22. From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of *Othello*[1]

Bahadır Cahit TOSUN[2]

Abstract

Grounded in Aristotle's theory of tragedy as presented in the *Poetics*, this article offers a reinterpretation of *Othello* not merely as a tale of personal error (*hamartia*), but as a critique of systemic misrecognition. In Shakespeare's play, logos, the rational force of speech and meaning, is corrupted by rhetoric and bias, no longer functioning as a stable conduit of truth. Iago emerges not just as a villain but as a figure of anti-logic, whose manipulation of language dismantles reason and obscures moral distinctions. Othello's downfall is shown to result not only from a lapse in practical wisdom (*phronḍsis*), but from his progressive estrangement from the civic rationality of the *polis*. Similarly, Desdemona's ethical clarity becomes unreadable in a discursive environment structured by suspicion and cultural prejudice. Drawing from Aristotle's *Poetics*, *Politics*, and the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the article contends that the play's catharsis does not offer resolution, but instead reveals the fragility of ethical recognition and the limits of rational discourse in a racially and socially fragmented world. Ultimately, *Othello* is read as a tragedy that indicts not only individual failure, but the ideological structures that fail to sustain justice, virtue, and intelligible moral action.

Keywords: Aristotle, Othello, tragedy, logos, phronḍsis, civic exclusion, catharsis

Adres	Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

362 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

Cesaretten Yıkıma: Othello'nun Aristotelesçi Yorumlaması³

Öz

Bu makale, Aristoteles'in *Poetika*'da ortaya koyduğu trajedi kuramına dayanarak *Othello*'yu yalnızca bireysel bir yanılgı (*hamartia*) öyküsü olarak değil, sistematik bir yanlış tanıma biçiminin eleştirisi olarak yeniden yorumlamaktadır. Shakespeare'in oyununda *logos*, aklın, anlamın ve söylemin taşıyıcısı, retorik çarpıtmalar ve önyargılar yoluyla yozlaşır; artık hakikatin güvenilir bir aracı işlevini yerine getiremez. Iago, yalnızca bir kötü karakter değil, aynı zamanda akıl karşıtı bir figür olarak belirir; dili silaha dönüştürerek muhakemeyi çözer, ahlaki sınırları bulanıklaştırır ve etik kavrayışı mümkün kılan çerçeveleri parçalar. Othello'nun düşüşü, yalnızca pratik bilgelikteki (*phronēsis*) bir eksiklikten değil, aynı zamanda adım adım *polis*in akılcı ve siyasal düzeninden dışlanmasından kaynaklanır. Benzer biçimde, Desdemona'nın etik tutarlılığı da şüphe ve kültürel önyargı ile biçimlenmiş söylemsel bir ortamda artık okunamaz hâle gelir. Poetika, Politika ve Nikomakhos'a Etik metinlerinden hareketle makale, oyundaki katharsisin bir çözülme ya da denge değil, aksine etik tanımanın kırılganlığını ve akıl yürütmenin sınırlılığını ifşa ettiğini ileri sürer. Bu bağlamda Othello, yalnızca bireysel bir çöküşü değil, adalet, erdem ve anlamlı ahlaki eylem iddiasındaki ideolojik yapıların kendisini de sorgulayan bir trajedi olarak okunur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Aristoteles, Othello, trajedi, logos, pratik bilgelik, yurttaşlıktan dışlanma, katharsis.

Adres	Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

I. Introduction

Among Shakespeare's major tragedies, *Othello* occupies a liminal position, neither consumed by metaphysical speculation as in *Hamlet*, nor immersed in the collapse of sovereign order as in *King Lear* (Greenblatt, 2018). Instead, the drama of *Othello* unfolds within the interior recesses of ethical failure, rhetorical deception, and the subtle dissonance between martial virtue and civic trust (Neely, 2004; Holloway, 2007). The play stages not merely a personal downfall, but the tragic unmaking of a subject whose excellence in military valor is rendered inert by a deficit in deliberative reason and civic prudence (Howland, 2002; Aristotle, 1984c). In this regard, *Othello* proves particularly receptive to analysis through Aristotelian categories, especially those delineated in the *Poetics*, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and the *Politics* (Aristotle, 1984a; Aristotle, 1984b; Aristotle, 1984c).

Central to Aristotle's conception of tragedy is the transformation of a figure of nobility through *hamartia*, a tragic flaw, not born of vice but of a misjudgment (Aristotle, 1984a, p. 2319). *Othello* conforms to this structure with disquieting precision: a figure of foreign origin, integrated yet never fully interior to the Venetian *polis*, whose ethical misrecognition becomes the fulcrum of the plot's catastrophic turn (Bartels, 1993; Dietz, 2012). The tragic momentum is neither arbitrary nor externally imposed; rather, it derives from an internally fractured capacity for judgment, exacerbated by Iago's manipulative *logos*, and culminating in the protagonist's descent from civic heroism into existential isolation (Kruse, 1979; Oliver, 1959).

Simultaneously, the political ontology of *Othello* resists Aristotelian ideals of the *polis* as a community of virtuous and rational agents (Aristotle, 1984c). While military excellence (*aretḍ*) secures Othello's provisional acceptance, his racial and cultural exteriority precludes full inclusion within the moral fabric of Venetian society (Kuzner, 2007; Leithart, 2006). This structural estrangement underscores a deeper philosophical tension: the disjunction between individual virtue and collective recognition, between the semblance of honor and the absence of *phronḍsis* (Buckle, 2002; Holloway, 2007).

The following analysis examines *Othello* through the Aristotelian triad of form, ethics, and polity (Cantor, 2017). By situating the play within the contours of ancient tragic theory, it becomes possible to trace the anatomy of a character whose fall embodies not only the classical model of tragedy, but also a dramatization of the limits of ethical agency within politically stratified worlds (Holloway, 2007; Miller, 2022).

II. The Architecture of Ruin: Tragic Form, Hamartia, and Aristotelian Structure

In *Poetics*, Aristotle defines tragedy not as visual display but as the imitation of a serious and complete action, culminating in the protagonist's fall due to *hamartia*, not vice or villainy; a formula which *Othello* realizes with uncanny precision (Aristotle, 1984a). The titular Moor is introduced not as an abstract embodiment of nobility but as a figure whose *aretḍ*, grounded in martial excellence, aligns with the Aristotelian requirement of a character "neither eminently good nor just," but still elevated (Aristotle, 1984a).

Yet this very nobility, defined by valor and reputation, proves insufficient when confronted with the demands of *phronḍsis*, or practical judgment; an insufficiency that marks the beginning of his tragic fall. Othello's failure lies not in moral corruption but in an erosion of *phronḍsis*, a collapse rendered visible through his vulnerability to Iago's rhetoric and his own unchecked *pathos* (Howland, 2002). Such a

Adres	**Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi	*RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com	**e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124	**phone:** +90 505 7958124

364 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

collapse of discernment, as outlined by Aristotle (Aristotle, 1984b), constitutes the very essence of tragic causality: the fall stemming not from divine will or villainous intent, but from the protagonist's internal failure to see clearly (Kruse, 1979).

It is within this framework of ethical blindness that Aristotle situates the moment of recognition, *anagnorisis*, as the pivotal turning point in tragic development. This erosion of reason reaches its critical turning point in *anagnorisis*, the recognition that marks a transition "from ignorance to knowledge," as described by Aristotle (1984, p. 2322); a moment which, in *Othello*, arrives too late to prevent the unfolding tragedy. By the same token, a further intensification of the protagonist's downfall unfolds through *peripeteia*, the structural reversal Aristotle defines as the point where the course of action shifts to its opposite (Aristotle, 1984a, p. 2321). Closely intertwined with *anagnorisis*, this dramatic shift signals the moment in which Othello, once a paragon of composed authority and moral discernment, becomes destabilized by suspicion and emotional disarray. The narrative shift from harmony to chaos, from justice to transgression, is not incidental but rather serves as a defining feature of Aristotelian tragic structure, in which reversal and recognition function as interdependent forces of collapse.

These moments of dramatic reversal are not merely narrative devices but structural imperatives that anchor the play firmly within Aristotelian poetics. The structural necessity of anagnorisis and peripeteia firmly aligns Othello with the Aristotelian imperative: that the most compelling tragedies center on a protagonist of moral stature who descends through error, not inherent wickedness (Aristotle, 1984a). In Shakespeare's portrayal, this descent is rendered not through outward spectacle but through the erosion of internal faculties, particularly trust, voice, and identity (Holloway, 2007).

This tragic integrity is reinforced through the unity of action, another essential component in Aristotle's framework where the plot unfolds with relentless coherence toward its fatal resolution with the murder of Desdemona that is followed by Othello's suicide. There are no diversions or episodic ruptures, only the unbroken unraveling of a singular tragic arc. As Aristotle cautions, fragmentation undermines the emotional impact of tragedy (Aristotle, 1984a); yet Othello sustains a harrowing linearity that deepens its affective power.

Taken together, these structural and thematic elements enact Aristotle's enduring warning that greatness, when severed from rational deliberation, becomes not a mark of virtue but a catalyst for ruin. This moral lesson is not conveyed through overt instruction but through the devastating silences that punctuate the movement from accusation to recognition (Buckle, 2002).

This culmination of Othello's descent reinforces the Aristotelian conviction that tragedy functions not merely to depict suffering, but to illuminate the fragility of human judgment when stripped of reasoned deliberation (Aristotle, 1984a). The silence following Desdemona's death, interrupted only by belated recognition, becomes a dramatic void where speech fails, yet meaning deepens (Holloway, 2007). In this moment, catharsis is achieved not through vengeance or resolution, but through the audience's confrontation with irreversible moral collapse (Aristotle, 1984a; Buckle, 2002).

Indeed, Aristotle's emphasis on *eleos* and *phobos*, pity and fear, is realized in Othello's final act, where the audience is left to mourn not only the innocent lives lost, but also the tragic erosion of a character who once embodied martial honor and public trust (Aristotle, 1984a; Howland, 2002). The tragedy thus concludes not with restoration but with existential reckoning, marking the ethical boundary between greatness and blindness (Cantor, 2017).

In viewing *Othello* through the lens of Aristotelian tragic theory, the play emerges not merely as a dramatic narrative of jealousy and betrayal, but as a philosophical inquiry into the limits of ethical agency, reasoned judgment, and civic belonging. Othello's downfall is not incidental but structurally inscribed within the Aristotelian conception of tragedy, where reversal, recognition, and internal misjudgment coalesce into a coherent arc of ruin (Aristotle, 1984a). Shakespeare's tragedy thus enacts a classical moral architecture: a warning that excellence, unmoored from *phronḍsis*, becomes not a guarantor of virtue but a prelude to destruction (Howland, 2002; Miller, 2022). This inner collapse reaches its most distilled expression when Othello, poised on the threshold between judgment and execution, utters the fatal refrain:

> Put out the light, and then put out the light. If I quench thee, thou flaming minister, I can again thy former light restore should I repent me; but once put out thy light, thou cunning'st pattern of excelling nature, I know not where is that Promethean heat that can thy light relume. (Shakespeare,n.d.,5.2.7–13)

The repetition folds the literal into the symbolic, binding the extinguishing of a candle's flame to the silencing of a human soul, until illumination and annihilation become indistinguishable. In that act, what is darkened is not merely the chamber, nor even Desdemona's life, but the last fragile ember of logos, the rational clarity that once bound Othello to the civic and ethical order, now surrendered to irreversible night.

This Aristotelian logic extends further in the play's structural alignment**,** where Othello's tragic path is shaped by the triad of *ethos*, *logos*, and *polis*, simultaneously affirming and destabilizing classical ideals, and revealing the tragic cost of moral misrecognition within a stratified civic order (Kuzner, 2007; Dietz, 2012). Through this structural and ethical alignment, Othello emerges not merely as a product of early modern drama, but as a deeply Aristotelian meditation on human fallibility, political alienation, and the tragic inward turn of greatness.

III. Iago as Counter-*Logos*: The Rhetoric of Undoing

In the Aristotelian cosmos, *logos* is not mere speech but the very instrument through which ethical order is sustained; the faculty that elevates the human soul from appetite to reason, from instinct to deliberation, from chaos to *polis*. Yet in *Othello*, Shakespeare stages a vertiginous inversion: the emergence of *counter-logos*, a form of speech that cloaks itself in reason only to hollow it out, seduce it, and weaponize it, which as a perverse incarnation finds its voice in Iago.

Iago does not speak in the idiom of truth, nor does he lie in the conventional sense. His genius lies in his capacity to *infect* discourse. He speaks in ellipses, insinuations, and half-truths that act not as statements but as viruses: linguistic fragments that enter Othello's epistemic bloodstream and corrupt his phronetic immune system. When Iago whispers, "I am not what I am" (*Othello,* 1.1.65), he issues not only a statement of duplicity but a metaphysical declaration: that logos has been unmoored from essence, that the sign no longer guarantees the thing.

Aristotle does not conceive of the tragic hero as wicked, but as one who errs in judgment, whose excellence harbors a fracture invisible until the moment of collapse (Aristotle, 1984a); Othello's error, however, is not a solitary lapse, it is engineered. Not through force, but through a discourse so coiled in ambiguity, so fluent in insinuation, that even dialectic, designed to untangle truth, finds itself bound in its loops (Neely, 2004; Holloway, 2007);

366 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

> O, beware, my lord, of jealousy;
> It is the green-eyed monster which doth mock
> The meat it feeds on; that cuckold lives in bliss
> Who, certain of his fate, loves not his wronger;
> But, O, what damned minutes tells he o'er
> Who dotes, yet doubts; suspects, yet strongly loves! (Shakespeare, n.d., 3.3.165–171)

This counsel appears to caution against jealousy, yet its paradoxes such as loving while doubting, suspecting while loving, dissolve the stability of reason. The metaphor of a "green-eyed monster" that mocks its own sustenance fuses the grotesque with the intimate, collapsing metaphor into psychological reality. In Aristotelian terms, this is rhetoric stripped of ethical grounding; persuasion that simulates care while corroding the very judgment it pretends to protect. Iago is no sophist of idle deception, he is *logos* inverted, the philosopher of corrosion, the rhetorician who dissolves meaning from within (Howland, 2002).

Iago's rhetoric does not function through open confrontation or overt persuasion; instead, it operates by inhabiting thought itself, not as a clearly articulated argument but as a slow distortion of judgment that mimics the form of reason while hollowing out its ethical core. His words do not challenge Othello's beliefs directly; they insinuate themselves into the structure of his thinking, shaping suspicion not through evidence but through the manipulation of inference. What Othello begins to trust is not Iago as a man, but Iago's language as a logic; one that appears consistent, restrained, and rational, yet subtly erodes the very principles it claims to uphold. Over time, the rhythm and tone of Othello's speech begin to reflect this borrowed framework; the clarity that once marked his judgment gives way to a fragmented cadence, where confidence is replaced by conjecture. When he ultimately condemns Desdemona, it is no longer a verdict rooted in his own moral deliberation, but one voiced through the rhetorical structure that Iago has implanted within him (Greenblatt, 2018; Bartels, 1993).This is no mere manipulation, it is metaphysical possession; *logos* has become the very tool of its undoing, a perversion of what Aristotle envisioned as the vehicle of ethical and political deliberation (Aristotle, 1984c).

Othello, once governed by *phronḍsis*, the kind of measured judgment expected of a soldier entrusted with civic responsibility, begins to unravel under the sustained pressure of a discourse that simulates rationality while steadily replacing its content with suspicion and affect. The deliberative posture that once defined his speech, grounded in a balance of trust and inquiry, gives way to a pattern of conjecture that no longer proceeds from evidence but is shaped by the emotional tempo Iago has carefully orchestrated. This erosion of reason does not erupt as a sudden rupture; it advances in recursive layers, incrementally dissolving the coherence of thought and speech until what remains is a fragmented shell of deliberation. When Othello utters, "Think, my lord? By heaven, thou echo'st me, as if there were some monster in thy thought too hideous to be shown" (3.3.106–108), the moment does not signify an awakening to doubt but a full absorption into a rhetorical logic no longer his own.

In this transformation, Iago's rhetoric enacts more than manipulation or deception; it performs an ontological subversion that detaches *logos* from its ethical and civic foundations. From an Aristotelian perspective, he becomes not simply a violator of order but a profaner of the polis itself, destabilizing the one structure, rational speech, that enables both personal virtue and collective life. His language obscures rather than clarifies, fractures rather than builds, replicating the forms of deliberation only to empty them of their moral and epistemic substance. He functions as a tragic daimon, not by tempting *aretḍ* into failure through external threat, but by persuading it to betray itself through the imitation of rational form devoid of ethical content.

The consequence of this process is most acutely visible in Othello's speech, which, once marked by martial restraint and civic composure, deteriorates into repetition, confusion, and eventually rage. The moment his rhetorical patterns begin to echo Iago's, their tropes, their ellipses, their recursive ambiguity, marks not the beginning of tragedy but its culmination. The final blow does not occur when he lifts his hand against Desdemona; it takes place when he no longer recognizes his own voice as his own, when speech ceases to articulate judgment and becomes a channel for another's design. In this collapse of voice, *logos* becomes its own undoing, and Shakespeare reveals that even the most virtuous character, deprived of ethical self-recognition, may be led to ruin not by force or destiny, but by the seduction of a counterfeit reason.

IV. Desdemona and the Ethical Counterpoint: *Aretḍ* Without Agency

Desdemona enters the tragic field not as a passive foil to Othello's descent but as the embodiment of a moral integrity that remains uncorrupted even in the face of rhetorical distortion, political suspicion, and emotional collapse (Neely, 2004; Holloway, 2007). Her virtue, unlike Othello's, is not performative nor contingent upon public recognition; it resides in a private constancy that does not negotiate, strategize, or retreat. She occupies a space of *aretḍ* in its purest Aristotelian sense, excellence of character expressed through ethical disposition (Aristotle, 1984c, p. 110); yet her position within the dramatic world is marked by an acute absence of agency (Leithart, 2006). She is not a deliberative subject who navigates the complexities of action through *phronḍsis*; rather, she embodies the ethical without possessing the political (Dietz, 2012).

Her speech does not participate in the dialectical framework that defines civic deliberation; she speaks from a position outside the logic of contestation, where virtue does not require defense and trust is not conditional (Bartels, 1993). In a world increasingly governed by suspicion and insinuation, Desdemona's unwavering sincerity fails to register as credible, not because it lacks clarity or force, but because the discursive structure into which she speaks no longer possesses the capacity to receive unmediated ethical expression as epistemically legible (Greenblatt, 2018). Her words are neither disingenuous nor naive; they are misread because the terms of interpretation have already been altered by Iago's infiltration of the symbolic order (Howland, 2002).

As Othello's speech becomes progressively entangled in Iago's rhetorical cadence, Desdemona's language is evacuated of meaning, not through incoherence but through misrecognition (Oliver, 1959). Her fidelity becomes evidence of concealment, her vulnerability becomes a sign of duplicity, and her steadfastness is interpreted as the mask of subversion. She remains constant not because she is unaware, but because she refuses to adapt to a logic that demands the performance of suspicion.

> *His* unkindness may defeat my life,
> But never taint my love. I cannot say "whore":
> It does abhor me now I speak the word;
> To do the act that might the addition earn
> Not the world's mass *of vanity could make me*. (Shakespeare, n.d., 4.2.160–164)

Desdemona's declaration resists not only the accusation but the very language of moral degradation. Her steadfastness embodies Aristotle's aretḍ, excellence of character expressed through consistent action(Aristotle, 1984b, p. 1743). Yet it operates outside the apparatus of political agency. In the interpretive economy of a polis corrupted by suspicion, such virtue cannot be registered as truth. What remains is moral clarity without civic recognition, an ethical light that shines yet cannot alter the course of events.

368 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

In this refusal, she affirms a vision of aretḍ that is unyielding, luminous, and tragically silent. What she cannot do is transform this ethical clarity into political consequence, for the polis that surrounds her has ceased to recognize virtue unaccompanied by the apparatus of self-defense (Kuzner, 2007).

In Desdemona, Shakespeare constructs a character whose ethical strength lies precisely in her inability to participate in the world that deconstructs her. She stands not in opposition to Othello but as the remainder of a moral order that has already been eroded. Her tragedy is not that she falters but that she cannot act; she possesses the highest moral disposition without the structural power to intervene in its misrecognition (Cantor, 2017). This ethical stasis, radiant yet voiceless, marks the limit of *aretḍ* when it is severed from agency and cast adrift in a world where *logos* no longer serves truth, and discourse no longer sustains meaning (Miller, 2022).

V. Race, Polis, and Political Belonging

Othello's tragic arc is inscribed not solely within the realm of ethical misrecognition but within a broader framework of political exclusion, in which the ideal of *aretḍ* is rendered unintelligible outside the norms of civic nativity. Aristotle defines the *polis* as a community of individuals bound together by shared purpose, speech, and moral vision; an association formed not merely for survival but for the realization of virtue through collective life (Aristotle, 1984c). Othello, despite embodying martial excellence and rhetorical restraint, remains external to this civic totality. He is granted status, but not belonging; praised for his usefulness, yet distanced from the ethical interiority of the Venetian polity (Dietz, 2012).

His presence within the political order is therefore conditional, not ontological. The Venetian senate accepts his service, but not his integration; it tolerates his distinction, while disavowing his equivalence. This structural alienation renders his *logos* inherently precarious, as his capacity for ethical speech, central to Aristotelian citizenship, is always already undermined by his racial and cultural alterity (Bartels, 1993; Kuzner, 2007). His downfall thus cannot be read purely as the result of individual hamartia; rather, it reflects a civic logic in which the foreigner, however virtuous, remains ontologically disposable.

The dissolution of Othello's rational agency constitutes more than a psychological deterioration; it enacts a political unmaking that parallels the unraveling of his conditional place within the civic imagination of Venice (Dietz, 2012). His speech, once marked by restraint and rhetorical precision, begins to lose its persuasive force not as a result of incoherence but because it emanates from a body that was never granted full discursive authority within the symbolic economy of the *polis* (Bartels, 1993). Iago's language does not merely infect Othello's mind; it saturates the entire interpretive field, transforming not only interpersonal trust but the epistemic expectations by which truth itself is recognized. Within such a corrupted hermeneutic environment, Othello's voice, though structurally intact, becomes semantically unintelligible, no longer situated within a moral order capable of receiving ethical clarity from a racialized Other (Kuzner, 2007; Holloway, 2007).The suspension of Othello's foreignness under the exceptional conditions of military necessity constitutes not a moment of genuine civic inclusion, but a strategic deferral of difference; a temporary erasure that functions to secure Venetian stability rather than to recognize ethical equivalence. Once that suspension collapses, his perceived distinctiveness is no longer coded as virtuous singularity but reemerges as surplus, as a disruptive excess that resists assimilation into the symbolic economy of the *polis*. The very attributes that once sustained his provisional legitimacy, discipline, eloquence, martial authority, are retroactively refigured as symptoms of unreliability, affective opacity, and latent threat (Kuzner, 2007; Bartels, 1993).

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

What unfolds, therefore, is not a purely psychological deterioration nor a singular failure of ethical reasoning, but a reactivation of a civic imaginary predicated upon containment, purification, and the foreclosure of alterity. Othello's fall, when viewed through this lens, is not simply the unraveling of a tragic individual; it is the dramaturgical staging of a political structure reclaiming its ontological boundaries by disqualifying the stranger's claim to virtue. His excellence, rendered legible only in moments of exceptional necessity, is recoded as unintelligible once the threat of difference surpasses the utility of inclusion (Dietz, 2012; Leithart, 2006).

Consequently, the tragedy dramatizes more than personal ruin; it renders visible the conditions under which belonging itself becomes conditional, the moment at which virtue, when unaccompanied by nativity, is no longer intelligible as ethical presence but collapses into a void of suspicion. Shakespeare thus inscribes into the tragic form a critique of the limits of cosmopolitan recognition, exposing a civic order that grants temporary esteem while withholding political interiority, and in doing so, transforms *aretḍ* without inscription into silence without recourse (Greenblatt, 2018; Holloway, 2007).

VI. *Catharsis* and the Audience's Moral Reckoning

In Aristotle's *Poetics*, *catharsis* is not to be confused with a sentimental or therapeutic release; rather, it is conceived as a profound ethical recalibration, a process by which the spectator, through experiencing pity and fear, is compelled to confront the limits of human judgment and the fragility of moral action (Aristotle, 1984a, p. 24). In *Othello*, however, this process is neither gentle nor redemptive; instead, it is charged with a relentless intensity that leaves no space for tranquil reflection or orderly restoration. The emotional resonance of the tragedy does not emerge from the death of its protagonist alone, but from the recognition that Othello's fall is as much a collapse of moral order as it is a personal tragedy; a fall that implicates not just character but community, not just misjudgment but the structural fragility of logos itself (Howland, 2002; Greenblatt, 2018).

Unlike classical models of *catharsis*, in which the hero's downfall elicits a sense of tragic proportion and poetic justice, *Othello* presents the audience with an unsettling asymmetry: the protagonist's destruction is both excessive and inevitable, orchestrated not by fate or divine decree, but by the corruption of the very faculties that should safeguard ethical reasoning; language, deliberation, trust. The play's climactic recognition scene, where Othello belatedly realizes the enormity of his error, arrives not as a moment of redemption, but as a confirmation that recognition, when deferred beyond the threshold of action, becomes powerless to repair what has been destroyed (Neely, 2004; McEvoy, 2013).

Moreover, the play's rhetorical structure subverts Aristotelian expectations by transferring the site of tragic learning from the hero to the audience. If, as Aristotle asserts, the tragic action should move the spectator through *eleos* and *phobos*, then *Othello* does so not by reaffirming a moral cosmos, but by revealing how precarious such a cosmos truly is, how susceptible reason is to its perversion, how easily civic trust can be undermined by speech that imitates truth without anchoring itself in ethical substance (Loomba, 2005; Bartels, 1993). Iago's rhetoric operates not simply to deceive Othello, but to warp the epistemic conditions under which knowledge is discerned, thus implicating the very mechanisms of understanding the audience would ordinarily rely upon.

In this regard, *Othello* produces a *catharsis* that is less a cleansing than a confrontation, a demand that the viewer acknowledge how the instruments of civilization, logos, deliberation, moral clarity, can become complicit in their own collapse when severed from recognition, inclusion, and ethical

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124

370 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

discernment (Warnicke, 2006; Kuzner, 2007). The audience does not exit the theatrical experience with a sense of narrative closure or ethical resolution; rather, it confronts the unsettling realization that moral collapse is not merely the burden of flawed individuals, but is structurally inscribed within the very interpretive frameworks that govern whose utterances gain legitimacy, whose integrity is granted epistemological credence, and whose humanity is rendered intelligible within the civic and dramatic order.

> *If I do die* before thee, prithee shroud me
> In one of those same sheets.
> ...
> My mother had a maid call'd Barbary:
> She was in love, and he she loved proved mad
> And did forsake her. She had a song of "Willow";
> An old thing 'twas, but it express'd her fortune,
> And she died singing it. (Shakespeare, n.d., 4.3.21–26)

Desdemona's recollection of the "Willow Song" operates as both an intimate confession and an ominous foreshadowing, in which personal memory dissolves into a lament with universal resonance. From an Aristotelian perspective, the moment intensifies eleos, pity, by rendering her quiet acceptance of mortality at once deeply individual and broadly symbolic (Aristotle, 1984a, p. 2320). The shroud she invokes is no longer merely a burial cloth; it becomes a civic emblem, a silent testament to a polis unable to safeguard innocence, and a visual augury of the misrecognition that will determine her end.

The final silence that follows Desdemona's murder and Othello's suicide is not a space of reconciliation, but of epistemic ruin. It is a silence filled not with peace, but with the echo of distorted speech, of reason inverted, of tragedy made possible by the fragility of the ethical and political frameworks that once promised order. In *Othello*, catharsis does not signal closure; it marks the beginning of reckoning; not only with what has been witnessed, but with how easily such witnessing can be structured by misrecognition.

This cathartic function, as articulated in *Poetics*, is traditionally conceived as the purgation of pity and fear; yet in *Othello*, what is purged is not merely emotional excess, but the illusion that rationality and justice are evenly distributed across all subjects. The audience's affective response is not directed solely at Othello's personal fall, but at the broader conditions that render his downfall intelligible, even inevitable, within the ideological parameters of race, rhetoric, and political legitimacy (Aristotle, 1984a; Greenblatt, 2018). In this sense, catharsis becomes a mode of ethical rupture: it interrupts the spectator's complacency, demanding not consolation, but critical recognition.

Furthermore, the tragedy does not restore a moral order; it reveals that such an order, if it ever existed, was selectively applied. Othello's eloquence, nobility, and military service, qualities that momentarily earned him a place within Venetian civitas, are retroactively nullified not because he ceases to possess them, but because they are no longer legible through the distorted optics of suspicion. The audience is thus left not with the assurance of rebalanced justice, but with the moral burden of witnessing how justice itself may collapse under the weight of racialized distrust and rhetorical manipulation (Bartels, 1993; Kuzner, 2007).

What remains after the unraveling of voice and vitality in *Othello* is not the soothing closure of a resolved

Adres | Address
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | e-mail: editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | phone: +90 505 7958124

narrative arc, but an ethical dissonance that lingers, unmoored from redemption. In defiance of the Aristotelian schema wherein catharsis entails the purgation of pity and fear through the restoration of moral order, the play delivers a subversive variant: a recognition not of justice restored, but of its structural elusiveness (Aristotle, 1984a; Greenblatt, 2018). The tragic event no longer culminates in the reaffirmation of ethical coherence; rather, it exposes the very fragility of the epistemic architecture that once promised intelligibility, reciprocity, and belonging.

Othello's downfall, in this light, cannot be ascribed solely to the affective volatility of the tragic hero; it is precipitated by an interpretive regime wherein virtue, once displaced from the culturally sanctioned body, loses its semantic purchase altogether (Bartels, 1993; Holloway, 2007). His *aretḏ*, previously valorized through eloquence, valor, and restraint, becomes undecipherable once refracted through Iago's anti-logos; a rhetoric that contaminates not merely action, but the very criteria by which action is rendered meaningful. Consequently, the audience's *anagnorisis* is not directed at the tragic figure alone, but at the compromised discursive mechanisms that determine which forms of excellence are recognized as ethically legible and which are foreclosed within the symbolic grammar of the polis (Dietz, 2012; Kuzner, 2007).

What lingers, then, is not merely the memory of a tragic fall, but the unsettling recognition that the frameworks through which moral legitimacy is conferred are themselves unstable, selective, and contingent upon structures of race, rhetoric, and power. Catharsis, in this reconfigured light, becomes less an emotional resolution than a cognitive disturbance; a realization that ethical visibility is not universally accessible but contingent upon the interpretive economy of the polis (Neely, 2004; Sanders, 2006). The audience, far from purged, is burdened with the task of reassessing its own assumptions: who is granted the right to suffer meaningfully, whose pain is rendered intelligible, and whose virtue is structurally inaudible.

Furthermore, the play's conclusion does not return the social order to balance, as classical tragedy might suggest, but instead implicates that very order as complicit in the collapse it seeks to mourn. The silence that follows is not one of reconciliation, but of interpretive failure; a void that exposes the dependence of civic coherence on exclusionary logics. In witnessing Othello's undoing, the audience is forced to confront the tragic insight that reason itself may be weaponized, and that ethical destruction may proceed not from chaos, but from a rationality whose boundaries have already been drawn to exclude the Other (Leithart, 2006; Greenblatt, 2018).

VII. Conclusion

The final sequence of Othello offers no restoration of balance, no affirmation of moral coherence, and no return to the ethical equilibrium traditionally associated with classical tragedy. Rather than guiding the audience toward a resolution that purges pity and fear, the play reveals the precariousness of those very emotions when mediated through racialized suspicion, distorted rhetoric, and an interpretive structure that privileges familiarity over justice. What collapses is not simply a noble character overwhelmed by internal flaw, but a fragile discursive system that fails to sustain the legibility of virtue when articulated by a subject outside the symbolic center of the polis. In this framework, tragedy is not a vehicle for resolution but a mechanism for unveiling the conditions under which excellence becomes inaudible, logos loses its ethical compass, and the audience is forced to confront the extent to which belonging itself is constructed through exclusion.

372 / *RumeliDE* Journal of Language and Literature Studies 2025.47 (August)

From Valor to Ruin: An Aristotelian Interpretation of Othello / Tosun, B. C.

In light of these dynamics, the interpretive conclusions developed in this study acquire a sharper resonance, inviting a final reflection on how Othello's tragic arc continues to speak to enduring philosophical and cultural concerns. Such a reading not only consolidates the interpretive arc developed across this study but also situates Othello within a continuum of tragic thought that bridges Aristotelian theory and the modern condition. The gradual disintegration of phronēsis under the combined weight of rhetorical subversion and civic exclusion reveals how the very attributes that confer moral distinction may, when severed from the discipline of reasoned deliberation, become instruments of self-destruction. This convergence of inner flaw and structural constraint affirms the enduring relevance of Aristotle's tragic model, demonstrating that the mechanisms of ethical collapse on Shakespeare's stage remain instructive for understanding the precariousness of moral recognition in any age.

References

Aristotle. (1984a). Poetics (R. Janko, Trans.). In J. Barnes (Ed.), The complete works of Aristotle (Vol. 2, pp. 2316–2340). Princeton University Press.

Aristotle. (1984b). Nicomachean ethics (T. Irwin, Trans.). In J. Barnes (Ed.), The complete works of Aristotle (Vol. 2, pp. 1729–1867). Princeton University Press.

Aristotle. (1984c). Politics (B. Jowett, Trans.). In J. Barnes (Ed.), The complete works of Aristotle (Vol. 2, pp. 1986–2129). Princeton University Press.

Bartels, E. C. (1993). *Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Buckle, S. (2002). Aristotle's republic or why Aristotle's ethics is not virtue ethics. *Philosophy*, 77(302), 565–595.

Cantor, P. A. (2017). *Shakespeare's Roman trilogy: The twilight of the ancient world*. University of Chicago Press.

Dietz, M. G. (2012). Between polis and empire: Aristotle's *Politics*. *American Political Science Review*, 106(2), 275–293.

Greenblatt, S. (2018). *Tyrant: Shakespeare on politics*. W. W. Norton.

Holloway, C. (2007). Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and Aristotle's great-souled man. *The Review of Politics*, 69(3), 353–374.

Howland, J. (2002). Aristotle's great-souled man. *The Review of Politics*, 64(1), 27–56.

Kruse, N. W. (1979). The process of Aristotelian catharsis: A reidentification. *Theatre Journal*, 31(2), 162–171.

Kuzner, J. (2007). Unbuilding the city: *Coriolanus* and the birth of Republican Rome. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 58(2), 174–199.

Leithart, P. J. (2006). City of in-gratia: Roman ingratitude in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*. *Literature and Theology*, 20(4), 341–360.

Loomba, A. (2005). *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.

McEvoy, S. (2013). *Shakespeare and the Tragedy of Knowledge*. Routledge.

Miller, F. D. (2022). Aristotle's political theory. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition).

Neely, C. T. (2004). Women and Men in Othello: "What should such a fool do with so good a woman?" In Shakespearean Tragedy and Gender (pp. 211–239). Wiley-Blackwell.

Oliver, H. J. (1959). Coriolanus as Tragic Hero. *Shakespeare Quarterly, 10*(1), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.2307/286702

Sanders, E. R. (2006). *The Body of the Actor in Coriolanus. Shakespeare Quarterly, 57(4), 387–412. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25475209*

Shakespeare, W. (n.d.). Othello, the Moor of Venice (B. A. Mowat & P. Werstine, Eds.). Folger Shakespeare Library. https://folger-main-site-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2022/11/othello_PDF_FolgerShakespeare.pdf

Warnicke, R. (2006). *Women and Gender in Early Modern England*. Pearson.

Adres | **Address**
RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi | *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*
e-posta: editor@rumelide.com | **e-mail:** editor@rumelide.com,
tel: +90 505 7958124 | **phone:** +90 505 7958124