

## Irony in World Dramas

**Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna**

PhD, Associate Professor of the Bukhara State University

**Ergasheva Fotima Rasuljonovna**

Master's Student 2nd course, Bukhara State University

dagotys@mail.ru

**Abstract:** The playwright, like an actor, loses the fate of the characters on himself, lives their conflicts. This is not about the methods of creating the play, there are various ways, but about the essence of the structural relations of the drama. The communication of the author with the viewer - reader remains dramatic in nature. Of course, the immediacy of stage relations in the literary version is reproduced indirectly, metaphorically, and this in its own way affects the movement of dramatic forms.

**Keywords:** actor, dramatic irony, hero, stylistic principles, psychology, sarcasm, mocking, humiliating, playwright.

---

### I. Introduction

Sarcasm (Greek sarcasmos, sarkaro - exactly: I cut meat, bribe it) - comic type, one of the tools of art style; thought-provoking, based on the ridiculed, irreconcilable laugh. In sarcasm the attitude towards the object is not in the form of "soft, mild", "humorous", on the contrary, there is anger and hatred. It expresses a naked, insulting, blatant, and nudity-destroying object. Sarcasm has two cynical meanings, and these features differ from those of the accused or abuser. Although exposure is a hallmark of sarcasm, rejection is the main point. According to it, sarcasm is far superior to cynicism and it's kind of war, madness, ridicule, mocking, humiliating laughter. Sarcasm is widely used in lyrical and dramatic genres, in publicist, humorous and comic books, and in public speaking.

### II. Literature review

In literary studies sarcasm is known from antiquity. J. Swift, Cervantes, Gogol, Saltikov Shchedrin, Mayakovsky, Hamza, Abdullah Kadiri, Abdullah Kahhor, Gafur Gulom, Sayd Ahmad and others have used effectively. It also suggests a certain type of connection between the artist and the viewer through a character who is separated from the author and actor (puppet theater, mask theater) and merged with them in the theater of live reincarnation, the drama in its literary being is inherent in full measure. The playwright, like an actor, loses the fate of the characters on himself, lives their conflicts. This is not about the methods of creating the play, there are various ways, but about the essence of the structural relations of the drama. The communication of the author with the viewer - reader remains dramatic in nature. Of course, the immediacy of stage relations in the literary version is reproduced indirectly, metaphorically, and this in its own way affects the movement of dramatic forms. In foreign art history there are many works that put forward the irony as the general principle of drama. R. Sharpe presents the history of world drama in the form of an evolution of irony, from its classical forms in ancient drama to the complex, multi-stage ironic displacements of a playwright such as Pirandello. The researcher discovers the ironic effect at the basis of all the moments of dramatic action, the whole

psychology of perception of drama, up to the tragic catharsis, which is presented as a kind of “harmony” of victory and death, prepared by a whole system of ironic twists and turns of the hero’s fate. The predecessor of Sharpe A. Thompson, classifying the forms of irony, along with verbal irony and irony of characters, singles out a special dramatic irony, suggesting a mismatch between what was expected and what happened. He finds a special kind of irony in the drama of Ibsen (“Ibsenian irony”), where the cycle of dramatic action as a whole reveals the discrepancy between the ideal and the real course of life. Indeed, the drama seems to represent an unlimited field of irony - in words, situations, twists of fate. The viewer knows more than each character individually, and this gives him the opportunity to ironically perceive actions and words on the stage, to clearly feel the discrepancy between the intended and their real meaning. The irony of fate constantly makes itself felt in the drama. We are struck by her vicissitudes and surprise will make us laugh. And yet it is impossible to reduce the whole poetry of drama to a system of ironic figures. In essence, we simply replace the concept of “drama” with the term “irony”, reduce the content of the dramatic to a system of ironic devices. It is necessary to specify the concept of “irony” in relation to drama. It would seem, most likely, to apply this term to the phraseological level, to the ironic substitution of words. But even here it is essential in relation to which this substitution takes place. In the dialogue cited from A. N. Ostrovsky’s play “Not All the Shrovetide for a Cat,” Agnia tells Akhov that it is “fun” to wait for the death of an old husband. From the phraseological point of view, there is obvious irony. Agnia took the word “fun” from Akhov, who praises the life of a young wife with an old man, and, substituting it into his situation, destroyed the structure of his interlocutor. And at the same time, Agniya opens up differently in relation to the audience, here she does not irony, but speaks directly about herself. Therefore, there is no need to apply the concept of “dramatic irony” in this case. The scene gives the viewer, which turned out to be erroneous, the assumption that Agnia will agree to become Akhov's wife, as if she has no other way. But the “ironic” replica of Agnia herself is more likely preparing a different solution. The hero of the dramatic fairy tale by E. L. Schwartz “Shadow” The scientist meets his own shadow, which has left him and is now making a political career, has taken possession of his bride - the princess. The shadow persuades the Scientist to renounce the princess otherwise he will be killed by order of the ministers: “Refusing to sign this miserable little paper, you kill me, your best friend, and the poor, helpless princess. Will we survive your death!”

The insidious Shadow seems to be pretending to be falsified by the logic of the Scientist’s feelings, ironic, although there is no phraseological irony here. In fact, the dramatic irony lies precisely in the fact that the Shadow is telling the truth, according to the logic of things, it really cannot survive its master, although this will become apparent later when the order is given to chop off the head of the Scientist. This Schwartz play is some perfect dramatic solution. A conventional fairy-tale situation allows the playwright to build an action on the collision of two characters who are as close as opposed. They exist only together and at the same time live in different dimensions. The world of royal ceremonies and secular politics, in which the Shadow feels so comfortable, is actually a ghost, it only holds like the shadow of a real, living human. In its purified form, the dialectic of dramatic irony also appears here. Everything is built as if on allegory, on hints. But in fact, the author speaks directly with the reader, but you only need to be able to understand him. It depends on the viewer at what point he will master this dual logic and join in the ironic game. A stronger clash with the viewer is possible on the stage, direct irony towards him. There is an episode in *The Ghosts of Eduardo de Filippo*, where the hero of this comedy farce Pasquale Loyacono, exhausted by the struggle with the ghosts of the modern world, is finally left alone and drinks his daily afternoon cup of coffee. On the stage, a whole ritual is usually played with the preparation of coffee. Eduardo de Filippo does the same, playing the role of Pasquale. Only it is obvious to him that the liquid that the little Neapolitan drinks with such pathos and pleasure is actually some kind of disgusting burda. Affection breaks through irony. The actor turned her right into the hall, to his compatriots. Exposing illusions, the ghostly hopes that people of post-war Italy lived, the playwright did not idealize the “little Italian”, did not intend to pretend that a lie is just an innocent manifestation of Italian national imagination,

did not want to erect this traditional cup of coffee in an expression of the national spirit. The ironic intonation of the play broke through a direct blow to the viewer. A very important point in the interaction between the stage and the viewer is the dialectic of surprise, in which, at the same time, there can be no pure chance, a game of ignorance, the unpreparedness of the audience. Dramatic irony is one of the manifestations of this dialectic, which is born primarily in the theatrical being of drama. Although at the beginning a lot was said about the poetic language and the style of Shakespeare's plays, we did not touch on some issues then. Most of the text is written in white verses, but in some scenes the characters speak prose. The ratio of verse and prose in Shakespeare's plays is a rather complicated problem; in Hamlet, it is solved simply.

### **III. Discussion**

All prosaic dialogues have a comic tone. Everywhere where Hamlet, playing the madman, talks with Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Ophelia, the king, Ozric, he speaks prose and laughs at them, his speech is full of sarcasm, satirical remarks. This can be easily verified by referring to the appropriate parts of the text: the second scene of the second act contains Hamlet's ridicule against Polonius, a playful conversation with former university comrades, then a friendly but not mocking reception of actors, Hamlet's order to Polonius to accept the whole troupe well; The Prince's conversation with Ophelia is full of sarcasm. Hamlet's advice to actors contains satirical attacks against the bad style of play (III, 2, 1-50); Before and during the presentation of the "mousetrap," Hamlet's conversation with his mother, Ophelia, and the king is full of caustic remarks (III, 2, 97-147, 233-265), the same conversation about the flute with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (III, 2, 360-389), a mockery of Polonius about what the cloud looks like (III, 2, 390-405). The prince's answers are full of caustic taunts when he is questioned about where he hid the body of Polonius (IV, 2, 1-33; 3, 17-55). Humor, satire, irony are heard in the conversation of the grave diggers with Hamlet (V, 1, 1-240), and the conversation with Ozrik has a parody and satirical character (V, 2, 81-202). Of the prosaic dialogues, only two are free from this tone: the letter of Prince Horatio (IV, 6, 6-31), his conversation with a friend before the fight (V, 2, 203-235), but, notifying the king of his return, Hamlet could deny himself irony (IV, 7, 43-48). Shakespearean scholars note five different types of prose in Hamlet: 1) in formal documents, that is, Hamlet's letters, 2) in dialogues of people of the lower class (grave diggers), 3) in simple colloquial speech (Hamlet and actors, Hamlet and Horatio), 4) in speeches testifying to a dull mind (several remarks of Ophelia and Hamlet), 5) a special place in prose belongs to Hamlet's words that heaven, earth and people no longer please him (II, 2, 306-322). Here Shakespeare's prose reaches truly poetic elevation and beauty. Variations of prose contribute to our concept of the diversity of the speech style of the characters, but the contrast between the two main elements of the language of tragedy — prose and poetry — is even more felt. Moreover, sometimes the transition from poetry to prose serves to ease tragic tension or precede pathetic scenes; in other cases, prose also acquires an intensely dramatic sound (Hamlet's break with Ophelia, III, 1, 102-157; bold answers of the prince to the king, IV, 3, 20 - 39). Poetic speech prevails in Hamlet. Shakespeare's white verse has reached extraordinary diversity and flexibility here. In large poetic speeches, a different tone sounds: passion, pathos, judiciousness, irony, epic calm - you will not list everything. It is especially noteworthy that, while reading and listening, we begin to perceive the poetic speech as normal, it seems conversational, and we forget about the conventions of the poetic language of the tragedy, as it sounds natural. Here you should pay attention to an interesting trick used by Shakespeare. Literary texts are introduced into the tragedy - "quotes" from plays supposedly on stage - from Dido (Shaggy Pierre ... - II, 2, 472-541) and whole scenes from The Killing of Gonzago. The Killing of Gonzago style contrasts sharply with the poetic speech of the characters. The heroes of the tragedy say in white rhymed verse, the characters in "The Killing of Gonzago" in rhymed couplets:

Ah, dear friend, separation is near an hour;

Mighty forces the fire in me went out ...

III, 2, 183-184

To this speech of the actor-king, the actor-queen answers:

Earth, do not send me food, firmament - rays!

Fade away the joy of the day, the peace of nights!

III, 2, 226–227

Due to the fact that “The Killing of Gonzago” is written in a pompous style the impression of the naturalness of the speeches of Hamlet and other characters of the Shakespearean tragedy is reinforced. "Hamlet" contains a kind of anthology of the English Renaissance theatre. Shakespeare reflected in this tragedy the three stages of the English Renaissance theatre. The first, earliest stage is represented by the naive, straightforward tragedy of “The Killing of Gonzago”. In such a spirit, writers of the secular humanistic theater wrote and played plays in the 1560-1570s. There are no special intricacies of the plot the psychology of the characters is still very simple the abundance of moral maxims resembles the genre with which the humanistic drama began - morality. The play itself is also typical, primarily in that the play is preceded by a pantomime; in it, without words, with just gestures, movement and facial expressions, the content of the play is briefly played out. Playwrights of the late 1580s refuse to pantomime. Shakespeare retains it in his tragedy to emphasize the archaic character of the troupe that arrived in Elsinore. The next stage in the development of the Renaissance drama was rhetorical tragedy and comedy. "University minds" - Christopher Marlowe, Robert Green, Thomas Kidd and others abandoned the old "jumping" rhyming verse, replacing it with a white verse. They filled the characters' speeches with various rhetorical techniques and gave the sound of the verse power and strength. This stage of the poetic drama of the English Renaissance is represented by a monologue from the tragedy of Dido, which the actor reads at the request of Hamlet. Finally, the tragedy itself embodies the stylistic principles of the third, highest period of English drama, marked by the work of Shakespeare himself. The hero of the tragedy “in life” speaks of Shakespearean prose and white verse, but as soon as the problem of literary style arises, he is one step behind modernity, behind the natural dramatic speech of Shakespeare. We can say the same about the epistolary style of the Prince of Denmark. At first glance, the style of Hamlet Ophelia's love message seems strange:

Do not believe that the sun is clear,

That the stars are a swarm of lights

That truth is not powerful

But believe my love.

Oh dear Ophelia, these dimensions are not given to me. I do not know how to calculate my sighs; but that I love you completely, oh completely, wonderful, believe it. Farewell: Yours forever...”(II, 2, 116–124). Some critics thought that the writing style was parody. In fact, we are dealing here with the same trick as in The Killing of Gonzago. The distinction between ordinary spoken language and book writing is emphasized. The affect of the syllable is unquestionable here, but it is consistent with how Prince Ophelia perceived to his insanity. He was for her a “mirror of taste”, to be more precise, a mirror of “glass”. Is it any wonder that his love message is written somewhat manneredly? Even Polonius's writing style seems bad. He comments on the beginning of Hamlet's message: “To Heaven, to the idol of my soul, to the opulent Ophelia ...” This is a bad expression, a vulgar expression...”(II, 2, 109–111). It would seem - what is it? Upon closer examination, it turns out that Shakespeare, with humor and irony, reflected the struggle of two schools of ancient rhetoric, which left a mark on the literary style of the Renaissance, as humanists learned the style from ancient masters. Hamlet in this case resorts to the exaggeratedly flowery style of the direction of rhetoric, which was called Asianism. Polonius, with his university studies, would apparently prefer a more rigorous, logically clear style of the Cicero school, of Atticism.

However, the old courtier is inconsistent. He confirms his stylistic credo when he pronounces the words that have become famous:

Since brevity is the soul of the mind,

And verbosity is perishable embellishment...

I will be brief.

II, 2, 90–91

Contrary to the promise, it spreads thought through the tree. He does it in his own way skillfully, following the fashion that arose at the end of the 16th century thanks to the novel by Shakespeare's senior contemporary John Lily (1554-1606) *Euphéous, or the Anatomy of Wit* (1579). The sophisticated style of Lily, who used an infinite number of rhetorical figures, was called "euphism." Frequent in it are parallels, antitheses, detailed comparisons, and complex metaphors. The Speech of Polonia is a Shakespearean parody of the euphism style. Polonium utters:

Serene Monarchs, state,

Why day - day, night - night and time - time,

That would be wasting night, day and time. ...

The prince, your son, is insane:

Mad, for what is madness.

How exactly is not being crazy?

...that he is insane

That is true; the truth is that it's a pity

And it's a pity it's true...

Even Polonius himself is forced to admit that "it turned out stupid," asserts that he will be "more unsophisticated", but continues in the same vein: "we only have to // Find the reason for this effect, // Or rather, a defect, because // This defective effect is not without reason ..." (II, 2, 87-103). If you put together the style motifs scattered throughout the play and judgments about them, you will find Shakespeare's unusually great interest in the problems of artistic culture, awareness of its modern directions and his own definite line, consisting in the desire to concentrate thoughts, words and actions. But this is by no means achieved by simplification, but by a sense of proportion. Hamlet has a lot of rhetoric, poetry, pathos, deep drama and vivid stage effects. But nothing is excessive. Shakespeare knows where to stop, sharply change his tone, taking the viewer along. What should be the play, Shakespeare expressed in the words of the same Hamlet, when he asks the first actor to read a monologue. The play to which the prince refers is not found it did not exist and was created by his own imagination. "... The play, I remember, has not recovered from the crowd; for most, it was caviar; but it was - as I perceived by others, too, whose judgment in such matters is louder than mine," says Hamlet, "a great play, well distributed across the scenes, constructed as simply as skillfully. I remember someone said that the poems in it were not seasoned in order to make the content tasty, and the speeches did not contain anything that would accuse the author of pretentiousness, and called it a respectable device, healthy and pleasant, and much more beautiful than smartly dressed" (II, 2, 456-466). Here he is - the ideal of a Shakespeare playwright at the time of the creation of Hamlet and other great tragedies - Othello, King Lear, Macbeth, Anthony and Cleopatra.

## Conclusion

It has been said clearly and definitely: we need a clear and skillful composition of action, the speech of the characters, devoid of pretentiousness, so that everything together is not outwardly bright, but truly beautiful. And, we repeat: "do not transgress the simplicity of nature." All

deviations from these principles –pretentiousness of style, sophistication of expressions, artificial tonality (“The Killing of Gonzago”) - are called upon to make for us a life-truthful and complex composition of action and, in essence, a conditional form of speech of characters speaking in poetic language. The “simplicity of nature” in art is achieved by no means simple means.

## References

1. Fitrat. Rules of literature. T. 1995.
2. Hudoyberdiyev E. Introduction to Literary Studies. T. 1995.
3. Kasim Y. Symbols in New Uzbek Poetry // Uzbek Language and Literature.-1998.- №5- P.3-8.
4. Sarymsakov B.I. Fundamentals and Criteria of Fiction.- T. 2004.
5. Potebnya A. Aesthetics and Poetics.-M., 1976.
6. Bakhtin M.M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity.-M.: Art, 1986.
7. Borev Y.B. Aesthetics –M., 1988.
8. Mineralov Yu.I. Theory of literary literature.-M., 1999.
9. Encyclopedic Literary Dictionary.-M., 1987.
10. Mavlanova Ugiylo Khamdamovna, Ruziyeva Dilfuza Salimboevna, Babaeva Vasila Toshpulatovna. Irony in dramatic works//International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation. – 2020. – T. 24. – №. 3.
11. Mavlonova U. K., Maxmurovna M. K. THE INTRODUCTION OF IRONY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE //International Engineering Journal for Research & Development. – 2020. – T. 5. – №. 3. – С. 4-4.
12. Ugiylo Khamdamovna Mavlonova, Dilfuza Salimboyevna Ruziyeva. THE USE OF IRONY IN LITERATURE // International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – Issue 04, Volume 84. SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS
13. Mavlonova Ugiylo Khamdamovna 2020. Similarities and differences between types of comic. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 3, 9 (Sep. 2020), 105-107. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v3i9.596>.
14. Mavlonova U.K., Makhmurova M.Kh., Kodirov T.D. DESCRIPTION OF ART MEDIA IN LITERATURE // LXIV International Correspondence Scientific and Practical Conference “EUROPEAN RESEARCH: INNOVATION IN SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY» June 5-9, 2020. London, United Kingdom
15. Sharipova D.Sh , Mavlonova U.Kh., Ibatova N.I. BEHAVIORAL LANGUAGE ETIQUETTE IN UZBEK PROVERBS AND SAYINGS // ВЕСТНИК НАУКИ И ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ № 11(89). Часть 3. 2020. P: 51-53
16. Mavlonova U Kh, RA Akhmedova. ANALYSIS OF SITUATIONAL IRONY IN EXAMPLES FROM GENERAL CASES. ЖУРНАЛ «ACADEMY» © ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО «ПРОБЛЕМЫ НАУКИ». Том 62, номер 11, ст. 24-26.
17. U.K. Mavlonova, R.A. Achilova. THE PROBLEM OF TRANSLATION OF REALIA (AMERICANISMS). *Dostijeniya nauki i obrazovaniya*, 5/59, 2020.
18. Mavlonova Ugiylo Khamdamovna, “IRONY IN FITRAT’S DRAMAS”, *IEJRD - International Multidisciplinary Journal*, vol. 5, no. CONGRESS, p. 3, Nov. 2020.

19. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna, Makhmurova Mavjuda Khalimovna. ANALYSIS OF SITUATIONAL IRONY IN LITERATURE. ЖУРНАЛ «ACADEMY» © ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО «ПРОБЛЕМЫ НАУКИ». Том 62, номер 11, ст. 26-27.
20. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna. (2021). IRONY IN LYRICS. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability*, 2(4), 77-81. Retrieved from <https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejrds/article/view/609>
21. У.Х. МАВЛЯНОВА. КИНОЯНИНГ ОҒЗАКИ, ВАЗИЯТЛИ ВА ДРАМАТИК КЎРИНИШЛАРДА ҚЎЛЛАНИЛИШ АҲАМИЯТИ - МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 2021.
22. О. Mavlonova. Kinoya yoxud istehzo turlari. ВЕСТНИК НУУз/ ЎзМУ хабарлари. 1 (1), 2021, 216-218-b.
23. M.U. KHAMDAMOVNA. TYPES OF IRONY AND ITS USAGE IN THE CONTEXT. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY/ BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI ILMIY AXBOROTI. 2/78, 2020, 208-213. УДК: 616.89-008.444.5
24. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna. THE ROLE OF IRONY IN UZBEK LITERATURE. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY. 2021/3(85), P. 50-59
25. Khamdamovna, M.U. 2021. Aesthetic and Psychological Features of Irony. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 4, 10 (Oct. 2021), 184-187. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v4i10.2318>.
26. Khamdamovna, M. U. (2021). The use of Irony in Uzbek Poems as a Speech Decoration. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE*, 2(11), 17-20. <https://doi.org/10.47494/cajlp.v2i11.242>
27. Khamdamovna, M. U. . (2021). Irony and Sarcasm in English Humour. "ONLINE - CONFERENCES" PLATFORM, 78–82. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/597>
28. Mavlonova, U. (2021). ЭСТЕТИЧЕСКИЕ И ФИЛОСОФСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ИРОНИИ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 7(7), извлечено от [https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/3937](https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3937)
29. Mavlonova, U. (2022). ADABIY VOSITA: KINOYA VA ISTEHZO O'RTASIDAGI FARQ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 8(8). извлечено от [http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/4167](http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/4167)
30. Khamdamovna M. U., Saidakhmedovna U. D., Izatilloevna K. D. Text Forming Features of Irony in American Prose //Journal of Positive School Psychology. – 2022. – С. 9691–9697-9691–9697.
31. MU Khamdamovna. Irony as a Topical Form of Comic. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. Volume 5, Issue 6, Jun 2022. P. 4-7. e-ISSN : 26203502 p-ISSN : 26153785
32. Khamdamovna, M.U. 2022. Irony Expressed by Adjectives and Verbs in English Literature. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 5, 12 (Dec. 2022), 281-283.