

The Tragic Triad Decision Framework: An Inferential Methodology for Complex Decision-Making from Classical Greek Tragedy

Assimina Perri and Dimitrios Thomakos
Cybernetics and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

Department of Business Administration
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Athens, Greece

`cail@ba.uoa.gr`

November 13, 2025

Abstract

This paper presents the Tragic Triad Decision Framework (TTDF), a novel inferential and inductive methodology for decision-making under conditions of moral complexity, competing values, and irreducible uncertainty. Drawing systematically from the philosophical architectures embedded in the works of the three major Athenian tragedians—Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides—we formalize five foundational axioms, five theorems with corollaries, seven operational rules, and a comprehensive decision matrix. The framework synthesizes Aeschylean systemic-temporal reasoning, Sophoclean ethical-agential deliberation, and Euripidean psychological-practical insight into an integrated decision methodology applicable to contemporary strategic, organizational, and policy contexts. We demonstrate that ancient tragic wisdom, when properly formalized, offers rigorous analytical tools for navigating the “tragic choices” characteristic of high-stakes decision environments where all options involve sacrifice of legitimate values.

Keywords: decision theory, Greek tragedy, moral dilemmas, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, inferential methodology, applied ethics

1 Introduction

Decision-making under conditions of genuine moral complexity—where competing legitimate values cannot be simultaneously satisfied—constitutes one of the most challenging domains of human judgment. Such “tragic choices” [Calabresi and Bobbitt, 1978] arise in medical ethics, public policy, organizational leadership, and personal life when decision-

makers confront irreducible trade-offs between goods rather than simple good-versus-evil dichotomies.

Contemporary decision theory, while mathematically sophisticated, often proves insufficient for these contexts. Expected utility maximization assumes commensurable values; multi-criteria decision analysis presupposes stable preference orderings; and behavioral economics focuses primarily on cognitive biases rather than moral architecture. What remains underdeveloped is a framework that formally acknowledges value incommensurability, epistemic humility, collective responsibility, and the irreversibility of consequential action.

This paper proposes that classical Greek tragedy—specifically the extant works of Aeschylus (c. 525–456 BCE), Sophocles (c. 497–406 BCE), and Euripides (c. 480–406 BCE)—contains a sophisticated, though previously unformalised, decision methodology uniquely suited to tragic choice contexts. These playwrights were not merely artists but philosophical investigators of human decision-making under extreme constraint [Nussbaum, 1986]. Their dramatic works function as extended thought experiments exploring the logic of choice when fate, duty, passion, and consequence collide.

We extract from their collective corpus three complementary analytical lenses: the Aeschylean emphasis on systemic causation and institutional evolution; the Sophoclean focus on individual moral agency and competing loyalties; and the Euripidean integration of rationality and emotion in psychologically realistic characters. By formalizing these perspectives into axioms, theorems, rules, and a decision matrix, we create the **Tragic Triad Decision Framework** (TTDF)—an inferential methodology that honors complexity while providing structured guidance.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews relevant literature on Greek tragedy and decision theory; Section 3 presents the formal framework structure including axioms and theorems; Section 4 introduces the operational rules and decision matrix; Section 5 discusses applications and implications; Section 6 concludes.

2 Background and Literature

2.1 Decision Theory and Moral Complexity

Classical decision theory, rooted in von Neumann and Morgenstern’s expected utility theorem [von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1944], assumes rational agents maximize utility under uncertainty. Extensions including prospect theory [Kahneman and Tversky, 1979], multi-attribute utility theory [Keeney and Raiffa, 1976], and game-theoretic approaches have enriched the field considerably. However, these frameworks struggle with what Calabresi and Bobbitt term “tragic choices”—decisions where society must allocate scarce resources in ways that sacrifice fundamental values [Calabresi and Bobbitt, 1978].

Sen’s work on capability approaches and value plurality [Sen, 1985] acknowledges incommensurability, while moral philosophy has long recognized tragic dilemmas where duty conflicts with duty [Williams, 1973]. Yet formal decision methodologies incorporating these insights remain rare. Most frameworks either collapse values into single metrics (losing moral nuance) or provide only qualitative guidance (sacrificing analytical rigor).

2.2 Philosophical Dimensions of Greek Tragedy

Greek tragedy has long been recognized as philosophically rich terrain. Aristotle’s *Poetics* established foundational concepts including *hamartia* (tragic error), *peripeteia* (reversal), and *catharsis* (purification through emotional engagement) [Aristotle, 1996]. Modern scholarship has deepened appreciation for tragedy’s epistemological and ethical dimensions.

Nussbaum argues that Greek tragedies embody a form of practical reasoning irreducible to rule-following, revealing the “fragility of goodness” when external contingencies overwhelm moral intention [Nussbaum, 1986]. Goldhill emphasizes tragedy’s role in democratic Athens as a site for collective deliberation about justice, responsibility, and civic obligation [Goldhill, 1987]. Seaford explores how tragic plots encode tensions between archaic honor codes and emerging institutional rationality [Seaford, 1994].

2.3 The Three Tragedians: Distinctive Perspectives

While sharing common dramatic conventions, the three major tragedians offer distinct philosophical orientations:

Aeschylus (c. 525–456 BCE) emphasizes collective responsibility, generational curse, and institutional evolution. His *Oresteia* trilogy traces the transformation from blood vengeance to legal adjudication, embodying a systemic perspective on justice [Gagarin, 1976]. Aeschylean protagonists operate within dense networks of familial, religious, and civic obligations that constrain individual agency.

Sophocles (c. 497–406 BCE) foregrounds individual moral autonomy and the collision between competing ethical imperatives. His heroes—Antigone, Oedipus, Ajax—face impossible choices between legitimate duties [Knox, 1964]. Sophoclean tragedy explores the limits of human knowledge and the irreducibility of certain value conflicts [Williams, 1993].

Euripides (c. 480–406 BCE) introduces psychological realism and rational critique, depicting characters who deliberate explicitly about their choices using both *logos* (reason) and *pathos* (emotion) [Lloyd, 1992]. Euripidean protagonists like Medea articulate sophisticated cost-benefit reasoning while acknowledging passion’s role in decision [Gill, 1996].

These complementary perspectives have not previously been synthesized into a formal decision framework. This paper undertakes that synthesis.

3 The Tragic Triad Decision Framework: Formal Structure

3.1 Foundational Axioms

We begin by establishing five axioms derived inductively from analysis of the tragic corpus. These axioms serve as non-reducible premises for subsequent theoretical development.

Axiom 1 (Principle of Multiple Causation—Aeschylean). *Every decision exists within intersecting causal chains: personal agency, inherited constraints, systemic forces, and temporal necessity. No choice is isolated from its historical and communal context.*

Aeschylus’s *Oresteia* exemplifies this axiom: Orestes’ decision to kill Clytemnestra emerges from Apollo’s command, ancestral curse, filial duty, and civic obligation—a nexus of causal forces no single factor explains.

Axiom 2 (Principle of Competing Goods—Sophoclean). *Tragic decisions emerge when two or more legitimate values conflict irreconcilably. The decision-maker must choose between competing moral imperatives, not between good and evil.*

Antigone’s choice to bury Polynices despite Creon’s edict epitomizes this axiom: divine law versus civic law, familial loyalty versus political order—both claims possess moral legitimacy.

Axiom 3 (Principle of Rational-Emotive Equilibrium—Euripidean). *Optimal decisions require balance between logical analysis (logos) and emotional wisdom (pathos). Neither pure rationality nor unchecked passion yields sustainable outcomes.*

Medea’s deliberation (Euripides, *Medea* 1021–1080) demonstrates this principle: she rationally assesses revenge against maternal love, ultimately failing to maintain equilibrium—a cautionary instance of the axiom’s violation.

Axiom 4 (Principle of Hamartia Recognition). *Every decision carries potential for error (hamartia), often arising from incomplete information, cognitive limitations, or misjudgment rather than moral failure.*

Oedipus’s choices throughout *Oedipus Rex* illustrate decisions made with epistemic constraint: his investigation proceeds rationally but within a knowledge structure that systematically obscures crucial facts.

Axiom 5 (Principle of Irreversible Consequence). *Decisions create reality through action; once enacted, consequences unfold according to systemic logic that may exceed the decision-maker's control or intention.*

Agamemnon's sacrifice of Iphigenia initiates a causal chain culminating in his own murder—consequences extending far beyond the immediate military necessity that motivated the original choice.

3.2 Fundamental Theorems

From these axioms, we derive five theorems that characterize decision dynamics in tragic contexts.

Theorem 1 (Collective Responsibility Theorem). *Individual decisions generate consequences that extend beyond the individual, affecting communities, institutions, and future generations.*

Proof Sketch. From Axiom 1 (Multiple Causation), decisions exist within systemic networks. From Axiom 5 (Irreversible Consequence), enacted choices generate effects according to system logic. Therefore, individual decisions necessarily propagate through the causal networks in which they are embedded, affecting all nodes (persons, institutions, future states) connected within those networks. □ □

Corollary 2. *Decision-makers bear responsibility not only for intended outcomes but for reasonably foreseeable systemic effects.*

Theorem 3 (Moral Dilemma Incompleteness Theorem). *In authentic moral dilemmas, no choice eliminates all negative consequences; every option involves sacrifice of some legitimate value.*

Proof Sketch. From Axiom 2 (Competing Goods), moral dilemmas entail irreducible conflict between legitimate values $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_n$. If choice C_i satisfies value V_j , it necessarily violates at least one other legitimate value V_k (by definition of irreducible conflict). Therefore, no choice C_i exists that satisfies all V_j simultaneously. Every choice involves value sacrifice. □ □

Corollary 4. *The quality of a tragic decision is measured not by perfect outcomes but by the process of deliberation and acknowledgment of sacrificed values.*

Theorem 5 (Deliberative Balance Theorem). *Decisions made under extreme emotional states or pure rationality divorced from human values are more prone to catastrophic error than balanced deliberation.*

Proof Sketch. From Axiom 3 (Rational-Emotive Equilibrium), optimal decisions require balance between *logos* and *pathos*. Let E denote decision quality as a function of rational component r and emotional component e : $E = f(r, e)$. Extreme states are defined as $r \rightarrow 1, e \rightarrow 0$ (pure rationality) or $r \rightarrow 0, e \rightarrow 1$ (pure emotion). From Axiom 3, f is maximized when r and e are balanced. At extremes, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial r}$ or $\frac{\partial f}{\partial e} \rightarrow 0$, indicating suboptimal decision quality. Therefore, extreme states yield inferior decisions relative to balanced deliberation. $\square$ $\square$

Corollary 6. *Effective decision-making requires temporal spacing to allow both emotional processing and rational analysis.*

Theorem 7 (Knowledge-Action Gap Theorem). *Perfect knowledge is unattainable before action; decisions must be made with epistemic humility regarding unknown factors and unintended consequences.*

Proof Sketch. From Axiom 4 (Hamartia Recognition), all decisions involve potential error due to epistemic constraints. From Axiom 5 (Irreversible Consequence), consequences unfold according to complex system dynamics. The information required for perfect foresight includes: (i) complete knowledge of current system state; (ii) complete knowledge of system dynamics; (iii) perfect prediction of all actors' future choices; (iv) complete knowledge of external perturbations. Conditions (i)–(iv) are epistemically unattainable for complex social systems. Therefore, decisions must proceed under irreducible uncertainty. $\square$ $\square$

Corollary 8 (Hubris Corollary). *Hubris (hybris)—overconfidence in one's knowledge or control—increases the magnitude of decision error by suppressing appropriate epistemic humility.*

Theorem 9 (Institutional Justice Theorem). *Systems that transform personal revenge into structured, impersonal procedures reduce cycles of retributive violence and enable sustainable social cooperation.*

Proof Sketch. From Axiom 1 (Multiple Causation), actions exist within systemic contexts. Personal revenge operates through direct reciprocity: harm begets counter-harm in iterative cycles. From Axiom 5 (Irreversible Consequence), each revenge act initiates new causal chains. Without external constraint, revenge cycles persist indefinitely. Institutional procedures break direct reciprocity by: (i) imposing third-party adjudication; (ii) standardizing penalties; (iii) legitimating outcomes through process. These mechanisms interrupt revenge cycles, enabling stable equilibria. This is precisely the transformation Aeschylus depicts in the *Oresteia's* progression from Furies to Eumenides, from vendetta to court. $\square$ $\square$

Corollary 10. *Individual decision-making benefits from institutional frameworks that constrain arbitrary action and provide procedural legitimacy.*

4 Operational Rules and Decision Matrix

4.1 Decision-Making Rules

The following seven rules translate axioms and theorems into operational guidance.

Rule 1 (Temporal Triangulation—Aeschylean). *Before deciding, examine: (1) past precedents and inherited constraints; (2) present stakeholder interests and systemic position; (3) future implications across multiple time horizons.*

Rule 2 (Value Mapping—Sophoclean). *Explicitly identify: (1) all legitimate values at stake; (2) which values conflict irreducibly; (3) what will be sacrificed under each option; (4) personal moral convictions versus external obligations.*

Rule 3 (Dual-Process Deliberation—Euripidean). *Engage both: (1) analytical reasoning (evidence, logic, probabilistic thinking); (2) emotional intelligence (intuition, empathy, values clarity); (3) iterative dialogue between rational and emotional assessments.*

Rule 4 (Epistemic Humility Protocol). *Acknowledge: (1) known unknowns (identified information gaps); (2) unknown unknowns (potential for unforeseen factors); (3) cognitive biases and personal limitations; (4) need for corrective feedback mechanisms.*

Rule 5 (Stakeholder Consequence Analysis). *Map impacts on: (1) primary actors (direct decision participants); (2) secondary stakeholders (immediately affected parties); (3) tertiary effects (systemic and temporal ripples); (4) vulnerable or marginalized populations.*

Rule 6 (Procedural Legitimacy Check). *Ensure: (1) decision follows established institutional norms where applicable; (2) process is transparent and defensible; (3) affected parties have voice or representation; (4) appeals or revision mechanisms exist.*

Rule 7 (Post-Decision Reflexivity). *After enacting choice: (1) monitor actual versus intended consequences; (2) acknowledge errors and tragic sacrifices; (3) extract lessons for institutional learning; (4) accept responsibility without paralysis.*

4.2 The Tragic Triad Decision Matrix (TTDM)

The TTDM operationalizes the framework through systematic evaluation. Table 1 presents the matrix structure. Due to its width, the table is displayed in landscape orientation on the following page.

Table 1: The Tragic Triad Decision Matrix (TTDM)

Decision Dimension	Aeschylean (Systemic-Temporal)	Lens	Sophoclean (Ethical-Agential)	Lens	Euripidean (Psycho-Practical)	Lens	Synthesis
Problem Framing	Historical context? Inherited constraints? Collective impact?		Competing values? Moral imperatives in conflict?		Emotional vs. rational framing? Psychological drivers?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$
Information State	Systemic patterns known? Precedents? Long-term trajectories?		Stakeholder values understood? Moral principles clear?		Cognitive biases identified? Emotional state assessed?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$
Options Generation	Institutional solutions? Preventive mechanisms? Collective remedies?		Honor competing values? Individual vs. civic duty balance?		Balance passion and reason? Realistic feasibility?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$
Consequence Projection	Generational effects? Systemic feedback loops? Precedent set?		Values sacrificed? Moral residue? Who bears cost?		Psychological sustainability? Implementation barriers?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$
Decision Legitimacy	Due process? Community accountability? Institutional reform potential?		Personal integrity maintained? Moral justification defensible?		Self-awareness present? Emotional authenticity?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$
Post-Decision Protocol	Institutional learning? Structural adjustment? Collective catharsis?		Moral responsibility accepted? Tragic recognition acknowledged?		Psychological integration? Adaptation capacity?		$\sum(A + S + E)/3$

4.3 Scoring Protocol

For each cell in the matrix, assign a score $s \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$:

- **5:** Exemplary integration of the dimension
- **4:** Thorough consideration with minor gaps
- **3:** Adequate but incomplete analysis
- **2:** Minimal consideration, significant gaps
- **1:** Dimension completely unaddressed or violated

Let A_i, S_i, E_i denote Aeschylean, Sophoclean, and Euripidean scores for dimension i . The synthesis score for dimension i is:

$$\text{Synthesis}_i = \frac{A_i + S_i + E_i}{3}$$

The overall decision quality score Q is:

$$Q = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 \text{Synthesis}_i = \frac{1}{18} \sum_{i=1}^6 (A_i + S_i + E_i)$$

4.4 Interpretation Framework

- **4.0–5.0:** High-quality tragic decision (optimal given constraints)
- **3.0–3.9:** Adequate decision with notable gaps
- **2.0–2.9:** Problematic decision with major weaknesses
- **1.0–1.9:** Critically flawed decision

4.5 Profile Analysis

Beyond the aggregate score Q , the profile of scores across dimensions reveals decision-making tendencies:

Aeschylean-Dominant ($\bar{A} > \bar{S}, \bar{E}$): Strong systemic thinking but may neglect individual agency or psychological realism.

Sophoclean-Dominant ($\bar{S} > \bar{A}, \bar{E}$): Strong moral clarity but may underweight systemic constraints or emotional factors.

Euripidean-Dominant ($\bar{E} > \bar{A}, \bar{S}$): Strong psychological insight but may lack institutional grounding or moral rigor.

Balanced Tragic Wisdom ($\bar{A} \approx \bar{S} \approx \bar{E}$): Integrates all three perspectives for comprehensive decision quality.

5 Application Protocol

The TTDF is implemented through a five-phase protocol:

5.1 Phase 1: Decision Identification

- Define the decision requiring judgment with precision
- Identify why the decision is difficult (competing goods, uncertainty, high stakes)
- Establish decision timeline and stakeholders

5.2 Phase 2: Triadic Analysis

- Apply each analytical lens (Aeschylean, Sophoclean, Euripidean) systematically using Rules 1–7
- Complete TTDM matrix scoring with documented rationale for each cell
- Identify which dimension(s) are weakest in current analysis

5.3 Phase 3: Iterative Refinement

- Strengthen weak dimensions through additional inquiry, consultation, or deliberation
- Re-score matrix after refinement
- Continue iterative improvement until balanced synthesis achieved or resource constraints met

5.4 Phase 4: Deliberative Choice

- Make decision with full awareness of tragic sacrifices inherent in the choice
- Document reasoning comprehensively across all three lenses
- Establish monitoring metrics aligned with consequence projections
- Communicate decision with appropriate acknowledgment of value trade-offs

5.5 Phase 5: Cathartic Reflection

- Implement post-decision protocols (Rule 7)
- Monitor outcomes against projections
- Accept responsibility for consequences while avoiding decision paralysis
- Contribute lessons learned to collective organizational or community wisdom

6 Discussion

6.1 Theoretical Contributions

The TTDF makes several contributions to decision theory:

Formalisation of Tragic Wisdom: While Greek tragedy has long been recognised as philosophically significant, this framework represents the first systematic formalisation of tragic insights into axiomatic decision theory. By extracting inferential structures from dramatic texts, we demonstrate that ancient cultural artifacts can yield rigorous analytical frameworks.

Value Pluralism Integration: Unlike standard decision frameworks that assume value commensurability, the TTDF incorporates irreducible value conflict as a foundational axiom (Axiom 2). The Moral Dilemma Incompleteness Theorem (Theorem 2) formally establishes that some decisions necessarily involve sacrifice, reframing decision quality from outcome optimization to process integrity.

Systemic-Temporal Perspective: The Aeschylean lens introduces longitudinal and collective dimensions often absent from individualistic decision models. The Collective Responsibility Theorem (Theorem 1) and Institutional Justice Theorem (Theorem 5) provide theoretical grounding for considering intergenerational and systemic effects.

Emotional Intelligence Integration: The Euripidean lens, formalized in Axiom 3 and Theorem 3, provides theoretical justification for incorporating emotional processing into rigorous decision methodology—a dimension often excluded from “rational” frameworks despite mounting evidence of emotion’s epistemic value.

6.2 Practical Applications

The TTDF has potential applications across multiple domains:

Medical Ethics: End-of-life decisions, resource allocation, and treatment trade-offs exemplify tragic choices where the framework’s emphasis on competing goods, stakeholder consequences, and value acknowledgment proves particularly relevant.

Public Policy: Policy decisions involving environmental protection versus economic development, security versus liberty, or distributional justice require exactly the kind of multi-lens analysis the TTDF provides.

Organizational Leadership: Strategic decisions involving layoffs, market exits, or mission changes involve competing stakeholder interests and long-term systemic effects well-suited to triadic analysis.

Personal Life Decisions: Career changes, family obligations, and ethical dilemmas in personal relationships often involve the same structure of competing legitimate values that tragedy explores.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

Cultural Specificity: The framework emerges from Greek cultural context. While we argue for its universal applicability to tragic choice structures, empirical validation across diverse cultural settings remains necessary.

Scoring Subjectivity: The TTDM scoring protocol involves subjective judgment. Future research should develop inter-rater reliability measures and potentially integrate more objective metrics where available.

Computational Implementation: The current framework requires human judgment throughout. Computational decision support systems implementing the TTDF could enhance scalability but would need careful design to preserve nuance.

Empirical Validation: Systematic comparison of decisions made using the TTDF versus standard frameworks would provide empirical evidence of the methodology’s value-added. Longitudinal studies tracking decision quality and consequences would be particularly valuable.

Integration with Other Frameworks: Exploring how the TTDF complements or conflicts with existing methodologies (e.g., utilitarianism, deontology, virtue ethics, capabilities approach) could enrich theoretical understanding.

6.4 Comparison with Existing Frameworks

Table 2 provides a comparative overview of the TTDF relative to established decision frameworks.

Table 2: Comparative Framework Analysis

Framework	Value Pluralism	Systemic Effects	Emotional Intelligence	Epistemic Humility	Process Focus	Formal Structure
Expected Utility	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	High
Multi-Criteria	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Medium	High
Capabilities	High	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
Virtue Ethics	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium	High	Low
TTDF	High	High	High	High	High	High

The TTDF’s distinctive strength lies in simultaneously maintaining formal rigor while incorporating dimensions (value pluralism, emotion, systemic effects) that other frameworks treat as secondary or external to core methodology.

7 Conclusion

This paper has presented the Tragic Triad Decision Framework (TTDF), a novel inferential methodology synthesizing decision-making wisdom from the three major Athenian tragedians. By formalizing Aeschylean systemic-temporal reasoning, Sophoclean ethical-agential deliberation, and Euripidean psychological-practical insight into five axioms, five theorems, seven rules, and a comprehensive decision matrix, we provide a rigorous yet humanistic approach to complex decisions involving competing values and irreducible uncertainty.

The framework’s central insight is that decisions of genuine moral complexity cannot be reduced to optimization algorithms or simple principles. Instead, they require multi-perspectival analysis acknowledging: the systemic embeddedness of choice (Aeschylus); the irreducible conflict between legitimate goods (Sophocles); and the necessity of balancing reason and emotion (Euripides). By bringing these dimensions into structured dialogue through the TTDM, decision-makers can navigate tragic choices with greater clarity, humility, and moral integrity.

Greek tragedy, far from being merely historical artifact, offers living wisdom for contemporary decision-making. The tragedians understood what modern decision science is rediscovering: that many of our most important choices involve sacrifice, that knowledge is always incomplete, that emotion and reason must work in concert, and that individual decisions ripple through social systems across time. The TTDF formalizes this ancient wisdom, making it accessible to contemporary practice.

Future research should pursue empirical validation, computational implementation, cross-cultural testing, and integration with complementary frameworks. Theoretical extensions might explore connections to game theory (especially non-cooperative games and social dilemmas), network theory (for systemic effects), and neuroscience (for the rational-emotive equilibrium). The framework also invites application to emerging challenges—climate policy, artificial intelligence governance, biotechnology ethics—where tragic choices between competing goods will only intensify.

Ultimately, the TTDF offers not a method for eliminating difficulty from difficult decisions, but a methodology for engaging that difficulty with intellectual rigor, moral courage, and human wisdom. In doing so, it honors the tragic vision: that while we cannot escape the constraints of circumstance, choice, and consequence, we can face them with eyes open—and in that facing, find both meaning and dignity.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the enduring relevance of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, whose works continue to illuminate the human condition twenty-five centuries after their

composition.

References

- Aristotle. 1996. *Poetics*. Translated by Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books.
- Calabresi, Guido, and Philip Bobbitt. 1978. *Tragic Choices*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Gagarin, Michael. 1976. *Aeschylean Drama*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gill, Christopher. 1996. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldhill, Simon. 1987. "The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107: 58–76.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. 1979. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk." *Econometrica* 47(2): 263–291.
- Keeney, Ralph L., and Howard Raiffa. 1976. *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Trade-offs*. New York: Wiley.
- Knox, Bernard M.W. 1964. *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lloyd, Michael. 1992. *The Agon in Euripides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1986. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seaford, Richard. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, Amartya. 1985. "Well-Being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984." *The Journal of Philosophy* 82(4): 169–221.
- von Neumann, John, and Oskar Morgenstern. 1944. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, Bernard. 1973. "Ethical Consistency." In *Problems of the Self*, 166–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Bernard. 1993. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.