

UDC 1.18:7.01

## TRAGEDY IN ANCIENT PERIOD OF AESTHETICS. ARISTOTLE'S TRAGEDY CONCEPT

**Jabir Mammadov**

*Khazar University,  
ANAS Institute of Philosophy,  
Department of Journalism,  
Mehseti str. 41, AZ 1096, Baku, Azerbaijan*

In the article it is given information about the tragedy, it is paid attention Aristotle's theory of tragedy, and it is investigated the place of it on philosophy and on aesthetics. In the article, it has compared Plato's opinions with the theory of Aristotle about tragedy also. The reasons for Plato's attitude toward tragic art are being researched. It can be said about Plato that he did not accept the tragedy as an art sample or artwork, even he said that it would not be the place for the tragedy in his "ideal state". Plato preferred to silence more than just talking about the tragedy.

*Key words:* Aristotle, tragic, philosophy, "Poetics", Greek.

The tragedy is generally associated with disasters, deep sorrows, bloody and sad events, and human deaths. The person remembers his/her past and comprehends what will happen in future because he/she carries internal tension, anxiety, and anxiety. The human being was constantly thinking about, in particular, regrets, sadness, separation, death, and etc. and was seeking a cure for him. Perhaps, it is not casual that human beings looked for remedies (in fact, desperation) as a water of life, eternal life, and the resurrection of the dead. Humanity has often come to this conclusion: "Joy is temporary, sorrow is eternal!". When a person cannot find a remedy for his troubles, death, or tragedy, he has set it as a purpose to lift it, to make it immaculate, and to make man immortal in this way. In this sense, he is not able to do physical life, but he tries to do it in the spiritual world. In other words, he is able to make in the art that he wants. The "scene of life" has become "self-understanding" opportunity to think about people, to understand oneself, which it is symbolized and raised to a height that is inaccessible by art. Although art has benefited from life, and "raw material" of art is life-related, but every tragic or accidental event cannot be and has never been the subject of art. It means, if every tragic event had been brought to art as it is, the true essence of the tragedy was incomprehensible, its philosophical and aesthetic value disappeared, and it would be an imitation of the story of life without any philosophical-aesthetic value.

Here it can be concluded that, as is often the case, the essence of the tragedy is no similar to the misfortunes of human life. Tragedy reveals significant and profound conflicts in society. That is why, the tragic art-works appears to be more, especially in the period of public recession and revolutionary explosions, when the contradictions that divide society are manifested in a different form.

One of the features of the tragedy is that it is indispensable and inevitable. It is assumed that more times the necessity arises from the human's nature, from not to give up his character – from the "internal necessity" in such situations

The question arises: Is every tragedy, accident, human death, prejudice, tears and etc. tragic? – Certainly, not! The tragic situation usually occurs, when both of the "clashed" heroes are justified, and the winner is justified regardless of who should win. On the other hand, the tragic situation becomes an absolute winner. But it is impossible to say it about an accident, disaster, and so on.

The first serious philosophical thoughts about tragic are found in the works of ancient Greek philosophers. Of course, it is natural. It is known that the tragedy, as an example of art, occurred in ancient Greece. Today the views of two great philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, who lived in the same period, are very important for philosophers and especially for aesthetic researchers.

The imagination about the tragedy was very common and primitive in the in ancient times, almost, it did not go beyond from the “spectacular spectacle” level. There is not found serious thoughts about the tragedy and its philosophical seriousness till Aristotle. This is true, that Plato said certain thoughts about the tragedy, but those thoughts related to a rejection of the tragedy, and the idea that the tragedy does not belong to art. Plato, one of the foremost of ancient philosophers, is known to have opposed the tragedy. But it is interesting that neither the people of that time nor the later generations accepted this position of the famous philosopher, they chose to watch life in tough and tragic clashes, as in the classic tragedies of Ancient times, and as in the tragedies of Shakespeare, Cornelius, Rasin, Byron, Pushkin and many other great writers. Otherwise, the tragedies of Aeschylus (525/524–456/455 BC) did not live on the scenes today.

It can be said about Plato that he did not accept the tragedy as an art sample or artwork, even he said that it would not be the place for the tragedy in his “ideal state”. Plato preferred to silence more than just talking about the tragedy.

The question arises: What was the reason for Plato’s silence about the tragedy at a time when the tragedy stood at the peak of Greek art? How could it be that the philosopher does not see the tragedy and does not comment on it? A. Losev tried to give the answer to those questions. Of course, it is not possible to prove it with a scientific way. Because we do not have any documents or written sources on this. But A. Losev’s arguments, assumptions make the reader to think about it. A. Losev links with two main reasons why Plato did not write about the tragedy.

The first reason was that the Greeks, who created the great and secular tragedy, were intimately and directly attached to it. But at that time it was very difficult to analyze the works of art from any philosophical, aesthetic, and another side. Today, we analyze the Greek art more accurately and deeply than the Greeks themselves. We have more sensitive philosophical, aesthetic, artistic and historical categories and suitable methods for that than Greeks. Therefore, it is not surprising that Plato analyzed the tragedy very indefinitely and even Georgy talked about it more clearly. In Aristotle, the explanation of the tragedy is largely formal, and important thoughts can be found not only of Poetics but also from his other works.

The second reason is that there is no strong and specific tragedy analysis in Plato. Personally, his cosmological and moralistic attractiveness is always more than other Greek authors. Thus, in essence, Plato only occasionally performed on the tragedy in his works, and he always spoke non-systematic, as if he was most importantly careless, almost critical and indifferent [7, p. 641].

A. Losev offers only logic-based arguments why Plato stayed away from tragedy. The author is mainly trying to explain it with Plato’s political view. The point is that Plato neither accept democracy, nor tyranny as a true aristocrat. At the same time, the Greek tragedy could not be imagined only as an artwork of tyranny, or the era of oppression. But Plato believed that the tragedy had both elements of democracy and the Tyrian ideology.

In general, it is impossible to understand whether Plato had any special attitude as aesthetic value to tragedy or as a special art genre, which it has own rule and structure.

In fact, when applying to the tragedy as an aesthetic category, both medieval European philosophers and researchers who study modern aesthetic are based on the views of Aristotle. In other words, the thoughts of Aristotle still maintain their innovation for the category of tragedy. Aristotle has widely commented the tragedy in his Poetics.

Unlike Plato, who had a negative attitude to the tragedy, Aristotle estimated the tragedy as the highest pinnacle of art. This view corresponded to the leading place of the tragedy in ancient artistic culture. Aristotle considered that “The tragedy is the testimony of movement and life, happiness, and unhappiness” and said that the tragedy reflects the transition from happiness to unhappiness [1, p. 31].

Aristotle gave moral and aesthetic meaning to the concept of “catharsis” (purification, refining). For him “the catharsis” means the purification of the soul, completely lighting of it. The tragedy has cognitive importance and it has a moral-aesthetic, educational effects on a person.

Aristotle put questions the tragic character of the hero: “The tragedy that happened to one innocent creates a sense of compassion for others who are facing a tragedy. On the other hand, the feeling of fear raises, when the people witnessed who has faced with the misery. The tragic hero does not differ by his kindness and justice, and he does not suffer misfortune for his evil, but he is overtaken by it for his mistake” [9, p. 13–84].

Aristotle notes that the nature of tragedy is synthetic. Aristotle said: “<...> The tragedy is imitation, but it is not the imitation of people. It is an imitation of actions, life, happiness, and misery of men” [1, p. 50]. The meaning of these words is: The task of the tragedy is not to show the personal lives of individuals apart from very important problems of the time, but it is to re-emphasize the clash of “happiness” and “unhappiness” in the general sense of the real public conflict and the great social impact.

Aristotle describes the tragedy as follows: “The tragedy is the imitation of the subject, which it affects us with the feelings of “pity” and “fear” that we call catharsis. It is serious, completed and very important, each part of it is decorated with beautiful words with imagination”.

It should be noted that this definition had a great impact on the authors of the tragedy, also philosophers who commented on the tragedy, as well as the philosophers who researched the tragedy as an aesthetic category.

According to Aristotle, the purpose of the tragedy is to describe a certain action rather than its certain quality. For him, people have certain qualities for their own characteristic, but they are happier or vice versa for their actions and deeds [1, p. 31].

Aristotle divides the tragedy into four types:

1. The complex tragedies (Tragedies where there are unexpected changes observed in peripeteia or events).
2. The calamity tragedies (scandals, torture-based tragedies).
3. The character tragedies (tragedies characterized by character).
4. The mythological tragedies (The tragedies which they are in epic or oral form) [2, p. 52].

The theory of tragedy, which presented by Aristotle in *Poetics*, has not lost its significance nowadays for its perfection. Even the great German thinker, dramatist, poet and journalist, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781), wrote about the value of *Poetics* in his Hamburg drama: “For the existing thoughts about the tragedy, I am determined to prove that, the tragedy cannot even go one step further than the way which Aristotle scratched. If the tragedy deviated little from this path then it would be far from its perfectness” [1, p. 7].

Aristotle said in his *Poetics*, that the tragedy is characterized by a great personality, who was tested, known for seriousness and dignity, but he ruined for the cruelty of destiny. Aristotle’s explanation should be related to the change of fate from bad to good. But he said that the best example of changing from good to bad is the form of *The Tsar Oedipus* by Sophocles. Because it arouses a feeling of pity and fear in the audience. As a response to the torture of the hero of the tragedy, it happens the catharsis, emotional purification or healing of the audience, by practicing their emotions.

Aristotle noted that the author of the tragedy must try to use all kinds of tragedies in his work. If this is not possible, at least, he should try to use most of the types and the most important of them. Aristotle wrote about the writers of the tragedy of his era: "Although most of them make knot well, but they open it worth. However, both tasks need to be performed well" [1, p. 50].

There was no special theory of tragedy of philosophy and aesthetics of Ancient and Medieval Eras. At that time, the doctrine of the tragedy was considered as an integral part of the doctrine of existence, the cosmology and the ontology. The tragedy was understood to be an important element of the space and the existence. It is not casually, the phenomena of the tragedy does not stay at the center of attention, but it stands the impact of the tragedy and description of the formal –technical problems of the tragedy. The Aristotle's view to tragedy can be explained on the basis of analysis of his whole philosophy and, first of all, with his metaphysics. According to the teachings of Aristotle, which he considered the mind as the first driving force, the tragedy happens at that time, the eternal driving force (mind) comes out of "eternity" and becomes temporarily.

Aristotle's tragedy teaching may be an example to understand how the tragedy is perceived in ancient Greek philosophy. So, in the ancient Greek philosophy, the whole world and space were considered a kind of complete (intact) tragic integrity [7, p. 348–450].

The ancient Eastern (Oriental) philosophy (including early Christianity and Islam), which did not believe in personal origin, did not work in the concept of tragedy. Because they acknowledged that the source of everything was divine power, and they believed that every event (regardless of whether it was good or bad) which happens, it comes from the divine. In other words, they considered that happening event was beyond human will.

In the enlightenment aesthetics of XVII – XVIII centuries, the tragedy is considered a literary genre, and its conceptual and formal features were in the foreground. N. Boileau, D. Diderot, G. Lessing, and others have developed the interpretation of the tragedy, which it has given by Aristotle from the moral point of view. F. Schiller, who continued Kantian philosophy, saw the source of tragedy in the conflict between human feelings, nature, and morality [10, p. 124].

Aristotle expressed his attitude to various forms of tragedy that the tragedies should not be in the epic form: "<...> One thing to keep in mind <...> The tragedies should not be written in epic-contented. When I say "epic-contented", I mean multi-fabulous tragedy" [1, p. 50].

According to Aristotle, "Structure of the best tragedy should not be simple; It must be complex and complete, representing events of fear and compassion. Because this is a specific form of art" [4, p. 15].

According to Aristotle, "The failure of the tragic hero's fate is not due to any moral fault or deficiency. But the tragedy itself is a kind of fault" [1, p. 50]. It is inevitable the death of the hero in the tragedy, but the consequences of the hero's some actions are unexpected. It is also a paradox that the death of the hero can result in the emergence of a great power (For example, power, law, gods, fortune or community). Because the disintegration of one of the two opposing forces results that one of them is strengthening and takes other's power. If the hero's misfortune, even his death, is not the clashing of facing forces, or it has any other reason, Aristotle characterized it as an accident, not as a tragedy [1, p. 50].

According to Aristotle, the hero of the tragedy must have a definite understanding of human destiny, the fate, the will of the gods. In Poetics, Aristotle gives a new definition of the ancient Greek word "tragedia". He shows that the tragedy is an example of art which it attracts the attention of the person, it is full (It has the beginning (prologue), the body (the development of events), the end (epilogue) and it has specific actions were carried out in an impassioned language. At the same time, the tragedy is an imitation, which the actors demonstrate in life form, it consists of different parts, and it is carried out by cleansing emotions like pity and fear.

As Aristotle says, the tragedy is not an imitation of serious and completed action, which it has a certain volume with the storytelling of tale, but it is an imitation through the action with different, and colorful language. It helps to purify those feelings and similar passions through the sense of pity and fear [1, p. 50]. Where Aristotle says “colorful language”, he implies a literary form, which combines rhythm, harmony, music, and the use of them in various parts of the tragedy. Because the tragedy is accompanied sometimes by the measurement, or size, and sometimes with music.

Generally, it can be said, the common tradition of the tragedy focuses on any event with a mournful end. Traditionally, the tragedy ends with the physical or moral death of at least one of the heroes. According to Aristotle, the tragic event must comply with the requirements in *Poetics*. According to this definition, the accident, which it happens in the household, cannot be a social tragedy. Because the hero is the victim of events and conditions, regardless of his or her psychological or religious commitment, which determines his self-understanding and death [8, p. 33–34]. The cause of the “tragedy” is the most discussed issue.

According to Aristotle, first of all, the tragedy must be a mere imitation of serious events. The tragedy must be a certain size. That volume should be determined so that, the audience can understand the essence of the events that took place during that time, he can imagine imaginative situation in his mind, he is able to understand the meaning of events, which it changes the fate of the tragic hero, from happiness to unhappiness or vice versa. That is, the tragedy cannot be too large or too compact, shorter. Because the long performance has satisfied the audience, which led to a lack of understanding of the event due to its information. Or, on the contrary, very short spectacle ends often without occurring tragic atmosphere, or aura in an audience, the problem has been solved without tension, and “knot”, it would not be the necessary impact and would miss the true target.

According to Aristotle: “Tragedy should differ from the epic” [1, p. 67]. At the same time, the tragedy must express complete and perfect event. Aristotle distinguished tragedy from other areas of poetry, he noted that the tragedy has unique, colorful, attractive language.

Academician Krachkovsky, a prominent Russian scientist, said that it is difficult to say that the works of Aristotle were directly or indirectly influenced to literary creativity, or the theory of Arabic poetry when he told about the influence of *Poetics* to Arabic literary environment. Works of Arabic poetry differ from the works of the Greek philosopher, including Aristotle’s *Poetics*, for their style and spirit. Aristotle’s *Poetics* played a coincidental role in the development of Arab poetry, although it had aroused some interest in the history of Arabic philosophical thought, but did not attract the attention of poetry theorists sufficiently. Arabic poetry has appeared in a different environment, among Arabic linguists and philologists and their direct native language observation. It is because Arabic poetics are based on a linguistic principle that, Aristotle’s psychological poetry did not have a serious impact on it and it was far from theorists of literature [6, p. 366].

It should be noted that the Oriental philosophers, such as Ibn Rushd, Abu Bashar Matta, and Ibn Sina, have caused recognizing and reading of Aristotle’s *Poetics* in the West, by describing the true essence of the tragedy in a philosophical way and making it a scientific theory. As a result of the translation of this works by those philosophers (and many other works of Greek philosophers) into Greek from Latin, this work (*Poetics*) was known in the Western world and it stimulated the growth of new-generation philosophers in the West.

Although the aesthetic of Medieval Muslim East has own important features, it should not be forgotten that it is also in harmony with certain aspects of Greek philosophy and aesthetics. Theories about universal harmony that the Arabs closely co-ordinate with their musical problems have been tied to the harmony and musical theories of Pythagoras’ school representatives [7, p. 360].

Supporters of this kind of approach to the issue try to justify their judgments, based on the views of Ibn Rush and other Eastern philosophers on tragedy and comedy.

They show that deeply knowing Poetics, as Ibn Rusht, when they spoke about tragedy and comedy, they called tragedy as “praise and appreciation” connecting with *gasida* (Arabic prose form), and comedy as “humiliation” connecting with *hajv* (Arabic prose form).

From here it can be concluded that Aristotle played an important role in creating the aesthetic-philosophical category of tragedy.

### References

1. Aristotle. Poetics. Transl., Foreword and comments by A. Aslanov. Baku: Sharg-Garb, 2006. 80 p. (in Azerbaijani).
2. Aristotle. Poetics. Chapter 18. 1456 a. Translator I. Tunaly. Istanbul: Publishing house of Remzy Kitabevi A.O. Publications. Format, print and volume: Evrim Matbaachylyk Ltd. 1987. 104 p. (in Turkish).
3. Aristotle. Poetics. Writer's book. Trans. M. Pozdnev. St. Petersburg: Amphora, 2008. 320 p. (in Russian).
4. Brockett G. Oscar, Hildy J. Franklin. History of the Theatre (10th edition). Pearson Publisher, 2007. 704 p.
5. Kovacs C. Ancient Rome. Publisher: Floris Books, 2005. 224 p.
6. Krachkovsky I. Arabic poetics. Selected works. M.-L. Vol. II. 1965. 700 p. (in Russian).
7. Losev A., Shestakov V. History of aesthetic categories. Moscow: Arts, 1965. 376 p. (in Russian).
8. Ley G. The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy: Playing Space and Chorus. University of Chicago Press, 2007. 226 p.
9. Williams R. Modern Tragedy. London: Chatto & Windus, 1966, 476 p.
10. Schiller F. Essays / edited by Walter Hinderer and Daniel O. Dahlstrom. On the Art of Tragedy. Translated by Daniel O. Dahlstrom. 1–21. New York: Bloomsbury Academic Continuum, 1993. 296 p.

## ТРАГЕДІЯ В ДРЕВНЬОМУ ПЕРІОДІ ЕСТЕТИКИ. КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ТРАГЕДІЇ АРИСТОТЕЛЯ

Джабир Мамедов

*Хазарський університет,  
Інститут філософії НАН, кафедра журналістики  
вул. Мехсети, 41, 1096, м. Баку, Азербайджанська Республіка*

У статті надається інформація про трагедію, звертається увага на теорію трагедії Аристотеля, досліджується її місце у філософії й естетиці. Порівняно думки Платона з теорією Аристотеля про трагедію. Вивчаються причини ставлення Платона до трагічного мистецтва. Про Платона можна сказати, що він не прийняв трагедію як зразок мистецтва або твір мистецтва, він навіть зазначав, що в його «ідеальній державі» немає місця для трагедії. Платон вважав за краще мовчати, аніж говорити про трагедію.

*Ключові слова:* Аристотель, трагічний, філософія, «Поетика», грецький.