TRAGIC EFFECT IN TWO LEVELS OF EMOTIONS AND INTELLECTUAL RECOGNITION

EFECTO TRÁGICO EN DOS NIVEL DE EMOCIONES Y RECONOCIMIENTO INTELECTUAL

RESUMEN
Algunos teóricos están de acuerdo con Horace en la idea de que la intención del drama trágico, como la de los otros tipos de drama, es solo atraer aplausos a los espectadores y darle satisfacción a la mente. Este fue un estudio de análisis de contenido. Antes del análisis, los recursos disponibles se dividieron en dos grupos; el primer grupo entendió la persistencia de la tragedia como su efecto sobre las emociones y el afecto, y el otro grupo descubrió que el disfrute de la tragedia no era una diversión. Pensadores destacados en esta área, presentan una definición relativamente completa de la importancia de la tragedia.
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ABSTRACT
Some theoreticians agree with Horace in the idea that the tragic drama’s intention, like that of the other kinds of drama, is solely enticing applause in the spectators and giving them gladness of the mind. This was a content analysis study. Prior to analysis, the available resources were divided into two groups: the first group to understand the persistence of tragedy as its effect on emotions and affect and the other group find the enjoyment of tragedy not as an amusement. In the present research summing ideas of the prominent thinkers in this area, comes up with a relatively thorough definition of the importance of tragedy.
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INTRODUCTION

Tragedy is the display of the test followed by the downfall of the individuals who, though not being perfect, are the best amongst the other elements of the story. Throughout Shah Nameh, Rostam is the symbol of resistance, chivalry, heroism and the re-taker of the wronged persons’ rights. He is the one who frees Bijan from the captivity of the well and he is the one who revenges the person who shed the pure blood of Siāvash.

Somewhere he puts the kingship crown on the head of Qobad and helps the fanciful Kaykāvus and, in another stage, assists Iranians against their enemies. He is good but not complete because he is occasionally found in need of the resolving tricks of Zāl and the guidance of the phoenix and it is again him who kills his innocent son in a difficult test (Zadeh & Akbari, 2016; Shamsayi, 2017).

On the other hand, Esfandiyar, the supporter of the Behi religion and savior of Iran’s territory against the foreigners’ raid, is captivated by the carnal wishes and dragged towards death with his own hands.

The hero in a tragedy cannot and should not be perfect and flawless. Orestes, son of Agamemnon, kills his mother for betrayal but he is not acquitted by the gods for doing so and he flees to Athena. If the hero of a tragedy acts without any mistake, there would not come about the dual sorrowful paradox stemming from the positive and negative events of a tragic story that deploy the negative feelings of sadness before the addressees’ desire for expecting something useful and positive in return (Jahandideh & Khaefi, 2017).

Generally, philosophers have been believed that the usefulness should be really so significant that it can overcome grief; it has to be so important that turn tragedy into the most superior form of literature and the most frequently repeated of all the arts. Tragic effect was invented to describe or define this usefulness. What makes this research necessary is that today the balance between sadness and usefulness in tragic stories is gone. The protagonists in the stories always tend to grieve, or there is no logical connection between sadness and usefulness in the protagonist. This research examines this relationship and the fractured relationship between usefulness and sadness.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This was a content analysis study. Prior to analysis, the available resources were divided into two groups: the first group to understand the persistence of tragedy as its effect on emotions and affect and to see only the usefulness of tragedy in the immediate and transient enjoyment of the addressees, and the other group to find the enjoyment of tragedy not as an amusement and not even as a solution to escaping the temporary sufferings of life but as a way to reach cognizance and real ideology during the aftermath of a tragic event and consider an ethereal value for
tragedy and its protagonists and realize them as a burning candle assisting mankind in understanding the relationship between humans and truth. Then the sources representing each of these two groups were selected and analyzed rationally.

RESULTS

Controversies over the tragedy’s importance or its mere amusing nature stem from Plato’s deductions. His discussions begin in the third chapter and peak in the tenth chapter. Since tragedy is recognized as the symbol of poetry and art in Greece, the arrow of his criticisms was directed at this genre.

Their standpoint regarding poetry can be more clearly understood in an expression of part of the ideas by Plato and his disciples regarding Greece’s dramas.

Possibly, Gorgias’s intention of the offensive words is such behaviors as murdering of father by the son and/or incest and war against the gods and other issues of the kind that used to be presented within the format of Greece’s tragedy.

On the other hand, Plato’s criticisms addressed the judges of the festivals for, at least, they, as the primary critics of the dramatic literature, were expected to make distinctions between a popular play and an excellent drama; but, their judgments, as well, were occasionally influenced by the people masses and they were paving the way through their appointing of third degree plays for the ever increasing absurdity of this art.

Therefore, poets have no room in Plato’s utopia, and they should be secluded. Plato accuses all the poets and Homer of lying and believes that the things they say about the gods are nothing more than false narrations (de Beistegui, & Sparks, 2017; Munteanu, 2018).

Of course, one should note that Plato is also a religious corrector and cannot stand the mutiny of the poets’ heroes against the pre-Olympian gods and believes that poetry has to be censored for, as he opines, correct upbringing, it was made clear that what words and stories should our society members hear about the gods during their childhood and what types of speeches they should not hear so that they can respectfully treat their gods, father and mother in adulthood and consecrate friendship with one another.

Now, if this intention is a praiseworthy issue, the poem is also extolled and vice versa. It is based on this dual approach towards poetry that Plato states, in a conversation with Glaucon, that we would only present our society with the poems
the contents of which are extolment of the gods and admiration of the honorable men.

He is objected for the fact that he seminally implicitly divides poems into two sets of imitative and non-imitative and expresses that the imitative poems have no room in the country; but, in continuation and in the allegory of the bed-maker, he calls the God as the real bed-maker and finds the carpenter as the constructor of something similar to bed and realizes the painter who draws the picture of a bed as the imitator of the thing firstly made by the God and then by the carpenter and concludes that the constructor of a thing that is three stages away from the truth is called imitator and that the writers of dramas are solely imitators.

He has the following words as his decisive idea about poetry, all poets, including Homer and others, only show us ghosts and shadows in regard of human capabilities and other cases and are incapable of comprehending the true competencies and the other truths (Fóti, 2019; Hyland, 2016).

Therefore, unlike Plato’s speeches, the thing that the painter or a poet shows to us is not just ghosts and shadows that are devoid of any truth rather it is the manifestation of the events we experience them and/or, at least, expect and wish to experience them. In other words, the value of Rostam and Esfandiyar’s story does not only lie in a simple fight between two heroes in an unknown time; the story is valuable to us and we feel joy after each time of hearing it for the fact that it bears a point related to us.

However, even Plato cannot deny the pleasure he experiences after each time of watching and hearing a tragic work.

Unlike this statement, the sorrow originating from a tragedy is a sort of sadness that can be generalized to all the mankind. It is a sadness that stems from a sort of cognizance that is the result of the audience feedback to the tragedy’s events and final result; but, in the other literary genres, it is the personal emotions of the protagonist that are retold not those of a collective human archetype. So, the emotions fall in a more subtle concept in tragedy than the other literary genres. The second criticism of Plato’s notion is as follows: assuming his reasoning that emotions stemming from a tragic issue cause the deviation of the honorable part, it is still related to emotional valuableness or non-valuableness but the role of tragedy in the intellect and wisdom level is neglected.

Apart from the inciting of feelings and affections, a tragic story is followed by an epistemological result that is the product of the hero’s battle with the destiny. Of course, this approach by Plato towards the result and usefulness of tragedy might have been influenced by bearing witness to the people’s enjoyment of the tragedy-
like absurd plays that, as Plato opines, found their way onto the scene by bribery (Eshraghi & Taffler, 2015; Young, 2017).

Another point seen in Plato’s statements is the dividing of the soul to inferior and honorable but, as the Islamic thinkers hold it, the soul is absolutely clean and honorable and it is usually deployed before the ego or the self that is inferior and discussion in this regard is beyond the present study’s scope (Rapp, 2015; Stride, Thomas & Chamorro, 2019).

DISCUSSION

Amongst the most influential theoreticians who have made theories about tragedy after Aristotle up to 18th century, Horace can be pointed out. Although some believe that there are not posited any serious discussions in his ideas about tragedy, this few debates by him are worthy of contemplation considering the stagnation of literary criticism during the years after Aristotle until the Europe’s literary renaissance (except the Islamic critics like Hafiz and Abd Al-Qaher Jorjani).

This is the behavior that was intensively criticized by Plato and he strongly rejects this downgrading of speech to the limits of some absurd words for the happiness of the audience and some groups of general publics. But the thing that is worthy of admiration and deserves admiration in Horace’s work is his efforts parallel to the construction of rules for writing an artwork whether be it a tragic one or a dramatic play.

This is the first effort made in line with the expressing of a solution for distinguishing a genre from the others away from the epistemological and cognitive concepts and without the complexities of the philosophical theories. Horace’s freedom of a law called “inspiration in poem” helped him deal with the attributes of the literary types in a more scientific manner than his antecedents.

Tragedy’s joy is the product of several paradoxical issues creating pleasure in the audience. It can be asked that why does the audience enjoy the sadness and anxiety in tragedy? And, is the repetitive excitement of the tragedy’s audience only limited to its sympathy with the hero?

The horrible incidents and catastrophes should be offered in an artistic and dramatic way along with certain colors and enamels and rhymes and pitches so that they can provoke pleasure and the daily heart-scratching events of life cannot at all be accompanied by a joy like that of a tragic art. It has to be stated in explaining this point that, besides the audience’s taking of a position in a safe place during being exposed to the events and incidents in a tragedy that help it reach
peace of the mind, there is another reason for the unpleasantness of the tragedy in the ordinary life and that is the idea that, in tragedy, the audience seeks something beyond what it can experience in life and, in fact, the human beings enjoy the observation of the experiences and the actions they could never make. The tragedy's art lies in awakening and corroborating [the feelings of] sympathy and fury, anxiety and aggression of the spectators. This statement can be completed as follows: tragedy's art lies in awakening such feelings as wrath, fear, sorrow and anxiety stemming from empathy with the tragedy's hero in the entire scenes of an event the experiencing of which is envied by the audience in its ordinary life. Of course, the musical effect and the superiority of sadness to happiness, as well, aid to the engaging of the spectators in the tragedy's content.

The interpretation of tragedy's joy can be simply summarized in a Dionysian matter by a review of his book. In more simple terms, Dionysian matter means rapture and drunkard resulting from an ideological idea by which any issue is intended that individuals, from the followers of a football team to the believers in a religious ritual, would spend part of their lives instantly on it. Consider the fans of a sport game that are busy zealously shouting and clapping for their favorite athletes during the match. Anything that happens on the path of game, from sadness and grief to anxiety and fear and happiness and joy, all causes the spectators find themselves in a situation that distances them away from the ordinary issues of life for a limited period of time.

In fact, the spectators of the sport game like the witnesses of tragedy feel sympathy with the imaginary behaviors of the heroes and exchange their ordinary life's sadness with the excellent and ungettable sadness of tragedy. This momentary escape of the realities always residing in the minds of humans is the most preliminary type of rapture; I presented the above example for getting close as much as possible to the concept of rapture or the very Dionysian matter by Nietzsche. Now, compare this momentary escape of the life's truth with the behaviors of Sufis during Samā.

The Sufi performing Samā is indeed relieving oneself from the truth that is always intriguing his mind via placing oneself in a rapturous situation by the assistance of dancing and music and singing. This truth can be thinking about right-doing and wrong-doing and others of the kind in Sufi's mind. So, Sufi gets rid of such thoughts for a limited period of time upon entering a rapturous state and he enjoys it. Now, let's get back to Nietzsche's definition of joy in tragedy. Nietzsche believes that the heroes' behaviors in tragedy and the spectators or singers' accompaniment and correspondence with them originate from the religious rituals in ancient Greece wherein the religious leaders performed some religious behaviors along with playing of music and singing and the others accompanied them and became rapturous. Now, these leaders have given their place to the
heroes in tragedy and the spectators become rapturous through singing along with them and experience the Dionysian matter. So, based on this definition by Nietzsche of tragedy, it can be stated that a metaphysical leisure separates us for a moment from the turmoil of the variable roles. We truly become our own primitive existences for some short instants.

The abovementioned questions can be answered as follows: the feeling of happiness in confrontation with Dionysian matter is the product of the pass by tragedy’s hero that is indeed a representative of the mankind through the path of experiencing such a wonderful issue from the behavioral conflicts and arriving at a divine unity. In my opinion, the perception of the most subtle relationships between the human beings and the God as a result of tragedy is the only reason for the regeneration of this sublime genre again and again (Hamilton, 2017; Walsh & Varnava, 2016).

The Aristotle’s ideas about poetry and the characteristics of tragedy genre were discussed in the first and second parts of the present research paper and their various aspects were explored and criticized in a comparative approach to the eastern culture.

Their difference surfaces when Plato considers the product of imitation as not useful for its being copied from the original truth and distant from it for three stages and Aristotle find imitation not only pleasurable but also useful and beneficial for everyone and believes that “the human beings obtain their preliminary knowledge in the same way by imitation and mimicry and that all the people enjoy imitation and mimesis” (Hyland, 2016, p.128).

In expressing the quality of the usefulness of imitation and instruction by imitation, he continues that:

> Watching an image similar to its original version causes pleasure because watching and observing these images helps us gain information and recognition of the whereabouts of the original version of the forms and discern the thing implied of the original version in those forms. It is like when a person says that this image shows the shape of that thing and, if we happen not to have seen that image before, the image would still makes us feel happy in the mind not because it copies and depicts its original subject but because use has been made of a perfect industry therein and/or because it has been colored pleasantly and/or due to other similar aspects (Hyland, 2016, p.129).

This statement by Aristotle about the value and usefulness of poetry, as an imitation, help us maximally succeed in explaining the usefulness of poetry as well
as the quality with which joy is felt through sympathizing with the heroes. This theory by Aristotle can be matched with the components of tragedy and it can be stated that tragedy is pleasurable because it is an excellent and processed imitation of reality. Tragedy is an imitation of reality that is per se very sublime and its attainment in the ordinary life is deemed impossible. Heroes are also imitations of our own selves but they have become more courageous, stronger and more ambitious and, on the one hand, they provide us with the possibility of sympathizing with them because they are copies of us and, on the other hand, experience their chivalries in the world of imagination and fancies for it is impossible in the daily life. The experiencing of the pleasant feeling incited in us during watching a film or playing a computer game is very much similar to this same fabricated and processed imitation.

If we finish our discussions about tragedy's imitation of truth in this point, we would be also accused of limiting the tragedy's effect only to the feelings and emotions, but we avoid this accusation by expressing its usefulness. As it was mentioned before, tragedy provides us with the experiencing of a sublime imitation of the truth, but this is just the beginning. By stimulating our feelings and placing us in a situation that we can perceive things beyond the ordinary issues, tragedy enables us to conceive such non-describable concepts as determinism and free will and our relationships with the life's horrible afflictions and their reasons in the light of experiencing the most subtle type of the human being's relationship with the creator.

Aristotle’s emphasis on the method of finishing a tragedy based on its termination through the actions by the heroes is for the fact that the road can be paved for the maximal empathy of the audience with the hero so that it cannot ever get separated in the light of the narrator’s utterances from the rapture resulting from this empathy even for a moment. The benefit of a well-constructed tragedy is that it allows the spectator feel a sort of this-other with the tragedy’s hero. It is by means of this-otherwise that the tragedy’s audience experiences the hero’s fear and empathy comes about for a large amount when the tragic catastrophe comes to an end.

We also believe that the hero, of a tragedy, though is apparently seeking for domination over and overcoming the destiny by his own efforts and endeavors that are displayed in Greece’s tragedies through the battles against the gods, a divine test comes after all these actions so that the hero can reach the truth through entering these challenges and suffering of the calamities that he has never been forsaken by the God. The concept reaches its peak in the end of the tragedy, to wit at the time that the hero, tired of his fruitless efforts, accepts the destiny willingly and gladly and finds a power beyond his vigor and wants in the entire of the events and incidents.
Now, we apply the same interpretation about Schopenhauer regarding tragedy. The first part of the tragedy that includes events like the heroes' mistakes, defeat, weakness, flawed decisions, overcoming of the chance and haphazard incidents and misery and woefulness and uses it in his definition of tragedy; but, he disregards the second part that is, in fact, the truth product of tragedy and the substitution of the sublime matter for the shortfalls and failures of the heroes.

Tragedy showcases its most excellent type of combining affection, intellect and intuition in the literature. Sophocles, Euripides, Aeschylus, Homer and Ferdowsi as well as the other tragedy composers have attempted in the course of history to create heroes capable of fighting the destiny by their own human vigor and talent and without seeking assistance from the heavens thereby to actualize the mankind’s internal wishes for defeating the determinism of the fate. Whether coming out as a loser or a victor, our Ruritanian heroes would not have anything stripped away off the value of their efforts in fighting the destiny. The great literary men have been seeking to test the chance of defeating the force of determinism and fate by the human beings’ free will and ambition through designing psychologically and physically strong heroes who resist the events of the day.

Along with the praising of these heroes who go to fight the destiny, these poets have made efforts to prove that the mankind can prevail the events that cannot be given any other name than destiny and the heavenly force and help the mankind have his dream, i.e. the archetype of overcoming the power of determinism, come true at least in the world of imagination and poetry.

But they achieve a thing more valuable than that in the light of their hero’s defeat. Along with their heroes, they portray this single truth that is latent inside the tragedy’s catastrophes and transcends beyond the hedges of the corporeal wishes. The audience and the onlookers, as well, pursue the actions of their heroes with zeal and ardor and enjoy their efforts on the path of the actualization of such an archetype as the defeat of determinism and find themselves sympathized and empathized with their heroes.

However, in the climax of the story, the hero again cannot afford saving oneself from the strong claws of fate and determinism. It is right here that catharsis and moderation of the human wishes, as the tragedy’s goals, are objectified with the hero’s acceptance of defeat. Thus, enjoyment of affections and emotions and their stimulation comes about at the time of the heroes’ fight with the challenges of the story’s path and recognition and cognizance are gained in the end of the tragedy with the spectators’ pondering over the events in the course of the story. Experiencing the pass through these stages and arriving at a sublime goal and result is the very thing wherein the secret to the persistence of the most excellent literary genre is concealed.
CONCLUSIÓN

This is a fight with what the ordinary man or, the middleman cannot directly face with and it has been the main theme of tragedy from the past up to now and the plays and works written in tragedy genre would be extensively accepted by the audience when this theme is expressed in beautiful words and emotionally to the maximum possible extent. As an example, amongst the modern tragedies greatly welcomed by the general public, the “death of a seller” by Arthur Miller can be pointed out. The theme and the gist of the modern tragedy that has been borrowed from the past can be perceived in a short glance at the pillars of this play that is somewhat bestowed with the spirits of tragedy.

The birth of real tragedy entails an appropriate situational context and the existence of a special cultural ground for the fostering of such genius persons as Ferdowsi, Euripides, Sophocles and Aeschylus.

It can be actually stated that we have had three elements of such an arty as tragedy during the three centuries of the west’s history; the first one is pertinent to the ancient era in Greece that features a notable unity and lasts from Achilles to Euripides. The second one lasts for a longer period of time and blossoms in Europe. The magnificent florescence of Shakespeare time’s theater and the Spanish golden era’s theater and France’s 17th century tragedy belong to one period. We add a period named Ferdowsi’s time thereto.

It is in this way that the traditional tragedy gives its place to drama. It is with the daily expansion of the personal philosophies that the ground is set for the more loneliness of the mankind and his achievement of nothing more than individual ideologies following which the situation becomes so that the tragedy spirit is diminished with all its good and bad dimensions. Of course, this interpretation could have come about if the world did not bear witness to the master of a tragedy combined and blended with collective wisdom and personal emotions, i.e. Hakim Ferdowsi (2016). In his only flawless tragedy, i.e. Rostam and Esfandiyar, Ferdowsi preserves the heritage of the Greek heroes and mixes the supernatural traits of the ancient tragedies with the human wisdom could transfer tragedy to a new stage of institution and intellect’s concomitance. Esfandiyar represents the today’s mankind who, meanwhile shouting his wants, knows that this freedom is limited and bounded. Ferdowsi is a contemporary of the period of the intellect and wisdom’s development in Islamic civilization. He is completely aware of the duality of the individual and history and he is looking for the language by which he can amalgamate excellent tragedy with the intellect and wisdom.
He achieves a style in tragedy that both incorporated realism and guarded the Greece’s tragedy traditions. Ferdowsi show it well that tragedy genre can be something other than the fight against the gods and/or the decisive condemnation of the heroes. This way, he could inspire the tragedy reciters after himself. Although the poets after him did not have a mental ability and a situation like him for making and processing an excellent tragedy in all the aspects, each had a share of it one way or another. For instance, Akhavan Thalith’s inspiration by Ferdowsi’s storytelling characteristics was not limited to his epical tone rather his poetry, as a speech expressed on behalf of a group of his contemporary people, was the story of a group waiting for the rain. In the poem “the winter”, the readers witness a reflection of the domination of the bitter truths of life over the right or wrong wants of the people. This accounts for part of the characteristic of Ferdowsi’s tragedy. Akhavan’s poems exhibit the failure of the human efforts on their long and distant path to their goal hence we are again bearing witness to the fact that tragedy can exert the highest effect in every era in contrast to all other literary types.

By giving birth to tragedy in every period in a novel tone, the poets and genius literary men remind the mankind of this eternal prophecy of the tragedy that there is always needed a heroic resistance against the destiny. Modern tragedy can be an illustration of a style of a sublime life. The fixed part of tragedy is a perpetual conflict between injustice and the human nature. The today’s mankind is making efforts for perceiving his position against the universe’s limitations and, whether being fruitful or not, they can be the subjects of tragedy because, like Esfandiyar, he, as well, can demand his right and fight for it even if fails in the end; but, no difference would be created in the principle of suspension of determinism in the middle scenes of tragedy show at the time that the hero starts moving forward and knows no limitation. Modern tragedy should pick up as its subject the heart of a middleman. It was stated in the previous sections of the present article that the subject of tragedy is the expression of the mankind’s collective wants and envies as events that the humans like to experience but it is due to their heavy costs that they prefer to experience these emotions in a safe corner through sympathizing with the heroes of a tragedy.
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