

HUMAN ACTION IN GREEK TRAGEDIES



SÜMEYRA HAMARAT

MAY, 2022

HUMAN ACTION IN GREEK TRAGEDIES

BY

SÜMEYRA HAMARAT

MA THESIS

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

MAY, 2022

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: 12.06.2022

Name/Surname: Sümeyra HAMARAT

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I try to explain the essence of human action through Greek tragedies. With this attempt, I aim to conduct a discussion by centering on Karl Jaspers's concept of boundary situation and making use of Michael Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope. In the example of Oedipus that I focus on in this study, fate emerges as a boundary situation for Oedipus which he cannot leap over and therefore is doomed to be exposed to. On his way to this fate, Oedipus encounters some thresholds. On the other hand, these thresholds are boundary situations that he cannot easily evade but can somehow leap over them with his skills. When the fate becomes his reality, Oedipus will look back and realize that these thresholds and boundary situations are experiences that serve his fate as a boundary situation. For Oedipus, who is deeply shaken when faced with his fate as a mere failure, a new possibility arises; possible Existenz. In other words, a possibility arises for self-discovery, enlightening his Existenz and gaining self-consciousness. This form of Existenz offers him a new possibility of action; unconditional action. The unconditional action that emerges after Oedipus faces his fate as a boundary situation will be a free action stemming from its own internal determinations, unlike an action that serves his various interests and purposes. Indeed, when he takes unconditional action, Oedipus will have the courage to take responsibility for his own choices and decisions.

Keywords: Karl Jaspers, Michael Bakhtin, Boundary Situation, Threshold Chronotope, Tragedy, Oedipus

ÖZET

İnsan eyleminin neliğini Yunan tragedyaları üzerinden anlamlandırmaya çalıştığım elinizdeki bu tezde Karl Jaspers'in sınır durum kavramını merkeze yerleştirerek ve Michael Bakhtin'in eşik kronotopu kavramından da yararlanarak bir tartışma yürütmeyi amaçlamaktayım. Oedipus örneklemini merkeze yerleştirdiğim bu çalışmada yazgı Oedipus için bir sınır durumu olarak üzerinden atlayamayacağı, bu nedenle maruz kalmaya mahkum olduğu bir deneyimdir. Bu yazgıya hızla giderken Oedipus birtakım eşiklerle karşılaşır. Bu eşikler ise içinden kolaylıkla sıyrılamadığı ancak maharetiyle bir şekilde üzerinden atlayabildiği birer sınır durumudur. Oedipus yazgı kendini gerçekleştirdiği zaman geriye dönüp bakınca bu eşiklerin ve sınır durumlarının, bir sınır durumu olarak yazgısına hizmet eden birer deneyim olduğunu anlayacaktır. Salt bir başarısızlık olarak yazgısıyla yüzleştiği zaman derin bir sarsıntı yaşayan Oedipus için yeni bir imkan doğar; possible Existenz. Diğer bir ifadeyle kendini keşfetme, varoluşunu aydınlatma ve kendilik bilinci kazanması için bir imkan doğar. Bu varoluş biçimi ise ona yeni bir eylem imkanı sunar; unconditional action. Bir sınır durumu olarak yazgısıyla yüzleştikten sonra ortaya çıkan koşulsuz eylem onun çeşitli çıkar ve amaçlarına hizmet eden eylem olmanın aksine kendi içsel belirlenimlerinden kaynaklanan özgür bir eylem olacaktır. Nitekim koşulsuz eylem gerçekleştirdiğinde Oedipus kendi seçim, kararlarının sorumluluğunu almak cesareti gösterecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Karl Jaspers, Michael Bakhtin, Sınır Durum, Eşik Kronotopu, Tragedya, Oedipus.

To my dear dad, Bahattin Hamarat



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express the debt of gratitude I owe to my dear advisor Levent Kavas, who mentored me with his scientific guidance in the preparation of this study. I want to thank my lovely mum, Hakime Hamarat, who supported me unconditionally while working and softened the stress I experienced with her compassion. I want to thank Mücahid Sağman, Sümeyya Sağman, and Tuğba Hamarat, who had inspiring discussions with me because of our close academic interests, for guiding me with their criticism. I owe a debt of gratitude to my pretty nephews Ahya Emin Sağman and Emir Bera Sağman, who gave me peace with their presence and made the process bearable with their colorful plays.

Finally, I would like to express my endless thanks to my dear dad Bahattin Hamarat, who brought me to a deep threshold by leaving this world, the secret subject of my inner transformation, and whose presence I always felt beside me.

İstanbul, 2022

Sümeyyra Hamarat

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. BOUNDARY SITUATIONS IN KARL JASPERS.....	9
1. What is Man?	11
1. a. Man as Dasein.....	12
1. b. Man as Consciousness	14
1. c. Man as Soul (Geist)	15
1. d. Man as Existenz.....	16
1. d. i. world and existenz.	20
1. d. ii. existenz and transcendent being	24
2. Boundary Situations and Enlightenment of Existence.....	27
2. a. Situation Being	27
2. b. From “Situation Being” to “Boundary Situations”.....	28
2. c. Boundary Situations and Existenz	31
2. d. Boundary Situations and Mundane Being.....	35
2. e. Boundary Situation and Transcendence	39
2. f. Human Action in Boundary Situations	43
2. g. Specific Boundary Situations	47
2. g. 1. death.....	48
2. g. 2. suffering	51
2. g. 3. struggle.....	52
2. g. 4. guilt.	54
CHAPTER 3. INTERLUDE	57
CHAPTER 4. TRAGIC ACTION IN GREEK TRAGEDIES.....	67
4. 1. Game of Fortune: Oedipus	72
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION.....	112
REFERENCES	120

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Jaspers puts forward a philosophy of Existenz based on the question of “*what is a man*”. Thinking that “*man is basically more than he can know about himself,*” Jaspers turns to the concept of boundary situation to understand “*what too much is in him.*” A human being who always lives in a situation has the opportunity to move to another state of his own will. But some experiences bring him to the threshold, in the words of Michael Bakhtin. This threshold shows parallelism with Jaspers' concept of the boundary situation. It is the moment when a deep split is experienced, moments of crisis are encountered, and defeats and renewals are taken place. These boundary situations are experiences in which a person is shaken to the core, exposed as if hitting a wall and cannot be easily leaped over. As a result, when boundary situations appear as a horizon that people can never exceed, they drag human being towards a tragic fate. In this thesis, in your hand, I aim to discuss how the tragic characters become tragic, their tragic actions and whether there is a new possibility of action for them by focusing on Oedipus, who is obliged to a tragic fate. To make this framework more understandable, I will continue the discussion by taking Jaspers's concept of boundary situation to the center and making benefit of Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope.

I plan to base the thesis on two main pillars. The first pillar, which I have covered with the title of “*Boundary Situations in Karl Jaspers,*” which focuses entirely on Jaspers' philosophy, will be divided into two passages in itself. The section titled “*What is Man*” will focus on the two dimensions of hu human beings and their relationship to each other. The empirical ego, the first Being dimension is divided into three styles of Being; Dasein, Consciousness, and Geist. (Erdem, 2007, p. 114) These

styles of Being are rationally researchable and objectively debatable. To understand Existenz, the second Being dimension, these Being styles must be known. However, although they can be the object of scientific research, Existenz cannot be the object of such research. (Erdem, 2020, p. 162) According to Jaspers, Existenz is related to the dimension that indicates that the human being has more about himself than he can know. Indeed, Existential enlightenment has a quality that goes completely beyond the boundaries of science and needs a philosophical effort. At this point, the discussion of the essence of human beings gains a new meaning. The second part, titled *“Boundary Situations and Enlightenment of Existence,”* aims to discuss the possibilities that enable Existential enlightenment by placing the concept of boundary situation at the center of the discussion. According to Jaspers, since the main purpose of boundary situations is to awaken Existenz, when Existenz experiences boundary situations, he begins to make sense of himself and realize himself. Such a discovery gives Existenz the possibility to notice its own value. Since a life in which Existenz is not awakened is a life without a ground, it is necessary to turn to Existential enlightenment in order not to be without ground. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 132) However, Existenz alone is insufficient; it needs a power that can enlighten itself. The power to enlighten Existenz will only be the Transcendent Being, at the source of everything. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) To reach the Transcendence, Existenz needs to know how to read boundary situations. In this part of the thesis, I will touch on some boundary situations that enable Existenz to awaken; death, suffering, struggle, and guilt. Indeed, Jaspers thinks that human being life is filled with failures. According to him, human being is destined to die, suffer and struggle. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 52) It lives on under the yoke of fortune. He is dragged towards guilt he can never save himself from. (Jaspers, 1997, pp. 52–53) As a boundary situation, death, suffering, struggle, and guilt lead to a

deep failure, a fundamental shaking in human being life. However, such a failure does not have a negative function in human being life; on the contrary, it has a positive function in terms of awakening Existenz. Indeed, Existenz begins to discover himself by experiencing boundary situations. This discovery also offers people the possibility to perform an action arising from their own essence within the framework of their own choices and decisions.

Before moving on to the second pillar of the thesis, I believe that it would be beneficial to create an intermediate chapter that will connect these two foundation pillars. Indeed, this chapter aims to open the door to being able to read Jaspers's concept of the boundary situation in relation to the tragedy texts. For this purpose, Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of chronotope, especially the chronotope of threshold, will serve to make the frame more understandable. The concept of chronotope, created by Bakhtin by combining the Greek words *Chronos* (time) and *topos* (space), points to the close relationship of time and space with each other in fictional texts. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 84) For Bakhtin, the importance of this concept, which carries a load of emotion and value, is that it is the place where the main narrative knots are connected and united in the novel. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 250) The threshold chronotope, on the other hand, is the chronotope of breaks, shakes, and splits in human being life. According to Bakhtin, who meticulously focuses on Dostoevsky's novels, spaces such as up, down, the stairway, the threshold, the lobby, and stairway landing are places where radical changes and crises are experienced, where the person is defeated, renewed, and the reversal takes place. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 169) In such spaces, time flows completely outside of biographical time; the intrinsic significance of a single moment for the hero's actions can be equal to a billion years. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 149) As a result, Dostoevsky's heroes are heroes who live on the threshold of deep splits and reversals. The boundary

experience, which Bakhtin refers to as the threshold, turns into a tragic experience when it appears in Jaspers as a horizon that the hero can never exceed. The hero's actions in such a boundary turn into tragic action. Therefore, reading Jaspers's concept of boundary situation in tragedy texts with the help of Bakhtin's threshold chronotope will enable us to make sense of what the tragic action is.

The chapter titled “*Tragic Action in Greek Tragedies*,” which is the second pillar of the thesis, aims to discuss the nature of tragic action in Greek tragedy by focusing on the example of Oedipus. It will continue this discussion by centered on Jaspers's concept of boundary situation and by making use of Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope. The tragedy is a dramatic tension in which the hero gets stuck as a result of the personal choices he has made intentionally or unknowingly. (Eksen, 2003, p. 15) Indeed, according to Jaspers, tragedy is that the hero has no way out of the situation he experiences; he is experiencing a deep failure at the boundary. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 30) The tragic action that emerges from such an experience helps the hero reveal his unexplored nature. Therefore, the tragic failure of the hero, who is exposed to the boundary situation, helps to make visible his true nature, his Existenz, as Jaspers put it. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 41)

In the “*Game of Fortune: Oedipus*” passage, which is the only subtitle of the second pillar of the thesis, I will divide the tragic story of Oedipus into five episodes and try to discuss it within the framework of the questions below. While conducting this discussion, I will also touch on tragic characters such as Antigone, Creon, and Medea to make the framework more understandable.

While discussing each of the five separate episodes, I will try to find answers to the following questions cyclically. Firstly, I will touch on the issue of each episode. By

pointing out that these episodes contain some tragic factors, I will try to trace what these tragic factors are. Secondly, I will try to understand how these tragic factors relate to Jaspers's concept of the boundary situation. Finally, I will investigate the relation of the tragic factor in each episode to the threshold chronotope in terms of it that relates to the concept of the boundary situation. While conducting this discussion, it would be appropriate to mention some concepts to make the text more understandable. These concepts, which I have set place in each episode, will also essentially contribute to the discussion in other episodes throughout the entire chapter.

Before moving on to each episode, it's worth mentioning; fate as a boundary situation is at the center of this chapter. While Oedipus is rapidly drifting towards this fate, the thresholds he encounters are also boundary situations that serve fate as a boundary situation. When the knot is untied, and fate becomes reality, Oedipus will look back and realize that all these thresholds and boundary situations drag him to fate as a boundary situation. As a result, while Oedipus is going to his tragic end, all threshold experiences and boundary situations that he encounters will appear as experiences that he somehow leaped over and continued on his way, although he has difficulty in leaping over them. However, fate as a boundary situation is a horizon that he can never exceed, that he has to submit to desperately. It will also be this experience that makes Oedipus tragic.

The first episode, starting from the tragic error of Laios that caused him to live through the tragic prophecy, aims to mention his effort to get rid of his son Oedipus with his wife Iokaste after hearing about the prophecy and Oedipus's holding on to life by reason of his fate. In this episode that a cyclical discussion will be conducted within the framework of the above questions; the concepts that will help the discussion will be as follows; *phronêsis* (wisdom) and *Moirai* (fate). Legend has it that Laios hearing the

prophecy as a result of his tragic error is a boundary situation, as Jaspers put it, a moment of crisis. His later planting that bitter seed in his wife's field deepens this crisis even more. It is a return of fortune; he is dragged from happiness to destruction. It is this experience that also makes him tragic. In Bakhtin's words, Laios comes to a threshold and wants to leap over that threshold. For this, he must choose between two sharp choices; Either he will kill his son and thus escape the prophecy, or he will wait for the prophecy to become reality. He is dragged towards a deeper disaster, in other words, the prophecy, by also dragging the Laios family, who prefers to eliminate his son.

The second episode will mention that Oedipus, who grew up with the king and queen of Corinth, as a result of hearing that they were not his birth mum-dad, went to the Delphi temple and heard the first prophecy, and as a result, he left the city to escape the prophecy. In this framework, the concepts that will be helpful while conducting the discussion are these; will, choice, decision, "*gnôthi seauton*," and ananke (necessity). Legend has it that when Oedipus, who goes to the Delphi temple, hears the first prophecy, that is when he first faces his fate that he would kill his father and marry his mother, he comes to a threshold like his father, Laios, and experiences the moment of crisis. He hits his fate like hitting a wall. Faced with a boundary situation that he cannot struggle with, Oedipus is a tragic character who wants to escape this fate. While his father Laios is exposed to the boundary situation as a price for his own action, Oedipus is a tragic character whose fate was determined before he was born, as he is a member of a cursed family. Miserable Oedipus, who is not fully aware of what will happen to him, somehow exceeds the threshold he came to by leaving the city where he grew up. However, this time, fate will not stop following this tragic human being behind. In this

episode, his own contribution to the tragic fate of Oedipus, who is running towards his fate, will also be discussed.

The third episode will talk about the process until Oedipus, who left the city where he grew up, met his father Laios on his way to Thebes, killed him as a result of a conflict, and then until all the gates of the city were opened in front of him until the end by answering the riddle of Spinks, who was haunting Thebes. The concepts that will contribute to the discussion in this episode are road and encounter chronotopes, *tuchê* (fortune), *hamartia* (tragic error), and riddle. According to the legend, the intersection where father and son encounter is essentially a space where the fates of both are intertwined. For Oedipus, this becomes a new boundary experience; he comes to a threshold. Moreover, at this threshold, the first section of fate becomes reality; the son has killed the father. Oedipus moves completely out of biographical time in this space. His fate which he cannot rescue himself from under the yoke of fortune, draws him in. However, Oedipus internally adopts this fate so much that it is like he is doing all his actions willingly. While this tragic character living on the boundary continues on his way, unaware that he is a father murderer, he comes to a threshold again when he encounters Spinks. However, he leaps over this threshold with his own intelligence and opens the doors of the city of Thebes to the end.

The fourth episode will mention to Oedipus, who becomes king of Thebes and marries his mother, rushes toward fate as a result of his blinding hubris while trying to save the city from the plague epidemic that plagued the city. This hubris captures him so much that he does not believe even though the prophet Teiresias tells all the truth, but the messenger from Corinth helps him understand the truth without realizing it, and Oedipus now faces his fate. Unable to withstand this violent fate, his mother kills herself while Oedipus blinds his eyes. Concepts that will help to discuss the episode

will be; concepts of hybris (hubris), miasma (dirt), peripeteia (reversal), and anagnorisis (recognition). According to the legend, in this episode, the whole curtain is opened, the knot is untied, and fate becomes reality. Oedipus sowed suffering seeds in his mother's field and killed his father. When Oedipus, who is confronted with this suffering truth of the prophecy, realizes that the city's miasma is himself, this time, the threshold he has come to becomes unexceedable for him. He faces his fate as a boundary situation. His tragic disaster is so heavy that it is out of the question for him to leap over it. His fate is a boundary situation for Oedipus and shatters his identity. His tragic fate makes him a hunter that hunts himself. This tragic hunter, who realizes himself when he achieves his hunt, tries to cope with this boundary experience only by gouging his eyes.

The last episode of this chapter tells about Oedipus who gouged out his eyes, arriving at a holy place in Colonus in the territory of Athens, with his daughter Antigone, accepting him as a guest by King Theseus, who is the owner of this land and happening his holy death. The concepts that I will mention in this episode will be as follows; Existenz, possible action, responsibility, freedom, choice, and decision. Legend has it that the suffering death of his wife/mother and the cold face of fate encounter Oedipus an absolute failure. However, according to Jaspers, this absolute failure contains within itself possible Existenz. In other words, this boundary experience that he will never be able to exceed offers Oedipus the possibility to discover himself and enlighten his Existenz. For this reason, his tragic fate is not considered negative in terms of transforming Oedipus. Indeed, Oedipus experiences a deep transformation on this journey with his daughter. Realizing his tragic errors and submitting to Apollo's fate, this tragic human being is rewarded with a holy death at the end of his work *Oedipus at Colonus*.

CHAPTER 2. BOUNDARY SITUATIONS IN KARL JASPERS

What is man? The answer to this question is quite complicated. But, there is a question as much complicated as this answer: "*Can man be fully apprehended in that which is knowable concerning him?*" (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63) Karl Jaspers presents a philosophy of existence based on this question. Actually, the philosophy of existence is the philosophy of having a grasp of the area that contains the unity of human being and above the information by making use of all the real information. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 8)

Human being lives in the cosmos. He asks questions against the cosmos and looks for the solutions to these questions in himself. The main purpose of his questions understand human being and find the place of himself in the cosmos. But, to understand as a whole the cosmos and human being is impossible. Hence, the important thing is to research the problem of becoming before Being itself. Because human being firstly wants to understand his own becoming. In this way, human being confronts with the question of Existenz. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 8)

Jaspers says that "*man is fundamentally more than he can know about himself.*" (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63) The expression of "more" mentioned in here actually refers to Existenz. Because Existenz is beyond knowable. Then, what is¹ Existenz? (Erdem, 2014, p. 23) According to Heidegger, "Ti Estin" developed by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle is a very difficult question to answer. (Heidegger, 1990, p. 15) Because the questioned thing is not an objective thing that we have information about. Accordingly, Existenz is not a notion that we have exact information about. The answer to Existenz's

¹ Greek translation of the question "What's?" is "Ti Estin".

question can never be given with words, but only it can be enlightened. (Erdem, 2014, p. 23)

At the same time, the questioner who asks "what Existenz is" can only be a specific human being. Due to this reason, the problem of Existenz will necessarily turn into the search of the questioner for his own Existenz. The human being who asks this question tries to make sense of Existenz based on his own situation. As Yusuf Örnek clarifies that in the philosophy of Jaspers, the situation means the body of relationships in which everybody necessarily finds themselves. (Örnek, 1983, p. 54) Therefore, human being is always in situations. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178) Situations consist of actions and experiments of human being according to his external conditions. (Erdem, 2014, p. 54) "*Situations exist by changing.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178) I can choose one situation over the other. But, there are also some situations can't change. These are called boundary situations. Existenz becomes reality in these boundary situations. It only emerges in actions. These are situations that bring the human being over to the boundary of a certain event like pain, death, or war (Jaspers, 1997, p. 9). It is possible for human being to be himself only if he isn't indifferent to the boundary situation. According to Jaspers, "*we become ourselves by entering with open eyes into the boundary situations. We can know them only externally, and their reality can only be felt by Existenz. To experience boundary situations is the same as Existenz.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 179)

In this chapter of the thesis, I will discuss *the notion of boundary situation* of Karl Jaspers with reference to his notions such as *Dasein*, *Existenz*, *transcendence*, *boundary sciences*, *will*, *choice*, *freedom*, *unconditional action* etc.

1. What is Man?

Hans Saner states that the answer to Jaspers' question of "what is man?" can not be given in a single sentence. According to him, the answer to this question must be looked for in all of Jaspers' philosophy. So indeed, while answering the question of "what is man," Jaspers discusses the opportunities of human being in the widest sense. He doesn't limit human being with certain representations. He doesn't speak of man representations, talks about "the way of becoming human". (Erdem, 2007, p. 111) Accordingly, he discusses human being as a dynamic being.

Jaspers mentions two Being dimensions of human being. These are different from each other, but reciprocally interrelated. The first one is "empirical ego." This field can be rationally investigated and objectively discussed. This field has three Being styles: Dasein, Consciousness, and Geist. (Erdem, 2007, p. 114) Karl Jaspers says that these Being styles have to be known so that Existenz, the second Being dimension of human being, is understood. These can be a research object of sciences, but Existenz can't be a research object. (Erdem, 2020, p. 162)

Jaspers explain this situation in his book called *Way to Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy*:

The truth is that man is accessible to himself in two ways: as object of inquiry, and as existence endowed with a freedom that is inaccessible to inquiry. In the one case man is conceived as object, in the other as the nonobject which man is and of which he becomes aware when he achieves authentic awareness of himself. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63)

1. a. Man as Dasein

As Haluk Erdem states, Karl Jaspers uses the notion of Dasein in a wide sense. In his philosophy, all of the beings that belong to the World are called as Mundane beings (Weltdasein). But I will mention only human being that is investigated by sciences like biology, psychology, and anthropology here. (Erdem, 2020, p. 162)

According to Jaspers, human being firstly exists as Dasein, that is to say, as being-in-the-World. This Being style, the research object of biology, lies at the root of other Being styles and constitutes the area of bodily life. It splits up two as body and soul and has biological boundaries. (Erdem, 2014, p. 25) In addition to this, it struggles to survive. According to Jaspers, this Being style is a natural unconcern and a rude instinctuality. (Erdem, 2014, p. 26) *“In natural unconcern, I don't ask about myself,”* *“I am living with a naive sense of existence.”* (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25) For this reason, I don't have selfhood consciousness, and I am not aware of opportunities of my consciousness. I live within the comfort of the world without having any doubt. This Being style resembles childhood. (Erdem, 2014, p. 26) Jaspers clarifies this resemblance with these expressions:

I was unconcerned as a child-which does not mean that my self was in balance. I was only dimly self-aware, unable to find myself, and thus a creature of moods. When I was mixed up, it was my parents who straightened me out, not I. I was living with a naive sense of existence, a possible I but not yet a decided one, a creature that says "I," though not yet one that will reflect upon itself. I knew fear, and for moments I would be at my wits' end, but I did not know despair. Moved by impulses, I was oblivious from one mood to the next. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25)

In Jaspers' philosophy, Dasein is an objective Being affected by external conditions. Its essence is connected with the biological construction of human being. But, as regards Heidegger, the essence of Dasein is in its Existenz. (Heidegger, 2009, p. 15)

Jaspers says that human being as Dasein can be a research object in terms of sciences. That's why he expresses that human being has been understood in many different ways, such as "zoon logon echon," "zoon politikon," "homo faber," "homo laborans," or "homo economicus" up until now. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 60) Human being is apprehended in race theories as a special kind, in Psychoanalysis as an unconscious being and in Marxism as a producing being thanks to his labour and so, as a dominant being in the society thank to his production. (Erdem, 2003, p. 174) With the result that this apprehension states that *man as an empirical existent in the world is a knowable object*. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 65) But these indicate just a part of human being, not his whole. Jaspers explains this with these expressions in his book called "Way to Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy":

Yet all such departments of knowledge apprehend something about man, some process which actually takes place, but never man as a whole. When these methods of inquiry lay claim to absolute knowledge of the whole man and this they have all done they lose sight of the real man and go far toward extinguishing their proponents' consciousness of man and even their own humanity, the humanity which is freedom and relation to God. (Jaspers, 1964, pp. 65–66)

With the result that, the answer of sciences to the question of "What is man?" is insufficient from the point of Karl Jaspers. That's why it is necessary to be researched the nature of human being from different perspectives.

1. b. Man as Consciousness

Consciousness, another Being style of human being, is a characteristic that just belongs to human being. Consciousness actually means becoming subjective. All objective beings are only understood thanks to it. (Erdem, 2014, p. 28)

According to Jaspers, basically, *"objective being and subjective being are the two modes that strike us."* Objects include beings that can't be subject as well as people who are subject to their own lives. That is to say, while human being can be an object for anybody, he is at the same time a subject of his own life. Consequently, *"there remains a point where the objective and subjective I are one."* (Jaspers, 1969, p. 47) human being is only conscious of his own existence by way of relating with an objective being. While he investigates himself by way of relating with the world, he at the same time investigates the world that he lives in there. (Sarp, 2010, p. 9)

Karl Jaspers correspondingly says these in his book called "Philosophy is For Everyman; A Short Course in Philosophical Thinking":

We are conscious of ourselves only if we are at the same time oriented to objects. There is no ego without an object, and no object without an ego. In other words: no object without subject, no subject without object. (Jaspers, 1967, p. 23)

Consciousness has the same construction with the other egos. It recognizes and knows the objective beings. It is joint and universal for everybody. So, we are general consciousness that is the same for everybody. Thanks to the general conscious, we can go towards the objective beings. This existence style contains abstract thought, objectivity, universal judgment, and scientific knowledge. We can't think without general consciousness. (Erdem, 2020, p. 163) In conclusion, general consciousness makes everything that is the subject of knowledge the object. In this way, the subject that makes sense of the objects emerges. (Erdem, 2014, p. 30)

Jaspers is of the opinion that general consciousness is a "possibility of thinking." When this thinking that exists in everybody by necessity objectifies itself, Dasein, that is unconcern to everything and to doubt nothing starts to wake up from the dead sleep. As Erdem states that the only way to get rid of Dasein asks a question. (Erdem, 2014, p. 29) Because, in the situation of Dasein, human being doesn't ask about himself. He tries to understand the world without thinking about it. Whenever human being understands that he can ask, he starts to awaken from the state of the unconcern (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25) and becomes a researching Being. In this way, the world gradually becomes a research object for him. (Erdem, 2014, p. 29)

1. c. Man as Soul (Geist)

After Jaspers mentions two Being styles of human being, he also mentions soul, the third Being style of him. According to him, we would be mistaken to say that human being is only composed of Dasein and consciousness. He has, at the same time, a soul. After Jaspers asks "what is man," he answers like this: "*Physiology studies him as body, psychology as soul, sociology as a social being.*" (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63) After, he writes the following about this Being style: "*man is never a merely formal intellectual self,*

nor is he ever mere vital existence. What he carries is either preserved in primitive communal obscurity or realized in a spiritual entirety which he becomes aware of but can never adequately know.” (Jaspers, 1970, p. 49)

Jaspers terms “entirety” as “idea.” It is impossible to know idea as a whole as is seen from the words like human being and world about which, no matter how much we investigate. human being who is a carrier of ideas researches and creates a semantic world. Therefore, human being as soul makes sense of ideas. human being lives by participating in ideas by the way of his thoughts and actions. Thus, he can act according to important ideas such as favour and justice. Hence, ideas direct human being to positive actions. (Erdem, 2020, p. 164)

1. d. Man as Existenz

The researches we have done by way of different sciences related to the question of "What is man" thus far clarify human Being only as Dasein, as consciousness, and as soul. This boundary that sciences set to human being actually exhibits the sciences' own boundary. Especially psychology and sociology that Karl Jaspers is called "boundary sciences," show clearly their own boundaries. (Örnek, 1983, p. 56) With the result that these are not enough to apprehend human being as a whole. Because human being is always a lot more from these pieces of information. There is at all times an unexplained part of human being. That's unexplained part is Existenz. Existenz that cannot be explained by sciences can be enlightened if and only by philosophy. Philosophy is an activity of a sole human being who developed boundary consciousness. (Örnek, 1983, p. 56) So what does Existenz mean?

Jaspers gets the word of Existenz from Kierkegaard. What he means with this is the essence of human Beings. (Örnek, 1985, p. 179) Jaspers doesn't use Existenz as a concept. According to him, Existenz is "*a sign that points beyond all objectiveness.*" (Jaspers, 1969, p. 66)

In the age we live, we are born into an established system, lead our life in this system and die in there. So, almost everything is predetermined: (Örnek, 1985, p. 179) How we will lead a life, how we will have a job or to whom we will get married... But people aren't mostly aware of this situation. (Örnek, 1985, p. 180) Jaspers explains this manner of life which he is called natural unconcern this way: "*In natural unconcern, I don't ask about myself. I accomplish the ends that are closest to me, and I think about my tasks. I say "I," but it does not trouble me in what sense I am.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25) According to Jaspers, generally modern human being unconsciously consumes his life like this. human being who leads this kind of unquestioned life is called mass person. The main characteristic of mass person is that he isn't aware of his own Existenz as Jaspers states above. For this reason, the mass person that is meant here isn't ignorant, uncultured people. On the contrary, knowledgeable, cultured people can also be mass person. (Örnek, 1985, p. 180)

But, human being can awaken from this unconcern one day and ask "who I am." In this questioning, he is not only curious, but also he is involved. What awakens him is a jolt in the situation he lives in. It can shock him in his roots. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25) In this way, human being can start to face the questions that he never asked before: "Why do I lead this kind of life, not another kind? What is the meaning of the life I live? Am I really determinative when making a decision? These questions about actual Existenz of human being can't belong to an objective debate. It is a possibility that only a person can realize. The name of this possibility is Existenz. (Örnek, 1985, p. 180) The

aim of philosophy is to think one's own Existenz and enlighten one's Existenz. Existenz is the yardstick of all existential philosophies and the starting point of philosophizing activity. (Erdem, 2014, p. 34)

Philosophy of Existenz benefits from all of the objective information, but goes beyond it. Human being wants to be himself thanks to this thinking. It does not know objects, but it only enlightens and affects the Being of the person who engages in this kind of thinking activity. It makes possible freedom of the thinker by suspending the knowledge of the world. His arbitrary act provides to confirm Transcendent Being(Aşkın Varlık). (Erdem, 2014, p. 34)

Jaspers says that the first person to use the term of philosophy of Existenz was Fritz Heinemann in his book "New Ways of Philosophy," published in 1929. Jaspers, who is troubled with the term of existentialism being used as a catch-word opposes being attributed different meanings to this word. (Jaspers, 1971a, p. 95). Existenz is Existenz in case of possibility in his own philosophy. In other words, Existenz is not, but can be and ought to be. Hence, Existenz is a possibility waiting to realize itself. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 3) He explains possible Existenz more clearly by this means:

This being is myself as Existenz. I am Existenz if I do not become an object for myself. In Existenz I know, without being able to see it, that what I call my "self" is independent. The possibility of Existenz is what I live by; it is only in its realization that I am myself. Attempts to comprehend it make it vanish, for it is not a psychological subject. I feel more deeply rooted in its possibility than in my self-objectifying grasp of my nature and my character. Existenz appears to itself as Dasein, in the polarity of subjectivity and objectivity; but it is not the appearance of an object given anywhere or uncoverable as underlying any

reflection. It is phenomenal only for itself and for other Existenz. (Jaspers, 1970, pp. 3–4)

According to him, Dasein isn't Existenz, but human being is a possible Existenz in Dasein. Existenz, in all choice and decision that human being make, as a possibility, *takes a step toward being or away from being, toward nothingness*. Dasein lives and dies, but Existenz never dies and doesn't know death. Even though Dasein exists empirically, Existence exists only as freedom. Dasein is also entirely temporal, but although Existenz is in time, it is more than time. While Dasein is finite, Existenz is infinite. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 4)

As Erdem states that Existenz as a possibility expresses freedom that hasn't yet been realized. Existenz is in absolute historicalness. That is to say, it is in one by one people and it is unrepresentable. It cannot be the subject of universal expressions. It isn't possible to analyze Existenz because it isn't a concept that is stated by categories. Existenz doesn't show itself directly but, can indirectly make feel. So then, how we will speak of Existenz if it cannot be handled as a concept? How will we feel Existenz? (Erdem, 20014, p. 36)

Existenz has a very unique language that Jaspers called "sign" (Signs). These signs that is cannot be explained by sciences are "communication," "selfhood," "freedom," "boundary situations," "unconditional action," and "choice." Enlightenment of these means enlightenment of Existenz. Existenz will also become more understandable when compared to the being called "World being" (Weltsein) in other words, "Mundane being" (Weltdasein). (Erdem, 2014, p. 37)

1. d. i. world and existenz.

Jaspers accepts a given external world. There are objective beings that we can get information about in this world. He calls all of the beings that belong to this knowable world as Mundane beings (Welt Dasein). (Erdem, 2020, p. 162) Even though there are these style beings in the external world, the world itself as whole is not an object of knowledge. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 80) On the other hand, information about objects only belongs to appearances, as Kant says. The world cannot be their cause. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 79) Because Jaspers think that *“the world has not ended.”* Hence, *“the world is not explainable starting from itself; but one thing in the world is explained from the other forever.”* (Jaspers, 1964, p. 76) As a result, with respect to Jaspers, the world is not a sum of all beings.

Not reduction of the world to object is a prerequisite to philosophical apperception of being. Because the world has a dimension that transcends the object. Because the world is in an inconsumable depth, it is not suitable certain and objective description. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 77) Jaspers, in the second volume of his study called "Philosophy," says that the expressions called soul(Seele) and God(Gott) in mythological language is equivalent to the expressions called Existenz and Transcendent Being (Aşkın Varlık) in the philosophical language. According to him, these Being forms don't belong to this world. They can't be given the meaning like beings in the knowable world. But, it doesn't mean they are nothing even if they are unknown. They must have different essences. They could be objects of thought, if not of cognition. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 3)

Every world system explains the world with an absolute perspective. The difference from old myths of the scientific worldview that is one of them is that it is a

new myth. (Jaspers, 1964, p.76) Therefore, philosophical ontology has to recognize and involve the scientific worldview. Consequently, "beings in the objective world" are only appearances. They are apprehended by scientific knowledge. However, someone who knows well the boundary of scientific knowledge will feel Existenz exists at the border of all these known. (Erdem, 2014, p. 38)

Jaspers places Mundane beings opposite Existenz. Existenz is not, but can be and ought to be. It is decided in time whether it is in eternity or not. (Erdem, 2014, p. 38)

According to Jaspers, the known world is alien for human being in the beginning. There is a distance between human being and the world. The world is in its own reality without caring for the human being. Human being doesn't feel safe himself in the face of such this world. Because human being doesn't hear a familiar language in this world. No matter how hard he tries to comprehend the world, the more homeless he will feel. Hence, the human being never grasps the world as a whole, he can only comprehend some particles in the world. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 4) But yet human being feels in his home, as long as he knows some particles in the world. The world becomes closer to him. Because the laws of the world are the laws of his own reason. As he expands his cognition of the world, he finds feels that he belongs in it and finds peace. Because now he has found a world to talk with himself. As a result, human being will feel safe himself as he gets to know the world. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 5)

Jaspers says that after human being recognizes the world, he will experience that it is much more than it is known. According to him, the contentment human being experiences after the world comprehends leads to a choice: Either the world will seduce

human being again or human being will transcend the world. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 5) He expresses this situation as follows:

I may crave the world as the font of my joy of living, may be drawn to it and deceived about it by my blind will to live. I can indeed not exist without this craving, but as an absolute impulse it becomes self-destructive; it is against this impulse that my possible Existenz warns me to detach myself from the world lest I become its prey. Or, in the world that is so close to me, so much my kin, I may set out to transcend the world. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 5)

Then, such a world never be the world that we know. It will change according to times and people. Neither it says the same things to all people, nor it says the same things at all times. If human being turns his back on such this world, he can't transcend the world that is an object of sciences. Because it is not imperative for human being to transcend the world. Transcending the world is only possible with freedom. Freedom exists as a possibility in human being. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 5)

Possible Existenz cuts loose from the world to realize itself. But its grasp of the world will give it more than the world can be. World and Existenz can neither separate from each other nor become one. There is tension between them. This tension is necessary according to Jaspers. Because possible Existenz can philosophize thanks to this tension. *"The world, as what can be known, and Existenz, as that must be elucidated, are dialectically distinguished and then reconsidered as one."* (Jaspers, 1970, s. 5)

The incomprehensible and nonobjective nature of Existenz causes suspicion against it, and this leads to unsatisfaction. As a matter of fact that there is no way to annihilate doubt about Existenz. It can be denied just as any philosophical thought can

be denied. Because it is inaccessible to one who discusses it in terms of the purely objective intellect. Yet this doubt can differently transcend because it is possible to *get beyond the bounds of objective knowability with a leap that exceeds the capacity of rational insight*. Philosophizing begins and finishes at the point after this leap. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 6) Existenz is the origin of the philosophy of Existenz, not its purpose. What is transcended by philosophizing takes human being to himself. When the origin of the philosophizing is suspected, human being falls into helplessness. That is also the helplessness of human being's self-being. The premise of philosophizing, therefore, must be to grab Existenz. Later, the certainty that is enlightened by philosophizing will appear. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 7)

According to Jaspers, three meanings of Being should be mentioned: objective Being, Existenz, and Transcendent Being. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 10) If it is stated state with the concepts of Blackham, the first is Being-there as an object of empirical world, the second is Being-oneself as apart from objective Being, and the third is Being-in-itself as an ungraspable transcendence. (Blackham, 2005, p. 51) These are three separate borderlines of Being in which human being is. Being firstly is found as objective Being, then is known as Existenz, and reaches Transcendent Being in the end. In terms of Jaspers, philosophy is to transcend. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 14) Transcending happens in three ways: in world orientation, in the enlightenment of Existenz, and in metaphysics. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 15)

As it will be understood from the above-mentioned, the condition for the realization of Existenz is Transcendent Being, in other words, God. Transcendent Being has a large position in Jaspers' philosophy, but I will only mention the relation between Existenz and Transcendent Being in this chapter.

1. d. ii. existenz and transcendent being.

While Jaspers calls Being, which is the source of our being and the limit of our faith, as the Transcendent Being, he terms all of the methods that open the ways to it as metaphysics, too. (Reneaux, 1994, p. 54)

Transcendent Being is God in Jaspers' philosophy. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 71) Reneaux puts more emphasis on transcendence and says as follows: "The God of Jaspers is transcendence" This emphasis, indeed, refers to the difference between the theological conception of God and Jaspers' conception of God. The religion of revelation as a matter of fact has an authority that restricts freedom. If the action of human being is not free and does not originate himself, this action cannot depend on Existenz. (Reneaux, 1994, p. 55) As a result, in the theological conception of God, the faith(*inanç*) is from top to bottom, that is, from God to human being. Whereas in Jaspers' philosophy, God becomes clear as a result of which Existenz reaches transcendence by its free and philosophical effort. Hence, his philosophical faith is from human being to God. (Özer, 2020, pp. 52–53) However, despite all these, the Christian religion also has a positive side because of its being a religion of prayer and its personal orientation towards transcendence. Its dangerous dimension originates that God is approached with a "self" centered mood. (Jaspers, 2001, pp. 40–41) As Blackham states, in addition to these, Jaspers clearly rejects the movements based on matter such as materialism, naturalism. Because these movements not only openly reject transcendence, but they also seek falsehoods instead. Whereas transcendence is a holistic appearance of the world. (Blackham, 2005, p. 67)

According to Jaspers, God is not a topic of knowledge and so cannot be explained necessarily. Because He isn't the subject of sensory perception, He is invisible. He can only be believed. Hence, the faith of God cannot be reached with reference to the world. So what is the source of this belief? The source of this belief is human being's freedom. Because according to Jaspers, human being who comprehends his own freedom definitely reaches to God. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 71) He expresses his idea in this way:

I do not exist alone by myself in my freedom, my own Being is given to me in my freedom. Because I can go out of myself. I cannot place my becoming free under pressure. Indeed, wherever I am by myself, I certainly know that I am not alone by myself in there. The highest freedom knows itself in free time as independent of the world and the deepest dependence to the Transcendent Being." (Jaspers, 1997, p. 71)

If there is a certain connection between the Being of God and freedom, there is also a connection between the negation of God and the negation of freedom. In addition, it is necessary to mention a connection between the claim of freedom without God and the deification of human being. This kind of freedom, according to Jaspers, is the false freedom of arbitrariness. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 45) On the other hand, it prevents human being's freedom to see himself as sufficient in terms of Being. human being may seem powerful, but he is ultimately a rootless being. This situation drives him to despair. Hence, there is no valid base for the self-confidence of human being. For this reason, a real freedom can only be accessed on a real Existenz. Then, God certainly exists in terms of Existenz even if not in terms of knowledge. (Jaspers, 1964, pp. 45–46)

Kolakowski says that the question of "do you believe in God or not" is a wrong question in terms of Jaspers. Therefore, it is an unanswerable question. (Kolakowski,

1999, p. 161) Since God cannot be objectively proved, there is no need to prove Him. According to Jaspers' faith, God a transcendence that leads a secret life without speaking within us but can only be revealed through ciphers (chiffren). Human being is connected with transcendence. Transcendence is not an object. According to Jaspers, it cannot be objectified. (Kolakowski, 1999, p. 162) Existenz and transcendence are two Beings that cannot be separated from each other. These are neither symmetrical realities nor do they correspond to one-to-one. Both are beyond the limits of knowledge. Indeed, Existenz cannot also be objectified. Existenz is not "sosein (as seen), but as it is understood," and even "thing that cannot be otherwise." These expressions are based on the following proposition: I am not Being, I am an Existenz (a possible I)". That is, "I am this for I cannot be otherwise!" Existenz is also connected with me. I become myself when I meet my possible Existenz without restricting myself to my mundane reality. (Kolakowski, 1999, p. 163)

According to Jaspers, "Existenz is with Transcendent Being." (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) Because Transcendent Being must exist for Existenz to be possible. (Erdem, 2014, p. 41) Human being can only grasp the reality of God as Existenz. Existenz also has a purpose, such as reaching God. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 162) At the same time, in terms of Jaspers, since "being human means turning to freedom and God," the ultimate goal of human being is to turn to God. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 66) Otherwise, human being can neither know himself nor be himself. human being only in where he perceives the Transcendent Being exists as Existenz and can say I exist. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 162)

Jaspers thinks that human being is faced with a philosophical choice. According to him, human being has to decide whether the World is everything or not, that is, whether the Transcendent Being exists or not. (Erdem, 2014, p. 41) His answer is as follows: "If the world were a whole, if it were all, there would be no existential possibility but

suicide." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 268) For this reason that the Transcendent Being provides human being a possibility to live in real terms. In addition to this, it is not a correct approach to see the Transcendent Being experienced by Existenz as an objective and dogmatic Being in terms of Jaspers. (Erdem, 2014, p. 41) Because transcendence can be determined by none of the empirical verification and none of the imperative conclusion.

Transcendent Being, which is on the opposite side the world, is Being itself according to Jaspers. Transcendent Being is neither object nor Existenz itself. His place is essentially the boundary human being is in front of when he is himself. Human being cannot feel the Transcendent Being as Dasein or as general consciousness. (Erdem, 2014, p. 42) Because only possible Existenz can ask the question of Transcendent Being and the answer can be understood by it again. (Jaspers, 1971b, p. 14)

2. Boundary Situations and Enlightenment of Existence

2. a. Situation Being

According to Jaspers, situation is not only a reality managed by natural laws; it is also a sense-related reality. It is neither psychological nor physical. But both are included in the situation. He defines situation as; "*It is the concrete reality which means advantage or detriment, opportunity or obstacle, to my existence.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 177) Like many other existentialists, also Jaspers thinks that human being as Dasein always finds himself in situations. Yet, it is difficult for human being to know the situation he is in. He can maybe know it partially and can act in the light of this knowledge, but cannot know completely. (Jaspers, 1970, pp. 177–178) The situations

of human being can be made the research object by the various sciences, but this reality is not an object of one science. Jaspers enumerates various examples for this: While biologists examine methodically situations in the concept of animal environment, economists examine them in terms of supply and demand, or anthropogeographic. Historians examine the effects of their singular emergence either. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 177)

As also I state above, human being as Dasein always is found within situations. He has the capability to change these situations according to his designs and plans. Hence, human being can change from one situation to another thanks to his plans and designs. But he can never go out of situations completely. Because he is a situation Being. Indeed, human being can change a situation thereby understanding and having knowledge about it. As a result of this change, he can place from a situation to another. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178)

2. b. From “Situation Being” to “Boundary Situations”

The concept of "boundary situation" is undoubtedly one of Jaspers' most important concepts. That's why other philosophers and scientists think that even this concept alone is enough to show that Jaspers was a philosopher. (Miron, 2012, p. 141) Although he made the concept of "the boundary situation" the subject of study in the seventh chapter of the second volume of his book called "Philosophy", he also refers to this concept in his book published in 1919, "The Psychology of Worldviews". Hence, this concept also appears us in two different periods of Jaspers that is the medical-psychological period and the philosophical period. In order to be better comprehensible the concept of boundary situation within the framework that I have discussed it, it would

be correct to mention how Jaspers addressed this concept in his philosophical period that is our main focus of interest before mentioning the difference between these two periods.

As a "situation Being", human being doesn't reside in always in situations that he can change through his plans and designs. There are also situations that he cannot change but he has to reside in. Even if the appearance of such situations changes, its dominating power makes its presence felt. They are not surveyable, only can enlighten. In the words of Jaspers, "they are like a wall we run into, a wall on which we founder. We cannot modify them." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178) Jaspers is called these as boundary states and explains it by this means:

I will die sooner or later; I will suffer sooner or later, I will fight sooner or later, I am under the yoke of the random, drifting toward a crime that I cannot get rid of. These situations of our existence I call boundary situation. (Jaspers, 1997, pp. 52–53)

Boundary situation doesn't emerge in the consciousness of Dasein; at the same time, it isn't also the situations of general consciousness. Because knowing consciousness objectifies that situation by acting according to its purpose. Thus, he either avoids it, either ignores it, or forgets about it. According to Jaspers, consciousness is included boundary. It can only approach the source of the situation within its inadequacy by asking questions. As situations belong to consciousness, boundary situations also belong to Existenz. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 179) Hence, experiencing boundary situations, which shakes the foundations of a person's all existence, is not a part of daily life, namely, a part of human being as "situation Being." Even Existenz doesn't continuously experience boundary situations. (Miron, 2012, p. 141)

The notion of boundary situation that Jaspers researches in psychology are basically based on the sense of selfhood observing worldviews in order to reveal human being in his own uniqueness and fullness. (Miron, 2012, p. 142) Human being who observes this infinitely multifarious encounters some special situations. Although these situations may seem to him that can be changed at first, these are beyond all particular situations. These situations that are felt, experienced everywhere at the limit of our Being, Jaspers also calls "boundary situations" in his psychology works. Human being, who exists in a tangible world divided into subject and object, realizes that there was nothing in the world that could not be doubted when he experiences boundary situations. Everything is in flux, relative and split into opposites. Nothing is whole, absolute and essential. (Edwin Latzel, 184) Although boundary situations are unbearable for life and do not appear in full clarity in the process we experience, human being grasps sharpens his awareness of being, as a finite Being when facing boundary situations. Thus, the boundaries of the worldviews become clear to him to enlighten his experience. (Miron, 2012, p. 142) Jaspers discusses some concepts such as suffering, death, chance, and guilt as boundary situations in his psychology works as in his philosophical discussions.

There are, of course, people who lack conscious boundary situations experiences. They live in without question in a traditional world-order. Boundary situations aren't a breakpoint for them. However, for someone who consciously experiences boundary situation, a "vital process" is emerged. The conscious boundary situations initiate a new process in which situations that previously had been covered over with the hard shells of worldviews ensure dissolve. But, because human being cannot live without his shells, one shell is dissolved only to make room for a new one.

Consequently, life includes both a dissolution and a formation of shells. (Latzel, 1957, p. 185)

As I also mentioned above, Jaspers, in the field of psychology, discusses boundary situations and the "vital process" which these situations bring. Thus, he tries to provide the basis for the understanding and classification of spiritual types. (Latzel, 1957, pp. 185–186) On the other hand, In his *Way to Wisdom, An Introduction to Philosophy* (1949), he states the experience of boundary situations, along with wonder and doubt, is the deepest source of philosophy. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 20) In fact, according to him, boundary situations are a deeper source than wonder and doubt. (Latzel, 1957, p. 186) Because philosophizing begins with a jolt and looks for an aim with reference to a disappointment. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 23–24)

According to Ronny Miron, the discussion of boundary situations expands the framework of philosophizing. But, in the explication of selfhood, this expansion is "horizontal", namely, boundary situations broaden Existenz a new horizon to reveal previously hidden aspects of existence from itself. On the other hand, in Jaspers' philosophical discussions, this expansion is "vertical", namely, boundary situations deepen people's ability to experience Existenz and provide to recognize some aspects of it. According to Jaspers such a human being involves the meaning of Existenz. (Miron, 2012, p. 141)

2. c. Boundary Situations and Existenz

According to Jaspers, boundary situations are a reality that belongs to Existenz. Contrary to being made research objects situations that belong to consciousness, boundary situations don't exist for purely intellectual apprehension of consciousness.

(Latzel, 1957, p. 188) In Jaspers' own words "as existence I am in situations; as possible Existenz in existence I am in boundary situations." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 182) Here an absolute limit is drawn to the intellect. In addition to this, boundary situations cannot be considered as a mere subspecies of situations in general. Boundary situations and Existenz that belong to each other go beyond the knowable. (Latzel, 1957, p. 189) Actually "to experience boundary situations is the same as Existenz" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 179). There is certainly no universally valid proof of this proposition, which is completely meaningless to pure reason. For this very reason that boundary situations are not an intellectual concept and do not belong to an objective category, so they cannot be conceptually exhausted. It is a signum, a mere index. It allows me the possibility to be myself and bodes for the depth within me as the potential for "exist." (Latzel, 1957, p. 189)

Existenz can avoid boundary situations by closing its eyes, but in such situations, self-being can take a leap into realizing its authentic being. human being tries to preserve his existence in the world. When faced with border situations, he may try to avoid it, or he may suffer. But eventually, he has to surrender to them. The most meaningful reaction of a person who is faced with boundary situations is not to act according to various calculations or plans. Boundary states are a possibility to transform into the Existenz we potentially are, "by entering into it with open eyes we become ourselves." Otherwise, "the boundary plays its proper role of something immanent which already points to transcendence." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 179) Whereas the realization of Existenz cannot be in immanence. For that, the boundary has to be crossed. When such a transcendence takes place, "situations of existing become situations of Existenz." Such a transformation that takes place at the border means the experiencing of boundary situations. (Erdem, 2014, p. 56)

Jeanne Hersch emphasizes that what Jaspers means by the concept of boundary should be understood well. The boundary he refers to does not mean a temporary boundary or a boundary that can be gone beyond at any time. Since every boundary is for human beings, it is also human being who determines boundary and creates its essence. The boundary cannot be overcome by being defined it. The boundary is for the person trying to overcome it. For these reasons, the boundary does not describe an objective place. Nor is it a static concept. Since the boundary is an obstacle that the subject hits it with, this obstacle bodes for its meaning. The importance of the boundary is right here in terms of Existenz. (Erdem, 2014, p. 56)

Since boundary enlightens transcendent, namely, Existenz, human being cannot experience boundary situations as Dasein or consciousness. Only possible Existenz realizes itself by experiencing boundary situations. (Erdem, 2014, p. 57) Enlightenment of Existenz creates a sensitivity in humans for what is genuine or what is false. Thanks to this sensitivity, human being tends towards a more human being life. (Latzel, 1957, p. 190) Jaspers discusses the leap in which Existenz experiences in boundary situations in three forms.

In boundary situations, when human being doubts his own Being and the world in general, he wants to learn truly what is he by attempting to release himself from all these ties. (Jaspers, 1970, pp. 179–180) The first leap experienced here, "in view of the dubiousness of all things, takes human being from mundane existence to the substantial solitude of universal knowledge." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 181) After making this first leap, human being finds himself still within situations as a possible Existenz related to reality. "His lonely self-being turns into the knowledge which in Existenz opens his mind to boundary situations." For him, no longer, the world is neither only an object of knowledge nor a thing that he will remain indifferent. The world is also a thing that

contains his own shaken self. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 180) Human being as a possible Existenz seizes the objective knowledge about the world and his own Being but is not satisfied with it. Because what authentically concerns him makes its presence felt at the boundaries of what is knowable as an object. In here, being-world and Existenz are separated from each other for human being. Being-world is a knowable area as a specific dimension of being. But Existenz is not a thing that human being escapes by considering. Human being can either be Existenz or not be it. (Latzel, 1957, p. 191)²

The second leap experienced in boundary situations "in view of man's necessary involvement in the world in which he fails, takes him from a contemplation of things to the elucidation of possible Existenz." (Jaspers, 1970, pp. 181–182) But "the leap from the solitude of cognitive self-being to the consciousness of its possible Existenz does not aim at valid knowledge. Its aim is to elucidate the nontransparent boundary situations." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 181) At the same time, "their elucidate contemplation does not yet amount to existential realization." When human being discusses boundary situations, he doesn't do it as Existenz, Existenz is ready to leap but has not leaped yet. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 181) Therefore, at this point, human being has not been himself by philosophizing yet. It is only the third leap in boundary situations that takes him from possible Existenz to real Existenz. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 182) Human being life seems in a completely different way after this leap. He uses the phrase "me myself" in its new

² At this point, there is a "choice" in which the boundary situations are decisive. Man can choose both sides. By choosing not to be an Existenz, he can stay within the boundaries of the objectively knowable world and live in a single realm of being. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of people prefer it. However, choosing to be Existenz is an "action" that requires going beyond boundaries of the knowable area of Being and wants courage. This choice opens important doors for man: "freedom", "responsibility", "transcendence", "God", "being yourself"(kendin olma) ect.

meaning. This leap made human being realize himself and took him to his own reality.
(Jaspers, 1970, p. 181)

According to Jaspers, human being hungers for the world, wants to know and experience it. This impulse pushes him to desire to be whole. This situation "makes man's condition as a possible Existenz paradoxical." Because human being wants the impossible. This want gives him the possible existence that he does not directly want. The desire of Existenz to be whole is also insufficient due to the resistance of the boundary situations. Therefore, the goal always remains too high to be reached, and human being cannot be whole. But he should want to the impossible again and again.
(Latzel, 1957, p. 193)

Consequently, the main function of boundary situations is to awaken possible Existenz. Although the experience of border situations such as war, pain, crime, and death is painful, they don't have a negative function in Jaspers' philosophy. On the contrary, by experiencing boundary situations, Existenz tries to discover its own meaning and make itself real. (Erdem, 2014, p. 57) In addition to this, as human being struggles with boundary situations, he expands his knowledge of them. Thanks to this expansion, he realizes that he cannot deal with boundary situations. (Erdem, 2014, p. 57)

2. d. Boundary Situations and Mundane Being

Jaspers considers the world (Welt) as a field containing objects in itself. He also considers the sum of the beings existing in the world as Mundane beings (Weltdasein). So, Jaspers uses the concept of Dasein in a broader sense here. However, due to the boundary of my research, in this study, when I say human being as Dasein, I will mean

on the human being being considered by various sciences and focus on him. (Erdem, 2014, p. 25)

As the Encompassing Being (*Kuşatan Valık*), the world encompasses human being, it is at the same time a whole that can exist without human beings. However, because human being cannot reach this wholeness, he tries to grasp the world piece by piece through various sciences. As the world exists independently of human beings, even if human being disappears, it does not change. It continues to exist as it is. However, Being of the world is necessary for human being to exist, and any change that will take place in the world directly affects the Being of human being. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 119)

In the world he lives in, the human being primarily continues his Being as Dasein. Sciences, which aim to investigate the world and human beings, view human being as Dasein that lives in constant situations. The situation is a whole of relations in which every single person necessarily finds himself. This whole of relationships is examined by anthropology, physiology, psychology, sociology, and other disciplines with their own methods to better understand human Being. (Örnek, 1983, p. 54) The scientific effort aims to reveal obligatory and generally accepted knowledge as a result of these studies. However, according to Jaspers, these results revealed by the sciences about the world and human beings are not the whole of reality but only a part of it. Because scientific knowledge is not unlimited. Where its boundary is reached, the main reality makes itself felt. Enlightening these boundaries is not something science can do; it is the beginning of philosophy. On the other hand, the purpose of philosophy is not to limit scientific knowledge, but to make the boundaries it reaches knowable. (Örnek, 1983, p. 55)

This kind of Being, which is the research object of various sciences, is a biological mechanism that struggles to survive. He is both powerless and unknowing. Jaspers expresses it like this; “*dasein knows nothing about itself.*” (Çiçek, 2008, p. 131) Human being as Dasein is in “*a natural unconcern*” state. Like he does not ask questions about himself, the main thing he focuses on, is to perform his duties. Since he has no self-consciousness, he does not know what it means even if he says “*I*”. This kind of Being is essentially a childhood state, that is, a mental state that has not found itself. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25) As a result, man's Dasein state is a state of weakness, it is constantly changing, and he has neither the consciousness nor the power to be patient. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 131)

A human being who lives in constant situations and can switch from one situation to another by his own will may one day wake up from the state of this unconcern. It is not just thought that awakens him from the state of this unconcern, it is a jolt that shakes him to the root and that he can never change; in other words, it is his experience of boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 25)

Boundary situations cannot be made an object of research by various sciences like the situations in which human beings are always present. This is a field that transcends the boundaries of science, and a philosophical effort is required. Therefore, human being cannot experience boundary states as Dasein or consciousness. Only possible existence (possible Existenz) realizes itself by experiencing boundary states. (Erdem, 2014, 57) Since the main purpose of boundary situations is to awaken Existenz, Existenz goes to understand and realize itself by experiencing boundary situations. Human being's only salvation is to become conscious of his Existenz. Because everything without Existenz is groundless. Human being must attain this consciousness in order not to be left without a ground. For this reason, it is important for the human

being to know himself, to realize his worth, and therefore to transcend Dasein. (Hasan Çiçek, 132) However, this awakening may not occur in every human being who encounters boundary situations, and he may not exceed his Dasein. Even according to Jaspers, this awakening does not occur in the majority of people. There are two choices for people here: either the human being who experiences the boundary situation takes a step towards self-knowledge and realization, or he gets over the agony of the boundary experience and continues his life from where he left off.

If the human being is open to self-realization while experiencing boundary situations, he falls into an insoluble duality after the leap he experiences in boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 182) Because he is in the world as an Existenz, but he is no longer merely in the world. To appear to have overcome this duality, he may seem to choose one of two sides: either he can step out of the world altogether with an incommunicable, wordless mysticism or plunge altogether into the world with factual positivism. However, it should not be forgotten that the mystic goes on living in this world. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183) Human being's everyday life and "*his mystical being-outside-the-world*" can subsist in parallel but independently. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183) "*Beneath the unconscious contradiction lies the fact, then, that the boundary situation has been covered up.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183) Or the mystic's everyday life may be entwined with his mystical experience, but later this intertwining may "*move into the duality, which in the boundary situation is for Existenz the essence of mundane Being.*" (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183)

As a possible Existenz, human being experiences mystical and positivist moments in life. The tension between these two puts him back into the duality. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183) "*Seeming contradictions coexist in the duality, and if the vigor of the*

contradiction does not weaken either side, it is the truth of Existenz.” (Jaspers, 1970, p. 183)

2. e. Boundary Situation and Transcendence

Jaspers searches for the source of human being outside the world. This idea can be supported by the following couplet of Mevlânâ: *“You are not water, not soil, something else you are.../ Outside of the slime world you are, on the journey you are.”* (Mevlânâ Celâleddîn-i Rûmî, 1964, p.205) Looking for the origin of human being outside of nature and history, Jaspers thinks that human being is always longing for that place. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 58) This field, beyond human being and the world, un-come-at-able by reason and science, is Transcendence, a metaphysical field in Jaspers philosophy. Transcendence refers to God. Metaphysics, on the other hand, is a field that reveals the transcendent and reveals its relationship with Existenz, thus leading us to the transcendent. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 160)

Since Existenz alone is insufficient, power is needed to enlighten it. The human being knows that he is connected with another power because of this insufficiency. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) For this reason, according to Jaspers, Existenz is enlightened with the Transcendent (Aşkın Olan). “beings” who are associated with the Transcendent Being are also free. But these free beings are not true Being, because true Being is Transcendent. Jaspers names the divine for Transcendent. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 161) On the other hand, God is the real form of Being in which human being can completely give himself to Him. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 100) He is an Absolute Being that includes all beings. Jaspers puts it this way: *“The place of the Transcendent Being, or the Transcendent Being himself, is the field of Encompassing Being (Kuşatıcı Varlık)*

that contain every object.” (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) As a result, Existenz is with Transcendent Being (Aşkın Varlık). (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) “*Then what is the Being that stands at the root of everything and from which every object emerges?*” (Jaspers, 1997, p. 59) The answer to this question is the Encompassing Being, namely the Transcendent Being, in Jaspers. He includes every object. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 61) He is also the source of everything. Since, for human being as Existenz, the Transcendent Being is the truth, human being exists thanks to Him. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 161) Because human being did not create himself. He is a being connected with God. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 64) Jaspers says that Transcendent is for Existenz only and Existenz is with Transcendent Being. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 161-162) Thus, he states that human being can grasp the reality of God only as Existenz. In addition, he states the following by underlining that the main goal of human being is to turn to God: “*The humanity is freedom and relation to God.*” (Jaspers, 1964, p. 66)

The source of freedom is God; that is, human being is free because of his relationship with the Transcendent Being, and he is in this world to realize his freedom. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 162) Because, as I mentioned above, human being is not a self-sufficient being. Therefore, he wants to transcend himself, and within his own nothingness, he reaches God, who provides him to permeate himself with the depth of his consciousness. In addition, turning to human being’s God is not an innate state, but is related to freedom. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 65) Existenz knows Transcendent given to itself in freedom. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 162) Actually, the more authentically free human being is, the more certain God is for him. Because where he is free, it is sure that he does not exist by himself. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 65)

Transcendent Being, which is located opposite the world, is Being itself according to Jaspers. Transcendent Being is neither object nor Existenz itself. Its place

is essentially the boundary that he is in front of when human being is himself. Human being cannot feel the Transcendent Being as Dasein or as general consciousness. (Erdem, 2014, p. 42) Because only possible Existenz can ask the question of Transcendent Being and the answer can be understood by it again. (Jaspers, 1971, p. 14)

Through metaphysics, human being can recognize the encompassing Being of the Transcendent. He can know metaphysics through ciphers (Chiffren/Schiffre). (Jaspers, 1997, p. 64) In other words, to know the Transcendent Being, it is necessary to read the ciphers (Schiffrelesen) through metaphysics. Without ciphers, it is not possible to know God. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 171) Ciphers are signs that God created to inform us. Like believing in God is subjective, understanding ciphers have subjective construction. There may be changes in the understanding of ciphers according to human being's grasping power and ability. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 142)

Since ciphers are for Existenz, only Existenz can read ciphers. Philosophy is an essential tool for reading ciphers. By philosophizing, human being can bring into being ciphers and thus express the existential relationship with them. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 172) Other fields such as poetry and art apart from philosophy help to read the ciphers. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 130) But according to Jaspers, the main field that reads ciphers is philosophy. Solving ciphers by philosophical effort ultimately leads human being to God.

Boundary situations belong to Existenz. Jaspers just as treats situations as belonging to immanent consciousness, he takes boundary situations in hand as belonging to Existenz that is transcendent. (Erdem, 2014, p. 55) They are also one of

the most distinctive ciphers of Jaspers' philosophy. For this reason, to reach the Transcendent, Existenz must read boundary situations.

Boundary situations such as death, coincidence, crime, and world insecurity show failure to Jaspers. So what should human being do in the face of this failure? (Jaspers, 1997, p. 54) Boundary situations as a failure are one of the most distinct ciphers for attaining the Transcendent Being. Because human being Existenz is destined to fail. Although a human being is a being trying to reach his goal, cannot reach this goal. This is because he is finite: human being is finite, and God is infinite. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 173) However, Existenz becomes clearer in this failure, and the Transcendent shows itself here. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 260) Since everything that is born is destined to die, everything that is finite will one day disappear and only God will remain. Death as a boundary experience does not create despair and nothingness in Jaspers philosophy. On the contrary, it helps to grasp that human being is limited and finite. Therefore, death is such as to confirm the existence of the infinite. In Jaspers' philosophy, human being can reach God even thereby starting from only the reality of death. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 173)

As a result, Jaspers' philosophy shows that human being can reach Existenz by surpassing Dasein, which is his raw state. Turning to himself, questioning himself and thus "*knowing thyself*," Existenz realizes his insufficiency and turns to the Transcendent Being, the most competent being. Thus, it expresses that human being who is know thyself will also know God.

2. f. Human Action in Boundary Situations

All the changes that happen in the world merely happen. The movement of the stars, the change in animals and plants occur within the unconscious purposefulness of their existence. However, human being is alive that can act alone. Because, in his own action, he knows his will. Therefore, action is an activity that he knows and determines. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 255)

While human being is determining his action, he may pay regard to various purposes, interests, or authorities. Such actions are conditioned actions. Because they make people dependent on others, their purpose of Being, or a certain authority. They always appear before people in a determinism, human being can only hold on to them from the outside. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79) But something else is also present in human being actions. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 256) The source of this is within human being himself. This is what Jaspers calls unconditional action. Hence, unconditional actions come from within the person himself. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79)

According to Jaspers, actions depend on situations. As a human being turns from one situation to another with his will, he determines his action in connection with it. However, it is necessary to be mentioned unconditional action in boundary situations where human being encounters as if hitting a wall. Jaspers expresses this situation as follows: *"The unconditional is concealed, only in the boundary situation, it regulates the way of life by its given judgment without talking."* (Jaspers, 1997, p. 80) According to him, unconditional action appears over time within a fear given by self-distrust in the perception of boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 81) It emerges in love, war, and undertaking high duties. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 76)

Jaspers thinks there is no adequate definition of unconditional action. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 256) For him, unconditional action is merely an appeal, that is, a sign that will not be comprehensible to him unless human being translates it into his own being. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 257) This appeal is to awaken and enlighten Existenz, which is human being's own essential Being. It wants to remind himself of his own possibility. (Çüçen, 2015, p. 178) Thus, it enables him to become conscious of himself. This becoming conscious of himself is revealed only in the unconditional one. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79)

The human being action that results in Existenz's self-realization in the world must be unique in character. (Piecuch, 2019, p. 207) Because unconditional action requires this. This state expresses itself in a conscious decision of Existenz that Existenz refers to Transzendenz. (Piecuch, 2019, p. 208) Thus, *“unconditional action is an expression of selfconscious Existenz doing in phenomenal existence, with reference to its transcendence, what it considers essential for all eternity.”* (Jaspers, 1970, p. 256)

Jaspers equates Existenz with freedom. According to him, the essence of the action originating from Existenz comes from the inside of human being, from what is unconditional within him. Unconditional action is free, unlike conditioned action, which is external, linked to the individual's life goals and interests. By knowing the causes and purposes of human being actions, he acts within what is finite and conditioned. But he lives on something that cannot be objectively explained, that is, what is unconditional. (Piecuch, 2019, p. 208) As a result, unconditionalness arises from freedom. Freedom, too, is not the law of nature, but that which, due to its own transcendent basis, cannot be otherwise. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 80) Here, the impossibility of proving is in question. Because the action arising from existential freedom requires neither mathematical proof nor empirical proof. It belongs to the realm of belief itself.

(Jaspers, 1997, p. 81) "Unconditionality is the timelessness that exists in time."

(Jaspers, 1997, p. 81) Therefore, it is not only temporal, it is also against time.

For a human being to perform an unconditional action, he must know thyself and therefore reach self-consciousness. So how can a human being know thyself? For a human being to know thyself with a consciousness about the essence, he must have decisions and choices arising only from himself. (Blackham, 2005, p. 54) As a matter of fact, freedom in general meaning can make man's own choice without being under any external influence and act accordingly. (Cevizci, 2005, p. 1305) However, a free will must be knowledge-based. Because a self-conscious human being cannot make a choice blindly. He needs to choose within the scope of certain limits. For this, he must lean back against certain values. Hence, there is no random freedom for such a person. The general decisiveness of human being's choice is important in the world for the ascension to transcendence. (Blackham, 2005, p. 55) As Blackham states, "There is no choice without decisiveness, no decision without will, no will without responsibility, no responsibility without Being." (Blackham, 2005, p. 55) This expression shows the choice arising from within the human being himself. When human being chooses without being objectively determined and without escaping responsibility, he breaks the objective decisiveness relating to "being-there" in his consciousness about himself. Thus he creates "an unconditioned I" out of himself. (Blackham, 2005, p. 56)

It is quite essential for a human being to find himself, choose himself and trust himself. But to be able to achieve this, he must be with others. There is no arbitrariness in the choices of a human being who cares about the freedom of others. He makes his choice within a sense of responsibility that prioritizes the freedom of others. (Uybadın, 2014, p. 74)

There is a choice in unconditional action. Human being chooses what he understands as good between good and bad. Jaspers examines good and bad in three steps. First, according to him, bad is human being life that remains within what is conditioned. Such a life is an irregular life that goes by. On the other hand, a good life does not discard the happiness of Existenz. But it is under the condition of the general law of morally right action. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 82) Therefore, in the first step, the relationship between good and bad is moral. The will, obeying the moral law, knows how to dominate the motives. In the second step, the relationship between good and bad is related to actual morals. Here, the accuracy of the item that determines human being action is important. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 83) As in Kant's moral law, an action with a good outcome is bad if it is performed because it provides profits. Therefore, a good action is good because it obeys the moral law. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 82) In the third step, if the will turns badly, it goes towards suffering, barbarism, and destruction. The good, on the other hand, is an unconditional Being. This unconditional Being is love. So here the relation between good and bad is metaphysical; There is in question the structure of the items that direct human being action. There is love opposite to grudge. While love leads human being to Existenz, grudge leads to extinction. While love arises from human being's relationship with Transcendent Being, grudge leads to the dissolution of human being's relationship with Transcendent Being. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 83)

Human being always has the desire to choose and decide. He may choose a life according to his moral duty, or, on the contrary, a life according to his motives. While making his decision, he may turn to grudge or love. human being may not be able to decide between these two and may also be left hanging. However, according to Jaspers, not being able to take a firm stance is bad. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 84) Because “*man awakens*

only when he distinguishes between good and bad. He becomes himself when he decides which way he is going and acts accordingly." (Jaspers, 1964, p. 61)

2. g. Specific Boundary Situations

Human being is always in situations. According to Jaspers, the situation is essentially a frame or playing field in which the subject performs his action. Situations may change as depending on human being will or may not have again once they miss. However, there are situations in itself that cannot be changed, people are exposed to them. For example, human being has in his destiny dying, suffering, struggling. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 52) Under the yoke of coincidence, he is dragged towards a crime he cannot save himself from. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 52–53) These states of human being Existenz are what Jaspers calls boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 53) These situations cannot be known, but they are felt. *"Along with wonder and doubt, awareness of these boundary situations is the most profound source of philosophy."* (Jaspers, 1964, p. 20) Hence, *"the source of philosophy is to be sought in wonder, in doubt, in a sense of forsakenness. In any case it begins with an inner upheaval, which determines its goal."* (Jaspers, 1964, pp. 23–24)

Jaspers sometimes touches on different concepts of boundary situations in his works. In his early works, he dealt with the concepts of "struggle, death, coincidence and, crime" while describing the boundary situation. However, in his later works, he replaced coincidence with the concept of suffering. Thus, suffering appears as a concept of boundary situations.

According to Jaspers, boundary situations are at the same time antinomy. He thinks that every situation has a correspondence. Since these are interconnected, they

cannot be understood without the others. So struggle (Kampf) and “help” (hilfe); “death” (tod) and “life” (leben); “coincidence” (zufall) and “meaning/purpose/relevance” (sinn); It corresponds to “crime” (schuld) and “consciousness of redemption” (entsündigungsbewusstsein). One of them cannot exist without the other. As a result, Jaspers thinks that every boundary situation has an antinomy, and according to him, boundary situations can be known together with their antinomies. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 140)

2. g. 1. death.

Death, according to Jaspers, is a general situation of the world. Besides, it is an absolute personal reality and a private, individual situation. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 143) Jaspers refers to death, which is a reality that everyone will experience, as follows; *“Everything that is born is destined to die... In addition to this, no one doubts that death is inevitable in the end after artificial life extensions that are always further being prolonged.”* (Jaspers, 1995, p. 162)

Jaspers does not treat death, an objective fact of Being, as a boundary situation. For plants and animals, death is an objective fact, but not a boundary situation. However, human being is the only creature that knows that he is going to die. His mortal nature and his thrown into the world become apparent in boundary situations. The important point for the philosophy of existence is not the content of death or how it occurs, but the effect of death on human being life as a boundary situation and how it leads to meaning in his life. In addition, human being does not know when he is going to die. Ignorance about when death will come causes apathy to people about death. But death is in front of everyone and it is impossible to escape from it. He realizes this when the

people he loves die or when he thinks about the fact that he will die one day. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 193) As a result, thinking about the reality of death causes a deep jolting in people, this situation awakens Existenz. Death gives human being himself. Thanks to this, meaning is created in human being life. (Jaspers, 1995 p. 168) If death had not occurred, human being's desire to find himself would have become difficult. Thus, self-transcendence would not occur. According to Bollnow, death is a reality that enlightens the human being at the point of existence, and human being occurs under the threat of death. (Bollnow, 2004, p. 84)

In Jaspers' philosophy, there is no question of being frightened or alarmed by death. If ever there is to be fear, it is "*fear that feel in face of nothingness.*" (Jaspers, 1995, p. 163) But, according to Jaspers, "*nothingness after death is not real nothingness.*" (Jaspers, 1995, p. 163) Therefore, fear of death is improper. Because according to him, there is a future after death, and eternity can be talked about. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 163) Human being must have this consciousness to stand without fear in the face of death. In addition to this, calmness in the face of death occurs only with the awareness that death cannot take anything away from a person. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 169)

Death is not clearly found in human being life, but it creates discomfort and uneasiness by making its presence felt somehow. The thought "I will not be no longer" causes insecurity. This is a fear that makes one feel that their very Being is in danger. (Bollnow, 2004, p. 100) Jaspers calls the fear that a person feels most deeply "*fear of Existenz*" (*Varoluş korkusu*) and distinguishes it from the simple "*fear of Being*" (*Varlık korkusu*). Because the important point in the fear of Existenz is not the loss of the continuity of the Existenz, but the fear of the value of the lost Existenz. (Bollnow, 2004, p. 101)

According to Jaspers, what will enable people to overcome their fear of death is neither religion, a divine belief, nor medical support. Human being can overcome the fear of death only through philosophy. Jaspers puts it this way: *“To philosophize means to learn to die.”* (Jaspers, 1997, p. 78) *“If making philosophy is learning to die, then being able to die is also the condition of real life. Learning to die is the same being able to die.”* (Jaspers, 1997, p. 132) Socrates, who reached what was infallible by living in the enlightenment of his own mind, is a philosopher who has learned to die. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 77) Therefore, he was able to walk on his own path without being uneasy under the influence of anger, enmity, and his rightfulness. He was able to risk death by leaning on his own beliefs and values, not interested in the possibility of escaping conviction. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 78) Similarly, when Seneca Nero wanted to kill him, he did not act inappropriately, did not think of getting himself forgiven, and did not lose his balance. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 78) Thomas Morus is also one of those who choose death with a merely moral understanding due to his devotion to his own belief. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 78) According to Jaspers, these people who know themselves are real pathfinders for all humanity. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 78)

In summary, death always throws people out of the shelter of daily life and shows how unnecessary his plans and programs are. Thanks to death, human being realizes that nothing is permanent. Death grasps life with a feeling of severe restlessness and thus attains freedom in order to fulfill the requirements of human being Existenz. All the excuses that prevent a person from veritably encountering and struggling with his own life collapse in the face of death. (Bollnow, 2004, p. 102) Regarding this situation, Jaspers says: *“A doing that does not lose its value in the face of death means to be done within Existenz.”* (Bollnow, 2004, p. 103) This also shows that death is a final and absolute criterion for Existenz. For this reason, death is an important and decisive issue

for the philosophy of existence. Just as, according to Jaspers, being in a boundary situation and existing are the same thing, existing means to be in the presence of death. (Bollnow, 2004, p. 103)

2. g. 2. suffering.

According to Jaspers, human being life is full of failures and powerlessness. As a boundary situation, suffering indicates failure, too. Suffering is the restriction of Existenz. It is a partial destruction. Although the experiences of suffering vary greatly in degree and type, ultimately all people get their fair share of it. No one can get rid of from suffering completely. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 202) So how can human being help himself in the face of this failure? Here is Jaspers' answer to this:

By looking upon everything that is not within my power as necessary and indifferent to me, but by raising what does depend on me, namely the mode and content of my ideas, to clarity and freedom by thought. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 19)

For Jaspers, suffering as a boundary situation is clarified through philosophy. The source of philosophy is in the face of a being to be amazed, to have a deep doubt, to become aware of suffering and to experience boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 55) human being often avoids from boundary situations in his day-to-day lives, lives with his eyes closed as if they did not exist. If he encounters boundary situations through philosophy, he finds himself. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 20) Philosophy grips him with a jolting that affects him from the root. What starts philosophy is essentially human-specific suffering of Existenz. The distress of obscurity, failure, and inadequacy compels one to philosophize. As a result, philosophy begins with the existing of suffering, when a person begins to journey towards his own Existenz within suffering,

this suffering is alleviated, if not completely eliminated. Although the experiences of suffering in human being life become more bearable with a philosophical effort, very few people prefer to get help from philosophy.

2. g. 3. struggle.

While death and suffering are two boundary situations in which human being is affected without his own action, struggle and guilt become boundary situations only when there is human being action. Therefore, while human being is passive in the experience of death and suffering, he is active in situations of struggle and guilt. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 204)

Struggle as a boundary situation is, according to Jaspers, the basic form of all kinds of Existenz. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 140) Because all people live in struggle. A life without struggle is out of the question. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 204) However, there is no grudge or fight in his understanding of struggle; on the contrary, there is mutual understanding, communication and love. Existenz takes place only in communication. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 212) Existenz is enlightened in love struggle. Such an understanding of struggle fosters unity and reconciliation, not separation and division in society. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 141) For this reason, Jaspers thinks that the struggle within communication is a unique solidarity, and the person gives this struggle for the Existenz of the other as well as himself. For Existenz, this struggle means; an utter candor, the elimination of all kinds of power and superiority, showing themselves of both combatants without reserve and being thrown into question themselves. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 60) For this reason, the struggle in existential communication and the struggle of existing have very different meanings. While tools such as lies, deception, fraud, and creating enemies are used in

the struggle of existing, there is a struggle based on love in which all power superiorities are eliminated and both sides can openly reveal themselves in the struggle in existential communication. (Erdem, 2014, p. 50) For this reason, while human being action is conditional in the struggle of existing, that is, while pursuing some goals and interests, human being action is unconditional in the struggle in existential communication. In other words, it is based on an internal source and a person can perform such an action only by knowing himself.

According to Jaspers, while love is a silent construction in the world, grudge has a destructive effect on Existenz. (Jaspers, 1997, pp. 83–84) According to him, the root of love is not in the world. Hence, love cannot be proved as an objective reality. It is not known whether it exists or not, whether it is a real situation between two people in time and space. However, the power and importance of love is undeniable. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 142) *“In love, man gives up the simple self-argument, gets rid of all kinds of anger, and controls the smugness of being hurtful.”* (Jaspers, 1997, p. 312) Therefore, it is no coincidence that Jaspers places love at the foundation of social relations.

One of the important values of existential communication is equality. Jaspers says that the struggle takes place on equal levels. He expresses this equality thus: "The fight is not waged by Existenz against Existenz; it is a joint fight against oneself and the other, but solely for truth. It can only be waged on a level of complete equality." (Jaspers, 1970, p. 60) Besides, in existential communication, "being thyself" means the same as "being free with someone else". Because freedom depends on communication, an isolated I is not free. Therefore, communication is the basis of freedom. (Erdem, 2014, p. 51)

As a result, the struggle is necessary for human being, and human being must struggle to be sure that he exists. For nothing phenomenal is existentially definitive. In order for human being to exist existentially, he must be in struggle. According to Jaspers, struggle as a boundary situation does not only bring a deep self-awareness but also drives a human being to helpless despair. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 212)

2. g. 4. guilt.

Human being makes choices while doing acts in his life. The choices he makes have to be between diversity and interchangeability on the one hand and the One on the other. The consequence of choosing plenty is that everything becomes nothing. But the consequence of choosing the One is to reject something else, in other words, to betray it. This situation creates a sense of guilt that is objectively inconceivable and incomprehensible to one. Thus, with his actions, human being influences his own Existenz and the Existenz of other people in some way. So this active entrance into life will deprive other people of certain things and will let entanglements sully the soul. When these consequences of his actions start to shock him, human being may choose to do nothing to avoid the feeling of guilt. He may think that by doing nothing, he will not deprive nobody of anything, that he will stay pure and that he will not have to reject no particular one. However, according to Jaspers, inaction itself is also a kind of action. This is action by omission, and this also has consequences. Consistently and absolutely maintained, inaction can lead to devastating consequences. If a person can do something but does not do it, he is guilty of the consequence of his inaction. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 216)

A person experiencing the feeling of guilt in the boundary situation, he will call himself responsible for his act. Because responsibility is a word as to a human being's readiness to take the guilt upon himself. Such a person cannot think of comforting himself by making up various excuses. Because unrealistic excuses are impossible for Existenz in the boundary situation. To be himself, human being must bear the burden of guilt. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 217)

"Existenz is freedom." (Bochenski, 1981, p. 20) Human being becomes aware of his freedom in his existential choice, that is, in the decision to be himself. Besides, if a person knows that he is free, he also knows that he is guilty. Crime is no stranger to freedom. Crime is within freedom itself, due to human being's freedom, there is crime. Because to live, human being has to be active, and the mere reason for guilt is activity. According to Jaspers, inactivity is also a kind of activity. In his choice and activity, human being catches what is One, namely, a possibility. But this possibility that he catches affects the lives of others. human being commits an offense because of the choice he has made with his own Existenz. With this offense he commits, he hinders and even destroys the lives of others. (Bochenski, 1981, p. 21)

Focusing carefully on the concept of guilt, what Jaspers actually wants to do is to show people their guilt and remind them of their responsibilities. Based on such a understanding, he talks about to exist four types of guilt in human being life:

Criminal guilt: Criminal guilt, a crime that can be seen in all societies, results from the violation of unequivocal law. The current authority punishes this crime, which includes illegal acts and infamous crimes. (Jaspers, 2000, p. 25)

Moral guilt: Violation of social rules and principles is considered guilt. It is called moral guilt if a person does not determine his action according to these principles and

does not take his moral responsibility. The conscience of human being, the society, and the current authority punish this crime. (Jaspers, 2000, p. 25)

Metaphysical guilt: Because people are responsible for every wrong and every injustice in the world, they must struggle with it in solidarity. If they do not fulfill their responsibilities, they become guilty. According to Jaspers, people's lack of solidarity with other people is called metaphysical guilt. Such a guilt is punished alone by Transcendent Being, that is, God. (Jaspers, 2000, p. 26) For this reason, all people are responsible in the presence of the Transcendent Being to other people and the world they live in. According to Jaspers, *"if human beings were able to free themselves from metaphysical guilt, they would be angels, and all the other three concepts of guilt would become immaterial."* (Jaspers, 2000, p. 27)

Political guilt: Jaspers sees Napoleon's expression that *"politics is destiny"* as a reality of the technical age. (Jaspers, 1995, p. 69) Politics that regulate the thoughts and behaviors of society is *"the greatest event for people to live together in the world."* (Jaspers, 1995, p. 85) For this reason, Jaspers thinks that politics is too important to be left to politicians alone and tries to awaken political consciousness in the society.

Jaspers explains the where of politics in human being life through two possibilities. In the first possibility, *"the ethos of politics is the principle of a state in which all participate with their consciousness, their knowledge, their opinions, and their wills."* (Jaspers, 2000, p. 29) Such an order provides political freedom in which responsibility is shared by all, duties and opportunities are possible. In the second possibility, there is a political dictatorship in which the majority are alienated from politics and bad rulers rule. Since state power is not felt to be the individual's business, people do not feel the need to share the responsibility. Politically inactive people act in blind obedience. They

think they have an easy conscience because they don't take any political responsibility. (Jaspers, 2000, p. 29) However, according to Jaspers, people's nonfulfilment of their responsibilities comes at a heavy cost. Throughout human being history, societies have been ruled by totalitarian governments and dictatorships because they have not fulfilled their political responsibilities. But in the source of this problem, there are the managed rather than the managers. Because the managed did not question, did not take up their responsibilities, and obeyed blindly. The source of the power of dictatorships is this resistlessness of the people. (Çiçek, 2003, p. 146) Therefore, Jaspers defines people's not doing their part in the political sense as political guilt. In conclusion, according to Jaspers, all problems are human being and political. That human being is not interested in politics means that he is not interested in himself. People who fell into this indifference committed infamous crimes because they did not fulfill their duties in wars.

CHAPTER 3. INTERLUDE

As is also understood from the framework that I tried to build in the above chapter, boundary situations are a reality that human being is exposed to as if he hits a wall and cannot change by his will but has to reside in. According to Jaspers, the fact that he will eventually die or suffer, living under the yoke of the random, drifting toward a crime that he cannot get rid of are boundary situations. (Jaspers, 1997, pp. 52–53) However, these boundary situations that cannot be grasped by pure reason also give human being the possibility to be himself. In other words, it points to the depth within the human being as the potential to "exist". (Latzel, 1957, p. 189) Thus, a new possibility of action arises. This possibility is the possibility of awakening and enlightening the Existenz, which is the real being of human being. Because a human

being performs an action originating from his own essence, he also performs a free action. Choices and decisions have the key importance to the realization of free action.

The next part of my thesis will be the problem of tragic action in Greek tragedy. Tragedy would be broadly defined as a literary genre in which human beings (knowingly or not) are faced with the obligation to choose between some possibilities of action. The actor(fail) who is faced with obligation to choose between possibilities of action is completely in a boundary situations if I were to put it in Jaspers' terms. When he falls into a tragic error (for example, Oedipus) as a result of the choice he will make, this boundary experience becomes much more evident to the actor, and thus he is dragged into a sorry state of affairs. Maybe this situation creates a whole new possibility of action for him.

Relating Jaspers' concept of boundary situations, which appears as a horizon that one cannot exceed, to Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope, is an important point in terms of making sense of the nature of tragic action. Because Bakhtin's threshold chronotope is both in similarity with Jaspers' concept of boundary situations and is a fruitful resource for understanding the essence of tragic action. Thinking about the essence of the tragic act through this dual connection will provide us with a broaden horizon.

Bakhtin borrowed the concept of chronotope, formed by the combination of the Greek words *Chronos* (time) and *topos* (space), from Einstein's Theory of Relativity and used this concept to draw attention to the close relationship between time and space in fictional texts. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 84) However, for Bakhtin, the concept of chronotope does not only mean the coexistence of time and space, but also expresses the emotion-value they carry. He expresses this situation in the following words:

In literature and art itself, temporal and spatial determinations are inseparable from one another, and always colored by emotions and values. Abstract thought can, of course, think time and space as separate entities and conceive them as things apart from the emotions and values that attach to them. But living artistic perception (which also of course involves thought, but not abstract thought) makes no such divisions and permits no such segmentation. It seizes on the chronotope in all its wholeness and fullness. Art and literature are shot through with chronotopic values of varying degree and scope. Each motif, each separate aspect of artistic work bears value. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 243)

So, what is the significance of all these time-spaces in terms of Bakhtin? According to him, the most obvious point showing the significance of time-spaces the meaning they have in terms of narrative. Because they are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel. They are the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied. Therefore, the meaning that shapes the narrative belongs to time-spaces. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 250)

The concept of chronotope makes time palpable and visible. It makes narrative events possible concrete, makes them possible to take on flesh, and thus gain life. So, an event becomes communicable, it turns into information. The person can give precise information about the place and time of the event. As a result, it is the concept of chronotope that provides the ground essential for the showing forth, the representability of events. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 250)

While Bakhtin deals with chronotopes in various motifs, he mentions that each chronotope can include within it an unlimited number of minor chronotopes. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 252) Some of these chronotopes are these; the chronotope of the road, the

chronotope of the drawing room, the chronotope of encounter, the chronotope of threshold... Within the limits of a single work we may notice a number of these different chronotopes and complex interactions among them. Moreover, it is also a common situation for one of these chronotopes to envelope or dominate the others. They can coexist, they can be intertwined. In addition to this, they can replace or oppose one another, contradict one another. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 252) I will focus on the chronotope of threshold, staying within the boundaries drawn by my thesis, instead of mentioning one by one all these chronotopes that Bakhtin has discussed. I will mention on other chronotopes because of regarding to the the chronotope of threshold. In this way, I will not go beyond the main discussion focus of my thesis.

The most fundamental feature of the chonotope of threshold, one of the chronotope highly charged with emotion and value that Bakhtin mentioned, is as the chronotope of crisis and break in human being life. The word "threshold" itself already in everyday usage is connected with the breaking point of the life and the moment of crisis, the decision that changes the life (or the indecisiveness that fails to change the life, the fear to step over the threshold). In Dostoevsky, the chronotopes related to the threshold (the staircase, the front hall, and corridor chronotopes, as well as the chronotopes of the street and square in the open space) are the main points of action. These points are the places. These points are the places where crisis events occur, the falls, resurrections, renewals, decisions that determine the whole life of a human being. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 248) The decision moments of the characters who are on the edge of a threshold are related to the time of enigma and carnival, which are all-inclusive chronotopes. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 249) Bakhtin explains this as follows:

In Dostoevsky these moments of decision become part of the great all-embracing chronotopes of mystery- and carnival-time. These times relate to one

another in Dostoevsky in a highly distinctive way,- they are interwoven with one another much as they had been intermingled for centuries on the public squares of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (and in essence as they had been intermingled on the ancient squares of Greece and Rome, although in somewhat different forms). It is as if Dostoevsky's landscape is animated and illuminated by the ancient public square's spirit of carnival and mystery: in the streets (outside) and in his mass scenes, especially the parlor scenes (inside). (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 249)

In his works, Dostoevsky almost never uses biographical time, he "leaps over" it. It can be said that in the actions of his characters, the inner significance of a moment is equal to a "billion years. Hence, Dostoevsky concentrates at points of crisis that the moment loses its temporal restrictiveness, at turning points and catastrophes. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 149) However, in Tolstoy, time doesn't deviate from biographical time. There is no doubt, in Tolstoy, there are also crises, falls, spiritual renewals and resurrections like in Dostoevsky. But these are not instantaneous and firmly clinging to biographical time. For example, in the novel of *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, Ivan Ilyich's times of crisis and the first formation of awareness spread to all moments of the final stage of his illness and only end with his death. In addition, in the novel of *War and Peace*, Pierre Bezukhov's spiritual resurrections are completely a long and slow resurrection. In the play of *The Power of Darkness*, on the other hand, the renewal and regret of Nikita are less lengthy but still not instantaneous. However, we find in Tolstoy only one exception: in the story of *Master And Man*, at the last moment of his life, Brekhunov experiences a spiritual rebirth without any preparation and completely unexpected. However, Tolstoy does not attribute a fundamental and decisive value to moments in his works.

The word "suddenly" is rarely found in his works. In contrast to Dostoevsky, Tolstoy loves the stretching-out of time. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 249)

In essence, Dostoyevsky, who leaps over the space, concentrates action on only two points; the threshold where crises and turning points emerge (doorways, entrance ways, staircases, corridors, and so forth) and the public square where the catastrophe, the scandal take place, which usually takes place in the dining room. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 149) In the novel of *Crime and Punishment*, spaces such as up, down, the stairway, the threshold, the lobby are important places where crisis, radical change, an unexpected turn of fate takes place, where decisions are made, where the forbidden line is overstepped, where one is renewed or perishes. In his works, the actions occur primarily in these spaces. Except for scandals and scenes of disaster, Dostoevsky hardly ever uses the interior spaces of a house, spaces distant from boundaries, that is, from the threshold, the interior spaces that are considered as public spaces (the drawing room or the hall). He "leaps over" all kinds of spaces that are comfortably habitable, well-arranged, and stable, in other words, everything that is not related to the threshold. The reason for this is that the the lives he describes do not take place in that sort of space. Dostoevsky is not the writer of mansion, house, apartment. Far from the threshold, in comfortably habitable these space live a life in biographical time: they are born, they pass through childhood and youth, they marry, give birth to children, and die. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 169) Contrary to Dostoevsky in Tolstoy, there are mansions where the nobles lived, and a time that flows biographically. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 249)

If we come back to the novel of *Crime and Punishment*, the threshold is the fundamental space of action in the novel. Raskolnikov is a character living on the threshold. His room opens directly onto the landing of the staircase. He never locks his door, even when he goes out. So, his room is unenclosed interior space. In such a space,

it is impossible to be sustained biographical time. Here can be experienced only moments of crisis, can be made ultimate decisions, can be taken place deaths and rebirths. When the visitors ring the doorbell, Raskolnikov experiences terrible moments at the threshold of a murdered pawnbroker inside the house. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 170)

Similarly in the novel of *The Gambler*, the atmosphere of gambling is a space that unexpected and sudden changes of destiny occur and sudden rises and falls take place. The stake is similar to a crisis. One feels himself on the threshold. Since the time of gambling is also a special time, a minute in here should be considered equal to years. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 171)

In addition, Brandist deals with the chronotope of stair in relation to Raskolnikov's position in the plot. Based on Bakhtin's thoughts, he makes the following evaluation; the chronotope of stair is related to the chronotope of threshold but can be treated independently of it.

A crowd appears on the stairway and on the street below while Raskolnikov is at the top of the stairs. This is seen as an image of the carnival king-pretender being decrowned before the ridicule of the crowd. Thus we have a chronotope in which space assumes great significance with up, down, the stairway, the threshold and the landing representing points of crisis and transformation, transcendence leading to death or rebirth. Such 'threshold' scenes are found to be common in Dostoevsky's fictional world and serve as equivalents of the extreme threshold situations in the Socratic dialogue. (Brandist, 2002, pp. 148–149)

The chronotopes of encounter and road which are considered concerning each other in Bakhtin's theory, are noteworthy in that they are related to the threshold

chronotope. In the chronotopes of encounter, the temporal element predominates and it is, too, more intense concerning the load of emotions-values. The chronotope of road, on the other hand, is broader scope, but it has a lower intensity concerning the load of emotions-values. The most important function of the chronotope of road allows of encounters. Because the road is a good place for random encounters. The road unites people who are deeply divided with each other into social, class, religious, national, and other aspects at one spatial and temporal point. So, people who cannot come across each other in daily life can meet on the roads. In these encounters, various contrasts, collisions, moments of crisis, declines, and rises may appear. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 243) People's fates may interweave with one another and they can experience some boundary situations that reduce their mobility. These experiences can bring them to a threshold, and they can need to overcome that threshold.

If we talk about the scenes of scandal and disaster that usually take place in the drawing rooms of the house or in the hall (public square), these scenes are also very important in Dostoevsky's works. Bakhtin exemplifies this situation in this way:

The carnivalized nether world of "Bobok" is internally profoundly resonant with those scenes of scandal and catastrophe that have such crucial significance in almost all of Dostoevsky's works. These scenes, usually taking place in drawing rooms, are of course considerably more complex, more motley, more full of carnivalized contrasts, abrupt mesalliances and eccentricities, fundamental crownings and decrownings... (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 145)

In the novel of *Crime and Punishment*, similarly, there is strikingly carnivalized scene of scandals and decrownings at the funeral feast for Marmeladov. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 146) In all these scenes, everything happens unexpectedly. They are out of place,

incompatible and impermissible considering the “normal” course of life. Here, the grand drawing room is the public square with all the specific logic of carnivalized public-square life. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 146) In addition to this, in Dostoevsky, local images, which are equivalent to the public square of the carnival, are also important. In terms of this, Bakhtin sees Raskolnikov as a contemporary version of a carnival king in the process of being decrowned. The public square has been replaced by the third-class railway cars, streets, taverns, roads, bathhouses, and decks of ships. (Vice, 1997, p. 207)

Dostoevsky's work that has carnival elements, *A Nasty Story* has similarly the scenes of scandal. The hero of the story (one of the three generals) that centers an argument among three generals attends the wedding ceremony of one of his lowliest subordinates to test his liberal-humanistic idea. Due to inexperience of never using alcohol before, he gets thoroughly drunk here. Everything that happens in the story develops in an extreme inappropriateness and scandalous nature. The work is full of sharp carnivalistic contrasts, mesalliances, debasings, and decrownings. The story, which contains a rather cruel moral experimentation is deliberately in a critical boundary under the influence of elements of hidden socio-political and literary polemic. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 155) As a matter of fact, being on the threshold is a critical situation according to Bakhtin, that is, it is a rather determined, sharp, in boundary experience without any ambiguity.

As a result, the boundary expressed as the threshold in terms of Bakhtin turns into a tragic situation when it is defined in Jaspers as a horizon that one can never overcome. Human being who is doomed to the boundary experience that he cannot overcome and lives on the threshold is responsible for giving a decision. It will be this decision that leads him into the tragic experience. In Dostoevsky's novel of *A Nasty Story*, the decision that the general attends the wedding ceremony of one of his lowliest

subordinates causes him to experience a critical boundary, a tragic situation. In the tragedy of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, Oedipus, who was afraid that prophecy he got news would come true, and that therefore decided to leave the land where he grew up is also a character who lives on the threshold. Thus, he goes on a journey towards a destiny that he cannot overcome, but he will see after attempting to overcome what he cannot overcome. The chronotopes of encounter and road deepen the boundary experience that Oedipus lives in this story. Oedipus, who encounters his real father, Laios, on this journey, comes to a threshold and kills by conflicting with him, thus overcomes this threshold. Coming true the first part of his destiny, Oedipus encounters the Sphinx as unaware of what has happened to him, and comes to a new threshold. By giving the correct answer to the difficult riddle of the Sphinx, the gate of the city of Thebes opens in front of him and thus overcoming this threshold. However, because he answers the Sphinx's riddle correctly, he marries his real mother, Iokaste, and thus comes true the second part of his destiny. As a result, Oedipus' destiny realizes itself by following him as a threshold that constantly changes and he cannot overcome. Like other tragic characters, Antigone is also a character who lives on the boundary, namely on the threshold as a result of her decision; either he will bury the dead body of his brother Polynices and thus heed the divine judgment, or he will not be able to bury Polynices's dead body, and thus he will submit the judgment of Creon. Believing that "every dead man has the right to be buried" and thus choosing to bury her brother's body at any cost, Antigone is led into a boundary experience by being in opposition to Creon's power. She is sentenced to death by being locked alive in a blind celler. Here, too, Antigone, who comes to a new threshold, eliminates all possibilities that may happen from now on by hanging herself. Creon, who adopts a worldview that is the exact opposite of Antigone in the tragedy of Sophocles' *Antigone*, is also another tragic character who

lives on the threshold. Creon pays a heavy price for his decision against Antigone's action. Because this decision results not only in the death of Antigone but also in the death of his son Haemon and his wife Eurydice, and two dead people come out of his palace. This boundary experience shows Creon his tragic error, but there is nothing he can do anymore; he cannot bring back neither his wife nor his son. Medea, who got married and has children as a result of her decision in the past, is also another tragic character who is on the threshold due to her deep regret. As a result, she tried to change everything radically with the desire that all these experiences had not happened, and as a result, she killed her children. With her action, Medea attempted to eliminate all possibilities regarding this marriage, and thus she leads into a boundary situation. As it can be noticed in all these tragic works, the characters are led into tragic error by choosing one of the distinct and clear decisions before them. In this respect, tragic experiences that are lived on the thresholds where rather sharp, clear, and certainty dominate in tragic works happen.

In the last part of my thesis, my aim is to reveal the tragic actions of the characters in the works of tragedy in a larger spectrum of the framework of the concept of boundary situation and the chronotope of threshold as Jaspers and Bakhtin mention. In my opinion, tragic action can also offer a new possibility for action to the characters. We can express this possibility as a possible-action.

CHAPTER 4. TRAGIC ACTION IN GREEK TRAGEDIES

As stated in Aristotle's *Poetics*, which is the main nutritional source for research on tragedy, tragedy "imitates actions, life, happiness or destruction, not people." According to him, happiness or destruction is in the action. The end that human being

aims at is not also a state but an action. Therefore, people can turn to happiness or destruction through their actions. Besides, according to him, people do not come into action to imitate the characters. They take on characters as they perform their actions. It is for these reasons that Aristotle thinks that actions are one of the main aims of tragedy, and the main thing is the purpose for him. (Aristotle, 2013, satir 1450a–20)

According to Vernant and Vidal-Naquet, tragedy, within the framework of its own rules and qualities, is an original type of literature that expresses the unknown aspects of human being actions until that time by using a unique form of expression. It also shows a certain stage in the formation of a responsible subject. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 23) Most tragedies present the dramatic tension that the perpetrator gets stuck in as a result of the personal choices he has made knowingly or unknowingly. (Eksen, 2003, p. 15) Indeed, according to Jaspers, absolute and radical tragedy is that the perpetrator has no way out in the face of the experienced situation. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 30) He is exposed to a situation in which he is stuck, and it is a failure for him. While Jaspers names this experience of failure, which the perpetrator cannot escape from, as a boundary situation, Bakhtin considers the crisis experiences of the perpetrator as the threshold chronotope in literary texts. In the last part of my thesis, I will try to present the tragic actions of the characters in Greek tragedy within the framework of Jaspers' concept of boundary situations. In this context, Bakhtin's threshold chronotope is important in terms of making the frame more understandable.

According to Jaspers, the tragic action reveals the relationship of the human being with his unexplored side that exists in the background. It is for this reason that the tragic failure of the person experiencing the boundary situation reveals the true nature of life. This failure is not an experience where the reality of life disappears; on the contrary, an experience where this reality is more visible. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 41)

What human being learns essentially from tragic knowledge is what afflicts him with and what failed him. According to Jaspers, the tragic person who experiences the boundary is in a situation to choose between good and evil. While he realizes himself by turning to the good, he abolishes his own identity by turning to evil. His obstinacy and hubris throw him into the arms of evil, while his patience and courage elevate him to good. The borderline experience of the tragic person enlarges them rather than diminishes them. Indeed, in tragedy, beyond good and evil, there is the greatness of the tragic human being. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 56) Jaspers thinks that Plato's words are also valid for the tragic person:

...shall we not affirm that the best endowed souls become worse than the others under a bad education? Or do you suppose that great crimes and unmixed wickedness spring from a slight nature and not from a vigorous one corrupted by its nurture, while a weak nature will never be the cause of anything great, either for good or evil?" (Plato, y.y., satir 491e) "It is from men of this type (the best endowed souls) that those spring who do the greatest harm to communities and individuals, and the greatest good when the stream chances to be turned into that channel, but a small nature never does anything great to a man or a city. (Plato, y.y., satir 495a)

Tragic people such as Oedipus, Antigone, and Medea have an important distinction at this point from people of weak nature. This greatness of the tragic human being derives mainly from his actions. Indeed, action is a way of manifestation of one's own existence. Human being essentially exists himself with his actions, and it is his actions that make people tragic. In tragedies, there is always a meaningful relationship between human being action and divine power. The heroes, who design life within the framework of their own plans, always get their share of the divine power, which is much

more comprehensive and complex. It is for this reason that these heroes unexpectedly condemned to tragic experiences submit to the divine will. They reach the truth of the divine, not with knowledge but with *tawakkul*. Thus, they sacrifice their will and existence to Gods. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 81) In this respect, the tragic is accompanied by a relentless power; This divine power is called fate. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 92)

Heroes living under the yoke of fate do not only fall into pain, destruction, and misery when they have a tragic experience. This destruction also shatters their souls. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 75) Because tragedy brings people to the threshold of doom. Indeed, the threshold, as Bakhtin understands it, is connected with the breaking point of life, the moment of crisis, a life-changing decision. At the thresholds (doorways, entrances, the staircase, the front hall, corridor, etc.), which are the main action points in Dostoevsky's works, the heroes experience declines, resurrections, and renewals that are decisive in their entire lives. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 248) Dostoevsky "leaps over" spaces unrelated to the threshold in which comfortable lives exist. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 169) In the texts of tragedy, the threshold experience of the heroes, similar to that in Dostoyevsky, coincides with a crisis, a turning point in which there are declines, resurrections, and renewals. Indeed, these texts also leap over lives unrelated to the threshold. According to Jaspers, tragedy brings human being to the brink of doom, and at this threshold the person finds himself transformed. Thus, a tragic hero on the threshold like Cassandra grasps the tragic atmosphere she is in. He establishes a relationship between himself and his fate with the questions he asks about the nature of truth. In such a struggle, he realizes the power that keeps him alive and reveals the meaning of victory-defeat. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 75) In this respect, according to Jaspers, tragedy transcends the boundaries of existence and frees up people. (Jaspers, 1952, pp. 75–76) However, it should be noted that Jaspers does not claim that every person who

has had a tragic experience will transcend their boundaries and become free. Such an experience, so to speak, is one that people with solid nature can dare. In this respect, tragedy will either be an experience in which a person with solid nature becomes free by transforming himself while passing through, or it will be a transition period in which a person with weak nature continues his life as a result of such an experience. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 76)

As a result, according to Jaspers, human being always performs his action with a choice and decision. The person who has had a tragic experience either allows the tragic experience to transform himself or ignores it. But it is certain that tragedy is a necessity that must be gone through it. As a boundary experience, it coincides with the breaking point of the human being. The main function of boundary situations is to awaken Existenz. Although boundary situations such as war, crime, and death are painful experiences for people, they have a positive function in terms of awakening Existenz, in other words, giving people the possibility to know themselves and be themselves. Therefore, Existenz tends towards self-discovery and realization by experiencing boundary situations. (Erdem, 2014, p. 57) Tragedy, which deals with existing reality from enormous perspectives, also suggests the highest human being possibilities: (Jaspers, 1952, p. 27) to enlighten possible Existenz, that is, to enable Existenz to turn towards itself and to know itself. In this respect, the works of tragedy offer the heroes a new possibility for action as a result of their boundary experiences. In the title below, I will try to discuss by centering the tragic experience of Oedipus, for which his fate has turned into a boundary situation, in the framework I mentioned above. While conducting this discussion, it is useful to state that; as a boundary situation, Oedipus, who is speeding towards his fate, encounters many thresholds. These threshold experiences are also one of each boundary situation that serves fate as

the boundary situation I will refer to. However, when fate finally becomes reality, Oedipus will look back and realize that each threshold experience and boundary situation is part of his destiny as a boundary situation that sits at the center of his tragic life. As a result, fate as a boundary situation cannot be an experience that Oedipus can leap over, while each threshold experience is a boundary situation that he can leap over but then realizes that it is a part of fate.

4. 1. Game of Fortune: Oedipus

Watch now, spectator. Before you is a fully wound machine. Slowly its spring will unwind the entire span of a human life. It is one of the most perfect machines devised by infernal gods for the mathematical annihilation of a mortal.” (Cocteau, 1963, p. 6)

These words in Jean Cocteau's modern Oedipus work, *The Infernal Machine*, according to André Bonnard, are also valid for Sophocles' work of *Oedipus Tyrannus*. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 76) Indeed, Sophocles seems to have set the story plot of the work like the establishment of a machine. All people, especially Oedipus, seem to have become a part of unaware of the task assigned to them, without knowing what purpose this ticking time bomb serves. However, they perceive themselves as stand-alone creatures unrelated to this machine. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 76)

Descended from Labdacus, Oedipus is a tragic character whose fate was determined before he was born. Legend has it that his father, Laios, fell in love with Pelops' handsome son, Chrysippus, and tried to seduce him. However, Chrysippus was raped because he was indifferent to Laios and refused his request for sexual intercourse.

Chrysippus, who was devastated by this shame, ended his life. His father Pelops cursed Laios and wished the Labdacus lineage to dry up. (Vernant, 2001, pp. 138–139)

Laios points to an essentially aberration in this story. His action is nothing but a deviation that has crossed its boundaries and transformed the entire family's fate. Indeed, he was attracted to a young human being instead of a woman. Moreover, this interest is one-sided, he engaged in violent sexual intercourse without the consent of the other party. In addition to all these, Laios is the guest of Pelops and sexually abused him in the house where he was a guest. He has also crossed the boundaries of the host-guest relationship. (Vernant, 2001, p. 139) Therefore, Laios' sexual relationship with Chrysippus is a deep error that goes beyond boundaries. So much so that this error determined the fate of the whole family. Indeed, Laios, who became the head of Thebes, marries Jocasta, but they do not have children. He goes to the temple of Delphi to have an heir to succeed him. However, the prophet gives himself that bitter prophecy: *"You will have a son, he will kill you, he will lie with his mother."* It is here that fate first manifests itself as a boundary situation. Shaken by the news he received, Laios is glad that he does not have a child. However, he somehow manages to plant that bitter seed in his wife's field and has a son. What makes Laios tragic is his experience with this prophecy. Thus, the husband and wife skewer the three-day-old baby from its heels and give it to a shepherd to leave him for dead at an unknown mountain, and they think that in this way they escaped the prophecy. However, the shepherd took pity on this poor baby, gave it to a Corinthian shepherd, and asked him to take it far away. The shepherd thinks of the king Polybos, who could not have children, and the queen Periborea. He presents this poor baby as a gift to them. Thus, Oedipus's destiny endows her with life to realize itself. (Sophocles, 1962a, pp. 6–139)

In the legend, Laios is a character who doesn't have common sense, lacks practical wisdom, and cannot be described as *phronimos* in Aristotle's words. Indeed, according to Aristotle, *phronêsis* (saneness) is a kind of *hexis* (disposition) that exists with reason in the face of good and bad things and enables us to direct our actions to the right. (Aristotle, 2009, p. 1140b5) Therefore, *phronêsis* can be described as the wisdom to distinguish between good and bad actions under different conditions and to deal with them, while *phronimos* can be described as a person who can distinguish this good and bad actions. In this respect, *phronêsis* is an indispensable condition for being a good person and achieving *eudaimonia* (happiness). (Eksen, 2003, p. 38) The fact that Laios, who led a life far from such a common sense and therefore *eudaimonia*, somehow succeeded in planting that bitter seed in his wife's field after receiving the news from the prophet, and therefore having a son, this time drags him and his wife Jocasta to a new boundary experience. This boundary experience manifests itself in the choicelessness, which seems like two options; either they will get rid of the poor child as soon as possible or they will wait for the fate to come true. These two unresolved options are the source of the tragic tension, and Laios and Jocasta, who decide on the first option, begin to drift towards their fate.

Tragedy *Antigone* (Sophocles, 1962b) also contains important discussions about the practical reason (*phronêsis*), like *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Indeed, as Serdar Tekin states, the work begins with a crisis, a boundary experience that requires the actions of the heroes, and develops through their way of not seeing and understanding. (Tekin, 2017, p. 95) The end of the piece finishes with the following words of the choir that places *phronêsis*, in the sense of right thinking, at the source of human being happiness;

Of happiness the chiefest part

Is a wise heart

And to defraud the gods in aught

With peril's fraught.

Swelling words of high-flown might

Mightily the gods do smite.

Chastisement for errors past

Wisdom brings to age at last. (Sophocles, 1962b, satir 1350)

Seriously, throughout the work, we witness that the characters criticize each other for not acting prudently. Both Creon and Antigone appear in the work as two characters who know exactly what they are doing and are completely sure of their decisions, although they accuse the other side of lack of common sense. Antigone tells her sister Ismene that she will bury her brother's body even if it costs her life, and she thinks it is an honorable decision. With a similar determination, Creon says that he based his decisions on Polyneices and Eteocles on the most correct principles. It is not seen that both characters exchange their thoughts neither among themselves nor with those around them. What makes their attitudes interesting here for Tekin is that they seem to base their decisions on an obvious truth. (Tekin, 2017, p. 95) While Antigone sees herself as responsible only to the deads, Creon sees herself as responsible only to the city. Despite these differences, both of them are two characters that cannot be called pronimos because they have a hard and reductionist mindset. (Tekin, 2017, p. 103) As a result, the decisions and choices of these two tragic characters, who do not have common sense, lead them to the threshold, and at the end of the work, this threshold turns into a painful boundary situation for both of them.

Bakhtin mentions various spaces while exemplifying the threshold chronotope in Dostoevsky's works; "*The threshold, the lobby, the corridor, the landing, the staircase, the steps of the staircase, the rooms leading to the staircase, the doors to the front and back yards, and beyond them the city: squares, streets, facades of buildings, taverns, gambling dens, bridges, middens.*" (Bakhtin, 2001, p. 303) None of these spaces are unconnected with the threshold; These are the places where moments of crisis, fundamental changes, unexpected transformations of fortune take place, decisions are made, the boundaries of the forbidden are transcended, renewals and resurrections take place. (Bakhtin, 2001, p. 302) The temple of Delphi appears as places where unexpected reversals are announced for other tragic heroes, including Laios, where the hero first encounters the price to be paid due to the violation of the border and therefore experiences moments of crisis, drifts from happiness to destruction, where is shaken, defeated and renewed. After hearing the suffering prophecy in the temple of Delphi from the prophet, the reversal experienced by Laios also takes place from happiness to destruction, and it is this experience that makes it tragic. Laios experiences such a moment of crisis that the threshold he is in turns into a boundary situation for him, and to exceed this boundary situation, he chooses the first of two very sharp and unambiguous options and sacrifices his son. However, fate follows him, and as a result, Laios has to pay the price of his own action by dragging his family along with him in a way he never expected.

Like most tragedy works, it is possible to read *Oedipus Tyrannus* tragedy as a tragedy based on confronting Oedipus with his own fate. However, as Eksen states, in the understanding of fate(Moira) in Ancient Greece, everything is not predetermined like the product of a divine machine. Therefore, this concept does not mean that no action takes place outside a boundary drawn by divine powers. (Eksen, 2003, p. 16-17)

Greek gods are not idealized Gods in the shape of absolute goodness and perfection. Their power is bounded. For example, although they are exempt from aging and death, they are not eternal. Even if people are powerless against them, their power is not enough for everything. It is fate that bounds the powers of the gods. (F. M. Cornford, 1957, p. 12) For this reason, the central position of the gods in Greek tragedies does not indicate the existence of a closed field of values that draws a sharp boundary between good and bad actions. (Eksen, 2003, p. 17) Besides, Moira is a moral command that draws the boundaries of right and wrong. (F. M. Cornford, 1957, p. 13) For this reason, it draws the boundaries of right and wrong action for both gods and human beings. However, as I mentioned before, the concept of Moira should not be confused with the concept of fate in monotheistic religions. Indeed, Moira does not refer to a divine order designed by the conscious decision of the Gods, but rather to an abstract and indefinite order expressed in moral terms. In such a moral plane, it is important that a divine decision network does not constitute the cause of every human being action. (Eksen, 2003, p. 19) Indeed, W. C. Greene expresses this situation in the context of *Prometheus Bound* tragedy:

The fatality to which Zeus is subject is not mere mechanical necessity but is the moral nature which he must in time assume, and which therefore defines his freedom of action. (Greene, 1944, p. 108)

It is necessary to place the tragic story of Oedipus in this context. Indeed, Oedipus could not go beyond his fate, but this fate is not a fate that does not allow him to act. He has gone beyond the boundaries of morality, not fate, as a result of his own decisions and choices. Thus, he has committed a tragic error, and revenge restored the shaky balance. (F. M. Cornford, 1957, p. 14)

When Oedipus, who grew up with the Corinthian king Polybos and the queen Periborea, is a young human being, one of his friends hits him in the face that his father is not his real son. Shaken by the words he heard, Oedipus asks the king and queen this unsettling question, but no explanation made by them is convincing for Oedipus. Unable to bear the fact that his inner doubt is gnawing at him with each passing day, this young human being decides to secretly visit the Delphi temple and consult the prophet. The answer he received confirms the old prophecy. Shaken by this prophecy that he heard for the first time, Oedipus decided not to set foot in Corinth again to escape from his fate and left the city. Unaware of what will happen, he sets off for Thebes. (Sophocles, 1962a, pp. 6–139)

The temple of Delphi, on which the words *gnôthi seauton* (“*know thyself*”) are engraved, can be described as a place where, like his father Laios, Oedipus received the news of his unexpected reversal. It is a space where he experienced the moment of crisis in which he would be dragged from happiness to destruction and faced for the first time his fate that shook him from his roots. As Bakhtin understands it, such a space is directly related to the threshold. Therefore, one of the places that brought Oedipus to the threshold in the plot of the work is the temple of Delphi. The situation that confronts him with the first prophecy is that he did not pay enough care of the question he would ask the prophet. The temple of Delphi has three basic commandments for those who come to consult the prophet, and these commands must be remembered before visiting. Although there are differences in interpretation among various thinkers, Roscher explains these three commandments as follows; The command *mêden agan* (“*not too much*”) orders those who come to counseling to ask useful questions by reducing the questions they want to ask to obligatory ones instead of asking too many questions. *Egguê* (*the pledge*) command, on the other hand, orders those who come to consult the

prophet not to wish for things they cannot fulfill and not to make any commitments regarding these things. The command *gnôthi seauton* (“*know thyself*”) also orders those who come to consult the prophet to ask as few questions as possible, knowing what they need, according to Roscher. Therefore, the person should ask with a small number and information that is suitable for his needs. (Foucault, 2005, pp. 3–4) Oedipus, who could not consult with the prophet about the question “Am I the true son of Polybos and Periborea or not,” which was the main reason for his departure from his city, encounters his fate for the first time as a boundary situation when he encounters the prophecy that he will kill his father and sleep with his mother. He hits this boundary situation, as Jaspers states, like hitting a wall. This boundary experience appeared as a horizon that he could never exceed and turned his life into a tragic experience. Faced with the experience of such a boundary that he could never exceed, Oedipus appears here as a tragic character. He experiences the moment of a deep crisis, lives a turning point in his life, and he is on the threshold between the city he grew up in and the outside. To leap over this threshold, he must decide, that is, he must make a choice. He thinks that if he stays in the city, his fate will come true. Because, according to him, since the people he knows as his parents live in this city, his fate is tied to this city. Escaping from fate means escaping from the city in a way. Therefore, since the city’s boundaries are the boundaries that hold his fate within for Oedipus, it is necessary to go beyond these boundaries. As a result, Oedipus, who is on the threshold between the city and the outside, exceeds this threshold by preferring the outside of the city and sets out for Thebes. Although this threshold between the city and the outside does not appear as a boundary situation for her, when fate becomes reality, there will be an important breaking moment when he will understand that he is a part of it.

To make the choices of Oedipus in the plot more understandable, it would be useful to look at Rivier's critical analyzes, although he dealt with Aeschylus specifically. He thinks that the decisions made by the tragic heroes who come to the threshold are ultimately *ananke* (necessity, obligation) imposed by the gods. For this reason, the choices, actions, responsibilities, and freedoms of the heroes cannot be considered without relation to *ananke*. Indeed, for Rivier, the approach that "the decisions of the heroes are entirely their responsibility" means that the ultimate role of superhuman powers that brings the tragic dimension to the tragedy texts has been obscured. However, divine powers are not only found outside the heroes but also play a central role in their own choices. Therefore, there is a divine *ananke* in their decisions. Although there is no word corresponding to the word *will* in Archaic and Classical Greek, if we talk about a *will* in tragic heroes, it will not be an autonomous *will* in the modern sense, but a *will* based on the fear brought about by the respect for the divine. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 52)

The double motivation theory proposed by Lesky to this critical discussion of Rivier is quite meaningful in terms of the framework of my thesis. Indeed, according to this theory, what explains the hero's action can sometimes be interpreted as the result of a divine impulse and sometimes as a result of a purely human being impulse. Both interpretations are so intertwined that they cannot be separated from each other. The tragic hero appropriates this necessity imposed on him in the course of his character. In other words, he passionately embraces what he has to do. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 53) Rivier chose the word *will* to show that the heroes are not completely passive in their decisions, even if they lack choice. Because according to him, commitment to the divine should not be perceived as a commitment that mechanizes people but as a commitment that liberates them. Therefore, it cannot be said that this

commitment renders human being will and decision sterile. Indeed, according to Vernant, decisions without choice, and responsibility independent of intention are among the forms of will in Ancient Greece. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 55)

“A hero's field of action intersects with the divine power's field of action, and the hero's fall occurs at this intersection.” (Eksen, 2008, p. 151) Oedipus' choices, decisions, and the responsibility he must take will be more understandable when placed within this context. Like his decisions cannot be considered independently of fate, his actions show how he internalizes these decisions. He digests his decisions so much that this clarity and sharpness are reflected in his actions. For instance, when he became the king of Thebes, he passionately carried out actions that would drag him towards his fate, and he did not listen to the words of Iokaste and the prophet Teiresias, who tried to warn him many times. Divine causality and human being initiative, which are so clearly opposed to each other, are inextricably intertwined in the story of Oedipus. For this reason, Oedipus' actions cannot be isolated from divine power, nor can he escape from individual responsibility.

It is possible to see another context where the divine power's field of action and human being initiative intersect, within different dynamics in the tragedy of *Antigone*. This other dynamic in question arises from: Unlike the text of *Oedipus Tyrannus*, in the tragedy of *Antigone*, human being initiative corresponds to the orders of Creon, which the whole city has to obey. Everyone, including Antigone, is obliged to obey these commandments. For this reason, the divine power's field of action and human being initiative appear in conflict, not intertwined with each other. We witness the clash of two different laws; only Antigone, who submits to the divine law, and Creon, who puts the city's commands above all else. Indeed, Antigone, who was caught red-handed

while trying to bury the body of her brother Polyneices, expresses this conflict with the following words;

Yea, for these laws were not ordained of Zeus,

And she who sits enthroned with gods below,

Justice, enacted not these human laws.

Nor did I deem that thou, a mortal man,

Could'st by a breath annul and override

The immutable unwritten laws of Heaven.

They were not born to-day nor yesterday;

They die not; (Sophocles, 1962b, satir 450–457)

If we go back to the story of Oedipus, when he set out for Thebes, the Thebans suffered from a dragon with a woman's head and a lion's body, which was described as Sphinx, a dark folk singer. She took the lives of many young men who lived in Thebes because they could not answer the riddle she asked with songs correctly. For this reason, Laios, with his men, sets out for the Delphi temple to consult the prophet. Unbeknownst to each other, father and son meet at a crossroads where three roads intersect. On this road, where two vehicles cannot pass at the same time, Laios orders Oedipus to get out of the way, but an argument breaks out between them. As a result of this argument, Laios hits Oedipus with his whip, and Oedipus, who responds to this, kills his father and his companions, except for a servant. Taking advantage of Oedipus's momentary emptiness, the servant quickly flees to Thebes and spreads the fearful news that a bandit gang has killed the king throughout the city. (Sophocles, 1962a)

Oedipus, who continues on his way, encounters Sphinx when he comes to Thebes and saves Thebes from this trouble by giving the correct answer to his famous riddle. The people, grateful for this action of Oedipus, declare him their new king and marry the widowed queen. The servant, who knows him as he sees him, hides this fact from everyone and leaves the city with the permission of the queen Iokaste to spend the rest of his life in the mountains. (Sophocles, 1962a)

The encounter and road chronotopes that Bakhtin considers together are in a mutual relationship. In the encounter chronotope, temporality outweighs, and the emotion-value density is high. In contrast, the temporality of the road chronotope is more well-rounded, but the emotion-value density is lower. Encounters often take place on the road in novels. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 243) Indeed, the road is one of the most convenient places for the realization of events under the yoke of chance. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 244) It is a rare place where people from different groups, classes, religions, and nationalities, whose paths are impossible to come together, cross paths, and come together by chance. In such a coincidence, a contrast may appear, or different fates may collide and merge into one another. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 243) In this respect, the road is both the space of new beginnings and the place where the knots are untied. (Bakhtin, 2008, p. 243)

Oedipus sets out unaware that he was abandoned by his birth mother and father at the top of the mountain to get rid of the prophecy, while Laios is unaware that his son is still alive. As Bakhtin expresses it, this journey spreads over a wider period of time in a more stable emotional intensity. However, father and son encounter at a crossroads where three roads intersect. In this encounter, which takes place in a short period, the stable emotional intensity of the parties rises. This is a coincidence, and coincidences serve fate in this work. Indeed, at this crossroads where father and son

encounter, their fates interlock, and the son kills the father. Oedipus comes to another threshold on this occasion. He is now a tragic character who murdered his father and fulfilled the first part of his fate. However, he is unaware that the first part of his fate as a boundary situation has come true. Therefore, when fate becomes reality, he will look back and realize what a deep split it was. The road is here where the first knot of fate is untied, and the actions of Oedipus here are wholly tragic. Because the threshold he came to on the way is a breaking point in his life, a turning moment. He is faced with a crisis and experiences deep failure. Time goes out of the normal course of biographical time for him. Jaspers thinks that boundary situations expose one to absolute failure. In the course of biographical time, human being performs his actions in situations and can voluntarily move from one situation to another. However, when he experiences boundary situations that go out of the course of biographical time, all his mobility disappears, and he is exposed to the boundary situation he lives in. For this very reason, death and suffering are the fate of human beings. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 52)

Oedipus experiences a boundary situation in which he has no mobility at this threshold. However, this boundary experience appears only as a part of the fate as a boundary situation. It is completely got out of biographical time. Under the yoke of fortune, Oedipus is dragged into a crime that he cannot save himself from. (Jaspers, 1997, pp. 52–53) While trying to escape the prophecy, he sadly falls into his arms. He experiences a split in the deepest part of his multi-layered personality, but he has not yet heard this cry coming from his deep. He is still far from a consciousness that will allow all these suffering experiences to transform him. For this reason, the threshold follows him until he unties the knot, constantly chasing him, and appears in his life on various occasions. By killing his father, Oedipus overcomes a threshold at the crossroads he encounters and continues his journey towards his fate as a boundary situation.

In Jaspers' early works, the concept of "coincidence" (Zufall) is also among the boundary situation concepts. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 140) Coincidence is a concept that cannot be considered independently of fate (Moirai) in Greek tragedies. Indeed, one of the most convenient mechanisms for fate to become reality is coincidences. Any coincidence that happens to Oedipus rapidly drags him towards his fate. The English equivalents of this concept, which we can express as *tuchê* in Greek, can be translated as "chance," "luck," and "fortune". *Tuchê*, which refers to a power that exists outside the field of human being action, essentially refers to unpredictable and uncontrollable events related to the functioning of the cosmos. In the verses below, Iokaste's reaction to *tuchê* is a stereotyped expression that also shows the attitude of tragic heroes against *tuchê*; (Eksen, 2003, pp. 20-21)

Why should a mortal man, the sport of chance,

With no assured foreknowledge, be afraid

Best live a careless life from hand to mouth. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 89)

The concept of *tuchê* has crucial importance in the works of tragedy in terms of showing the double inadequacy of the tragic person. Indeed, *tuchê*, on the one hand, points to the concept of *ananké* (necessity), which determines the boundaries of human being action, on the other hand, indicates the impossibility of foresight, depending on the principles that support *ananké*. (Eksen, 2003, p. 21) Aristotle explains misfortune as the unpredictability of the damage done. Damage that occurs not in an unpredictable way but without thought of evil, is a mistake. Therefore, according to Aristotle, human being makes a mistake if he is at the beginning of causing harm, but if the cause is outside of human being, the harm he experiences is misfortune. (Aristotle, 2009, *satır* 1135b15)

Socrates thinks that doing bad actions is due to ignorance. (Plato, y.y., satir 609c) According to him, bad action is an error, a misdemeanor. This statement of Socrates is an extension of the old understandings about misdemeanors. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 62) Indeed, according to Gernet, misdemeanor, hamartema occurs as a fault of thought, a religious stain, a spiritual weakness. He says that hamartanein is the eclipse of reason and an illusion in the sense of blindness that causes destruction. Hamartia is a mental illness and a complete loss of phronêsis. (Gernet, 1917, p. 305) Hamartia surrounds the individual from within as a religious force. In one sense it identifies with it, while in the other it surpasses the individual by remaining outside it. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 62) According to Eksen, hamartia ("error") is such a fall that the hero neither deserved nor did he deserve it. This decline neither has a structure to activate moral values nor is it the result of mere coincidence. It is an experience that activates feelings of fear and pity in human beings. (Eksen, 2008, p. 148) At this point, the term hamartia cannot be understood as a purely accidental fall because it is an error, nor can it be understood only in the causality of "crime and punishment". (Eksen, 2008, p. 148) However, the murder committed by Oedipus, who fell into the lap of a deep tragic error, will not only envelop him but will also turn into a curse that will surround his descendants. It will even besiege the entire city and pollute its lands. In this respect, as Gernet states, it will not be only Oedipus who commits the crime. "*Crime exists outside of him, crime is objective.*" (Gernet, 1917, p. 305) But Oedipus, who committed the crime, was so caught up in this sinister power that the action enveloped him and dragged him after him. Therefore, Oedipus was also included in this action. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, pp. 62–63)

Consequently, Oedipus commits terrible errors by his own action. Aristotle says that a hero becomes a tragic character by his actions. So, what makes Oedipus tragic is

his praxis(action). The choices he makes through his actions are decisive in pushing him towards happiness or destruction. Like divine influence, he contributes to his tragic destiny. (Yiğit, 2008, pp. 159–160) However, when the Medea tragedy is looked at, a very different frame will be encountered. Indeed, Oedipus unknowingly committed tragic errors. However, all the terrible errors Medea made were not due to her ignorance but were within her knowledge. According to the legend, Medea turned her back on her father because of her deep love for Jason, killed Pelias so that the human being she loved could become king, and consented to live in exile in Corinth. Despite all her sacrifices, Jason left Medea and decided to marry Creon's daughter. As if all this was not enough, Medea learned that she was exiled from Corinth at Keon's order. Unable to endure such an injustice, Medea burned with a desire for revenge. (Euripides, 1996) Therefore, the main action that marks the work is revenge. Medea actually wants to burn down her experiences with Jason as if they never happened. Her action is therefore a destructive action. The happiness or destruction of all characters depends on her choice, and all her choices are deliberate. (Yiğit, 2008, p. 160) In the face of this deep helplessness and suffering of Medea, although the choir tries to calm her and keep her away from extremism, it is in vain. As Yiğit states, Medea's desperation is quite dangerous when her past is considered. Indeed, from the first pages of his work, Euripides introduced a murderer and pointed to the inevitable end. Medea will take a life again, and this life she will take will be from her own house. (Yiğit, 2008, pp. 160–161) However, it is also worth noting that: The tragedy of Euripides differs from the tragedy of Sophocles at critical points. One of them stems from the fact that the divine influence is slowly erased and the human being soul is brought into question in the tragedy of Euripides. Nussbaum's words are quite meaningful at this point;

Human beings have often wished to believe that ethical success, acting and living well, are things that depend only on human effort, things that human beings can always control, no matter what happens in the world around them... The vulnerability of good people to ethically significant reversals is among the central themes of tragedy. (Nussbaum, 1992, p. 263)

Putting aside the tragedy of Euripides, in which the human being soul is an issue if it is necessary to continue through the work of *Oedipus Tyrannus*, in which the divine influence is dominant, various theses have been put forward by researchers about the tragic errors of Oedipus. According to some, Oedipus angered Apollo for defying the prophet Teiresias, and he was punished as a result. Others think that he is already in complete tragic error by escaping from fate. Some researchers have focused on practical errors, too. For example, there are those who think that it is a tragic error that Laios did not avoid any kind of murder or marriage after hearing the prophecy that his child would kill his father and marry his mother. (Eksen, 2008, p. 149)

Despite this rich list, Vernant thinks that the actions of the Ancient Greek human being cannot be understood through a single center. According to him, an action in Ancient Greece could not be understood from a single volitional center but in the diversity in which rational and irrational actions intermingled. Therefore, to make sense of action, its polysemy should always be considered. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 113) *Oedipus Tyrannus* should also be understood within this diversity. Indeed, he is also the manager of the drama of which he is the victim. Despite the warnings of the prophet Teiresias, Iokaste, and the servant, who see the facts as daylight, the never-ending desire to unmask the criminal within will not stop and will drag him towards disaster. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 116) Oedipus is a tragic character who represents the exact opposite of all his actions and discourses. This polysemy in his

words and actions shows his double personality when delved his deeper. This double personality will dissolve when he realizes that the person he thought he was is the exact opposite. Until then, Oedipus will not be able to hear this secret discourse that comes from his deep within. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 116)

The tragic action cannot be understood only within the plural desires of human beings, it can only be understood at the intersection of the humane and the superhuman. In addition to this, the tragic action takes place in such a complex structure that it is hardly possible to separate the humane from the superhuman. (Eksen, 2008, pp. 153–154) Precisely for this reason, the tragic human being is not located in the center of the action, but he is located in an open space where inner actions and external actions are in relation. Oedipus, who is on the scene from the beginning to the end of the tragedy, is also not located in a singular center of the actions. He is located in the open space where the plural powers that are the source of the actions intersect. (Eksen, 2008, p. 154) Because of this plurality, Oedipus says:

Apollo, friends, Apollo, he it was

That brought these ills to pass;

But the right hand that dealt the blow

Was mine, none other. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 123)

The riddles, which were extremely common among primitive peoples, George Thomson says, function as an initiation exam. Clearchus of Soli, who says that riddles are a humorous problem in exchange for reward and punishment, thinks that their solution shows human being intelligence. (Thomson, 1968, p. 178) The riddle Sphinx, which had such a function asked Oedipus, was as follows;

A thing there is whose voice is one,
 Whose feet are four and two and three;
 So mutable a thing is none
 That moves in earth or sky or sea;
 When on most feet this thing doth go,
 Its strength is least, its pace most slow. (Thomson, 1968, pp. 178–179)

This riddle in question informs the fate of the Labdacuses, according to Vernant. All animals in general, whether two-footed or four-footed, have the same nature. Their conditions that determine their way of life do not change until from their birth to their death. Therefore, each species has a single nature. But human being's nature is not like that, he has three different natures. The stage of childhood and the stage of adulthood belong to a completely different reality. It must exceed a threshold in the transition from childhood to adulthood. For this, it must pass some exams. When he exceeds this boundary, he has a completely different personality. He manages in creating a new self out of himself. (Vernant, 2001, p. 148)

Human being both stays the same and changes in these three phases. Vernant asks this question;

So, where should we place Oedipus here? Oedipus is a tragic character born, although he should not have been born. Therefore, his birth is untimely. Although he is the legitimate son of Laios, he is also a cursed creature. Thus, his position is crippled from birth to death. Even though his mum-dad tried to get rid of him after hearing the prophecy, he miraculously hold on to life. Even though he was expelled from the city of Thebes where he was born, his fate has brought him back to the land where he was

born, moreover, he granted him the kingdom he deserved. For these reasons, Oedipus is located in a rather unstable position. (Vernant, 2001, p. 148) By completing the fate that enabled him to return to the land of his birth, he has caused the three stages of Being of human being to become entangled. Oedipus, who confused youth, adulthood, and old age, and disturbed the order of the seasons, has killed his father and entered his mother's bed. By spreading seeds on her own mother's land, he has identified with her father, and her siblings have become her own children. For these reasons, saved Thebes from its curse by answering the riddle of the Sphinx as "human," Oedipus is a freak creature with four legs in the morning, two at noon, and three in the evening. (Vernant, 2001, p. 149)

Oedipus, who gives the correct answer to Sphinx's difficult riddle, becomes the new king of Thebes and the new husband of queen Jocasta. For many years everything goes well. Oedipus has four children with the queen, two boys (Polyneices and Eteocles) and two girls (Ismene and Antigone). After this period of tranquility, a plague epidemic breaks out in the city. While the wealth of the lands of Thebes used to keep up with the order of the seasons, the order of the seasons is disturbed and the fertility of the land is lost. This change in order is also reflected in the obstetrics as well, and newborn children now look like freak creatures. As if all these were not enough, a disease infects everyone, young and old, men and women. (Sophocles, 1962a)

As this relentless disease ravages the entire city, Creon sends a representative to the Delphi temple to consult the prophet. The prophet says that they will not be able to get rid of this relentless epidemic until the murderer of Laios is found and punished. Thereupon, Oedipus decides to mobilize all his means to find the murderer. As Oedipus begins a deep investigation, Creon says that the prophet Teiresias will be very useful for the outcome of this investigation. Teiresias, who was brought before Oedipus, does

not want to answer his questions because he knows that the epidemic that plagued the city was caused by him. Teiresias has taken this prophecy from Apollo but preferred to remain silent. Getting angry at this silence, Oedipus realizes that this is no ordinary silence. He thinks that Creon has designs on his own throne and that they have agreed with Teiresias for this. Teiresias tells all the truth in the face of this endless hubris of Oedipus and confesses that the epidemic that plagued the city was caused by him. Confused by Teiresias' words, Oedipus' anger increases exponentially and demands that Creon leave the city immediately. He thinks he killed Laios because he coveted his throne. Although Jocasta wants to find the break, his efforts are in vain. There is only one person who remains to solve these confusions; the servant who claims to have killed Laios by a bandit gang, and is the only survivor of the attack. However, this servant brought before Oedipus seems to have taken an oath to keep quiet like Teiresias. (Sophocles, 1962a)

Meanwhile, a messenger comes from Corinth to Thebes and informs Oedipus that his parents are dead. Although Oedipus is saddened by this deplorable event, he rejoices inside, thinking that the prophecy did not come true. After all, he didn't kill his father himself, and he didn't sleep in the same bed as his mother. However, this joy of Oedipus is short-lived. The messenger tells Oedipus that he had made a mistake by leaving his native city because Polybos and Periborea were not his birth mum-dad. He says he personally took it from a shepherd in Cithaeron and presented it to the king and queen. He tells the whole story by confronting the shepherd who was there. With the masterful expression of Sophocles, the shepherd turns out to be the same person as the servant who witnessed the death of Laios. Unable to bear the pressure of Oedipus, the servant confesses all the truth. At that moment all doubts dissipate and Oedipus begins to see the truth. By running to the palace like crazy, he wants to see Iokaste who is both

his wife and his mum. However, he finds Iokaste hanged herself from the ceiling with his belt. With the buckle of the dress of Jocasta, who was already dead when he arrived, Oedipus also gouges out his eyes and remains covered in blood. (Sophocles, 1962a)

The plague epidemic that infected the city of Thebes originates from the spiritual dirt ("miasma") of Oedipus, a human being living on the threshold. Indeed, Oedipus is a tragic character that contains in himself all the features of being on the threshold; he is untouchable but forbidden, holy but cursed. (Arıcı, 2009, p. 92) In addition, the person on the threshold not only carries this miasma but also pollutes the people he comes in contact with. For this reason, this miasma that rubs off on Oedipus does not only lead him to disaster, it also absorbs the city of Thebes, and the plague epidemic is a manifestation of this spiritual dirt. Since pollution is contagious, the order is under the threat of disorder, existence is under the threat of non-existence, and life is under the threat of death. (Arıcı, 2009, p. 94) In addition to this, Eliade thinks that pollution itself has a double valued structure. For him, it is therefore difficult to separate the dirtiness from the holy. (Eliade, 1958, p. 15) Indeed, as I said above, Oedipus is holy but cursed, that is, he carries a miasma on him. So much so that this miasma infects everyone who comes into contact with it.

Jaspers points to Oedipus's endless desire to know, saying that all the disasters that befall him are closely related to this desire. Indeed, he always deviates in undesirable ways because he is thirsty for knowledge. For this reason, he carries the desire to know and the curse of fate on himself. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 60) Indeed, after hearing the prophecy that the epidemic will not leave the city without the murderer of Laios being found and punished, Oedipus begins to investigate with great seriousness and does not think of taking a step back even if his end is a disaster. Teiresias, Jocasta, and the servant who eyewitnesses the death of Laios think that he should choose

ignorance to protect him from this tragic disaster, and they try to discourage him from the investigation. But this tragic human being, with a relentless obsession with knowledge, does not lend an ear to their warnings. He is a hunter, but the prey he pursues is none other than himself. Deeply obsessed with knowledge, this hunter's deep ignorance continues until he unties the knot. Oedipus doesn't know who he is until the knot is untied. Therefore, he has no self-knowledge. To be able to access this knowledge, that is, to face his fate as a boundary situation, he constantly experiences certain boundary situations and encounters thresholds. Then the knot is untied and he faces his disaster. But until the knot is untied and fate becomes reality, the threshold follows Oedipus.

Fate brings Oedipus to the threshold in four different ways until he realizes himself. These thresholds that he has come to are a boundary experience for him. The first reveals itself in his dialogue with the prophet Teiresias. Indeed, this blind prophet, whom he summoned to contribute to the investigation he carried out to find Laios' murderer, prefers to remain silent instead of helping him. Because Teiresias knows very well that as a result of the prophecy he received from Apollo, Oedipus was a hunter who hunted himself, that he killed his father and married his mother, and that this investigation he conducted prepared his own disaster. But the ignorance he is within now is the source of tranquility for him. However, Oedipus, who has a strong "hybris" (hubris), is enraged by the silence of the blind prophet. The only explanation that comes to his mind is: Once upon a time, Creon coveted Laios' place and destroyed him. The prophet who knows this truth stays silent and becomes a partner in this crime. And so the murderer is Creon. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 78) This first threshold he comes to will encumber him, no matter how much he tries to leap over it since he has no common sense and has succumbed to his hubris. Although the interpretation range of the tragic

error (hamartia) is wide, hybris, that is, excessive hubris and violation of the boundaries that are not suitable for humans is a kind of hamartia according to some researchers. (Freydberg, 2008, p. 87) According to them, Oedipus was defeated by his own hubris by defying the prophet and was punished for this reason. In this respect, their lack of common sense of Oedipus is also due to his hubris. Because in hybris, it is impossible for a person to see the truth and act with common sense. Oedipus's accusation against the prophet causes a new situation to arise and Teiresias strikes the truth in his face;

I say thou art the murderer of the man

Whose murderer thou pursuest. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 35)

It is these words that are the first blow to Oedipus. It brings him to the brink and confronts him with a reality he can't understand. Moreover, Teiresias is not content with this and goes one step further and says that Laios' murderer soiled his mother's bed and that he was his father's murderer. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 45) This threshold that he has come to is the experience of fate as a boundary situation. But fate is so harsh and sharp that Oedipus cannot yet develop the understanding to face it. Although the threshold causes a slit within his deep, it does not yet manifest itself at the conscious level. Although Oedipus experiences a boundary situation, he cannot yet face the reality he has experienced. The moment of crisis is like a still clear sea. Therefore, he is quite sure that he is the son of the king of Corinth and has no past connection with the city of Thebes. The false sign that fate has given him is convincing enough, and he does not doubt that Creon is Laios' murderer. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 78)

Oedipus comes to the second threshold in the dialogue between Jocasta and him. To comfort him in the face of Teiresias' words, Jocasta says that Laios was killed by unidentified bandits at the crossroads of three roads. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 67) These

words refresh Oedipus' memories and helplessly bring him to another threshold. This is too a boundary situation, but he has not yet faced fate itself. This is a boundary experience that he can only understand when he goes backward after fate has happened. He had also killed a group of men who cut his road off on a similar road himself. For this reason, he whelms Jocasta by asking detailed questions about the road Laios was killed on. Despite everything, he has only one hope; this only hope is when the servant, who survived the attack on the king, tells him that a bandit gang killed Laios. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 79)

Before explaining the third and fourth thresholds that Oedipus comes from, it is useful to mention two concepts that Aristotle dealt with; *peripeteia* (reversal) and *anagnorisis* (recognition) concepts. Indeed, like these concepts are accepted as the two basic concepts of a work of tragedy in Aristotle's reading, they will be very useful in explaining the second and third thresholds that Oedipus comes from, too. Of course, Aristotle adds a third to these; *pathos*, that is, suffering. *Pathos* can be defined as events that result in destruction or pain. Deaths, deep suffering, and injuries are all examples of *pathos*. (Aristotle, 2013, satır 1452b10) *Anagnorisis* can be defined as the transition from noninformation to information. (Aristotle, 2013, satır 1452a35) *Peripeteia* is the reversal of action, the moments when the course of events is reversed. (Aristotle, 2013, satır 1452a25) According to Aristotle, the best *anagnorisis* is the *anagnorisis* that accompanies *peripeteia*, as in the example of Oedipus. (Aristotle, 2013, satır 1452b)

For example, his dialogue with the messenger from Corinth, where he came to the third threshold, causes a deep break. Indeed, the messenger who gave the news of his father's death wants to comfort Oedipus in the face of the eeriness of the prophecy, with all good intentions. He tells him that Polybos, king of Corinth, and Queen Periborea are not his birth mum-dad, so there is no need to fear marrying the queen. He

confesses that he personally took him from a shepherd in Cithaeron when he was a baby and presented him as a gift to the king and queen. At that moment, Jocasta understands everything and desperately wants to dissuade Oedipus from this investigation. But in vain, because Oedipus continues to interrogate the messenger. (Bonnard, 1959, pp. 80–81) Fate strikes one more final blow, dragging him towards a threshold he can never leap over. The Corinthian messenger confronts the shepherd of Cithaeron. In Sophocles' masterful fiction, this shepherd is revealed to be the same person as the servant who witnessed Laios' death. Indeed, without including any unnecessary details in his work, the poet wants Oedipus to see all the facts at the same time. Thus, when Oedipus learns that he is the son of Laios from his father's servant, he no longer needs to ask who killed him. The whole curtain is parted, the knot is untied, and fate becomes reality. Oedipus had a son by sowing his own seed in his mother's field, killed his father, and caused the plague epidemic to haunt the city. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 81) The source of miasma infecting the city is itself. This is a deep break for him, he is horrified, and he has come to terms with his disaster. In the words of Aristotle, he experiences *peripeteia*, in the words of Jaspers he is exposed to a boundary situation, and this boundary situation is fate itself. His mobility disappears. As Bakhtin said, he comes to a threshold, and this time he is not faced with an exceedable threshold. The threshold shatters his old identity. As a result, together with this threshold that will never be exceeded this time, Oedipus confronts the main issue on which the whole story is built; fate as a boundary situation. All the thresholds and boundary situations that he experiences in the work are actually each part of the fate that sits in the center of the work as a boundary situation. When he looks back after facing his fate, he will realize that all the thresholds and boundary situations he has experienced are each part of his fate. As a result, when the

knot is untied, Oedipus gets rid of ignorance that is his tranquility and drifts from ignorance to knowledge. Thus, he experiences anagnorisis and peripeteia together.

After fate becomes reality, Oedipus in horror rushes to the palace to see both his mother and wife, Iokaste. However, he finds her hanging from the ceiling with her belt. Iokaste has been already dead. This brings him to a new threshold. None of these thresholds are thresholds that he can exceed. Oedipus experiences these as boundary situations that he will never be able to exceed, and these experiences are part of his fate. One of the boundary situations that Jaspers discusses is also death. Although he thinks that death is a general condition, he also says that it is an absolute personal reality. (Çiçek, 2003, p. 143) Since everyone born is destined to die, death is a unique reality that cannot be avoided and is individually experienced by every individual. According to Jaspers, one of the most important differences that separate human beings from animals is knowledge about death. Indeed, animals do not lead a life with the foreknowledge that *"I will die one day"*. For this reason, death is far from being a boundary situation for them. Yet, human being is the only Being that knows that he will die one day. This is hard information for him to remove. Human being is exposed to this knowledge and experiences it as a boundary situation. Especially the death of his loved ones and people around him re-encounters him with his main reality, he is deeply shaken and gets closer to his Existenz. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 193) Death gives human being the possibility to regain himself. The death of Jocasta also shakes Oedipus deeply. His double personality, which lies deep in the polysemy in his actions, reveals itself through these suffering experiences. He begins to realize that he is not who he thinks he is anymore, but rather the opposite, and hears the secret discourse that comes from the depths of fate. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 116) Thus, the position of Oedipus with his double and conflicting personality is also determined. He is both above and

below human being. It is stronger than humans. Besides being a hero close to the divine, he is also a wild animal abandoned to the wild solitude of nature. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 136) He experiences a deep crisis in the face of the lifeless body of his mother/wife, and his mobility completely disappears. Oedipus is a miserable human being whose identity has been shattered by fate. He is a tragic character who is the opposite of all his actions and discourses. As a result of the deep shaking she experiences, she blinds her eyes with the buckle of Iokaste's dress.

Oedipus is now blind and stained. As it is explained in *Oedipus at Colonus* is the continuation of the poet's work *Oedipus Tyrannus*, his two sons mistreated Oedipus, damaged his honor, and even though they had the possibility to save him from exile with a single word from their mouth, they did not take care of him. However, her two daughters have dedicated their lives to their dad. While Oedipus was grateful to his daughters as a result of this suffering experience, he cursed both of his sons. He wished that both of his sons would never get along, that they would fight for domination and be the cause of each other's death. This curse of his completely comes true. Eteocles and Polynices have a grudge against each other. One of the two brothers, who agreed on the point that they would dominate the city in turn, Eteocles said that he would not descend after he ascended the throne. Thereupon, Polyneices took refuge in Argos and organized The Seven against Thebes expedition. (Sophocles, 1962c) At the end of the war, the two brothers were the murderers of each other, and Creon took the throne in their place.

As for Oedipus, he is exiled from Thebes. Taking Antigone with him, he arrives at a holy place where the altar of the Erinyes that is forbidden sitting in Colonus, which is in the territory of Athens. Although the people around him tell him to leave, King Theseus, who hears about the situation, accepts him. Because Oedipus tells him the

whole suffering story that happened to him. He feels that his end is getting closer. He promises to protect it in the wars Athens will face if he accepts him. Thereupon, Theseus gives him the status of *metooikos*, that is, he gains the status of a privileged immigrant. He promises that nothing will happen to him in this land. Meanwhile, neither Creon and his men, who want to take him back to Thebes, nor his son Polyneices, fulfill their request for help. Thanks to Theseus' protection, Oedipus stays in the land he wants to stay in. When the moment of death comes, there is a miraculous moment witnessed only by Theseus. It is a holy death. This tragic human being, who went underground after his death, at the same time, rises towards the gods of Olympus. He descends from the aboveground to the underground, and from there he ascends to the sky. The grave of Oedipus, known only to Theseus, is a guarantee of military success and the city's survival. (Sophocles, 1962c)

As Vernant also states, Oedipus, who appeared like a god at the beginning of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* work, at the end of the work becomes the source of the dirt that befell the city. At the beginning of *Oedipus at Colonus* work, the blind and miserable Oedipus, who begs the king Theseus, at the end of the work becomes a valuable guest of the city of Athens and guarantees the city's survival. Finally, his miraculous death takes place like a guide moving towards the grave where he will be buried. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 329) The tragic point of this blind and miserable human being, who lives a life of sharp ups and downs between the two cities, is undoubted that he lives around the boundary. He lives in a region where the action area of divine power and the area of human being action intersect. This intersection, however, cannot be only confined to the moment of fall, in which Oedipus blinded his eyes. The play takes shape under the shadow of Apollo from the very beginning. For this reason, many scenes are witnessed in the legend where the chain of human being and divine causation intersect.

This situation allows a very rich interpretation of tragedy in terms of content. (Eksen, 2008, p. 151) For these reasons, evaluating Oedipus' actions through a single center will cast a shadow over the richness of the work.

Conducting a discussion on the source of action is very meaningful for the Oedipus work. Indeed, as I mentioned before, the discussion is as follows; does the action depend on a human being or a divine source? Therefore, is the human being responsible for his action or is he free from responsibility under the yoke of divine power? In other words, is a human being guilty of his actions or guilt-free for living in the shadow of Apollo? Aristotle thinks that actions depend on the human being. Therefore, human being is responsible for his actions. (Aristotle, 2009, satır 1113b11-14) Contrary to the Socratic moral understanding, which claims that bad stems from ignorance, he thinks that human being is also responsible for his ignorance. Indeed, according to him, doing certain kinds of actions causes the creation of the same kind of person. (Aristotle, 2009, satır 1114a7-8) If actions find their *arkhe* in human being s, then the creator of actions is also human being. However, it should be noted that Aristotle, conducting such a discussion, does not make any reference to willpower. Indeed, as I mentioned before, there is no concept in Ancient Greece that would correspond to the concept of will. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 52) As Vernant points out, in Aristotle, the decision is considered as the choice (*hairesis*). Intention lies at the source of responsibility. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 70) Therefore, while there is a responsibility and choice based on intention in Aristotle, what is missing in him is the will itself. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 70) However, Vernant also thinks it would be useful to make the following distinction; according to him, Aristotle does not put forced realization against free wanting. He places compulsion from outside before the determination from within. Although there are important differences

between these two determinations, both ultimately depend on ananke. When the subject performs an action, even if he does compulsorily it with a determination coming from within, the source of his action is himself. He is also responsible for his actions because he has the *arkhe* of the decision he has taken. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 70)

In the texts of tragedy, on the other hand, in the decisions made by the heroes, the intentions of the gods and the people's passions are in cooperate. In fact, there is complicity in the middle. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 74) It is precisely because of this complicity, Aeschylus says the following in his work of tragedy, *The Persians*;

... 'but, whenever anyone himself makes an effort (for his disaster)³

the god too lends a hand. (Aeschylus, 2009, satir 742)

For Vernant, the complicity between these two polar opposites defines the nature of the tragic action. The tragic tension that was made in the decisions taken is also due to this complicity. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 75) When the origin of the action stems from both the determination within the hero himself and the divine power that transcends it, the hero sometimes becomes the agency of the action, and sometimes he becomes the person affected by the action of the agency. (Vernant ve Vidal-Naquet, 1990, p. 77) From this point of view, although Oedipus is the victim of a fate determined before he was born, he is also the agency of the actions that he exhibits in the realization of this bad fate since he does them passionately and with an inner necessity. Thus, he kills his father with a deep passion. To get rid of the miasma that plagued the city, he again goes after Laios' murderer with such a passion. While going to the hunt, he hunts himself but carries out all his actions by his own choice. What gives him direction is his own hubris as well as divine power. For these very reasons,

³ parenthetical word is my addition.

she is responsible for the murder and all the tragic fate that befell her. Besides, he carves out his eyes with his own hands with the buckle of Iokaste's dress. A palace official who reported the event to the public, this time talks about him as the agency of an intentional bad, not as a victim of fate, and says the following;

Ills wrought of malice, not unwittingly.

The worst to bear are self-inflicted wounds. (Sophocles, 1962a, satir 1230–1231)

In the final analysis, as in other works of tragedy, like all the events and actions that take place in Oedipus tragedy cannot be considered free from an external determination, they are also the independent of Oedipus' inner determination. There is two such ananke in the work.

Oedipus, who lives on the boundary of the intersection of divine causality and human being initiative, experiences many moments of crisis. It is these crisis experiences that make him tragic. He encounters many thresholds and continues on his way by leaping over those thresholds in his own way. But each threshold he encounters are steps that lead him to a deep disintegration. Each of these thresholds becomes his experience of crises, and as a result of the decisions he takes to exceed these crises, he is quickly dragged towards his fate as a boundary situation. Anymore it comes to such a point that his fate becomes reality. Oedipus learns that he is a miasma that infects the city, that he has planted his own seeds in his mother's field and killed his father with his own hands. This fate is not exceeded for Oedipus, unlike the threshold experiences he used to come from. When the threshold appears for him as a horizon that can no longer be exceeded, it turns into his fate as the boundary situation that Jaspers

expresses. Oedipus is exposed to this experience, hits it like he hits a wall, and completely loses his mobility.

Then, a journey begins. He is exiled from Thebes with his daughter Antigone and starts for the land of Athens. Lost his power completely, became the miasma of the city, killed his father and got married to his mother, witnessed the death of his mother as a result of all these mistakes, and blinded his eyes for could not stand his dark fate any longer, this miserable human being cannot receive the support he expects from his sons. It is the only two poor daughters who love him at heart in this world. Boundary situations such as the suffering face of death, the never-ending play of fortune, and deep distrust of the world drive Oedipus an absolute failure. According to Jaspers, this absolute failure hides possible existence in itself. In other words, for a person to start thinking about himself, to realize his Existenz and enlighten it, he must encounter this absolute failure, that is, he must experience boundary situations.

Jaspers thinks of human being as "*possible Existenz in dasein*". (Jaspers, 1970, p. 4) Namely, according to him, mundane Being potentially hides Existenz within itself. Although human being, as a mundane Being, exhibits conditional actions that pursue various authorities, interests, or purposes, there is also another possibility of action in him, as he potentially hides Existenz within him. Jaspers defines this possibility of action originating from within human being's own as unconditional action. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79) Unconditional action exists only when a human being is exposed to boundary situations. Therefore, when a human being encounters a threshold that he cannot exceed, a new possibility arises for himself. I think the same possibility applies to Oedipus. After experiencing fate as an unexceedable boundary situation, a whole new possibility for action arises for him.

Oedipus's tragic fate, which has given him a new possibility for action, follows his family as a curse handed down from his father to him and from him his daughter Antigone. In this respect, Antigone appears as a tragic character with the curse she received from her father. Indeed, at the very beginning of *Antigone* tragedy, Sophocles confronts this poor girl with a boundary situation; either he will bury the body of his brother Polyneices despite Creon's orders and do the gods' command, or he will obey Creon's command and turn his back on the divine command. Being on the threshold between mundane law and divine law, Antigone confidently thinks that a mortal's command is no more important than the eternal law of the gods, choosing to bury her brother's body and break Creon's law. However, she cannot reach her goal and her tragic fate appears with this action she has taken. Similarly, Creon also cannot achieve his goal by sending Antigone to death, on the contrary, he prepares for his tragic disaster. Indeed, his son Haimon, who was engaged to Antigone, opposes this punishment and commits suicide, and his wife Euridyke, who cannot bear the death of her son, also kills herself. Creon who experiences a deep crisis, in the words of Jaspers, faces a tragic boundary situation. In the work, Antigone and Creon share a similar fate. Within the plot of the work in question, neither of them can achieve what they aim at. (Tekin, 2017, p. 88) Indeed, Creon opposes the divine law and imposes his command despite the city's security. He ultimately brings the city to the brink of disaster. Antigone wants to bury her brother's body at the cost of even her life. But his action is also destined to fail. It is the actions that make them tragic, too. In this respect, we witness the contingency, unpredictability, and uncanniness of human being action in the work. (Tekin, 2017, p. 89) Finally, it is useful to ask the following question; is a new possibility of action, which appears with the experience of an absolute failure that a hero cannot exceed, is in question for Antigone and Creon as it is for Oedipus? In other words, can the

unconditional action possibility that allows Oedipus to realize himself and enlighten his Existenz also apply to Antigone and Creon?

Antigone, who thinks that every dead person has the right to be buried, is left to die in a blind cellar because she buried her brother's body despite Creon. His tragic end makes him utter the following words:

To fade and wither in a living tomb,

An alien midst the living and the dead.” (Sophocles, 1962b, p. 381)

The choir's response to his words is as follows:

“In thy boldness over-rash

Madly thou thy foot didst dash

'Gainst high Justice' altar stair.

Thou a father's guilt dost bear. (Sophocles, 1962b, p. 381)

Carrying the tragic legacy of her father with her action that transcends the boundary, Antigone cannot have a new possibility for action since takes her life thereby unable to bear this tragic fate. If she had not preferred death, it would have been possible to talk about the possibility of such an action for her as well. However, because Antigone hanged herself, she eliminated all possibilities that could happen after that. It is possible to talk about the possibility of such an action for Creon, who, unlike Antigone, did not prefer death. Indeed, since Creon prefers to live, he is open to all possibilities that may come true from now on. Faced with the death of his son and wife in the work, Creon realizes his tragic mistake and mentions deep regret with these words:

I am the guilty cause. I did the deed,

Thy murderer. Yea, I guilty plead.

My henchmen, lead me hence, away, away,

A cipher, less than nothing; no delay! (Sophocles, 1962b, pp. 415–416)

This deep regret that he experienced due to the boundary situation he came to open up a new opportunity for action for Kreon. However, the difference between this possibility of action and Oedipus' possibility of action is that; After facing his tragic fate as a boundary situation, Oedipus goes on a journey that will allow reading a new possibility of action In the work titled *Oedipus at Colonus*. However, It doesn't reach the present day any work on what Creon went through after he faced his tragic fate as a boundary situation.

Oedipus, who learns the truth after committing a terrible tragic error, is a character who takes the risk of being a fallen human being by punishing himself in the face of this tragic disaster that he unknowingly drags the city into. Hence, he assumes responsibility for a mistake he made unknowingly. However, unlike Oedipus, Medea, who breaks off relations with her entire family because of her love for Jason, who even causes the death of someone else for the human being she loves, and agrees to live in exile, does not prefer to take responsibility because of any crimes she has committed. She takes a destructive action to take her revenge on Jason, who betrayed her and thought of marrying Creon's daughter. (Yiğit, 2008, pp. 162–163) The best way to revenge upon Jason is to kill her children. Because she thinks that her marriage with Jason, and the children she gave birth to from him was a big mistake. So, she looks for a way to make up for this regret. The most sensible choice for this is to root out everything as if it never happened. Due to these reasons, she decides to kill her children.

However, she does not also take any responsibility due to her action. Indeed, she expresses this in these words:

Medea: O sons, your father's treachery cost you your lives.

Jason: It was not my hand that killed my sons.

Medea: No, not your hand; But your insult to me, and your new-wedded wife.

(Euripides, 1996, satır 1364–6)

As a result, Medea is a repulsive character who slides out of everything with her self-confident attitude. (Yiğit, 2008, p. 163) She is a tragic character who lives on the threshold between two passions: her love for her children and her femininity pride. This experience turns into a boundary situation for her. There is a deep split. However, looking at her children, she thinks that the moment she dispensed with killing them was the moment when she succumbs to her passion. Unlike Oedipus, she does not experience any tediousness after experiencing her tragic disaster. (Yiğit, 2008, p. 164) In conclusion, it is useful to say that; there is no possibility of a new action for Medea. Because she attempted to eliminate all possibilities about her own marriage and was dragged towards a boundary experience.

Returning to Jaspers, according to him, human being has a tendency “to transcend it at every boundary reached.” (Jaspers, 1995, p. 64) Because he goes on his way of life, without never satisfied. Since he is a passenger who is always on the road, even if he finds what he is looking for, the journey is not something that is consumed for him. Indeed, he often cannot find what he is looking for, too. (Çiçek, 2008, p. 134) After hearing the first prophecy that made him decide to leave the land where he grew up, Oedipus embarks on a journey of life without knowing what he is looking for. He meets with many obstacles along the way, he faces thresholds that often make him

experience moments of crisis. However, he continues his journey by leaping over them every time. He somehow crosses these boundaries. But what he seeks is himself, whom it will later cause a deep slit within. He encounters such a himself that this person is not very similar to himself he used to know. He has essentially a double person; It is both hunt and hunter. However, as Jaspers states, being on the road is not a process that ends, so being human being is not a completed or ending process. The journey continues throughout life. After the dark side of fate reveals itself, the story of Oedipus does not come to an end. This time, he continues his life journey with his daughter Antigone from where he left off, but with completely different dynamics.

For Oedipus, who took conditional actions depending on various authorities, interests, and purposes while he was the king of Thebes, this boundary experience that his fate causes, creates a new possibility for action; the possibility of unconditional action. Jaspers thinks that unconditional action is a call that cannot be understood by a human being unless he translates it into his own Being. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 257) On the other hand, this call wants to remind people of their own possibility, to awaken and enlighten their Existenz. (Çüçen, 2015, p. 178) As a result, human being's self-consciousness can only come true in the unconditional. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79) Oedipus' ability to reach his own possibility and awaken his existence is possible only through unconditional action.

According to Jaspers, who states that Existenz is equal to freedom, the essence of an action originating from Existenz comes from the unconditional. On the other hand, unconditional action is free because it originates from the human being himself. (Piecuch, 2019, p. 208) To perform an unconditional action, a human being must know himself, therefore he must have self-consciousness. As Blackham states, for a human being to know himself with a consciousness about his essence, he must have choices

and decisions coming from his own inner dynamics. (Blackham, 2005, p. 54) He should have the courage to take responsibility in light of these choices and decisions. At this point, Blackham states: *“There is no choice without decisiveness, no decision without a will, no will without responsibility, no responsibility without Being.”* (Blackham, 2005, p. 55) Therefore, as long as a human being can make his own choices and take his responsibilities without being determined by any external condition, he can take unconditional action and reach Existential enlightenment.

Oedipus is a hero who wants to know. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 57) His obsession with knowledge always causes him to go in undesirable ways, according to Jaspers. All the disasters that have befallen him are the result of this thirst for knowledge and a result of his fate. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 60) Andre Bonnard speaks of the connection between Oedipus' blindness and knowledge. Actually, despite being deeply obsessed with knowledge, Oedipus, according to Bonnard, also makes his own ignorance visible when gouging out his eyes. This action points to the inadequacy or even nothingness of human being knowledge. In addition to this, it also points to another type of knowledge, which is brighter than the knowledge of the dark world. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 89) Indeed, while Oedipus lives in a dark world with seeing eyes, he begins to live in a brighter world with blind eyes. In other words, Oedipus, who lived a dark life despite his eyesight in a process when he was deeply obsessed with knowledge, has a brighter life after losing his eyes. When gouging out his eye, he does not say that "only all-seeing are gods" at the end of his work titled *Oedipus Tyrannus*. He has possession of a light that enables him to grasp the outside world as it is and favors human being freedom against all expectations. Therefore, after Oedipus experiences a boundary that he will never be able to exceed, he not only shows the extraordinary end of tragedy to the

audience by carving his eyes but also provides an opportunity for the audience to reach the highest meaning of tragedy. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 89)

Oedipus says that it was Apollo who caused his disaster, but that he gouged out his eyes with his own hands. (Sophocles, 1962a, p. 123) These words essentially mean that he has assumed his fate. He sees that he lives on a threshold between divine causation and human being initiative. He begins to see his experience as it is. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 90) Thus, a deep transformation process begins in him. The following words in *Oedipus at Colonus* are an expression of this transformation;

Stern-visaged queens, since coming to this land

First, in your sanctuary I bent the knee,

Frown not on me or Phoebus, who, when erst

He told me all my miseries to come,

Spake of this respite after many years,

Some haven in a far-off land, a rest

Vouchsafed at last by dread divinities.

‘There,’ said he, ‘shalt thou round thy weary life,

A blessing to the land wherein thou dwell'st,

But to the land that cast thee forth, a curse.’

And of my weird he promised signs should come.

Earthquake, or thunderclap, or lightning flash.

And now I recognise as yours the sign (Sophocles, 1962c, p. 155)

In this transformation process, Oedipus chooses his own way and makes his debut as a free person. For the first time, he takes to responsibility for his choice and decision effectively, not passively. After seeing and accepting his fate as it is, Oedipus begins to exceed it and leave it behind. Freedom is this, according to Bonnard. (Bonnard, 1959, p. 90) He now takes free actions arising from his own inner determinations. According to Jaspers, to perform these actions, he must reach self-knowledge. Indeed, after Oedipus faces his own reality and accepts what is as it is, he begins to do unconditional action originating from his inner determinations and to leave his suffering life behind which he succumbs to his conditional actions. This life, which was cursed by the way of knowledge and fate, now assigns a new value to him. What Apollo said comes true one by one. Oedipus' death takes place in a holy space. While his bones fertile the land, his grave turns into a holy shrine. (Jaspers, 1952, p. 61)

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

Tragedy works have guided my thesis while making sense of the essence of human being action. In my discussion, which centers on the works titled *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Oedipus at Colonus*, Karl Jaspers's concept of the boundary situation has a central place in understanding the essence of human being action. Michael Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope, on the other hand, has an important function in terms of making the framework more understandable.

Jaspers, who put forward a philosophy of Existenz starting from a complex question such as “*What is a man*”, touches on two basic dimensions of human being; the empirical ego which is divided into three as Dasein, consciousness, and Geist, and Existenz. (Erdem, 2007, p. 114) While the empirical ego essentially refers to the

rational dimension of the human being that can be researched, that is, knowable, Existenz is beyond the researchable. Therefore, it is not the object of scientific research. (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63) This distinction leads Jaspers to ask: “*Can a man be fully grasped with what is known about him?*” (Jaspers, 1964, p. 63) That is to say, does the fact that human being can be known as Dasein, consciousness, and Geist make it possible to grasp him adequately? Starting from this question, Jaspers points out that the essence of human being action cannot be adequately understood with such research, since he thinks that the essence of human beings cannot be adequately grasped in its knowable dimension. Indeed, according to him, the essence of human being action reveals itself in an existential search that is beyond the knowable.

A human being who every time lives in situations can change a situation and move to another situation within the framework of his own plans and designs. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178) However, there are also situations that a human being cannot change but have to live within. In Jaspers' words, such situations are “*like a wall we fall on.*” (Jaspers, 1970, p. 178) Such situations, which he calls boundary situations, carry a whole new possibility for human being action. For this reason, boundary situations will be a productive research area in a research on the essence of human being action.

According to Jaspers, who seeks the essence of human being action beyond the knowable, that is in an existential research, boundary situations make existential research possible. Indeed, the main purpose of boundary situations is to wake up Existenz. For this reason, an existential enlightenment, that is, the possibility of self-understanding and realization arises for a human being who experiences any boundary situation. As a result, as situations belong to consciousness that is the immanent, boundary situations belong to the Existenz that is transcendent. (Haluk Erdem, 2014, p. 55) However, since Existenz is insufficient on its own, it needs the power to enlighten

itself. This power is the Transcendent Being, which, according to Jaspers, is the most perfect being. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 309) Enable to reach the Transcendent Being, Existenz needs to read the boundary situations.

Jaspers thinks that human being actions are determined based on situations. A human being who performs conditional action within situations encounters a new possibility for action when he experiences boundary situations; unconditional action. Unconditional action without an adequate definition is essentially a sign that cannot be understood by a human being unless translated into his own Being. (Jaspers, 1970, p. 257) It is a call to awaken and enlighten Existenz. Thus, it provides a possibility for human being to realize their own consciousness. (Jaspers, 1997, p. 79) The essence of an action originating from Existenz essentially comes from the unconditional within human being. Unconditional arises from freedom. (Piecuch, 2019, p. 208) As a result, the action arising from existential freedom is unconditional. To perform unconditional action, a human being needs to know himself and have his own choices and decisions.

Jaspers's concept of boundary situation, which provides the possibility to read connected with tragic texts, is in parallel with Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of threshold chronotope. Indeed, the threshold chronotope, which is the chronotope of breaks, shakes, and splits in human being life, is the space where the human being is defeated, renewed, and experiences the reversal. The threshold that appears in places such as "*up, down, the stairway, the threshold, the lobby, and stairway landing*" is the point where wrong decisions are made and the forbidden is gone beyond. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 169) Heroes who come to the threshold live the inner experience of a moment as the equivalent of a million years, completely going out of biographical time. (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 149) Finally, it is worth mentioning; the threshold chronotope that Bakhtin deals with in literary texts appears in Jaspers as a boundary situation. This boundary

situation turns into a tragic experience when it appears as a horizon that the hero can never exceed. The threshold and boundary situation concepts, which offer the possibility to research the essence of human being action through tragic texts, provide a possibility for the essence of tragic action to be revealed.

Though the essence of human being action in Greek tragedy is the main focus of the discussion of this thesis, the concepts of a boundary situation and threshold chronotope shed light on this discussion. This discussion, which is carried out, especially over the Oedipus text, places fate as a boundary situation in the center of the text. The hero encounters some thresholds while going toward his fate. These threshold experiences, on the other hand, are boundary situations that serve fate as a boundary situation that takes part in the center of the text. When fate becomes reality, the hero looks back and realizes that all these threshold experiences and boundary situations are part of his tragic fate. As a result, fate as a boundary situation is a horizon that the hero can never exceed. What makes him tragic is that he can not exceed fate. It is this of fate that makes it tragic. But each threshold experience and each boundary situation that the hero encounters and over which he can leap is part of his fate. When the knot is untied, they appear as a sign of tragic disaster.

Oedipus' fate was determined before he was born. As a boundary situation that sits in the center of the text, this tragic fate is as follows; *Oedipus will kill his father and have sexual intercourse with his mother*. Throughout the whole text, Oedipus experiences several boundary situations and thresholds that will be dragged toward his own fate. Firstly, he hears that the people who raised him, whom he thought were his mum-dad, were not his birth family, and he came to a threshold. To leap over this threshold, he decides to go to the Delphi temple and satisfy his curiosity. Thus, he leaps the first threshold. However, he comes to another threshold, facing his fate for the first

time in the temple of Delphi. To leap over this threshold experience, he decides to leave the city where he grew up and sets out for Thebes. On the way, he encounters his own father Laios, and his men and experiences a conflict. As a result of this conflict, he comes true the first part of his fate by killing his father. However, since the knot has not been untied yet, he is unaware of the consequences of his actions. He continues on his way and this time comes to a new threshold by encountering the Sphinx. Knowing his riddle correctly, Oedipus has leaped over this threshold and thus the gates of the city of Thebes are opened wide for him. Marrying Queen Iokaste, this tragic human being makes real the second part of his fate, too. This tragic couple, who lives in tranquility for many years, has four children, two girls, and two boys. But these years of tranquility end one day and a plague epidemic begins in the city. Oedipus, who learns that Laios' murderer must be caught to save the city from this plague, and mobilizes all his strength, is so hubris that he does not heed the warnings of anyone who tries to warn him. A messenger from Corinth, without realizing it, makes statements that will cause him to see all the facts. Thus, Oedipus faces his tragic fate. This experience, which he will never be able to exceed, will be a turn of fortune for him. On his way to hunt, he realizes that he is a hunted hunter; moreover, he is both the hunter and the hunted. The fate he encounters this time as a boundary situation is unlike any other boundary situation and threshold experience he thought he had leaped over before. In no way does he dare to change it, to leap over it. He is just exposed to it and turns into a tragic character. According to Jaspers, a possibility is hidden in the boundary situations that human being has to pass through: possible Existenz. In my opinion, the text Oedipus at Colonus describes Oedipus's search for a new possibility after his absolute failure, which he experienced due to his fate. This absolute failure indeed hides within itself possible Existenz. To put it another way, Oedipus' fate as a boundary situation that he can never

exceed offers him the possibility to discover himself and enlighten his Existenz. For this reason, this tragic fate has a positive meaning since it contains a possibility within itself, unlike a negative meaning. On the other hand, Possible Existenz contains a new possibility of action within itself; possible action. Indeed, when Oedipus was king of Thebes, he exhibited conditional action by considering various purposes and interests. However, after facing its fate as a boundary situation, he contains a new form of Existenz that exists as a possibility and a new possibility of action within himself. This new possible action does not pursue any purpose or interest, unlike conditional action. This possible action, which enables Oedipus to become conscious of himself, to awaken his Existenz, has been called unconditional action by Jaspers. In conclusion, we can say that; Oedipus goes on a long journey with his daughter Antigone, to whom he transfers his curse, which is his family legacy. In this journey, he experiences a deep transformation and is rewarded with a holy death by Apollo.

Carrying the tragic fate that she inherited from her father, Antigone also appears as a tragic character living on the boundary as a result of the decisions and the choices she made. The choice that brought her to the threshold is this; Either she will bury the body of his brother Polynices and uses her choice in favor of divine judgment, or she will not be able to bury Polynices's body and she submits to the judgment of Creon. Being on the threshold between the earthly law and the divine law, Antigone self-assuredly obeys the divine law and violates Creon's command. This choice turns into a boundary situation that determines her fate, and it is decided that she will be left to die in a blind cellar. Thus, Antigone is dragged into a crisis, a deep split. In the end, by hanging herself, she eliminates all possibilities that can consist of herself. Creon, on the other hand, experiences a deep crisis when he encounters the corpses of his son Haimon, who took his life after Antigone's suicide, and his wife Euridyke who killed herself because

could not stand the death of her son. He comes to a threshold, and this threshold is a boundary situation that makes him deeply regret it. Well, does this absolute failure that is experienced by Creon and Antigone also make a new possibility of action for them like Oedipus? In fact, by hanging herself, Antigone eliminates all possibilities. Therefore, there cannot be a new possibility of action for her. However, we can talk about such a possibility of action for Kreon. Indeed, by not ending his life, he leaves himself open to all possibilities. However, his fundamental difference from Oedipus is this; there is no text describing the life in which Creon drifted after this tragic fate. For this reason, it must be said that a new possibility of action exists only as a possibility for him.

In conclusion, Medea, another tragic character standing on the threshold, should also be mentioned. Indeed, she has experienced deep regret in her marriage as a result of a choice she made in the past. However, she prefers to annihilate this deep regret by eradicating it rather than repairing it. This tragic woman, who came to the threshold between womanhood dignity, and the love of children, is dragged into a boundary situation by killing her children and eliminating all possibilities for her marriage. This boundary situation does not make a new possibility of action for Medea. Indeed, Medea is a destructive character that uproots all possibilities.

In summary, this thesis in your hand, which centered on the Oedipus sample started by trying to make sense of what the human being is through the philosophy of Jaspers. According to Jaspers, in addition to the researchable dimension of human beings, there is also a dimension that cannot be the object of any scientific research. Both dimensions provide different action possibilities for human beings. Indeed, while the researchable dimension of the human being performs conditioned actions because it displays an action by considering various authorities, aims, and interests, the unexplored dimension

of him, which states that there is more to him than is known about him performs unconditional actions arising from himself. It is possible only in boundary situations for a human being to discover the dimension that goes beyond his mundane Being and to perform unconditional action arising from himself. These boundary situations, such as death, suffering, and living under the yoke of fortune, are experiences that people are exposed to them and thus enable them to experience inner transformations. In these experiences, which Bakhtin refers to as threshold, people experience moments of crisis, splits, turns of fortune, defeats, and renewals.

I believe that this possibility is also possible for Oedipus. Indeed, Oedipus, who took conditional action within the framework of various goals and interests while he was the king of the city of Thebes, turns to a new action possibility after facing his fate as a boundary situation.

Because he experiences his fate that he cannot exceed in any way, unlike the thresholds he was able to leap over before. This fate creates a profound transformation in Oedipus. When he looks back on all the mistakes he has committed unknowingly, he accepts the whole reality and takes his responsibilities. This experience essentially offers Oedipus the possibility to discover himself and to enlighten his Existenz. This possibility also hides within it a new possibility of action; unconditional action. Oedipus can now perform unconditional action within the framework of his own decisions and choices stemming from his own internal determinations.

Indeed, this deep transformation of Oedipus is rewarded by Apollo and he bids farewell to this world with a holy death.

REFERENCES

- Aeschylus. (2009). *Persae*. (A. F. Garvie, Ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Arıcı, O. (2009). *Muğlaklık ve Tragedya*. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tiyatro Eleştirmenliği ve Dramaturji Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi.
- Aristotle. (2009). *The Nicomachean Ethics*. (D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. (2013). *Poetics*. (A. Kenny, Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. (C. Emerson, Trans.) (8. ed.). London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2001). *Karnaval dan Romana*. (C. Soydemir, Çev.) (1. ed.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2008). *The Dialogic Imagination*. (C. Emerson ve M. Holquist, Trans.) (17. ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2019). *Origin of the German Trauerspiel*. (H. Eiland, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Blackham, H. J. (2005). *Karl Jaspers*. (E. Uşşaklı, Çev.) *Altı Varoluşçu Düşünür* (1. bs.). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Bochenski, M. (1981). *Existenz Felsefesi ve Jaspers*. K. Jaspers (Yaz.) M. Akalın (Çev.), *Felsefeye Giriş* içinde (2. bs.). İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Bollnow, O. F. (2004). *Varoluş Felsefesi*. (Medeni Beyaztaş, Çev.). İstanbul: Efkâr

Yayınları.

Bonnard, A. (1959). *Greek Civilization From The Antigone to Socrates*. (L. Sells, Trans.). New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Brandist, C. (2002). *The Bakhtin Circle Philosophy, Culture and Politics*. London: Pluto Press.

Cevizci, A. (2005). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.

Çiçek, H. (2003). Karl Jaspers'in Siyaset Anlayışında "Politik Suç" Kavramı. *Felsefe Dünyası*, 1(37), 144–152.

Çiçek, H. (2008). *Karl Jaspers'in Siyaset Felsefesi*. (1. ed.). İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Cocteau, J. (1963). The Infernal Machine. A. Bermel (Trans.), *The Infernal Machine and Other Plays by Jean Cocteau* içinde (p. 1–96). New York, NY: A New Directions Book.

Çüçen, K. (2015). *Varoluş Filozofları*, (1. ed.). İstanbul: Sentez Yayıncılık.

Eksen, K. (2003). *Human Action in Greek Tragedies*. Boğaziçi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy, Thesis of Master, İstanbul.

Eksen, K. (2008). Trajik Hata ve Sessizlik. *Cogito, Tragedya. (Yapı Kredi Yayınları)*, (54), 145–158.

Eliade, M. (1958). *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (1. bs.). New York, NY: Sheed and Ward.

Erdem, H. H. (2003). Karl Jaspers felsefesinde insan problemi. *Felsefe Dünyası*, 1(37), 173–178.

Erdem, H. H. (2007). *Karl Jaspers Felsefesinde Hakikat, İletişim ve Siyaset*. (1. ed.). Ankara: Ebabil Yayınları.

- Erdem, H. H. (2014). *Karl Jaspers Felsefesine Giriş*. (1. ed.). İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Erdem, H. H. (2020). Karl Jaspers ve “mümkün varoluş”un felsefesi. *Doğubati Düşünce Dergisi*, (92), 159–171.
- Euripides. (1996). *Medea and Other Plays*. (P. Vellacott, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- F. M. Cornford. (1957). *From Religion to Philosophy A Study in The Origins of Western Speculation*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbook.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *The Heneuneutics of the Subject Lectures at The College de France, 1981-1982*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freydberg, B. (2008). Coriolanus’un Oidipal Laneti ve Trajik Kurtuluş Sorunu. (Kerem Eksen, Çev.), *Cogito, Tragedya*. (Yapı Kredi Yayınları), (54), 78–94.
- Gernet, L. (1917). *Recherches Sur Le Développement De La Pensée Juridique Et Morale En Grèce*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Greene, W. C. (1944). *Moirai, Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1990). *Nedir Bu Felsefe?* (D. Tunç, Çev.) (1. bs.). İstanbul: Logos Yayıncılık.
- Heidegger, M. (2009). *Metafizik Nedir?* (Y. Örnek, Çev.) (3. bs.). Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.
- Jaspers, K (1995). *Felsefi Düşünüşün Küçük Okulu*. (S. Umran, Çev.). İstanbul: Birleşil Yayıncılık.
- Jaspers, K. (1952). *Tragedy is Not Enough*. (H. A. T. Reiche, H. T. Moore ve K. W.

Deutsch, Trans.) *Theology Today*. Boston: The Beacon Press.

Jaspers, K. (1964). *Way to Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy*. (R. Manheim, Trans.) (7. bs.). United States: Yale University Press.

Jaspers, K. (1967). *Philosophy is For Everyman; A Short Course in Philosophical Thinking*. (R. F. C. Hull and G. Wels, Trans.). New York, America: Harcourt, Brace & World Publisher.

Jaspers, K. (1969). *Philosophy 1*. (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Jaspers, K. (1970). *Philosophy 2*. (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). Chicago, America: The University of Chicago Press.

Jaspers, K. (1971a). *Philosophy of Existence*. (R. F. Grabau, Trans.). Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jaspers, K. (1971b). *Philosophy 3*. (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Jaspers, K. (1997). *Felsefe Nedir?* (İ. Z. Eyüboğlu, Çev.) (3. bs.). İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Jaspers, K. (2000). *The Question Of German Guilt*. (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). New York: Fordham University Press.

Jaspers, K. (2001). *Felsefî İnanç*. (A. Kanat, Çev.) (1. bs.). İzmir: İlyas Matbaası.

Kolakowski, L. (1999). *Modernliğin Sonsuz Duruşması*. (M. Ayaz, Çev.). İstanbul: Pınar Yayınları.

Latzel, E. (1957). The Concept of “Ultimate Situation” in Jaspers’ Philosophy. P. A. Schilpp (Ed.), *Philosophy of Karl Jaspers* içinde (1. ed., p. 177–208). New York:

Tudar Publishing Company.

Mevlânâ Celâleddîn-i Rûmî. (1964). *Rubailer*. (Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, Çev.). İstanbul:

Remzi Kitabevi.

Miron, R. (2012). *Karl Jaspers: From Selfhood to Being*. Amsterdam - New York:

Rodopi. <https://books.google.it/books?id=nHuEMAEACAAJ> adresinden erişildi.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1992). Tragedy and Self-sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and

Pity. A. O. Rorty (Ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics* içinde (p. 261–290).

Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Örnek, Y. (1983). Bilimde, Felsefede ve Politikada Karl Jaspers. *Türkiye Felsefe*

Kurumu içinde . Ankara.

Örnek, Y. (1985). Varoluş Felsefesi Mi, Akıl Felsefesi Mi? *Hacettepe Üniversitesi*

Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 3(2), 177–185.

Özer, N. (2020). *Karl Jaspers'te Felsefi İnanç Problemi*. Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli

Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Felsefe Anabilim Dalı, Felsefe Bilim Dalı,

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.

Piecuch, C. (2019). Eternity in Time by Karl Jaspers. B. Pešić ve P. Žitko (Ed.),

Existence and The One içinde (p. 201–218). Buenos Aires: TeseoPress Design.

Piecuch, C. (2019). Eternity in Time by Karl Jaspers. B. Pešić ve P. Žitko (Ed.),

Existence and The One içinde (p. 201–218). Buenos Aires: TeseoPress Design.

Plato. (y.y.). *The Republic II*. (P. Shorey, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University

Press.

Reneaux, R. (1994). *Egzistansiyalizm Üzerine Dersler*. (M. Korlaelçi, Çev.). Kayseri:

Kayseri Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Reneaux, R. (1994). *Egzistansiyalizm Üzerine Dersler*. (M. Korlaelçi, Çev.). Kayseri:

Kayseri Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Sarp, A. (2010). *Karl Jaspers Felsefesinde İnsan Problemi*. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Felsefe Anabilim Dalı, Sistematik Felsefe ve Mantık Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.
- Sophocles. (1962). Oedipus The King. F. Storr (Ed.), *Oedipus The King, Oedipus At Colonus, Antigone* içinde . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sophocles. (1962b). Antigone. F. Storr (Ed.), *Oedipus The King, Oedipus At Colonus, Antigone* içinde . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sophocles. (1962b). Oedipus At Colonus. F. Storr (Ed.), *Oedipus The King, Oedipus At Colonus, Antigone* içinde . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tekin, S. (2017). Adalet, Pratik Akıl, Eylem: Antigone. D. Sezer ve N. Kalaycı (Haz.), *Siyasalın Peşinde - Dünyaya Tragedyalarla Bakmak* içinde (1. bs.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Uybadın, A. (2014). “Söz”ün Özgürlük İradesinden Tasarlanması: Karl Jaspers ve Varoluşsal İletişim. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Halkla İlişkiler ve Reklamcılık Anabilim Dalı.
- Vernant, J.-P. (2001). *Evren Tanrılar İnsanlar*. (M. E. Özcan, Çev.). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.
- Vernant, J.-P. ve Vidal-Naquet, P. (1990). *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. (J. Lloyd, Trans.). New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Vice, S. (1997). *Introducing Bakhtin*. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Yiğit, R. İ. (2008). Medeia’ya Acımak. *Cogito, Tragedya. (Yapı Kredi Yayınları)*, (54), 159–169.