

The Style Of Expressing Individuality In Tragedies Of Shakespeare

G'affarova Dilafruz Vaydulla qizi

A researcher of 100004-European, American, Australian language and Literature,
Namangan State University
e-mail: gdilafruz@mail.ru
mobile number: +93 7762882

ANNOTATION

Shakespeare's works are very different among other writers' works. Particularly, his tragedies are certainly among his most famous works. In this article we have analyzed Shakespeare's style of expressing individuality in tragedies of Shakespeare which he devoted to Kings. Below the main attention is paid on analysis of "King Lear" by Shakespeare and Shakespeare's mastery of poetic expression.

Key words: literature, tragedy, plays, genre

William Shakespeare is an outstanding poet and playwright William Shakespeare is the favourite author of millions of readers all over the world. No other writer's plays have been produced so often and read so widely in so many different countries. He had a greater influence than any other author. Many years after passed his death but Shakespeare's works are truly immortal and will retain their immortality as long as the human race exists. He is a true classic: every new generation finds something new and unperceived in his creative works.

According to the Bradley, Shakespeare's tragedies indicate that the "main interest" of their authors mind was in character, the inner nature of human being which determines their deeds and their fare.

Bradley's concern with Shakespearean character of course been challenged by a number of critics on the grounds that it is reductive. It scales emblematic,

nonrealistic dramas down to the level of quiet, realistic portrait galleries of interesting human specimens: it turns the plays into second-rate novels. But the challenges offered by a which variety of newer critical approaches are perhaps more radical, since they take issue not only with Bradley, but also with some of his subsequent detractors and revisers on the central issues of the nature of language, the capacity of writing to express the operations of the writer's mind or to present character; and indeed the nature of characters, of reading and of the written text. The most fundamental challenge is that offered by what has come to be known as "structuralism"[1,p.226].

The term is a broad one, referring rather generally to a number of roughly related critical positions which emerged in France and America during the 1950 and 1960s. The roots of structuralism lie in studies of the nature of language made by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, and by American linguists such as Edward Sapir, Benjamin lee, and Honard Bloomfield. Its fundamental arguments are different to summarize, but central to them is a denial of the sort of transparency in language which Bradley's notion of reading requires.

In respect of literary criticism, the first casualty of this kind of thinking will be the simple, straightforward concept of realism; the idea that language makes actual, unmediated contact a "real world" beyond itself, which it describes with greater or less accuracy. The second, related casualty will be a no less simple, straightforward concept of "expression": the notion that language directly and in an unmediated fashion expresses the thoughts that occur in the head of utter. The nature of language as a structure, and as a structuring process, clearly denies the transparency on which these notions depend. In effect, structuralisms argue both the "real world" and our own thoughts about it are determined by the language through whose agency we exist in and encounter the world. It follows, even from the dangerously skimpy outline given about, that the foundations of Bradleian criticism of Shakespeare will be severely by any such approach[2,p.300].

It may be course be objected that where both structuralism and post structuralism forces upon the text of Shakespearian play, that text is only one aspect of the play's existence. A prior and major dimension of it must involve the play's performance, before an audience, in the theatre. The modern critical approach which takes the study of semiotics. The central concern of semiotics is with the nature of signs. Although as a field of study it can not properly be termed a science and in truth is more accurately described as a point of view, or "way of looking" at the world, it has a long history, stretching back at least to the ancient Greeks. Semiotics is dedicated to the study of how meaning is produced in society, and these concerns itself with the whole range of the process of signification and communication: that is, with generation and exchange of meanings. Semiotic literary criticism certainly draws on the insights provided by structuralism, particularly with regard to its concept of the text, but it aims at a more complete investigation of the text within its own historical and cultural setting, as well as within the setting it acquires in the modern world. Seen these, the text is far from the relatively simple object that Bradleian critical analysis makes of it. In the words Alessandro Serpieri, it stands as the site of "virtually all the semiotic systems at work in a given culture".

In the case of dramatic text, the situation is even more complex as numbers of non-verbal semiotic systems involving dress, make-up, gesture, spatial relations, the use of props, the use of music, the use of sound effects, etc., all become involved. And even though the dominant system may be that of language, its language designed to be uttered and not to read: language that performs actions and in doing so also refers to the context in which its uttered. Nevertheless, the semiotic analysis of Shakespeare's texts has made a number of inroads into the wilderness, and is actively involved in clearing a significant.

In Britain, King Lear, in old age, chooses to retire and divide up Britain between his three daughters. However, he declares that they must first be wed before being given the land. He asks his daughters the extent of their love of him. Two oldest, Goneril and Regan, both flatter him with praise and are rewarded

generously with land and marriage to the Duke of Albany and the Duke of Cornwall, respectively. Lear's youngest and most beloved daughter, Cordelia, refuses to flatter her father, going only so far as to say that she loves him as much as a daughter should. Lear, unjustly enraged, gives her no land. The Earl of Kent tries to convince Lear to reconsider, but Lear refuses then banishes Kent for acting traitorously by supporting Cordelia. Gloucester then brings the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy in and Lear offers Cordelia to Burgundy, though without dowry of land, contrary to a previous agreement. Burgundy declines, but the French King, impressed by Cordelia's steadfastness, takes her as Queen of France. Next, Lear passes all powers and governance of Britain down to Albany and Cornwall.

Edmund, bastard son of Gloucester, vows to himself to reclaim land his father has given to his "legitimate" son Edgar. Edmund does this by showing his father a letter he (Edmund) forged, which makes it seem that Edgar wants to take over his father's lands and revenues jointly with Edmund. Gloucester is enraged, but Edmund calms him. Later, Edmund warns Edgar that he is in trouble with his father, pretending to help him.

Gloucester instructs her steward, Oswald, to act coldly to King Lear and his knights, in efforts to chide him since he continues to grow more unruly. Kent arrives, disguised as a servant, and offers his services to Lear, who accepts. However, as a result of the servants' lack of respect for Lear, his own fool's derision of him, and Goneril's ill respect toward him, Lear storms out of Goneril's home, never to look on her again. Lear goes next to Regan's house. While leaving, the fool again criticizes Lear for giving his lands to his daughters. Later, Lear fears he (himself) is becoming insane.

At Gloucester's castle, Edmund convinces Edgar to flee, then wounds himself to make it look like Edgar attacked him. Gloucester, thankful for Edmund's support of him, vows to capture Edgar and reward Edmund. Regan and Cornwall arrive to discuss with Albany their ensuing war against Lear.

Kent arrives at Gloucester's with a message from Lear and meets Oswald (whom Kent dislikes and mistrusts) with a message from Goneril. Kent attacks Oswald, but Cornwall and Regan break up the fight, after which Kent is put in the stocks for 24 hours[3,p.320].

Edgar, still running, tells himself he must disguise himself as a beggar. King Lear arrives, finding Kent in the stocks.

At first, Regan and Cornwall refuse to see Lear, further enraging him, but then they allow him to enter. Oswald and Goneril arrive, and Lear becomes further to the brink, he leaves Gloucester's castle, entering a storm. The daughters and Cornwall are glad he leaves, though Gloucester is privately concerned for his health.

In the storm, Kent sends a man to Dover to get Cordelia and her French forces to rescue Lear and help him fight Albany and Cornwall. Lear stands in the storm swearing at the and his daughters, but Kent convinces him to hide in a cave.

Gloucester tells Edmund of the French forces and departs for Lear, but Edmund plans to betray his father and inform Cornwall of the proceedings. Kent finds Lear, nearly delirious, in the storm and tries to take him into the cave. Fusty then, Edgar emerges from the cave, pretending to be a mad man. Lear likes him and refuses to go into the cave. Gloucester arrives (not recognized Edgar), and convinces them all to go to a farmhouse of his. Edmund, as promised, informs Cornwall of Gloucester's dealings with the French army. Cornwall vows to arrest Gloucester and name Edmund the Duke of Gloucester.

At the farmhouse, Lear, growing more insane, pretends his two eldest daughters are on trial for betraying him. Edgar laments that the King's predicament makes it difficult to keep up his (Edgard's) charade, out of sympathy for the King's madness Gloucester returns and convinces Lear, Kent, and the fool to flee because Cornwall plans to kill him. Cornwall captures Gloucester and with Regan cheering him on, plucks out Gloucester's eyeballs with his bare fingers. During the torture, Gloucester's servant rescues his master from Cornwall and they flee to Dover to

meet the French. On the way there, Gloucester and the servant meet Edgar (still a mad man, named Poor Tom), who leads his father (Gloucester) the rest of the way.

At Albany's Palace, Goneril promises her love to Edmund, since her husband (Albany) refuses to fight the French. Albany believes that the daughters mistreated their father (Lear). A messenger brings news that Cornwall is dead, from a fatal job he received when a servant attacked him while he was plucking out Gloucester's eyeballs. Albany, feeling sorry for Gloucester and learning of Edmund's treachery with his wife, vows revenge.

At Dover, Cordelia sends a sentry out to find her estranged father. Regan intruded Oswald (Goneril's servant) to tell Edmund that she (Regan) wants to marry him, since Cornwall is dead. Edgar pretends to let Gloucester jump off a cliff (Gloucester believes truly happened), then Edgar pretends to be a different man and continues to help his father. Lear, fully mad now, approaches and speaks to them. Cordelia's men arrive and take Lear to her. Oswald comes across Edgar and Gloucester, threat Ewing to kill them. Edgar, though, kills Oswald, and discovers by letter that Goneril plants to murder Albany any marry Edmund. At Cordelia's camp, King Lear awakes, more same than before, recognizes Cordelia[4,p.67].

At her camp, Goneril, while arguing with Albany, states to herself that she would rather lose the battle than let Regan marry Edmund. Edgar, disguised, brings warning of ill plots (by Goneril) to Albany. Lear and Cordelia are captured in battle by Edmund. Edmund sends them to jail and instructs a Captain to kill them. Edgar arrives and fight and wounds Edmund, who admits his teachers to all. Goneril mortally poisons Regan then stables herself. Edmund reveals that he and Regan ordered the Captain to hang Cordelia and kill Lear. Lear then emerges with dead Cordelia, and tells all he killed the Captain that hang her. Edmund dies and king Lear, in grief over Cordelia, dies.

Every father of grown-up children recognizes the general truth of Lear's situation, yet the play shows no eagerness to explore the facts of any such realistically conceived case or to document its detail, in the manner of Othello for

example. The individuals in King Lear move always across landscapes of the widest extent, cress-crossed in numerable simultaneous purposes King Lear enacts the meaning of fatherhood rather than its experience, aided in this by the presence of the duplicate father, Gloucester, and his antithetical sons, one virtuous, who by the symmetry they provide reinforce our sense that we have here an abstracted pattern rather than a particular history. Indeed when we come to compare King Lear with its source in the old play of King Lear (1590) we find good evidence of Shakespeare sing the radically different quality of story he found in Sidney's Anadia (his source for the Gloucester plot) to counteract the pious providentialism that old play provided, meaning a deliberate effort to render history as mistory. The love-auction in Shakespeare's first scene a religion whose other traces have entirely disappeared[5,p.230].. As soon as we try to describe this action in personal terms we lose our bearings. What is going on here, we ask. Why do Lear and Cordelia pile one folly on top of another? There is no other sign that Cordelia is particularly foolish. It is possible, of course, to assume that Shakespeare was just being incompetent. Nahun Tate congratulated himself that his 1681 Version of the play had rescued King Lear from its author's inconsequence and provided the characters with acceptable motives. He does not seem to have noticed that Shakespeare had already been offered acceptable motives in his source play, and had rejected them. Evidently it was Shakespeare's intention to present human actions stripped of their conventional explanatory surface and rendered not less but more mysterious by every effort the characters make to connect causes with result or, generalize events into examples. In such an unanchored world of prehistory the mixture of the familiar with the strange, the known and unknowable, is strongly biased towards the strange and the unknowable.

Even the humour here belongs in the anarchic, the wild, the, desperate. Lear's fool is a jester by profession, but the effect he creates is not one of professional control and expertise but of jokes pulled out of agony and frustration, of the crazy interconnections offered as the last efforts to the signal towards

meaning. Lear's madness makes a similar effect (thou wouldn't make a good fool, he is told) Hamlet's madness is attached, initially at least, to a specific purpose, but Lear's madness represents only the fragmentation of all significance in a world where the differentiation of human identity from animal nature is no large embodied in the conduct of the exemplary leaders of society but can only be picked up, piece by piece, from accident and hallucination.

To sum up, Shakespeare is one of the most immortal persons of human history. He was needed in every age. There was no decade when Shakespeare and his plays hadn't risen in the horizon of art in new shade and in new power.

Used literature:

1. Bradley A.C. Shakespearian Tragedy, Lectures on King Lear –London: Pinguin ,1991- 226.p
2. Cercignani, Fausto. Shakespeare's Works and Elizabethan Pronunciation - Oxford: University Press,1981- 300.p
3. Craig Leon .Harold of philosophy and kings- Toronto: Pronto University Press ,2003. 320.p
4. David Scott Kastan .A Companion to Shakespeare-Kastan,1999 -67.p
5. Dowden Eduward “Shakespear” New York :Appleton,1881- 230.p