



2528-9705

Örgütsel Davranış Araştırmaları Dergisi
Journal Of Organizational Behavior Research
Cilt / Vol.: 3, Sayı / Is.: S2, Yıl/Year: 2018, Kod/ID: 81S2365



RECOGNITION OF LATENCY AND TRAGEDY IN TWO STORIES FROM SHAHNAMEH

Reza NAZEMIYAN^{1*}, Meisam KHOEINI²

¹ Faculty Member and Associate Professor, Arabic Language and Literature Department, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran,

² MA Graduate, Persian Language and Literature, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran.

***Corresponding Author:**

ABSTRACT

Unlike what is proposed in literature and theater, tragedy is neither a sad story nor an exciting epic rather it is an assessment of the psychological and physical power of the mankind. With all his or her weaknesses, the protagonist should alone make a decision in a tragedy and take an intervention alone and, in the end, shoulder the ramifications of his or her measures whereas this does not hold in latency. In latent genre, the situational context of the story moves towards the direction in which the protagonists can finally exonerate themselves and generalize the consequences of their actions to the external factors. The present study aims at enumeration of the features of latent genre in Rostam and Sohrab Story and comparison of them with the scales of an excellent tragedy in the same story so as to prove the idea that the only tragedy existent in personal literature is that introduced in Rostam and Esfandiyar story recounted as qualifying the criteria of latent genre.

Keywords: *Tragedy, Latency, Rostam and Sohrab, Shahnameh*

INTRODUCTION

It has to be noted that tragedy is doleful; but, not all dreary stories can be called tragedy. In tragedy, the protagonist should be fully insightful of every action s/he performs so that tragic genre can thereby become capable of portraying the subtlest human emotions stemming from confrontation with the determinism of fate.

Tragedy is neither a sad story nor an exciting epic rather it is an assessment of the mankind's power of psyche and physique with all his weaknesses. It is only in such a state that Aristotle's statement indicating that tragedy is the most excellent literary type is manifested. There is no winning party in tragedy and any decision made by the protagonist leads to their victory and dominance on the surface but to the defeat of both parties indeed. In fact, the thing that lays a layer of the dust of sadness and sorrowfulness on the mirror of the audience heart in tragedy is not like that in any other gloomy literary type such as drama, novel and so forth wherein the grief is the result of losing a dear person, devastation of the territory of the nations and/or the departure of the lover from the beloved that might come about due to betrayal and jealousy and other sorts of vices rather the sadness, in tragedy, is the product of the audience's deep and subtle contemplation and pondering about the result and outcome of the tragedy. It is the result reflecting the human inability and weakness in the face of a choice forced by the destiny.

It is here that the sadness of the tragedy takes a rank more valuable and more superior to the other literary styles.

Walter Benjamin, a literary critic and philosopher, states in this regard that “Hamlet is not a tragedy rather it is a sorrowful drama. In fact, he believes that it is better to describe all the so-called tragedies by Shakespeare with such a word as lamentable dramas” (Young, 2016, 306). In German language, two terms, “tragodie” and “trauerspiel” meaning “tragedy” and “lamentable drama”, respectively, are used interchangeably; but, Walter is of the belief that these two names should be given two different denotations. This is the very utterance we are intending to prove in this article via enumerating the differences between latency and tragedy. The main motive of the author in investigating and showcasing the differences between latency and tragedy lies in the researchers’ approaches to tragedy and, subsequently, the stories presented in Shahnameh. It is these same approaches that have caused such great experts as Isidore Seville, a fourth century literary man and theoretician, make mistakes. The gist of his words in regard of this issue is that tragedy incorporates sad stories about the countries and kings. In Iran, as well, there are works that have been brought to existence with the same look in investigating the stories of Shahnameh. Amongst these works, an article can be pointed out under the title of “the investigation and elaboration of the human communication in the formation of Siavash tragedy” by Dr. Ali Akbar Farhangi who defines tragedy in an introduction to his own article that “tragedy in Shahnameh is the communication cul de sac and tragedy is the last point of confrontation wherein the good character is killed and sacrificed” (Farhangi, 2013, 18). Moreover, another article of this type is called “the investigation and analysis of the two tragedies, named Sohrab and Forood, based on Fray’s theory of tragedy mythos” by Dr. Muhammad Irani who believes that the two aforesaid stories possess strong tragic themes whereas, unlike these statements, one should know that the subject of tragedy is not the getting killed of a good or a bad person and considering sad story and tragedy as similar and limiting tragedy to the death of a protagonist in a sad drama is an approach that causes the downgrading of such a high-ranking genre as tragedy to the low level of a drama while an excellent tragedy features a lot more subtle features one of which is sadness. And, of course, it has to be noted in this regard that sadness of a tragedy differs from the sadness of a drama or any other literary work and this will be dealt with in a part of the current research paper. In this article, we try showcasing the attributes converting a work to a tragedy and comparing them to those of the latent genre so as to reveal the main difference of tragedy from the other works resembling it in appearance but lacking the principles of an excellent tragedy in their depth and prove that latency and tragedy each separately make audience face a different ideology and the mere sadness and/or murdering of the antagonist or protagonist cannot provide for a story’s fall in the group of tragedy genre.

STUDY METHOD:

The present study deals with the criticism and comparison of two classic works, named Rostam and Esfandiyar and Rostam and Sohrab, and a descriptive-analytical approach will be adopted to the novel theories proposed in this area so that it can be clarified whether these two stories can be categorized in two different genres or not considering their great many of similarities in terms of the apparent structure and their differences in respect to the situational context and story-telling infrastructures. It is also intended according to the textual evidence herein to



scrutinize the techniques used by the writer for presenting the audience with two different ideologies.

DISCUSSION:

Identity of Tragedy:

Any serious and radical discussion and research on tragedy finally results in the formation of two essential questions. The first is that what is tragedy? And, the second is that why does it matter to us? There are many statements made by the researchers regarding the history of tragedy formation and biography of the tragedy writers. Therefore, in the present study, we skip the repetitions and put forth the discussion by asking two questions.

The principle in tragedy is that the story should be laid on the foundation of choosing two evils none of which should fall short of the other in any respect. Tragedy is a story that does not come to a normal end because the result should be sought in the thoughts of the later generations. In dramas and tragic poems, zeal and love are displayed as lethal forces intending the perishing of the protagonist. The frustration and perish point is where the protagonist is obliged to make a decision to choose one of the either evils. The protagonist is found on a path made up of his or her deeds. Therefore, “tragedy is to show that the calamities an individual is inflicted are the sure results of his or her actions” (Sana’ei, 1991, 310-311). It is by means of enumerating the tragedy characteristics and comparing them with the elements of the latent genre that an organized and clear-cut classification of an excellent tragedy is attained in this study and these categorized elements are applied to arrive at a framework for distinguishing each quasi-tragic story from an original tragedy. It is presumed in the present study that many of the sad stories such as those recited by Shakespeare and/or Siavash story and others cannot be grouped with the tragic stories and the only tragic work in Persian literature is Rostam and Esfandiyar story and Rostam and Sohrab story, with all its wonders and magnificence, has been recited within the format of an elegy hence not a tragedy. In the current research paper, Rostam and Sohrab story is utilized as research material to serve comparison.

What Is Tragedy?

(An Answer to the First Question)

In Aristotle’s mind, “tragedy is a representation of a serious and perfect action of a great importance and colored and glazed with rich words and each pillars of it are used in separate” (Young, 2016, 56). By color and glaze in this statement, the very rhythm and melody are intended and the separate pillars, as well, encompass the different tone and reading of the verses in various states. Furthermore, Aristotle is of the belief that “tragedy is capable of purifying the mind of such emotions via provoking sympathy and fear or dread” (Ibid, 60). Iamblichus believes that “there are potential human affections inside us that can become wilder if sieged from each direction; but, in case of being put into activity and in proper proportion, they can protect us ... [using tragedy] we inspect our affections and make them milder and render them purified” (Ibid, 61). Based on the aforesaid statement, it can be claimed that Iamblichus’s idea about the path tragedy takes for purification and edification of the soul and the so-called catharsis is similar to that of Aristotle. Catharsis has been dealt with in more details in another article by the same author under the title of “read-out of the determinism archetype in Rostam and Esfandiyar tragedy”.



In his famous theory called “transformation”, Hume states that “tragedy is a bitter and sweet affection in which, although the sweet part dominates, the bitter element still persists” (Ibid, 110). Hume’s statement about tragedy is straightforward, plain and free-standing; but, it can be a solution to some extent because his use of “bitter and sweet affection” leads us to the contradiction existent in tragedy. This existent paradox plays an essential role in the definition of tragedy that we will offer in the end.

Schopenhauer introduces another vital element to us in his definition of tragedy. He believes that “demonstration of a great misery is the only necessary element for a tragedy” (Ibid, 261). In his theory, he proposes three types of misery: misery resulting from 1) evil-doing, 2) destiny and 3) the position and relationship between and in respect to one another. By the last case, the very weak point of tragedy or hamartia is probably intended as the human beings are instigated to harm one another based on these same weak points. In our classification of tragedy’s characteristics, the eighth feature is devoted to this same case and it will be dealt with in its right place.

Friedrich Schelling has the following statement about the nature of tragedy: “the duty of philosophy is paying attention to the conflict between freedom and destiny. Amongst all the arts, it is only tragedy that can attain such an optimum. Therefore, it is the most superior of all the arts” (Ibid, 122). It can be inferred from this statement that the definition of tragedy from Schelling’s definition embraces the very representation of the coordination between destiny and freedom with the objective conflict between these two realities.

The horse of the notions by other philosophers and literary critics like Hegel, Niche, Heidegger, Holderlin and some others sprints in the same course. So, the expression of the entire ideas of these philosophers is outside the scope of the present study and a complete definition of tragedy is presented as shown below in a summarization of all the utterances:

“Tragedy is laid on the foundation of the selection of two evils none of which is lesser than the other. In tragedy, the protagonist is not given a right to escape the choice. Tragedy is sad; but, not all the sad stories are to be considered as tragedy. In tragedy, no help would come from the sky for the protagonist. In fact, tragedy is a serious and perfect assessment manifestation of human with all his weaknesses and the placement of the protagonist, as the representative of the mankind, in the swirling paths of making a choice on the dilemma of destiny causes the provocation of such contradictory emotions as love and hatred, revenge and forgiveness, fear and courage and reason and senses in the protagonist and, consequently, the tragedy audience. The huge misery that holds a firm grip of the protagonist on his or her path of a human’s combat with the determinism of fate is of the type that eventually causes felicity and redemption of the depravities. The protagonists in tragedies are not necessarily from aristocrat class because the emotions flowing in tragedy pertain to the collective human archetypes and the tragedy’s persistence resides in this same important secret”.

Like any other literary style, tragedy, as well, is an industry for the transferring of thoughts, feelings and wisdom. Therefore, it possesses its own specific framework. In the entire literature, it is based on these same style-specific frameworks that we become capable of differentiating the various genres. Comedy and burlesque are distinguished from Gnostic literature and Gnostic literature from epics based on these same definitions of the literary criteria. We intend to offer and display the differences existent between tragedy and latent genres so that the dos and don’ts of this genre could be clarified because we believe that



overlapping may come about in the definition of the tragedy unless its hedges are delimited from the other genres. The forthcoming part deals with the classification of the constituent elements of Rostam and Esfandiyar story as the most excellent tragedy following which it will be compared with the elegy of Rostam and Sohrab, recited in latent genre.

Elements of Tragedy versus Elements of Latency:

Six primary characteristics that cause a literary work to be upgraded to tragedy level are expressed in the upcoming section following which they will be compared.

- 1) "Tragedy is a story wherein the chain of the deterministic events makes the main character or all the characters move towards an unpleasant and catastrophic destiny" (Dehkhoda, under the title "tragedy", 1998). In tragedy, the individuals know what they do and are well aware of their deeds. They make efforts to prevent catastrophe; but, they are defeated in their battle with the determinism of the fate. But, in latency, the protagonists do not know what they are doing and what is about to happen to them. Sohrab goes to Iran hoping to be embraced in his father's bosom and he never expects visiting his father in the battlefield. The latency and concealment space is set from the very beginning of the story. When Rostam is the king of Samangan, Tahmineh goes to Rostam's royal court at midnight in the dark with nobody being informed of it.

"They started speaking covertly and secretly and they engaged in conversation in a cozy bedroom"

"He asked her: what's your name? What are you searching for on this dark night? What is your aspiration?" (Ferdawsi, 1996, 122)

Nobody gets aware of this relationship and Tahmineh only becomes willing to disclose the secret when she becomes faced with Sohrab's threat:

"From whose egg and from what gem I have been born? What can I say when they ask me of my father's name?"

"If I leave this question unanswered, you will not let me stay alive" (Ibid, 125)

Then, Tahmineh eagerly keeps on hiding Sohrab's identity. She is afraid that he might separate him from her son upon becoming aware of the existence of a chivalrous son and he will take him to Iran and she does not want it to happen and finds the solution in keeping the secret covert and her son anonymous.

"If the father recognizes you from your sign, he will become rebelliously proud"

"If he finds out, he will ask you to remain in his company and this injures your mother's heart" (Ibid, 126)

On the other hand, Afrasiab, crazing for conquering Iran, uses all his power to keep Sohrab anonymous.

"He said the solution is that we must keep him anonymous"

"The son should not know who his father is or he will ornament him with the love of his soul and jewelry" (Ibid, 128).

But, in Rostam and Esfandiyar story, both of the protagonists know each other very well. In the presence of Gashtasp, Esfandiar recalls good things of Rostam and his ancestors and he knows well who is waiting for him.

"They called him the lord of Rakhsh, Rostam's horse; the world conqueror and lion-defeater and crown-endower!"



“He has not become newly known in the world rather he is a great figure from Kaikhosraw’s era!” (Ibid, 303)

Therefore, Esfandiyar is left with no excuse for becoming aware of the idea that who should he bring hand-tied to the royal court of the king. On the other hand, Rostam knows his rival very well and knows what destiny awaits him upon killing Esfandiyar.

“And, if I happen to kill him in the battlefield, I would turn out yellow-faced and ashamed before the kings” (Ferdawsi, 361)

The main theme of the tragedy is based on the protagonists’ full awareness of the characters, decisions and final result of the works as well as the conscious selection of either of the two evils. It is the same as what is seen in the story of Esfandiyar whereas there is no choice left for the protagonists due to their lack of awareness of the conditions and latency of the results of the works.

Some believe that Rostam killed Sohrab while knowing that he was his son and they have written many things in justifying their reasons. In this regard, it can be succinctly and briefly stated that, first of all, although Rostam could not become proud of getting married to a girl from enemy’s territory, one should note that he left signs for Tahmineh so that he might recognize his son in future and, on the other hand, his sigh and mourning after the death of Sohrab and Rostam’s unfruitful attempt for killing Rostam cannot be ignored and blame the deceitfulness of such heroes as Rostam. The person who has spent all his life for defending freedom and honor cannot be simply accused of killing his own child.

“Rostam took a dagger in his hand so as to cut his inferior head off his body” (Ibid, 190)

Secondly, accepting this assumption that Rostam knew Sohrab does not provide for any imagination indicating Sohrab’s awareness of the existing conditions and, surely, Sohrab, as the main hero of the story, did not know his father till the last moment and he was deprived of introducing himself during the whole course of the story. Based thereon, Sohrab’s story possesses the latent genre features.

- 2) “Tragedy means showing the magnificence of the human beings and their limitations in fighting the devastative factors in the scene of life ... he fights and struggles but he cannot survive the predicament wherein he is trapped” (Niche, 1975, 11-13). During the entire tragedy, the efforts of all the story elements are directed at prevention of the disaster. In fact, the value of a tragedy is measured in the hugeness of the catastrophe awaiting the heroes. Calamity does not abruptly take place in tragedy rather the story moves towards catastrophe and the climax of the story in a mild curve. The protagonist and the entire elements of the story try in the course of the curve to prevent the occurrence of the accident. Esfandiyar’s mother tries advising him and warning him of the greed of governance:

“In the entire universe, listen to this advice by your mother, do not hasten towards evildoing and do not make efforts for bad things ...” (Ibid, 306)

But, in latent genre, unlike tragedy, all of the characters and the internal and external elements guide the heroes towards catastrophe. Tahmineh and Afrasiyab do their best to keep hidden the identity of Sohrab each with their own different intentions (one for keeping her son with herself and the other for the death of Rostam). In Esfandiyar



tragedy, there are external barriers on his path. The camel kneels down before Esfandiyar so as to prevent him from moving forward and it acts as an external warning.

“The camel laid down before him in such a way that you would think it has become united with the ground” (Ibid, 309)

On the contrary, in Sohrab’s story, the only hope of the father’s recognition of his son is diminished with the murdering of a hero, named Zand, by Rostam who had gone during a night for spying to the camp of enemy’s troopers as a result of which the protagonists get another step closer to the catastrophe.

“The iron-shield punched him in his neck as a result of which his soul got out of his body”

“The champion of the battles froze in his place and his war life came to an end and so did his fiesta” (Ibid, 155)

In this regard, there are a lot of evidence indicating the conflict between Esfandiyar Tragedy and latency of Sohrab story. The dual behavior of Rostam in confrontation with the predicament is one external factor taking opposite stances in the two stories. In Esfandiyar story we bear witness to Rostam’s hesitation in fulfilling the king’s order. In opposition to Esfandiyar’s invitation for battle, Rostam suggests celebration and invites to peace. It seems that Rostam is aware of the catastrophe’s emergence by an internal force and tries to prevent it from occurring via hesitating and faltering.

“We should first eat what we have; after that the world does as you order” (Ibid, 321)

On the contrary, it is this same Rostam who behaves differently in Sohrab story and hastily and inconsiderately beats on the war drum and, quite opposite to his behavior before Esfandiyar, uses all his strength to make catastrophe happen. Where Sohrab repeatedly tries establishing peace and reconciliation and blows in kindness flute out of the affectionate instinct of a father and a son, Rostam ignorantly challenges him to a fight and conceals his personality.

“When Rostam made such a talk, Sohrab became instigated in his heart for accepting his challenge” (Ibid, 170)

“Laughing by both of his lips, he asked Rostam did you not say that you were with him last night”

“I feel sympathy for you in my heart and tear comes to my eyes when I look at you” (Ibid, 180)

“Presently, I imagine that you are Rostam if you are a descendant of the powerful famous Nariman”

“He answered that he is not Rostam and not a descendant of Nariman’s Sam” (Ibid, 171)

In sum, tragedy is laid on the foundation of awareness, recognition and decision-making and latent genre moves in an opposite direction thereto.

- 3) “Tragedy has struggle as its subject and both of the parties have the right over the subject of struggle” (Sana’ei, 1991, 328). In Rostam and Esfandiyar Tragedy, it is seen that none of the protagonists have any other solution left for the thing that is about to happen. They assess every aspect of the issue and become incumbently forced to choose between two evils none lesser than the other. If it could be returned to a previous time



in the past, the heroes again made the same decisions. Rostam cannot be submitted with tied hands and humiliation because he is the representative of the championship rituals and giving himself up to it means doubting the heroic honor. And, on the other hand, killing Esfandiyar is not a solution that Rostam can come to terms with it because he has always been a defender of Iranian kings.

“There are two solutions both of which are cursed and bad; formal and heretic damaging of the tradition and denounced”

“And, doing so makes me defamed; Gashtasp would cause an unhappy ending for me”

“And, if I happen to kill him in the battlefield, I would turn out yellow-faced before the kings” (Ibid, 361)

On the other hand, Esfandiyar, urged by his rites, has no other way but to obey the king even if the order is unfair and unwise. Esfandiyar finds himself submitted to the king's order upon being asked by Gashtasp to tie Rostam's hands, though he regrets and sees his death in doing so.

“The army commander brought his eyebrows together and told the lord of the world that you should not do anything against religion!”

“You withhold the position of the king from me! It seems you want me away from this universe!”

“But, I am one of your servants and obedient to your order and verdicts” (Ibid, 304)

Even if Gashtasp gives up what he has asked for, it would have no effect on the occurrence of catastrophe. Where Gashtasp asks his minister that would my son stay alive with my resignation from the throne and crown, Jamasp replies him with an answer the king did not want to hear:

“If I deliver him the crown and the superiority treasure right on top of the kingship throne”

“Would it be the case that nobody shall see him in Zavolestan and nobody would know him in Kavolestan ...” (Ibid, 297)

In response, Jamasp foretells the victory of destiny and death of the prince:

“The sharp claw of the dragon has already been stretched out, who can get clear of it by manliness and knowledge?” (ibid, 298)

In Rostam and Esfandiyar tragedy, both of the heroes somehow are right and none of them can be blamed for the road they have taken and this is the essence of tragedy's grief that provokes sympathy in the audience for the bitter destiny holding a firm grip of the heroes; but, this does not hold in latent genre. The path whereon the protagonists have stepped is the result of the companions' treason. Rostam and Sohrab are not puppets in the hands of destiny rather they are tricked by the avarice of their associates; a mother who deprives her son of the father's love for the fear of losing him and the king who uses the love of a father and a son to gain power. It is even so in the rest of the story that the pan of mischievousness scale becomes heavier on Rostam's side in such a way that the reader can easily accuse Rostam of lack of love and intrinsic amore for his father because Rostam reaches a standpoint wherein he rejects the affectionate requests of Sohrab making the reader ask himself or herself the question as to how is it possible for Sohrab to become inclined in his heart towards Rostam in the first sight but this does not happen for Rostam. When dying, Sohrab scolds him for his unkindness.



“He told him: now, if you are Rostam; you stubbornly killed me out of bad temper”

“I gave you all sorts of cues to guide you and you did not even show the tiniest bit of mercy ...” (Ibid, 187)

In tragedy, the protagonist cannot be accused but this does not hold in latency.

- 4) “Tragedy should illustrate the human beings’ deeds and actions not their behaviors and it has to show how the calamities one is inflicted with are the evident results of his or her deeds” (Sana’ei, 1991, 311-312). In tragedy, the protagonist and antagonist are well aware of the consequences of their decisions and the results of any choice and intervention they make; therefore, they would have no excuse in the end to acquit themselves whereas it is not so in latent genre wherein the story is organized from the very beginning in such a way that the heroes can excuse themselves in the end. In Rostam and Sohrab story, Rostam is convicted for his disregarding of fatherly love and ignoring the emotional signs Sohrab displays; but, he becomes completely remorseful immediately following bearing witness to Sohrab’s armband and recognizing that he is his son and even tries committing suicide for the fact that he has had no other option in doing so due to his ignorance and not knowing that he has been his son and regrets what he has done and if time could be returned to a date in past he would have made another decision while such a thing is missing from tragedy.

“Rostam sat on the backside of his horse, Rakhsh, like a dust and his face was full of blood and his lip was full of cold wind”

“He told the triumphant men: “I have neither heart nor head and body today” (Ferdawsi, 1996, 189)

All these behaviors of Rostam signify that he can be exonerated from these incidents. Even if we accept that Rostam knew he has been his son, the general context of the story would set the conditions in such a way for Rostam to come up with the denial of his familiarity with him. “In real tragedy, one finds himself or herself in a huge predicament, of course, while knowing the whereabouts and aspects of the issue. This is while the present story (Rostam and Sohrab) is based on latency of the name and identity and this somewhat excuses the hero from complete liability in choices he makes” (Hamidiyan, 2004, 281). In fact, the interventions in tragedy are made consciously like a chess game but it is more like card playing and based on lack of recognition and awareness in latency¹.

- 5) The differences between sadness of tragedy and sadness of latent genre: the grief resulting from tragedy is generalizable to the entire mankind. It is a deep sorrow that results from perception of a type of cognizance attained from reader’s feedback to the tragedy’s events and end but the sadness, of a latent genre, retells the personal emotions of the protagonist and it results from a mistake and puts the audience only in a temporary remorseful mood that is forgotten with the story reaching an end and it is only the feeling of sympathy for the protagonist that causes the audience to become sad whereas the sadness of tragedy is the result of the failure of another human archetype. In fact, the thing that lays dust of grief and sadness on the reader’s mirror of heart in tragedy, unlike the other sad genres like drama or novel, is not the loss of a dear person

¹I have written down this example from the speech made by Professor Hamidiyan in a Shahnameh class.



and not the departure of the lover and beloved and not even the destruction of the territory of a nation rather it is the grief that results from the exhibition of an archetypal failure, human's defeat of destiny. In the peak point of tragedy, the protagonist has the right to make choices but it is making a decision about how to be defeated and it is this way that the archetype of overcoming the fate is again condemned to failure and it is right at this point that the sadness of tragedy takes a position higher and subtler than the sadness in other literary styles. The sadness of a tragedy is a public grief hence it is not required that the heroes be from aristocrat class so that their downfall from luckiness to misery and wretchedness can find meaning because the failure is of an archetypal nature in tragedy and it does not remain at the level of the grief for losing wealth or rank; but, since the heroes' fight like the battle between the heroes and the gods causes more fear and harassment in the audience and, subsequently, the defeat of the mythical protagonist instigates greater sorrow in the audience, the tragedies usually revolve around such individuals.

- 6) Based on a statement by Hegel, "in tragic collision, the claim parties are identically excused. The Greek tragedy gives room to neither the absolutely killer-ed [character] nor the wild [character]. The devilish issue is a figure that is aesthetically useless and has no place in tragedy" (Young, 2016, 190). This utterance by Hegel might somewhat hold in the superficial layers of tragedy; but, it has to be noted that the pan of the good and evil scale should be imbalanced so that tragedy could be formed and the protagonists could be placed on a dilemma for making a decision as a result of which the characters become captivated by depravities that are called hamartia in tragedy and translated into tragic flaw, meaning tragic weak points, in English. We agree to Hegel's statement up to the point it says there is no such a thing as absolutely negative character in tragedy but one should note that pride, translated in Greece's tragedy into hubris and also the other vices like greed, authoritativeness, lust, jealousy and so on are depravities that hold a firm grip of the protagonist and antagonist's collar in the beginning and occasionally in the middle of the way. Schopenhauer knows the position and relationship of the human beings with one another as the cause of such an entanglement. In fact, unlike what Hegel states, the entire aesthetics of tragedy are constructed based on purification and edification of these same naughty behaviors.

The Value of Tragedy:

(An Answer to the Second Question)

"Gorgias states that tragedy composers, like flutists, have no goal other than satisfying the pleasure" (Young, 2016, 23). Even Gorgias who, like Plato, did not give a rank to the poets in his utopia, confesses the creation of pleasure in the audience of tragedy. Now, the question is that what factors make tragedy audience take pleasure therein and what is the secret of the persistence of this literary genre? "The philosophers have generally chosen one of the two answers given to the tragic effect issue. They have either placed the tragic effect in senses and affections' levels or in reason and recognition level" (Young, 2016, 17-18). The effect placed on the senses and affections level is instantaneous and transient and the effect perceived by reason and cognition is stable and permanent. In fact, cognizance is obtained in tragedy through senses and affections.



Tragedy depicts the most excellent combination of reason and senses in the literature. Sufokel, Oripid, Ischolus, Ferdawsi and the other tragedy composers have endeavored in the course of history to create heroes that can use their own human power and talent and with receiving no help from the sky to fight destiny and defeat it. These great literary men have sought the designing of powerful heroes who can physically and psychologically resist the incidents of the time and become victors so as to prove the superiority of the human option over fate and it is at the side of the extolling these heroes that they have engaged in denouncing the shaky heroes who give up too the fate and destiny. In fact, the first class tragedy composers are the representatives of the mankind who try constructing and processing heroes capable of fighting with destiny so as to prove that the mankind can overcome his fate; they help mankind have his dream, i.e. the archetype of overcoming the power of determinism, come true. Tragedy audience follows the actions of these heroes with utmost zeal and fervor and enjoys their making of efforts on this path and feels empathy with them but the heroes are found again failed in the climax of the story in saving themselves from the strong paws of the determinism and fate. It is right here that catharsis and equilibration of human wishes and yearnings are proposed as the usefulness of tragedy. Therefore, pleasure and stimulation of affections and feelings are created in the audience upon watching the fight and struggles of the heroes and cognizance and recognition come about in the end of the tragedy with the audience's contemplation over the incidents that have happened in the course of the story and the audience is in a constant experience loop from the beginning to the end of every tragic story and this constitutes the persistence secret of the most excellent literary genre.



CONCLUSION:

The present study sought finding answers to two main questions regarding the tragedy genre. The first question is that what is tragedy? The answer to this question was investigated from the perspective of the critics of this field and efforts were made to remove the shortfalls of these answers to some extent via classifying six primary characteristics of tragedy. It was proved based on a comparison of two stories from Shahnameh and relying on the testimonial examples that the mere sadness of a work is not a comprehensive and inclusive reason for its being considered as tragic and tragedy, as the most excellent literary type, needs something more than a sorrowful story. The six characteristics categorized in the first part of the present article offer a framework of a perfect tragedy. In response to the second question indicating why tragedy is valuable for the readers, it was attempted to deal with the issue from epistemological recognition perspective based on a pooling of senses and affections and reasons and cognition. The persistence secret of tragedy was found residing in the remorseful experience of mankind's fight with determinism that finally leads to his defeat and it was also pointed out that the defeat causes purification and edification and catharsis of the heroes and, subsequently, the readers. It was also proved that tragedy's pleasure lies in the conflict of a useful defeat experienced by the mankind in confrontation with a tragic incident and emotional and logical events.

References

Dehkhoda, A., (1991), "dictionary", 2nd ed., Tehran, Tehran University.

Farhangi, A., and Ghanbar Abadi, M., (2013), “investigation and elaboration of the human communications in formation of Siavash Tragedy”, research journal of mythical literature, 9(16): 17-34.

Ferdawsi, A., (1996), “Shahnameh”, revised by Jalal Khaleghi Motlagh, vs. 2 and 5, 1st ed., California, Farda Publication Institute in cooperation with Iran Heritage Foundation.

Hamidiyan, S., (2004), “an introduction to Ferdawsi’s thoughts and art”, 2nd ed., Tehran, Nahid.

Irani, M and Biglari, S., (2013), “investigation and analysis of the two tragedies of Sohrab and Forood based on Fray’s theory of tragedy mythos”, literary studies, (26): 119-145.

Niche, F., (1975), “theosophy in intellectual renaissance period of Greeks”, tr. Kambiz Gutan, 1st ed., Tehran, Book Translation and Publication Institute.

Sana’ei, M., (1991), “Ferdawsi, master of tragedy”, 1st ed., Tehran, Modabber.

Young, J., (2016), “the philosophy of tragedy from Plato to Jijek”, tr. Hassan Amiri Ara, 1st ed., Tehran, Qoqnoos.

