
PHILOSOPHICAL EVOLUTION OF TRAGEDY: A GENEALOGICAL APPROACH TO THE TRAGEDY CONCEPT IN TRAGIC ERA

Moslem Aeeni¹, Seyed Mostafa Mokhtabad Amrei^{2*}

¹ Master of Dramatic Literature, Faculty of Arts, Tarbiat Modares University of Tehran
moslem.aeeni@gmail.com

² Professor of Dramatic Literature, Faculty of Arts, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran
mokhtabm@modares.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of tragedy from Greece to the modern and postmodern world must be traced first to Achilles, Sophocles, and Euripides, and then to comedians such as Aristophanes and Menander to Seneca and Terence in Rome. For the same reason, there was a transition period from the middle ages to Shakespeare and Romantic drama and Lessink. The modern world is also associated with playwrights such as Ibsen and Strindberg, who played an important role in the next generation developments and engaged in rebellion. The evolution of the history of tragedy, and its conceptual transformation into tragedy in the modern and postmodern era, manifests itself in playwrights in Europe and America. Recognizing the evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of tragedy as an intellectual and philosophical phenomenon in its explaining, particularly modern types of tragedy and postmodern drama are especially important. By reflecting on tragedy and tragic, and linking these concepts to postmodern drama, one can arrive at a period of conceptual and content transition from classical to modern and postmodern and the emergence of postmodern dramatic literature. Dramatic works of this period and new types of tragedy are known with playwrights such as Eugene Ionesco, Bertolt Brecht, Samuel Beckett, Heiner Müller, and Harold Pinter in Europe, and Eugene O'Neill, Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams, Edward Albee, Sam Shepard, David Mamet and August Wilson in America. These dramatists made a major contribution to the spread of drama in the world, the formation and stabilization of tragedy, and the transition to postmodern drama, and played an important role in the emergence of contemporary drama thinking.

Keywords

Tragedy, Tragic, Evolution, Modern, Postmodern

Introduction

Tragedy and Tragic; A Genealogical Approach

The word tragedy in ancient Greece refers to a variety of plays written by dramatists of the time such as Thes Pis, Achilles, Sophocles, and Euripides. These tragedians wrote their plays to be performed in public and to attend theater and ritual festivals. In The Art of Poetry, Aristotle looks at tragedy from an artistic, philosophical, and theatrical point of view and enumerates different types of tragedy. And for tragedy, he determines a certain scale, length, and size that the

evolutionary and historical course of tragedy from Greece to the Modern and Postmodern world can be studied and evaluated. According to this researcher and the research issue, tragedy has undergone change, transformation, and transmutation at every point in time, which can be traced first to Greece and then to modern and postmodern times. The study of tragedy with a historical approach indicates this situation and turning tragedy into a tragic phenomenon or the achievement of tragedy in a tragic sense. Among the thirty or so tragedy plays from ancient Greece belonging to three great tragedians i.e., Achilles,

Sophocles, and Euripides, from one play to the next, and from one playwright to another, we see fundamental differences and changes in dramatic thinking and writing style, and ultimately the conclusion and meaning of the plays.

We see the evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of tragedy from Greece to Ancient Rome and then the period of weakness and decline of tragedy in the Middle Ages to the era of Neoclassicism and the readings of Corneille, Racine, Shakespeare.

In the same way in modern times, Henrik Ibsen and August Strindberg, and the postmodern era in Europe and America, is associated with playwrights such as Samuel Beckett, Heiner Müller, John James Osborne, Tom Stoppard, Sir Arnold Wesker, and in America Sam Shepard, David Mamet, and August Wilson. A study and research plan that looks at the same changes and developments in tragedy, based on the word tragedy from Greece to modern times, and tragic drama and evolution, metamorphosis and conceptual transubstantiation into postmodern drama and all these phenomena, change and develop it aesthetically and according to Aristotle, it goes beyond Aristotle and the art of poetry.

Aristotle refers to features in defining tragedy and its types and considers quality for tragedy.

Aristotle points out that the poet should place himself in the place of the spectator as much as possible during the design and order of the legend and at the time of writing the work (Aristotle, 2002: 143). Aristotle refers to the points that the tragedian must pay attention to, and if he has this feature, he is more competent in composing tragedy. Among poets, those are considered more capable than others that are influenced by real emotions (ibid.). Of course, after the fall of the prosperous Age of Greece, Greek tragedy and what Aristotle considered the ultimate goal of tragedy in the arts of poetry underwent an evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation and continued on a transition path from Greece to the modern and postmodern world. In Aristotelian thought, the art of poetry is suitable for those who either naturally enjoy this gift or have a lot of passion and excitement, because in the first case they can voluntarily become any person they want, and in the second case, they can completely

surrender themselves to the passions and emotions (ibid.). The tragedy in the structure of the Greek city-state had a special place for performance and a specific audience, with a more specific purpose in which social, political, and cultural phenomena were evident. Richard Schechner in a chapter of his book called *Towards a Place to Perform*, says about the theatrical place: The theater is a place whose only use or main use is to show or to perform the performance. In my opinion, the emergence of this particular kind of space - theatrical place - in human cultures does not go back to later periods (for example, to the Greeks of the fifth century BC) but has existed since the beginning and is one of the signs of our biological species (Schechner, 2007: 284). Whether we disagree or agree with Schechner, the issue of the place of performance or the theater seems to be important, and Greek tragedians paid more attention to the discussion of competitiveness and the philosophical and aesthetic question of tragedy. Along with the changes, apparent and conceptual changes in tragedy and tragic matter, the evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of Greek tragedy into Roman tragedy and from there to all of Europe and the Elizabethan drama period, and the tragedies of William Shakespeare, we see different and sometimes unbalanced interpretations and conclusions, such as what we see in the tragedy of Oedipus and other tragedies of Greek playwrights. In the modern era, tragedy has undergone various and significant transformations in aesthetic concepts and practices. After Ibsen and Strindberg, their legacy became more widespread in Europe and later in the United States, and tragedy entered a new phase. Although modern art tended to take a terrestrial view of its content principles, on the other hand, postmodern art on the destruction of authoritarianism, opening its arms to diversity and rejecting grand narratives, finally took a step towards multiplicity (Mokhtabad, 2008: 83). Accordingly, contemporary theatrical and dramatic systems, from Stanislavsky to Brecht and the emergence of multifaceted drama and performances that carried multifaceted existence were all born of modernism and postmodernism, and the intellectual, ideological, political, and cultural

nature of tragedy has undergone the same changes of systems. Theaters must reflect the specific semantic coherence of life. The difference between partial truths and complete reality is not to the extent that it can be understood and interpreted as the result of separate insights based on equivalence (Miter, 2005: 252). Theater and the concept of the polis in ancient Greece also underwent new conceptual, semantic, and formal transformations in the process of metamorphosis and transubstantiation of meaning, and in the process of theater ritualization and its influence on Greek tragedies, we also witness a kind of transformation and transmutation. Since in the religious and traditional structure of Greece in the spring months, when the sea was moving again after the stormy winter months, the citizens of Athens celebrate the festival so that the great celebration of the city or Dionysia is the largest and most important festival of the city government. The most important element of this festival was the performance of tragedy during the day (Fischer, Lichte, 2002: 46). After the end of the tragedy writing era in ancient Greece, the terrible beginning of the cultural repression of the people began, and this project took place in the conflict between religions. The powerful impact of religious performances on spectators was undoubtedly due to the unique connection between the actors and the audience (ibid.46). However, these festivals played an important role in the intellectual and philosophical evolution of Greek man, and in them, tragedy acted as the main motivator. Greek religion, if it could not end the wars, would alleviate the economic suffering of the people to some extent through numerous festivals (Durant, 2012: 3). Concerning this situation in ancient Greece, we are faced with playwrights who at one time were able to reach the pinnacle of theatrical art and the aim of tragedy. According to Will Durant: Achilles with his strong poetry and dry philosophy paved the way for Greek drama and set the boundaries of Greek drama; Sophocles adorned it with his rhythmic music and calm philosophy; and Euripides, with works that stemmed from his violent emotions and turbulent doubts, guided the evolution of this art towards perfection (ibid: 41). In this regard, the connection between tragedy and

its historical and aesthetic character in Greek society created different uses and aspects, and the audience of these tragedies, according to their tastes and ideas, became related to the issues. From one perspective, the subject of tragedies is raw biographies, broken lives, premature deaths, unfulfilled promises, remorse, and regret, failed ambitions, and tricks of destiny (Schechner, 2007: 81). The evolution and history of drama and tragedy from ancient Greece to Roman drama and tragedy, followed by Drame Biblique and allegorical plays and devotional drama that followed on a purely historical path to Drame Bourgeois and the theories of such drama proposed by Diderot and Beaumarchais reached France, and romantic drama or Drame Romantique. The revolution of tragedy and drama in this period and the nineteenth century made a revolution in the theater that this revolution manifested itself in the field of art form and dominance. People like Alexandra Dumas and Madame de Stael have taken a big step in the development of drama and tragedy by theorizing in the field of drama and tragedy, as well as dramatic techniques and analyzing dramatic texts, and have transformed the spread of tragedy in Europe and the world. The introduction of Cromwell by Victor Hugo is an important work that not only argues against the new classical tragedy, the law of three unities, and the ironic long style, but also advocates, in particular, artistic theories that favor the sublime and tragic style, as well as the comic, ugly, and ultimately ridiculous and awkward style. Hugo in Cromwell, a play that is impracticable due to its vast dimensions, offers a theory of drama and its practical usage. This play has the characteristics of a romantic drama. It is focused on historical heroism, drawing a society, and describing a political crisis (Shahin, Ghavimi, 2004: 128). In the modern era, transformation, metamorphosis, and transmutation took place in all kinds of dramas, and dramas and tragedies moved more towards readability. Modern theatricals were also able to find solutions to the type of confrontation with the audience. Solutions that consciously or unconsciously led to the change of theater and drama path. Modernists, who had problems both with the collective production of theater and with its collective perception, were gradually shifted

from the theater being seen to the theater being read (Sameti et al., 2017: 119). Dramatists such as Brecht and Beckett can be considered among modern playwrights who value the thinking and reasoning of the audience more than their involvement in being seen or read, and their tragedies are more like the tragedies of rupture, loneliness, displacement, and human misery. Brecht's dialectical epic theater is for the scientific age- and this is something very new about him in the radical sense of the theatre's audience (Fischer, Liehte, 2002: 324).

Evolution, Metamorphosis, and Transubstantiation in Tragedy

To understand the types of tragedy, it is necessary to start from the meaning of these words.

Evolution is associated with oscillation and a kind of rotation. But the word metamorphosis, which is associated with the process, refers to the path of evolution and mutation, and its full and precise meaning is the change of face and form. In English, the word Metamorphosis is used for this description. The word transubstantiation has a different meaning; The change from one kind to another, and here from one phenomenon to another, and also in its nature means transformation. The historical and aesthetic path of tragedy, which has continued from Plato and his views and his disciple Aristotle to the modern and postmodern world, has itself undergone an evolution, metamorphosis, and semantic and conceptual transubstantiation, so that Greek tragedy is different from Roman tragedy and Roman tragedy is different from recent, modern and postmodern tragedies. It should be said that in this path of evolution and transformation, the role of dramaturge and the phenomenon of dramaturgy will play a major role in understanding this historical path from ancient Greece to the postmodern world. The aesthetic connection between the transition period and the historical passage of this evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation in tragedy can be traced and studied comprehensively with the growth and development of the literary and artistic dramaturgy phenomenon and the role of dermatologist in theatrical art.

Although the word dramaturgy is derived from the Greek word (Dramaturgia) (meaning to pay for a

play), it was Gottheld Ephraim Lessing who first introduced dramaturgy as a theatrical data and action with the publication of the Hamburgische Dramaturgie (1767-9) (Turner, Brent, 2010: 45-46). After Lessing, in the course of the evolution of playwriting and drama in the nineteenth century, dramaturgy and literary management flourished in England, and the tragedy and its components were given to the same literary directors, playwrights, directors, and actors. Nineteenth-century English theater witnessed both the domination of director-actors and their downfall. The many tasks that most of the directors took on exclusively increased their workload terribly, this complex system of intense conflict between playwrights and theater directors became a major problem, and all of them eventually led to the fall of the high values of the drama and especially the works of tragedians. Meanwhile, with the growth and development of material life and the move towards realism in the nineteenth-century of England, the tastes and temperaments of the audience became more and more superficial, and the tragedy no longer had the function of the past in its traditional sense. William Archer and Harley Granville Barker were two influential characters in British literary and theater management. Love for Shakespeare and his works was very important in the project of nationalization of the English theater, but it should be noted that the education and intellectualism of the general and special audience and the presentation of the truth and moral legitimacy of England in the world was equally important (ibid.: 103). During the transition of drama and tragedy in Europe, Bertolt Brecht was also one of the theorists and founders of tragedy. Brecht's theories and experiences have caused fundamental changes and artistic reforms in the theaters of Central and Eastern Europe and German-speaking countries (ibid.: 137). However, these views and theories and Brecht's empiricism were further developed in the 60s and 70s in English-speaking countries such as the United States. The dramatic changes in contemporary American theater and the liberation from tragedy as a dominant theatrical genre, both among playwrights and directors and executive groups, had become a theatrical norm, and the role of American

playwrights is very influential. The dramatist is considered a facilitator in most American theater. He is a person who should be among the playwrights, directors, producers, designers, actors, and spectators, provide information and beliefs, and ensure that the lines of communication remain open and constructive (Brahimi et al., 2011: 289). What shows us more about the legacy of dramaturgy in modern and postmodern times is the way we deal with the text in a connection between the creator - the playwright - or the dramatist of the playwright. Tragedy has undergone a conceptual and content metamorphosis due to these transformations and changes, both in content and form. In the modern period, which was affected by various factors in the direction of the drama and its fundamental changes compared to the classical period, the attention to Platonic dialogues as a drama gradually increased (Sameti et al., 2017: 117). At the same time, the way was opened for what we call postmodern drama, and the theoretical and intellectual frameworks of tragedy were transformed. The path of connection between Greek drama from Achilles to Aristophanes and later in Stoic Rome, where the importance of tragedy and drama shifted to joyful games and mass rituals, can be traced by the continuing antagonism of the church and its powerful institution. The period of the controlled revival of drama in the Middle Ages can also be a dramatic and debatable change. The evolution of the tragedy continues with the intellectual roots of the Renaissance and England of the Elizabethan era, and people such as Christofo Marlow and William Shakespeare led it to the theater and drama of the eighteenth-century of England and then Spain. But theater and drama in France were able to find a new and very philosophical identity, and people such as Pierre Corny, Moliere, Racine as a tragedy writer, and critic Dennis Diderot were encouraged to critique and theorize about drama and tragedy. However, with the French Revolution, the identity and structure of theater and drama were severely revised and even censored. In Italy, Goldoni and Gozzi, in Germany, Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller continued to do so, expanding the intellectual, philosophical, and contemporary contexts of tragedy and drama

in Europe and elsewhere. In the Renaissance, the subject of tragedy changed in terms of identity and social and political status. Francis Bacon and John Locke mostly write the Evolution of the Meaning of Knowledge and the Installation Common to the Theme of Liberal Humanism. Locke sought to prove the valid theory of liberal humanism, and his work on the knowledge, development and optimization of certain aspects of Bacon paid special attention to Descartes (Belsey, 1985: 82). Accordingly, the trend of drama and tragedy after this period towards the philosophical discussions of art and the semantics of art, and with this credibility, drama and tragedy became important as a philosophical-artistic phenomenon and a semantic subject. After these events, romantic art, as an art in which the content dominates the face or in other words, the soul over the material, distances itself from the physical and external affairs and pays attention to inner space. This distancing from the outside, paying attention to the mentality, and dealing with the inner will not result in partial attention to the characters (Hassani Sirat, Shaghol, 2014: 16).

The Transition of Tragedy to the Metamorphosis of Roman Drama and the Beginning of Christianity

The tragedy in Aristotle's poetry has undergone many contents and semantic ups and downs in its evolution. Greece, the Roman Empire, the Christian and medieval worlds up to the modern era, and the contemporary tragic world all contribute to the growth and prosperity, decline and weakness of tragedy, as Steiner speaks of tragic death. As the tragedy in the works of Achilles, Sophocles and Euripides was accompanied by differences and developments, and after the Greek civilization, this legacy was transferred to Seneca and from him to Shakespeare and through Shakespeare's tragedies to the modern era and the postmodern world. Oedipus Sophocles seems to be the greatest tragedy in the world and the best source of adaptation and reference for playwrights and even other fields of art. The Oedipus complex is extremely important for understanding the history of humanity and the development of religion and ethics (Lekouk, Solier, 2002: 51). In contrast to Sophocles' tragedies, Euripides was able to look at

tragedy and drama differently, freeing the drama from the usual barriers and the undisputed domination of the gods and their dominance. Euripides, with the works that arose from his fierce emotions and turbulent doubts, led the evolution of this art towards perfection (Durant, 2012: 41). And after him, tragedy on its way from ancient Greece to the Roman Empire reached its peak in the works of Seneca in the power and aesthetics of words, weight, and melody, although its dramatic values diminished in the course of this transformation and metamorphosis, and after Seneca, it almost lost its importance by Roman comedians. With the fall and defeat of the Roman Empire and the domination of Christianity over Rome, almost tragedy reached the weakest point in its entire history, and drama and tragedy served the ecclesiastical and aesthetic purposes of Christianity. During this period of Miracle plays, the Mysteries were able, under the supervision of the Church, to fill to some extent the emptiness of tragedy among the people under the influence and control of the Church. Gradually, from the twelfth century onwards, religious plays became more complex and detailed than they could be presented to the public indoors. A platform was built outside the churchyard, and the play was performed with the help of actors chosen from among the people who had been trained to memorize their long roles (ibid. : 111-112).

Tragedy and Tragic in the Postmodern World

Tragedy in the political structure of ancient Greece was a completely elitist and glorious phenomenon belonging to the upper class, the so-called nobility, and sages. By recognizing tragedy and classifying it, Aristotle was able to draw a general and logical scale for tragedy, and through this, in the evolution and metamorphosis of tragedy into tragic, and modern tragedy and postmodern drama, the main patterns and logical frameworks have a major contribution. The historical and evolutionary course of tragedy from ancient Greece has so far experienced difficulties that have always aroused the eyes of artists and critics familiar with tragedy and drama. Of course, concerning tragedy and the course of developments, changes, or the course of its evolution and descent, some points seem enlightening. The aesthetic path of tragedy in

ancient Greece is called the word tragic in modern times, which, like tragedy, will end in any other literature, including fiction and novels. Modern tragedy and postmodern drama have a different logic from classical tragedies and even the word tragic. The modern era itself posed a great challenge to tragedy and paved the way for the emergence of a type of tragedy now called postmodern drama. Henrik Ibsen criticized the rules of Aristotelian drama, freeing drama and tragedy from poetic language. Ibsen's legacy went to Strindberg and all of Europe, and later to the United States and even the rest of the world and their drama. In Europe and between the two world wars, Brecht and Beckett undertook innovations in tragedy and tragic phenomena, and their legacy became the basis for the emergence of postmodern multidimensional drama. Undoubtedly, today what is called postmodern drama has been created evolutionarily and historically, and the best examples of it should be found in contemporary European and American dramatic literature. Comparison and modeling of modern tragedy and today's postmodern drama from the classical tragedies of ancient Greece is one of the basic components of new and modern art forms and their new historical path. Reflecting and recognizing the basic components of modernism and postmodernism during playwriting is a good criterion for measuring the differences and tragic changes from the classical to the modern and postmodern eras. Aristotle is best known as a formalist in his method of examining tragedy in poetry or art. The reason for such an argument is that he first looks at tragedy as a special kind of literature and hardly speaks about epistemology (Ghaderi, 2011: 33). In modern tragedy, and in the same way postmodern drama, we are dealing with a kind of slippage and fading that first had its influence on the tragedy and drama of that time in the form of the Romantic Movement. It should be noted that the idea of utopia or the way of thinking of modernism fits very well and sometimes it can be said that this idea lies in the essence of modernism (Ibid: 65). Modernism and postmodernism are among the most important factors in the evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of tragedy, and these two are amazing challenges in theater and drama. The age

of modernism has embodied a kind of pluralism, dialectical logic, esoteric and philosophical rationality, and the fading of mysticism and moral teachings, to which tragedy crystallizes as a mirror. After 1960, the postmodern thoughts and reflections by the main thinkers-theorists from Nietzsche to Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty and later Wittgenstein and Derrida, and famous people such as Paul Michel Foucault, Jean Baudrillard, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Alain Badiou, Slavoj Zizek, and Richard Rorty were continued, and today, in its absolute sense, it is placed in postmodernism in connection with thought and aesthetics. However, one of the crises that progressive postmodernism has faced is the lack of meaning or waiting for meaning (Mokhtabad, 2008: 87).

The American Avant-Garde Theater and its various performances, as well as the emergence of alternative writing methods and dominant and anti-traditional plays in this period and the emergence of a taboo generation that emerged in the three currents of playwriting, directing, and acting, played the largest role. The tragedy of this period, which is the epitome of American dramatic literature, all have unique features and, to some extent, are emerging philosophical-theatrical experiences. Various characteristics include storytelling, lack of a clear plot and structure, confusion and complexity of the story center, and dramatic situations, opposition to social customs and taboos and playing with the dominant culture and challenging American culture, rebellion against family and family system and the issue of identity and its connection to the contemporary family and society, and the American Dream and the death of the American Dream. The different and abnormal plays of Neil Simon, Edward Albee, David Mamet, Sam Shepard, Marsha Norman, Arthur Kopit, and August Wilson showed themselves more in this situation. Concerning these circumstances, the black theater also made a significant contribution, devoting many playwrights, directors, and actors to the American developed theater. It should be mentioned that when the word black and white was radically tested in the United States, it was immediately reflected in the theater (Cohn, 1991: 103). After the effects of these events and the

emergence of a kind of postcolonial theater, more attention was paid to class and racial aspects, and the connection between these ideas and the phenomenon of postcolonial theater and drama became more and more evident in Europe and later in the United States. Postcolonialism and race, like other fields of study or critical aspects of the contemporary humanities, resist simple definitions or summaries. These two terms, alone or in combination, sometimes in a sad coexistence, if not contradictory, encompass a wide range of critics with very different theoretical, ideological, aesthetic, historical, and regional positions (Molp, Wake, 2015: 214). Given the recognition of these features and the basics mentioned above, in contemporary drama, we can mention the types of tragedy that are presented with completely conventional concepts and close to the issues, which are the same forms of postcolonial drama that are influenced in terms of form and content. Postcolonial studies refer to the efforts of scholars in various fields such as literature, cultural studies, history, and anthropology, in general, to cope with the legacy of European colonialism (ibid.: 224).

Modern Tragedy and Postmodern Drama

In this section, we will look at the transition period of tragedy and recognize its definitions and fundamental developments according to prominent experts, writers, and critics, and understand the difference between classical and modern tragedy and what can be considered today as postmodern drama or postmodern dramatic literature. Aristotle believes that tragedy is an imitation of a serious action that has a measure and is complete. Its language is accompanied by pleasant verbal device, each of which is woven separately into components of the work; It has a theatrical form and not a narrative, and it is associated with events that arouse fear and pity by which the refinement of these emotions is achieved (Leach, 2009: 7). With his definition of tragedy, Aristotle goes on to describe in more detail the tragedy and divides the plots into two main types, i.e., simple and complex. From Aristotle's point of view, action is divided into two main categories, namely, simple action, which occurs by changing the status and circumstances of the hero, and complex action, which occurs by

conflict and sudden change of his status as an inseparable link. Aristotle distinguishes between an incident that occurred due to another incident and an incident that occurs after that incident. A person who is in this situation is a person who has fallen from the top to the bottom and from happiness and success to misery and gloom. According to Diomidis in the fourth century, tragedy is a narrative in which the fate of a hero who can also be semi-divine is created by characters trapped in miserable situations. Thus, according to the definition of Aristotle and Diomidis, tragedy occurs for both the divine hero and the semi-divine hero. In the sixth and seventh centuries AD, Isidore of Seville said: "Tragedy includes the sad stories of the commonwealth and the kings and the bourgeoisie and the divine and semi-divine heroes". When we compare these definitions with other definitions, such as John Garland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we come across some interesting points. The tragedy is a poem written in a sublime style that deals with shameful and evil deeds, which begins with joy and leads to sorrow (Ibid: 9). According to this definition, tragedy is not related just to high-ranking and semi-divine people, and it is enough for shameful and criminal acts to occur in it. However, in the art of poetry, Aristotle considers the life of nobles and aristocrats to be more suitable for poetic imitation. Therefore, he says tragedy is the imitation of those who are superior to us, thus he does not necessarily limit this superiority to its class meaning, and promotes another meaning, that is, a desirable character that can be found in every class of people (Ghaderi, 2011: 18). An examination of the views of Aristotle and its comparison with other theorists and experts well shows the evolution and metamorphosis of tragedy in different eras. Jeffrey Chaucer said the tragedy is the narration of a particular story, like the old books that bring to life someone's memory, which is one day ultimately successful and from the peak descends to the abyss (Leach, 2009: 9). According to Chaucer's definition, tragedy is also reminiscent of human memories and stories, and at the same time, tragedy tells a special story. Aristotle also refers to the storytelling of tragedy and considers it a full verb, that is, that tragedy has a beginning,

middle, and end. Sir Philip Sidney has also discussed the tragedy in detail. He describes tragedy as follows: A tragedy is considered a prominent work that opens deep wounds and reveals fabricated wounds, frightens kings from the oppression, and manifests the cruel nature of the oppressors, and by arousing admiration and compassion, they reveal the invalidity of this world and show us what golden roofs should not be built on traditional affairs (ibid.). With this definition of tragedy, Sydney not only addresses the points made by Aristotle but also tries to express them more fully and eloquently. He distinguishes between high tragedy and low tragedy. Tragedy boasts so far, unlike comedy, which has a lower level and usually causes laughter and cheerfulness. This statement of William Shakespeare may also be interesting in turn: After that, reason sang this lament for the phoenix and the dove, these kings and the stars of love, as co-authors of their tragic fate (ibid. : 11). We must never forget that tragedy has been perceived and recognized differently between tribes in different eras. So far, by presenting these definitions, we have realized that tragedy has undergone fundamental changes over time, and each of the scholars has tried to have definitions that are appropriate to the worldview and their knowledge and understanding of tragedy. What is certain is that our understanding of tragedy and its circumstances and occurrence is quite different from that of the ancient Greeks, who lived two thousand five hundred years ago. The Greeks used the word tragedy to describe a kind of play, which they had a major role in its construction. The tragedy is based on its historical metamorphoses from ancient Greece to Rome, then to Shakespeare and Racine and modern-day playwrights, and later to postmodern writers. Aristotle believes that tragedy is more philosophical and serious than history. The reason for this life is that poetry speaks of global issues and history is specific to particular topics or in other words what poetry expresses is general and what history presents is partial (Pool, 2010: 32). By Aristotle's definition, tragedy may seem more important than history, but tragedy has always undergone extensive changes throughout history. These developments may have been entirely to the

detriment of tragedy, but by examining the views of the scholars, we can see these fundamental changes in the concept and recognition of tragedy in today's world. Chapman about tragedy says that following credible truth or action, who deserves respect expects it in a poem whose subject is not the truth, but things like truth. They criticize them by excuses such as lack of truth in these natural stories, and they are nothing except miserly and miserable souls. Basic education, glorious motivation, and aspiration towards virtue, refraining from its contradictory actions, are the soul, organs, and scope of a real tragedy (Leach, 2009: 11).

Jean Racine was the great French tragedian of the seventeenth century, whose work is considered a classic of the Renaissance and, according to some theorists, the drama of modern European times. Of course, the main features of the classical period can be seen more in them and he had different readings of Greek drama. In his plays, Racine has made extreme use of classical rules in the best possible way. In his definition of tragedy, he points out the necessity of no bloodshed, does not even consider death necessary, values only its action and its greatness, and refers to the heroic and pure characters of humanity, because they can evoke emotions and have a profound impact on the audience. The soul of the tragic character ignores all the preliminary issues. Everything changes in the blink of an eye, and when that fateful word is finally uttered, everything becomes fundamental. Similarly, the calmness or dignity or the excitement and joy of the tragic character in the face of death are only heroic in appearance and the ordinary language of psychology. As a young playwright once said, the dying heroes of a tragedy are much deadlier than they die (Tragedy, 2006: 42). Although George Steiner commented on the death of tragedy differently, and essentially the death and decline of tragedy in the new World, it was John Dryden, the great English poet, translator, literary critic, and playwright who was called the King of English Poets speaks of tragedy as a different way. The deaths of Anthony and Cleopatra have been the subject of our nation's greatest geniuses since Shakespeare and this has been done in such a way that the example of their work has given me the confidence to test myself

in the first place and among the many suitors, and generally to test myself to achieve that sign. I do not doubt that this motivation has always motivated us in this endeavor. I mean moral superiority because the main characters of this play were famous role models for illegitimate love, and their end was just as unpleasant and unbelievable (Leach, 2009: 12-13). Dryden takes a special look at tragedy; he deals mainly with love and its sufferings in tragedy and examines tragedy in the form of emotional issues. A look at the tragedy in his novel way reveals an identity different from what existed before his time. Tragedy can be studied and researched mostly in this period with love and emotional issues or traces of these methods. On the death of tragedy, Steiner says; Ibsen was the first in whose work the ideal of the tragic form was not inspired by any of the ancient patterns and Shakespeare, and before that could happen, the literary language center had to move from poetry to prose. (Steiner, 2007: 44). The fundamental changes of the seventeenth century, as well as the development of industrial societies and the emergence of new theorists in the field of drama, all of whom were poets, playwrights, or critics, caused tragedy to undergo a fundamental evolution and metamorphosis, both in content and form. Metamorphosis and the evolution of tragedy should be considered in several main factors, including political, cultural, social, religious, and even scientific in the world. Kier Kegaard describes it this way: The tragic hero does not know the terrible and with Clumenster and Iphigenia and tears are soothing but sighs that do not fit in the word cause suffering (Leach, 2009: 14). Transformation in tragedy is a very deep issue and in terms of research seems to require fundamental research in the history of tragedy and its historical development. Greek tragedy was certainly very different from Roman tragedy, and Roman tragedy was different from medieval dramas, morals, mysteries, and miracles and these three genres were different from neoclassical and romantic tragedies. Friedrich Nietzsche is a philosopher who has a special view on tragedy. Nietzsche essentially studies tragedy and its origins and comes up with interesting theories. Although Nietzsche interprets tragedy differently

from what Aristotle and the Greeks know, he refers to points that have not been said until then. He explains in the birth of tragedy as follows: Tragic myth has convinced us that even ugly and uncoordinated cases are merely an aesthetic game that the will carries with it, at the height of joy. To understand directly the difficult phenomenon of Dionysian art, we must now turn to the enormous importance of musical inconsistency. The pleasure that a tragic myth creates is the same pleasure that disharmony creates in music. That first Dionysian joy is present, even alongside suffering, the common source of music and tragic myth (ibid .: 15-15). Here we see that Nietzsche uses the word tragic, now we have to deal with what is the difference between tragedy and tragic? Almost the end of the nineteenth century, two Scandinavian playwrights, Henrik Ibsen and Johann August Strindberg, created a completely unexpected revolution in the form and subject of tragedy. Their effects reflected pathological tragic traits, behavioral strangeness, inherited abnormalities, insanity, and more or less emotional states and psychosis. Their tragic insight indicated a sick society that was spiritually and morally corrupt. These types of tragedies were far removed from Aristotelian and classical concepts (Tragedy, 2006: 207). If tragedy is studied as an art and we look at it in the course of history, we will find that tragedy has undergone many fundamental changes from the seventeenth century to the present day. What we know about the tragedy today is associated with misery, sorrow, adversity, desperation, and vagrancy, and the calamity of the common man today that can happen to any family or family member loved one, or acquaintance. Tragedy no longer has the dignity of the past and has come to ordinary, poor, and needy people. I. A. Richards comments on the tragedy in the principles of literary criticism, saying that tragedy is one of the most complete known experiences, that in its system and structure it can accept anything new and put it in its framework. Richards points out that tragedy is invulnerable and can create different aspects, so tragedy can manifest itself as a superior species and there is nothing that cannot be presented as a tragic theory. Perhaps Richards' conception of tragedy can be interpreted in such a way that tragedy is a

genre that has more flexibility than other literary genres, and that tragedy, therefore, becomes a place to recount the actions and deeds of human beings and worries and fears, hardships and sufferings. Therefore, this tragedy has hidden all these voices in its heart. Jean Anouilh, the great contemporary French novelist, has an interesting idea of tragedy and sees the tragedy as a spring that returns to its original position when compressed to its fullest. According to Anouilh, tragedy acts automatically. The tragedy is a serious drama from Aristotle's point of view, and wherever Aristotle refers to tragedy, this seriousness has special importance and role, but in today's world where most viewers pay attention to tragic drama, they know different types of drama. In Aristotle's time, these common divisions may not have existed, but it was the spectators and those involved in plays and festivals who understood the distinction between tragedy and comedy because each had its characteristics. The difference between the two words tragic and tragedy can be evaluated as follows; although the two words are highly semantically related, they are markedly different in function and nature. To better understand tragedy and its difference with tragic, we should consider what P. Rykvur said; he considers the tragic essence in the connection between poetry, drama, and the creation of characters, and introduces the tragic hero as the creator of tragic dramas, for which we find abundance in the world of imagination. Although the tragedy in its essence causes a continuous and interconnected flow in the play, and this transformation and the emergence of tragedy in the play causes a tragic phenomenon, it seems that besides the drama, there are many uses for the word tragic. In his Book Theater and Art, Henry Guhyh makes every effort to find, under the influence of Hegel, a common denominator for the tragedies of all eras. He says that tragedy arises in the presence of transcendence, and this transcendence creates tragic moments. French novelist and playwright, Jean Giraudoux, also defines tragedy as the inseparable relationship between human beings and other forces: What is tragedy? It is the confirmation of a frightening relationship between evil and destiny greater than human destiny. This is a human being

separated from the horizontal position by the collars that keep him standing, while commitment moves him but he has forgotten his will (Tomaso, 2007: 14-15). Now, according to these definitions, in today's world, it seems that the most tragic action has crystallized itself in the form of words and depicting the world and the problems of man and the social conditions in which he is caught. Today's characters, which are caught up in everyday life and human problems, are no longer alien to the world of kings, gods. It is possible to study this change, evolution, and metamorphosis of the tragedy, which is first mentioned as a noun from Greece, but gradually gives way to an adjective in the modern and postmodern eras. The new era no longer reflects tragedy in that sense of the past, and tragedy gives way to a phenomenon as tragic. Later, the adjective of tragic is used for many other situations, and the word tragic, which evokes painful memories, is also used for a variety of novels and other literary genres. The transubstantiation that has taken place in the concept of tragedy and tragic throughout history can be divided into several major eras:

1. Ancient Greece
2. Ancient Rome
3. Medieval
4. The Neoclassical period and the 16th and 17th centuries in England and France
5. Modern times and Modern tragedy
6. The Postmodern era and the emergence of Postmodern drama

The contemporary era is a period in which the word tragic can be applied to any play that has these characteristics. George Steiner also uses the term for plays by Bertolt Brecht and Samuel Beckett and divides their work into modern tragedy. Of course, it should not be forgotten that this adjective is also used for the leaders of the theater of the absurd, including Eugene Ionesco and Arthur Adamov, and others, and the group's plays are also referred to as the tragedy of the failure of language and communication. What is known today as postmodernism should be considered a fluid, changing, and interpreting movement. Postmodernism is a term that overlaps with other terms such as postmodernism and they all refer to the post-modernist period or modernity. The world after the era of modernity

and the achievement of industrial, scientific and cultural, artistic, social, and political progress enters a period after it, namely postmodernism or after modernism. After the end of modernism, according to theorists, critics, and intellectuals, the world enters a stage that is referred to as postmodernism. Although the movements of Marxism and poststructuralism have greatly influenced the emergence of postmodernism, it seems that postmodernism itself, as a profound intellectual and philosophical movement, has had a great influence on world events and human thought. Postmodernism as a movement is essentially a reaction against intellectual, philosophical, spiritual, literary, and artistic events and crises, and it can be considered as a kind of opposition to the enlightenment or the failure of this era. Postmodernism, like a submerged complex and like an infinite sea, irrigates the world and brings about a fundamental change in human thought. Postmodernism is believed by some to be a social reformer, in other words, as a medicine to heal the wounds of modernity and the ills of the modern world. World War I and its devastating effects, followed by a far more devastating civil war, World War II, the killing and slaughter of innocent people, all set the stage for post-modernism. The situation after the Second World War and the disruption of moral principles and various factors such as fading of faith and belief and the emergence of consumerism and the culture of promoting it among the different societies and the emergence of a comprehensive or post-industrial era, as well as increasing and influencing media and social and cultural networks have created a global image between the people and the audience. It should not be forgotten that there are many differences and divisions between theorists and scholars of this period. Postmodernism, as a fundamental movement in the field of humanities, has taken its foundations and infrastructures from several movements and philosophical schools of thought, and it may seem that postmodernism has achieved what it wanted. In addition, when we look at the basic elements and components of this movement or school, we see many similarities and similarities between it and another intellectual, philosophical, and literary-artistic movements of

the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although postmodernism is close to modernism, Dadaism, and Futurism, it is closer to modernism in terms of the influential practices and symbols used in it and its basic components. The distinction between modern and postmodern art, and the difference between the two schools, has always been one of the most important and controversial questions of the contemporary era. If we consider the emergence of the modern era or modernity between the years 1800 to 1920, then we see the emergence of many changes in the world, all of which have affected human life and thought in some way. Postmodernism first manifested itself in the two fields of literature and architecture and led to the emergence of new methods in these two fields and their different fields and related tendencies.

Ulysses by James Joyce and The Wasteland by T. S. Eliot created new methods in the literature.

Ulysses Joyce's novel, with its conceptual and structural revolution, as well as the Wasteland of Eliot with a new and stormy language, promised the emergence of a new era in literature. In the art of architecture, new and innovative methods were created, all of which were the product of cultural, climatic, and ideological changes, and these changes were manifested in the form of special complexities in architectural works. In postmodern architecture, there was talk of the applicability of art, whether or not modern art is still an applied art, and in what ways it can be applied. In the midst of these upheavals and uprisings, some artists and intellectuals also stood up against the capitalist system and its influence on art and literature and expressed their protest in different ways. They wanted to create art that could not be sold, priced, and offered simply and cheaply. Artists were thinking of creating new, original, and personal ways. The point of difference between modern and postmodern art was pluralism. Pluralism was seen in literary and artistic works after World War II and the civil wars in Europe and the countries involved in the conflict. Artists and intellectuals sought to create this method to make their works irreplaceable and more valuable. Arts such as pop art, performance art, and global and technological advances in the use of the Internet, television, and satellite

networks have given rise to a pluralistic view and an element called pluralism in contemporary world art and drama. Pluralists believe that there is never a definite, permanent, unified, and universal belief. Pluralism is well illustrated in two articles by Ihab Hassan on Postmodern Art and Pluralism and by Jean-François Lyatard on the Postmodern Condition. Perhaps the explanation for this is that the art of slicing or cut up is a technique used by both modern and postmodern artists, the modern artist breaks up a phenomenon to show its hidden angles and harmony, and to give us a consistent image. Nevertheless, the postmodern artist dissects the phenomenon to expose its differences and contradictions. In addition, the difference between modern society and post-modern society is that in modern society, the government and its structure show that the people and the ruling system are all doing the same thing, and this creates a single, complete image. However, in postmodern society, this distinction stands out, and unity no longer makes sense. Both artists are arguing that the world needs to change, but the postmodern artist in answer to how the world can be changed and rebuilt has no answer except that I do not know how and with what quality; and he just says that there are different ways as the number of human beings. We must not forget that post-modern art is the art of participation and that everyone communicates with post-modern art through his knowledge and experience, and his savings. Now we must point to one of the main concepts and philosophical tendencies of the postmodern period, the word deconstruction. This concept itself has various interpretations among theorists and critics of postmodernism. Deconstruction has been presented under the influence of post-modernist forms or a branch of its tendencies. Deconstructionism debate that always evokes the center-margin discourse is any phenomenon if it loses its center or its center is removed, and what will happen and how will the discourse of this relationship be determined. The connection between center-margin and deconstruction becomes clear with a phenomenon called defamiliarization.

Postmodern Tragedy and Drama in Europe and America

Playwrights know the evolutionary and aesthetic path of tragedy in modern times in Europe, and the postmodern drama was formed in America on this basis. The transitional legacy of the modern tragedy reached contemporary Europe after Ibsen and reached the United States from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom in philosophical and aesthetic developments. In the twentieth century, such violent storms and hurricanes from the newly emerged art of cinema blew towards the theater that all the efforts and existence of this only alive old art remained to ignite our time (Mokhtabad, 1387: 84). After World War I and between World War II, innovations emerged in Europe and the United States that became very popular in Britain and the United States after World War II. In the 1960s in England, playwrights such as John Arden, Edward Bond, Tom Stoppard, and Christopher Hampton, Harold Pinter, and John Osborne took a fresh look at drama and tragedy and produced a variety of multifaceted and creative works. The writing process of this play continued with the work of John Tan Miller, John Dexter, William Gaskill, and Trevor Nunn. After the Royal Shakespeare Company, various other groups and companies entered the theater, and each of them shows a different field for presenting and selecting plays. They built many theaters and collections to set a good example for future generations and future groups. In Germany Brecht and the ensemble group, and France Beckett and his plays and the use of language dialogues fundamentally and absurdly influenced the new generation of contemporary American playwrights. Beckett, in anticipation of Godot, his latest tape, happy days, and other works such as novels and stage, television, and radio shows in his masterpieces, often discredits language and memory and its power to shape reality; subjects that Sam Shepard later addressed in depth in plays such as *Buried Child* (1978), *Fool for love* (1983) and *A Lie of the Mind* (1985) (Sadik, 1397: 43). Beckett has also extended his legacy of new tragedy and meaning to Harold Pinter's two one-act plays, *The Room* and *the Food Elevator*. Sometime later, Edward Albee and David Mamet culminated his legacy in the United States. American theaters were occupied by Arthur Miller and Tennessee

Williams in the years after World War II. These two important American playwrights explored social issues, especially the human costs of the post-war industrial capitalist system and the paradoxical nature of the American dream. Both of them followed the rules of family realism, but also freely used anti-realist tools to express their views on stage in the best possible way (ibid: 51). Playwrights of the 1960s and 1970s had different characteristics in playwriting, paying to play write, and characterization, social phenomena and civil movements in the United States, and women's rights and labor and anti-war movements. Protests against Broadway art were the origins of new forms of drama and theater in the United States. The influence of American playwrights on Absurd drama, and people like Ionesco and its anti-theatrical idea, left American playwrights increasingly free to make creative changes to their plays. Great playwrights such as Arthur Miller, Neil Simon, Sam Shepard, David Mamet, and August Wilson made the most changes to their plays. Today, based on these currents and the breadth of new methods, dramatic and multifaceted innovations can be examined in the context of the aesthetics of drama and its evolution and metamorphosis in form and content; and recognized new types of drama and aesthetics of performance.

Conclusion

The evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation of tragedy from Greece to the modern and postmodern world follow a journey that took place with an aesthetic turn from Greek drama to Roman drama. This evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation, have continued their practical, symbolic, and ritualistic aspects to poetic and philosophical subtleties in terms of form and content, expressive, and fundamental forms. Tragedy and tragic, and the thought resulting from this content and meaning have also undergone this historical course and system of evolution, metamorphosis, and transubstantiation. According to the explanation of these concepts in the philosophical-theatrical understanding of tragedy, a new kind of reading and communication device called text analysis

and a kind of reproduction in the heart of this tragic evolutionary process will be needed, in which the role of playwrights and literary drama phenomenon which is more colorful. Greek tragedy, modern tragedy, and postmodern drama perhaps show us the forms of this movement and the historical system in tragedy. Although this evolution is accompanied by the conceptual transubstantiation of the word tragedy into tragicomic, the role of several playwrights should not be overlooked, including; Euripides, Seneca, Shakespeare, Lessing, Ibsen, and Strindberg, as well as the rest of the modern world, such as Samuel Beckett and Bertolt Brecht, in postmodern Europe and America, playwrights such as; John Osborne, Heiner Müller, Tom Stoppard, Sam Shepard, David Mamet, and August Wilson. The current avant-garde playwriting and theater after the 1960s contributed to the growth and development of this transitional heritage, led to heresy, and re-skinning in the form and content of plays and even the nature of tragedy. The transition from classical drama to modern and postmodern drama and the emergence of a current called postmodern dramatic literature has been able to be a vehicle for the flow of these creative contexts and this evolutionary process. Modern tragedy in Europe and America, as well as postmodern dramatic literature, is a must; Take the road to a new place and determine its uncertain future or tragic history. As Steiner speaks about the death of tragedy, the period of the decline and defeat of tragedy can be equated with modernism and postmodernism. Family tragedies, completely personal and creative-minded play, or in a familiar way, and the use of new domains for playwriting and tragedy, especially after the 60s and 70s, led us to more social, political, and cultural directions. Playwrights such as Eugene Ionesco and Harold Pinter, and Americans such as Arthur Miller, Neil Simon, Sam Shepard, and David Mamet on the path of transmitting, transforming conceptual and contextual tragedy and tragic thought pushed postmodern to new theatrical forms and writing tragedy in context. The phenomenon of the transfer and attainment of a new kind of knowledge in tragedy promised the emergence of a new genre called postmodern drama to civilized

and critically-minded societies and the theatrical acceptance of new and progressive genres.

References

- [1] Steiner, George (2007), *The Death of Tragedy*, translated by Behzad Ghaderi, Tehran, Namayesh Publishing
- [2] Shekhar, Richard (2007), *Theory of Performance*, translated by Mehdi Nasrollahzadeh, Tehran, Samt Publishing
- [3] Ghaderi, Behzad (2011), *The Perspective of Dramatic Literature, Transition from Aristotle to Postmodernism and Postcolonialism*, Abadan, Porsesh Publishing
- [4] Ghaderi, Nasrollah (2009), *Anatomy of Drama Structure*, Tehran, Neyestan Publishing
- [5] Leach, Kilford (2002), *What is tragedy?* Translation: Helen Oliaeinia, Isfahan, Farda Publishing
- [6] Nazerzadeh, Kermani, Farhad (1986), *Pioneer, Empiricist and Absinthe Theater*, Tehran, University Jihad Publishing
- [7] Nazerzadeh, Kermani, Farhad (2011), *An Introduction to Dramatic Studies*, Tehran, Samt Publishing
- [8] Pol, Adrian (2010), *An Introduction to Tragedy*, translated by Pedram La'lbakhsh, Tehran, Afraz Publishing
- [9] Barahimi, Mansour and et al. (2014), *What is dramaturgy? Who is a dramaturge?* Tehran, Bidgol Publishing
- [10] Turner, Katie, Brent, Sean (2011), *Dramaturgy and Performance*, translated by Mohammad Jafar Yousefian, Parasto Mohebbi, Tehran, Afra Publishing
- [11] Tomaso, Jean-Marie (2007), *Drama and tragedy*, translated by Nad Ali Hamedani, Tehran, Qatreh Publishing
- [12] Tragedy (2006), *Collection of Articles: Morad Farhadpour et al.*, Tehran, Soroush Publishing
- [13] Lekrek, Gay, Solier, Christoph (2002), *The Eternal Adventures of Theater*, translated by Nad Ali Hamedani, Tehran, Qatreh Publishing

- [14] Zarrinkoob, Abdolhossein (2002), Aristotle and the Art of Poetry, Tehran, Amirkabir Publishing
- [15] Miter, Schumit (2005), Recognition of theater systems, translated by Abdolhossein Mortazavi, Mitra Alavitalab, Tehran, Qatreh Publishing
- [16] Melps, Simon, Vick Powell (2015), An Introduction to Critical Theory, translated by Golnaz Sarkarfarshi, Tehran, Samt Publishing
- [17] Leach, Robert (2016), Theater Studies, Translation: Maryam Nemat Tavousi, Tehran, Qatreh Publishing
- [18] Durant, William James (2012), History of Theater, Compiled and Edited by: Abbas Shadravan, Tehran, Practical and Cultural Publishing
- [19] Shahin, Shahnaz, Ghavimi, Mahvash (2004), Comprehensive Analytical Culture of Theater, Tehran, Tehran University Press
- [20] Sadik, Antji (2018), Contemporary American Theater, translated by Rezvaneh Emamipour, Tehran, Ejaz Publishing
- [21] Mokhtabad, Seyed Mostafa (2008), Postmodernism and Theater, Journal of adorable Arts No. 34, Summer, 81 to 90
- [22] Hosseini Sirat, Maryam Sadat, Shaqoul, Yousef (2014), A Study of Ancient Greek Tragedy and Modern Tragedy from Hegel's Perspective, Quarterly Journal of Fiction , Razi College of Literature and Humanities, No. 6, Spring, 1 to 20
- [23] Sameti, Mozhdeh and et al. (2017), Simulations and narration from Plato's dialogues to modern reading dramas, Journal of Literary Criticism and Theory, No. 3, Spring and Summer, 103-128
- [24] Fischer- Lichte, Erka (2002) History of European Drama and Theatre, Translated by Joriley, Routledge, London and New York.
- [25] O'tool, John (1992) the Process of Drama: Negotiating Art and Meaning, Routledge' London and New York.
- [26] Lambert, J.W (1971) Drama in Britaian 1964-1973, Longman Group. LTD.London.
- [27] Belsey, Catherine (1985) the Subject of trage, Identity and Diferenc in Renaissance drame, Methuen, London and New York.
- [28] Cohn, Ruby (1991) New American Dramatists 1960 -1990, Macmllan, London.
- [29] -Aristotle (1995) Poetlcs, Edited and translated by Stephen Hallwell, Harvard University press.
- [30] Gilbert, Helen, Tanpking, joanne (2002) Post – colonial Drama: theory, practice, politics, routledge, London and New York.
- [31]