



A Study of the Essence of Tragedy in Millerian Plays Throughout Nietzsche's Idea of Inevitability

Mohammad Mahdi Kashani Lotfabadi^{1,*}; Maryam Harati²

¹Lecturer and Instructor, PN University of Mashhad, Iran

²Young Researchers Club, Islamic Azad University, Shahre Qods Branch, Tehran, Iran

Email: mrmharati@yahoo.com

*Corresponding author.

Email: mahdikashani99@gmail.com

Received 10 October 2011; accepted 5 December 2011

Abstract

Arthur Miller's plays give a deep tragic sensation to the readers dealing with tragic life of modern man; in which a normal man who seems to have committed no tragic flaw faces a drastic tragic outcome. In his article *Tragedy and Common Man*, Miller declares his intent of re-portraying tragedy in the twentieth century: "since the life of man and his challenges has had been the apt subject for tragedy throughout history". Besides, in his *Birth of Tragedy* Nietzsche points out that tragedy claims a spreading subject in man's life which encompasses the whole human generations and drags them to a tragic fate, and this is raised from a deep-seated problem in man's life. All Millerian heroes are stricken in such a tragic fate. The present study deals with the indispensable problem of this tragic fate which seems to take in the world of Millerian tragedy and calls this factor as "Inevitability": the unavoidable tragic end, in which the tragic hero is stricken, has no loophole, and finally has to submit the fate. This study tracks the paradigm of this discourse in Arthur Miller's tragic plays. Finally the article comes to the conclusion that despite all the struggles of the heroes of modern tragedies, their fate is inevitable. The inevitability is the factor Nietzsche point out for the birth of tragedy: the fundamental problem in man's fate drags him to the unavoidable noose, and it is the reason for the re-birth of tragedy in twentieth century and Arthur Miller's plays.

Key words: Tragedy; Inevitability; Tragic Flaw; Tragic Pity and Fear; Catharsis; Presentiment

Mohammad Mahdi Kashani Lotfabadi, Maryam Harati (2011). A Study of the Essence of Tragedy in Millerian Plays Throughout Nietzsche's Idea of Inevitability. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3(3), 79-85. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/j.sll.1923156320110303.424> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.sll.1923156320110303.424>

INTRODUCTION

Man and his life has been the apt subject of different genres of literature for a long time throughout the history, among which tragedy is known as the most humanistic genre. Tragedies consider the life of man and his fate through its tragic look over his life. And this aspect is common in all tragedies, from those tragic plays which had been defined by Aristotle as the seeming battle of man and his gods, that of magistrates, kings, and royal people, while committed a trivial tragic flaw; and Aristotle has defined the supreme end of these tragedies as raising the feelings of pity and fear. To those plays called modern tragedies that have the common man as the apt subject of tragedy, no more a magistrate. They consider the tragic life of common man and elevate this normal man to the status of hero, or better to say, an anti-hero.

As it comes to the discourse on tragedy, Aristotle's treaty on tragedy comes to open the discussion; a discourse that sets pity, fear, and catharsis as its pillars. Aristotle believes that the catharsis is due to the pity and fear raised by a feeling of ruth and a comprehension strengthened by a tragic flaw. He believes this tragic flaw as the reason for the high torturous toil of the tragic hero. Yet, is this trifle action and unwary flaw an ample a reason for the tribulations of Othello, Macbeth, and Oedipus, and many other known tragic heroes? Looking for the answer in Aristotle's discourse seems fruitless, since he never mentions other factors affecting the inauspicious fate of the tragic hero. Nietzsche calls this problem as reason for the dire fate of the tragic heroes.

Through scrutinizing the tragedy from the ancient Greece, Seneca, Shakespeare, to the modern Beckett and Miller, it is easily discernible that there is a factor which disappoints all the tragic hero's scrambles and leads the tragic hero to his/her flaw and eventually brings up the tragic catastrophe and the tragic end; a factor which is indispensable, indestructible: Inevitability; a factor which, above the Nietzsche's calamity, brings permanent apprehension, commotion, and indissoluble panic, and which helps to accelerate the inevitable tragic end. Due to the German philosopher, this factor is in man's essence, and is imminent and indestructible. This factor is nothing but a same abstract known for a long time from Sophocles, Aristotle, to Nietzsche, and to Miller, a factor known in all as: Inevitability.

Arthur Miller's plays are known as modern tragedies (Williams, 1996, p.40) and "they are the most important reminiscent of the ancient tragic traditions in the twentieth century" (p.41), which has the modern man as the subject of a tragic fate like Oedipus and Hamlet. Millerian heroes had lived as a common man and had committed no tragic flaw in their life; yet, the ghastly tragic doom falls on them unexpectedly. They, like an ancient tragic hero, become entangled in the inevitability and come to their final tragic end. *All My Sons*, *Death of a Salesman*, *The Crucible*, and *A View from the Bridge* all re-count the story of a common man who has committed no flaw, but disinclination to remain flaccid while facing the inevitability. Due to Miller:

"[T]he flaw, or crack in the characters, is really nothing-and need be nothing, but his inherent unwillingness to remain passive in the face of what he conceives to be a challenge to his dignity, his image of his rightful status. Only the passive, only those who accept their lot without active retaliation, are flawless." (Miller 1977, p.2)

The term inevitability is a loan from both Nietzsche and Miller, a term they use as the cornerstone in their discourse on tragedy, and it is the key term in the concept of tragedy as general. Yet, because of the heavy overcasts of Aristotle's discourse on tragedy, this aspect and factor had been forced to the unnoticed edges of the discourses.

Twentieth century's critics call Miller more a tragedian than a playwright (Bigsby, 1997). And since ever his play had been studied in the light of tragedy and its discourses. Yet, all the critics had have been looking to find the foreknown tragic elements in his plays; the elements known to us from Sophocles, Aristotle, Shakespeare, to Haggel. Besides, based on these tragedy definitions, Millerian plays "are not tragedies, or they are not sophisticated ones" (Williams, 1996, p.440). Though, having a brief look to Miller's theoretical short essay on tragedy, (Miller, 1977), we come to this point that he had thoroughly seized the tragic discourse and the reasons of

the birth of tragedy in the ancient Greece; and the works written with this background are tantamount to the known classic tragedies, and prototypes such as Oedipus at Colonus, or Macbeth. In this regard, it seems vital to look deeply in to the elements of the birth of tragedy posed by Nietzsche and the tragic elements of Millerian modern tragedies. So, to accomplish such a study the present article had chosen four cornerstones of Miller's tragic works as prototypes to undertake this study.

1. THE CONCEPT OF TRAGEDY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

"We come to tragedy by many roads. It is an immediate experience, a conflict of theory, an academic problem" (p.14) Raymond Williams in his *Modern Tragedy* states this, and goes on to indicate the experience of tragedy in an ordinary life. He adds that "It (tragedy) has not been the death of princes; it has been at once more personal and more general" (p.15-18). Accordingly he had known it so: "tragedy is the life of a man driven to silence, in a disregarded working life" (p. 40). Besides, Miller in his *Tragedy and the Common Man* (1977), states that "tragedy", then "is the consequence of a man's total compulsion to evaluate himself justly" (p.2). He adds that "the flaw, or crack in the character, is really nothing and need be nothing, but his inherent unwillingness to remain passive..." (p.2). Thus, following in Williams' discourse and considering Miller's plays we come see this reluctance as the personal and the problem mentioned by Nietzsche as the general, which made the Inevitable gloom of tragedy fall upon not only twentieth century's Modern man, but also on the man in different historical eras. By and large, the central concern of this study is this inevitable factor in the problem and its consequent apprehensions coming forth while struggling with the Inevitability in Millerian tragedy.

The Dutch philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, had posed his theory on the birth of tragedy in the pivotal point of the twentieth century. Throughout man's history, to the time of the late philosopher, tragedy had been the concern of innumerable works and disputes, each discussing one aspect of the complicated tragic ideology. Nietzsche believed that tragedy "served an important cultural function for the Athenians" (p.11) and due to this he believes that tragedy was needed (p.14). His thesis is two-folded, each embracing a vital point: one that there is a problem in Athenians; next, that tragedy is a solution of a particular kind to that problem and that the birth of tragedy was the consequent of the problem and its solution.³ It is important to recognize that the problem is not uniquely Greek; the Greeks were merely exemplars

³Willy Loman is the hero of Miller's 'Death of a Salesman'

of human and man's culture, which is the general factor. The problem which Nietzsche has in mind is central to all human existence. Nietzsche believes the spirit of tragedy as a crucial means to approach this human problem if not, at least, to solve it. So, it is not surprising that Nietzsche argues for the re-emergence of tragic ideology and art within modern cultures, for human had been and will be entangled in such a fundamental problem.

Even though, accepting this argument, what is the problem of Willy Loman as a tragic hero? Is he aware of such a problem? What does he do while facing this apprehensive problem? What's the role of Eddie's⁴, Joe's, or Proctor's struggling actions in the withdrawal of the tragic end? Whether the problem of these men be the same or not, what is the essence and nature of this problem?

2. NIETZSCHE'S BIRTH OF TRAGEDY

In suggesting that the Greeks had a problem at all, Nietzsche was departing from the tradition of his age within which the Greeks were viewed as a happy nation; while he viewed the Greeks like all humans, "grappling with instinct pessimism" and an instinct apprehension. In Nietzsche's view the universe in which man lives is the product of interacting great forces, that man neither observes nor has any insight on their nature and essence as such. Consequently, what man puts together as his conception of the world never actually addresses the fundamental realities. This unknown world spells apprehension on man, and it is the emergence of the so-called problem. Thus, "we are buffeted about like, so many leaves or twinges in a flood tide, life in the world is full of pain and torment perhaps it would be better not to live at all" (*Birth of Tragedy*, 1966, p.13). Even the most trivial incident would spell a ghastly apprehension on man. Nietzsche alludes to the insightful saying of the Chorus in Sophocles' play that "show me the man who longs to live a day beyond his time, who turns his back on a decent length of life, I'll show the world a man who clings to folly. For the long, looming days lay up a thousand things closer to pain than pleasure, and the pleasure disappear. Not to be born is best when all is reckoned in" (*Oedipus at Colonus*, Fagles, p.155). In Hecht's translation we read that:

'Whoever craves a greater portion of longevity,
And does not want the modest share- in my view,
Such a man is bound to foolishness. For the long days,
Heap up a shambles, closer to grief and pain,
Whereas he will no more know his pleasures,
Or their place, when into life's excess he has declined.' (*Oedipus at Colonus*, Hecht. p.155)

Here, the want of a 'greater portion' and the reluctance of the 'modest share', is what Miller refers to as 'inherent

unwillingness to remain passive', consequently this brings 'pain and grief' and leaves the tragic man into the life's declined excess. Therefore it's not a unique problem of royal family and magistrates; it falls upon all the members in the society. When the chorus states that: 'Not to be born surpasses all arguments'(p.156), signifies that the mere action of being born into this world brings the Inevitable on human. It is human destiny, then to be controlled by the darkest universal realities and live in a world of illusions made by human dreams. And this brings a disparity that Sartre called the "Nausea", and in late twentieth century was called the "absurd". Thus, now in the opening decades of the twenty first century it is very simplistic to think of tragedy only as a means of arousing Fear and Pity or, Catharsis. It is the representation of a general problem inherent in human life.

The point that the present study deals with is a part of those dark realities bringing delusion on man, something called "inevitability". Since the creation of world and human essence necessarily misses the supernatural, it ignores other aspects of the true universal reality or metaphysics; disquietedly, we will always be weird up denying everything that fails to fit the specifics of our own created world. As time passes, the summation of denied experiences begins to loom-large, it grows into the dark side of reality, the one which we ignore or actively repress, i.e. the inevitable. The concept mentioned here and around which the discussion will be continued is a part of those dark realities in the shade of life which lead man to an uncanny illusion; something call as Inevitability.

So, tragedy is no more coming forth, because of disappointment, hubris or flaw. The Inevitable appears and forces the common man to confront whatever he/she have been trying to shut out of the nice, tidy livable, while illusionary, world. This compulsory confrontation with the inevitability brings apprehension and anxiety; this is the apprehension that made the young Oedipus leave his godfather's home and led him to kill his own father in the way to Thebes; and the same horrendous anxiety that made the old Oedipus blind himself and chooses a self exile from Thebes. Nietzsche alludes to the old saying of Silenus to king Midas; when finally king asked him what was the best thing of all for men, the very finest. The daemon replied:

"Suffering creature, born for a day, child of accident and toil,
why are you forcing me to say what is the most unpleasant thing for you to hear?! The very best thing for you is totally unreachable: not to have been born, not to exist, to be nothing. The second best thing for you however is this: to die soon."
(Nietzsche, 1966, p.21)

This notion is apparently visible in Beckettian tragedies, i.e. Beckett's plays; and less apparently, while strongly shown through the anxiety and apprehension in

⁴Eddie is the central tragic figure in Miller's 'A View from the Bridge'.

Millerian tragedies. By and large, this token shows that neither Beckett nor Miller was the creator of this anxiety and apprehension; and that it had existed long before them: since the Greek tragedy. Moreover, there is an Inevitability conjoined to this dreadful human problem: the more trying to get rid of the You-know-is-to-happen but you-don't-know-what, the more Inevitable it seems. The reluctance to remain passive becomes the source of man's apprehension. The anxiety and apprehension comes to the common man when nothing can be done to withdraw it. And the closer to the coming about of the Inevitability, the harsher the apprehension gets; this continues till the Inevitability collapse on man and drags him/her to his/her tragic end.

Nietzsche (1885) proposed that "the Greek knew and felt the terror and horror of existence," a horror which has been always with man, the cause of Oedipus' flaw and his drastic end, the same as of Macbeth's and Othello's, and here that is the cause of apprehension in Miller's tragic men and the horror in his tragedies. As Nietzsche suggested:

"that immense distrust of the titanic forces of nature, that Moria (Fate) enthroned mercilessly above all knowledge, that vulture that devoured Prometheus, friend [and savior] of man, that fatal lot drawn by wise Oedipus,... in short that entire philosophy of the woodland Gods, together with its mythical illustrations, from which the melancholy Etruscans died off...was inevitable..." (p.29)

3. INEVITABILITY IN ARTHUR MILLER'S PLAYS

Millerian tragedy is overwhelmed with apprehension which is indebted to the fundamental problem that Nietzsche posed; the problem that led to the birth of tragedy. All of the characters in Millerian tragedy, are caught in this trap; the trap of ineradicable Inevitability. In *All My sons*⁵ we are dealing with such an apprehension from the beginning, a dread and anxiety of the Inevitable; the dark side of the reality which Joe Keller fears to look at. Joe, a small manufacturer, has committed a social crime for which he has escaped responsibility. He acquiesced in the sending of defective fraction to the Air Force in wartime, which had led to eradication of twenty young pilots including Joe's own son, and consequently causing the beat of the army in the war. Beside this social crime, he had allowed another man, his partner, to take the consequences and imprisonment. The actions of the play is presented in a way that the social, general crime is made personal, [by the fact of the death of Keller's own pilot-son]; and through the realization of the fact that all the society could have been as a personal private family, the crime is made social again, in a new understanding of

what sociality and personality is.

From the beginning of the play, or even far before it's beginning, Joe has an anxiety, some dark feeling involves him that an appalling ending would inevitably come. Just some hours initiating the play, Larry's (Joe's deceased pilot-son) memorial tree strikes down by the lightening; a simple matter in the eyes of Chris, the younger son, yet he himself tries to pretend that it is not important; while it is the most powerful sign for Joe to go down deep into his long-hidden anxiety. By this sign, Joe knows that something is approaching to him, something unknown, the Inevitability of Joe's own created-world; his own pretending reality, and at the same time something drastically threatening his illusions. However; Joe has no idea of what would it be, or how it will come. Joe knows that facing the Inevitability is inescapable. From long ago he had been in such a dreadful situation but as all other men he never dared to face it or at least to talk about it, thus as soon as he realizes its near approach, he tries his best to hinder it; yet, the more panicky trying, the nearer the Inevitability comes; so that, in less than a day's duration he has no loophole but to kill himself. These are the two fundamental factors that Aristotle refers to as the essential features of a tragedy; that is, all actions taking place in a span of twenty four hours (a day), yet these are the consequences of man's life long deeds and decisions. And committing suicide (bloodshed), which is the last resort that Oedipus suggests men. This Inevitability is also apparent in cases of Willy, Proctor⁶ or even Eddie, they have got no loophole but facing the inevitability. Like as all the other tragic heroes in literary world, they, too, have to submit to this Inevitability.

It can be truly claimed that Millerian tragic heroes are the common men entangled in a categorical inevitability. John proctor, the decent victim in *The Crucible*, tries his best to avoid the approaching final scene; however. From the beginning when the witchcraft rumor had spread in the village, this terror overwhelmed him that he couldn't help himself prying in Reverend Parris' house. The Inevitable end is brought on him with a simple trick played on him by Abigail through Mary Warren, and had made a horrendous effect on his mind. However, it is not since then that he gets into trouble; from the very beginning it is his subconscious that warns him of something dreadful approaching. A man who declares "I have hardly stepped off my land this seven month", is now in Salem, but why? What brought John to Salem? Is that something except his disconcerted subconscious desire? From time to time this subconscious becomes foregrounded in his speech: "What's she doing? Girl, what ails you? Stop that wailing!" (*The Crucible*, 2003, pp.21-22). What's the cause of his beseeching to "stop that" except for

⁵A Play by Arthur Miller. (1961)

⁶The hero of Miller's *'The Crucible'*.

the feeling of terror and Inevitability in him? Is that something other than his anxious unconscious?!

Williams (1966), said that “*The Crucible* may remind us of *Enemy of the People*, [by Henric Ibsen], but there is a wholly new sense of the terrible” and apprehension in it. “Individuals suffer for what they are and naturally desire rather than for what they try to do, and the innocents are swept up with the guilty, with epidemic force” (p.104-105). He adds that in such circumstances the innocent and the sinful come together with an overwhelming force exclusively. Then, is this epidemic force upon individuals, making them suffer for what they desire something except inevitability? Nevertheless, do these common men and tragic characters naturally desire what comes on them? If no, while challenging the inevitable they face the unavoidable outcome; besides, it’s the strongest point in Millerian tragedy in accord with Aristotelian tradition, Senecan and Shakespearian tragedies: the unfair catastrophic outcome of a flaw. An action or flaw not necessarily of great value leads to an unfair disaster; by the way, this flaw is not essentially the result of decisions standing before Gods’ will (such as Antigone and her brother’s burial). Just the sense of reluctance to remain passive before Inevitability is enough to drag man to his/her drastic tragic end as any other common man.

And it is so, when Miller said that “the tragic feeling is evoked in us when we are in the presence of a character who is ready to lay down his life, if need be, to secure one thing: his sense of personal dignity” (1977, p.2): what John Proctor was obliged to do finally. He dishonored himself by confessing his lechery, though degrading himself; it is to save his total dignity. Miller claims: only the passive and only those who accept their lot without active retaliation are flawless. And later he explicitly pointed the terror, fear, and the anxiety aroused by it and the inevitable cosmos. He continues that “but there are among us today, as there always have been, those who act against the scheme of things that degrades them, and in the process of action everything we have accepted out of fear or insensitivity or ignorance is shaken before us and examined, and from this total onslaught by an individual against the seemingly stable cosmos surrounding us, from this total examination of the unchangeable environment, comes the terror and the fear that is classically associated with tragedy” (Miller, 1977, p.2-3).

In this manner, even Proctor’s confession of adulatory as his last resort, the final loophole for him to overcome the Inevitable, can do nothing to make his escape; the confession has no role in his destiny, but acts only as a catalyst for the Inevitable to happen. Therefore, Proctor is a tragic hero, not necessarily a king or prince, as Oedipus or Hamlet, but a simple, common farmer, entangled in the Inevitable. Similarly when John tries to use Mary Warren’s proof of Abigail’s tricks, just then in a horrible moment all the evidences brings out to be against himself; after long talks Proctor had persuaded Mary to testify his

wife and his own innocence in the court, and she presents in the court to do so. Yet, to Proctors misfortune, when Abby plays a trick on Mary and accuses Mary of witchery, Mary find no other way but to play in Abby’s game and returns the spear point to Proctor as her last resort:

PROCTOR to Mary: ...Now remember what the angel Raphael said to the boy Tobias. Remember it. ... “Do that which is good, and no harm shall come to thee.”

MARY: Aye.

PROCTOR: Aye, sir. She swears now that she never saw Satan; nor any spirit...she declares her friends are lying now.

DANFORTH: Mary Warren, how came you to this turnabout? Has Mr. Proctor threatened you for deposition?...

MARY: No, Sir. I am with God now.

DANFORTH: You are with God now.

MARY: Aye, sir. I cannot lie no more.

DANFORTH: (to Abigail) Now then. It does not escape me that this deposition may be devised to blind us; it may well be that Mary has been conquered by Satan, who sends her here to distract our sacred purpose. If so, her neck will break for it, but if she speaks true, I bid you now drop your guile and confess your pretense, for a quick confession will go easier with you Abigail Williams, rise. Is there any truth in this?

ABIGAIL: No, sir. ... I have naught to change, sir. She lies. (*The Crucible*, p.87-91)

Here the judge tries to drag out the truth; and finally when it come about to be proved that Abigail it on the wrong side, she decides to turn the witchery to Mary herself. Abigail starts pretending of seeing a yellow bird as the spirit of Mary coming down; and in this trick all the girls get along with Abby and they repeat whatever Mary tells in her defense:

ABIGAIL, shivering visibly: it is a wind, a wind! ... oh, Heavenly Father, take away this shadow! ... oh, Mary, this is a black art to change your shape. No, I cannot stop my mouth; it’s God’s work I do.

MARY: Abby, I’m here!

PROCTOR: They’re pretending, Mr. Danforth.

ABIGAIL:... Oh, please, Mary! Don’t come down.

MARY: She sees nothin’!

ABIGAIL, now staring full front as though hypnotized, and mimicking the exact tone of Mary Warren’s cry: She sees nothin’!

MARY: Never!

GIRLS: Never!

...

DANFORTH: A little while ago you were afflicted. Now it seems you afflict others; where did you find this power?

MARY: I—have no power.

GIRLS: I have no power.

...

DANFORTH: ... You will confess yourself or you will hang! ...

PROCTOR: Mary, remember the angel Raphael—do that which is good and—

...

MARY, staring in horror: I cannot!

GIRLS: I cannot!

PROCTOR: Mary, tell the Governor what they—he has hardly got a word out, when, seeing him coming for her, she rushes out of his reach, screaming in horror.

MARY: Don’t touch me—don’t touch me! At which the girls halt at the door. (*The Crucible*, p.97-106)

This is here, when Mary gives up, and Abby feels her close win that she and the girls stop playing the trick; for they now know that Mary will continue the way to save herself from being accused. And that is true; Mary continues to accuse Proctor to save herself:

PROCTOR, astonished: Mary!

MARY, pointing at Proctor: You're the Devi's man! I'll not hang with you! I love Go. ... he come at me by night and every day to sign, to sign, to—... My name he wants my name. "I'll murder you" he says, "if my wife hangs! We must go and overthrow the court" he says! (*The Crucible*, p.108-110)

He [Proctor] can do nothing, as if the whole cosmos has come together to destruct his life, personality and dignity; and his active struggling is of no use; this is what Proctor feels from the very beginning and this knowledge is the reason for his tragic end. Although subconsciously, or as Miller puts it, "out of fear, insensitivity or ignorance", yet he knows the reality of the inevitability.

As it pondered over, Inevitability is the opposite side of the reality that we know. Men try to look at the bright side, where the light is, without turning our faces toward the Inevitability. We try to convince, or better to say "deceive", ourselves that this enlightened side is the sole reality, while, simultaneously this is the Inevitability which is at the back of our mind. We dare not to look at it but we have our mind permanently on it. By the way, which one is the truth and reality, the seemingly enlightened part or the Inevitability? However; this Inevitability is the cause of the anxiety and terror, which can be seen explicitly in Willy Loman, and any other Millerian tragic heroes.

Willy Loman (in *Death of a Salesman*), having the lowest status in the society, suffers from the differences between what he thinks and the reality which has brought him into a state of uncertainty. He is a common man, neither a prince nor a king; however, as mentioned from Miller's *Tragedy and Common Man* or Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*, this fact is not meddling with his tragic destiny, so far as all the men in the society suffer, Willy, too, undergoes the same inevitability. As he comes back home, at the beginning of the play in an appearance as if he had been fired. It is as if Willy had come home to die, as though he knew what is going to happen. He sees the inevitable approach of the Inevitability from the very beginning of the play. Willy's destiny from the beginning is an inevitable death: a Tragedy. There is nothing metaphysical; just as a puzzle done in advance, everything had been put together in a way that Willy cannot stop the inevitability. The challenges with his rival-neighbor friend, Charley; the struggles with his young boss, Howard; the unemployment of his aged sons Biff and Happy; the broken relation between father and son, Willy and Biff; the dissatisfaction in his marital life with Linda; all with some other factors brings an understanding to Willy from the current state: the knowledge that he has no choice but to die. All his attempts to prevent this drastic end are nothing but tragic fiascoes. His absurd attempts to

impose himself upon Howard, to prove to Charley that he is not yet a good-for-nothing, and his useless and absurd encouragements to make Biff believe in American Dream, all illustrate his reluctance to remain passive facing the matters degrading him. Therefore, as Miller's other characters Willy, too aptly, deserves to be a tragic hero.

Normally, in no other tragedy preceding Millerian modern tragedies, even the greatest ones in the history; we do not have the word "Death" in the title. While here we are dealing with the Death of a salesman, and we face the Death in the title. This Death imposes the sense of an unsolvable problem and the Inevitability from the beginning; to put it another way, we are foretold of Willy's inevitable death; no one can do anything to stop or postpone it. In this regard Willy has no other choice; he should kill himself as dose Joe Keller. They went toward the dark inevitability, though reluctantly, and too ironically, they found their own reality, personality and self in the approaching Inevitability; it is a drastic understanding that left them no alternative but, as Silenus said to king Midas, "to die soon". Eddie, in 'A View from the Bridge' is not different from Willy, Proctor, and Joe, neither in his problem nor his anxieties and finally his understanding of the Inevitability in his life.

Eddie's anxiety is apparent from his first appearance. He is in deep apprehension; but of what origin?! It is something that we can come to, through scrutinizing his apprehensive actions in the play. He thinks that impeding the horny Cathy of being appeared in the society would, just as a pretext, prevent the approach of the Inevitable, or even to retard it by obstructing Cathy's marriage. The most obvious indication of Eddie's irritated mind is his entreaty to Alfieri to do something, when he sees his own debility in impeding the Inevitable. Despite all his feebleness he did whatever he could to impede it; however, the more he tried the nearer the Inevitable became.

By and large, this state of problem, apprehension-anxiety, and the Inevitability is not exclusive to the protagonists in Millerian tragedies; while it is explicitly noticeable in all the other characters and individuals in the play; and the reason is not that thorny: all of them are common men, and apt to be a tragic hero. In 'A View from the Bridge', this state of anxiety is apparent in each individual: Marco and Radolpho from their very first appearance suffer from this apprehension of the unknown Inevitability. Beatrice, too, is aware of the fact that an Inevitable is going to happen, but just as all other men, she can do nothing, of course, in spite of her most struggling endeavors. Just is the same, the efforts of all the other men in *The Crucible*; strives of Biff, Linda and Happy in the *Death of a Salesman*; and the struggles of Chris, Ann and Kate in *All My Sons*.

Here the vital question that had puzzled all the thinkers so far, is the essence of this Inevitable force; is that the Moria that Nietzsche referred to? Is this fate-Inevitable,

the source of the above problem (as discussed in the *Birth of Tragedy*)? Nietzsche asserted that “the immeasurable suffering of the brave individual, on one hand, and on the other, the peril faced by the gods, even a presentiment of the twilight of the gods, are the compelling power for a metaphysical oneness, for a reconciliation of both these worlds of suffering, all this is a powerful reminder of the central point and major claim of the Aeschylean world view, which sees fate (Moria) enthroned over gods and men as eternal justice.” (Nietzsche, 1885, p.52) This Inevitability is something that all these characters know its presence and have the knowledge that this darkness is the infugitive reality, the Inevitable, and that the lightened part is not the reality, but a transitory ideality. However, they still try to accept the ideality as the reality and do not dare to look at the Inevitable while their mind is eternally focused on it. From this duality and pretension arises the state of anxiety in them; causing the unknown dreadful thing, the Inevitable, to happen whatever it might be called it is the problem in man’s essence. Again the German philosopher states in his *Birth of the Tragedy*:

“...the best and loftiest thing which mankind can share is achieved through a crime, and people must now accept the further consequences, namely, the entire flood of suffering and troubles with the offended divine presence afflict the nobly ambitious human race. Such thing must happen”. (1885, p.53)

Or in other words, this fate [thing] is Inevitable.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, despite all the attempts of Millerian modern tragic heroes, their catastrophic end is Inevitable. And this is a factor which Nietzsche refers to as the reason for the birth of tragedy: a fundamental problem in man’s fate that pulls him/her to the Inevitability; and this is the reason for the rebirth of tragedy in the twentieth century and Arthur Miller’s plays. So, when this “indestructible will of man” faces with the Inevitable, while man’s will is enfeebled by the fear and anxiety of the eternal problem; the result of the encountering is obvious: a man, like Willy, Joe, Eddie and Proctor, is the apt subject for tragedy. An unavoidable factor explicitly forms the tragic heroes’ fate. This happens in a manner that all the efforts of such a man for overcoming the Inevitable become fruitless and, on the contrary, his endeavors become a means for the scattered parts of the Inevitable puzzle of reality to come together more swiftly, and so the inevitability takes place more quickly and all the endeavors of man remains useless. This fruitlessness, nausea, and absurdity are the certain outcomes of the Inevitability, and they are indispensable parts of the tragic destiny of man. The essence of man has no impact on his Moria. In

either circumstance this is the inevitability that drags man to death. Consequently there is no difference between Oedipus the King and an enduring salesman named Willy Loman, for this is the Inevitability that draws both to their tragic deaths. And as for this Inevitability, the more they strive in this drastic inevitability, like Macbeth⁷, the more tragic would be their death.

In line with these, it has been observed that Arthur Miller’s plays, as twentieth century’s tragedy prototypes, are all meddled with the factor of inevitability. The characters of all these plays, while having committed any tragic flaw are all entangled in this inevitability, in spite of their scrambles. The tragic catharsis is no more raised by pity and fear, while this is the apprehension and anxieties that emerge the catharsis, and leads the hero to a tragic self-destruction: suicide.

The present article reread the tragic discourse and the fundamental factor of tragedy based on Nietzsche’s discourse in tragedy, while searching the modern paradigm and modules in Millerian tragedies. Millerian modern tragic heroes, like their famous preceding prototypes, are caught in the fundamental problem of man’s generations, and as any other common man they become tragic heroes. Future researches in this area can rummage aspects of this inevitable factor in other tragedies, in their own turn prepare a better understanding of tragic works, either modern or ancient; or carry out a comparative study on the traditional tragic elements versus Inevitability.

REFERENCES

- Bigsby, Ch. (1997). Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bressler, Ch. (2007). *Literary Criticism*, 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Bushnell, R. (2005). Ed. *A Companion To Tragedy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Magnus, B. (1996). Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Miller, A. (1978). Tragedy and the Common Man, from *The Theater essays of Arthur Miller*. pp. 3-7. Copyright 1949, copyright renewed 1977 by Arthur Miller.
- (2003). *The Crucible*. New York: Penguin Group.
- (1975). *All My Sons*. London: Penguin Books.
- (1960). *A View from the Bridge*. New York: Compass Books.
- (1998). *Death of a Salesman*. Penguin
- Nietzsche, F. (1966). *The Birth of Tragedy* (with The Case of Wagner). Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage.
- Sophocles. (2004). Oedipus at Colonus. *From the Three Theban Plays*. Hertfordshire.
- Williams, R. (1966). *Modern Tragedy*. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable Ltd.

⁷It is said that Macbeth is the most tragic tragedy, for all his efforts are fiascoes.