

THE ASPECTS OF IPHIGENIE

Yong-Woo Jin

Over the years, interpretation of Iphigenie, daughter of Agamemnon has been heavily influenced by changing fashions in literary trend and philosophy; but while this is inevitable and in a sense desirable, it is doubtful whether a representation of her real character can ever be reached down to the ideal extent to which her genuine shape subjected to those literary trends' being appropriate is delineated to life, either carnal or spiritual, even in the face of death, let alone in the ordinary way or daily base. Apart from such doubt, and yet in literary tradition from the ancient onwards, Iphigenie stands as an unsurpassed success and therefore a convincing evidence that at first by Euripides Iphigenie stands up to uplift the tone of the brilliant character portrayals to that sustained tragic intensity; secondly by Racine's pen she turns out "plus fidèle qu'Euripide, esprit fort, à la vocation religieuse de la tragédie," and lastly according to Goethe's ingenuity she became the loftiest symbol of the German humane idealism. So that these interpretations made the judgement that each interpretation has a different significance from all the others, there, then, are three distinct interpretations of which each age's literary work is made up are identified through the literary trend current in the age. In other words, each writer, not to mention Euripides, has broken new philosophical and penetrating ground in each own work namesaked as Iphigenie. Each has articulated a point of view that a writer seems to have doomed to write his work in terms of a certain variety of the existing literary trend, inherited from the preceding ones, despite what the age is identified with its characteristic, either handed down somehow or generated from the formal coherence and integrity due to what we call the spirit of the times. Again in other words, what one underneath all the superficially seemingly feeling of satisfaction at having his creative writing ability demonstrated holds out for his age confirmed by the fact that its ideas and thoughts are echoed in his creative imagination hardly need be discussing. Further, there is, not to speak of tragic point, to be considered, when we come to the fate of heroine Iphigenie, a certain resemblance in the outward and obvious appearance. The genuine shape of each Iphigenie by its writer is doubtless extremely unlike, so much unlike that each could have dealt without much difficulty with situation which

proved not pleasing to the other.

This theme is not only treated as the namesake of Iphigenie by the above three giants, but also it recurs with the alternations, modifications which stir up the modifier to refashion in arbitrary or capricious manners as matter of his own convenience and therefore by chance be able to close in style, diction and versification to what the former storyteller had delineated so far, mystically if not gorgeously, in his specific imagination. The suggestion what I want to go on to make is that there are clear resemblances and a good assortment of likes to associate us what has been already depicted about either the same theme, or its equivalent or otherwise. This language suggesting, by different levels of age, how Iphigenie is to be treated is not in a ritual approval influenced by each periodic sense but in that truth of view point mainly qualified if not characterized in proportion to that influence tinged respectively with the age's critical turn of mind. Such is the case that it is not for nothing to quote such a statement as Der alte Goethe äuszerte gelegentlich, er habe gute getan, dass er sich mith *Götz und Egmont* den übermächtigen Shakespeare "vom Halse schaffte." (EcKermann, 25, December 1825). Mit Iphigenie lud er sich Racine und die Griechen auf.¹⁾

To go further in detail, *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, inspired by the Iphigenie of Euripides and none the less echoic from the same story used by the ancient gaint as the source, has a definitely eighteenth-century flavour; while Racine takes as his direct source a Greek tragedy, Euripides' *Iphigeniea in Aulies* (405 B.C.), and yet follows it closely. What is more, the general opinion that his own Iphigenie is a more polished play, more complex in its plot and its psychology, but perhaps not equalled the poignant greatness of its model is also to back up what to many readers will doubtlessly seem a plausible and rather agreeable characterization of the play's significance.

Therefore, the characteristics of Iphigenie's tradition are: first, to be so proper in its inheritance as to become a likely, rather challenging task for us to ascertain what inheritance those three playwrights have used for their monumental works respectively; secondly, the analysis describing by different literary views how extensively its tradition has changed among the three is not in an inconsiderable level but in a weighty substance of that literary exuberance Iphigenie maintains for sake of intellectual treasure; and thirdly, in some cases of modification the influence of certain sources or books on later writer is

1) Werner Keller, "Das Drama Goethes", *Handbuch des Deutschen Dramas*, ed. Walter Hinck (Dusseldorf: Bagel, 1980), p.139.

too contrastive and too derivative to give illustrations, even necessarily selective, of the way in which the former literary monument is woven into the texture of the later writer. Such incomparableness is so great and so extensive both in substance and in name that a superficial or shallow defence could not help being made of what we call the anarchism in argument, rather "an almost empty garner" to borrow I. A. Richards' language, whose declaration continues on.

A few conjectures, a supply of admonitions, many acute isolated observations, some brilliant guesses, much oratory and applied poetry, inexhaustible confusion, a sufficiency of dogma, no small stock of prejudices, whimsies and crotchets, a profusion of mysticism, a little genuine speculation, sundry stray inspirations, pregnant hints and random aperçus; of such as these, it may be said without exaggeration, is extant critical theory composed. ²⁾

As such shown above, in particular by virtue of the third head than in the other two ones, we can see how incalculably various, how unpredictably chaotic is the extant literary work which, modified as it is so as not to allude to the similarity, is derived from the one and same source. What Euripides made happy future, Racine makes lovers's being reunited and Greek's free sailing for Troy, and Goethe also, blessing departure. It would be rash at this stage in the passage of page to make suggestive to what extant Iphigenie has plotted, as that suggestion shown above is too shortcircuited to resort to distinction each Iphigenie would distinguish in dramatization. Here we plausibly argue that whenever possibly the both enlarged its plot, and much less plausibly that they may not have been able to drastically alter its texture for fear of the then extant literary atmosphere where some extreme view is quite untenable.

Little is to be gained by considering such change or modification in relation to its distinctive, apparent and definite generalization, rather characterization unless we recognize how vast and immense the scope or extent of having been transfigured in plot as well as in story, and what contrast and derivation from the source literary monument fall into those transfigurations in respect of necessity, or selectivity, by the current stance in which the author could write at his will. Modification or transfiguration is vast subject, and especially that alteration to go on in proportion to gradual transition of age is not only vast, but too often vague. Vast and vague as it is, and thus impossible to be under-

2) I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960), p.2.

stood fully in one of its most limited characterizations, it is difficult, or beside the point, for us to grasp in substance to what extent it has proceeded, in frankness, changed to what it is.

From this conception of transfiguration, otherwise called modification or alteration as a form of tradition, not steady but ever transitional, so far enunciated should lead us still to that last case of consideration under those three heads which treated discriminatively though even arbitrarily at a look a good deal which can meet its tidal current of transisting literary tradition. Now we come to the word tradition, we could not help referring to T.S. Eliot's hold "Tradition and the Individual Talent" to make us known to that substance of literary procedures, where "the difference between the present and the past is that the conscious present is an awareness of the past in a way and to an extent which the past's awareness of itself cannot show.³⁾

To proceed to a more explicable and explanatory exposition of the relation between the present and the past, the existing literary monuments, the current works form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified, changed, altered in a way as well as to some or the utmost extent where the writer could expose his talent forming his own literary monument. This "modification" either of applying to his work whatever existing ones either advantageous or favourable for his poetic sensibility, or of modeling the past poet's overflowing spontaneity with pretentiousness in the only aspect tradition accounts for itself seems likely to be beside the point, and difficult as well. It is far more significant to trace in reality the various steps of modification on this stage of page than to refer to what the tradition has done hitherto. The point of consideration is not that the poet retained so little of the spirit of the earlier works, but that he was able to use of them so variant a way that the new design treated on the former extant work or works can not be identified without much exploration of its sources. Such is the case that the existing materials form a spontaneous basis for an ambitious or pretentious work; and nothing better illustrates the poet's literary genius than just that way he made use of those extants for his own design, the purpose. The directness of modifying, either to lessen or to augment in necessity, has so clearly served this purpose for a leitmotive in all the writings of the precursors or pioneers of change, that no doubt there are special difficulties in the way of construing the whole bunch of literature in connection with the complex relations between the originative and its imitative, that is, between classic and its traditions, on such

3) T.S. Eliot, *Selected Prose*. (1953; rpt. Aylesbury: Hunt-Barnard, 1959), p.25.

a cleavage of contrast as shown here, partly rather so often arbitrarily modified at will. Here I have come to think that I might usefully say something about what has happened since the ancient age marked with Greek literature from the point of view of one of those who discover a literary tradition to move from surface to depth, to overstate what would be negligible to its acme and the like, and back if necessary.

Allowing for the possibility of my own favourable bias, I have so far been as arbitrary rather exclusive as I can be in delineating what are the modifying aspects of what we call the literary tradition. We now take into consideration that this complex and wide field of our discipline belongs to the literary historian, and so it is more plausible for this stage of excuse that much relevant to comparative literary history should be chiefly dealable with the present subject. This famous generalization of comparative literature by Betz is so relevant to our present subject as to seemingly explicit the genuine nature of our controversy in line, so that nobody scarcely takes it for granted that his language is our key point when the words 'ages' take place of the words 'nations' used in point.

To investigate how "nations" have learned from each other, how they praise and criticize, accept and reject, imitate and distort, understand or misunderstand each other, how they open their hearts or turn from each other, to show that individualities, like whole periods, are but links of the long, multi-stranded chain that connects past and present, nation and nation, man and man — these, in general terms, are the tasks of comparative literary history.⁴⁾

It is difficult, therefore, to assume that "no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone." His work or his world delineated so successfully as to be lined up as only the classic is the literary world of what has been inherited from the predecessor either in the contemporary or in the course of past time as well as in being influential in both senses both of consciousness and of unconsciousness. That would be less eloquent oratory having good reason for having theorized so far than the ensuing statement by Hartman. "It is difficult, however, to gauge the intrinsic value of a text when the original value, associated with an individual author (a "subject"), fades into a play

4) *Comparative Literature: The Early Years*. (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1973), p.146.

of pretexts Every other culture is not only equally near to God (historicism) but equally far from the interpreter or observer. A homogenizing or flattening out occurs that signals to Erich Auerbach the end (in the real world too) of national diversity and cultural heterogeneity. Auerbach, in *Mimesis*, sees the common and the elemental emerging once more; they seem to augur the dissolution of the dynamic, colorful past of the Western nations whose changing sense of reality he has just delineated.”⁵⁾

But besides this quotation to show the interrelationship between the originative value and what its interpreter has observed under his retouch, we can distinguish his direct words in which Auerbach explains the imaginative clue suggesting the schematic materials best conceivable for his *Mimesis* converging what he called “the representation of reality in Western literature.” The interest in the series of verses alluding to Odysseus’s scar, which is the direct example to the movement of thought in the traditional proceedings, is the primitive one in the whole study of the discipline.⁶⁾ Not only this interest in that scar, but also many other similarities inured to the literary tradition are able to make use of so many of his episodes in accordance with the poet’s appropriate design, so that he would not mind practising modifications or alterations beyond time and space, provided they justified themselves by being more effective than the original, rather the current episodes at hand. The main outlines of his story or structure being usually if not closely settled by the sources event, he concerns himself mainly with an alteration of the characters.

How is it, now that our protagonist Iphigenie so strongly overpowers us that we are for a while either unconscious of her being or regard it as almost irrelevant to point. Although briefly mentioned about its particular characteristics existed in itself, that ritual festival of Euripides’ Iphigenia is, like all of the Greek tragedies, an effort to show us the desperate struggle of man cursed under crimes the gods ordained and therefore that effort leads eventually to bring about so trial an affliction of mortals with the divine punishments as to free themselves from it. This is the main point of the story due to be delivered beforehand before making it clear in such details as we apprehend who and what Orest and Pylades, to say nothing of Iphigenia, are, and discover what they are about. Orest who has killed his libidinous and treacherous or bloody mother who had helped kill his father, Agamemnon, arrives with his friend Pylades on the shadowy shore of Tauris, being em-

5) Geoffrey H. Hartman, “The Culture of Criticism”, *PMLA*, Vol.99, No.3. (1984), p.382.

6) Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1953), p.4.

barrassed in pursuit of the Furies from the very day of such hideous matricide onwards. It is according to Apollo's decree that he can rid himself from the pursuers so frightful as to steadily entreat for many years his sister, the Artemis priestess, Iphigenia to bring back the statue of Apollo's sister, Artemis to Greece. This entreaty is not known to him even until this time, but it has been attended her for a long time, who in accordance with the severity of the barbarian law is in charge of capturing every alien whose landing on the shores of Artemis may risk his own life in expecting little, so that the both Greeks can not but reluctantly accept their fate. Yet in the meantime the three Greeks have no sooner recognized one another as to their identities than try to escape such misfortune as the execution is generally looked upon to be the fatal prediction. It is natural that their clever attempt is, first of all, converged to deceive the king Thoas so as to hand over that holy statue from him, still more make secret escape along with Iphigenia who has got tired out thoroughly as well as helplessly since her gloomy but dull exile in the foreign land of Taurians. However, they are not so much happy as the old saying winks at them that hardship never comes alone without companions, and the ruthless waves of the salt sea surge them back again ashore to that barbarious King, still angry at their having stolen away from his sovereign.

It is as good as if they were not on so much favourable terms with Fortune, when soon after that steal from that barbarious demon it is not long before a looming Greek land in imagination vanishes away in the air too quickly for them to make it delight to return to their homeland, that looming Greek they have pined for even in dream.

Such is the story of Euripides's Iphigenia, but that of Racine's is not based on it with so much resemblance as Goethe's is. The Greek fleet collected at Aulis for surprising Troy is under restraint from proceeding its assault by contrary winds being blown fiercely, and an oracle has demanded the sacrifice of Iphigenie at the price of its release from that unfavourable weather. Assented to the persistent insistence of the priest Calchas and Ulysses, Agamemnon has at last reluctantly sent Argos for her on the ostensible reason that Achilles already engaged with her wishes to hold their nuptial ceremony before the departure for Troy. On the one hand, soon after such assentation, Agamemnon begins to doubt that right course for her happiness and for parental obligation alike is due to the ruthless and reckless resolution as father to his daughter, and that his obsequious obedience to the gods is by all means necessary for him and for her as well. This is the very disturbance in mind on which he is stumbling and wandering around far and near between that divine mandate

over himself and the natural passion naturally derived from a parental affection. Agamemnon reluctantly submitting to such mandatory power, his daughter and her mother Clytemnestra not knowing his arrive in time, not only assuming that the young and lovely lady will get married with Achilles, but also rejoicing in her heart that she is to be led to the altar to hold the nuptial ceremony. At last the true purpose is disclosed to the all who are attending there, and among whom Clytemnestra and Achilles are infuriated more than anyone else, but the polite Iphigenie is ready so boldly for accepting her own fate as to repress her fiancé with imperturbable composure. No matter what consequences such embarrassment may cause, he is at once a true father to his daughter and even a faithful husband to his wife as well, and therefore the natural affection of Agamemnon once again defeats his own reason in order to let the young couple steal away secretly from the camp. In spite of his natural passion inundated in himself for taking care of his relatives, he can not but submit to the public uproar lest its violent eruption should cause no little accident to them and by doing so it is likely to happen the consequent tumult that the interference of Achilles only escalates no less enagement to his decision making than his wife's obstruction. Racine invented Eriphile who is a strange character completely unknown to the reader whose concentration ever once converged on Euripides, and who of unknown birth is captive of Achilles and is loving him while jealous strongly of Iphigenia, even wishing to win him by the means of death of his betrothed. On arriving at the altar, Iphigenie must stand aghast at this clash broken out between her betrothed accompanying his supporters as well as his trains and the rest of the forces who are solicitous for releasing themselves from the contrary winds only her sacrifice can appease and turn in the opposite direction. Calchas readily intercedes in it as soon as he has arrived there, declaring the divine intention that the gods have now made it clear that the victim they ask for is not the daughter of Agamemnon Iphigenie, but Eriphile at whose birth as a daughter of Theseus and Helen Iphigenie was the true name. She dashes forward to the altar to take her own life as a fatal destiny given her, for she can not choose but accept exposing her life to the fate.

Such is the story of Iphigenie that is written down by Racine about two thousand years later after the first appearance of the namesake that shaped on story after story which helped man become wise and knowledgeable. Not to be missed is the remained one that Goethe demonstrated specifically in the character delineation its masterpiece, the humanistic and ideal image to be pined for among the contemporaries ecstatic in the new literary trend;

nevertheless I will make it a rule to jot down his story like dots unless it is impossible for evolving the theory to make it briefer or shorter, because that story is utterly derived from Euripides that is already described as was shown. First, what Goethe designed in describing his Iphigenia is too complicated and delicate to be approached for critics who, however long term their study on it may have lasted, have mainly extolled the great merit as the essence of the worthwhile literary work rather than paid consecutive attention to what is its excellent achievement in light of accurate interpretation as usual. Just as it is very common nowadays that many scholars theorize that tragedy originated from such primitive rites as the Festival of Dionysus during which the ancient Greeks celebrated the deaths of the winter kings and rebirths of the gods of spring and renewed life, so it too seems natural that Iphigenia is somehow of such rites in its original creation, rather the vestige remained not sharply outlined, so to speak, symbolic and festival in the interest of presenting primitive ceremonies. The first plan of writing this drama started in 1779, along with the first presentation of it which took place in Weimar that same year, and Goethe himself played Orest, the hero, while the heroine, Iphigenia, was played by Corona Schröter, then a beautiful and wellknown actress. Among the four different texts of it the two are written in prose, but the fourth, still the last one in verse completed in Rome, the capital of Italy where he had enjoyed various travels for two years or so until 1788.

Although he follows much closely the external course of events of the old Greek legend which has been down so far, he changed so radically the consequent significance as well as relatively and equally its intrinsic import that Schiller is quite right in defining Goethe's Iphigenia "astonishing modern and un-Greek." This is, it seems to me, almost as much of note as something like what Raymond Picard has expressed when compiling "Oeuvres complètes de Racine." Here let me confirm his judgement about the comparison between Euripides and Racine with the passage quoted from him:

Il fabrique de la légende: il invente le personnage d'Eriphile; et cette création, bien loin d'avoir l'air d'une pièce rapportée, est si bien tissée dans la trame de l'histoire que quiconque lirait la tragédie d'Euriphile après celles de Racine trouverait l'économie de l'Iphigénie antique moins satisfaisante que celle de l'Iphigénie moderne.⁷⁾

7) Raymond Picard, (ed.), *Racine, Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969).

It is clear thus that Picard made an effort to display rather immoderately his panegyric so as to enhance the widespread renown of Racine to higher level than what it was then, whether as established so far in the field of literary works or as settled in magnifying its eminence. This may be in fact likely to take place at the time when editing or compiling is in progress, but it is not an exaggeration, so neither is true, because a viewpoint or judgement is as usual for anybody's for preferring. Much of the comparable and contrasting relationships indicated thus far among those playwrights who handled the drama of namesake, Iphigenia, is, if any, good enough to theorize such a inter-relationship to certain extent that the comparison not only of the differences but also of the similarities, delicate as its approaching method to develop such theorization at full length to the adequate and proper end is, is indispensable and primary as the main topics to be evolved on here. Literally so difficult and so complex that the ability to handle them is above me is not to exclude Euripides from the following theorization in which those differences as well as those similarities are obliged to materialize as the controversial exercises.

The comparative study of such contrast and such parallel which are distinct and distinguishable between Racine and Goethe will be examined and elucidated with as much distinction as estimable in or worthy of indicating the specific characteristics intrinsically latent in both of the playwright, each of whom exerted to denote his ideal and himself within, as shown in Goethe's effort:

Iphigenie ist wöhl die tiefste Selbstenthüllung des Dichters. Iphigenie, die heilende Frau, ist nicht nur eine Erinnerung an die Odilienlegende, die Goethe im Elsass gefunden hatte, sie ist das dichterische Bild Charlottes von Stein, die des Dichters Wesen heilte wie Iphigenie den Orest. "Ich wünsche, Deiner Güte, Weisheit, Mässigung und Geduld teilhaft zu werden; ich bitte Dich fussfällig: vollende Dein Werk, mache mich recht gut!", so schreibt er 1781 an die Geliebte, die ihm, 'Schwester' bleiben wollte. ⁸⁾

Through his own play and hence never Racine is beyond that example Goethe without exaggeration or inaccuracy does show here. In Goethe, Iphigenia, serving as a priestess to Artemis in a savage land who has spirited

8) Goethe, *Dramen: Egmont, Iphigenie auf Tauris, Torquato Tasso* (München: Wilhelm Goldmann, 1959), p.8.

her away out of the terrible reign of Thoas, laments and mourns over and over her cruel destiny that was once ordained herself to be a victim to the sacrificial altar. Afire with endless reproach on her cursed family whose lot or doom is inherited down from Tantalus who offered his son Pelps as a victim to the altar, she can not help receiving the same destiny, however deplorable or disastrous, to herself that since that cruel filicide the lineage of her descendent blood has so far without any exception remained banned under and suffered from the providential ordainment so severe and righteous as never to disregard the prejudicial results come about in the unparalleled grounds. Such lamentation expressed grievously and frankly through her own lips in the presence of Orest who is not yet identified to her is not only the regret about Tantalus's descendents so utterly execrated, by virtue of the bloody or appalling filicide as to reluctantly experience it, but also her assumption precarious as well as unwarrantable that in imagination her brother and sister are at the risk of slightly edging at their best Avernus Netzen, though it turns out virtually this is not the case in time. No sooner has she heard his answer that they are still alive than spring out of her lips these words:

Goldne Sonne, leihe mir
die schonsten Strahlen, lege sie zum Dank
von Jovis Thorn! denn ich bin arm und stumm. (III i)

This seems to me some like a prayer prayed by an anxious prayer believing a certain answer or some like an outward joy suddenly burst into eruption as if to observe an ostensible ceremony as pompous and sumptuous as if not to control an internal turmoil of mind in the heart calloused through repression no less constant than frequent and therefore unconsciously utter it on and on in ecstasy. So plain and so obvious as to easily conceive as frequently and carelessly as usual is her inevitable and irresistible mental progress which transferred so rapidly from that deplorability due to the predestined if not premeditated agitation so joyful even as to accompany its successive ejaculation that this seems too conversant at first look with those who so admirably insisted. Even while we are aware of being inclined to be their satellites who are unconscious at the worst or faithful at the best, it seems to us how deeply and constantly Racine made an effort to express more readily the passions of parental affections, particularly of filial duty than Goethe.

For one thing, of course, this is, if possible in some sense, one of the aspects which were favourably being traced by what we might call the early inundation

of the new idea, really an embryo of Romanticism which was now about to originate from the smoldering embers of Neo-Classicism already almost disintegrated to such an extent in describing psychological phenomena more complex and perplexing than the preceding ones in literature that the influence of this embryo correspondingly started to triumph over its predecessor slumbering under such disintegration to portend its fatal termination. Such psychological phenomenon is, it is true, nothing but the attribution directly stemmed from *Der Sturm und Drang*, in other words none other than Romanticism which helped to describe such eruption of human mind, the so called abysmal, unsearchable and infinite multiplicity of mind, which Kant, more exactly and elaborately, also earlier than anybody else, tried to understand or indulged in taking advantage as either beneficial or useful to confront. This means that he is no other person than the first philosopher who theorized logically how our mental procedure works against the visible, the surrounding circumstances among which either we enjoy our lives or not and so sometimes are not able to endure the unfavourable conditions; in short, he made the human mind active, instead of passive, in the reception of impression from the external world. This is important not because it is really an epoch in literary theory, but it helped to express fully or limitlessly our imagination we have as much as we like as is shown in such an example as *Iphigenie*. I have theorized so far in order to make it clear that the difference and contrast between Racine and Goethe are distinguishable despite of accepting the same topic as a material for literary works. Not only this can account in that such a literary turmoil which is reared on and supported by the theory of Kant's philosophy did present its masterpiece so as to repudiate the literary heritage Neo-Classics have favoured so much as to diffuse out wholly through the European literature since its revival owing to the influence of the Renaissance, but also it helps that turmoil evolve into the imaginative literary works the maturity of which extends on and on to the point at which as an absolute principle this new trend has had control or preeminence over all the Europe until the embryo of Realism.

In conclusion, not so much likely and fertile in his imagination of literary fields as are shown in Goethe whose insight is inundated partly with meticulous subtleness to allow his ability to delineate the selected objects in truth and in reality, not to mention genuineness, and partly with the familiarity with the idea of fictionality or of a virtual world which leads to the profound imagination, then to the original sources of Romanticism, is Racine only satisfied to faithfully exercise the literary principle of the Greek antiquity philosophers

at last to succeed, as an eminent creator, in the world newly affected with Neo-Classicism. Such seems more real or genuine than true by giving it the authority quoted from W.D. Howarth and others.⁹⁾

That authority is "Tragedy is for Racine the Working-out of an inexorable series of events leading to a foreseeable catastrophe; plot is simplest; the action is already at crisis point when the play opens; and once the inexorable first step is taken, tension mounts between the incompatible protagonists until one or more of them is destroyed."

It is no doubt that what I have endeavoured so far is that Goethe's Iphigenia has been treated more genuinely than Racine's namesake, for this is, it seems to me, of my inveterate or intrinsic prejudice hidden within myself than any other reason.

Professor, Department of English

Kyung Hee University

9) W.D. Howarth, H.M. Peyre, and I. Cruickshank, *French Literature from 1600 to the Present*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1974), pp.22-23.