

MODERN LITERARY INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CATEGORY OF IRONY ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE WORK OF A.P. CHEKHOV.

Kadirova Nigora Abdurashidovna

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Republic of Uzbekistan

Annotation: The article deals with modern literary interpretations of the category of irony in relation to the literary heritage of A.P. Chekhov, accumulated in fiction, the experience of expressing irony as a subject of theoretical consideration in literary criticism of the XX-XXI centuries.

Key concepts: irony, hidden irony, open irony, visual irony, artistic mode, speech markers, satire, humor.

Introduction

The relevance of the study is determined by the fact that in the last decades of the XX-XXI centuries, the interest of domestic and foreign scientists in studying the features of A.P. Chekhov's literary reputation, creative individuality, including its ironic side, which was noted by the writer's contemporaries, has increased: "The enemy of sentiments and lofty hobbies, he seemed to keep himself in the mouthpiece of cold irony ...", recalled I.E. Repin about his meetings with the playwright in the 1890s. One of the most important ways of expressing it in the writer's works is the ironic detail as an attribute of the "poetics of infinitesimals". [4, p.130] Therefore, the conceptual role of precisely the ironic detail in the artistic system of A.P. Chekhov requires further purposeful reflection.

Purpose of the study

The aim of the study is to consider modern literary interpretations of the category of irony in relation to the literary heritage of A.P. Chekhov.

Research methods and materials

The study used the methods of comparative studies, literary analysis and the method of quantitative processing of the data obtained. The material for the study was literary articles on the work of A.P. Chekhov, studies of the theory of irony in Russian and world literary criticism.

Results and its discussion

One of the first special studies of how Chekhov's irony manifests itself in the writer's works belongs to E.A. Polotsk. In her opinion, irony distinguishes, first of all, his dramaturgy, since the genre features of a dramatic work, which excludes the possibility of direct authorial assessments and retains the form of objectivity, suggest all the conditions for the manifestation of irony.

Another prominent researcher of Chekhov's work A.P. Chudakov, analyzing the features of the writer's comic, revealed the originality of the humor of the early period.

A.P. Skaftymov came to a new understanding of Chekhov's poetics, however, in his works, the peculiarities of the writer's irony were not specifically considered.

L.E. Kreuchik, linking the specificity of irony with the subjectivity of the author's narration,

emphasized that Chekhov's irony does not result in pure denial and intellectual play: "ruthlessness and sympathy in Chekhov's works are inseparable. The basis of this indivisibility is the irony of the writer. Chekhov is ironic, because he not only sees the discrepancy between the desired and the real, but also understands well how far people are from the ideal. [7, p.65]

In the works of A.V. Kubasov, the originality of the artistic world of A.P. Chekhov is viewed through the prism of refracted "two-voice", reflecting the reflexivity and irony of the author's consciousness. At the same time, the researcher pays great attention to the phenomenon of intertext in Chekhov's prose: "the saturation with explicit, semi-hidden and deeply hidden quotations, reminiscences, allusions to someone else's text is one of the most important features of Chekhov's work". [8, p.16] In our opinion, it is also largely associated with manifestations of irony.

As part of a comparative analysis of the works of A.N. Ostrovsky and A.P. Chekhov, N.V. Mokina writes about the functions of laughter and the motive of "fun" as important components of the anthropology of writers and their philosophy of life, emphasizing that "many of Ostrovsky's innovations have become a point departures and for Chekhov's quests.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that it presents a detailed typology of ironic details in the works of A.P. Chekhov, which is important for understanding the uniqueness of his artistic style, largely due to the peculiarities of the rhetorical expression of irony through details through various tropes and figures. This rhetorical aspect of the identification of total irony in the writer's work with the help of figurative and expressive means is systematically considered for the first time. As rhetorical markers of ironic intention, they emotively designate and express it at the lexical level, perform an architectonic function at the syntactic level, thereby ensuring greater objectivity of their interpretation.

The research methodology consists of historical-functional and typological approaches, as well as the principles and techniques of modern literary analysis and interpretation of a work of art, which, being implemented in a scientific context, suggest, on the one hand, taking into account the main interpretations of the works of A.P. Chekhov, corresponding to the necessary "range of adequacy" [5, p.12], and on the other hand, the need for their correction and addition. Hence the analytical review of those studies expanded in our work, in which, to one degree or another, various aspects of the functioning of ironic details in the work of the classic writer are considered.

The experience of expressing irony accumulated in fiction has become the subject of theoretical consideration in Russian literary criticism of the XX-XXI centuries. So, M.M. Bakhtin revealed the roots of irony, hidden in universal carnival laughter, in folk laughter culture [1, p.132].

A.F. Losev and V.P. Shestakov characterized irony in the light of the general theory of the comic along with humor, satire, and sarcasm. In their opinion, "irony is one of the complex aesthetic categories related to the so-called aesthetic modifications. Every irony contains some element of allegory, cunning and deceit, but it is quite obvious that no deceit in itself is irony. Irony, unlike deceit, not only hides the truth, but also expresses it, only in a special allegorical way" [10, p.326]. In the extensive classification of types of irony proposed by Yu.V. Borev, the historical approach, which makes it possible to single out the Socratic, romantic, existential types of irony, is combined with its presentation as a device of a rhetorical strategy, as well as a form of the comic. In irony,

the scientist sees emotional criticism that has "an undercurrent, laughter with overtones, subtle mockery, covered by a deliberate statement or an outwardly positive assessment of the phenomenon" [2, p. 266]. In this case, irony is characterized in many ways from the point of view of pathos, as well as taking into account its structural and semantic features and form of expression. Modern literary definitions of irony in typological coverage are presented in the works of A.P. Chudakova, V.I. Tyupy and T.A. Kasatkina. So, A.P. Chudakov, distinguishing irony by the peculiarities of its manifestation in Chekhov's prose and dramaturgy, singled out internal (hidden) irony, that is, realized in a general context, and explicit (open) irony, expressed by various means, including ironic details.

Considering them as the main means of expressing irony, A.P. Chudakov distinguished them by functional features:

- a) visual (landscape, portrait, interior details);
- b) behavioral (first of all, speech characteristics are meant as elements of inadequate speech behavior that cause irony). In this case, it is revealed thanks to the author's remarks, puns, comparisons, neologisms and other techniques found in the text of the work.

At the same time, as the scientist rightly emphasizes, various types of ironic details cannot exist in isolation and have only an explicit or hidden nature of expression. Thus, the diverse palette of Chekhov's details combines many emotional and expressive shades: from light irony to outright sarcasm.

At the heart of V.I. Tyupa to the study of Chekhov's works lies in the allocation of two main types of artistry: dramatic and sarcastic. "Chekhov's irony in the stories of the mature period is predominantly *sarcastic* (highlighted by V.I. Tyupa. - N.K.), dating back to M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, but not turning into a satirical denunciation of the Gogol type, which always borders on a sermon. The conspicuous differences between Chekhov's laughter and the laughter of Saltykov-Shchedrin are, to a large extent, the differences between realistic symbolism and realistic grotesque, which do not affect sarcasm as a deep, "architectonic" strategy of artistic thinking common to both writers, fundamentally not reducible to satire. Sarcastic irony, condensing the external reality of life into a sharply defined character, reveals the illusory nature of the inner, intimate, personal in a person. It "carries out the characteristic "localization" of the character, tying him to a certain place in the world order, creating a caricatured, externalized, functional image of the human individuality".

According to the literary critic, "for Chekhov, sarcastic typification consists in weakening the depicted (not depicting!) personal principle, in reducing the character to a typical character, as a result of which the very name or nickname of the hero often becomes a household name". Dramatization, on the other hand, "implies the development of the inner autonomy of the hero's personality, pushing the traditional object of realistic typification – character" into the background of artistic interest.

In this regard, V.I. Tyupa rightly emphasizes that "sarcasm and drama are not only the most relevant types of ideological and emotional assessment for a mature Chekhov, but also the key ways of creative typification in the writer's stories". Indeed, satirical irony, turning into sarcasm,

pretending to affirm the subject, ridicules and denies its essence, serves, for example, as a way to expose the rude, ignorant representatives of bureaucratic Russia, who live in a strictly regulated world. However, in our opinion, in the works of A.P. Chekhov, one can find examples of satirical, tragic, and tragicomic irony. It should also be noted that, defining irony as a mode of artistry in all its diversity, V.I. Tyupa highlights such fundamental properties of irony as opposition to pathos and non-authoritarianism.

Similarly, T.A. Kasatkina, without reducing irony only to a kind of humor or satire, emphasizes that irony has its own special field of activity, which functionally does not coincide with the field of activity of other emotional-value orientations based on the comic. [6, p.276] According to the researcher, irony is not aimed at reality itself, but at its comprehension in the system of one or another emotional and value orientation, which, for the most part, seems to be false. Valuable is the thought of T.A. Kasatkina that total irony can turn into a tool for mastering reality.

An innovative interpretation of Chekhov's irony, due to the intertext, is presented in the works of R.G. Nazirova and A.Ya. Kubasov. From their point of view, the interaction of text and intertext determines the intonational originality of A.P. Chekhov, his “emotional two-sidedness”, about which A.P. Skaftymov.

In the theory of modern literary criticism, other variants of the typology of Chekhov's irony are distinguished, for example, from the point of view of the dynamics of the ironic tone or the nature of speech interaction. In our opinion, various types and ways of expressing irony associated with the use of details can be traced in the writer's works. Each Chekhovian text has its own unique set of different types of ironic details, along with other ways of expressing the author's irony.

Ultimately, considering the ironic aspect of A.P. Chekhov, one should keep in mind the impossibility of subjecting it to a clear and unambiguous division into types, subspecies, etc., since typology to a certain extent formalizes the “living matter” of a literary text.

Let us sum up some results of the historical and functional coverage of the category of irony in aesthetics, criticism and literature. Traditionally, irony is defined as a form of the comic, along with humor and satire. In irony, a discrepancy between the subjective representation and the objective state of things is always expressed, but unlike other manifestations of the comic, irony does not have its own object, choosing any object or phenomenon itself. On the one hand, in the typology of types of comic irony is on a par with parody, grotesque, burlesque, etc.; on the other hand, it is self-sufficient as a kind of emotional-valuable attitude of the author to reality.

As a full-fledged form of the comic, irony traditionally correlates with humor and satire without merging with them. If humor retains sympathy for the object of ridicule, then irony ascribes to it what is not in it, as if elevating it in order to emphasize the absence of positive properties. In irony, the funny is hidden under the mask of seriousness, a negative attitude to the subject prevails in it, while in humor, the funny, also hiding under the mask of the serious, continues to retain a positive beginning.

Satire in this series is a form of destructive ridicule of the world and man when they do not correspond to their nature and purpose. Satire is unconditionally negative in relation to the subject of the image, opposing a certain ideal to it. The purpose of satire is to arouse in the public a sharp

rejection and condemnation of the ridiculed phenomena. In comparison with satire, irony is more restrained, it is intellectual. If satire clearly points to negative phenomena, then irony is designed to awaken the independence of thinking in relation to them. Thanks to irony, the author is able to veil his position in the work. In this case, irony is realized as a rhetorical device.

Conclusions

Having traced the evolution of understanding the category of irony in aesthetics and literary criticism, noting the richest tradition of its expression in world and Russian literature, we can say that A.P. Chekhov. Consciously and unconsciously, he used in his work the entire arsenal of ironic means and techniques, primarily an ironic detail. It acquires a special, conceptual meaning in his prose and dramatic works.

The ironic detail is an essential component in the structure of the portrait, landscape, interior and other attributes of description in the works of A.P. Chekhov, as well as in various forms of speech interaction between characters and narration. Expressing the author's position, the ironic detail makes it possible to reveal its second plan behind the direct meaning. In addition, the ironic detail acquires axiological significance, due to which A.P. Chekhov can be called an ironic writer.

In our opinion, A.P. Chekhov in his works creates special conditions for the functioning of an ironic detail, associated with such properties of the internal structure of a literary text that make its ironic interpretation possible. The writer has developed his own strategy and tactics for creating irony. Its most important marker is precisely the detail, with the help of which the ironic intention is mainly explicated.

References:

1. Bakhtin M. M. *Creativity of Francois Rabelais and folk culture of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. - M.: Fiction, 1990. - P. 132.
2. Borev Yu.V. *Basic aesthetic categories*. - M.: Higher School, 1960. - p. 266.
3. Borisova V.V., Shaulov S.S. *Artistic text: aspects of analysis and interpretation at school and university*. - Ufa: Publishing house of BSPU, 2018. - 192 p.
4. Byaly G.A. *Russian realism: from Turgenev to Chekhov*. - St. Petersburg: Soviet writer, 1990. - P. 130.
5. Esaulov I.A., Tarasov B.N., Sytina Yu.N. *Analysis, interpretation and understanding in the study of Dostoevsky's heritage*. - M.: Indrik, 2021. - P. 12.
6. Kasatkina T.A. *Characterology of Dostoevsky*. - M.: Heritage, 1996. - 276 p.
7. Kroichik L.E. *The poetics of the comic in the works of A.P. Chekhov*. - Voronezh: Publishing House of the Voronezh State University, 1986. - P. 65.
8. Kubasov A.V. *Prose by A.P. Chekhov. The art of styling*. - Yekaterinburg: Publishing House Ural, State Pedagogical University, 1998. - P. 16;
9. Kubasov A.V. *Prose A.P. Chekhov: the art of stylization*. - Yekaterinburg, 1998. - 399 p.
10. Losev A.F., Shestakov V.P. *History of aesthetic categories*. - M.: Art, 1965. - p. 326.
11. Расулов, И. И. (2015). Из опыта изучения семантической структуры фразеологизмов. *In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 343-345).
12. Расулов, И. И. (2015). Глагольные категории причастий узбекского и русского языков. *In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 341-342).

13. Расулов, И. И. (2020). Вопросы изучения наречных фразеологизмов в русском и узбекском языках. In Система непрерывного филологического образования: школа–колледж–вуз. Современные подходы к преподаванию дисциплин филологического цикла в условиях полилингвального образования (pp. 320-323).
14. Inatovich, R. I. (2021). Study of adverbial phraseological units of the russian and Uzbek languages with explicitly expressed meaning. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR), 10(3), 356-360.
15. Расулова, М. Х. (2018). Прием обратной связи на уроках литературы. In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее (pp. 554-555).
16. Расулова, М. Х. (2016). Проектная работа на занятиях по русской литературе. In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее (pp. 329-330).
17. Расулова, М. Х. (2015). Нравственное мерило в русской литературе. In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее (pp. 339-340).
18. Расулова, М. Х. (2015). "Идейность" безыдейной литературы. In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее (pp. 338-339).
19. Керимова, З. С., & Мирзоев, Ш. А. (2010). Этнокультурные условия формирования готовности девушек к материнству. Известия Дагестанского государственного педагогического университета. Психолого-педагогические науки, (1), 26-33.
20. Расулова, М. Х. (2016). Опыт применения метода проектов при обучении русскому языку. In Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее (pp. 327-329).