

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS**  
**PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE**  
**PROGRAM**

**THUMOS AND PSUKHE FROM MYTHOLOGY TO PLATO**

**AYBÜKE FAYETÖRBAY**

**119679006**

**Asst. Prof. Ömer Behiç ALBAYRAK**

**ISTANBUL**

**2022**

## **Thumos and Psukhe from Mythology to Plato**

### **Mitolojiden Plato'a Thumos ve Psukhe**

Aybüke FAYETÖRBAY

119679006

**Tez Danışmanı:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ömer Behiç ALBAYRAK (İmza).....  
İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyesi:** Doç. Dr. Zeynep TALAY TURNER (İmza).....  
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyesi:** Doç. Dr. Ferda KESKİN (İmza).....  
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 20.07.2022

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 74

#### **Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)**

- 1) Plato
- 2) Antik Yunan
- 3) Thumos
- 4) Psukhe
- 5) Eros

#### **Keywords (İngilizce)**

- 1) Plato
- 2) Ancient Greek
- 3) Tyhmos
- 4) Pysche
- 5) Love

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Ömer Albayrak, my thesis advisor and supervisor, who enabled me to safely pass many critical points through his valuable guidance in the course of long and difficult process of this thesis study. I also owe a debt of gratitude both to Kaan Atalay who paved the way for the concept of *thumos* to be the subject of debate in this thesis by introducing me thereto, and to all of my teachers, particularly Ferda Keskin, for their great contributions to me since my first day in the Philosophy and Social Thought Master's Degree Program. I also own a great thank you to my beloved cousin Zeynep Ekin Öztürk who has helped me in a very critical time for this thesis. And my last thanks go to all of my beloved ones who encouraged and supported me from the first moment they have become aware of this thesis study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	vi
ÖZET .....	vi
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. THUMOS AND PSUKHE .....	5
1.1. ETYMOLOGICAL TRACES .....	5
1.2. SPECIFIC MEANING AND FUNCTION OF THUMOS.....	8
2. THUMOS AND PSUKHE IN MYTHOLOGICAL TEXTS.....	123
2.1. MYTHOLOGY IN GENERAL.....	13
3. THUMOS IN TRAGEDIES.....	234
4. THUMOS IN PHILOSOPHY.....	345
4.1. PYTHAGORAS .....	40
4.2. PLACE OF THUMOS IN PSUKHE IN PLATO.....	412
4.2.1. Aletheia .....	445
4.2.1.1. Soma (Body) .....	50
4.2.1.2. Psukhe (Spirit).....	534
4.2.2. A Transitivity between Human and the Divine.....	589
4.2.2.1. Eros (Love) .....	59
4.2.3. Thumos As A Power .....	61
CONCLUSION .....	634
REFERENCES.....	667

## ABSTRACT

This study discusses the meanings, change, and transformation of *psukhe* and *thumos* concepts encountered in Ancient Greece, and points out where they have reached in Plato. The discussion turns around the mythological texts, tragedies, and Plato's works. Though the use of *psukhe* in mythology is roughly limited by 'the thing abandoning the body upon death, after Pythagoras defines the philosophy as an activity that makes the salvation of *psukhe* possible, *psukhe* becomes one of the central concepts of philosophy, and *psukhe*'s articulation process starts. According to Plato, it is a part of this process as a stage reached in the search for justification of human competence and knowledge with *psukhe*. Plato thinks of the nature of *psukhe* in three parts and defines and establishes *thumos* as one of the parts of *psukhe*. This type of thinking leads us towards a totally different mentality because the Greeks' *aporia* is not whether the source is this or that, but is that it is/may be both this and that and that it is impossible to distinguish them, while in Plato, *aletheia* is handled as a problem regarding the existence of human, i.e. the tension in the existence of human. Acting at all times within the borders of this tension between the one which is knowable and the one which is unknowable, human is now the actor/maker of their own choices. And the tragic existence of humans confronts us in this relationship between spirit (*psukhe*) and body (*soma*). In the last part of this study, it will be stated that it is in fact the Love that enables both transition and self-creation of the human in his tension between *psukhe* and *soma*, and that the Love is indeed *kinesis* emerging upon activation of *thumos*, and it will be noted and seen that the power encouraging the human to discover the gateway between what's humane and what's divine is *thumos*.

**Keywords:** Plato, Ancient Greek, *Thumos*, *Psukhe*, *Eros*.

## ÖZET

Bu çalışma, Antik Yunan'da karşılaştığımız psukhe ve thumos kavramlarının anlamlarını, değişimini, dönüşümünü tartışarak Plato'da nasıl bir hal aldığını göstermektedir. Tartışma, mitolojik metinler, tragedyalar ve Plato'un eserleri etrafında hareket etmektedir. Psukhe'nin mitolojideki kullanımını, kabaca, 'ölünce bedeni terk eden şey' ile sınırlıyken Pythagoras'ın felsefeyi psukhe'nin selametini mümkün kılacak faaliyet olarak tarif etmesiyle birlikte psukhe felsefenin merkezi kavramlarından biri haline gelir ve psukhe'nin artikülasyon süreci başlar. Plato ise bu sürecin insan muktadirliğini ve bilgiyi psukhe ile temellendirme arayışının geldiği bir aşama olarak bir parçasıdır. Plato, psukhe'nin doğasını üç parça olarak düşünür ve thumos'u psukhe'nin parçalarından biri olarak tarif ve tesis eder. Bu ele alınış biçimi, bizi farklı bir anlayışa doğru götürmektedir. Çünkü Yunanlıların aporia'sı, kaynağın ya o ya bu olması değil hem o hem bu olduğu/olabileceği ve bunun ayırt edilmesinin imkansızlığı iken Plato'da aletheia, insanın varoluşuna, varoluşundaki gerilime dair bir mesele olarak ele alınmaktadır. Her daim bu bilinebilir olanla bilinemez olan arasındaki gerilimde hareket eden insan artık kendi seçimlerinin failidir. İnsanın trajik varoluşu da işte bu ruh (psukhe) ve beden (soma) ilişkisinde karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Çalışmanın son bölümü itibariyle de, insanın psukhe ve soma arasındaki geriliminde hem bir geçiş hem de kendini yaratma faaliyetine imkan verenin Aşk ve Aşk'ın da aslında thumos'un harekete geçirilmesiyle beliren bir kinesis olduğu açıklanacak, insanı, insani olanla ilahi olan arasındaki geçiti keşfetmeye iten gücün de thumos olduğu görülecektir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Plato, Antik Yunan, Psukhe, Thumos, Eros.

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis will examine how the concepts of thumos and psukhe evolved from the mythological era to Plato, and will discuss how thumos has held a potential power to combine/integrate the human and the divine by becoming a part of psukhe in Plato. The aim of this discussion is to show the different meanings and discussion of the concepts of psukhe and thumos, and then to explain how thumos in Plato became a part of the soul (psukhe) encompassing the infinite possibilities under the domination of a finite body (soma) and turned into an energeia which is at all times reborn and regenerated no matter what is done

In that case, we will need first to look into the etymological traces of the concepts of thumos and psukhe in order to comprehend the specific meaning and function of thumos. As we will see when we look at it in-depth, human beings in Ancient Greece had a different life practice in the mythological tradition, with their action being determined by the gods. Therefore, divine power is required for the concept of thumos to function. With the examples of thumos and psukhe in mythological texts as discussed in the third chapter, we are going to find out that these concepts have by time been interpreted with various different meanings and perspectives depending on the specific culture of each period, beginning with the primordial ages.

In the fourth chapter, in which we will see the rupture between mythological tradition and tragedies, will be an important milestone in terms of study, following the mythological tradition in which nothing happens without the intervention of the gods. Because in Greece, with the emergence of cities (polis), there was a radical rupture from the mythological tradition in which the divine was decentralized and chaotic was dominant. The significance of tragedies that developed during the period when the transformation of the polis was most evident is that human beings first appeared as an agent in this period. This chapter is important because it emerges in the tension resulting from the emergence of human as an agent. This tension will appear between the mortal and finite human on one side and the

immortal and everlasting gods on the other side. And tragedies will also emerge as the ethical space of this tension arising out of the togetherness of the mortal and finite human and the immortal and infinite (eternal) gods. The establishment of cities after the seventh century paved the way for a crisis for the Ancient Greeks, because there was not any construction based on self-sufficiency as seen in family or village, but on the contrary, there was a need for political space and organization. Against the mythological tradition that doesn't attribute any capabilities to human beings, humans are now capable with cities. At this point, it will be necessary to look at the link between ethos and daimon. Heraclitus's *Ἠθος Ἀνθρώπου Δαιμόν* (*êthos anthrôpôi daimôn*) statement combines two meanings together due to its syntax-based structure. This expression says that the human's character (ethos) is both their fate (daimon) and that the human's fate (daimon) is their character (ethos). The expression is bi-directional since character and fate may have made or may have caused the other to make it at the same time, and this is indistinguishable. As to Plato, daimon is in fact not the fate of a human being, but the human's power to change their fate.

We will discuss the concepts of thumos and psukhe in Plato together in Chapter Five of this study titled 'Thumos in Philosophy, and we will consider them in three frameworks: Pre-Pythagoras, Pythagoras, and Plato so that Pythagoras is in a key position on this subject due to close philosophical relations of Pythagoras with Plato. This route is important, because no matter how they are, human has always tried to make sense of life, and felt the need to account for the effects of such feelings as rage, happiness, desire, and envy. In for pre-Pythagoras era, we reach a new junction point as movement and sensation, and to say that those who look at movements of living creatures associate psukhe with movement, but when sensation (aesthesia) comes into question, thumos comes into play other than psukhe. Considering that Pythagoras's thoughts on psukhe have influenced Plato, in Pythagoras part, we are going to separately discuss Pythagoras who bases his philosophy on the acts and relations of numbers, and to note and see that Pythagoras's ideas regarding the immortality of spirit and the probable transmigration of spirit into different mortal bodies play a great role in the

philosophy of Plato. We are also going to state that in his Idea Theory asserting that true knowledge comes only from the world of ideas, Plato was influenced by Pythagorean theory of numbers, and also that both Plato's spirit and body metaphor saying that the body is the prison of the soul, and in Plato's Anamnesis (reminiscence), the reincarnation and immortality of spiritual ideas of Pythagorean philosophy have played great roles for Plato. In the articulation process of *psukhe*, starting with Pythagoras, to handle Plato as a stage reached in the search for grounding the human competence and knowledge with *psukhe* will enable us to further clarify the whole picture. From the moment Plato turned *thumos* into a natural capability of *psukhe* and divided the soul into three parts: reason (to *logistikon*), spirit (to *tumoeides*), and appetite (to *epitymetikon*), *psukhe* which has till then been used in mythology only and roughly as 'the thing abandoning the body upon death' has been replaced by a new structure hosting and encompassing infinite possibilities. When we consider this process as a stage in which the quest to ground the human competence and knowledge with *psukhe* has come, the concept of *aletheia* becomes an important point, because for Plato, *aletheia* is the issue of human existence. Because in the course of discussion of the concept of *aletheia* over Plato, the key point is that even under circumstances making it possible for human to grasp it, it becomes impossible for human to comprehend it due to the body it is subjected to. However, because *aletheia* is associated with the tension in the existence of human in Plato and when the creation activity occurs, this condition of *aporeticness* becomes an opportunity for human. As will elaborate further in the main chapter, Plato clarifies his idea with the analogy of a divided line: *Noesis*, *Dianoia*, *Pistis* and *Eikasia*. *Noesis* (apprehension and discernment) and *Dianoia* (inferential comprehension) lead us to knowledge, while *Pistis* (belief) and *Eikasia* (estimation) lead us to *doxa*. Movement between said planes is related directly to the movement of *psukhe*. In *Doxa*, when we talk about the laws of the body in its entirety, our subject in the area of thoughts area will be *psukhe*. Exactly this point takes us to arrogance and Love. Since we have become limited with *psukhe* being subject to and dependent upon a body, the domination we establish on the existing one over *doxa* will push us to *hubris*. *Hubris* is a negative concept

for aletheia, because it wishes to dominate everything we establish and enter into a relationship with, and therefore, our desire to keep under control against the probability of loss further increases. For this reason, the area that will construct knowledge is the laws of psukhe. In Plato, psukhe is the part hosting the mind, and a part of the Good. It is Love that will make it possible for psukhe to reach completely the Good because Love arises in what is lacking. The love and the force that makes us dare to Love is the thumos, which is also the last chapter of the thesis.

## 1. THUMOS AND PSUKHE

In this chapter, we will examine the etymological origins of the concepts of thumos and psukhe, as well as the specific meaning and function of thumos from this context. We, then, will move on to their counterparts in philosophy and explain with Plato how these concepts were affected by both mythology and tragedies and the differences caused by the rupture between tragedies and mythology after looking at the expressions of thumos and psukhe in mythological texts and tragedies. Because as we will discuss in detail later this rupture points out that human existence becomes a problematic in the tension between mortality and immortality of human as a result of the fact that the human existence is finite and mortal due to the body (soma) and contains the infinite and immortal due to psukhe.

Although we will explain the etymological origins and meanings of the concepts of thumos and psukhe in this chapter, it will not be easy to understand the tension between psukhe and soma as well as the development and change of thumos in this tension without first seeing the basis of these two concepts in mythology which carry the core of human existence.

### 1.1. ETYMOLOGICAL TRACES

In terms of its etymological origin, thumos (θυμός) (Liddell & Scott, 1996) is derived from the verb thyo (θύω). “Etymologically it is clear that the word θυμός is connected with the Latin word fumus (smoke) and the Greek word θύω (*thyo* / to sacrifice); so that it really suggests a hot welling-up of blood.” (Jaeger & Robinson, 1948) It is related to the part of the human body corresponding to phrenes, i.e. diaphragm. On the other hand, the olfactory dimension indicated by the “thy-origin” should not be ignored. This word was also used when describing how the gods were affected by the smells in the sacrificial ceremony. This means to say that it is both a principle of life and at the same time has a divine dimension. The reason why it is translated as anger today is that the central emotion in the texts of the Iliad

and Odysseus is anger. But thumos is what pushes people to action, which can change when feelings and thoughts change. Thumos is also a psychic force to which other emotions such as friendship, revenge, sadness, and happiness belong. For example, it would be incorrect to talk about only thumos of a brave warrior. It is conceivable to talk about the thumos of both a courageous warrior and the coward in front of him because thumos is expressed as a principle of life in Ancient Greece.

Another concept, psukhe (ψυχή), that will be discussed within the framework of this study is derived from the Greek origin psúkhō (Ψύχω), which means “blowing out”. It is translated as breath-sustaining life. “Psyche, like the names given to the soul, denotes something like air or breath, and it manifests itself in the breathing of the living man. It escapes out of the mouth- or out of the open wound of the dying- and after escaping from its prison, is now an eponymous image/ εἶδωλον (eidolon).” (Rohde, 1925) Eidolon is a representation, view, and image of the body.

ἐνθ' αὐτ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησε θεά, γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:

εἶδωλον ποίησε, δέμας δ' ἤικτο γυναικί,

Ἴφθίμη, κόρρη μεγαλήτορος Ἰκαρίοιο,

τὴν Εὐμηλος ὄπυιε Φερῆς ἐνὶ οἰκίᾳ ναίων.<sup>1</sup>

Then the goddess, flashing-eyed Athena, took other counsel

She made a phantom, and likened it in form to a woman

Iphthime, daughter of great hearted Icarus,

Whom Eumelus wedded, whose home was in Pherae.

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,

σχέτλιε, τίπτ' ἔτι μείζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μήσεαι ἔργον;

πῶς ἔτλης Ἄϊδόσδε κατελθέμεν, ἔνθα τε νεκροὶ

---

<sup>1</sup> Homeros, Odysseia, 4. 795-798.

ἀφραδέες ναίουσι, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων; <sup>2</sup>

‘Son of Laertes, sprung from Zeus, Odysseus of many devices,

What did yet greater than this will you devise in your heart?

How did you dare to come down to Hades,

Where dwell the unheeding dead,

The phantoms of men outworn.

At this point, the matter of debate is not the *psukhe*’s having a duller another side apart from its living side, or something which can be incorporated by human into their Cartesian body-spirit dichotomy (dualism) with which they are acquainted and upon which they are dependent because *eidolon* is outside the usual soul (mind) definition. The human being is so acquainted with and so dependent upon the Cartesian body-spirit dichotomy (dualism) facing difficulty in understanding and expressing a different point of view or a different metaphysical justification. However, *psukhe* bears two meanings: a principle of living and the shadow of a dead, i.e. *eidolon*. That is why the Homeric belief’s *psukhe*, being at the same time a hazy image *eidolon* belonging to Hades, survives even after all vital activities of the body. “According to the Homeric view, human beings exist twice over: once as an outward and visible shape, and again as an invisible image which only gains its freedom in death. Thus, and nothing else, is the *Psukhe*.” (Rohde, 1925) The concept of *psukhe*, which has had various understandings and meanings since primordial times, is a directly political concept. Because in Ancient Greece, there was a different kind of life practice in the mythological tradition where there was more than one god. For the Greeks, most heroes were the children of the gods themselves. As Jacob Burckhardt stated; “Aeacus was the son of Zeus, and father of Telamon and Peleus; thus, Achilles and Ajax were grandsons of Zeus. The gods so often in Homer made themselves visible, and who in the land of the Phaeacians frequently crossed the path of the solitary wanderer, or joined human beings at the table for a feast, continue to appear here and there well into the days of late

---

<sup>2</sup> Homeros, *Odysseia*, 11. 473-476.

antiquity.” (Burckhardt, 1999) In this practice the act of human is determined by the gods. Therefore, the gods do not only direct the destiny of humans, but also the destiny of society. Thus, human is in a state of despair and ignorance.

VII. After the century, the establishment of cities emerged as a crisis for the Greeks, whose only source of meaning was the mythological tradition. Because there is no construction on self-sufficiency as in the family or village, on the contrary, there is a need for a political space and organization. The human being, acting in the tension between the knowable and the unknowable, is now the agent of their own choices. The significance of this is that human will now have the opportunity to construct themselves instead of fulfilling the words of the Gods to which they was previously subject so that psukhe will force them to cross the area constructed by the borders of the body (soma). Psukhe forgets itself with the natural instrumentalization of psukhe to the body and mind to desire in life. However, at the moment human chooses to get out of doxa, they get rid of tyranny and becomes free to the extent they transform themselves under autokinesis of psukhe.

## **1.2. SPECIFIC MEANING AND FUNCTION OF THUMOS**

In ancient Greece, the human was engaged in a different living practice with all of their actions determined by the gods within the mythological tradition. The words of the gods are absolute and omnipotent. During this period, though thumos often refers to the feeling of rage, it is actually what pushes human to take action. Thus, it is the power that will enable human to build themselves. But in the mythological period, there is not yet a person who can transform themselves. While they think that they are the source of the act, they see that it is actually the result of a divine determination. “The life in Greek cities is intertwined with religion: The gods not only manage the destinies of individuals, but also the society as a whole.” (Eco, 2018)

πάντες κ' αὐτόθ' ὄλοντο ἐμῶ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες.

ἀλλά με μοῖρ' ὅλοη καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός,

ἀνδρῶν δ' Εὐφορβος: σὺ δέ με τρίτος ἐξεναρίζεις.<sup>3</sup>

Nay, it was baneful Fate and the son of Leto that slew me

And of men Euphorbus, while you are the third in my slaying

In these verses about the death of Patroklos, Patroklos says what caused his death is not only Hector, and even Hector is the last reason for his death, thereby expressing the point of view of the Greeks about gods and the intervention power of gods. Eco says, “The powers and abilities of intervention of gods is a fact, not of faith, according to the Greeks.” (2018) Therefore, it is not possible to mention about a *psukhe* having an infinite capacity. Human is the absolute enforcer of the rule of god. *Thumos* is not autokinetic; each activity is carried out under the influence of a divine power. “According to the Greeks, fate particularly means ‘sharing’; at the moment of birth, a ‘part’ of life is given to man, and on the basis of that part, aside from the events determining and qualifying the life of that man, the moment and conditions of death are also determined. Let’s start with the word the feminine version of which is *moira*, and the male version of which is *moros*. Both are derived out of *mer*-root which means both ‘part’ of field, and destiny of a person. Thus, we are again confronted with the concept of fate as the ‘appointed and assigned part’. The word *moira* is at the same time the name of deities. *Moiras* are the goddesses appointing and assigning the share of life to everyone. The genealogical tree knowledge presented by *Hesiodos* leaves no room for doubt about the legitimacy of order imposed on the life of men, because those who decide this order are the daughters of Zeus, the king of gods. *Aisa* is the other term used for fate and destiny in Greece. Here also we see a metaphoric expression of ‘dividing’. *Aisa* (*aise* according to *Homeros*), in fact, can indicate both the part of the booty assigned to a warrior, and the part of life (or fate) assigned to a person.” (Eco, 2018)

οὐ γάρ οἱ τῆδ' αἴσα φίλων ἀπονόσφιν ὀλέσθαι,

ἀλλ' ἔτι οἱ μοῖρ' ἐστὶ φίλους τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Homeros*, *Iliad*, 16.849-850.

<sup>4</sup> *Homeros*, *Odysseia*, 5. 113-115.

Now Zeus is telling you to send him off as soon as possible.

For it is not ordained that he will die far from his friends.

Instead his **fate** decrees he'll see his family

And make it home to his own high-roofed house and native land.

The last concept used by the Greeks when talking about fate is daimon. The daimon, which we will talk about in the Tragedies section, "means divine power, while the daiomai form means 'dividing, sharing'." (Eco, 2018) The Ancient Greeks have faced an aporia concerning the ability to recognize whether the act is performed by themselves or by the gods. Aporia of the Ancient Greeks is not that the source of the act is either themselves or the gods, but that it is / may be both themselves and the gods, and it is impossible to distinguish them. As such, thumos is just like an enigma, but besides this enigmatic aspect, it has also a specific meaning and function.

Hesiod, the poet who appeared after Homer, explains the universe, gods, and human activities in his poems titled Theogony and Works and Days. By expressing that people and gods were intertwined in ancient Greece, and everything has already been determined by gods, he indeed demonstrates clearly that a psukhe having an endless capacity cannot be mentioned, because the situation of human is in fact the result of a process again caused by the gods. Therefore, for activation of the concept thumos used in the case of human activities, divine power is needed. "Thus, the gods who act in their poems are therefore not 'mythological characters' designed at the table to please and make happy an audience who is in need of nice fairy tales, but are depictions of divine powers that are an integral part of the cultural horizon of Greek people" (Eco, 2018).

While mythological tradition in which the divine is decentralized and chaotic dominates, human is in despair and ignorance, because the acts of human were already determined by the gods. However, upon the establishment of cities

(*poleis*)<sup>5</sup>, a radical rupture occurred. VII. After the century, the establishment of cities emerges as a crisis for the Greeks, whose only source of meaning is the mythological tradition. Because there is no construction on self-sufficiency as in the family or village, on the contrary, there is a need for a political space and organization. For this reason, in the face of such a radical situation, the actual world of the Ancient Greek people and the world of meaning were completely separated from each other. With the divine background in the myths, the process of making sense of himself has begun for the people in the city, where a political space and organization emerged. The chaos and tension produced by the Greeks' process of making sense of this situation VI. It is possible to see it in the tragedies that emerged at the end of the century. Tragedies are important because, in parallel with the emergence of the human polis, who act in the tension between the knowable and the unknowable in the mythological tradition, they are now the agents of their own choices. In the mythological tradition, while human is the absolute executor of the words of the gods, their mortal and finite existence has become problematic with tragedies.

From the very beginning, philosophy has always attempted to bridge the gap between the human and the divine, the earthly and the otherworldly, the finite and the infinite. From this point of view, it demonstrates that the gods did not close the door from the outside, but rather from the inside, by human. To do so, one must first venture to open the door.<sup>6</sup> Thumos is the driving force that makes it possible. Thumos is the motivation and movement tool for Psukhe to realize these possibilities within the autokinesis and the limitlessness of possibilities, leaving all the determinations of the soma.

Thumos is what within us yet does not belong there. Thumos not only leads us to what is good, but it also inspires us to fight for it.

---

<sup>5</sup> πόλις (polis): City-states in Greece.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>6</sup> In the part titled *V.II. Place of Thumos in Psukhe in Plato*, it will be detailed over Plato who is the basis of this thesis.

## 2. THUMOS AND PSUKHE IN MYTHOLOGICAL TEXTS

### 2.1. MYTHOLOGY IN GENERAL

μῦθος / *mythos*, meaning word, speech, word, is an ancient narrative. “In Greek language, *mythos* actually meant ‘word’ in the sense of ‘last word’ or final pronouncement. This contrasted with *logos* which also meant ‘word’, but in the sense of a truth which can be argued and maybe changed (as in, what’s the word on...?). Unlike *logoi*, which were written in prose, myths were recorded in verse.” (Watson, 2002) Therefore, myths are not created by creation but by transference. In Vernant's words; “What was there when there was nothing, when there was nothing? The Greeks answered this question with narratives and myths.” (Vernant, 2018)

A comparison of myths of communities living in different geographies, different cultures, and different time slices reveals to which extent the myths and narratives seeming to be fairly different from each other are indeed similar and identical. We can immediately understand that a narrative is a myth wherever it belongs, because myths are too original to be confused with any other narrative genre. As a matter of fact, Kranz also touched on this subject in his work called *Ancient Philosophy*. “We see in many nations the mythological teachings about how the earth came into existence; for instance, we see them in the eastern nations Babylonians, Phoenicians, Jews, Persians, and old Turks. To compare these teachings with those of the old Hellenic civilizations, and to put forth their similarities and dissimilarities will by no means be useless.” (Kranz, 1994)<sup>7</sup> In this context, the first myth narrating the chaotic mythology lying in the origin of cosmos is the poem titled *Birth of Gods (Theogonia)* of Hesiodos, a poet who has doubtlessly lived between VIII. and VII. Centuries BC. This poem deals with cosmos starting from chaos, the genealogical tree of gods, and human. The earth

---

<sup>7</sup> Walther Kranz, çev. Suad Y. Baydur, *Antik Felsefe, Sosyal*, İstanbul 1994, s.11. *The English translation of this source has been made by the owner of the thesis.*

passes from *Khaos*<sup>8</sup> to *Kozmos*<sup>9</sup>, and time starts to flow. Human beings have taken their place on earth, and gods in *Aither*<sup>10</sup>. As the leader of Olympians<sup>11</sup>, Zeus has defeated the Titans, the group of gods managing the world in the Golden Age, thus seizing power and taking the helm of cosmos. And the problem starts just at that point. Gods do not only live in Olympos, but also share the earth with human.

Vernant describes this painting as follows; “Particularly in the plain Mecone, a plain near Corinthos in Greece, where men and gods live together. They eat at the same table, gather around the same table, and participate in common celebrations. They eat and drink, and also listen to Mousas singing the glory of Zeus and divine adventures of gods. In a nutshell, everything is proceeding in the best way.” (Vernant, 2018) But there is also someone else in this universe: Prometheus who challenges Zeus in the order of Zeus. His name meaning *foreseer*<sup>12</sup>, Prometheus is a rebel who alone revolts as a Titan against the gods of Olympus. He has not in fact fought against Zeus during the insurrections of Titans, but nurses a grudge against Zeus and his friends. One day, during a banquet given in the city, a bull is sacrificed. Zeus calls Prometheus and entrusts him with the task of sharing the meat between mortals on one side and gods on the other. With this act of sharing, the borders between gods and human beings will have been determined. On one side, there is a part covered with a delicious fat layer but has white bones inside, and on the other side, there is another part filled with a tasteless stomach but has eatable pieces inside. Zeus looks at these two parts and understands the cunningness of Prometheus, but nevertheless permits him to make the first choice. Prometheus gives to human the part which is better in his opinion, and thus deceives Zeus. So is it really like that? With this choice, human is now sealed with mortality. In order to survive, humans are required to eat and drink wine, and thus, cook meat, and produce wine from grapes, i.e. to work and produce. But on the other side, the gods

---

<sup>8</sup> Χάος (chaos): Dark gap. Disorder, borderless, bottomless.

<sup>9</sup> κόσμος (cosmos): Order, world, universe.

<sup>10</sup> Αἰθήρ (aither): Upper sky.

<sup>11</sup> The highest mountain of Greece is the Mount Olympos. Twelve Olympians are the group of gods in the Greek mythology.

<sup>12</sup> Προμηθεύς (Prometheus): πρό (pro, “before”) + μανθάνω (manthánō, “to think”).

are perpetual with their immortality foods. Zeus has seen this trick but has not left Prometheus unpunished and unrequited. From that day on, human has remained without both wheat and fire. Remaining without wheat means to remain without bread, and remaining without fire also means a disaster for human, because they cannot cook and eat their meats without fire. Then, Prometheus finds a way also for light a fire. He steals a seed from the fire of Zeus, and takes it to the humans. After that day, humans start to cook, warm up and live. Therefore, Prometheus has chained up to a rock, and his liver is eaten by an eagle forever. The fire of Prometheus is not Zeus's divine fire, but a finite fire. Therefore, it is required to be continuously stoked up in order to be sustained. This finite fire is indeed a metaphor. It symbolizes the mind. It means the recognition by human of their creative power. It also means a movement of human towards the tension underlying their existence, i.e. their becoming the actor/maker of their own acts. And *thumos* will be the motivation in this movement of the human whose *psukhe* will get out of all such predetermined aspects of the body.

Another important name in Greek mythological literature is Homer. "Homeric poems take place like two monoliths at the beginning of Greek literature. What has remained from countless myths and legends which constitute the mythology repertoire of the Greeks are two events linked to Troia (also known as Ilium) War, being a long fight between Achaeans and Troians in order to hold the control of the Dardanelles Strait, which are narrated in the form of an epic poem. The events which happened during the long blockade of the city for ten years are narrated in Iliad, while Odysseia narrates the challenging journey undertaken by one of the Greek leaders to return to his homeland." (Eco, 2018)

The concepts of *thumos* and *psukhe* underlying this study have had various different mentalities and meanings depending on the culture of each age since the early ages. We are now starting to discuss first the concepts of *thumos* and *psukhe* in the light of this thought.

## Thumos

Etymologically derived from the verb θύω / thyo meaning ‘to sacrifice’ in the Greek language, the word θυμός / thumos has first been used in Homeros’s Iliad, especially in its parts relating to Achille. What permitted him to martially and bravely go into war is his thumos. Achille takes his courage, grief, and rage from thumos. Exactly due to this rage, thumos is translated as rage in the present day, but in fact, we see thumos also in the meanings of heart and life (spirit), in addition to rage, in Homeros.

τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τε κακοῦ τρέπεται χρῶς ἄλλυδις ἄλλη,  
οὐδέ οἱ ἀτρέμας ἦσθαι ἐρητύετ’ ἐν φρεσὶ **θυμός**,<sup>13</sup>

For a coward’s color always changes to another hue,

Heart pounding in his chest, his mind preoccupied with thoughts of death

οὔτε τις οὖν μοι νοῦσος ἐπήλυθεν, ἣ τε μάλιστα

τηκεδόνι στυγερῇ μελέων ἐξείλετο **θυμόν**:

ἀλλά με σός τε πόθος σά τε μήδεα, φαίδιμ’ Ὀδυσσεῦ,

σὴ τ’ ἀγανοφροσύνη μελιηδέα **θυμόν** ἀπηύρα.<sup>14</sup>

I was not struck and killed inside my home

by gentle arrows of the keen-eyed archer,

Nor did I die of some disease which steals spirit from our limbs,

As we waste away in pain

No, it was my longing for you, glorious Odysseus

For your loving care, that robbed me of my life, so honey sweet.

---

<sup>13</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 13. 279-280.

<sup>14</sup> Homeros, Odysseia, 11. 200-203.

οὐδ' Ἔκτορι **θυμὸν** ἔπειθον,  
ἀλλ' ὃ γε μίμν' Ἀχιλῆα πελώριον ἄσσον ἰόντα.  
ὥς δὲ δράκων ἐπὶ χειρὶ ὀρέστερος ἄνδρα μένησι  
βεβρωκῶς κακὰ φάρμακ', ἔδν δέ τε μιν χόλος αἰνός,  
σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἐλισσόμενος περὶ χειρὶ:  
ὥς Ἔκτωρ ἄσβεστον ἔχων μένος οὐχ ὑπεχώρει  
πύργῳ ἔπι προὔχοντι φαεινὴν ἀσπίδ' ἐρείσας:  
ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὄν μεγαλήτορα **θυμόν**:<sup>15</sup>

But Hector's **heart** would not budge,  
He stood awaiting huge Achilles, who was getting closer  
Just as a mountain snake waits for some man right by its lair  
After eating poison herbs so that a savage anger grips him,  
As he coils beside his den with a fearful glare  
That's how Hector's dauntless heart would not retreat.  
But then he leaned his bright shield up against the wall  
Where it jutted out, and, with a groan, spoke up,  
Addressing his courageous heart:

### **Psukhe**

Although ψυχή / psukhe contains a reference to the cold breath of death, it is not only a simple breath dying out.

#### **a. Being alive, life:**

Ἄτρεΐδης δ' ἄρ' ἔπειθ' Ὑπερήνορα ποιμένα λαῶν  
οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς ἄφυσσε  
δηώσας: **ψυχή** δὲ κατ' οὐταμένην ὠτειλήν

---

<sup>15</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 22. 90-98.

ἔσσυτ' ἐπειγομένη, τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυψε. <sup>16</sup>

Thereafter Atreus' son smote with a thrust in the flank Hyperenor, shepherd of the host,

And bronze let forth the bowels, as it clove through

And his soul sped hastening through the stricken wound,

And darkness enfolded his eyes.

μηὲν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος

οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,

πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν

ἥρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν

οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή. <sup>17</sup>

Sing, the goddess, sing the rage of son of Peleus, Achilles.

That murderous anger which condemned Achaeans

to countless agonies and threw many warrior souls

deep into Hades, leaving their dead bodies

carrion food for dogs and birds-

all in fulfilment of the will of Zeus

ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,

κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδες τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα,

ἄνδρὸς ἄσ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λειστή

οὔθ' ἐλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἔρκος ὀδόντων. <sup>18</sup>

Men can steal cattle, fat sheep, get tripods, herds of sorrel horses.

---

<sup>16</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 14. 516-519.

<sup>17</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 1. 1-5.

<sup>18</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 9. 406-409.

But no man gets his life back, not by theft or plunder,  
Once it has flown out from him,  
Passed beyond the barrier of this teeth.

These examples are also supported in The Idea of God in the Early Greek Philosophers as follows: “Homeros uses the word *psukhe* in connexion with a living person; he uses it to designate his life which is at quite the opposite pole from using it to refer to the dead.” (Jaeger & Robinson, 1948) When Hector and Achilles engage in a war where the award is *psukhe* of Hector<sup>19</sup>, *psukhe* is no more only a cold breath exhaled at the moment of death, but becomes a valuable thing tried to be kept by Hector and to be taken away from him by Achilles. What’s valuable is not the last breath before death but the life itself, because what a warrior wants to and may take away from another warrior is their life.

**b. Soul of a dead man, ghost:**

ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ **ψυχῇ** Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο  
πάντ' αὐτῷ μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' εἰκυῖα  
καὶ φωνήν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροῖ εἵματα ἔστο: <sup>20</sup>

Then poor Patroclus came to him as a ghost, looking exactly like him  
In all respects, in stature, handsome eyes, and voice.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας ὠρέξατο χερσὶ φίλησιν  
οὐδ' ἔλαβε: **ψυχῇ** δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἠὔτε καπνὸς  
ᾧχετο τετριγυῖα. <sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 22.161.

ἀλλὰ περὶ **ψυχῆς** θεὸν Ἴκτορος ἵπποδάμοιο.  
This race was for the sake of **life** of the rider Hector.

<sup>20</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 23. 65-67.

<sup>21</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 23. 98-100.

Saying this, Achilles reached out with his arms,  
But he grasped nothing. The spirit had departed,  
Going underground like vapor, muttering faintly.

Οὐ τί σε Περσεφόνη Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἀπαφίσκει,  
ἀλλ' αὐτὴ δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνησιν.  
οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἴνες ἔχουσιν,  
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τε πυρὸς κρατερὸν μένος αἰθομένοιο  
δαμνᾷ, ἐπεὶ κε πρῶτα λίπη λεύκ' ὀστέα θυμός,  
ψυχὴ δ' ἦϋτ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται.<sup>22</sup>

no, dread Persephone, daughter of Zeus,  
is not deceiving you. Once mortals die,  
this is what's ordained for them. Their sinews  
no longer hold the flesh and bone together.  
The mighty power of a blazing fire  
destroys them, once our spirit flies from us,  
from our white bones. And then it slips away,  
and, like a dream, it flutters to and fro.

Ἑρμῆς δὲ ψυχὰς Κυλλήνιος ἐξεκαλεῖτο  
ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων: ἔχε δὲ ῥάβδον μετὰ χερσὶν<sup>23</sup>

Hermesias from Kyllene was summoned up the **spirits** of the suitors one by one,  
And he held the beautiful gold stick in her hands;

As the human's soul survives also after it leaves the body in the  
mythological tradition, in Homeros, another meaning of psukhe is the illusion and

---

<sup>22</sup> Homeros, *Odysseia*, 11. 217-222.

<sup>23</sup> Homeros, *Odysseia*, 24. 1-2.

shadow (eidolon) of a dead. This means to say that psukhe is defined not only as a thing as mentioned above in the case of life, but also as a thing that survives in Hades also after human dies, in the case of death.

It is seen that in the mythologic age, there are similarities and differences between the concepts of thumos and psukhe. Psukhe bears the meanings of both life and the ghost of the dead. It is the cold breath of death, but at the same time a valuable object the person does not wish to lose. For this reason, psukhe is not a capacity, but life itself. After leaving the body upon death, psukhe goes to Hades<sup>24</sup>. The mythologization of psukhe in the form of leaving the body and going to Hades shows that psukhe is a valuable asset and even an award in war. Psukhe exists in a living human and keeps them in life, but at the same time is not affected by the death. And the mental acts attributed to spirit are committed not by psukhe, but by thumos. Thus, thumos is not only a simple rage but a psychic power covering a lot of feelings together with rage. At the same time, as it shares the same root with Latin fumus word meaning smoke, it may also be expressed as a type of breath just like psukhe. . Thumos may be in the forms and shapes going far beyond its physical body (air in the diaphragm), because unlike and differently from psukhe, thumos is a power which is required to be trained<sup>25</sup>, limited and restricted<sup>26</sup>, and struggled<sup>27</sup> by human being.

---

<sup>24</sup> Homeros, Odysseia, 14. 134.

ρίνον ἀπ' ὀστεόφιν ἐρύσαι, **ψυχή** δὲ λέλοιπεν:  
However, **the soul** of our master **has flew away** long time ago.

<sup>25</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 9. 496.

ἀλλ' Ἀχιλεῦ δάμασον **θυμὸν** μέγαν: οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ  
Come on Akhilleus, **defeat your noble heart**,

<sup>26</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 9. 554-556.

τέκνον ἐμὸν κάρτος μὲν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη  
δώσουσ' αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι, σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα **θυμὸν**  
ἴσχειν ἐν στήθεσσι: φιλοφροσύνη γὰρ ἀμείνων:  
ληγέμεναι δ' ἔριδος κακομηχάνου, ὄφρα σε μᾶλλον

“My son, said he, Athene and Here  
May give back your power if they wish so,  
But you must **repress your noble heart in your breast**,  
Be soft, said he, be cute,

Keep away from fight which is the source of sorrows.

<sup>27</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 9. 109-111.

πόλλ' ἀπεμυθεόμην: σὺ δὲ σῶ μεγαλήτορι **θυμῷ**

The dichotomy of body and soul did not yet exist in the world of Homer, who left the body at the time of death, but did not think and feel a life, namely ψυχή (psukhe) and a θυμός (thumos) whose functioning was entirely bodily. In ancient Greece, human is not yet aware of the power you have in your own soul. Because the source of every act he performs is the gods. As such, thumos is insufficient to justify human agency. Because unlike psukhe, it is not autokinetic. In Homer, the word θυμός (thumos) expresses concepts such as soul, heart, mind, passion, anger, while ψυχή (psukhe) is vitality.

However, all of them are only secondary meanings developed over time. Two words express rather different and separate psycho-physical phenomena and do not seem to be reducible to any common denominator. But at the time of Homeros, there was a tendency to combine thumos and psukhe in a single soul concept<sup>28</sup>. The notion of breath concept was not general enough to haphazardly gain any new association relating to the mind. Its meaning could not be expanded to such extent to gain its spiritual meaning as used today until the thing named and termed as thumos up to that time is started to be understood and interpreted subject to and depending upon psukhe, and accordingly, the bodily life is also accepted and seen as the basis of a higher conscious life. Thus, we don't need to explain why the word psukhe will inevitably defeat thumos in the competition to determine and decide which of these words would literally express better both the mere act of living and

---

εἶξας ἄνδρα φέριστον, ὃν ἀθάνατοὶ περ ἔτισαν,  
ἠτίμησας, ἐλὼν γὰρ ἔχεις γέρας: ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν  
But you **resigned yourself to your arrogance**,  
You looked down upon a man who is considered superior even by the gods,  
And you pocketed his share.

<sup>28</sup> Homeros, Iliad, 11. 333-335.

τοὺς μὲν Τυδείδης δουρικλειτὸς Διομήδης  
**θυμοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς** κεκαδῶν κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀπήυρα:  
Ἴππόδαμον δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Ὑπεύροχον ἐξενάριξεν.  
Famous pike user Diomedes, Tydeusoglu,  
Took away the **life and heart** of both of them,  
And robbed away their bright blacks.  
And Odysseus finished Hippodamos and Hypeirokhos off.

In the use of *thumos* and *psukhe* together, *thumos* points out a part beyond the body, i.e. heart, while *psukhe* points out physical life, spirit.

the life of the soul. Although, *thumos* was also used in Homer to include bodily life as well<sup>29</sup>, in the living language, *psukhe* prevailed, and *thumos* was more specifically limited to the sense of courage. (Jaeger & Robinson, 1948)

---

<sup>29</sup> Homeros, *Iliad*, 13. 671-672.  
τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ γναθμοῖο. καὶ οὐατος: ὄκα δὲ **θυμὸς**  
ᾤχετ' ἀπὸ μελέων, στυγερός δ' ἄρα μιν σκότος εἶλεν.

**His life** flew away from his body immediately,  
His eyes are covered by a terrible darkness.

### 3. THUMOS IN TRAGEDIES

Mythology explains Greek existence in ancient Greece, and the gods were the main factor behind this existence. There is a distinct form of life practice in the mythological tradition where there are several gods. Humans act is determined by the gods. “Nothing can happen without the gods being involved. At the very least, they need to allow humans to act. More often it seems like an agency is just an extension of divine agency. When the warriors are brave, it’s because the gods have put courage into their hearts; when they retreat, it’s the gods who have drained away their willingness to fight.” (Adamson, 2014) Myths were a very powerful force that dominated the lives of the Ancient Greek people and illuminated their entire existence. “Here then, as a nation which vigorously defended its myth as the ideal basis of its existence, and tried at all costs to make connections between that myth and practical life.” (Burckhardt, 1999) The power establishing the order between men and gods was the king. In Greece where the life was determined by the gods and the king was the absolute means of the political power, while mythological tradition in which the divine was decentralized and chaotic prevailed, there was a radical rupture with the emergence of cities (*polies*)<sup>30</sup>, and the authority of the king was weakened. The absoluteness of words of the gods has been broken, and agora has been built where people express their own thoughts, where there are opposites and variability. The absoluteness of the words of the gods has been broken, and the agora, where people express their thoughts, where opposites and variability exist, has been built. The establishment of cities emerges as a crisis for the Greeks, whose only source of meaning is the mythological tradition. Because there is no construction on self-sufficiency as in the family or village, on the contrary, there is a need for a political space and organization. According to Eco; “During archaic and classical ages, most of the Greeks lived in small autonomous communities tending self-sufficient within which violent struggles often develop tending to determine who should be part of it in its own right and who should be excluded.”

---

<sup>30</sup> πόλις (polis): City-states in Greece.  
H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

(Eco, 2018) Therefore, under such radical circumstances, the actual world of the Ancient Greek people and the world of meaning were completely ruptured from each other. During the process of making sense of this situation the Greeks, a new type of poem comes out in Athens in the fifth century BC. This type is the theatre put on the stage at religious festivals organized in honor of the God Dionysos. Theatrical performances are organized by means of a competition (agon) in which the tragedies and comedies to be put on the stage are selected. “The first competition in the Great Dionysia festival is organized in 449 BC. Included among competitors are both poets and actors. Starting date of competitions in the field of tragedy is 536 BC, in the field of comedy 486 BC” (Eco, 2018).

Tragedy / τραγωδία<sup>31</sup> is an effective type of theatre started at the end of the sixth century when the transformation of the polis was most evident. “Tragedy, as a genre of arts, has always been described as a theatrical play since it was introduced by the Greeks 2500 years ago. That is, since the very beginning, it is produced not for reading, but for hearing and watching.” (Latacz, 2016) The term tragedy (tragōdia), although not yet certain, is combined with the word goat (*tragos*)<sup>32</sup>, an animal associated with Dionysos, and the word song (ōdē)<sup>33</sup>, which either belong to the goat (sung by a chorus wearing goat masks) or written for the goat (goat is the prize of tragedy competitions), and means goat song. Since tragedies are often a way of connecting with people, they are original works that deal with themes of human nature. Therefore, they give voice to the problems relating to political and cultural life. For this reason, when we look at tragedies, it is possible to see the tension of the human who was capable of the emergence of cities with the mythological tradition. “The tension between past and present, between the world of myth and that of the polis is to be found again within each protagonist.” (Vernant,

---

<sup>31</sup> τραγωδία (tragedya): tragedy.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>32</sup> τράγος (tragos): goat.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>33</sup> ᾠδή (ode): song.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

1990) With the tragedies, it is recognized for the first time that human is the actor and maker of their own choices.

The most important representatives of tragedy are Aeschylus, Euripides and Sophocles. In 472 BC, Aeschylus' work called Persians was staged and this date is accepted as the beginning of classical tragedy. Eco says about tragedy; "Persians is the oldest one of all tragedies which have reached the present day and can be dated. The antagonisms of sea-land, night-daytime, and darkness-light which are frequently repeated in the play are strong images of the tension which has started to show up in those days. While the bravery of the Athenians is praised on one side, the defeat of the Persians is attributed to the gods on the other side. In spite of such praised powers, the human's feelings are also included therein. In this aspect, the word thumos is used with the meaning of heart and passion, while the word psukhe is used with the meaning of spirit (soul) and life. (Eco, 2018)

κακόμαντις ἄγαν ὀρσολοπεῖται

**θυμὸς** ἔσωθεν.<sup>34</sup>

**The soul** within my breast is distressed

and presages disaster.

φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ **θυμὸν** ὠακοστρόφουν.<sup>35</sup>

Cyrus, blessed in good fortune, came to the throne

and established peace for all his people.

Περσῶν ὅσοιπερ ἦσαν ἀκμαῖοι φύσιν,

**ψυχὴν** τ' ἄριστοι κευγένειαν ἐκπρεπεῖς,<sup>36</sup>

Those Persians who were in their life's prime, bravest in spirit,

Pre-eminent for noble birth, and always

---

<sup>34</sup> Aiskhylos, The Persians, 10.

<sup>35</sup> Aiskhylos, The Persians, 767.

<sup>36</sup> Aiskhylos, The Persians, 441-442.

among the foremost in loyalty to the King himself

Γῆ τε καὶ Ἑρμῆ, βασιλεῦ τ' ἐνέρων,

πέμψατ' ἔνερθεν **ψυχῆν** ἐς φῶς:<sup>37</sup>

Earth and Hermes, and you, Lord of the dead,

Send up to the light the spirit from below

We do not have any information about when the tragedies *The Suppliants* and *Prometheus Bound*, which have survived through the medieval manuscripts of Aeschylus were staged. The human existence that emerges between life and death in the works of Aeschylus, which prioritizes dialogue instead of stagnation, emerges with a rupture from the gods. The act of human becomes problematic in such an environment. “Unlike Homer and the lyric poets, Aiskhylos places his heroes on the brink of action in the face of the necessity to act. The playwriting of Aeschylus can be regarded as complete proof of the emergence of the individual as a free agent in the midst of Ancient Greek civilization.” (Vernant, 1990). In tragedy, there is a tragic crime that the hero has to commit, and this crime is a necessity for the hero’s existence. “Tragic human is constituted within the space encompassed by this pair, *ethos*, and *daimôn*.” (Vernant, 1990). If one of the two is eliminated he vanishes. It could be said that tragedy rests on a double reading of Heraclitus’ famous dictum, *Ἦθος Ἀνθρώπου Δαίμων* (*êthos anthrôpôi daimôn*). The minute it becomes impossible to read it equally well in the two different senses (as the syntactical symmetry allows) the formula loses its enigmatic character, its ambiguity, and the tragic consciousness is gone.

This expression says both human’s character (*ethos*) is their fate (*daimon*), and that human’s fate (*daimon*) is their character (*ethos*). The expression is bidirectional because the relationship between human’s character and their fate is not a unidirectional determination relationship. It is that two forces could have done or had it done at the same time and that it was indistinguishable. According to Vernant; “The logic of tragedy consists in operating on both planes in shifting from one

---

<sup>37</sup> Aiskhylos, *The Persians*, 629-630.

meaning to the other, always conscious of the opposition between them but never rejecting either. An ambiguous logic, it might be objected to. However, this is no longer the naïve ambiguity of myth, which does not yet question itself. On the contrary, tragedy, at the very moment when it passes from one level to the other” (Vernant, 1990). Controlling themes of the Prometheus Bound, being the sole surviving play out of Prometheia trilogy of Aiskhylos, are resistance to tyranny, power, and tension between gods and humans, and in line with it, thumos is used with the meaning of rage, while psukhe is used with the meaning of the heart.

καὶ μὴ σφριγῶντα **θυμὸν** ἰσχυαίνῃ βία.<sup>38</sup>

To calm its swollen **rage** too forcefully

πήματα, λύματα, δείματα ἀμ-

φάκει κέντρῳ τύψειν **ψυχὰν** ἐμάν.

ἰὼ ἰὼ μοῖρα μοῖρα,

πέφρικ' εἰσιδοῦσα πράξι' Ἰοῦς.<sup>39</sup>

Sorrow, defilement, haunting fear,

Fan my blood cold,

Stabbed with a two-edged sting!

Ah Fate, Fate, tremblingly I behold

The plight of Io, thine apportioning Io!

The experiences of Prometheus are actually a symbol of the tension and stuckness we are talking about. Prometheus rebels against this universe of gods but suffers interminable agonies exactly for this reason. Tragic human has got stuck in between the path determined by gods and the responsibilities of their free acts. The human acting in the tension between the knowable and the unknowable is now the agent of their own choices.

---

<sup>38</sup> Aiskhylos, Prometheus, 382.

<sup>39</sup> Aiskhylos, Prometheus, 691-695.

Euripides, another writer of tragedy after Aiskhyklos, comes to the fore with his brave words and his main protagonists being women. Euripides's heroines are also emphasized that they are living people even though they are caught in their passions, thumos. Furthermore, Euripides also put forth how the gods use nondivine ways if need be and when appropriate. In his work named Medea put on the stage for the first time in 432 BC, Euripides has shown the struggle between two sides of spirit, i.e. between reason and passion. Medea is a fully tragic hero. While she is a strong woman rebelling against her country at the beginning of the tragedy, she is transformed into a person preparing for her own end at the end of the tragedy. Medea's murdering her own children is neither fate nor a request of Zeus. This is nothing but Medea pulling the strings. In this tragedy, we see thumos in relation to rage, and psukhe in relation to spirit and soul.

**θυμοῦ** — τί πάσχω; — θεῶν ποριζόντων καλῶς;<sup>40</sup>

Why can't I stop being angry? What's wrong with me

δῆλον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον

νέφος οἰμωγῆς ὡς τάχ' ἀνάψει

μείζονι **θυμῷ** : τί ποτ' ἐργάσεται

μεγαλόσπλαγχνος δυσκατάπαυστος

**ψυχῇ** δηθεῖσα κακοῖσιν;<sup>41</sup>

As her temper grows even more intense,

it will soon catch fire. She's a passionate soul,

hard to restrain. What will she do next,

now her **heart**'s been bitten by these injuries?

**ψυχὴν** διέφθαρκ' : οἴχομαι δὲ καὶ βίου<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Euripides, Medea, 879.

<sup>41</sup> Euripides, Medea, 106-110.

<sup>42</sup> Euripides, Medea, 225.

But in my case, this unexpected blow that's hit me has destroyed my heart.

χρόνω δ' ἀπέστη καὶ μεθῆχ' ὁ δύσμορος

**ψυχῆν:** κακοῦ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἦν ὑπέρτερος.<sup>43</sup>

The poor man at last gave up.

His breathing stopped—he could not stand the pain

a moment longer.

Medea's "soul" has transformed into the irrational part for revenge in the tension between *psukhe* and *soma*. On one side while being a hero on the other, she crosses the line to kill her own children.

Another Euripides tragedy, dealing with the struggle between the balance-temperance on one side and the strength-enthusiasm on the other side and the contradiction of man nature, is *Bakkhas*. In the play, Dionysos is both in the palace and together with Bakkhas. He is both from Thebai and a foreigner. He is both mortal and immortal. There is rationality represented by Pentheus character on one side, and instinctiveness represented by Dionysos on the other side.

**θυμὸν** ἐκπνέων, ἰδρῶτα σώματος στάζων ἄπο,

χεῖλεσιν διδοῦς ὀδόντας: πλησίον δ' ἐγὼ παρῶν

ἦσυχος θάσσων ἔλευσσον. ἐν δὲ τῷδε τῷ χρόνω<sup>44</sup>

he kept panting in his rage, dripping sweat

from his whole body—his teeth gnawed his lip.

I watched him, sitting quietly nearby.

τὸ δὲ πτοηθὲν τόδ' ἔτι σῆ **ψυχῆ** πάρα;<sup>45</sup>

And your inner spirit, is it still shaking?

---

<sup>43</sup> Euripides, *Medea*, 1219.

<sup>44</sup> Euripides, *The Bacchae*, 620-621.

<sup>45</sup> Euripides, *The Bacchae*, 1268.

Tragedies are the first to address human beings' conflicting natures and their responsibility for their own acts. They are said to have to exist in a state of tension between life and death. These tragedies are also evident in Sophokles who is one of the three major tragedian writers of Ancient Greece, along with Aiskhykos and Euripides. Antigone, by asking "Is the law of the gods or the law of humanity supreme? Sophokles writes the first example of resistance plays. Human has stuck in between the divine laws they showed respect to and the laws of the state required to be complied with in order to live in polis. The conflict between Antigone and Kreon also showed this dilemma which is at all times discussed in tragedies.

ἐν τοῖσιν ὡσὶν ἢ 'πὶ τῇ **ψυχῇ** δάκνει,<sup>46</sup>

Is it in your ears or in your mind?

ἀφῆκα **θυμῶ**, καρδίας τοξεύματα<sup>47</sup>

Like an archer, I shoot these arrows now into your heart,

because you have provoked me. I'm **angry**,

So my aim is good.

τὸν **θυμὸν** οὗτος ἐς νεωτέρους ἀφῆ,<sup>48</sup>

Boy, lead us home so he can vent his **rage**,

Antigone, one of the daughters of King Oedipus, is portrayed not as an unattainable hero, but as a determined person behind her actions. Angered by King Creon's refusal to hold a funeral for her brother, Antigone defied everything she saw as unjust by burying her brother, who was described as a traitor, despite the fact that everyone said that he would end up doing so at the expense of King Creon. With Antigone, Sophocles actually shows the conflict between the thumos of man and the law.

---

<sup>46</sup> Sophokles, Antigone, 317.

<sup>47</sup> Sophokles, Antigone, 1085.

<sup>48</sup> Sophokles, Antigone, 1088.

Also in *King Oedipus* tragedy, the masterpiece of Sophokles, the conflict regarding the existence of man is problematized in detail.

ψυχῆς πλάνημα κάνακίνησις φρενῶν.<sup>49</sup>

... **my soul** is shaken, my mind confused.

θυμοῦ δι' ὀργῆς ἤτις ἀγριωτάτη.<sup>50</sup>

... I will. In my anger I will not conceal

Oedipus fails to establish the relationship between ethos and daimon, and as long as he fails to do so, his soul (psukhe) goes away from the eternity he is a part of and turns into a source of evil. Before the birth of Oedipus, the soothsayer tells his father, King Laius, that his yet-to-be-born son will kill him and will sleep with his mother, and that is his fate. That is why his parents left Oedipus outside the city to die when he was born, but Oedipus survives. Later, he learns that those who raised him are not his family, and takes to the roads in frenzy. The king and his men appear in front of him, he is in such a frenzied state that he kills the king, his father, but continues on his way without knowing it. Not knowing that the person he murdered is his own father, and his wife queen is his own mother, he returns to his country as the king, from which he left as the king's son. Then, he sends Kreon to the temple to get knowledge as to how the ongoing plague epidemic may be overcome, but Kreon comes back with a new question and puzzle. The plague epidemic can be overcome only if King Laius's murderer is found out, and the murderer is in that country. Oedipus, competent enough to solve the puzzle, fails to come to a conclusion with this hint. The chorus says that the truth must have been listened to from the soothsayer Teiresias. Hero stands under the tension between the world of myths and the world of polis. Oedipus, fed directly from this tension, fails to build a relationship with soothsayer Teiresias because she cannot establish a link between his daimon and ethos, because the soothsayer's words belong to eidos, and Oedipus

---

<sup>49</sup> Sophokles, Oedipus, 727.

<sup>50</sup> Sophokles, Oedipus, 344.

cannot see *eidōs*<sup>51</sup>. Each time Teiresias shows the truth about Oidipus, Oidipus becomes enraged, and just at the moment we indeed expect him to further approach the truth, due to his arrogance, he further moves away, and remains stuck in at *doxa*<sup>52</sup> level. Truth coming with Teiresias is seen and perceived not as an effect that may lead Oidipus to change himself, but as a threat. This threat is against Oidipus's own power and potency, and therefore falls on deaf ears to the extent it is so. His sole basis against the truth is his arrogance, and his arrogance is fed and nourished by his mortality and power. He has difficulty to see himself as the agent of his act. Oidipus cannot stand to see, know and live in this way, and puts a stop to it with his own hands and makes himself blind. "However, it is my own hands putting my eyes out. Why do I continue to see with these eyes which do not show me any beautiful thing worth to see?"<sup>53</sup> Oidipus does not make any choice, and submits to his own passion and arrogance (*hubris*)<sup>54</sup>, and is lost in polysemy covering both what's divine and what's a human being, and both mythological tradition and democratic tradition of polis. The will of human to deify themselves indicates the emergence of his will to power because this situation bears the traces of establishing a relationship with the truth not ethically, but as a tyranny and a will. The will to power of the disenfranchised human has found its tongue, and could not be realized because it could not get free from the domination of predeterminations.

As shown by all these examples, tragedy is the ethical place of tension in terms of human existence, the coexistence of mortal and finite human on one side and the immortal and infinite gods on the other side. With the tragedy, the human's acts are problematized, and human becomes the agent of their own acts by

---

<sup>51</sup> εἶδος (*eidōs*): form.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>52</sup> δόξα (*doxa*): expectation, belief, mere opinion, assumption.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

V.II.I. Although it will be mentioned in more detail in the *Aletheia* section, to briefly mention; When we are subject to *doxa*, that is, the field of opinion, we do not see what happened, but what we have done. To transcend the ontological situation between *psukhe* and *soma*, it is necessary to get out of the *doxa* field. The practice for *eidōs* must now change when leaving the *doxa* field.

<sup>53</sup> Sophokles, Oedipus, 1325-1330.

<sup>54</sup> ὕβρις (*hubris*): arrogance, pride, dangerous overconfidence.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

recognizing their own acts. In this dramatic picture, it is seen that thumos mostly leads to the destruction of the hero, but thumos is a power taking the human to each act they commit, good or bad.

#### 4. THUMOS IN PHILOSOPHY

*Before Pythagoras* Following this chapter of the study, thumos and psukhe in Plato will be discussed. Pythagoras plays a crucial role because of Pythagoras' strong philosophical relationship with Plato. Thus, while the development of thumos and psukhe in philosophy is examined in this chapter, Pythagoras is placed last in chronologic order, and the process is divided into two as before Pythagoras and Pythagoras.

The human owns feelings such as rage, happiness, desire, and envy, and approaches the life under the influence of these feelings on one side, and feels the necessity of unveiling the secrets of the universe on the other side because no matter how primitive they are, human has always tried to make sense of their surroundings. As we discussed in the previous chapters, while they were leading their life through the gods who were angry, jealous, falling in love, and fighting like humans at first, there was a rupture has occurred with tragedies, the foundation on which everything stood was shaken, and then human has taken the road for philosophical thought with a view to understanding and explaining the source of nature and the formation of the universe. If we were to convey this journey with Eco's words; "What we call philosophy today was born in a small region of the Mediterranean, between the Aegean sea and Ion sea. Although we know that there are other ways of thinking apart from the ones we inherited from the Greek world, the models on which Western philosophy is based belong to the Greek philosophy. While contemporary philosophy continues to deal with themes shaped on the basis of that thought from the beginning, the science questioning the starting point and the dimensions of the universe also begins with the philosophers before Socrates." (Eco, 2018). The philosophical thinking, which started with the cosmos, which ancient Greek philosophers attempted to comprehend, did not leave any questions unaddressed. As a result of this new window, the concepts of thumos and psukhe have also changed and developed. In Homeros era, psukhe was a thing that only determines whether the human is alive or not, and is not responsible for their feelings and

thoughts, but after Homeros, starting from tragedies, human has started to make headway toward thumos, i.e. to a concept having the feeling and thought powers.

The main subject that the Presocratic thinkers of the ancient Greek philosophy investigated was what the *arche*<sup>55</sup>, the basis from which everything was composed, was and how their views on the soul were formed in a way that was consistent with their explanation of existence. When it comes to philosophers of Presocratic period, because resources are limited, we learn their thoughts especially through Aristotle and in the eyes of him. Aristotle stated in his book *Peri Psukhes*, On the Soul, which is crucial work in clarifying the period's approach to the concept of psukhe, those pre-Socratic thinkers dealt with the concept of psukhe from two perspectives. Psukhe was seen as the principle of movement (kinesis) by those engaged in the movement, while it was regarded as the principle of sensation (aesthesis) by those engaged. "Movement, Sensation, Incorporeality, and each of these is traced back to the first principles. That is why (with one exception) all those who define the soul by its power of knowledge to make it either an element or constructed out of the elements."<sup>56</sup>

Thales, the first writer whose ideas about nature have survived, is called Ionian thinkers because they lived in Miletos, on the coast of Ionia, together with Anaximandros and Anaximenes, who were active after him. By choosing water as the source of everything, the first principle (*arche*), Thales actually becomes the beginning of nature studies and therefore philosophy. What made Thales the first representative of philosophy was not actually choosing water as the *arche*, but because he sought an answer for the material cause underlying the change. According to Thales, psukhe is also the cause of movement, because he thought that psukhe points out the existence of spirit (soul), i.e. the power leading to movement. "Thales, too, to judge from what is recorded about him, seems to have

---

<sup>55</sup> ἀρχή (*arkhe*): beginning, first.

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>56</sup> Aristoteles, çev. Ömer Aygün-Y.Gurur Sev, Ruh Üzerine, Pinhan, İstanbul 2019, *The English translation of this source has been made by the owner of the thesis.*

held soul to be a motive force, since he said that the magnet has a soul in it because it moves the iron.”<sup>57</sup> Aforesaid stone is only an external object. Thus, according to Thales, all objects having a spirit have limited ability to move. This link of *psukhe* with movement (*kinesis*) is similar to the concept of *psukhe* and the mentality of the mythological era. As a matter of fact, in heroes of Homeros, *psukhe* stands for life and breath, leaves the body upon death, and survives in Hades forever as a shadow of it.

Anaximander, Anaximenes, and Anaxagoras, philosophers who came after Thales, also treat *psukhe* as breath and air, like Homer. This view is quite suitable for thinkers emphasizing the reality of material elements. Aristotle says the following by making reference to Diogenes: “Diogenes and others held the soul to be air because he believed air to be finest in grain and a first principle; therein lay the grounds of the soul’s powers of knowing and originating movement. As the primordial principle, from which all other things are derived, it is cognitive; as finest in grain, it has the power to originate movement.”<sup>58</sup> Although *arche* has been expressed in different ways by Thales with the concept of water, by Anaximandros with the concept of *aperion* meaning unlimited and unbounded, by Anaximenes with air (*pneuma*) derived out of breath (*pneo*), and by Anaxagoras with the concept of *nous* corresponding to mind, when it comes to spirit, all of them have adopted a definition related to air-breath. Anaximenes defines *psukhe* as air holding cosmos and man together. With this statement, he in fact has considered *psukhe* as a principle that wraps and holds the body as a whole together and is at all times in motion, because he has established a relation between the concepts of *psukhe* and the breathed air, breath and life. Anaxagoras, mentioning about *nous* (mind) concept in respect of *psukhe* for the first time, argues that the aforesaid two concepts are different from each other, and suggests *nous* as the fundamental principle. “Anaxagoras seems to distinguish between soul and mind, but in practice he treats them as a single substance, except that it is mind that he specially posits as the principle of all things; at any rate what he says is that mind alone of all that

---

<sup>57</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima*, 405a8

<sup>58</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima* 405a8

is simple, unmixed, and pure. He assigns characteristics, knowing and origination of movement, to the same principle, when he says that it was mind that set the whole in movement.”<sup>59</sup> What Anaxagoras says exists in all living creatures is the concept of *psukhe*. According to him, *nous* (mind) does not exist in all living creatures within the meaning of *understanding*. “Mind as ‘understanding’ (*phronesis*) does not seem to exist even in all human beings, how can it exist in all animals?”<sup>60</sup>

Heraclitus says everything existing on earth is in motion, and names this motion as *psukhe*. “Heraclitus too says that the first principle (the warm exhalation) of which, everything else is composed is soul; further that this exhalation is most incorporeal and in ceaseless flux; that what is in movement requires that what knows it should be in movement; and that all that is has its being essentially in movement.”<sup>61</sup> And what does not stop moving is fire, according to Heraclitus. Fire is entirely composed of movements such as flaming, burning and extinction, etc. Thus, Heraclitus's *psukhe* is close to the fire and continuously flows and moves. “Similarly to soul-air of Anaximenes, that of Heraclitus’s spirit is also close to universal arche (starting point), thus to fire. It is not, however, adequate to determine whether Heraclitus’s *psukhe* is a vapor or breath (in any case similar to fire), a mixture of water and fire, or even of fire and air. But in any case, the variation of its properties of dryness, mobility and thinness at various different stages of a single life of from one individual to another directly affects the quality of cognitive processes.” (Eco, 2018) This means to say that for Heraclitus, *psukhe* is exactly the opposite and contrary to a calm and serene mood. As such, *psukhe* is a continuously changing and transforming element which is from time to time used also in place of *thumos*, because *thumos* is used in contexts pointing out such movements as rage, desire, and courage. On the other hand, Parmenides, as the most important representative of the Elea School, defends the everlasting and unchanging entity idea against the aforementioned movement and variation idea. Rhode says “Without any assistance from experience, simply by the pure logical

---

<sup>59</sup> Aristotle, De Anima 405a8

<sup>60</sup> Aristotle, De Anima 404b1

<sup>61</sup> Aristotle, De Anima 405a8

deductions to be made from a single fundamental concept (that of “Being”) which was to be grasped only by the understanding, this philosophy claimed to arrive at the whole content of its teaching.” (1925). According to him, what exists is existing, and what does not exist is not existing. Parmenides mentions about an everlasting, endless and eternal entity, and expresses the following ideas for spirit: “The mind (noos) of man depends for its existence upon the mixture of two ingredients of which everything, including its body, is composed. These ingredients are the “Light” and “Night” (the Warm and the Cold, Fire, and Earth.). What is mentally active is even in mankind, “the nature of limbs”, the character of his thought is determined by one of two elements which preponderate in the individual. Even a dead (because he still has a body) human has feeling and sensations, but these powers are deserted by the warm and the fiery and given over to the cold, the dark and silence.” (Rohde, 1925). Hence, for Parmenides, psukhe means the activity of elements occurring as a result of the mixture of basic ingredients. Another important idea relating to psukhe concept is expressed by Empedocles. According to him, the spirit is a blend of eternal and everlasting roots suggested by him as arche. They are air, water, earth, and fire. And change (variation) occurs through the separation or combination of these four roots in different ways and forms. Two driving principles ensuring the movement of these four roots are described as love, friendship (philotes) and hate, dispute (neikos). “Just as artists portray sensorial things by combining and bringing different things together, so does the Friendship and Dispute in creating ‘trees, women and men, wild animals, birds and fish fed in water, and gods with their long lives full of glory’ (fr.23). As a result, existence is more than a sensory perception; it is a mixture of the four “roots” in diverse proportions, influenced by Friendship and Discord.” (Rohde, 1925). The concept of soul, which Empedocles expresses in this way, does not actually refer to psukhe, but to thumos just as in Homeros, because the sensation and perception of human are found in blood (aimatos) which is a mixture of four roots.

Consequently, as we have also cited Aristotle, it can be said that we have come to a new distinction at the end of this section: Movement and sensation. Every philosopher looking at the movement of existing one associate psukhe with

movement and says that spirit is the most powerful factor. However, in the case of sensation (aisthesis), not *psukhe*, but *thumos* becomes involved. Though *thumos* has a relationship with movement due to its meanings such as getting angry and rushing, it is indeed far more than this association, because *thumos* is the power of human to resist things. Therefore, philosophers highlighting the movement formulate their ideas close to *psukhe* concept, while philosophers highlighting the sensation formulate their ideas close to *thumos* concept.

#### 4.1. PYTHAGORAS

This section discusses Pythagoras separately because his ideas on *psukhe* have affected and influenced Plato, we will describe how the Pythagorean teaching which also serves as the base of spirit and immortality debates still continuing in the present day looks at the concept of *psukhe*.

While the use of *psukhe* in mythology is roughly limited by “what leaves the body at death”, after Pythagoras, *psukhe* becomes one of the central concepts of philosophy. Pythagoras even defines philosophy as an activity that makes the salvation of *psukhe* possible. Hence, *psukhe*’s articulation process seems to start at this point. Pythagoras builds his philosophy on the basis of actions and relations of numbers. The “Pythagorean Theorem” where he defines the basic relationship between sides of triangles is his most important postulate. Numbers are the root and origin of everything. The central belief and argument of Pythagoras and his followers are “Everything is a number” which is valid also in the case of *psukhe*. For Pythagoras and his followers, *psukhe* was a characteristic of numbers in accordance with the number theory. Aristotle expresses the Pythagorean doctrine in the text called *De Anima* as follows; “The doctrine of the Pythagoreans seems to rest upon the same ideas; some of them declared the motes in air, others what moved them, to be soul. These motes were referred to because they are seen always in movement, even in a complete calm.”<sup>62</sup> And some Pythagoras followers think that

---

<sup>62</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima* 404a16

*psukhe* is harmony. “One more idea is expressed about spirit; this idea seems to be plausible and persuasive for many people, and it is right up there with all other ideas mentioned so far; and it is idea justified (*logous dedokuia*) as if giving an account of, similarly to the words and statements addressed to public. This idea defends that the soul is a kind of harmony, because harmony is a blend or composition of contraries, and body is compounded out of contraries.”<sup>63</sup> The idea of the immortality of the soul and the idea that the soul can transmigrate into different mortal bodies are also attributed to Pythagorean philosophy. According to this idea, each human being, animal, and plant has a unique and separate soul. The soul, which is imprisoned to the soma due to their sins, must reincarnate in different bodies so that it is purged. “Xenophanes of Colophon is another emigrant from Ionia to Magna Graecia in the same years portrays Pythagoras as he intervenes in defense of a beaten animal, moved by the idea that man's soul transmigrates through different forms of life.” (Eco, 2018) At the time of death, soma dies, but the immortal spirit survives just like it has survived also before transmigrating into that soma, because the spirit is eternal and everlasting. “The practical philosophy of the Pythagorean School is founded upon a conception of the soul as absolutely distinct from nature, and, in fact, opposed to it. It is thrust into the life of nature, but it is in a foreign world where it preserves its self-enclosed individuality intact and from which it escapes into independence to undergo ever-renewed incarnations. Its origin is supra-mundane, and so, too, when liberated from the shackles of natural life it will one day be enabled to return to a supernatural existence as a spirit.” (Rohde, 1925). If the spirit is only a combination of the opposites in harmony, then it should perish when the human body dies. But it is seen that spirit is an independent entity living in soma and continuing to live also after death. Though it seems as if there is a contradiction at this point, it becomes meaningful if and when it is said that spirit has a fragmental structure just like thumos. “Subdivision and separation of spirit or spirit’s *dunameis* (abilities) into *logikon* (intelligent) and *alogon* (irrational) parts have been taught by Pythagoras before Plato.” (Rohde, 1925).

---

<sup>63</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima* 407b27

It may be said that Plato's Theory of Ideas, arguing that the world we live in is just an illusion and that real knowledge is only found in the world of ideas, was influenced by the theory of number which is known only through the mind, as we see in Pythagorean philosophy. Furthermore, both in Plato's soul and body metaphor saying that the body is the prison of the soul, and in Plato's Anamnesis (reminiscence) Theory, the reincarnation and immortality of soul ideas of Pythagorean philosophy have played great roles for Plato. While there is a mystic aspect in Pythagorean philosophy, Plato carries these ideas into the philosophical area and separates the pieces of the soul in a rational manner.

#### **4.2. PLACE OF THUMOS IN PSUKHE IN PLATO**

Plato of Athens, a student of Socrates, can be considered the founder of Greek philosophy with his thoughts expressed in the form of a dialogue that includes the themes of morality, politics, epistemology and ontology.

One of the breaking points in the life of Plato is his making acquaintance with his teacher Socrates. Later, the unfair trial and tragic death of Socrates has doubtlessly affected the formation and development of ideas of Plato. In Ancient Greece, philosophy was seen as an activity that must lay the foundation of human life. From this point of view, Socrates has been a role model for Plato as he was always remembered for his life in conformity with his philosophy. As a matter of fact, he believed that being wrong is better than doing wrong and that body is mortal and impermanent, but the spirit is permanent, immortal, and infinite after he got the death penalty, he has calmly accepted the glass full of hemlock poison offered to him. The idea of death has not disturbed Socrates much, because he did not consider death as an end, on the contrary, he imagined death as a starting point. As such, Socrates' death has made him immortal. Dialogue between Socrates and Glaucon, as narrated by Plato, is cited below:

“What then? Do you think that an immortal thing ought to be seriously concerned for such a little time? and not rather for all time?”

- I think so, but what is this that you have in mind?
- Have you never perceived,” said I, “that our soul is immortal and never perishes?
- No, by Zeus, not I; but are you able to declare this?”<sup>64</sup>

Thus, this assumption of immortal and unperishable made for the human spirit was very far from the then-existing theological teaching. Starting from Plato, this flow starts to change, and theological theory regarding the nature of spirit starts to end. “Plato argues that spirit is a hypostasis separate from the body. In his various dialogues and in somewhat mythological contexts, Plato defends the immortality of the spirit, i.e. that spirit continues to survive also after the death of the body, and is reincarnated in different bodies one after the other (Gorgias, Phaidon, Phaidros, State’s X. book.)” (Eco, 2018). In the process of articulation of *psukhe* starting with Pythagoras, to think of Plato as a stage of this process and of the search for justification and grounding of human competence and knowledge with *psukhe* will enable us to clarify the overall picture. This is the meaning of what Plato has done by making *thumos* a natural capability of *psukhe*.

*Psukhe* forgets itself as a result of its inherent instrumentalization to the body and mind to desire in life. It evolves with immortality of soul (*soul’s transmigration from body to body*)<sup>65</sup>. This process brings with it various ruptures and for questioning of the relationship between *psukhe* and soma. For this reason, the source of all life activities in human is *psukhe*, but he divides *psukhe* into different parts in terms of their nature. “According to Plato, in any case, spirit’s earthly existence is divided into three separate parts or control centers probably due to its combination with body (*State IV, Phaidros, Timaios*): Rational part

---

<sup>64</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 10.608d.

<sup>65</sup> *Psukhe* doesn’t remember anything at first, but as he travels from body to body, cracks appear and Plato’s *Politeia VII*. The light he expresses with sunlight in the allegory of the cave in his book begins to enter. Sunlight is the good itself. The moment a person chooses to leave the cave, the mind kicks in.

(*logistikon*), spirited part (*thymoeides*), and finally, appetitive part (*epithymetikon*).” (Eco, 2018). Plato argues that soul is something more than mind. Accordingly, man’s soul is separated into three parts:<sup>66</sup>

1. **Rational part** (*to logistikon*), *arête*<sup>67</sup>: wisdom.
2. **Spirited part** (*to thymoeides*), *arête*: courage.
3. **Appetitive part** (*to epithymetikon*), *arête*: temperance.

Thus, three different kinds of activity have three different principles. Though Plato’s theory of tripartite division of the soul is for the first time declared in *Republic*, it is also described in *Phaidros*<sup>68</sup> with two horses metaphor, and is stated in *Timaios* dialogue<sup>69</sup> over its relationship with body. As to Plato, the components of organization of state must be parallel to sections of human body. Names given to state may be used also for man. Three classes corresponding to them in state are rulers, soldiers and people.<sup>70</sup>

Sections of Psukhe	Logistikon	Thumos	Epitymetikon
Arête	Wisdom	Courage	Temperance
Metaphor of Charioteer	Charioteer	White Horse	Black Horse
Metaphor of Body	Head / Brain	Heart	Stomach
Its Class in State	Ruler	Soldier	People

Here, the attention-grabbing part is *thumos* section of spirit.

Plato, *Republic* IV. 439e.

<sup>66</sup> 1. τὸ λογιστικὸν  
2. τὸ θυμοειδές  
3. τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν

<sup>67</sup> ἀρετή (arete): the concept that defines the maximum action potential. Efficiency, skill, excellence. H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>68</sup> Plato, *Phaidros*, 246a-247c.

Suppose the spirit is like the combined power of a biplane and the driver of the chariot drawn by these horses. One of the horses is good-natured and the other is opposite-tempered. That’s why it is difficult and tiring for us to drive the car.

<sup>69</sup> Plato, *Timaios*, 69d-70e, 89e.

The place of *to logistikon* is head, brain, place of *to thymoeides* is place of *thumos* is heart, chest, place of *to epithymetikon* is abdomen, stomach.

<sup>70</sup> Plato, *Politeia* IV. 439d-444b.

δύο ἡμῖν ὠρίσθω εἶδη ἐν ψυχῇ ἐνόητα: τὸ δὲ δὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ καὶ ᾧ θυμούμεθα πότερον τρίτον, ἢ τούτων ποτέρῳ ἂν εἴη ὁμοφυές;

There are two sides in **our spirit**, but there is also something named *thumos*. Shall we call it our third side?

Plato considers the nature of *psukhe* comprised of three parts, and defines and builds *thumos* as one of the parts of *psukhe*, without giving up *thumos*.

#### 4.2.1. Aletheia

Etymological root of *aletheia* (ἀλήθεια)<sup>71</sup> meaning righteousness and truth is the Greek word *alethes* (ἀληθής) meaning right. However, if *Lethe* is used with negator ‘a’, it means not to forget and not to hide. Mythological origin of the concept is also *Lethe* set down herein. *Lethe* is one the rivers in *Hades*. *Hades* is the god of underground world. “Like all other Olympians, *Hades*, son of Kronos and Rheo, is named as the God of dead ruling the underground dark world.”(Vernant, 2018). *Hades* is separated from the world of living creatures by rivers. In Plato’s *State*<sup>72</sup>, *Lethe*<sup>73</sup> is also one of these rivers. Located in Hades, the address of fear, *Lethe* is a river causing humen to forget the life, and thus, preventing the flow of knowledge.

The way Aletheia is handled in terms of Plato draws a different framework from the current understanding of truth. For Plato, aletheia is a problem of human existence. Therefore, while discussing the concept of *aletheia* over Plato, the key point is that even under circumstances making it possible for human to grasp it, it becomes impossible for human to comprehend it due to the body it is subjected to.

---

<sup>71</sup> ἀλήθεια (aletheia): truth. ἀληθής (alethes, “true”)+-ια (-ia).

ἀλήθεια (a-letheia): ἀ- (a-, not) + λήθω (léthō, “i hid”).

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>72</sup> The original name of the work, which was translated into Turkish as the State, is Politeia. Politeia (πολιτεία) derives from the word polites (πολίτης) meaning citizen, which comes from the root polis (πόλις) meaning city, state, and means participating in the administration and life of a city.

<sup>73</sup> Plato, Politeia, 621c.

However, this aporia turns into an opportunity for human with the fact that *aletheia* is about the tension in the human existence in Plato and the creation activity takes place; because, whether human is aware of it or not, this process is the beginning of radical transformations. When the uncertainty in life is accepted as a set of objects, the truth is also turned into some propositions and judgments. With this transformation, human breaks away from infinity of which they are a part of, and completely moves away from the establishing the relationship between knowledge and action. Because, as we have stated above, our approach to the object is indeed nothing else, but belief. Plato describes his idea with the divided line analogy in his book *Republic VI*. Wishing to start from epistemic states of knowledge, to mention about the states of entity corresponding to them, and to pass from epistemological state to ontological separation, Plato grades it by divided lines<sup>74</sup>: *Noesis*, *Dianoia*, *Pistis* and *Eikasia*. *Noesis* (understanding, cognizance) and *Dianoia* (inferential thought) leads us to knowledge, while *Pistis* (belief) and *Eikasia* (estimation) leads us to presumption. He also states that this grading is at the same time a ranking of reality with the following words: “And arrange them in a proportion, considering that they participate in clearness and precision in the same degree as their objects partake of truth and reality.”<sup>75</sup> *Noesis*’s object is idea; *Dianoia*’s are mathematical and geometric objects; *Pistis*’s objects are all objects, living plants and entities; and *Eikasia*’s are blurred pictures and reflections. Thus, in terms of *aletheia*, while only *doxa*, i.e. presumption is obtained from the below-the-line world of visible, *episteme*, i.e. exact and precise knowledge may be reached as we climb up to the above-the-line comprehended world, i.e. the world of ideas.

Plato's allegory of the cave<sup>76</sup>, which begins with Socrates asking Glaucon to imagine a cave in which people are trapped, is also complementary. From the

---

<sup>74</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 509d-510b.  
 intellectual noesis eidos (forms, ideas)  
 dianoia geometric  
 objects (matemactical)  
 doxa pistis “originals” of these images  
 eikasia images

<sup>75</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 511e.

<sup>76</sup> Plato *Politeia*, 514a-516b.

point of view of Plato, who divides the line right in the middle, the upper part shows the outside of the cave and the lower part shows the inside of the cave. In the allegory, there are people enchained to cave walls in such a manner not to be able to move their legs and necks. These people are obliged to watch only the empty wall in front of them. Behind them, there is a walking path and a fire, on which non-captive people walk. The bodies of people walking behind the wall do not cast a shadow, but the shadow of the objects they carry cast a shadow on the wall. Therefore, the enchained people do not see anything about the events happening behind them, they only see the shadows cast on the cave wall, and believe that the voices of speaking people echoing on the wall are coming from shadows. For prisoners, these shadows are a reality, because they neither have seen any object outside the cave nor are aware or cognizant of the fire. Then, in the Dialogue, an enchained human is assumed to be released and to get out of the cave. When the prisoner sees fire and light, their eyes are bewitched and captivated, and it is difficult for them to see the objects. The prisoner set free from their chains puts up resistance along the way. With each step taken forward, it becomes more difficult for them to turn back and explain what they see to the prisoners left behind, because both they are in a position not to accept the old by turning back, and they cannot explain to the prisoners left behind in the cave what they have seen outside the cave. At first, they do not believe it, but then they can look at the sun when they slowly get used to it. For the prisoner wishing to go back to the cave and explain what they have seen to the other prisoners, it will be rather difficult to explain what they have seen to the people in the cave and to convince them thereto, because the darkness is comfortable, but it requires courage to see the truth and to look at the light. The process caused by Aletheia may remind us that there are people enchained in the cave. With this reminder, the human may dare to look at the transformation caused by truth or may opt to ignore it and remain unresponsive thereto. However, neither of these situations extinguishes the potential of change/variation held by Aletheia.

The relationship between truth and knowledge established in Plato via doxa in the present day is the relationship of the body (soma) with its nature. Doxa is a place where psukhe stands only together with soma. Outside of doxa is a space

where the laws of soul are taken into consideration, rather than the rules of the body. The tragic existence of human takes place in this relationship between body (soma) and spirit (psukhe). Plato discusses that aletheia is about the tension in the human existence and its transformation into an opportunity for hu upon realization of the creative activity.

Yes, *aletheia* is *aporia* (ἀπορία)<sup>77</sup>, but exactly for this reason, it does not remain as aporetic as seen in tragedies and comes out as a problem required to be overcome, because only thanks to this fact, psukhe is activated and turned into a possibility. The more the spirit detaches itself from the body and the more it gets free of the body, the better it grasps. At the moment human opts to exit from doxa, they act with the power of self-transformation, not within determinism encompassing the absolute operator. The bidirectional relationship between daimon and ethos, as also mentioned in the Tragedies section, is fairly important in the case of impossibility of Aletheia and the possibility of creative activity, as long as it points out the aporia of human. With this transformed relationship, psukhe realizes, liberalizes, and reaches Aletheia of the real good by means of ethical creation activity. While in mythologies, the man was helpless and destitute against gods, and therefore, there was no ethical space, together with tragedies, a conflict has started, and the togetherness of the mortal (human) and the immortal (god) has built up an ethical space. This in turn is the relationship between ethos and daimon. Starting from the moment a human starts to build a life in polis, or to put it in other words, starts to live inside an existence based on forgetting their fate, they are face to face the true problem, because the area built by the borders of body (soma) will force them to create opportunities for overcoming these borders. The human being will now have the chance to build himself, rather than fulfilling the words and orders of the Gods they were subject to and dependent on once upon a time.

In *Ethos-daimon* matter, the most important point separating Plato from tragedies is that *daimon* is indeed not the fate of human, but the capacity and power

---

<sup>77</sup> ἀπορία (aporia): ἄπορος (áporos, “impassable, difficult”) + -ῖα (-iā).  
H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

of human to change their fate. To put it in other words, what's important is to understand the spirit (*psukhe*) containing and hosting infinite and endless opportunities under tyranny of a finite body (*soma*). *Psukhe* is in a close relationship with movement (*kinesis*)<sup>78</sup> because it exists within a life-death dynamic. In connection with movement (*kinesis*), it is comprised of unlimited capacities and carries and hosts the potential of releasing those capacities. On the other side, this capacity is subject to body (*soma*). Body (*soma*) is impermanent, i.e. mortal. When it moves within this limitation and finiteness, it becomes subject to *doxa*<sup>79</sup>, i.e. the area of presumption. Here, as there are *pistis* and *eikasia*, we see not what happens, but what we cause happening.<sup>80</sup> Hence, what's said about objects is nothing else, but data manufactured with belief. In Plato, human continue to carry the tension in the area of *doxa* where they live subject to the body. *Doxa* is the location where tyranny of *soma* on *psukhe* comes in sight. In *doxa* being the area of the visible things, it is not possible to build knowledge under the tyranny of the body (*soma*), because in Plato, the visible constitutes the basis of illusion as it is transitory and impermanent. Differences between visible things bring the man face-to-face the uncertainty. Against this uncertainty, the human tries to determine and dominate it and argues that something which is nothing else, but only an illusion is the truth. With this meaning, it is tragic, but human is under obligation to overcome this tension, because out-of-*doxa* is an area where the centricity of the laws of the body (*soma*) collapses, and the laws of spirit (*psukhe*) are taken into account. In order to overcome the ontologic state between *psukhe* and *soma* and to exit from the area of *doxa*, Plato says that we need to look at the area of thought where *noesis* and *dianoia* are active. After exiting from the area of *doxa*, for *eidōs*<sup>81</sup>, the practice is now

---

<sup>78</sup> κίνησις (*kinesis*): κινέω (*kīnéō*, "I'm moving.") + -σις (-*sis*).

H.G.Liddell and R.Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, Clarendon Press-Oxford.

<sup>79</sup> *doxa*: the unity of the hegemonico (reasoning), which is perceived by the sense organs and therefore subject to the determinations of the body (*soma*). ***doxa*: perception (soma) + hegemonicon (reasoning).**

<sup>80</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 509d-510b.

<sup>81</sup> The visible form derives from the root *id-* in conjunction with the verb *idein*, which means to see. Mental knowledge, the subject of which is *eidōs*, is defined as an act of thought (*noesis*), a similar act of seeing.

required to be changed. *Eikasia* and *pistis* included at the bottom of Table<sup>82</sup> attribute a wrong reality to appearances. And *dianoia* and *noesis* activities are shown at the top two boxes. *Dianoia* will penetrate into the visible in *noesis*, and will not fall into *doxa*, and will have deflect its direction towards *eidos*. The living of human with their body (*soma*) establishes their infiniteness, limitedness and deficiency. The reason underlying their infinite, limited and deficient existence is the human's hosting also the infiniteness thanks to their spirit (*psukhe*). Now, let's look at the two components leading to this tension, *soma* and *psukhe*, in more details.

#### **4.2.1.1. Soma (Body)**

In Plato, when we talk about soma, i.e. body, we are actually talking about the aforementioned laws of doxa. According to Plato, the visible things, i.e. all entities are on a ground of illusion as they are transient and impermanent, because differences between entities cause uncertainty in human, and in the face of uncertainty, the human actually tries to define what they have been trying to do from the very beginning. They try to classify and name the things by necessity. The key issue of the discussion that proceeds in the context of the question 'What is virtue?' in Menon's dialogue starts with the question asked by Menon to Socrates: "Can you tell me, Socrates, whether virtue can be taught, or is acquired by practice, not teaching? Or if neither by practice nor by learning, whether it comes to mankind by nature or in some other way?"<sup>83</sup> the main issue of the debate that proceeds in the context of the question is the definition. What Socrates looks for is what is the same and common in everyone in a lot of definitions of virtue, such as the virtue of woman, man, or child, and what is it that makes their virtue. It must exist in everything one by one, but must not be identifiable with or reducible to any one of them on the other side. This means to say that what Socrates chases after with 'What is X?' or 'What does it mean to be X?' in his dialogues is not a nominal definition,

---

<sup>82</sup> See. footnote.127.

<sup>83</sup> Plato, Menon, 70a.

but a real definition that also states why and for which purpose it is stated. We may mistake an object for a dog from a distance, but that object is indeed a pony. There is only one object, but our epistemological state related to that object is different. However, for Plato, the difference between knowledge and presumption is not simply defined as two epistemological states behind a single object, because weak vision and strong vision have different objects. As per Plato, beyond the single things we individually define as beautiful, fair, and good one by one is something which is inherently beautiful, fair, and good existentially separate and independent from them. That is why the things termed by Plato as eidos are not the objects of our senses. Eidos is not something into which we can penetrate by our senses or we can come across in the world but is not also something unreal due to that reason. Insomuch that, for Plato, eidos is more real than we come across in this world and do really exist. Only those who show the courage of going out of the cave can reach the forms. The moment when human opts to go out of doxa is not within determinism encompassing the absolute executor, and their spirit is mobilized to the extent they can transform and actually transforms themselves. In Plato, human is the one who can transform themselves and establish a link with infinity and eternity.

Another point that should be mentioned about the body (soma) is of course the human body. The human body is impermanent, that is mortal. His mortality points out his finiteness, its lack in the face of immortality. Human under the domination of this finiteness and soma is also condemned to a soul (self) that cannot be satisfied. It establishes an external relationship when they try to name and dominate everything with which it relates. Thus, human bases himself not on the object itself, but on a representation of the object at doxa level.

Before the emergence of its physical and bodily needs and before being imprisoned in the body, psukhe had a state of being in touch with the truth in himself beyond the instrumentality of doxa world and the domination they established. However, the domination established by psukhe through doxa on what exists, after penetrating into the body, has forced it into hubris. With psukhe being subject to

the body, the eternity experience of human was corrupted and became limited. This hubris process is explained in another narrative in *Symposion*. What this example of androgynous tells us is that failure to feel deficiency takes us to hubris. “In the first place, there were three kinds of human beings not merely the two sexes, male and female, as at present: there was a third kind as well, which had equal shares of the other two, and whose name survives though, the thing itself has vanished.”<sup>84</sup> When humans having forces and great greeds and ambitions dared to oppose and resist against Gods, Zeus decides to rip man in two in the middle. “I propose now to slice every one of them in two, so that while making them weaker we shall find them more useful by reason of their multiplication; and they shall walk erect upon two legs. If they continue turbulent and do not choose to keep quiet, I will do it again,’ said he; ‘I will slice every person in two, and then they must go their ways on one leg, hopping.’ So saying, he sliced each human being in two, just as they slice sorb-apples to make a dry preserve, or eggs with hairs.”<sup>85</sup> When female, male and androgynos, having both female and male forms, are divided as above to become only female and male, as their natural forms are separated into two, each half misses the other half and desires to live together. “This means to say that the love felt by man for its other half is very ancient feeling. Love intends to rebuild our first and original body, and to reinstate two separate entities to a single entity. Shortly, love resolves a trouble remaining from the creation and genesis of human being. Each of us is symbolon<sup>86</sup>, integral part of another human.”<sup>87</sup> In our nature, we were a complete whole, and now, love is the name of our wish to be completed. This division of unity mentioned in *Symposion*, the dialogue of Plato dealing with Eros (Love), may be an argument for the point of view to *psukhe* and *thumos* parallel to both the future Eros (Love) section, and what the human nature was at the beginning.

---

<sup>84</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 189e.

<sup>85</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 190d

<sup>86</sup> *Symbolon* is a piece of bowl of dish that is divided into two. When two people are guests of each other, they take one of these pieces of bowls (pots) as a sign of their friendship and keep it and when they die, they leave it to their children. This is where the meaning of the symbol comes from.

<sup>87</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 191d.

Although human being was divided into two so as not to act or behave like this, it seems that he still insists on looking for satisfaction in unreal things and continues to be doomed to *doxa*. What dooms us to *doxa* is *hubris*, i.e. arrogance, as also mentioned by us in the King Oidipus tragedy. Arrogance is a negative concept for *aletheia*. Being subject to and dependent upon body, and bodily and physical needs impose a limitation on the endless capacity of spirit. “When does the soul attain to truth (*aletheia*)? For when it tries to consider anything in company with the body, it is evidently deceived by it?”<sup>88</sup> The more the spirit detaches itself from body and the more it gets free of body, the better it grasps. “Every soul is immortal. For that which is ever moving is immortal but that which moves something else or is moved by something else, when it ceases to move, ceases to live.”<sup>89</sup> The spirit’s being the principle of spontaneous movement, and therefore, its being something which can neither be created nor be destroyed proves and demonstrates that it is by nature immortal. In *Phaidon*, his another dialogue discussing the immortality of spirit, Socrates says that it is required to investigate and find out the causes of creation and destruction in order to reach the knowledge as to immortality of spirit. He adds that when he tries to grasp and comprehend the objects with the help of senses, he fears about the probability of entire blinding of spirit. Therefore, he cannot acquire any knowledge as to nature of things through activities in the area of *doxa*. “if when it departs from the body it is defiled and impure, because it was always with the body and cared for it and loved it and was fascinated by it and its desires and pleasures, so that it thought nothing was true except the corporeal, which one can touch and see and drink and eat and employ in the pleasures of love, and if it is accustomed to hate and fear and avoid that which is shadowy and invisible to the eyes but is intelligible and tangible to philosophy;

---

<sup>88</sup> Plato, *Phaidon*, 65b. ....πότε οὖν, ἢ δ’ ὅς, ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς ἀληθείας ἄπτεται;

<sup>89</sup> Plato, *Phaidros*, 245d.

ἀρχὴ δὲ ἀγέννητον. ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀνάγκη πᾶν τὸ γιγνόμενον γίνεσθαι, αὐτὴν δὲ μηδ’ ἐξ ἑνός: εἰ γὰρ ἔκ του ἀρχῆς γίγνοιτο, οὐκ ἂν ἔτι ἀρχῆς γίγνοιτο. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀγέννητόν ἐστιν, καὶ ἀδιάφθορον αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη εἶναι. ἀρχῆς γὰρ δὴ ἀπολομένης οὔτε αὐτὴ ποτε ἔκ του οὔτε ἄλλο ἐξ ἐκείνης γενήσεται, εἴπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς δεῖ τὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι. οὕτω δὲ κινήσεως μὲν ἀρχὴ τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτὸ κινουόν. τοῦτο δὲ οὐτ’ ἀπόλλυσθαι οὔτε γίνεσθαι δυνατόν, ἢ πάντα τε οὐρανόν.

do you think a soul in this condition?”<sup>90</sup> With arrogance owned by him due to the nature of soma, human cannot go beyond the area of visible objects in fact, because they have the will of dominating and tyrannizing everything they get in touch with, and acts greedily running from something to the other. This is at the same time accompanied by fear, because they can indeed by no means own the objects themselves, and is face to face with the probability of losing them. Against this probability of loss, due to hubris, their appetite and wish for control further increase. But for Plato, the laws of the body cannot go beyond the area of doxa, i.e. the area of the visible things exactly for this reason. It is not possible to construct knowledge in the area of doxa. The explanation of what makes knowledge possible is the laws of spirit, i.e. *psukhe*.

#### 4.2.1.2. *Psukhe* (Spirit)

*Psukhe* is subject to the finiteness and boundedness of body in *psukhe* - *soma* tension. Desire has impulses, body has impositions. Moreover, these needs are instantaneous, and require immediate satisfaction. The whole potential owned by *psukhe* is limited by soma, but when it comes to mind, everything becomes different. Mind thinks of thinking, and when it grasps and understands the thinking, a thought emerges out of it. This means to say that the mind’s activity does not contain and require anything other than itself. As for its thinking activity, mind is infinite and unbounded. Therefore, the only way for it to practice autokinesis and unboundedness of *psukhe* is the mind’s own and pure activity. *Psukhe* will look at itself, and thus, will look at its own activity and movement in order to understand itself. *Eidos* is exactly this activity, because inanimate things and human-made object do not have *eidos*. In his *Timaios* dialogue, Plato says: “So because of all

---

<sup>90</sup> Plato, Phaidon, 81b.

ἐὰν δέ γε οἷμαι μεμιασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλάττηται, ἅτε τῷ σώματι ἀεὶ συνοῦσα καὶ τοῦτο θεραπεύουσα καὶ ἐρῶσα καὶ γοητευομένη ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τε τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν, ὥστε μηδὲν ἄλλο δοκεῖν εἶναι ἀληθὲς ἀλλ’ ἢ τὸ σωματοειδές, οὗ τις ἂν ἄψαιτο καὶ ἴδοι καὶ πίοι καὶ φάγοι καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια χρήσαιτο, τὸ δὲ τοῖς ὄμμασι σκοτᾶδες καὶ ἀιδές, νοητὸν δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφία ἀίρετόν, τοῦτο δὲ εἰθισμένη μισεῖν τε καὶ τρέμειν καὶ φεύγειν, οὕτω δὴ ἔχουσαν οἶει ψυχὴν αὐτὴν καθ’ αὐτὴν εἰλικρινῆ ἀπαλλάξεσθαι;

these and other kindred notions, we are unable also on waking up to distinguish clearly the unsleeping and truly subsisting substance, owing to our dreamy condition, or to state the truth—how that it belongs to a copy—seeing that it has not for its own even that substance for which it came into being, but fleets ever as a phantom of something else—to come into existence in some other thing, clinging to existence as best it may, on pain of being nothing at all; whereas to the aid of the really existent there comes the accurately true argument, that so long as one thing is one thing, and another something different, neither of the two will ever come to exist in the other so that the same thing becomes simultaneously both one and two...”<sup>91</sup> As the area of activity of pure mind, *eidos* is the basis of the existing ones. “For the colorless, formless, and intangible truly existing essence, with which all true knowledge is concerned, holds this region and is visible only to the mind, the pilot of the soul. Now the divine intelligence, since it is nurtured on mind and pure knowledge, and the intelligence of every soul which is capable of receiving that which befits it, rejoices in seeing reality for a space of time and by gazing upon truth is nourished and made happy until the revolution brings it again to the same place”<sup>92</sup> Human being, in fact being a part of this eternal and infinite one, can neither devote itself entirely to mind, nor entirely break off with mind, due to his tragic existence under tyranny of soma. Thus, only activities of *psukhe* remain behind. As *psukhe* now realizes itself with that activity when it moves, it is possible for *psukhe* to see *eidos* of that activity. *Eidos* is the building block of this activity. Given that the keystone underlying Plato’s *aletheia* idea as well is the human mind’s being a part of movement and activity, in Plato, *psukhe* is the section hosting the mind and a part of the Good. For this reason, because of nature of *psukhe*, human finds the opportunity to realise the creation activity within the real meaning of word, together with mind. In his *Timaios* dialogue discussing the process of creation and existence of universe, Plato says that cosmos is equipped by mind and *psukhe*, and *psukhe* is created in order to complete the creation. “When he saw that

---

<sup>91</sup> Plato, *Timaios*, 52.

<sup>92</sup> Plato, *Phaidros*, 247c.

if any entity does not have spirit, it does not have mind either, he imprisoned mind inside spirit, and spirit inside body. Then, he shaped and formed the cosmos as if he creates almost the best in terms of essence.”<sup>93</sup> “The soul thus seems to be destined from the beginning to give life to a body. It is not only the knowing and thinking element in a world of inanimate things, it is also the source of all movement.” (Rohde, 1925). Thus, the best movement is the movement of cosmos, i.e. the movement based upon the nature of *psukhe*.

Anything that happens in the body’s dominance to hinder *psukhe*’s action leads to its deterioration. And according to Plato, this deterioration makes human being unable to reach the good. “If, while life is admittedly intolerable with a ruined constitution of body even though accompanied by all the food and drink and wealth and power in the world, we are yet to be asked to suppose that, when the very nature and constitution of that whereby we live is disordered and corrupted, life is going to be worth living, if a man can only do as he pleases, and pleases to do anything save that which will rid him of evil and injustice and make him possessed of justice and virtue?”<sup>94</sup> For this reason, by saying that all three parts of the *psukhe* should act harmoniously and temperately, and justice (fairness) requires human to do whatever they do and to manage their acts in a manner not extrinsically to the nature of the relevant act, but in harmony with it, and this is possible only if human puts in order what they own, and not by unilateral domination of *soma* and *psukhe*, but only through mutual transformation of them. “That justice is indeed something of this kind, yet not in regard to the doing of one’s own business externally, but with regard to that which is within and in the true sense concerns one’s self, and the things of one’s self—it means that a man must not suffer the principles in his soul to do each the work of some other and interfere and meddle with one another, but that he should dispose well of what in the true sense of the word is properly his own, and having first attained to self-mastery and beautiful order within himself, and having harmonized these three principles, the notes or intervals of three terms quite literally

---

<sup>93</sup> Plato, *Timaios*, 30b.

<sup>94</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 445b.

the lowest, the highest, and the mean, and all others there may be between them, and having linked and bound all three together and made of himself a unit.”<sup>95</sup> Self-sufficient people will thus build a society living in peace.

Given that whatever the characteristics of the smallest part of something are, the whole of it will also have the same characteristics, tackling with state starting from the smallest part of society and making an analogy between human and state, Plato, in the social order built on the basis of narration of Socrates in *Politeia*<sup>96</sup>, says that the happiness of society must precede and rank over the happiness of social classes or humans, and that the primary protectors assigned for state administration must be selected from among humans who have worked only for the benefit of society, and have avoided and abstained from everything to the detriment of society. Also according to Socrates, such people who have internalized the laws of *psukhe* must be assigned for state administration, because it is possible to secure the justice by only this way. As handled by Socrates, justice is for a human to do only what is fit to their capabilities and talents. Accordingly, society is divided into three groups, namely rulers, guardians and producers. The right thing to do is to make sure that these three groups do their own jobs without interfering in jobs of others, because when it comes to what’s good for the state, the power of everyone to do their own job and mind his own business in the society is indeed as important as temperance, bravery and wisdom. Interference of these three social classes in jobs of each other is really destructive for the state.<sup>97</sup> To be temperate means to restrain desires and wishes, and to make the good side dominant over the bad side. Such temperance and wisdom may be found only in a small part of humans making up the society. Each human hosts and bears both a good side and a bad side. When the good side dominates, we call it self-control, but when the bad side dominates, we call it being a slave to their desires. Plato looks at the state and sees these two

---

<sup>95</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 443d.

<sup>96</sup> πολίτης (polites): citizen,

πολιτεία (politeía): Conditions and rights of citizens. Community of citizens in the city/state. *Politeia* derives from both the root polis, meaning city or state, and the verb *politeuomai*, meaning "I am an active citizen of the polis."

<sup>97</sup> Plato, *Politeia*, 433b-434d.

sides in the state as well, and draws a self-controlled state organization. “The intended meaning of this way of speaking appears to me to be that the soul of a man within him has a better part and a worse part, and the expression self-mastery means the control of the worse by the naturally better part. It is, at any rate, a term of praise. But when, because of bad breeding or some association,<sup>1</sup> the better part, which is the smaller, is dominated by the multitude of the worse, I think that our speech censures this as a reproach,<sup>1</sup> and calls the man in this plight non-self-controlled and licentious. “That seems likely,” he said. “Turn your eyes now upon our new city,” said I, “and you will find one of these conditions existent in it. For you will say that it is justly spoken of as the master of itself if that in which the superior rules the inferior is to be called sober and self-mastered. By all means, but the simple and moderate appetites which with the aid of reason and right opinion are guided by consideration you will find in few and those the best born and best educated.” “True,” he said. “And do you not find this too in your city and a domination there of the desires,” Socrates says a fair human being resembles a fair and just state, and the human spirit is also comprised of three different sections just like the social classes classified as above. As explained hereinabove in the section titled Place of Thumos in Psukhe in Plato, these sections are wisdom – rationalist, reasoning and judgment section (to logistikon), courage - heart section (to tumoeides), and temperance - appetite section (to epitymetikon). In order to clarify this structure, Socrates gives the example of a thirster . When a human is thirsty, it is natural for them to drink water, but they are also in a position to decide not to drink water. Yes, the appetite section leading to thirst is a part of psukhe, but the section which may take the decision not to drink water is also another section of psukhe. This means to say that a decision taken by logistikon is put into practice only if and when that decision is desired. Just at this point, the other section, thumos, i.e. courage and driving force comes into play. Therefore, the mind is required to be put into action for a good life. And this is possible only by getting out of doxa which makes justice impossible. The thing which moves and pushes the human out of doxa by changing the habits will be Love.

#### 4.2.2. A Transitivity between Human and the Divine

As we have already stated, in life, *psukhe* forgets itself with instrumentalization of *psukhe* being dependent on the body, and mind being dependent on desire, and in order to produce ideas and thoughts, *psukhe* must get rid of the effects of *soma*. However, this process is a difficult one as it is the process of moving from *doxa* level to *logos* level because of the way *psukhe* can continue its existence in the world only with *soma*. With the crossing of the borders of *doxa*, *psukhe* is freed from domination and becomes free. The path to the knowledge of the truth, i.e. the keep the truth above all else, can only begin after that point. The thing which will remove *psukhe* from all predetermined aspects of *soma* and make it possible for it to reach the Good as a whole is the Love, because Love arises in what is lacking, and because the ignorant person captured by his arrogance does not desire something which they do not feel the deficiency of. Human can get out of the cave, and pass from the one to the divine one only by means of Love and *thumos* which encourages human to fall in Love.

##### 4.2.2.1. Eros (Love)

If the arrogance emerging in human under the domination of *soma* condemns them to *doxa* and leads and pushes them to fear, ignorance and intemperance, at the point where human turns their steps towards the essential one with Love, they may learn to see the deficiency blatantly, and leave themselves to the Good through immortal *psukhe*. In Plato's dialogue *Symposion* dealing with Love and containing praises to Love, in fact, each character demonstrates a different aspect of Love and Eros. *Phaedrus* says *Eros* is the oldest and most respectful god, and thinks that only humans in love sacrifice their loves for someone else.<sup>98</sup> On the other hand, with his question 'Which *Eros* am I going to praise?' *Pausanias* says that in fact there is not a single *Eros*, and that just like all other acts, Love may also be good or bad depending on how it is executed.<sup>99</sup> *Eryksimakhos* agrees with the

---

<sup>98</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 178a-180b.

<sup>99</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 180c-181a.

duality idea of *Pausanias*, but also adds that *Eros* is not limited with men, and is universal.<sup>100</sup> As seen in these examples, the definition of *Eros* changes and varies continuously, and a final opinion cannot be formed thereon. “The upshot of these questions is that love or desire is a relative term, and *Eros* therefore exists only relationally: as a father or brother must be a father or brother of somebody, so love or desire is of somebody or something.” (Guthrie, 1986). On the other side, Socrates expresses his opinions on Love as follows: “A man may be said to love a thing not yet provided or possessed, when he would have the presence of certain things secured to him forever in the future. Then such a person, and in general all who feel desire, feel it for what is not provided or present; for something they have not or are not or lack and that sort of thing is the object of desire and love. Now then, First, is not Love directed to certain things of which, in the second place, he has a want.”<sup>101</sup> Love is the relation or link established by human through their *psukhe* with eternity from which they have broken, but on the other side continues to be a part of.

According to the myth, Love’s mother is *Penia* meaning poverty, and its father is *Poros* meaning wealth and abundance. While Love cannot get rid of poverty and boundedness on one side, it at all times chases the good and beautiful on the other side. It is never fully inside either poverty (non-existence) or wealth (existence).<sup>102</sup> Exactly for this reason, Love is close to human. Just like in the nature of Love, the Love in human also moves between ignorance and wisdom. Love emerges in the thing which is lacked. This may be either a bodily deprivation or a spiritual deprivation. In this path seeking the beautiful, human tends and heads first towards the beauty in the object, and then towards the beauty in the body. In both cases, Love is limited by the desire. After this point at *doxa* level, human wishes to integrate not transiently or temporarily, but eternally, because only in this way, it will be possible for human to desire the beautiful only for themselves. And when they understand that it will no more possible for them to exist without them, they

---

<sup>100</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 185e-186b.

<sup>101</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 200e.

<sup>102</sup> Plato, *Symposion*, 203c-203d.

will try to follow them at all costs. The more the spirit detaches itself from body and the more it gets free of body, the better it grasps. “To say that we find soul to be prior to body, and body secondary and posterior, soul governing and body being governed according to the ordinance of nature. Moods and dispositions and wishes and calculations and true opinions and considerations and memories will be prior to bodily length, breadth, depth and strength, if soul is prior to body”<sup>103</sup> It is revolutionist, because it stands for destruction of everything on which the life is established and built by humans. And it seems that the section realizing this is *thumos*. *Thumos* is the enthusiasm which is recreated and cannot be waived from, whatever is done and whatever happens.

#### **4.2.3. Thumos As A Power**

What makes it possible for a human to recognize the stressful existence of *psukhe* under tyranny of body and to engage in a questioning process with this awareness is the Love, as stated in the preceding part. What provokes the spirit within infinite uncertainty and tension in the life is the Love, and this provocative power is *thumos*. *Thumos* acts like an intermediary between *psukhe*'s rationalist and reasoning section and appetite section.

Although the acts of humans were determined by gods in ancient Greece, the gods were at the same time acting just like humans, and this is an indicator of the intertwinement between humans and gods. In that age when the words of the gods were absolutely accepted, *thumos* mostly referred and corresponded to rage. As seen in the early parts of the study, albeit being mostly associated with rage, *thumos* does not only constitute and build the feeling of rage but also directs this rage into action such as the urge to fight. Just as Achilles was what allowed him to go into battle bravely, *thumos* both encourages the warriors before the war and motivate them during the war. And it also encompasses the legitimate rage of a person having a sense of justice (equity) when they are wronged. However, we also speak of *thumos* also when we get angry for ourselves, because if and when our

---

<sup>103</sup> Plato, *Nomoi*, 896d-898a.

desires contained in the appetite section of psukhe want to do something contrary to the arguments of mind, then, thumos may make us angry also towards our own desires. Thus, thumos refers to activities such as thinking, knowing, and thinking about them, because thumos is the place where we think of the probabilities. For instance, in *Odysseus*, Circe advises Odysseus to plan his route and way in his thumos.

Here, one of the most important breaking points is the emergence of cities. Upon the foundation of cities (polies), the real world of the Ancient Greek people, whose only source was the mythological tradition, and the world of meaning was completely separated from each other. Starting from this point, contrary to the determination of everything by the gods, the humans now are in need of political space and organization, because, unlike the mythological tradition, which does not attribute any capabilities to humans, they now become competent. The reflections of this transformation have already been clearly seen in the tragedies of the same period. In this transition between mythological tradition and polis, human understands for the first time that they are the agent and maker of their own choices. As also explained in the Tragedy part, this tension takes us to Heraclitus's *ἠθος Ἀνθρώπου Δαιμόνων* (*êthos anthrôpôi daimôn*) statement. Thus, the relationship between character and the fate of human is not a unidirectional determination, but it is indeed bi-directional. It is not either X or Y, but it is both X and Y. Thus, thumos also lead human to take steps and take actions for becoming aware of their own acts. Contrary to only appetitive desires, thumos also desires reputation for itself. This drive will motivate it to take risks. Love is also kinesis emerging upon activation of thumos indeed. Thumos is both the source of feeling and the feeling itself. Thumos activates the groups which are made invisible by society. It incites to action the people who are suppressed by the strong and powerful groups. When equipped in accordance with the mind, it is the potential to take the man to eudemonia, because psukhe does not contain a given center point. We are going to discover and create it ourselves. There is no border, because it is impossible to have a border. Thumos is both what's inside us, and what bursts out of us. It may both

be a white horse encouraging us to the Love, and be a wild black horse that may lead us to destructive results. And we, charioteers, will direct it.

Thumos evokes and contains feelings such as rage, joy, pain, fear, and courage, and although it contains them, Plato's thumos represents a type of motivation similar to that of Homeros, and at the same time, it represents the capacity and power needed by human to maintain and continue this motivation and to pursue their purposes and objectives within the interaction with other sections of psukhe. Since the very beginning, since Pythagoras, philosophy is trying to open a gateway and a door between what's the human and what's divine, what's earthly and what's ethereal, and what's finite and what's infinite. When considered from this point of view, what Plato did was indeed to prove that the door has in fact not been closed from the outside (by gods), but it is not opened from the inside (by men). But for this, first of all, the door which has never been closed is required to be opened by us on our side. For this reason, first of all, we are required to dare to open the door. Thumos is the power making it possible.

## CONCLUSION

A sleepless lookout, having no words, with their eyes on the signal of the victory flame to be lit...

The tragedy *Oresteia* written by Aeschylus and the sole example of the Ancient Greek theatre trilogy starts with these words. Just like the fate of human determined by gods in the mythological tradition, they are waiting in front of the palace for many years for the gods to put an end to this torture. However, the situation is complicated as they can solve it as the gods say. This struggle between Agamemnon and Orestes is in a sense focused on the tension between mythological tradition on one side and polis on the other side. Trilogy is clearly a typical example of a tragic human's life. Gods now withdraw from the process of justice and leave it to human to provide justice. The withdrawal of gods from the process of justice may in fact be construed as the completion of the process of human's taking the control of their acts only in their own hands. Thus, *thumos* comes out as a concept where the prolonged process of thinking over and trying to determine the borders of agency of human has in one sense completed. Thanks to *thumos*, gods are getting out of business, and the agent (actor) now becomes the owner of their own acts entirely.

In Plato, the most basic point where the place of *thumos* in *psukhe* relies upon is the transitivity between the human and the divine. Even while trying to establish integrity, Plato defines and builds *thumos* as one of the parts of *psukhe*, and it is seen that *thumos* play a key role herein. In the *aporia* of the Ancient Greek people as to whether the act is performed by them or by gods, the key point is not the source is either this or that, but it is/may be both this and that, and it is impossible to distinguish them. While the power of nature and the caprices of gods have control over the humans, what Plato divides *psukhe* into three parts and making *thumos* a capability or talent of *psukhe* is to demonstrate that there is no barrier placed by gods, but in fact, the humans fail to act. Then, there is no dualism left behind.

When people in the cave looking at the wall, they see shadows and in fact, they do not see those shadows as shadows, but as a silhouette, since they do not have any

notion of shadow. What they actually need to learn is this notion of shadow. And this is possible only through contradiction because contradiction and tension awaken people. A person interferes in order to rescue and save them from the cave. They need a savior in order to be freed, but it is not enough alone they also need their own strength. A praxis is required. Thus, the prisoner got out of the cave by the savior sees the puppet, and likens the puppet and shadow, but as they do not know which one is the original, they establish a reverse link and say that the puppet is a copy of the shadow. Thus, they are still inside the cave indeed, because this is not something that can be done from the outside. It is impossible to impose this from outside to a human who does not have vision (eyesight) or desire to see. So, is there any way to go out of the cave? Praxis. By using praxis, to see the relations between wall, object, and fire, and compare puppet and shadow... Thus, we will start to resolve the relations between a living object and its representation. By rejecting traditional beliefs, we now become responsible for our own fate. This is exciting, but at the same time restless and stressful. Just like the human who faces the polis for the first time. It is on one side glamorous, and on the other side threatening. Against the terrible realities of the now, our own internal war is indeed a war between three parts of the soul. Depending on which part wins the war, we are having a life in that direction. To be accepted, success, reputation, desire, courage... To dare to open ourselves the door which was in fact never closed and is now required in order to achieve all of such objectives. Thumos is the power making it possible for us. The power that makes the distinction of defending what is right, and not seeking to win when we are wrong.

In this study of mine I wanted to show the concepts of *psukhe* and *thumos* in the state of Plato by arguing the meanings, alterations and conversions of them. The answer to why I wanted to work in the Ancient Greek field is actually to try to examine how the extraction of the human came in to today's state from the ancient times and what changed or disappeared along the time. The changes of the concepts of Thumos and *psukhe* from mythological period to Plato and conversions of them to the modern ages with their ever re-appearing nature urged me to write this study.

The actual reason behind why I wanted to choose the concepts of *Thumos* and *psukhe* was the thrill and curiosity I got when I first heard the concept of Thumos. An excitative force may encourage to love or it may have disastrous outcomes. I can say, I continued writing to discover the paths the question “In which practices it is involved in today’s world?” will take along with the curiosity of “What kind of a force is thumos?”

At the end of the study; I came to the conclusion of through thumos and psukhe humans are the agents of their own choices who are also the makers of their lives and how they do not need a greater savior to reach to the freedom they are coded by nature. Because we will discover by ourselves and then create. Of course I can say while noticing these facts I had a sour feeling that every philosophical work eventually seems to cause. Likewise, it feels like we writhe around the same things on the same loop evermore. We are people that always experience the same things. Because we are always after the infinite desire; we are in a constant battle to own pleasure, capacity, richness. By taking a look at what we are living through it is clear that we’ll still be living on the same loop. Likewise, with thumos we do not dare to walk through the wide open door right in front of us and instead we keep adding more locks to the already sealed door behind us. In this loop I wish there to be more thumos against the government, which is actually daring to discriminate and keeping the people under domination, just like how it was in Gezi.

## REFERENCES

- Aeschylus. (n.d.). *Aeschylus, Persians* Herbert Weir Smyth, ph. D., ed. Aeschylus, Persians, line 1. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0012>
- Adamson, P. (2014). *A History of Philosophy without any Gaps I: Classical Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
- Aeschylus. (n.d.). *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound* Herbert Weir Smyth, ph. D., ed. Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound, line 1. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0010>
- Aristoteles. (2018). *Ruh Üzerine (De Anima)* . (Ö. Aygün & Y. G. Sev, Trans.). Pinhan Yayıncılık .
- Burckhardt, J., Stern, S., & Murray, O. (1999). *The greeks and Greek civilization*. Fontana.
- C., G. W. K. (1986). *A history of greek philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, U. (2018). *Antik Yunan*. (L. Tonguç Basmacı, Trans.) (Vol. 2). Alfa Basım .
- Euripides. (n.d.). *Euripides, Bacchae* T. A. Buckley, ed. Euripides, Bacchae, line 1. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0092>
- Euripides. (n.d.). *Euripides, Medea* David Kovacs, ed. Euripides, Medea, line 1. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0114>
- Homer, Iliad*. Homer, Iliad, Book 1, line 1. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0134>
- Homer, Odyssey*. Homer, Odyssey, Book 1, line 1. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0136>

Howatson, M. C. (2013). *Oxford Antikçağ Sözlüğü*. (F. Ersöz, Trans.). Kitap Yayınevi.

Jaeger, W. (1948). *The Theology of The Early Greek Philosophers*. (E. S. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford Press.

Kranz, W. (1994). *Antik Felsefe*. (S. Y. Baydur, Trans.). Sosyal Yayınlar.

Latacz, J. (2016). *Antik Yunan Tragedyaları: Tüm Oyunlar: Tarihçe, inceleme, yorum*. (Y. Onay, Trans.). Mitos Boyut Yayınları.

Plato. (2013). *Diyaloglar*. (T. Aktüel, Trans.). Remzi Kitabevi.

*Plato, Euthyphro*. Plato, Euthyphro, section 2a. (n.d.) Retrieved Jun 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0170>

*Plato, Greater Hippias*. Plato, Greater Hippias, section 281a. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0180>

*Plato, laws*. Plato, Laws, Book 1, page 624. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0166>

*Plato, Parmenides*. Plato, Parmenides, section 126a. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0174>

Plato. (2012). *Phaidon Ruh Üzerine*. (N. Kayacı, Trans.). Kabalcı Yayıncılık.

*Plato, Republic*. Plato, Republic, Book 1, section 327a. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0168>

Rohde, E. (1925). *Psyche: The cult of souls and belief in immortality among greeks*. Routledge.

*Sophocles, Antigone* sir Richard Jebb, ed. Sophocles, Antigone, line 1. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0186>

*Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus* sir Richard Jebb, ed. Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus, line 1. (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0192>

Vernant, J.-P., & Vidal-Naquet, P. (1990). *Myth and tragedy in ancient Greece*. Zone Books.

Watson, P. (2002). *Ideas: A History of Thought and Invention from Fire to Freud*. Perfectbound.