

I. History and Heritage of Irony in British Literature and G. B. Shaw

George Bernard Shaw in this play deals with the issue of war in which the Bulgarian army led by Sergius get victory over the Serbians where captain Bluntschli is an escaped fugitive who ironically privileges the food (chocolate cream) rather than arms and ammunition. He is saved by Raina Petkoff with whom Bluntschli describes quit ironically about Sergius comparing him with Don Quixote without knowing him as Raina's lover. Raina becomes very much happy and glad to find her lover Sergius as the hero in the war but ironically choose the escaped fugitive at last. Hence, the play is full of irony.

Irony is one of the major associates of humour. The origin of irony goes back to the Greek comedy. In Greek comedy some characters who are less intelligent, in pretension, would say one thing and meaning the opposite. There is no intention to deceive or cheat but to gain special artistic effort. There may be similarities between irony and satire, but all ironies are not satire. However, satires are often stable ironies. Irony, unlike, satire does not work in the interest of stability. The ironists do not pretend to cure such as a universal or to solve its mysteries. It is satires that solves.

Irony is a remark which means the opposite of what it says. Dramatic irony is a remark whose significance is perceived by the audience but not by the actors on the stage. In drama and literature a statement or action whose apparent meaning is underlain by a contrary meaning is irony. In addition to verbal or rhetorical irony, there is also structural irony, metimes called "irony of situation." Structural irony typically takes the form of a discrepancy between appearance and reality, or between what a character expects and what actually happens. Both verbal and structural irony shares the suggestion of a concealed truth conflicting with surface appearances.

When irony is used structurally in a novel or a play, it is sometimes called 'tragic' or 'dramatic' irony. The classical Greek tragedy *Oedipus Rex*, by Greek dramatist Sophocles, Oedipus attempts to find the murderer of Laius, king of Thebes, unaware that he himself is the culprit. The audience, which knows the truth, perceives the dimension of his tragedy early in the play and anticipates consequences that Oedipus does not expect. His statements become unconsciously ironic—when, for example, he prays that the murderer's life 'is consumed in evil and wretchedness.'

Conscious ironies are recognized by the characters in a story or play. For example, in English dramatist William Shakespeare's play *Julius Caesar*, Mark Antony bitterly describes the men who have murdered Caesar as "honorable." In unconscious irony, words or actions are understood as ironic by the audience or reader, though not by the characters. In Shakespeare's tragic play *Othello*, the title character repeatedly describes treacherous Iago as "honest." Misled by Iago's lies, Othello becomes convinced that his innocent wife is dishonest. Othello recognizes Iago's deceptions only at the tragic conclusion of the play.

Language device, either in spoken or written form in which the real meaning is concealed or contradicted by the literal meanings of the words (verbal irony) or in a situation in which there is an incongruity between what is expected and what occurs. Verbal irony arises from a sophisticated or resigned awareness of contrast between what is and what ought to be and expresses a controlled pathos without sentimentality. It is a form of indirection that avoids overt praise or censure, as in the casual irony of the statement "That was a smart thing to do!" (meaning "very foolish").

Dramatic irony depends on the structure of a work rather than its use of words. In plays it is often created by the audience's awareness of a fate in store for the characters that they themselves are unaware of the situation. The Socratic irony of the

Platonic dialogues derives from this comic origin. Feigning ignorance and humility, Socrates goes about asking silly and obvious questions of all sorts of people on all sorts of subjects, only to expose their ignorance as more profound than his own. The nonliterary use of irony is usually considered sarcasm.

One of the aesthetic devices: irony has its brilliant history of its use from the ancient period to this age of post and post modernism period. Most of the literary critics or even humanists consider that this is the age of irony. Jonathan Swift (1667-1745), Anglo-Irish satirist and political pamphleteer, considered one of the greatest masters of English prose and one of the most impassioned satirists of human folly and pretension. His many pamphlets, prose, letters, and poetry were all marked by highly effective and economical language.

Among Swift's earliest prose work was *The Battle of the Books* published in 1697, a burlesque of the controversy then raging in literary circles over the relative merits of ancient and modern writers. In this work Swift championed the ancients and, with mordant satire, attacked the pedantry and sham scholarship of his day. His *A Tale of a Tub* published in 1704, is the most amusing of his satirical works and the most strikingly original. In it Swift ridiculed with matchless irony various forms of pretentious pedantry, mainly in literature and religion. The book gave rise to grave doubts concerning Swift's religious orthodoxy, however, and it is thought that because Queen Anne was offended, Swift lost his chance for ecclesiastical preferment in England.

In around 1725 he anonymously issued his *Drapier's Letters*, a series of highly effective pamphlets that secured the end of the royal patent granted to an Englishman coining copper halfpence in Ireland. Swift was trying to protect the Irish people from a further debasement of their currency. For his championship of their cause in these

essays and in “A Modest Proposal” published in 1729, Swift became a hero of the Irish people. “A Modest Proposal” embodies the mordantly ironic suggestion that the children of the Irish poor be sold as food to the wealthy, thus turning an economic burden to general profit.

English literature got a masterpiece, *Gulliver's Travels*, was published anonymously in 1726 by him; it met with instant success. Swift's satire was originally intended as an allegorical and acidic attack on the vanity and hypocrisy of contemporary courts, statesmen, and political parties, but in the writing of his book, which is presumed to have taken more than six years, he incorporated his ripest reflections on human society. *Gulliver's Travels* is, therefore, a savagely bitter work, mocking all humankind. Nonetheless, it is so imaginatively, wittily, and simply written that it became and has remained a favorite children's book.

Joseph Addison (1672-1719), English essayist, poet, and statesman, whose work, particularly in the periodicals *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, strongly influenced 18th-century English taste and opinion. *The Spectator*, for which Addison subsequently wrote the finest of his many essays. Addison's literary reputation reached its highest point in 1713, when his tragedy *Cato* was produced in London. It was translated into several languages, and such influential critics as the French writer and philosopher Voltaire pronounced it the finest tragedy in the English language. In the opinion of most critics today, however, this play, an artificial and undramatic work, was overestimated by Addison's contemporaries.

Addison's literary reputation has suffered a decline since his own time, when he was widely considered the most important of English authors. He influenced the literary taste of the 18th-century, in part by resurrecting the neglected ballad form in essays in *The Spectator*. He is now remembered mainly as one of the founders of the

modern familiar essay and as a prose stylist of polish, grace, and elegance. In *Pride and Prejudice*, Jane Austen begins with the proposition “It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.” In fact, it soon becomes clear that Austen means the opposite: women (or their mothers) are always in search of, and desperately on the lookout for, a rich single man to make a husband. The irony deepens as the story promotes his romance and ends in a double marriage proposal there in the novel.

Another influencing satirist writer in that era was Alexander Pope (1688-1744), English poet, who, modeling himself after the great poets of classical antiquity, wrote highly polished verse, often in a didactic or satirical vein. In verse translations, moral and critical essays, and satires that made him the foremost poet of his age, he brought the heroic couplet, which had been refined by John Dryden, to ultimate perfection. He was a bitterly quarrelsome man and attacked his literary contemporaries viciously and often without provocation. To some, however, he was warm and affectionate; he had a long and close friendship with the Anglo-Irish writer Jonathan Swift and the English writer John Gay.

Pope's literary career began in early adulthood, when the playwright William Wycherley, pleased by Pope's verse, introduced him into the circle of fashionable London wits and writers, who welcomed him as a prodigy. He first attracted public attention in 1709 with his *Pastorals*. In 1711 his *Essay on Criticism*, a brilliant exposition of the canons of taste, was published. His most famous poem, *The Rape of the Lock* published in 1712, a fanciful and ingenious mock-heroic work based on a true story, established his reputation securely. When Pope wrote *The Rape of the Lock* he could have assumed that his eighteenth century readers, educated in the classical and knowledgeable about epic, would recognize that it was a mockery. It plays off a

high sense of the heroic against the diminished scale of contemporary life. In this confrontation, Pope might be expected to have a clear allegiance to the classical epic poets. But if we see use of sarcasm in George Bernard Shaw in his writings the presupposition cannot be seen vibrantly unlike Alexander Pope. In *The Rape of the Lock*, Pope presents a world dominated by trivialities in terms of an epic grandeur. The fashionable society of the beaux and belles is not only allowed the defects but also the advantages of its scale. In the midst of its ironies the poem delights in the exotic preparations and instruments of Belinda's toilet and in the exquisiteness of the sylphs. It extends rapturous complimentary to Belinda and expresses genuine sympathy for the pathetic fate of the belles it mocks.

Pope published *Windsor Forest*, which endeared him to the Tories by referring to the Peace of Utrecht. And then after his work "The Wife of Bath" appeared, which, like his "The Temple of Fame", was imitative of the works of the same title by the 14th-century English poet Geoffrey Chaucer. Later in a collection of Pope's works containing the most noteworthy of his lyrics was published. Pope has translated Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He also published an edition of Shakespeare's plays.

Pope and his friend Swift had for years written scornful and very successful critical reviews of those whom they considered poor writers; they began a series of parodies of the same writers. The adversaries hurled insults at Swift and Pope in return, and Pope lampooned them in one of his best-known works, *The Dunciad*, a satire celebrating dullness. In 1734 he completed his *Essay on Man* which is full of sarcasm upon foolishness of human in a way it's a great irony as well. Pope's last works, *Imitations of Horace*, were attacks on political enemies of his friends.

Arms and the Man is one of George Bernard Shaw's successfully written plays that have become predominant and globally renowned. Shaw's play leads itself to two

themes that people can relate to, which are the importance of war and the essentials to true love and marriage. These themes are interwoven, for Shaw believed that while war is evil and stupid, and marriage desirable and good, both had become wrapped in romantic illusions which led to disastrous wars and also to unhappy marriages. The theme of war applies itself into the plot within the first few pages of the melodrama, when the Bulgarians are at war with the Serbs. Romance is portrayed by the humorous and ironic relationships of Raina, Sergius and Bluntschli. Unfortunately, due to society's lack of comprehension and failing to learn from our past errors, we are destined to repeat the majority of them.

Arms and the Man is "as fresh and up-to-date today" as when Shaw first produced his play in 1894. It is November 1885, during the Serbo-Bulgarian War. Raina Petkoff, a young Bulgarian woman, is in her bedchamber when her mother, Catherine, enters and announces there has been a battle close by and that Raina's fiancé, Major Sergius Saranoff, was the hero of a cavalry charge. The women rejoice that Sergius has proven to be as heroic as they expected, but they soon turn to securing the house because of fighting in the streets. Nonetheless, a Serbian officer gains entry through Raina's shutters. Raina decides to hide him and she denies having seen anyone when she is questioned by a Russian officer who is hunting for a man seen climbing the water pipe to Raina's balcony. Raina covers well, and the Russian leaves without noticing the pistol on Raina's bed.

When Raina hands the gun to the Serbian after the Russian leaves, the Serbian admits that the gun is not loaded because he carries chocolates in his cartridge belt instead of ammunition. He explains that he is a Swiss mercenary fighting for the Serbs because it is his profession to be a soldier and the Serbian war was close by. He adds that old, experienced soldiers carry food while only the young soldiers carry

weapons. Shocked by this attitude, Raina criticizes him for being a poor soldier. He counters by describing what makes a real fool, not knowing that his version of the day's cavalry charge makes fun of her betrothed. She is incensed but agrees to let him stay once he impresses upon her the danger of going back out into the street. She tries to impress him with her family's wealth and position, saying that they have the nobility to give refuge to an enemy. He pledges her safety and advises her to tell her mother about his presence, to keep matters proper. While she is gone, he falls into a deep sleep on her bed and he cannot be roused by a shocked Catherine. Raina takes pity on him and asks that they let him sleep.

On March 6, 1886, Raina's father, Major Paul Petkoff, comes home and announces the end of the war. Catherine is upset that the Serbians have agreed to a peace treaty, believing that her side should have a glorious victory. Major Saranoff arrives just after Petkoff makes comments indicating that Saranoff is not a talented military leader. Catherine praises Saranoff, but he announces that he is resigning from the army. Raina joins the conversation just before the discussion turns to a Swiss officer who bested the men in a horse trade and who had been, according to a friend's story, rescued by two Bulgarian ladies after a battle. Catherine and Raina pretend to be shocked by such unpatriotic behavior.

Catherine and Major Petkoff leave the two young people to have some time to alone. Raina and Sergius exchange all the silly platitudes expected of lovers about how much they missed each other and how they worship each other. However, while Raina is away to get her hat for a walk, Sergius flirts with the maid, Louka, whom he has apparently chased in the past. Louka protests his behavior and reveals that there is someone for whom Raina has real feelings, not the fake ones she puts on for Segius. Sergius becomes angry and insults Louka, although he is confused about his own

feelings.

Sergius goes to help Petkoff with some final military business. In his absence, Catherine tells Raina that Petkoff has asked for the coat they gave the enemy soldier when he left. Just then, the Swiss officer, Captain Bluntschli, arrives to return the coat. The women try but fail to hurry him away before Petkoff and Sergius see him. Bluntschli offers to help them with the logistics of their troop movements, and Petkoff invites him to stay, much to the discomfort of the ladies.

Bluntschli is busy drawing up orders, and Saranoff signs them as everyone else is lounging in the library. Petkoff complains that he would be more comfortable in his old coat, but he cannot find it. Now that Bluntschli has returned it, Catherine insists that the coat is in the blue closet, where she placed it since the last time her husband looked. When the servant finds the coat in the appropriate closet, Petkoff dismisses the incident as a foible of old age.

When Saranoff and Petkoff go out to deliver orders to the couriers, Raina has a chance to talk with Bluntschli alone, and she lets him know that his story about his evening in her room made it through camp rumors all the way to her father and her fiancé. After bantering about honor and lies, Raina reveals that she had slipped her portrait and a note into her father's old coat when she gave it to Bluntschli. Unfortunately, Bluntschli never discovered it, and they realize that it could still be in the pocket. A messenger arrives with telegrams that tell Bluntschli that his father has died and that he must attend to the family business.

Louka and the manservant, Nicola, have an exchange about Louka's ambitions and about the role of servants. Nicola realizes that it might be more to his advantage to let Louka marry Saranoff and to then become their servant. Later, Saranoff and Louka argue about whether Saranoff is afraid to express his love for Louka, and she

reveals that Raina has fallen for Bluntschli. Saranoff challenges Bluntschli to a duel, but when Raina charges that she saw Saranoff with Louka, he backs off. Raina then stirs Saranoff's emotions by telling him that Louka is engaged to Nicola.

Petkoff enters, complaining that his coat had to be repaired. When Raina helps Petkoff put on the coat, she pulls the incriminating photo from the pocket and tosses it to Bluntschli, not knowing that her father has already seen the photo. When Petkoff does not find the photo in his pocket, the questioning begins about the photo's inscription to a "Chocolate Cream Soldier," and an avalanche of truthful revelations from all parties begins. Nicola wisely denies being engaged to Louka so she can marry Saranoff. As Catherine protests the dishonor to Raina, Louka injects that Raina would not have married Saranoff anyway because of Bluntschli. The Swiss captain is hesitant to declare himself in love until he learns that Raina is twenty-three years old, and is not the teenager he thought she was. Confident then that she is old enough to know her feelings, Bluntschli asks for Raina's hand in marriage. Again, Catherine protests because she thinks Bluntschli cannot provide for her daughter appropriately, so he tells them of his great wealth. Raina puts up a token protest about being sold to the highest bidder, but Bluntschli reminds her that she fell in love with him before she knew he had any rank or money. She capitulates, and the play ends with everyone happy.

In line after line, Shaw satirizes the romantic notions about war that glorify a grisly business. If not for the comic dialogue, the audience would more easily recognize that they are being presented with a soldier who has escaped from a horrific battle after three days of being under fire. He is exhausted, starving, and being pursued. Such is the experience of a real soldier. Late in the play, Shaw throws in a gruesome report on the death of the man who told Bluntschli's secret about staying in

Raina's bedroom; there is nothing comic or heroic about being shot in the hip and then burned to death. When Raina expresses horror at such a death, Sergius adds, "And how ridiculous! Oh, war! War! The dream of patriots and heroes! A fraud, Bluntschli, a hollow sham." This kind of description caused Shaw's critics to accuse him of baseness, of trying to destroy the heroic concept. That a soldier would prefer food to cartridges in his belt was considered ludicrous by critics, but in the introduction to *Plays: Pleasant and Unpleasant*, Shaw was reported to have said that all he had to do was introduce any doubters to the first six real soldiers they came across, and his stage soldier would prove authentic.

It is also noteworthy that Catherine is dissatisfied with a peace treaty because, in her unrealistic vision of glorious war, there is supposed to be a crushing rout of the enemy followed by celebrations of a heroic victory. Shaw's message here is that there can be peaceful alternatives to perpetual fighting. He was dedicated throughout his life to curbing violence especially that of wars, and *Arms and the Man* was one of the vehicles he used to plead his case.

Shaw was a master flirt and he enjoyed the playful farce of romantic intrigues. But he recognized that playing a game differed from serious love, and he tried to convey as much in *Arms and the Man*, which is subtitled "An Anti-Romantic Comedy." In the play, Raina and Sergius have paired themselves for all the wrong reasons: because their social status requires a mate from the same social level; and because Sergius plays the role of the type of hero that Raina has been taught to admire, and Raina plays the role that Sergius expects from a woman of her station. The problem is that neither is portraying his/her real self, so their love is based on outward appearances, not on the true person beneath the facade. They are both acting out a romance according to their idealized standards for courtship rather than

according to their innermost feelings. Just as the cheerleader is expected to fall for the star quarterback, Raina has fallen for her brave army officer who looks handsome in his uniform. When Bluntschli and Louka force Raina and Sergius to examine their true feelings, Raina and Sergius discover that they have the courage and desire to follow their hearts instead of seeking to meet social expectations.

Arms and the Man illustrates the conflict between idealism and realism as well. The romantic ideal of war as a glorious opportunity for a man to display courage and honor is dispelled when Sergius admits that his heroic cavalry charge that won the battle was the wrong thing to do. His notable action does not get him his promotion and Sergius learns that "Soldiering, my dear madam, is the coward's art of attacking mercilessly when you are strong, and keeping out of harm's way when you are weak" (39).

Sergius and Raina must face the fact that their ideals about love are false. Fortunately, both of them are actually released by this knowledge to pursue their true loves. But first, Sergius goes through a period of despair in which he questions whether life is futile if the ideals by which he has set his standards of conduct fail to hold up when exposed to reality. This question is an underlying current throughout the play. Shaw gives a happy resolution, but it is a serious question that most people must face in life.

Much is made of Bluntschli's realism—i.e., keeping chocolates instead of ammunition in his cartridge belt, showing contempt for sentimentality, and reacting in a practical manner to his father's death. However, Nicola is the consummate realist in the play. Nicola's message is: adapt, exploit, and survive. Bluntschli proves to have a romantic side, after all, and thus is the most balanced character in the play in that he seems to know when to temper his romanticism with realism and when to stick to his

ideals.

In *Man and Superman* Shaw expounded his philosophy that humanity is the latest stage in a purposeful and eternal evolutionary movement of the “life force” toward ever-higher life forms. Shaw had already become established as a major playwright on the Continent by the performance of his plays there, but, curiously, his reputation lagged in England. We can say that, it was only with the production of *John Bull's Other Island* that Shaw's stage reputation was belatedly made in England.

Shaw continued, through high comedy, to explore religious consciousness and to point out society's complicity in its own evils. As a realist, George Bernard Shaw dislikes the romantic and sentimental Victorian content of late nineteenth century. He believed that the theatre should not give illusion side of the life but should give reality. In simple through his play, he always aims to give a moral lesson rather than pleasure. Similarly, he also aims to give a moral lesson from the preface of the play. So he frequently writes preface. In *Major Barbara's* preface, he gives the moral lesson or realistic part of life. i.e. poverty is crime. *Major Barbara* was written in London in early 1900s. It was produced in 1905 at Royal Court Theatre, London. Its tone is ironic as well like this drama *Arms and the Man* plus bombastic and ecstatic. In *Major Barbara* Shaw has his heroine, a major in the Salvation Army, discover that her estranged father, a munitions manufacturer, may be a dealer in death but that his principles and practice, however unorthodox, are religious in the highest sense, while those of the Salvation Army require the hypocrisies of often-false public confession and the donations of the distillers and the armourers against which it inveighs. In *The Doctor's Dilemma*, Shaw produced a satire upon the medical profession and upon both the artistic temperament and the public's inability to separate it from the artist's achievement. In *Androcles and the Lion*, Shaw dealt with true and false religious

exaltation in a philosophical play about early Christianity. Its central theme, examined through a group of early Christians condemned to the arena, is that one must have something worth dying for—an end outside oneself—in order to make life worth living.

Possibly Shaw's comedic masterpiece, and certainly his funniest and most popular play, is *Pygmalion*. It was claimed by Shaw to be a didactic drama about phonetics, and its antiheroic hero, Henry Higgins, is a phonetician, but the play is a humane comedy about love and the English class system. The play is about the training Higgins gives to a Cockney flower girl to enable her to pass as a lady and is also about the repercussions of the experiment's success. The drama shows a correct accent but no notion of polite conversation is one of the funniest in English drama. *Pygmalion* has been both filmed (1938), winning an Academy Award for Shaw for his screenplay, and adapted into an immensely popular musical, *My Fair Lady* (1956; motion-picture version, 1964).

In *Heartbreak House*, Shaw exposed, in a country-house setting on the eve of war, the spiritual bankruptcy of the generation responsible for the war's bloodshed. Attempting to keep from falling into “the bottomless pit of an utterly discouraging pessimism,” Shaw wrote five linked plays under the collective title *Back to Methuselah* (1922). They expound his philosophy of creative evolution in an extended dramatic parable. In the resulting masterpiece, *Saint Joan*, the Maid is treated not only as a Catholic saint and martyr but as a combination of practical mystic, heretical saint, and inspired genius. Joan, as the superior being “crushed between those mighty forces, the Church and the Law,” is the personification of the tragic heroine; her death embodies the paradox that humankind fears—and often kills—its saints and heroes and will go on doing so until the very higher moral qualities it fears become the

general condition of man through a process of evolutionary change. Acclaim for *Saint Joan* led to the awarding of the 1925 Nobel Prize for Literature to Shaw (he refused the award).

In his later plays Shaw intensified his explorations into tragicomic and nonrealistic symbolism. His milestone drama, *The Apple Cart* (performed 1929), a problem play dealing with the political problems of democracy. It is satire and a futuristic high comedy that emphasized Shaw's inner conflicts between his lifetime of radical politics and his essentially conservative mistrust of the common man's ability to govern him. It is a satire on democracy, on capitalism, on the government of England. The chief traditional sources of satire are wit and humour, irony and sarcasm, reproaches and moral sermons. *The Apple Cart* has a serious theme and a serious significance, and yet it has at the same time a conic consciousness, rich in wit and humour. If the play had been wholly serious and had dealt with the theme of democracy versus constitutional monarchy or the theme of plutocracy versus democracy and constitutional monarchy in a serious manner throughout, it would have become a tedious affair from the point of view of the audience in theatre.

The Apple Cart is a political extravaganza by the fact that the dramatist presents in the play events and political ideas which are supposed to take place in the future. *The Apple Cart* is a political play and it turns to the conflict between Proteus, the Prime Minister, representative of the people, and King Magnus standing for the right and privileges of the monarchy. In their single-minded defense of their respective interests, they become larger than life figures and acquire symbolic dimensions. Proteus symbolizes democratic right of the people and he stands for those rights with firmness and dedication, King Magnus defends the rights and privileges of the monarchs with equal devotion and determination, and in this conflict King

Magnus wins not because he is a monarch but because he is an abler and much better man.

In short, in the play Shaw established that uncontrolled democracy is monarchy but he stands for a system of checks and balances to correct the fault both of democracy and monarchy. Men like Magnus are the urgent need of the hour, because they are more able, shrewder and more cultured than the representatives of the people. A further dimension has been added to the play, by showing that both the elected representatives and monarch are in conflict with huge industrial concerns like Breakages, Limited whose power and influence must be curbed for the economic good of the nation.

Impudent, irreverent, and always a showman, Shaw used his buoyant wit to keep himself in the public eye to the end of his 94 years; his wiry figure, bristling beard, and dandyish cane were as well-known throughout the world as his plays. George Bernard Shaw was not merely the best comic dramatist of his time but also one of the most significant playwrights in the English language since the 17th century. Some of his greatest works for the stage—*Caesar and Cleopatra*, the “Don Juan in Hell” episode of *Man and Superman*, *Major Barbara*, *Heartbreak House*, and *Saint Joan*—have a high seriousness and prose beauty that were unmatched by his stage contemporaries. His development of a drama of moral passion and of intellectual conflict and debate, his revivifying the comedy of manners, his ventures into symbolic farce and into a theatre of disbelief helped shape the theatre of his time and after. A visionary and mystic whose philosophy of moral passion permeates his plays, Shaw was also the most trenchant pamphleteer since Swift; the most readable music critic in English; the best theatre critic of his generation; a prodigious lecturer and essayist on politics, economics, and sociological subjects; and one of the most prolific letter

writers in literature. By bringing a bold critical intelligence to his many other areas of interest, he helped mold the political, economic, and sociological thought of three generations.

One standard trait of comedic plays—often used by Shakespeare and also used by Shaw in *Arms and the Man*—is the use of an ending in which all the confusions of the play are resolved, and every romantic figure winds up with his or her ideal partner. The gimmicks in *Arms and the Man* of the lost coat and the incriminating inscription on the hidden photograph are also ploys that are typical of comedy. The gimmicks serve as catalysts to spark the humorous confusion, and work as objects around which the plot turns. In Shaw's hands, however, comedy is serious business disguised by farce. Always an innovator, Shaw introduced moral instruction into comedic plays, rather than taking the conventional route of writing essays or lectures to communicate his views.

Shaw does not simply dismiss Raina's idealism in favor of Bluntschli's pragmatism. He replaces her shallow ideals with more worthy ones. By the end of the play, Raina understands that a man like Bluntschli is more of a real hero than Sergius. The audience also discovers that Bluntschli's practical nature is not without romance because he has come back to see Raina rather than sending the coat back by courier. In fact, he admits to Sergius that he "climbed the balcony of this house when a man of sense would have dived into the nearest cellar." Together, Raina, Bluntschli, and Sergius attain a new realism that sees love and heroism as they really should be, according to Shaw. Thus Shaw does not reject romance and heroism, but rather brings his characters to an understanding of a higher definition of these values. That is, the course of the play has worked to maneuver the characters and the audience into a new position and thus redefine romance and heroism according to the light of realism.

II. The Politics of Irony

Irony is one of the major associates of humour. The origin of irony goes back to the Greek comedy. In Greek comedy some characters who are less intelligent, in pretension, would say one thing and meaning the opposite. According to professor Abrams irony is “A statement in which the meaning that is ostensible expressed” (135). There is no intension to deceive or cheat but to gain special artistic effort. There may be similarities between irony and satire, but all ironies are not satire. However, satires are often stable ironies. Irony, unlike, satire does not work in the interest of stability. The ironists do not pretend to cure such as a universal or to solve its mysteries. It is satires that solves.

Irony is a remark which means the opposite of what it says. Dramatic irony is a remark whose significance is perceived by the audience but not by the actors on the stage. Irony can be classified under these headings (i) verbal irony, (ii) structural irony, (iii) dramatic irony, (iv) cosmic irony, (v) romantic irony.

Oxford Advance Learner Dictionary defines that “irony is the amusing or strange aspect of a situation that is very different from what you expect”. In drama and literature a statement or action whose apparent meaning is underlain by a contrary meaning is irony. In addition to verbal or rhetorical irony, there is also structural irony, metimes called “irony of situation.” Structural irony typically takes the form of a discrepancy between appearance and reality, or between what a character expects and what actually happens. Both verbal and structural irony shares the suggestion of a concealed truth conflicting with surface appearances.

Conscious ironies are recognized by the characters in a story or play. For example, in English dramatist William Shakespeare’s play *Julius Caesar*, Mark Antony bitterly describes the men who have murdered Caesar as “honorable.” In

unconscious irony, words or actions are understood as ironic by the audience or reader, though not by the characters. In Shakespeare's tragic play *Othello*, the title character repeatedly describes treacherous Iago as "honest." Misled by Iago's lies, Othello becomes convinced that his innocent wife is dishonest. Othello recognizes Iago's deceptions only at the tragic conclusion of the play.

When irony is used structurally in a novel or a play, it is sometimes called 'tragic' or 'dramatic' irony. In *Oedipus Rex*, by Greek dramatist Sophocles, Oedipus attempts to find the murderer of Laius, king of Thebes, unaware that he himself is the culprit. The audience, which knows the truth, perceives the dimension of his tragedy early in the play and anticipates consequences that Oedipus does not expect. His statements become unconsciously ironic—when, for example, he prays that the murderer's life 'is consumed in evil and wretchedness.'

Language device, either in spoken or written form in which the real meaning is concealed or contradicted by the literal meanings of the words (verbal irony) or in a situation in which there is an incongruity between what is expected and what occurs. Verbal irony arises from a sophisticated or resigned awareness of contrast between what is and what ought to be and expresses a controlled pathos without sentimentality. It is a form of indirection that avoids overt praise or censure, as in the casual irony of the statement "That was a smart thing to do!" (meaning "very foolish").

Dramatic irony depends on the structure of a work rather than its use of words. In plays it is often created by the audience's awareness of a fate in store for the characters that they themselves are unaware of the situation. The Socratic irony of the Platonic dialogues derives from this comic origin. Feigning ignorance and humility, Socrates goes about asking silly and obvious questions of all sorts of people on all sorts of subjects, only to expose their ignorance as more profound than his own. The

nonliterary use of irony is usually considered sarcasm.

Irony, as a pervasive discursive strategy, is supposed to be concerned with discursive analysis—the politics—of representation in the practice of Cultural Studies. Discursive analysis, which examines how the knowledge that a particular discourse produces connects with power, intertwines irony with wider historical and socio—cultural contexts. These social dimensions of irony make its politics inevitable as its discursive presence is not only a matter of an intended message encoded in the text but also it is mostly produced by interpreters in a dynamic interplay of the said meaning with the unsaid one. To put it more explicitly, irony happens because discursive communities exist. Its discursive presence that comes about in interpretation—whether arising from the ironist’s intention or from the space between the said and the unsaid—carries such a serrated edge that the politics of irony becomes unequivocally apparent. The politics of irony, therefore is its discursive presence in the socio-historical and socio-economic aspects of its contexts of use and interpretation.

The use and the interpretation of irony always takes place in certain discursive community. The discursive community encompasses “those strangely enabling constraints of discursive context and foregrounds the particularities” not only of space and time “but of class, race, gender, ethnicity, sexual choice—not to mention nationality, religion, age, profession, and all the other micro-political groupings” in which we place ourselves or are placed by our society (Hutcheon 92). The overlapping of discursive communities in general by the complex configuration of “shared knowledge, beliefs, values, and communicative strategies” is the condition that makes the politics of irony possible to happen (91). This means that the politics of irony does not happen, as Pratt states, in “amiable communities” but itself comes into

being in “contact zones” of the “social spaces where different ideologies and cultures meet, dash, grapple with each other often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power” (qtd. in Hutcheon 93). In ironic discourse, the political meaning in the whole communicative process is not only altered and distorted but also made possible by different micropolitical power relations to which each of us differently belongs and form the basis of the expectations, assumptions, and preconceptions that we bring to the complex processing of discourse: of language in use. Irony, therefore, rarely “involves a simple decoding of a single inverted message; it is more often a semantically complex process of relating, differentiating, and combining said and unsaid meaning—and doing so with some evaluating edge” (89). Irony, as a culturally shaped process, involves forms of social practice, of interaction between participants in particular situation. The politics of irony cannot be:

Understood apart from its embodiment in context and...[it] has trouble in escaping from the power relations evoked by its evaluative edge. The paradoxically enabling constraints that are operative in all discourse obviously function here as well, but it is not only a question of who may use irony (and where, and, how) but who may interpret it. Whether viewed as an isolated or as the articulation of the human situation, irony involves the particularities of time and space, of immediate social situation and of general culture. (90-91)

The hypothesis of the concept of irony’s political functioning in socio-cultural contexts comes from Mikhail Bakhtin’s “notion of double voiced discourse” that is the forms for transmitting speech cannot be treated in isolation from the means of its contextualized “dialogizing”—the one is indissolubly linked with the other (B. Pandey, *Intellectual* 387). From the viewpoint of Bakhtinian dialogizing, it is irony in

use, in discourse, which gets precedence over irony as a textual strategy. In other words, it is “irony’s political functioning in contexts—in the sense of the more specific circumstantial, textual and intertextual environment of the text in question,” somewhat “broader than the pragmatic notion of contextual background—that generate overtones which facilitate an intercourse that enables the unsaid to enter into ironic” political “relation with the said” (387-88). This political relationship of the said and the unsaid with cultural ramifications becomes further clear if the Bakhtinian notion of double-voiced discourse is extended further with respect to the concept of “double consciousness” by W. E. B. Du Bois (Davis 42). Du Bois though does not connect the double consciousness to irony explicitly, his “knowledge of two cultures (white Americans and African American) give[s] African American a keen sensitivity to ironic meanings to the dissonance created” when “two cultural ideals rub against one another” (Davis 46). Such an irony sensibility becomes political when, as Du Bois claims, it leads the back to the sad reality of “always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others” (qtd. in Davis 46). The “ability to see is a quality that many people in majority cultures lack; they cannot get enough distance from themselves to turn the irony inward, that is to laugh at their own whiteness” (46). In this sense, it is the context that an existing community creates that sets such a scene for the very use and comprehension of the politics of irony. As in the words of Hutcheon, the “cutting edge” of irony “is always social and political” that “get[s] heated” at the “evaluating edge” of irony provoking responses from those who get it and in those who become victim of it (2). Irony is a political issue that involves “relations of power based in relations of communication with issues such as exclusion and inclusion, intervention and evasion, thereby making the functioning of irony inevitably political. Our nationality, male or female, working class or not, all these

factors condition the interpretation of the specific function of ironic meaning.

The function of ironic meaning gets its political edge even out of the ironist's intentional and the interpreter's interpretive move with a certain attitude towards both the said and the unsaid meaning of irony in certain discursive situation. In other words irony is a complex intentional act on the part of the both the interpreter and the ironist—one that has both semantic and evaluative dimensions between intentions and interpretations, which are directed by explicitly expressed" (11). The interpretation of irony, as Christine Kerbrat-Orecchioni says, "bring into play, besides their linguistic competence, the cultural and ideological competences of ironist and audience" (qtd. in Muecke 40-41). Reading or interpreting irony is at once reading or interpreting life itself where we read character and value, thereby referring to our deepest convictions. It is because of its very nature of foregrounding the politics of human agency in this that irony has become an important discursive strategy. Its discursiveness comes from the interpreter and the ironist as the agents who perform the act or attributing both meanings and motives, and do so in particular situation and context for a particular purpose, and with particular means. Such as attributing irony involve both semantic and evaluative inferences. Similarly, "the semantic dimension of irony" is influenced by the receiver and by "the surrounding tension-filled environments" (Hutcheon 12). This study, therefore, argues that politics of irony happens because of such a discursive communicative process in which irony "itself comes into being in the relations between meanings, between intentions and interpretations" (13). Irony explicitly sets up a relationship between ironist and audience that is political in nature as irony invokes of hierarchy and subordination, judgment and perhaps even moral superiority. Its "semantic and syntactic dimensions cannot be considered separately from the social, historical and cultural aspects of its contexts of deployment and

attribution” (16-17). In such a context, the interpreters’ interpretation is not simply a matter of the “subjective attitude of either interpreter or ironist, but [is] a function of the culture, language, and social context [where] both participants interact with each other and with the text itself” (91). In this light, the political meaning of irony is not only substitution of the both the ironist and the audience but is a matter of interpretation as much as of its use that as Huchon argues, happens,

In the space between the said and unsaid; it needs both to happen.

Ironic meaning is inclusive and relational: the said and the unsaid context in the interpreter, and each has meaning in relation to the other because they literally interact to create the real irony meaning, and the unsaid is not always a simple inversion or opposite of the said. [it] is the complex inclusive, relational and differential nature of ironic meaning making. [so] it is [impossible] to treat the semantics of irony separately from its conditions of use and reception. (13)

Thus the context of the construction of irony is always crucial to interpreting its meaning and politics. This point further clarifies that the politics of “irony is a relational strategy in the sense that it operates not only between” said and unsaid meaning, but also between people: ironist, interpreters, and targets” (58).

Irony, being relational discursive strategy, has its transideological political functions. The transideological nature of its “political means that irony can be used either to undercut or to reinforce both conservative and radical positions” (27). To put it more explicitly, irony can be provocative when its politics is conservative or Authoritarian as easily as when its politics is oppositional or subversive. It depends on who is using and attributing it and at whose expense it is seen to be. The politics of irony, in this sense, at once forces a distinction between irony that “might function

constructively to articulate new oppositional position[s],” and “irony that would work in a more negative and negativizing way” where the ironist would stand outside of system in a position of power (16-17).

The use of irony from the position of power, especially by the dominant authority, generates irony’s conservative politics function. Such as elitist use makes the irony as a weapon for “negating,” thereby becoming “largely destructive” (27). In this context, the notion of irony as a negation appears to be held by almost everyone who has been on the receiving end of an ironic attack or by those for whom the serious or the solemn and the univocal are the ideal. Obviously, the last group includes not only the humorless but those elites whose political commitments lead them to desire for didactic purposes and an unambiguous discourse of engagement. The totalitarian regime uses or attributes irony in order to materialize dangers in the protective cover of repressive irony. The conservative function of irony, therefore, is controlled by the, as Bakhtin says, “one-sidedly serious dogmatic and authoritarian cultures” (qtd. in Hutcheon 27). It is the repressive cultures’ affirmative and the destructive political functions of irony to force the marginal be complicit with the system. In the “affirming and negating” use, irony functions, in Culler’s words, as the “ultimate form of recuperation and naturalization”: “We reduce the strange or incongruous, or even attitudes with which we disagree, by calling them ironic and making them confirms rather than abuse our expectations” (qtd. in Hutcheon 28).

Another radical transideological political function of irony is to use it in a positive and constructively progressive way wherein it is used as a powerful tool or even as a weapon in the fight against a dominant authority by demystifying or subverting the repression. Oppositional theorist like feminists, postcolonialists, and other marginal use this function of irony where, as Culler reminds, “the forces of

oppression are subverted by the boundless power of irony that no prison can contain” (qtd. in Hutcheon 28). In such a use, irony is not taken, as Belsey reminds, as “authoritative because its meaning are implicit than explicit” (qtd. in Hutcheon 29). The recourse to irony’s multi-vocal instability is exploited by the oppositional theories at the expense of necessarily univocal social commitments in which irony not only works to point to the complexities of historical and social reality but also has the power to change that reality. So, the subversive function is the “mode of the unsaid, thee unheard, the unseen relishing them power in its verbal and structural form” (4). Irony, in this light, is a discursive strategy operating at the at the level of language, which has intrinsically subversive, self-questioning, and internally dialogized mode that can and does function tactically in the service of wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide variety of interests as Hutcheon reminds us:

Irony is often connected to the view that it is a self-critical, self-knowing, self-reflexive mode that has the power to challenge to the hierarchy of the every ‘sites’ of discourse, a hierarchy based in social relation of dominance and overturn, is said to have ‘politically transformative power.’ (30)

Such a subversive political function of irony has established ironic discourse as, in Terdiman’s words, a “counter discourse” (qtd. in Hutcheon 184). In this view, irony’s intimacy with the dominant discourse it contests is its strength to relativize the authority and stability in part by appropriating is power. This intimacy is what marks irony potentially an effective strategy of oppositionality since that ironized discourse can point to difference to avoid both imperial and simply oppositional single voicing. The ironized language can allow “alternative of being” through the “alternative of saying” (31). In such altenities, the marginalized can be heard by the center, and yet to

keep their critical distance and thus unbalance and undermine the authority. This function of irony, therefore, is “radical and democratizing” as it gives a room for alternative reactions (38). Irony involves social interactions as an inquiring mode to avoid the single and dogmatic. It becomes as Bakhtin says, “a special kind of substitute for silence” where in the irony’s working as self-protective suggests that irony can be interpreted as a kind of defense mechanism (qtd. in Hutcheon 35). Thus, the irony’s politics is not only relational but also counter discursive:

This is function of irony that doesn’t reject or refute or turn upside-down: no evasiveness or lack of courage on conviction, but an admission that there are times when we cannot be sure, not so much because we don’t know enough as because uncertainly is intrinsic of the essence. When such provisional position is seen as valuable, it is often called demystifying. For some, this provisionality actually becomes the essence of ‘true’ art, over which irony rules as a kind of divine protector. [Such a] function of irony has specifically been called “counter discursive’ in its ability to contest dominant habits of mind and expression. (51-52)

The counter discursive function of irony, which rests on irony’s denial over certainties by unmasking the world as an ambiguous and instable, is frequently exploited in oppositional theories. Such a function of irony lies in the realization of the power that lies in its potential to destabilize with critical ends and ideological contradictions so that not to let marginal resolve into the coherent and potentially oppressive dogma. It is the irony’s politics that gives, in Fisher’s words, a “survival skill, a tool for knowledge acknowledging complexity, a means of exposing or subverting oppressive hegemonic ideologies, and an art for affirming life in the face

of objective troubles” (qtd. in Hutcheon 26). Irony becomes a political method when it deconstructs and decenters the dominant discourses on the premise that the single vision produces worse illusions than the double vision. While irony has often been used as a weapon of dominant cultures to keep the subservient in their place, it has been reversed as something that springs from recognition of the socially constructed self as arbitrary, and that demands revision of values and conventions. This is the irony, for an instance, that feminism theorists and other marginal see as working to deprive, in the words of J. Butler, hegemonic culture and its critics of the claim to naturalized or essentialist gender identities” (qtd. in Hutcheon 32). They are said to be able to use irony as a particularly potent means of critique of or resistance to patriarchal social restrictions or even essentialist claims to truth. Irony, therefore, is seen both empowering and embleasuring. And it is often the transideological nature of irony itself that is exploited in order to recode into positive terms what the patriarchal discourse reads as a negative, in which silencing of women’s voice is transformed into the willed silence of the irony and traditional feminine manner. In this sense, irony becomes:

One sign of a loosening of a bonds that bind us to the single and the singular track, to a paranoid obsession with certitude and fixed and single destinations.’ Irony can be this kind of general reflexive mode, one that has the potential to reflect and model the recognition that all conceptualizations are limited, that what is socially maintained as truth is often politically motivated. (Hutcheon 33)

The transideological identity of “protean polymorphism.” In the Tittler’s words, is exploited as the rhetorical figure of the dialogic whose function is to project an alternative through which any element of the hear-and-now may be shown as

contingent, thereby subjecting the whole configuration of the power relationship to the erosive dialectical power of alterity (qtd. in Hutcheon 33).

The dialectical power of alterity arises from the said and the unsaid. The unsaid is related to the repressed, marginalized and colonized; it is not just unsaid, but unsayable within the hegemonic homogenous discourse. But irony is a matter of unspoken understandings, which can obviously cut across professional lines. So, just as the uncanny is never “surmounted,” the repressed is similarly related to the said in dialectic uncanny fashion; it can be seen as at once constitution and disruptive of any discursive structure of controlling intention. Morrison describes the kind of history or art with an eye to the uncanny as possessing a constant presence of haunting. The unsaid does get said in a hidden way—as the negative residues of a repressed history. Discursive irony, therefore, can also be linked with the question of writing alternative histories and unearthing repressed memory.

Thus, D. C. Muecke reminds, the politics of irony is like a gyroscope [with] corrective function ... that keeps life on an even keel or straight course,” restoring the balance when life is being taken too seriously “stabilizing the unstable” but also destabilizing “the excessive stable” where the irony observer’s awareness of himself or herself as an observer tends to enhance his/her feeling of freedom and induce a mood of satisfaction (4). The irony, as Conway and Seery state, “becomes ‘political’ ... when [it is] performed in the service of ‘life’ (2). Irony, in this way, functions as a guide and disciplinarian. There is much in every personal life, which like wild shoots must be pruned away, and irony is an excellent surgeon. Indeed, irony intensifies or reduces all socio-political ills. In so far as violence is concerned, irony deflects it by foregrounding it—a topic which the thesis addresses Bulgarian war in the ensuing section.

III. Satiric Notion in *Arms and the Man*

In a war between Bulgaria and Serbia, the Serbian soldiers are fleeing. A Serbian soldier surprises Raina Petkoff, the heroine, by entering into the bedroom for shelter. The Serbian officer is a Swiss mercenary soldier fighting on the Serbian side. His name is Captain Bluntschli. He is saved by Raina Petkoff with whom Bluntschli describes quite ironically about Sergius comparing him with Don Quixote without knowing him as Raina's lover. Raina becomes very much happy and glad to find her lover Sergius as the hero in the war but ironically choose the escaped fugitive at last. Hence, the play is full of irony. Her romantic notion about soldiers receives a shock when he tells her that he is afraid and unwilling to die. However, when the pursuers enter the house, she manages to hide Bluntschli successfully. Only Louka, the maidservant notices the pistol and knows that the fugitive is hiding in the room.

Four months later after the war. Major Petkoff and Sergius get a warm welcome from Mrs. Petkoff and Raina. The two men talk about a young Swiss soldier officer who had impressed them with his practical approach to the exchange of soldiers. Louka and Nicola discuss Raina's encounter with the Swiss soldier and Nicola advises her not to talk about it. Sergius is attracted to Louka and flirts with her when they are alone. The man has also heard stories about the Swiss soldier's escape and how a young girl had given him shelter. They do not know that the incident had taken place in Major Petkoff's own house. While the two men retire to the library, Captain Bluntschli arrives to return the coat that Catherine and Raina had lent him. The two women want him to go away and pretend not to know him when Major Petkoff and Sergius greet him warmly. The men persuade him to stay back for lunch.

After lunch, Bluntschli helps Major Petkoff and Sergius to make arrangements for the transport of troops. Major Petkoff asks for his coat and Raina is apprehensive

that he may discover the photograph, which she had put in the pocket for her '*Chocolate Cream Soldier*' and challenges Bluntschli to a duel which Raina interrupts and expresses her real feelings for Bluntschli. Louka succeeds in securing Sergius for herself and Major Petkoff and his wife give their consent to Bluntschli to marry Raina.

Shaw develops an ironical contrast between the two central characters. The play begins with an account of the glorious exploits of Major Sergius Saranoff, a and some young Bulgarian officer, in a daring cavalry raid, which turns the war in favour of the Bulgarians over the Serbs. In contrast, Captain Bluntschli, a professional soldier from Switzerland, acts like a coward. He climbs up to the balcony to escape capture, he threatens a woman with a gun, and he carries chocolates rather than cartridges because he claims that sweets are more useful on the battlefield.

In Raina Petkoff's eyes, the young romantic idealist who has bought into the stories of battlefield heroism, Saranoff is her ideal hero. However, as the play proceeds, we learn more about this raid and that despite its success; it was a suicidal gesture that should have failed. Eventually Saranoff is going to end up dead if he continues to engage in such ridiculous heroics. Meanwhile, we realize that Bluntschli has no misconceptions about the stupidity of war and that his actions have kept him alive.

Raina is one of Shaw's finest creations. There must have been a conflict between Shaw the artist and Shaw the moralist in the conception of such a powerful and fascinating character. But his greatness lies in the fact that he succeeds in presenting his philosophy behind the artistic facade. Unlike Bluntschli who is not presented with those sparks of a conventional hero, Raina is invested with all the charms and qualities of any heroine of a conventional comedy.

In the very beginning of the drama Raina is presented just as any other heroine from the romantic tradition. The dramatist describes her at length in the stage direction: On the balcony a young lady, intensively conscious of the romantic beauty of the night, and of the fact that her own youth and beauty are part of it, is gazing at the snowy Balkans.

The romantic ambience is suddenly enhanced with her mother's breaking of the news that a great battle at Slivnitsa has been won by none other than Sergius, to whom she is betrothed. The audience can understand that this is the same man in the large photograph. After the momentary expressions of feminine joys are over, Raina confesses that she not only "doubted him", but also the romantic view of 'patriotism' and the "heroic ideals". Now that she has found that she was a "prosaic little coward", she comes to the conclusion that "the world is really a glorious world for women who can think see its glory and men who can act its romance". After her mother and Louka have gone, she indulges herself in adoring the hero and enjoying the "blessed reality".

But very soon the climax of joy is interrupted by a fugitive who enters her chamber contrary to her wish "...if there are no fugitives.", which turns out to be a dramatic irony. Raina here may be said to be acting wisely by following the instructions of the fugitive at the point of his revolver; but since she has remained too much preoccupied with her romantic fantasies, she throws those ideas on the face of the man who, to her utter displeasure, is found to be voicing contrary views. Perhaps because of this fact, she gets interested in his views. One is reminded here of the Renaissance theory of magic that opposite poles attract each other. But along with this, Raina may also be said to be taking the opportunity to celebrate the supposed victory of her romantic ideas, feudal aristocratic values and Bulgerian fashions. She decides to save the fugitive partly under the influence of the heroic act of saving the

life of a fugitive in Ernani's opera. The audience can well understand her foolishness in placing herself and her family in the position of the nobles in Ernani's opera and enjoy the display with a smile.

In fact, Shaw dedicates Act I to shattering the feudal, nationalist and imperialist glorification of war. The first notion about bravery, shared by Raina and the audience as well, is mocked at by Bluntschli who tells her plainly that the ideal collapses under the constant threat of losing one's life and that it is prudent to save one's life by following the demands of instincts rather than heroic ideals. Under the strong emotion of patriotism and more importantly under the desire of taking a sweet revenge on him for blackmailing her, when Raina tries to categorize and differentiate the Bulgarian people from the enemy people, she gets to know the real story of Sergius's utter foolishness in leading a cavalry charge. At this she gets "deeply wounded" and tries to neutralize the situation (or examine the truth about Sergius particularly) by showing off the portrait of Sergius. But as Bluntschli apologizes and at the same time "stifles a laugh", she gets offended to the point of showing him the way out down the water-pipe. The mellow and tender aspects of her character are emphasized at the next moment when she takes pity on the worn-out soldier who surrenders his life.

Shaw takes this even further by pointing out the mother in her as she decisively reassures and proceeds to save Bluntschli. Here it must be noted that Raina saves him not just out of her romantic fancy created by Ernani's opera, and that nor all the romantic higher sentiments are mocked at by Shaw. What Shaw attacks are the pretensions, foolishness and class-consciousness associated with romantic behaviour of people.

In Act II, Raina, already transformed, tries to behave in usual accustomed

manner with Sergius, whom she finds somewhat changed partly by his experience in the front and partly by Bluntschli himself. As she tries to maintain the usual air, she gets internally upset by the story of an enemy soldier's escape with the help of two Bulgarian ladies. She perceives somehow that just like herself Sergius is also pretending to be in higher love. Her words betray conscious irony of their relationship: "When I think of you, I feel that I would never do a base deed, or think an ignoble thought" (50).

Again, since she has begun to suspect Sergius's person, after a few moments she looks down while going inside the house only to find his "higher love" to be offered to Louka so easily. As the entire project of fantasies gets crashed, she begins to express discontent and tensions. This is evident in her comment upon their relationship to her mother: "I always feel a longing to do or say something dreadful to him—to shock his propriety—to scandalise the five sense out of him" (59). She even wishes that Sergius find the truth about the "chocolate cream soldier". The wish-fulfilment occurs soon with Bluntschli's abrupt entrance. She welcomes him with a mischievous exclamation. Catherine, conscious of the sudden changes in her daughter, tries to manage the situation, but Raina waits for her turn to meet the captain.

In Act III Raina finds the opportunity to win Bluntschli. Far from being conscious of her real intention he tries to play down her questions in usual smart manner of a pragmatic man. After a while he is forced to admit his being infatuated admirer. Here Raina may be said to be stooping to conquer the man she eyes for her and for this she comes out of the image of a conventional woman. The original audience, who had still been to some extent under the Victorian notion of woman's modesty, could find an image of a different kind of woman in Raina, who goes on

saying one thing while thinking something else. For instance, she speaks of being quite perfect with Sergius, no meanness, no smallness, no deceit even after she spotted Sergius flirting with Louka and found the truth about the one really beautiful and noble part of her life. She does this intentionally to see whether Bluntschli can discover the person inside her. As soon as he does so, she leads him to acknowledge: "I'm your infatuated admirer" (80). Now, with her object fixed she goes to settle the score with Sergius who acts like a fool under pressure from two women.

In fine, we it can be said that Shaw presents the birth of the new woman in Raina who progresses from false ideas and ethos of the romantic tradition to a new realization her place in society in equal terms with men being fully conscious of her dignity. That is why she refuses to offer her hand to the "highest bidder" and claims Bluntschli as the "chocolate cream soldier". Finally, we can say that ultimately her romanticism wins over material and social concerns of her mother, but that part of her romanticism is not false in that it is humane and real.

George Bernard Shaw conceived of Bluntschli almost as a Hegelian character, in the sense that through him he has presented an antithesis of the conventional morality, romantic ideas of love and war and feudal notions of the place of the individual in society. Shaw does all this, however, under a dramatic scheme. The very name 'Bluntschli itself is perhaps deliberately chosen to cover up the potentialities of the man, with which he threatens the fragile facade of the complacent society. Through his character, however, Shaw attacks not only the ethos, romantic ideas and feudal concepts, he also inverts the tradition of the nature and role of the hero in comedy. But it should not be thought that Shaw presented Bluntschli with the sole object of satirizing, which is a destructive art; in fact, he presents his unheroic hero from a system of thought that seeks a better society, where the individual's status will

not been determined and fixed by class and gender, but by what s/he is capable of contributing to the making of a higher forms of individuals and society. In this respect it can be said that, though Shaw did not present a theoretical exposition of the theory, the idea is anticipated in the creation of the character of Bluntschli.

The audiences meet Bluntschli in the very opening of the drama in an unusual state for a hero. Quite contrary to the fantasies of a young girl, a fugitive enters the chamber in a very sorry state in the form of Bluntschli. The dramatist describes him as he appears to Raina and the audience:

...he is of middling stature and undistinguished appearance, with strong neck and shoulders, roundish obstinate looking head covered with short crisp bronze curls, clear quick eyes and good brows and mouth, hopelessly prosaic nose like that of a strong minded baby. (9-10)

What is striking about the man is the quick sense of the situation by which he blackmails the girl with repeated warning: "Do you understand that?" (10) but what is more striking is his honesty about his predicament: "I don't intend to get killed if I can help" (10). The confession, however, does not appeal to Raina, who owing to her Romantic, predisposition about war, and reacts with disdain: "Some soldiers, I know, are afraid to die". To this, quite contrary to her expectation, Bluntschli returns a plain statement which, though does not lessen her disdain, does create curiosity about the truths about a soldier and war: "All of them, dear lady, all of them, believe me" (10). He almost demonstrates the truth by resorting to using the young girl's cloak as a better weapon than the revolver. Raina is, on the one hand, deeply hurt by the 'unchivalrous' cynicism, and on the other, is forced to believe and take pity on the man who surrenders everything to her at the sounds of impending death. As she arranges for hiding him and saving his life, Bluntschli utters a warning as well as

lesson, which summarizes his situation: “Remember—nine soldiers out of ten are born fools” (13).

After Raina befools the soldiers and saves his life, Bluntschli appears seemingly a greater fool with his display of fear “like a frightened horse” and with the revelation that the revolver was empty. Raina gets “outraged” as the dramatist says, “in her most cherished ideals of manhood” when Bluntschli declares: “What use are cartridges in battle? I always carry chocolate instead; and I finished the last cake of that hours ago” (18). This leads to the famous (or infamous) chocolate cream episode, and with this begins Bluntschli’s gradual transformation from a mercenary into “chocolate cream soldier”. But the transformation—which may be called a metamorphosis, does not happen solely to Bluntschli; in fact, as a result of the action of the play, Raina changes and the fugitive causes her transformation with his new ideas and true reports of the battlefield and contradicting her ideas. For instance, when, irritated at un-heroic behaviour, she expresses her false confidence, “Our soldiers are not like that”, Bluntschli replies with authority: “Oh yes they are. There are only two sorts of soldiers: old ones and young ones. I’ve served fourteen years: half of your fellows never smelt powder before” (19).

In the course of talking when it comes to the cavalry charge launched by Sergius, Bluntschli exposes the glory in an authentic Shavian manner: “Well, it is a funny sight. It’s like slinging a handful of peas against a window pane: first one comes; then two or three close behind him; and then all the rest in a lump” (20). Bluntschli, however, in the enthusiasm of justifying his retreat also exposes the accidental heroism of Sergius, whom he describes as a “regular handsome fellow, with flashing eyes and lovely moustache, shouting his war-cry and charging like Don Quixote at the windmills” (21). His words produce tremendous effect on Raina, who,

in an attempt to neutralise her position shows him off Sergius' picture. Here it can be said that Bluntschli forces Raina to examine Sergius and their relationship in new light of realism.

While Bluntschli's display of his fatigue, inability and ignorance provide entertainment to the audience, it also underscores the sufferings, fatigue and tortures a soldier has to undergo in real situation. Quite contrary to the feudal glorification of a soldier's job as an orderly one of service of higher kind, Bluntschli lets himself into a loose delirium created by fatigue and accelerated by suddenly found refuge: "I'm to go to bed, but not to sleep. Be sure not to sleep, because of danger. Not to lie down either, only sit down" (31).

On the other hand, he chooses the best option to avoid getting killed through completely surrendering to the woman, in whom he has found instinctively a saviour. In Act II Bluntschli enters the stage in the middle of the action and once again his entrance creates a lot of confusion as he comes himself to return Major Petcoff's coat. The way Major Petkoff and Sergius receive him at the last moment of his being turned away from the house, makes it amply clear that Bluntschli is well known for his abilities as a captain among the higher ranks of the conflicting armies. Even before his arrival, we hear from Major Petcoff and Sergius how a Swish managed them to accept his terms. Here we find both Major Petcoff and Sergius somewhat changed in their attitude to war and Bluntschli as a captain caused this subtle change.

At the beginning of the Act III Raina begins in almost flirting tone, he keeps his cool even in such provocative words as: "You look ever so much nicer than when we last met...What you have done to yourself?" (76). The sweet start, however, gives way to serious exchange of words. Here Bluntschli seems to have chosen to appeal to Raina by contradicting and doubting her words. In fact, he takes her words lightly, but

questioned seriously he is forced to declare the following words which completely unsettle Raina from her Romantic disposition: “When you strike that noble attitude and soeak in that thrilling voice, I admire you; but I find it impossible to believe a single word you say” (79). But as soon as he finds Raina emotionally breaking down at her inner person being discovered, he balances the emotional sway in her favour (at the same time in his favour) by announcing the naturalist truth Shaw reiterates in other plays: “I’m like all the rest of them, the nurse, your parents, Sergius: I’m your infatuated admirer” (80).

In other words, Raina, like other Shavian heroines, has got the charm and ability to attract and involve men in the making of Superman. However, for the first time the audience perceive the extent to which Bluntschli has impressed Raina when in the middle of the conversation he suddenly informs her of his father’s death and decides to start for Switzerland.

After Bluntschli returns to the stage Bluntschli faces Sergius who challenges him for a duel as the former feels that he has been cheated by the Switzer. The way he accepts the challenge and answers the charges brought against him disheartens Sergius, who, on the other hand, is charged by Raina of making love to Louka in her back. Bluntschli sympathetically refuses to judge Louka, who, according to him, has acted in accordance with the reality of the situation she was in. Then as Raina’s photograph with the inscription leads to Bluntschli’s being discovered as “Chocolate Cream Soldier”, he tries to clear the doubts by stating what happened actually at the night of his escape from the front. But quite unexpectedly he falls into the trap of Raina’s arguments and he is led to declare that he is not married and, therefore, should consider marrying her. At this point once again Bluntschli shows his principle of judging people on their capacity to perform practical works in real situation, not on

what they do by adhering to foolish ideals, while he defends Nicola.

As Louka successfully traps down and hooks up Sergius, she tries to justify herself mischievously by pointing out, quite correctly, Raina's targeting of Bluntschli. Bluntschli goes on to refute the charges against him and Raina, he does the greatest by taking her for a girl of seventeen. Here Bluntschli's character undergoes a transformation as he comes in contact with Raina. Here it should be remembered that the transformation is preconceived by the dramatist so that he may present him as an agent for destroying the conventional romantic ideas about love and war and feudal concepts of man's place in society. It must be ironically enough, towards the end of the play he is forced to acknowledge Bluntschli's case there the romantic tendencies are innate and, therefore, necessary in the process of Creative Evolution, in the cases of Raina and Sergius those are partly self-imposed and partly imposed by their education. In other words, Bluntschli opposes the principles of romanticism with his creative brand of romanticism. And he does so with what a difference.

In Sergius the Romantic tradition of hero is inverted to the extent of making him play almost the part of a fool. As usual with other characters Shaw had a definite philosophical and artistic plan behind the creation of his character. That is to say, through the presentation of this character Shaw has attacked the outdated and false feudal ideals which are no longer relevant and realisable in the modern society which is urgently in need of those ideas and principles which the dramatist has undertaken to advocate. Unlike other principal characters he does not undergo any transformation save degradation from his position, which Shaw deliberately chose to illustrate in order to show his socialist principles in favour of a classless society. The audience, however, cannot be sure of the creative and sustaining capacity of the woman who literally traps him, not out of any creative motive but for material possessions and

social position.

Sergius is presented in the beginning of the play in perfect imitation of the theme of appearance and reality in conventional drama. As the curtain opens Shaw presents him in a photograph as “an extremely handsome officer, whose lofty bearing and magnetic glance can be felt even from the portrait” (2). The person in the photograph is highlighted to the point of being adored with Catherine’s breaking the news of his great victory in the battle of Slivnitsa and with Raina’s ecstasy about the man of the moment.

The adoration soon gets transformed into comic disgrace of impractical foolery which Shaw perhaps had in mind while conceiving of his character. As Bluntschli exposes his foolishness, the photograph turns into a comic curiosity of the audience and their focus is now shifted on to the fugitive. Sergius’ foolishness is further emphasized in Major Petcoff’s sarcasm, from whom the audience do not expect much insight: “Yes so that he could throw away whole brigade instead of regiments” (41). With the actual entrance of Sergius on the stage Shaw devotes a long passage of explanation for the understanding of his personality. What we gather about him is that he is a split personality, not purely in the psychological sense, but in the cultural sense. Shaw points to multiple contradictory features which are detached from common sense and practical intelligence and aligned with false ideas. In other words, he is given to lost ideals, which arose out of the feudal structure of the society and imperialist motive of the whole western civilization supported by the glittering ideas of Enlightenment.

When it comes to dealing with practical affairs of warfare, he fails miserably. But instead of confessing his worthlessness, he hypocritically tries to justify it by saying, “This hand is more accustomed to the sword than to the pen” (71). This

proves nothing other than catering amusement to the audience. This form of hypocrisy is further detected in his charge of deception against Raina while himself being fully conscious of his own digression in flirting with Louka behind her back. His false confidence, based on the supposedly unquestionable aristocratic power and position and on being a male member of that society, receives a terrible blow when Bluntschli accepts his challenge for a duel coolly without a question. He understands a change in Raina's mind but cannot anticipate that he can be equally charged by the new woman empowered with a voice: "Do you know that I looked out of the window as I went upstairs, to have a sight of my hero; and I saw something I did not understand then" (97). As he finds out that all his pretensions of heroic and romantic ideas are gone, he holds on to cynicism and declares: "Life's a farce" (97). But his pride still remains and he acts in accordance with the false sense of honour while apologising to Louka, the maidservant in chivalric fashion. This ironically leads him to fall into the trap laid by the strong-willed woman who readily captures him.

It can be said that his acceptance of Louka as his wife is truly heroic in the sense that he comes out of his fanciful self and acts out of reality principle. But the audience cannot be sure of higher order out of their union. They leave him at the mercy and good and strong will of the woman he marries. What a pity.

Shaw conceived of Louka as a strong willed woman, necessary for his dramatic purpose of exposing the vanity of the upper-class and the political purpose of showing the socialist principle of showing equality among individuals in a society. It must be said that it was a daring attempt on Shaw's part to lead and raise a maidservant to the status of an aristocratic lady. But he does not do this as a kind of poetic justice or as a matter of mercy; he makes her capable of realizing her aims and object by her worth as a human being and by her strong will power. And it is often the

trans-ideological nature of irony itself that is exploited in order to recode into positive terms what the patriarchal discourse reads as a negative, in which silencing of women's voice is transformed into the willed silence of the irony and traditional feminine manner. In this sense, irony becomes:

One sign of a loosening of a bonds that bind us to the single and the singular track, to a paranoid obsession with certitude and fixed and single destinations.' Irony can be this kind of general reflexive mode, one that has the potential to reflect and model the recognition that all conceptualizations are limited, that what is socially maintained as truth is often politically motivated. (Hutcheon 33)

In the beginning of the play Louka is presented as a maid-servant having some sort of tension with the lady she serves. She behaves in defiant manners and her physical movements, gestures and postures produce the impression of haughtiness and discontent. The audience ascribes this to typical feminine jealousy of a servant for the lady of the same age, but in second act they understand that she is Raina's rival in love and is eyeing something above her position. Her confidence is generated from some of the secrets she knows about the ladies of the house. Always on the lookout for those sorts of things, she discovers a terrible truth about the fugitive in Raina's chamber at night and keeps it for use in future.

In Act II Louka is given a loud voice justifying her position. While being instructed threateningly by the middle-aged maid servant Nicola, she scornfully rejects his advice and brands him as a person with "the soul of a servant" (36). From Nicola, however, we come to know the predicament of Louka and her father "on his little farm". Shaw here brings out the conflicts between rich and the poor, fuming in the backyard of patriotism and nationalism. Shaw makes this explicit by making

Nicola fully aware of the effects any confrontation with the aristocracy will bring about. It is not that Louka is not conscious of this; in fact, her defiance of the upper-class people can be ascribed to the angst deposited in her. But while Nicola chooses to reap profit by serving the upper-class and thereby cashing on their weaknesses, Louka resorts to using her youth and feminine skills backed up by her will-power to trap an upper-class gentleman.

In the second act Louka employs her youth and charms when she finds Sergius posing as a playboy. From the familiarity of their conversation we can understand that this is not the first time that Sergius engages himself in relaxation from the pressure of higher love for Raina. As soon as Louka detects his susceptibility or vulnerability, she proceeds to break Raina's pose of higher love by informing him of the presence of another man in her chamber at night. She does this in order to bring her down to her level of an ordinary human being before Sergius. Even she goes to the extent of saying "I am worth six of her", meaning that she is capable of serving or satisfying the six different persons in Sergius, which Raina, according to her, is not capable of. But it would be an injustice to the character if we say that Louka uses only her youthful charms; we find her possessing subtle power of observation, by which she can surely foretell Raina's move away from Sergius in the case of the fugitive's return. No other person, including Raina could have this kind anticipation because Louka observes her from a pragmatic position: "I know the difference between the sort of manner you and she put on before one another and the real manner" (55).

Thus she creates agitations in Sergius's mind quite consciously and deliberately in order that she may win him away by exposing both of them. But since she is intelligent enough to anticipate that he will not believe her unless and until he discovers the truth himself, she lets him out to find the rest of the truth.

In the third act Louka enters the stage with her usual bold free gait with the marked difference that her left sleeve is “looped up to the shoulder with a brooch, shewing her naked arm, with a broad gilt bracelet covering the bruise” (83). She does this intentionally in order to remind Sergius of the mark he made on her arm, and perhaps to display proudly the mark as a gift of love in a sort of masochistic exhibitionism. Nicola, as a man with practical wisdom can sense something wrong with her, and that is why he proceeds to warn her about her unusual fashion. Here once again she reiterates her contempt for his servile mentality and refuses to accept him as share of the bribes. Her basic independent nature is to be found in the following words: “You were born to be a servant. I was not. When you set up your shop you will be everybody’s servant instead of somebody’s servant” (85).

She demonstrates the place she is eying to reach at by seating herself ‘regally’ in Sergius’s chair, an act which the audience notice with surprise and amusement. As Nicola understands her and humbly makes way for Sergius, she once again attracts Sergius now with the mark of bruise, which she uses as a kind of bait for him. When Sergius tries to compensate for the bruise by offering her an amorous favour, she rejects it straight and tries to make him understand that she wants more. She entangles him in a sort of emotional cheating with the protestation of the courage she can show in the case of realising her true love: “If I loved you, though you would be as far beneath me as I am beneath you, I would dare to be the equal of my inferior” (90).

Here by implication of the logic Louka wants him to come out of the class-barrier and accept her on equal terms. When Sergius expresses his inability and insults her by making a comparison between Raina and her in terms of the difference between heaven and earth, she returns this and the charge of her being jealous of Raina with a bold assertion: “I have no reason to be. She will never marry you. The

man I told you of has come back. She will marry the Swiss” (91). Thus she succeeds in creating an emotional storm in his mind and in making him confess. In true chivalric fashion he even pronounces an oath, which she readily jumps upon to win him away in the next encounter with Sergius. Louka gathers all her strength of mind and risks being caught up in eavesdropping. At this point we find Raina insulting her from her supposed social superiority and thus quite unknowingly provoking her to disclose the truth about her chocolate cream soldier. Louka is further insulted after the discovery of the “chocolate cream soldier”, and she turns the situation in her favour by forcing Sergius to apologize to her. As he still clings to his false heroic ideals, he apologises and falls motionless in her trap.

In fine, we can say that through the presentation of Louka, Shaw illustrates once again the triumph of women in the chase of the men of their desire. There may be perhaps another reason: she is necessary as the woman for Sergius because she can balance the excess of romantic ideas and impractical dreams in him. But the audience cannot be sure of her capacity; for, immediately after becoming Major Sergius Saranoff’s “affianced bride”, she addresses the lady she was serving by her name and tries to scandalise Raina by openly expressing her doubt of the latter’s being “fonder of him than Sergius”. The audience and more particularly the readers can take note of the fact that she does not utter a single word after that. She remains speechless even at the climax of the action when the chocolate cream soldier becomes Raina’s man amidst many revelations and amazements.

In Shaw’s artistic design the character of Nicola is necessary in order to neutralize the excess of false ideas and illusions of some of the characters. In one sense, he contributes to consolidating Bluntschli’s pragmatic ideas and acts. But through his character Shaw also presents a member of the some of his socialist ideas.

In Nicola he presents a cold-blooded calculating man of the practical world who does not care for the false ideals and ideas and lives his life in accordance with the demand of the situation he is in.

In the beginning of Act III Shaw describes Nicola quite clearly in terms of his personality and physique, all of which go together to produce an impression of a man with keen practical intelligence and servile outlook:

He is a middle aged man of cool temperament and low but clear and keen intelligence with the complacency of the servant who values himself on his rank in servitude, and the imperturbability of the accurate calculator who has no illusions. (34)

He has undertaken to warn Louka because he has detected in her defiant manners and hostile attitudes, which, if not checked, will damage his prospect too in future. It is quite clear that he is more attached to the Petcoffs for material benefits than to Louka for emotional reasons. In support of his arguments, he cites plain practical reason: “When I leave their service and start a shop in Sophia, their custom will be half my capital: their bad word would ruin me” (34).

As Louka does not like his arguments and boasts of her secrets of the family, through which she intends to blackmail them, he plainly informs her that he too has got some of the secrets. But whereas Louka wants to use those secrets in order to defend her defiance and haughty manners, he wants to utilize those for advancing his material prospects. For, he knows the consequences any fall-out with the family will bring about. He says this because he is painfully conscious of the power of the upper-class in the society: “Child: you don’t know the power such high people have over the like of you and me when we try to rise out of our poverty against them” (35).

In spite of all these admonitions and threats, he fails to convince her and

‘complacently’ admits her charge of having the soul of a servant, and justifies this as the secret of success in service. In the third act Nicola is found to be in amorous mood, but his advance is checked by Louka’s unusual fashion of wearing her sleeve. Here once again he is forced to warn her in the same threatening tone. But it must be said here that his arguments are based on the false proposition that Louka can be purchased cheaply because of her vulnerable position. In fact, in this bargain he loses, because, even after cashing on many secrets of the family, he fails to sniff out or he may not consider the degree of seriousness of the growing amorous relationship between Sergius and Louka. Instead, in the face of her sarcastic volleys he falls back on to a kind of fanciful cynicism generated from a profit-making motive:

I’ve often thought that if Raina were out of the way, and you just less of a fool and Sergius just a little more of one, you might come to be one of my grandest customers, instead of only being my wife and costing me money. (86)

This will turn out to be a dramatic irony for him after a little while. But this also shows that he was not completely in the dark about their relationship: he just did not seriously consider the possibility. That is why he goes on threatening her on his supposed superiority as a male servant using the upper-class rhetoric of threat and sympathy. But as soon as Nicola finds the remote possibility, amounting to impossibility, turning out real, he releases her immediately in cold-blooded acceptance of his position from the celebrated engagement: “...it was only to give Louka protection. She had a soul above her station and I have been no more than, her confidential servant” (106).

This is not stoicism, but cynical pragmatic maneuvering of a middle-aged man, whose only ambition is to reap profit out of the fertile ground of feudalistic

manners and tastes. We cannot be sure of such a man's motive behind giving Louka 'protection'. As he goes out giving up all his claims on Louka, Sergius calls his act "either finest heroism or the most crawling baseness" (106). Bluntschli, on the other hand, judges him on practical and personal grounds and declares him "the ablest man in Bulgaria", meaning that he is the ablest of the Bulgarians in the play.

IV. Conclusion

Thus, my purpose of reading the play *Arms and the Man* was to examine the characters themselves to see what particular types of behavior ironically predominate among them. Once I have identified the dominant vices of the characters, I could explore the consequences of their behaviour, and I could do so by examining the incidents of the plot. According to the convenience of the study some of the satirical sentences and phrases are identified and classified like heroism, soldiering, battle, romance, kissing, passionate, admiration, desire, scolding, prejudice, marriage, status, prestige, pride and manners are blended with irony in the drama. Once again irony is a remark which means the opposite of what it says. Dramatic irony is a remark whose significance is perceived by the audience but not by the actors on the stage. Thus romance is portrayed by the humorous and ironic relationships of Raina, Sergius and Bluntschli in the drama.

Raina asks Bluntschli about the leader of the cavalry charge in the battle. Raina knew that the leader was Sergius, she was under the impression that he is the bravest man. But Bluntschli calls him a coward and a fool and he describes his behavior in the battlefield. His action in attacking the Serbian army was a foolish act. This man is the greatest fool of all those who had gone for war. He acted like a man out of senses. It was as if he and his regiment wanted to commit suicide. This is one of the fine examples of dramatic irony in the play.

The audience and the readers know that the leader was Sergius, the betrothed of Raina. But Bluntschli doesn't know it and speaks disparagingly about him. We are told of the heroic cavalry charge of Sergius and Raina is in raptures. But very soon Bluntschli focuses the searchlight of reason on war and soldiering. He makes Raina realize that Sergius, cavalry charge was in reality a rash and foolish act. All these

things are discussed in detail in this dissertation. In doing so George Bernard Shaw has shown to be expressing a critical attitude towards a various aspects of human conduct and affairs. The rhetoric, satire, therefore focused on morality, society, politics, or some other dimension of human nature. The social pretensions of the characters are shown to make them incapable of loving one another or feeling genuine affection for one another. Thus it has been proved in each case the plot is designed to dramatize not only the vice but also its moral or social implications. Satiric plots incorporated discovery scenes as well, and the discoveries of satire inevitably bring about the public exposure of the principal characters. These characters: Raina, Sergius, Bluntschli, and Lauka are representing the virtuous potentiality of human nature, not only highlighted the ugliness of surrounding them in the satiric world but also reminded us in the end that humanity is not and need not be depraved. In other words, satire offered me an intensified but not completely negative view of human imperfection.

Satire and Romance, rather than dramatizing the dominant patterns of human experience, embody the essential qualities and potentialities of human nature. Romance bears witness to what humanity can be at its best, Satire to what it can be at its worst. Romance offers us an idealized vision of character in the drama. Satire is a spectacle of inferior human conduct. Satire and romance are intended ultimately to produce clear-cut images of good or evil, virtue or vice, wisdom or folly; and those images may be embodied most vividly in characters that are boldly outlined rather than finely detailed. Such qualities may also be highlighted through contrast. Thus, the plots of satire and romance brought together characters from both extremes, using their interactions to create emphatic contrasts.

Therefore, *Arms and the Man* emphasizes the beautiful and the orderly tends

toward an idealized vision of the war, the mode is romantic one. Play focusing on the ugly and chaotic, tend towards a despoiled view of the world, and this I call 'satire'. This emphasized depend for their effect upon extreme views of human nature and existence. The action evolves out of the background of war and deals with men in arms. Shaw shows that the glory of war and the heroism of soldiers are mere illusions. War is a ridiculous and horrible act. Life is more important than soldiering to death under the title of patriotism. This play is a satire about the wrong notions of war and love.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Bangalore: Eastern Press Pvt. Ltd, 2004.
- Amstrong, Paul B. "The Politics of Irony in Reading Conrad." *Conradiana* 26. 2-3 (1994): 85-99.
- Chambers, Ross. "Reading and Being Read: Irony and Critical Practice in Cultural Studies." *The Minnesota Review* 45-44 (Fall-Spring 1995): 113-30.
- Conway, Deniel W., and John E. Seery, eds. *The Politics of Irony: Essay in Self Betrayal*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Davis, Kimberly Chabot. "White Filmmakers and Mionrity Subjects: Cinema Verite and the Politics of Irony in Hoop Dreams and Paris in Burning." *South AtlanticReview* 64.1 (Winter 1999): 26-47.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*. Student and Home Edition. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 2009.
- Enright, D. J. *The Alluring Problem: An Essay on Irony*. New York: OUP, 1968.
- Hornby, A. S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7th ed. London: OUP, 2005.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Microsoft Encarta Premium Encyclopedia*. Microsoft Corporation, 2009.
- Muecke, D. C. *Irony and the Ironic: The Critical Idiom*. New York: Methuen and Co., 1982.
- Pandey, Beerendra. "Deconstructing Irony: Reading Paul de Man." *Literary Studies* 15 (February 1996): 51-55.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *The Arms and the Man*. New Delhi: Heritage Classic, 2007.