful behaviour of an inferior toward a superior, and (b) the verbal manifestation: *κακοστομώμεν* (line 597).

[790] — Ὁρέστα, τὴν ὡς ἐμφανάν, ὅθεν ὥθη ἐξων  
πρὸς τὴν ὑβρίζη μπρόκ  
--'to be mocked' ('Schadenfreude')  
-- A messenger has just (lines 660,763) reported Orestes' 'death'. Clytaemnestra had reacted with little grief at the death of her son, now her sworn enemy determined to avenge his father's murder.
On the contrary, she expresses considerable relief (773-87). It is this reaction of Clytaemnestra which Electra calls 'mocking the dead' (Lattimore, 1964: 84n29). So, too, Jebb (1962: 115), 'Now, indeed, Orestes, thy fortune might be lamented, when it is thus with thee, and thou art mocked by this thy mother!'; and Watling (1971: 92) '...And this is your mother's tribute to your memory!', where the bitter 'tribute' indicates the opposite. It is not so much here that Clytaemnestra 'pours insults on him' (Grene, 1960, vol. II: 77) - she has not yet spoken ill of Orestes in her speech of lines 773-87, she has rather expressed immense relief at the death of an enemy: esp. 783-4 and 786-7. (In 792, Electra addresses Orestes' 'avenging spirit' (nemesis) to avenge this dishonour.)

[794] - ὑπῆριτε ὑν γὰρ ἐπαχώρον τυχαίνεις
--'to triumph mockingly' ('Schadenfreude')
--Both Jebb (1962: 115) and Grene (1960, Vol. II: 77) have 'insult', whereas Watling (1971: 92) translates: 'Gloat on your triumph, gloat'. The idea of gloating over the misfortunes of others is present, ἐπαχώρον τυχαίνεις, implying the opposite, as is indeed the case, for Electra, who had expected Orestes to save her (she has just now learnt that he is dead). 'Mocking' is attested by Lattimore (1964: 84n28) here. Perhaps one might again say (as of line 790, above) that it is not quite that Clytaemnestra had insulted Orestes and Electra (as both Jebb and Grene translate). ὑπῆριτε, in fact, refers to her mocking repartee of lines 791 and 793:-

790:  'Elec.: Can this be justice?
791:  Cly.: Justice is done to him,/Not yet to you.
792:  Elec.: Goddess of vengeance, hear,/And speak for the dead
793:  Cly.: She has heard most faithfully

And spoken well (Watling, 1971: 92)
--'mockery'

Chrysothemis has just entered, announcing the arrival of Orestes! Electra thinks she is making fun of her in her miseries: κατὰ τὸν ἑμῶν ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὅρρει λέγω τὰ δ’....

2.5.1. Hybris-words occur 8 times in the Electra, and in 5 of the 8 instances they are equivalent to the English 'insult'. (In lines 293, 522, 523 and 613, specifically a verbal insult is meant, here-as in line 271 Electra seems to take the outrageous behaviour of Aegisthus and Clytaemnestra as a personal insult (OR perhaps 'outrage' is the correct equivalent there).

In the remaining three, hybris occurs in the familiar sense of 'mocking'/'triumphing mockingly'/'crowing over the misfortunes of others' (lines 790, 794 and 881).

2.5.2. In only one of the 8 instances is hybris used of Electra (line 613). (In line 881 hybris is disclaimed by Chrysothemis, and the remaining 6 instances refer to Clytaemnestra.) It is clear that hybris as it is used in the Electra, plays no important rôle either in the intrigue or in the problem of the drama, denoting as it does merely the insults and verbal harangues between the two chief antagonists. The play really centres around the vengeance of Orestes, which is approved. (The murder of Clytaemnestra is justified by the argument of Electra that she had no longer acted like a true mother.) The personality of Electra is delineated akin to that of Antigone - loyalty to the dead, patient, long-
suffering. That *hybris* is applied to Clytaemnestr is consistent with the poet's purpose to direct sympathies against Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus. (As opposed to Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* and Euripides' *Electra*, where the defilement and guilt of the murder is accentuated - cf. Knox, 1964:12ff.)

In the *Electra* of Sophocles, it is a far cry from the idea that *hybris* constitutes the characteristic flaw of the tragic hero: rather it is the antagonists who are treated unsympathetically by their association with *hybris* (as also in the *Ajax*, p.60)

2.5.3. It also seems unlikely that *hybris* in the 'traditional' sense of the word is operative in Sophocles' *Electra* - though this question cannot be dealt with here. Few would probably go as far as to say that 'the proud Electra triumphs' (Kaufmann, 1969:77n41), but she certainly obtains a happy end to her past misery, and is probably never regarded as possessing *hybris* in the sense which is 'tragic'.

2.6. The *Philoctetes*

...τοιγαρον το σοι φράσσον
αὐτις πάλιν μοι πράγμ' ὅπως ὡ τ' ἐνύβρισαν
--'ill-treat'

-- Philoctetes asks Neoptolemus to resume the story of what the Atreidae did to him, i.e. 'picking up the sentence started in 331' (Webster, 1970:93). So, too, Jebb (1966:63): 'He had there intimated that, on reaching Troy, he had suffered some grievous wrong.' (He had, in his own words (330) ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐξελωβήθην, i.e. 'sustained grievous injuries - LSJ). It is important for understanding the sense in which Philoctetes uses ἐνύβρισαν here to remember that he has not yet heard of, nor knows anything of, the nature of Neoptolemus' story. All that he has heard is that Neoptolemus has suffered too at the hands of the sons of Atreus, and at the hand
of Odysseus'—lines 319-20. When Philoctetes uses *hybris* in line 342, we can therefore say that *hybris* designates something identical, or very similar to *οὐντυχών κακῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπειδών τῆς Ὀδυσσείας βίας*. This is why Jebb (1966:63) renders *ὅπως ἐνυπηρίσαν 'wherein they did thee a despite*', and Webster (1970:93) ‘how they did violence to you.’ And Lattimore (1964:84n28) gives this usage as an example of ‘bullying, the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living...’ (To say that they ‘insulted’ him (Watling, 1971:174; and Grene, 1960, Vol. III:60) gives perhaps too narrow a sense, if ‘to insult’ is generally a verbal action. They had not merely verbally insulted him, but ill-treated him in a wider sense by— at least, this is Neoptolemus’ tale— refusing him Achilles’ arms.)

"ill-treatment"

The context is similar to that of line 342, above, the chorus this time reacting to Neoptolemus’ tale told in lines 343-90. The interpretation of *πάο̂* is relevant here. If it is ‘referring to the full account of it which N. has just given’ (Jebb, 1966:71), it would indicate the verbal insults of the Atreidae and Odysseus quoted in lines 363-81. (Neoptolemus says that he departed κακά, διοβείς κακα, 382). But Webster (1970:97) prefers that πάο̂ be taken 'predicatively as in 386, "in full strength", another parallel being Ajax 275. The *hybris* would then not necessarily refer to the verbal insults, but specifically to the taking away of his father’s arms (line 399). Taken as referring to that act alone, Lattimore’s (1964:84n28) ‘the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living...’ and Watling’s (1971:176) ‘When the sons of Atreus did this thing to him’ adequately represent the sense of *hybris* here. This is one of the contexts where I think that ‘insolence’ (Jebb, 1966:71); (Grene, 1960:62), is inappropriate, for we have
here, not disrespectful behaviour towards a superior, but rather abusive action on the part of the stronger - see above, p.14. Interestingly, the noun is here used in exactly the same sense as its verbal counterpart in line 342.

\[1364\] -
\[\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\sigma\nu\kappa\alpha\upsilon\beta\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\]
\[\pi\alpha\rho\delta\varsigma\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\sigma\upsilon\lambda\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ldots\]

- 'to wrong/ill-treat/outrage'

--Though much later on in the play, Philoctetes, in returning to the subject of the taking away of Achilles' arms from Neoptolemus by the Atreidae, again uses hybris (as in lines 342 and 397 above) to refer to the incident. Apart from this consistency, there is nothing in the context to enable us to press any of the alternatives given above. (Both Jebb,1966:210, and Webster,1970:153 follow the O.C.T. in regarding the parenthetical \[\cdots\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota\nu\alpha\nu\] of lines 1365-7 which immediately follows the sentence quoted above, as spurious.) Watling's(1971:208) 'They mocked you' for 1364 seems inconsistent, but adequate renderings are: 'seeing that those men have done thee outrage'(Jebb,1966:210); 'They have done you wrong'(Greene,1960:101); Webster's(1970:153) paraphrase 'Neoptolemus has been wronged'. It being a compound verb, Lattimore (1964) does not discuss this instance, but his category 'the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living...' given for the similar instances in lines 342 and 397 above, would be equally fitting here.

2.6.1. 'Ill-treating'(of a weaker person) or 'wronging' is, then, the sense in which hybris and its cognates are used in all three occurrences in the Philoctetes.

2.6.2. In all three cases, it is used of the Atreidae, in that they wronged or ill-treated Neoptolemus when taking away from him his father's arms. It is never used of Philoctetes, who is, of course, the man 'more sinned against than sinning'. 'It is Philoctetes' play, a story of suffering' (Webster,1970:7). But the rationale
of his story of suffering is not given by *hybris* as it is used in the play. Rather, it seems that, like Electra and Oedipus in the *Oedipus Coloneus*, Philoctetes is the type of hero whose heroism lies in the ability to suffer and bear patiently, the prototype of Knox' (1964:7-9) idea of Sophoclean heroism.

2.6.3. Kaufmann (1969:77n41) says that 'Philoctetes has little to commend him to our sympathy except his pride, and he is not ruined for it'. Whether the 'traditional sense of *hybris* as 'pride' may be applied to Philoctetes, is a different question (cf. Knox, 1964:178, and Bremer, 1969:166). *Hybris*, as it is used in the Philoctetes, presents no key to the understanding of this tragedy.

2.7. The *Oedipus Coloneus*

[883] - \( \chi \rho \circ \text{ o}\chi \; \text{'hybris tād'}; \ \kappa \rho \; \text{'hybris all' ἀνεκτέα} \)

"'outrage"

-- Creon has threatened to remove Oedipus' daughters by force (lines 728-882). *Hybris* is used here, not to denote an actual deed of violence, but to 'refer to Creont and outrageous attempt'\(^{32}\) (Kaufmann, 1969:76). From the reaction of the chorusto his threats (555-7, 884-6), it is clear that they regard Creon's intended act as an 'outrage' - i.e. they are shocked and indignant at the 'abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living..'(Lattimore, 1964:84n28). This is borne out by the translations of Jebb (1965: 145) : 'Insolence! Cr. Insolence which thou must bear.'; Fitzgerald (in Grene and Lattimore, 1960, Vol. III: 885) : 'Chorus : Is this not criminal! Creon : If so, you'll bear it!' (But if the English word 'insolence' denoted disrespectful behaviour in an inferior towards a superior, *hybris* is not apt here - see p.14). Watling (1971:98) translates *hybris* with 'sacrilege', interpreting it as defilement of violation of religious sanctuary. But it is possible that here (as in a similar context, Aeschylus Supplices 426, see above, pp.22-3) the fear and indignation of the chorus rather
concerns the real dramatic situation - will Creon succeed in his attempt to remove Antigone and Ismene from Oedipus? It is precisely at this tension-laden moment that Theseus arrives on the scene (line 887). The dramatic situation has perhaps more to do with the outrage on Oedipus than the religious matter of violation of sanctuary. Furthermore, ἀνεκτέα in line 883 may be used to argue for ὑβρίς in the sense given above, for Creon says that they (the chorus) must bear it. (Watling, 1971:98, also translates δείνον in 877 with 'blasphemy' to be consistent with 'sacrilege' for ὑβρίς in line 883. But δείνον may also be rendered 'bold' (Jebb, 1965:145; and Fitzgerald, Grene and Lattimore, 1960:152). At any rate, an action which causes humiliation and indignation (cf. Fisher's, 1976:177-93 definition) seems broadly to be referred to here.

[960] - Ἄ λῆμ,' ἀνεκτέα, τοῦ καθυβρίζειν δοκεῖς
πότερον ἐμὸν γέρουντος, ἢ σαυτόν, τόδε;
--'to insult'
-- This passage, containing the compound verb, is not generally brought into account in treatises on ὑβρίς. Fortunately, the following translations concur: 'O arrogance unshamed! Whose age do you think you are insulting, mine or yours?' (Fitzgerald in Grene and Lattimore, 1960:155) ; 'O shameless soul, where think-est thou, falls this thy taunt - on my age, or thine own?' (Jebb, 1965:155) ; and 'Still unrepentant! Is it my grey head or yours that is more insulted by such talk -/A stream of vile abuse?'

The immediate context makes it quite clear that the equivalent of καθυβρίζειν is 'to insult or 'abuse verbally' : it refers to Creon's accusation of parricide and incest of lines 944-6, which Oedipus repeats in line 962 : ὅστις φόνους μοι καὶ γάμους καὶ συμφόρας...
That he means by καθυβρίζειν verbal insulting, is clear from τοῦ σοῦ διήκας στόματος (' line 963).
[1029] οὐ ψιλὸν οὐδ' ἀσκευον ἐς τοιήδ' ὑβρίν
ήκουτα τὸλμας τῆς παρεοιώσης τακν.'

--'outrage'

So Kaufmann (1969:76n40), identifying this usage with that in line 883, and Watling (1971:103) : 'You would not venture on such a daring outrage/Without some trusty backers'. Fitzgerald's (in Grene and Lattimore, 1960:158) and Jebb's (1965:165) translation of *hybris* as 'insolence' - for the same reason as given above on line 883 - perhaps gives the wrong sense. Jebb's (1965:165) note is more illuminating: 'The τὸλμα is the audacious spirit, manifested in the ὑβρίς, or outrageous action'. The general purport of the passage is similar that of line 883, but this time it is Theseus who uses *hybris* of Creon's outrageous attempt.

[1535]-- αἱ δὲ μυρίαι πόλεις
καὶ εὖ τίς οἰκήμ, ῥαδίοις καθυβρίσων

--'to attack'(violently)

Creon has now been thwarted in his outrageous designs, and Oedipus has turned to Theseus, hinting at possible danger to Athens from Thebes (1518-34). Watling's (1971:118) 'insult' and Fitzgerald's (Grene and Lattimore, 1960:178) 'arrogance' do not express the real, political danger with which Theseus is concerned. Jebb's (1965:237) translation: 'full many states lightly enter on offense, e'en though their neighbour lives aright'; and note: Most cities are apt to enter on aggression with a light heart', are more appropriate to the political tenor of Oedipus' speech.

2.7.1. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, *hybris* denotes 'outrage' (action causing shock, humiliation and indignation) twice - in lines 883 and 1029. 'Violent aggression' is signified in line 1535, and 'verbal insult' in line 960.

2.7.2. Not once is *hybris* used of Oedipus, neither is the word functional in any other way than simply denoting the physical and
verbal abusiveness of the antagonist, Creon. The attempted out-
rage of Creon (indicated by hybris in lines 883 and 1029) is, in-
deed, the central dramatic movement of the play. But the threat
is never realized, and constitutes only the final manifestation
of his suffering. Like the Electra and Philoctetes, the central
motif of the Oedipus Coloneus is 'suffering, long years and true
nobility' (lines 7-8), and his eventual apotheosis. (This in spite
of the fact that 'in the poet's final play Oedipus is far prouder
than he was in the Tyrannus' (Kaufmann, 1969:77)). Hybris is not,
then, in the Oedipus Coloneus a characteristic of the tragic hero;
rather it illustrates 'how a stronger man treats a weaker' (Whit-
man, 1951:254n23), in this case, the blind Oedipus being abused by
Creon.

2.8. Summary

2.8.1. Hybris—words occur 38 times in the extant tragedy of Sopho-
cles. They are employed to signify the following:—

- 11 times: 'mocking, triumphing mockingly ('Schadenfreude')
  (Ajax 153,196,304,367,955,971,1151; Antigone 840;
  Electra 790,794,881.)

- 9 times: 'outrage' (The abuse of superior strength to humiliate
  the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead' (Latti-
  more, 1964:23) ; Fisher's (1976:177-93) : 'behaviour
  causing shame or dishonour'
  (Ajax 560,1092,1385; Electra 271, Philoctetes 342,396,
  1364; Oedipus Coloneus 883,1029.)

- 6 times: 'disrespectful behaviour in an inferior toward a super-
  ior' - 'rebelliousness', 'disobedience' (Ajax 1081,1088;
  Antigone 309 .) — 'insolence' (verbal) (Ajax 1258; Anti-
  gone 480,482;)
- 6 times: 'insult', verbal offence'  
  (Trachiniae 280; Electra 293, 522, 523, 613; Oedipus Coloneus 960.)

- 4 times: 'violence'/'violent'/'violent deed'/'violent attack'  
  (Ajax 1061; Trachiniae 888, 1096; Oedipus Coloneus 1535.)

- twice: 'Irreligious pride/insolence'  
  (Oedipus Tyrannus 873.)

2.8.2. Of the 38 instances of hybris, only 9 (i.e. a ratio of less than 25 per cent., as in Aeschylus - see above, p.44) apply to the chief character(s) of the respective plays. Of the individual plays, the ratios are as follows: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>4 : 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigone</td>
<td>3 : 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachiniae</td>
<td>1 : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oedipus Tyrannus</td>
<td>0 : 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electra</td>
<td>1 : 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philoctetes</td>
<td>0 : 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oedipus Coloneus</td>
<td>0 : 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judging from the table above, one would not expect hybris, as it is used in the plays, to contribute significantly to our understanding of the Sophoclean tragedies. Indeed, in only one of the seven extant plays does it function in the structure of action, reaction and thought. (The Antigone is a drama of hybris: The
hybris of Antigone is her insolent disobedience to Creon in her dedication to the religious law of burial; it is the act of hybris in burying Polyneices, around which the play revolves structurally, and which causes Antigone's downfall. Conversely, Creon's implied hybris in lines 480, 482, involving his conflict with Antigone, equally inexorably constitutes the reason for his ruin.)

Apart from the Antigone, hybris, as it is used in Sophocles, does not play the important part 'traditionally' assigned to it. From a survey of the actual occurrences of hybris-words it is, of course, impossible to assess the function in Sophoclean tragedy of 'pride'/ 'arrogance'/ 'insolence' - i.e. what is 'traditionally' taken to be the 'meaning' of the word. This sense is only attested by way of exception, in Oedipus Tyrannus 873, where it does not supply the key to the tragic rationale of the play, as was shown above, pp. 73-4.
NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

(1) This occurrence (as also Ajax 954 and 1385) is not generally brought into account in discussions of *hybris*, escaping notice because it is a composite verb. Both its context and linking with the idea of 'Schadenfreude' over someone else's misfortunes (τὸν ἀφιεμένον - with dat. rei) make it similar to the simple verb in, e.g. 367, 954 and 971. The noun, too, is used similarly in line 196. Going over these instances, the reader will agree that there is no semantic difference in the usages of noun, simple verb and compound verb of the *hybris* family.

(2) Both Jebb and Kamerbeek report that the dat. rei is attested elsewhere with *καθωριζέων*.

(3) I have underlined the words which in both the quoted translations serve as equivalents for *hybris*.

(4) Neither Lattimore (1964) nor MacDowell (1976) include line 304 under their category of 'mocking'.

(5) Schneider and Hartung wrongly understood the line to read: 'Odysseus laughing at the black heart of Ajax' (Jebb, 1967: *ad loc.*).

(6) My emphasis of the phrase which gives the sense of *hybris* here.

(7) The grammatical subject of ὀψηφίζειν is, of course, elliptically, τὸν (τινὰ) (Kamerbeek, *ad loc.*).

(8) Incidentally, confirming the interpretation of *hybris* in lines 1081 and 1088 given above.

(9) cf. line 1385.

(10) For authority, one here - as in lines 153 and 955 - must rely solely on the commentaries and translations: see note (1) above.

(11) Teucer's repetition shows that he is obsessed with the indignity to the memory of Ajax.


(13) It is interesting to note in this regard that the preceding somewhat familiar conversation between Ajax and Athena (91-117), constitutes a watershed between scholars of irreconcilable schools.
Ajax has refused to comply with Athena's request that 'Odysseus' be treated mercifully.) Lucas (1959:133) says of this passage: 'The hero is guilty of the besetting sin of heroes, hybris... Athena herself asks Ajax, while he is still mad, to be merciful to his victims; his arrogant refusal shows him treating the goddess as no more than an equal.' By contrast, the pietistic interpretation of Lucas is totally inverted by Knox (1964:7) of the heroic-humanistic school: 'Athena, though her mockery is bitter, treats Ajax in his madness almost as an equal'. For Knox, this is proof of divine - i.e. Sophoclean - reverence for the heroic temper, the gods despising those who follow the common mean.

(14) cf. esp. Bowra's (1944) excellent analysis of the play in his chapter on the Ajax.
(15) cf., e.g., note (13) above.
(16) For example, one could not, attempting to retain these two specific senses, translate: 'Her first disobedience was... and now her second mocking triumph is...'
(17) It must be admitted that 'insolence' with ἐπιστάματι seems problematic. Jebb (1906:95) says that it is used 'with bitterness', i.e. sarcastically, as if to be insolent were an art which one could learn. However, the parallels adduced by Jebb are unconvincing: in line 686 of the Antigone and in Euripides fr. 796 ἐπιστάματι is used with λέγειν and σωφρονεῖν respectively, which seems quite natural.
(18) Though strictly speaking, of course, at line 309 Creon, in referring to the burial of Polyneices as a hybris, does not yet know that it was perpetrated by Antigone, it soon becomes clear that Antigone is indeed guilty of hybris as defined in line 309.
(19) But this is begging the question. On the other hand, Kitto's (1956:176) statement is equally categorical: 'The centre-piece is unmistakably Creon. We may prefer to make it Antigone, but if we do, Sophocles' design becomes in some degree unintelligible.' (A similar conclusion is reached by R.F. Goheen, The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone, p.98.).
(20) cf. Bremer (1969:139-40): 'Creon and Antigone share the play between them: Antigone has the more conspicuous part, she dominates
the action by her 'heroic temper', but it is Creon who has the longest part...

(21) cf. Introduction, p.15n8, above.
(22) MacDowell goes on to say: 'This passage is generally ignored by those who write about hybris in tragedy; but it has considerable negative importance, because it shows that the definition of hybris is not to be too narrowly drawn. If committing suicide in sorrow, shame and despair can be called hybris, that shows that hybris does not necessarily involve pride or arrogance, or setting oneself above the gods, or a desire to disgrace another person.' (My emphasis).
(23) See below, p. 107, for further examples.
(25) The MSS. have ὑπείς φυτεύει τῷ παντὶ. The conjecture is Blaydes', accepted by Winnington-Ingram (1971:126).
(26) See above, p.13, for further examples.
(27) See above, pp. 19 and 36.
(28) 'Insolence' in the accepted, not the obsolete, sense - see p.14.
(29) For a useful summary of the arguments, see Vellacott (1971) - Sophocles and Oedipus. It is this very problem which has led to Waldock's (1951:7) belief that 'There is no meaning in the Oedipus Rex'.
(31) Jebb (1966:60) prefers the MSS. οὐντὶξ hút to the πῦ τυχὼν of the O.C.T.
(32) My emphasis.
3. HYBRIS IN EURIPIDES

-In this section, considerably less attention will be given to arguments for or against a particular translation in a particular context. Euripides' style is generally clearer and less likely to create controversy in this regard. Only in problematic cases will a particular context be treated more extensively - where no translations or commentaries are quoted, the reader may assume that no real difference of opinion exists (as far as could be established). At any rate, the 'traditional' notion of what hybris means, has not been claimed for Euripides, either by the 'traditional' or the 'modern' school. Fraenkel, J. J. (1941:37) considers that Euripides uses hybris in a 'pasmunt' (common-place') sense, to denote 'allerlei onwellevendheid, rampen en onbeschoftheid' - unlike, according to him, Aeschylus and Euripides. The section is merely included: (1) for completeness' sake, and (2) to attempt to show that Euripides does not use hybris any differently from the other tragedians.1

3.1. The Alcestis

3.1.1. The only occurrence is the verb used in the sense of 'to be insolent', referring to Admetus verbally assaulting his father, Pheres, in lines 629-72, and treating him like a slave, in lines 675-8. Pheres' accusation is made in line 679.

3.2.2. It is not dramatically significant, the action of the play hinging on (a) Alcestis' heroic self-sacrifice, (b) Admetus' willingness to accept her sacrifice, and (c) (ultimately) Admetus' xenia (hospitality).

3.2. The Medea

3.2.1. 'To wrong'/'ill-treat'/'outrage' is the sense in which hybris and its cognates are used in five of the six instances in
the Medea. In lines 255 and 1366 Medea refers to Jason's infidelity to her, and in lines 782, 1061 and 1380 she uses hybris to denote the (hypothetical) 'outrage' or shame which her children will endure if she lets them be buried in Corinth, when their graves will be dishonoured, according to her, by the Corinthians – esp. 1380.

3.2.2. Hybris is never used of the notorious heroine of this play. The motivational force for her actions is not called hybris – it is, in fact, her barbarous passion to avenge the wrongs done to her.

3.3. The Heracleidae

3.3.1. In lines 18, 457,924,947,948, the noun, simple verb and compound verb refers to Eurystheus' ill-treatment of the children of Heracles, especially, but incidentally, too, of Iolaus and Heracles himself. In line 280 it is Copreus, the agent of Eurystheus who accuses Demophon of hybris (the noun). Vellacott, Orestes, 1972:114, translates 'arrogance', but the ᾠδείν ὀναθείν of line 295, referring to the same incident, indicates that we may here understand the same sense as in the other instance in the Heracleidae.

3.3.2. The play is certainly not about Eurystheus. It is about patriotism, warfare as a political means: its most important characters are Demophon, Iolaus, Macaria and Alcmene. It is true that Eurystheus' hybris is the cause of the war between Athens and Argos. But it has no significance in the further development of plot and character. (cf. Webster, 1967:101ff., Vellacott, 1975: 77, 184ff.; 1972 (Orestes) 23–4; and Murray (1965:45)).

3.4. The Hippolytus

3.4.1.
In contrast with the 'traditional' concept of 'hybris' as 'human pride punishable by the gods', here the mortal who is ἐνεπίσφατος, who is guilty of μεγα προνείν, is the victim of hybris on the part of a god.' (Lattimore, 1964:81n18).

-- 'Irreligious insolence'

--Here the traditional sense of disobedience to the gods or wishing to be more than mortal. Again, as in the previous passage, said by the nurse with regard to Phaedra's effort to suppress her love for Hippolytus. Aphrodite is the particular goddess, against whom Phaedra is warned not to commit hybris.

The verb is here used to signify the attempted 'rape' of Phaedra by Hippolytus, as it is mistakenly believed by Theseus, the real state of affairs (the opposite) having been misrepresented to him by Phaedra.

3.4.2. Hybris cannot, therefore, be intended by the poet to refer to Hippolytus, the allegation of Theseus being patently false. The case is similar to O.T. 873, where it is feared that Oedipus may be guilty of hybris. One might say the same of Phaedra. In line 474 she seems to be accused of irreligious hybris towards Aphrodite, in that she tries to suppress her sexual desire for Hippolytus. But this use is similarly ironical. It is Phaedra who soon yields to Aphrodite, and is therefore not guilty of irreligious hybris as defined in line 474. On the other hand, of Hippolytus, who is certainly guilty of hybris in this - the 'traditional' sense in denying the power of Aphrodite, the term is not used (cf. Lattimore, 1964:84n30). Of course, the force of the imputation of hybris in line 474 is, like O.T. 873 again, purely cautionary. Hybris, as it is defined in line 474, cannot apply to Phaedra:
the subsequent action of the play refutes the imputation. We must conclude: -

(a) That the term *hybris* is never used - except ironically - to refer to an actual characteristic of either Phaedra or Hippolytus.

(b) That, in spite of the fact that the story of Hippolytus could probably be a model of the 'irreligious pride leads to punishment' pattern (so Lattimore, 1964:27n53), and in spite of the fact that *hybris* occurs in the sense of 'irreligious pride' in the play (474), it does not seem to be used of Hippolytus' 'tragic flaw'.

3.5. The *Andromache*

3.5.1. 'Insolence' in the sense of 'disrespectful behaviour in an inferior towards a superior', is indicated by the simple verb in line 434, when it is said by Menelaus of Andromache. 'To wrong/do wrong to' is the sense of the verb in line 624. Here it is Peleus who accuses Menelaus of wronging his brother, Agamemnon, by urging him to sacrifice his daughter, Iphigenia, apparently not with Fisher's (1976:177-93) connotation of intending to, or causing dishonour to the victim. The verb with εις normally represents the idea of behaviour that is morally wrong, towards another, but in this context not with the intention of causing dishonour, but with ulterior, selfish motives.

In lines 977 and 994, the adjective and the verb, respectively occurs in the sense of 'to insult(verbally)'. Neoptolemus had called Orestes a 'matricide' and a 'victim of the gory-eyed goddess' (the Erinyes) - line 978. One notes here (a) that *hybrizein* in this sense is almost identical with ὄρειδίζειν (line 978) and (b) that the expression δῆριστής ἔν expresses exactly the same idea as δῆριστεῖν (the former in line 977, and the latter in line 994).
3.5.2. In this, another revenge-play, the main part is shared by Andromache and Hermione. The single reference to Andromache – Menelaus' stock accusation that she is insolent towards her superiors (line 434) is irrelevant to the course of the play, and the accusations and insults of lines 624,977 and 994 are equally incidental to the theme of the play.

3.6. The Hecuba

3.6.1. 'To mock', 'triumph mockingly' is the sense of the verb, the sole occurrence in this play. It is said by Polymestor, of Hecuba, glorying in her in her victorious revenge for Polymestor's murder of her son, Polydorus.

3.6.2. Polyxena is really the heroine of the play, along the same sacrificial lines as Macaria is of the Heracleidae. Nevertheless, Hecuba, too, is a principal character, and the sole hybris-reference is to her. But, in the sense used here, it is not of dramatic import – coming, as it does, at the end of the play, when revenge has been wreaked.

3.7. The Supplices

3.7.1. In lines 235,464,512,633,575,728 and 743 the noun, simple verb, compound verb and adjective refers to the 'outrage' of Creon (and with him, the city of Thebes) in refusing burial to the Argive chieftains. MacDowell (1976: 17) singles out the occurrences in 464 and 743 (where there are two instances) as being linked with the 'traditional' idea of koros. But it is equally possible that the sense of 'outrage' on a human plane is sufficient here, there being no link with the thought of divine retribution in these two contexts. (cf. Collard, 1975, ad loc.) The 'traditional' sense is, however found in line 495, where
υβρις ους δαπόλεσεν denotes the punishment of Capaneus for his irreligious boasting and challenges of Zeus. Zeus had struck him, in return for his godless insolence, down with a thunder-bolt - line 511: ἐξαρκέσας ἡν ὁ Ζεὺς τιμωρούμενος.

3.7.2. In the Supplices, the references to hybris as the cause of the ruin of Thebes, relate, at the most, to a side-motif to the main theme of the play (=the glorification of Athens), negatively characterizing the opponents of Athens.

3.8. The Hercules Furens

3.8.1. In line 181, υβρις μα refers to the 'violence' of the Centaurs, who had been beaten by Heracles. 'Ill-treatment' or 'outrage' would adequately represent the sense in which hybris-words are used in lines 261, 313, 459, 708 and 741, referring to Lycus' ill-treatment of the children of Heracles and their feeble protector, Amphitryon. Lattimore's (1964:23)'the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living...' is very apt here, as is Fisher's definition a state of mind in which pleasure is derived from causing shame or dishonour to a victim. Especially lines 459 and 741 contain instances of the latter kind.

3.8.2. As in the Supplices of Euripides, hybris has no function other than negatively characterizing the opponents of Athens' law of protection for the suppliant.

3.9. The Ion

3.9.1. In line 506 the chorus refer to the exposure of Ion as a 'mockery' of the relationship which begot him. (Lattimore's (1964: 81n19) 'rape' simply does not fit the immediate context (υβρις πιροδυπαλμών γάμων).

'To be outraged/insulted' is the equivalent of the usage of the
verb in line 810. The slave, addressing Creusa, feels that they/their house is being shamed or dishonoured by Xuthus' stated intention to introduce Ion as his heir. (What they do not know, of course, at this stage is that Ion is, in fact, the illegitimate offspring of Creousa and Apollo, thinking that Ion is Xuthus' illegitimate child.) Line 1020 can, at most be functional in a limited way, for character-
3:9.2. 'In this tragic-comedy ἱβρίς is not dramatically functional, beyond the use in 810, where it eventually achieves an ironi-cal twist, and in line 506, where it refers to the cruel mockery of Creon's exposure. Neither Xuthus nor Creusa is ultimately as-sociated with ἱβρίς.

3.11.1. 'To approach sexually' seems to represent the sense of
3:10. The Troades

[69] - ὥθησαν οἵθος ἐμοὶ ὑπὲρφθον μὲ καὶ παῖς εἰμοῦ.

Athena says that she and her temple were 'insulted' or 'violat-ed' when Ajax dragged Cassandra from her sanctuary. Another clear instance of the 'traditional' sense, which Lettimore (1964:86n34) ineffectually tries to explain away as 'not a challenge or a boast, but actual violation of the temple and lustful assault against Cassandra'. (1) The challenge was not explicit, but Ajax had nevertheless behaved 'insolently' (in the sense of disrespect for a superior) towards Athena; (2) Athena explicitly states that both she personally and her temple were affected by irreligious inso-

In line 905 Electra says she is afraid of insulting the dead, speaking in εκείνης, which is exactly what she was doing literally following speech (line 900) "to be proud, arrogant'.

Not merely 'treating other people as slaves' (MacDowell 1976:23)
"but simply the 'traditional' sense of being 'proud' or 'arrogant' (Vellacott, 1970:114): 'to queen it lordly'. Here not any harmful action is denoted - Hecuba is simply referring to Helena's legen-
dary vanity.

3.10.2. Interesting as these two clear instances of the 'traditional' sense of *hybris* are, *hybris* does not at all play a part in the dramatic structure of the *Troïades*. For the *Troïades* is nothing if not an anti-war 'orchestration of emotions'\(^5\), and line 1020 can, at most be functional in a limited way, for characterization, while the *hybris* of line 69 is equally irrelevant to the plot.

3.11. The *Electra*

3.11.1. 'To approach sexually' seems to represent the sense of the verb in line 46, where the Autourgos disavows having had sexual relations with Electra. In order to avoid ambiguity, the sexual theme has to be introduced, and the sexual connotation for *hybris* might legitimately be used, especially if the attitude towards sex is to be negative (cf. Aeschylus' *Suppliques*, passim). The equivalent given above is not really eventually different in import from, e.g. Vermeule's (in Grene and Lattimore, Vol. II : 50) 'holding down in violence'.

In line 68 'ill-treat'/'harm' is necessitated by the qualifying ἐν κακοῖς.

Still in respect of the Autourgos' abstention from sexual relations with Electra, in line 257, when the parents are directly related, the sense 'dishonour', 'cause shame to' would be more appropriate.

In line 902 Electra says she is afraid of 'insulting' the dead, speaking injuriously over the dead body of Aegisthus, which is exactly what she proceeds to do in her immediately following speech (lines 907-57).

But, again, the common sense of 'outrage' is used in lines 266 and 698, used in respect of Aegisthus' generally 'outrageous' behaviour which causes shame, i.e., in the first instance, of Electra's humble marriage, and, in the second instance, of
'outrage' or 'dishonour' to the dead.
The 'outrage' of line 947 (Aegisthus' sexual relations with Clytaemnestra), may, perhaps, legitimately rendered with a specific mention of the connotation 'sex' (so MacDowell(1976:7) and Vellacott(1973:137).

3.11.2. Not once is hybris used of Electra (or Orestes). The word is chiefly employed to refer to the insulting and outrageous behaviour of Aegisthus, (cf. Sophocles' Electra, where hybris is used similarly.)

3.12. The Iphigenia Taurica

In line 13 the phrase ἐβρισαθήντας γάμους Ἑλένης should be taken as a 'participle of applied predication' i.e. equivalent to the 'outrage' offered to Helen's marriage (Plattnauer,1938:60), referring, of course, to Paris' abduction of Helen. In line 930 Iphigenia asks Orestes whether Menelaus had taken their house by force. The element of 'violence' is important, as Iphigenia has already been told that Menelaus is no longer ruling over Argos (line 929), and now specifically wants to know whether he took it by violence or not.

3.12.2. The two hybris-refernces are quite irrelevant to the charming plot of this tragi-comedy - line 13 being a mere cursory reference to the cause of the Trojan War, and line 930 containing a question, unimportant to the plot, to which the answer is negative.

3.13. The Helena

3.13.1. 'To offer sexual violence', to 'rape', would be equivalent to the cognate accusative construction used in line 785. That hybris is used in a sexual sense by Helen here, is clear from the
fact that she answers Menelaus' reference to γαμεῖν...λέχη in line 784.

3.13.2. This revelation of Helen here, that Proteus had attempted to 'rape' her, does not, in this escapistic plot, correspond to the 'traditional' notion of the dramatic function of hybris.

3.14. The Phoenissae

3.14.1. The 'traditional' sense of hybris turns up again here, in lines 179 and 1112, where the first again refers to the irreligious boasting of Capaneus, and the second denies it of the wise Amphiaraus. (Cf. Euripides' Suppliants 495, above, and note that Aeschylus, in the Septem does not use hybris of Capaneus' proudly irreligious boasts.)

'to harm'/ 'ill-treat'/'outrage' is the general sense corresponding to the cognates of hybris in lines 620 (where Eteocles and Polynoeices reciprocate the compliment); 1592 (where the noun may be rendered 'malicious intent' or 'intent to dishonour' - this being disavowed by Creon, referring to his banishment of Oedipus); and lines 1644, 1663 and 1743 (where it is used of Creon's outrageous behaviour in refusing burial to Polynoeices - 1663 - and - in the other two cases - of his banishment of Oedipus).

3.14.2. Hybris does not play the important rôle 'traditionally' assigned to it in the reversals fortune in this melodramatic entertainment.

3.15. The Orestes

3.15.1. '(A) verbal insult' may be rendered for the sense of the verb in line 436, where Orestes is referring to the friends of Aegisthus calling him a μητροφόρην and further reviling or verbally offending him (cf., too, lines 479ff.)

'Mockery' (the noun) is what Menelaus accuses Orestes of when the former denied that he had killed Helen.
'Outrage' or 'action intended to cause dishonour or shame' (cf. Fisher's (1976:177-93) definition) is attested twice in the Orestes. ὄργαι occurs in both cases, lines 1038 and 1642, where the former refers (hypothetically) to the 'shame' or 'indignity' to Electra by being killed by an Argive commoner; the latter is used by the Deus ex Machina, Apollo, when he calls the race of mortals an ὄργαι to the earth - exhibiting, as Lattimore (1964: 84) observes, the same cynical Malthusianism which is attributed to Zeus in the Helena.

3.15.2. The hybris-references seem to have little relevance to the theme of the play, which is anti-Apollo and stresses the defamation of the murder of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra:

3.16. The Bacchae

3.16.1. The Bacchae (with 12 occurrences of hybris) is second only to Sophocles' Ajax in its prominence as a drama of hybris. The 'traditional' sense of 'irreligious insolence' is predominant. Hybris is used in this sense in lines 375, 516, 555, 1297 and 1347, referring to Pentheus' slight to Dionysus in denying his divinity. The religious connotation is denied by Fraenkel (1941:38), who argues that Pentheus is not aware of the fact that Dionysus represents the godhead himself, and that, consequently, these hybris-references should be understood as merely 'insults' and 'insulting behaviour' on a human level. Indeed, it has often been doubted that Euripides was capable of expressing this 'Aeschylean' sentiment (cf. Webster, 1967:274ff.) . But (contra Fraenkel's interpretation) one may argue that the Dionysus whom Pentheus slights, is in fact, the representative of the god himself, and, moreover, that Pentheus does not only insult the 'stranger' but also disparages the religion of Dionysus, which cannot be anything but a direct challenge to the divinity. Pentheus is 'insolent' in the sense of being disrespectful towards a superior, in this case a
god, which makes it a religious offence. (MacDowell, 1976:19 classifies the instances given above under his heading of 'disobedience to the gods')

'Violent' (for the adjective) is an equally important sense in the Bacchae, referring to the thyrsi of the Bacchants in line 113, and of bulls in line 743 - Winnington-Ingram (1948: ad loc.) glosses 'aggressive' or 'violent'.

In line 375 Pentheus accuses the 'stranger' (Dionysus) of being 'insolent' (disrespectful) towards him.

'Abuse of superior strength' is the sense of the noun in line 9, where the cruelty inflicted by Hera on Dionysus' mother, Semele, is indicated.

The interesting sense of a 'trick'/ 'laugh/mocking' occurs in line 616, where Dionysus says of himself that he had made a fool of Pentheus, by escaping his custody. (This use is comparable to Ajax 304, above.)

In line 779 Pentheus calls the Bacchae an ἄβραμα to Thbes, i.e. a 'shame', 'disgrace' (cf. Fisher's, 1976:177-93, definition).

Lastly, the sense of 'harming' or 'ill-treating' occurs in line 1311 - used hypothetically by Cadmus, it corresponds to Lattimore's (1964:23) category: 'the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living…'

3.16.3. The 'traditional' notion of the tragic rôle is fully attested in the Bacchae, where it is Pentheus' 'irreligious insolence' which is the direct cause of his downfall, (effected by Dionysus as punishment). That Euripides could have written a play with a religious import, has often been doubted, especially by the Verrallian school. But Winnington-Ingram (1948: passim) and Dodds (1960: introduction) have irrefutably shown that the message of the Bacchae is indeed religious in character. That one ignores at one's own peril (as Pentheus did) the reality and the power of the irrational element in the human experience - which is the domain of the god Dionysus. The irony is: Pentheus had thought that he was sôphrô'n in rejecting the emotionalism of
the Bacchants. But in doing so he committed the supreme folly, i.e. denying the reality of a god, in this case, the god who presides over the irrational element. This god, in direct reaction to mortal hybris, cruelly punished hybris by having him murdered by his own mother, a victim of Dionysiac delusion, in circumstances that arose from his own morbid opposition to Dionysus. But here Euripides added an ironical switch of sympathy. As in his other revenge-plays, Euripides has again introduced the theme of excessive and incommensurate revenge, whereby the sympathy of the spectator is redirected upon the avenger of an original wrong, now totally overshadowed by a greater wrong. Thus, the statement: 'The Bacchae is a drama in which the "traditional" notion of hybris as irreligious insolence, punished by the gods, is a central theme' should be qualified by an addition of the ironical switch of sympathy which follows the god's excessive punishment. Nevertheless, that the poet intended Dionysus to be taken seriously as a god, against whom it is hybris in the tragic sense to attempt to exalt oneself, is clear from the lyrical beauty and sublime reverence of the choral odes.

3.17. The Iphigenia Aulidensia

The sole occurrence (the cognate accusative construction in line 961), where Achilles upbraids Agamemnon for 'insulting' him in not asking his consent to use his name, is incidental to the plot.

3.18. Summary

3.18.1. Hybris-words occur 88 times in the tragedies of Euripides, in the following senses:—

In almost one half (42) of the instances, the general sense of 'harming'/ 'ill-treating' /causing 'outrage' are equivalent to hybris and its cognates; (Lattimore's, 1964:23 'bullying, the abuse of super-
ior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead'; and Fisher's (1976:177-93) definition of an action intended to, or causing, shame or dishonour for the victim, are both to the point.

(Međea 255,1366,782,1061,1380; Heracleis 18,230,457,924,947,948; Andromache 624; Supplices 235,464,512,633,575,728,743; Iphigenia Taurica 13; Hercules Furens 261,313,459,708,741; Electra 58,68,257,266,698; Orestes 1038,1642; Ion 810; Phoenissae 620(twice),1592,1644,1663,1743; Bacchae 9,779,1311.)

Related, but cases where more specific senses can be argued for:

(a) '(verbal)insult'

(Andromache 994; Electra 331,902; Ion 810; Orestes 436; Iphigenia Aulidensis 961)

(b) 'to mock', 'triumph mockingly' (Schadenfreude')

(Međea 603; Hecuba 1257; Ion 506; Orestes 1581.)

(c) 'violent'/'violence'/'physical assault'

(Hippolytus 446; Hercules Furens 181; Iphigenia Taurica 930; Bacchae 113,743.)

(d) 'insolence' (disrespectful behaviour in an inferior towards a superior'

(Alcestis 679; Andromache 434; Bacchae 247.)

(e) 'sexual violation', 'rape'

(Hippolytus 1073; Electra 46,947; Helena 785.)

The 'traditional sense of hybris is well represented in Euripides, with 12 instances: 'irreligious insolence'/'pride'

(Hippolytus 474(twice); Supplices 495; Troiades 69,1020; Phoenissae 179,1112; Bacchae 375,516,555,1297,1347.)
3.18.2. Yet, in spite of the many hybris-references in the tragedy of Euripides, only one of the seventeen may be said to revolve dramatically around hybris. In the Bacchae, the ruin of Pentheus is a tragedy of hybris in the 'traditional' sense of the word: Pentheus challenges the divinity does not know his place as mortal, and is duly punished by Dionysus, the god whom his (irreligious) 'insolence' had offended. However, the play ends with an ironic change of sympathy: has the punishment not exceeded the crime? Nevertheless, the tragedy of Pentheus, in the largest part of the play, before the ironical switch of sympathy, certainly complies with the 'traditional' notion of hybris.

3.18.3. The question of the tragic rôle of the concept of 'irreligious pride'/'arrogance' - irrespectively of whether the word hybris is used to refer to it or not - cannot be discussed here. The Hippolytus is an enigmatic case in point. Here it would seem that the action of the play is conditioned by precisely the 'irreligious insolence' in denying or challenging the power of Aphrodite. Yet hybris is never used of Hippolytus in this sense, though it is explicitly defined in line 474 of the play that to resist Aphrodite is hybris! Insomuch as the actual occurrences of the word are concerned, it is only in the Bacchae that hybris presents the key to the tragic rationale.
NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

(1) Neither is attempted to determine the chief character(s) - as in the case of Aeschylean and Sophoclean tragedy, chapters one and two, above - as this was found to be too problematic in Euripides.

(2) So MacDowell(1976:19) But Lattimore(1964/84n29) does not admit of a religious connotation: Phaedra's nurse tells her that to resist love is hybris (insubordination). So, too, Whitman(1951:254n23): 'Eur. Hipp. gives, not a definition, but a deliberate extension of the term.' Yet the context clearly points to hybris in the 'traditional' sense: It is not said that hybris is to resist 'love', but clearly stated that hybris means to want to be greater than the gods (line 475). With regard to Whitman's statement, one should remember that irreligious hybris, though exceptional in tragedy, was an important sense before tragedy (see Introduction, p.13), and, as used here, is rather an archaism than an innovation. Moreover, the sentiment would be quite in character for a personage like the nurse in the Hippolytus.

(3) Vellacott translates 'savage'. For hybris of the Centaurs, cf. Trachiniae 1096, above.

(4) So both MacDowell(1976) and Vellacott(1972), both ad loc.


(7) cf. Webster(1967:171ff.)

(8) Euripides' Rhesus is not taken into account, though Murray (1952, Euripides: introduction), Webster(1968:122) and Ritchie (1964:passim) argue for its authenticity. The single hybris reference is not of tragical import, according to both Lattimore (1964:85n35) and Ritchie(1964:90,97). The latter remarks that Rhesus is not guilty of hybris: the reference in line 917 is to his mother, Thamyris.
CONCLUSION

The reader is referred to the summaries concluding the chapters on hybris in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides respectively (pp. 43-4, 85-7 and 103-5 above), from which the following general conclusions may be drawn:--

1. The senses in which hybris and its cognates are used, in order of frequency, are:--
   1.1. 'Harming'/'ill-treating'/'(causing) outrage'.
       These senses correspond to the definitions of Whitman (1951:254n23): 'how a stronger man treats a weaker'; Lattimore(1964:23): 'bullying, the abuse of superior strength to humiliate the helpless living or outrage the helpless dead'; and Fisher(1976:177-93): 'behaviour intended to, or causing shame or dishonour'.
   1.2. 'Mocking'/'triumphing mockingly'('Schadenfreude').
   1.3. 'Violence'/'deed of violence'/violent'
   1.4. 'Irreligious pride/insolence'/'arrogance'
   1.5. 'Insult'(to offend verbally).
   1.6. 'Insolence'/'rebelliousness'/disobedience'(disrespectful behaviour in an inferior toward a superior).

2. The above conclusion compares as follows with definitions which have been given for hybris:--
   2.1. The 'traditional' view that hybris means '(irreligious) pride' or 'arrogance'(see pp.1-3 above) is proven wrong. This sense does occur, but only twice in Aeschylus, twice in Sophocles, and 12 times in Euripides. It seems to have been the sense in the age prior to the Classical era - and is retained in the Persae, the earliest extant Greek tragedy, and elsewhere used very often by elderly characters (e.g. the elderly chorus of the Oedipus Tyrannus, the nurse in the Hippolytus, and Hecuba in the Helena). The modern' view of hybris (see pp. 2-4 above) seems to have been the current usage of 5th Century literature, including Tragedy.
   2.2. Lattimore(1964:23) is correct in that 'bullying...' is the
most frequent sense in which hybris is used in Tragedy, but his
treatment is deficient, because only the LSJ categories (see p. 3
above) are followed, with the result that the clear instances of
the 'traditional' sense of 'irreligious pride' are ignored.
2.3. MacDowell(1976:19ff.) similarly attempts to argue away the
instances of the 'traditional' sense as mere 'disobedience'. The
connotations which he gives (see, again, p. 3 above) are correct,
but his definition (1976:29), 'having excess energy and misusing
it self-indulgently' lacks the important element that it is always
directed at a victim. (This element is excluded, apparently
on the basis of Sophocles' Trachiniae, 888, where hybris refers
to Deianeira's suicide. But here the victim is clearly Deianeira
herself.)
2.4. Fisher's(1976:177) definition, 'behaviour intended to, or
causing shame or dishonour' does include the element of a victim,
and the specific senses of 'mocking', 'insulting' and 'insolence'
given above are also completely compatible with this definition.
Unfortunately, he denies categorically the religious connotation,
as well as the (equally frequent) clear instances of 'violence'/
'violent deed' - where the idea of intention or result of dishonour
is not prominent - and 'sexual violation' - e.g. in Aeschylus'
Supplices, passim, where 'forced marriage' would not fit the con-
text (see p. 26 above).
2.5. Whitman's(1954:254n23) 'how a stronger man treats a weaker',
though, as Fisher's, covering the majority of instances, is not
wide enough to include the sense of disrespectful behaviour in an
inferior toward a superior, neither, again, does it take into
account instances of hybris as 'irreligious pride'.
2.6. It seems, then, that a definition of hybris in Greek Tragedy
should include the following elements:
2.6.1. That it denotes harming, ill-treating, or causing shame to
a victim;
2.6.2. That the abuse may be either physical or verbal.
2.6.3. That an archaic sense of 'irreligious pride/insolence' is
retained in a few clear instances.
3. **Hybris** is not used any differently by any of the three tragedians - contrary to the widely held belief that the 'irreligious' connotation is characteristically 'Aeschylean' or 'Sophoclean'. (Cf., e.g., Del Grande, 1947:131-48; Fraenkel, J.J., 1941:38; North, 1966:50; Winnington-Ingram, 1971:119n1.)

4. The different parts of speech in the **hybris** family are not used any differently from one another. For all the senses given above, there are examples of all the cognates.

5. As far as the tragic rôle of **hybris** as 'irreligious insolence, punishable by the gods' is concerned: only in Aeschylus' *Persae* and Euripides' *Bacchae* is this 'traditional' view vindicated. In none of the other extant plays is **hybris** used to indicate this sense as the tragic rationale. (In the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, where this sense of **hybris** does occur, it does not apply to Oedipus, as was shown above, pp. 70-4). The ratio of **hybris**-references to the chief characters, as compared to total **hybris**-references - less than 25% in both Aeschylus and Sophocles - tends to invalidate the 'traditional' notion of the tragic significance of **hybris**.

6. A question which had not received appropriate attention, is the question of the tragic significance of **hybris** in the 'modern' sense (see p. 9 above). It has been shown that the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus is a drama based on **hybris** (but **hybris** in the sense of 'crime'/'misdeed', and not in the sense of 'pride'. In the *Antigone* of Sophocles, **hybris** as 'insolence'/'disobedience' is the key moment around which the play revolves.

7. The question of whether the 'pride - punishment' pattern is frequently found in Greek Tragedy, has not been discussed insomuch as **hybris** is not actually used to denote the element of 'pride'. (A case in point is the enigmatic usage of **hybris** in the *Hippolytus* of Euripides: although **hybris** is defined in the 'traditional' sense in line 474 as 'wishing to be greater than the gods', it is never used of Hippolytus himself, whom one would have thought to be guilty of **hybris** in this sense.)
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