

Philosophical-Aesthetic and Linguistic Features of Comics

DILNOZA SHOHOBUTDINOVA

Tashkent Institute of Textile and Light Industry, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article explores the philosophical and aesthetic dimensions of comedy in French literature, focusing on major theories of humor and the linguistic mechanisms that create comic effects. It examines both linguistic and extralinguistic factors that contribute to humorous situations in French literary texts. The philosophical perspectives and aesthetic interpretations of various scholars are analyzed to show how irony, satire, and sarcasm function at the semantic and pragmatic levels of language. Special attention is given to how these features are expressed and developed within the tradition of French literary comedy.

Keywords: French literature, comedy, comic, humor, semantics, pragmatics, aesthetics, linguistics, philosophy, irony, satire, sarcasm.

INTRODUCTION

The comic has long occupied a vital position in human cultural expression. In literature, it is more than mere entertainment; it is a form of critique, resistance, and philosophical inquiry. Within the French literary tradition, comism is defined here as the artistic and intellectual engagement with the comic which holds a distinctive place. A number of studies are being carried out in world linguistics with the aim of forming the theoretical foundations of comedy, taking into account the versatility and scale of this linguistic phenomenon. The problem of humor has

long attracted the attention of philosophers, logicians, psychologists, physiologists, linguists, writers, and even now many interesting studies are being conducted and factual material has been collected, but a single, generally acceptable theoretical basis for humor in these studies has not yet been created.

Nowadays, it is important for our researchers to identify, analyze and study humorous situations in the literary texts of our writers, to identify the types of laughter and its perception by people.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of comedy began in the pre-Christian era. Among the first scholars to study comedy philosophically were Plato and Aristotle. They gave a philosophical definition of comedy. According to Aristotle (1957), the comic is a kind of error and absurdity that does not cause suffering to anyone and is not destructive to anyone. A comedy is a mistake or inconsistency (Aristotle 1957).

Philosopher Hegel (1938) describes the state of laughter in his own way, according to him, lies destroy self-confidence, behavior, actions, stubbornness, capriciousness of a person show a bad state in front of a good upbringing, and in front of a well-bred person the shortcomings of this person are clearly visible.

Bergson (1914) also showed how comic situations arise. Comicism consists in treating people as puppets. Funny cases can be seen below. Bergson (1914) presents his scheme: there are several situations that manifest comicism, which deliberately force a false idea into correct sentences, give the correct meaning to movable words, change the word order in a sentence, that is, the phenomenon of inversion occurs, comicism can be achieved by changing the place of repetitions in a sentence, by making word games in sentences, by changing the tone, and also through inversion and interference.

Bergson's classification is not up to the mark, but no one before him had ever said that words could make people laugh (Bergson 1914).

Kimmins (1928) also defined comedy and attempted to explain how laughter originates. Some researchers described Kimmins' definitions as unfounded, unnecessary and misleading. Monroe (1951) presents his classifications in the following:

- any violation of the sequence of events;
- any prohibited violation of the sequence of events;
- obscenity /indecency;
- to mix concepts related to different situational situations;

The scientist lists several other situations that can cause laughter. These include changing the meaning of words, actions that are not supported by reason, uncertainties, and unpleasant events (Monroe 1951).

The researcher focuses more on comedy in his work. The classifications he creates mainly show the situation, character, and situation. Since the classifications he gives are close in content to each other, he makes some mistakes (Spencer, 1898).

Below we will try to identify the rational core of the most important comments on comedy. It should be noted that many researchers consider comedy to be the result of contrast, "disorder" and an opposition.

Comic situations play an important role in the work of our scientists. Some consider criticism to be one of the important conditions for laughter. Some believe that where there is criticism, there is laughter, while others argue that a sense of superiority causes laughter. Some consider comedy to be an expected state of art, while others consider laughter to be an unexpected state.

Considering the views of comedy theorists on the true nature of comedy, it can be noted that comedy has several forms of manifestation, i.e. comedy comes in satirical and humorous forms (Obraztsov 1950).

The sense of humor is very abstract in nature. It is a reaction to the influence of the environment, but this reaction is directed mainly to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of higher social aspirations and desires, it is a reaction that changes from one formation to another, from one class to another.

Comedy is one of the manifestations of aesthetics. They are united by the fact that both comedy and aesthetics are based on a very complex process of perception of reality. A complex of emotions is formed both in comic perception and in the human psyche, just as in aesthetic perception, but they develop differently. In comic perception this difference of feelings will necessarily have an opposite character, and in the climax of a fable the mutually exclusive character of these feelings is resolved to such an extent that the original dominant feeling is destroyed or partially negated.

It is worth noting that in comedy, aesthetics is rejected, because in the comic situation, concepts contradict each other and destroy each other, however, conflict between them based on those elements that are the defining center of comic information.

Such a center for Aristotle (1957) is the conflict between the ugly and the beautiful. He writes in the *Poetics*: "Comedy is the revival of the mischievous, the unseemly, not only that which excites laughter, but not that which excites hatred. A mistake or something inappropriate may be funny, but at the same time it cannot cause pain or death to anyone, for example, indeed, we laugh at a wounded man, but not at a face distorted with pain.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Various methods were used in the philosophical and aesthetic study of the comedy. Several methods were used in the analysis of the artistic text. These methods are based on showing funny words, phrases, phraseological units, signs of the environment in the text, indicating a funny situation. Phrases were used in analyzing the artistic text.

Using the synchronic-descriptive method, we tried to illuminate the linguistic phenomena causing laughter, i.e. words, word combinations, phraseology at the same time, from the point of view of modernity with the help of French art texts. The contemporary state of the comic phenomenon was analyzed in the course of synchronic analysis.

Contextual analysis method involves analyzing a comic strip in context (i.e., in a particular situation, environment, and time).

Contextual analysis helps to determine the meaning and function of the words or phrases that provoke laughter, based on the surrounding topics and the setting of the conversation.

The methods of semantic and stylistic analysis of phraseological phrases include two-way actualization of phraseological phrases, convergence of different stylistic elements, violation of stylistic distribution of phraseological phrases, analysis of violation of semantic integrity of phraseological phrases. Semantic analysis is aimed at determining the meaning of a phraseologism, and stylistic analysis is aimed at studying its aesthetic and stylistic features in written or spoken speech.

The above methods allow us to analyze comic situations with the help of fiction texts of French writers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Various philosophical views on comedy have existed since before our era and continue to the present day. At the heart of all ideas lie contradictions. Aristotle's thoughts are a vivid example of this. One of the main signs of comedy is laughter. If we talk about laughter and comedy, laughter is a physiological process, while comedy belongs to art (Aristotle 1957).

Hegel (1938) approached the problem philosophically, defined comedy as a false, spurious, inverted phenomenon, and the French philosopher Bergson (1914) tried to prove that "comic consists in treating people like puppets and divided comedy into five main classes. However, Bergson's classifications do not cover all the ways of achieving a comic effect, and he only attempted to classify the meaning of the word comic and the ways of achieving a comic effect (Bergson 1914).

Kimmins (1928) also divides jokes into several types, but the classifications he gives are considered too simplistic and absurd. Another comedy researcher Monroe (1951) divides comedy into several classes and offers his own scheme. The methods given by him are related to comedy, which expresses the situation, the character of the situation.

All researchers defined comedy as the result of contrast, disorder, opposition.

The problem of comedy occupies one of the main places in the work of Borev (1957) considering comedy as a special form of criticism; he turns to the logical nature of comedy, the nature of perception (Borev 1957).

Analyzing the philosophical views of all researchers, we believe that Yu. Borev's "Comic" (1957) and Luka's dissertation research entitled "Wit" (1958) are the most correct and most favorable for us.

Based on the philosophical thoughts of Hegel (1938), Luk (1968) and Borev (1957) believe that comedy is a form of thinking, the result of the natural evolution of man as a psychophysiological unit.

In the logical mechanism of comics, the comic effect is achieved by attempting to express real reality through four, one after the other, systematic false facts, that is, it is based on violating the four basic laws of formal logic.

Thus, laughter is a person's psychological and logical reaction to the discrepancies between expected and actual events. In creating comedy, the inconsistency of events or words with our expectations, excessive details or contradictions create a comic effect.

CONCLUSION

The philosophical interpretation of the comic confirms that the aspects of opposition, contradiction, comparison presuppose the existence of two elements that negate each other in comic reasoning, and the category of opposition always creates a comic situation.

Comedy as an aesthetic category has a number of specific aspects: the inextricable connection of comedy with tragedy, the aesthetic nature of comedy, its social character, its socially significant life contradictions are the basis for the emergence of comedy.

The psychological mechanism of comedy is that people react to unusual or ambiguous situations, unexpected events, and

actions or words that do not conform to social norms and deviate from accepted norms, resulting in laughter or smiles, and a humorous situation.

REFERENCES

1. Abramov, N. 1909. *The Gift of Speech: The Art of Expressing One's Thoughts* (p. 31). St. Petersburg.
2. Aristotle. 1885. *Poetics* (p. 60). Warsaw.
3. Aristotle. 1957. *On the Art of Poetry* (p. 53). Moscow.
4. Bergson, A. 1914. *Laughter. Collected Works*. Vol. 5. St. Petersburg.
5. Borev, Y. 1957. *On the Comic* (p. 61). Moscow: Art.
6. Cicero. 1985. *Philosophical Treatises*. Trans. M. Rizhsky (pp. 173-189). Moscow: Science.
7. Dzemizok, B. 1974. *On the Comic* (pp. 87-89, 101). Moscow: Progress.
8. Hegel, G. W. F. 1938. *Lectures on Aesthetics*. Vol. 12 (pp. 71-72). Moscow.
9. Kimmins, G. W. 1928. *The Springs of Laughter*.
10. Luk, A. N. 1968. *On the Sense of Humor and Wit* (pp. 85, 115-116). Moscow: Art.
11. Monro, D. H. 1951. *Argument of Laughter* (pp. 182-187). Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
12. Obraztsov, S. 1950. *My Profession* (p. 213). Moscow: Iskusstvo.
13. Ovsyannikov, V. V. 2011. *Modality and Translation: Monograph* (p. 364). Zaporozhye: Prosvita.
14. Pocheptsov, G. G. 1974. *Theory of Communications*. Moscow.
15. Paul, J. 1804. *Vorschule der Ästhetik* (p. 104). Hamburg.
16. Quintilian, F. 1896. *Rules of Oratory*. Book 10, V. A. Alekseev. Trans. p. 47. St. Petersburg.
17. Spencer, G. 1898. *Tears, Laughter, and Grace*. p. 47. St. Petersburg.

DILNOZA SHOHOBUTDINOVA

RESEARCHER, TASHKENT INSTITUTE OF
TEXTILE AND LIGHT INDUSTRY, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <SHOXOBUTDINOVA@GMAIL.COM>