



UDC: 82-09

<https://doi.org/10.59849/2409-4838.2025.3.27>

**MADNESS AND GENIUS AS VEHICLES OF SOCIAL CRITIQUE IN THE CRITICAL
REALIST DRAMATURGY OF JALIL MAMMADGULUZADEH AND
ANTON CHEKHOV**

Shafa Shakir Aliyeva 

ANAS Institute of Literature named after Nizami Ganjavi, Baku, Azerbaijan

shafa.aliyeva@lit.science.az

Received: 20.02.2025

Accepted: 25.06.2025

*This article explores the aesthetic and philosophical functions of madness within the framework of critical realist dramaturgy, focusing on the works *The Mad Gathering* by Jalil Mammadguluzadeh and *Ward No. 6* by Anton Chekhov. Through a comparative approach, the study analyzes how the marginalized figures of the “little man” and the “surplus person” are constructed in early 20th-century Azerbaijani literature, emphasizing their symbolic roles in exposing social contradictions, ideological stagnation, and moral collapse. Madness is interpreted not as clinical deviance, but as a metaphor for resistance, ethical consciousness, and epistemological rupture. The article also provides a stylistic and semantic analysis of both authors’ dramaturgical techniques, revealing how madness functions as a critical tool for deconstructing normative behavior and institutional power. Ultimately, the study highlights the intellectual and emotional depth of critical realism and its ongoing relevance as a mode of social and artistic critique.*

Keywords: critical realism, madness, little man, surplus person, tragicomedy, dramaturgy.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of critical realism as a literary movement in Azerbaijani literature at the beginning of the 20th century marked a significant stage in the evolution of modern literary thought. Unlike Enlightenment realism or romanticism, which either idealized the world or sought moral uplift through rationality and didacticism, critical realism aimed to confront reality as it was — unvarnished, contradictory, and deeply shaped by socio-political forces. It sought to analyze and represent life not through abstraction or allegory, but through the concrete experiences of ordinary individuals embedded in complex societal structures.

Critical realism, as a phase within the broader realist tradition, did not emerge as a mere reaction against previous movements. Rather, it functioned as a transformative continuation of them. While Enlightenment realism sought to educate and uplift through reason and morality, critical realism recognized the limitations of such ideals in addressing the entrenched inequalities and moral contradictions of the time. The shift from Enlightenment realism to critical realism thus stemmed from the historical realization that education and moral guidance alone were insufficient to dismantle the structural injustices of society.

One of the most defining features of critical realism is its dual nature — both literary and philosophical. From a philosophical standpoint, it was deeply invested in constructing a worldview grounded in objective reality while acknowledging the organic, social, and spiritual dimensions of human existence. As certain philosophical interpretations assert, realism operates at three interconnected levels: the organic (natural existence), the social (historical and communal life), and the spiritual (individual consciousness and values). The human being becomes the central point that binds these layers together, serving as the lens through which the world is both experienced and interpreted.

From a literary-theoretical perspective, critical realism distinguishes itself through its method of social cognition. It does not merely portray life passively but seeks to critically analyze the socie-



tal conditions, contradictions, and moral decay that shape individual destinies. In doing so, it systematically rejects excessive romanticization, sentimentality, and mysticism. The critical realist writer becomes not only an artist but also a social thinker, a diagnostician of cultural and political maladies. This approach renders the writer's work both a form of literary expression and a vehicle for socio-political critique.

Importantly, critical realism did not aim to completely erase the influence of past aesthetic movements. As Yashar Garayev notes, *Enlightenment realism continues to coexist with critical realism for a long time, and on the other hand, critical realism itself is not completely cleansed of enlightenment ideology and motives* [5, p. 126]. This coexistence allowed critical realism to retain elements of moral concern and humanist values while moving toward a deeper engagement with the contradictions of modern life. The plurality of literary movements within Azerbaijani literature during this period further enriched the aesthetic and ideological landscape, enabling mutual influence and hybridization.

The rise of critical realism was also conditioned by broader historical processes: scientific and technological advancements, economic shifts, political upheavals, and the rise of revolutionary-democratic ideologies. Literature, as a reflection of its time, inevitably absorbed and responded to these forces. Thus, the development of critical realism can be seen as both a product of and a response to the social tensions, aspirations, and transformations of the early 20th century.

Despite its depth and richness, the historical-evolutionary approach to studying critical realism remains underdeveloped in some respects. While this method allows for a schematic and accessible understanding of literary processes, it sometimes lacks the nuance needed to capture the ideological complexity of the movement. Future research, therefore, must continue to address these gaps by examining critical realism not only as a literary style but also as a cultural and philosophical paradigm that shaped — and was shaped by — its historical moment.

MAIN PART

A core achievement of critical realism in Azerbaijani literature is its profound reorientation of narrative focus — away from the elite, the idealized, or the heroic, and toward the ordinary, the disempowered, and the socially invisible. This literary shift reflects not only a change in character typology but a radical rethinking of the moral, philosophical, and ideological purpose of literature. The “**little man**” (*kiçik adam*) and the —**surplus man**‖ (*artıq adam*) emerge in this framework as emblematic of both structural marginalization and inner human fragmentation. These figures serve not merely as representations of personal misfortune but as aesthetic symbols of a society in moral and ideological crisis.

The —little man‖ in critical realist literature is frequently a member of the lower social strata: a peasant, a petty clerk, a religious devotee, or a struggling worker. However, his smallness is not simply material or occupational — it is epistemological and existential. He is small because he has been rendered so by the structures of oppression around him: by ignorance institutionalized through clericalism, by poverty reproduced through feudal or colonial economies, and by powerlessness normalized through cultural submission. His existence is marked by dependency, silence, and spiritual stagnation.

In Jalil Mammadguluzadeh's works, these —little‖ characters populate almost every corner of his fictional world. Yet they are not merely objects of pity — they are the instruments through which the writer critiques the cultural, religious, and political systems that manufacture passivity and ignorance. In *The Mad Gathering* (*Dəli yığıncağı*), for example, we see an entire setting dominated by confused, blindly obedient, or superstitious characters whose perceptions of reality are shaped by false sheikhs and fake moralists. Their condition is not individual weakness, but collective blindness — a blindness produced by the very institutions that claim to enlighten them.

Importantly, Mammadguluzadeh's portrayal of the —little man‖ is not romanticized. He does not imbue these characters with latent heroism or idealistic virtue. Rather, he presents them with



psychological realism and satirical edge. The tragedy lies in their inability to see their own degradation — or worse, in their willingness to participate in the structures that degrade them. As Mammadguluzadeh suggests through his biting irony, ignorance is not only a result of social conditions but is often culturally internalized and voluntarily reproduced.

Distinct from the —little man‖ is the figure of the —surplus person‖ — often a more educated, introspective, or morally sensitive character who finds himself ideologically disconnected from both the ruling elite and the subjugated masses. This figure is deeply alienated: he is too aware to be content, but too isolated or powerless to effect change. His tragedy is not material poverty but intellectual and existential futility [4, p. 46].

This type of character resonates with the broader tradition of the —superfluous man‖ (*лишний человек*) in Russian literature — found in the works of Turgenev, Lermontov, and Dostoevsky — yet in the Azerbaijani context, it acquires a uniquely postcolonial and cultural specificity. The Azerbaijani surplus person is not just ideologically lost; he is also linguistically and spiritually displaced. He stands at the intersection of East and West, tradition and modernity, nationalism and submission. His words are often unheard, his insights unvalued, his actions ridiculed.

The existential crisis of the surplus person finds powerful expression in characters such as Molla Abbas in *The Mad Gathering*, whose internal lucidity is masked under a public performance of madness. He speaks the truth — but in a language no one understands. He critiques the society — but from within a role that society has already declared insane. The performativity of madness thus becomes a mechanism of both survival and resistance. Molla Abbas may be deemed —crazy‖ by his peers, but it is precisely through that label that he is allowed to speak freely. He becomes a prophet in a world that only permits prophecy under the cover of delirium.

Jalil Mammadguluzadeh often unites the —little man‖ and —surplus man‖ within a single tragicomic frame. The tragicomic genre — one of the most innovative forms in Azerbaijani critical realism — allows for the juxtaposition of absurdity and insight, pain and laughter, clarity and chaos. Characters such as Molla Abbas embody this duality. On one hand, they belong to the —little people‖ in terms of social class and powerlessness. On the other, they possess a moral and intellectual insight that places them outside the herd. Their madness is not mental illness but a poetic strategy — a way of being different without being destroyed.

In this sense, the tragicomic structure serves a dual function. It disarms censorship by framing truth as absurdity, and it deepens audience engagement by evoking both laughter and unease. It asks the reader not merely to sympathize with the character but to question the world that labels such characters as irrational. This aesthetic strategy becomes a subtle form of ideological resistance.

The inclusion of these marginalized typologies is not only a matter of character development — it is an ideological and epistemological intervention. Through them, Mammadguluzadeh and other critical realists seek to diagnose a society suffering from what might be called a —poverty of consciousness.‖ They do not blame individuals for their fate, but they hold society accountable for the structures that prevent enlightenment. Literature, in this view, becomes not a mirror of the ideal but a scalpel that dissects the real.

Moreover, these typologies challenge the traditional heroic paradigm that dominated earlier literary movements. Instead of glorifying sacrifice, idealism, or divine justice, critical realism presents ambiguity, paralysis, and internal struggle as legitimate literary subjects. This opens the door to a more human, complex, and historically grounded literature.

Ultimately, the —little man‖ and the —surplus person‖ function as complementary lenses through which critical realism examines the moral, psychological, and social fabric of Azerbaijani society. They are not simply characters; they are diagnostic tools. Their voices — confused, repressed, ironic, or defiant — articulate the deep fractures of a society in transition. Through them, literature transcends description and becomes critique; fiction becomes thought. Their presence in Azerbaijani critical realism is thus not merely a stylistic choice, but a moral necessity.



The motif of madness in critical realist dramaturgy, particularly as represented in the works of Jalil Mammadguluzadeh and Anton Chekhov, transcends its conventional clinical or psychopathological meanings. In these works, madness is not merely a symptom of personal instability but an aesthetic strategy — a deliberate narrative and philosophical device used to interrogate the moral contradictions, political hypocrisies, and ideological stagnation of normative society. Within the framework of critical realism, madness is functionalized as a counter-discourse: a symbolic language through which unspoken truths about the individual, society, and the state are laid bare.

Traditionally, madness in literature has been treated either as a source of comic relief or as an expression of internal psychological torment. In critical realism, however, it becomes something far more powerful: a form of epistemological rebellion. It serves to destabilize hegemonic narratives and to challenge normative categories of rationality and morality. Madness in this context is not what separates the character from reality — it is what enables the character to perceive reality more clearly than those considered —sane.¶

In *The Mad Gathering* (*Dəli yığıncağı*), Jalil Mammadguluzadeh creates a microcosm of society populated by characters who either feign madness to survive or are so consumed by ideological, religious, or moral delusion that they have lost touch with human reason. The play becomes a powerful indictment of a society where true sanity is indistinguishable from madness, and where the truly mad are often the only ones who speak the truth.

Molla Abbas, a central character in the play, epitomizes this inversion. Outwardly, he appears eccentric and erratic, but his monologues reveal a sharp, ironic awareness of the sociopolitical absurdity around him. In a pivotal scene, his address to Sona — filled with pain, irony, and philosophical reflection — culminates in his declaration: —By God and by all that is holy, we have fallen into a true ‘the mad gathering’¶ [6, p. 387]. In this context, madness is not the issue; it represents reality itself. His —madness¶ acts as a protective mask, a survival mechanism, and, most importantly, a narrative strategy to reveal the hidden contradictions within the system.

Anton Chekhov’s *Ward No. 6* employs a structurally different but thematically parallel approach. The protagonist Ivan Dmitritch is initially presented as a psychologically unstable inmate [8]. However, through his philosophical dialogues with Dr. Ragin, it becomes increasingly evident that his —madness¶ is a form of lucid resistance — an uncompromising moral response to a corrupt and indifferent world. His inability to reconcile with the injustices of society places him at odds with institutional norms, and thus he is diagnosed as mad. The ward in which he is confined becomes a metaphorical space — a prison for truth in a world ruled by ethical decay and social cruelty.

Dr. Ragin, on the other hand, embodies the figure of moral passivity and intellectual surrender. Despite his education and position, he fails to act, fails to intervene, and eventually becomes a victim of the very system he upheld. His descent into the very madness he once diagnosed reflects the impossibility of remaining neutral in a world that demands moral positioning. Thus, both madness and sanity are reversed: the —patient¶ is the philosopher; the —doctor¶ is the fool.

In both plays, madness is not only a state of mind — it is a **performative identity**. The mad characters use speech, gesture, irony, and silence as tools to navigate and challenge the boundaries imposed by society. Their dialogues are often more coherent and philosophically profound than those of the supposedly rational characters. This subversion forces the audience to reconsider what it means to be —sane.¶

In *The Mad Gathering*, Molla Abbas uses body language, exaggerated emotion, and contradictory statements to confuse his interlocutors, but his purpose is always to protect truth and integrity. His refusal to conform to expected patterns of discourse — his laughter, his sudden cries, his gestures — all serve to undermine the rigid, oppressive moral codes around him. His madness is theatrical, but it is also revolutionary. He is not mad in spite of his clarity; he is clear because he is mad.



Similarly, in *Ward No. 6*, Ivan Dmitritch's philosophical monologues mirror classical Socratic dialogues. His madness is marked by self-reflection, ethical rigor, and a refusal to accept injustice. His perceived mental instability is, in fact, a critique of society's collective madness — its cruelty, apathy, and hypocrisy. Chekhov does not portray Ivan as a caricature but as a tragic intellectual whose only mistake is to feel too deeply and think too independently [1, p. 143].

What both authors ultimately reveal is that madness is not a deviation from the norm — it is a literary metaphor for those who refuse to accept false norms. The societies depicted in these works are themselves insane: guided by dogma, fear, corruption, and illusion. Those who appear mad are, in fact, morally awake and spiritually conscious. Through this aesthetic inversion, Mammadguluzadeh and Chekhov position madness as an ethical stance, not a psychological failure.

This theme resonates especially in colonial or semi-colonial contexts like early 20th-century Azerbaijan. The madman becomes a national allegory — a symbol of the oppressed voice that refuses to be silenced. He is the truth-teller disguised as a fool, the philosopher misread as a lunatic. The space of madness becomes a refuge from social conformity and a platform for critical engagement.

Moreover, both playwrights use the spatial metaphor of confinement — whether a madhouse, a village, or a ward — to signify the limits of free thought in their societies. The physical boundaries echo the ideological restrictions of the time. Inside these confined spaces, characters transcend their limitations and express truths that are unspeakable in the outer world. The madhouse thus becomes a paradox: a place of captivity that grants intellectual liberation.

Despite differences in style and tone, Mammadguluzadeh and Chekhov share significant intertextual parallels. Both plays feature protagonists who are socially isolated, morally intense, and intellectually active. Their monologues serve as counter-discourses to the silence, repression, or stupidity of their surroundings. Both plays juxtapose madness with institutional power — whether religious in Mammadguluzadeh or medical in Chekhov — and reveal how these institutions control knowledge, label dissent, and perpetuate injustice [7].

Stylistically, Mammadguluzadeh employs satire, grotesque imagery, and tragicomedy. His language is hyperbolic, filled with irony and performative intensity [5, p.125]. Chekhov, in contrast, adopts a subdued, introspective tone, rich with psychological nuance and ethical ambiguity. Yet both styles converge in their use of madness as critique: one loud and theatrical, the other quiet and devastating.

In critical realist dramaturgy, madness becomes both a mirror — reflecting the contradictions and cruelties of society — and a weapon — destabilizing dominant ideologies and speaking truths that cannot be spoken otherwise. It is through the voices of the mad that we hear the clearest critiques of injustice. *It is through their gestures that we see the deepest wounds of conscience* [9].

For Mammadguluzadeh and Chekhov, the madman is not an outcast to be pitied or corrected. He is a prophet, a thinker, a survivor. He inhabits the margins of language, space, and reason — but from there, he sees what others refuse to see. His madness is not a fall from humanity but a different form of it. In this way, both authors reimagine dramaturgy as a space not only for narrative, but for resistance — not only for story, but for truth.

In the dramaturgical landscapes of Jalil Mammadguluzadeh and Anton Chekhov, madness transcends its literal meaning to emerge as a symbolic construct — a semantic vessel through which deeper social, moral, and existential meanings are encoded. Far from representing psychological illness alone, madness functions as a signifier of collective trauma, ethical decay, and societal absurdity. It is in this capacity that madness in critical realist literature becomes both a metaphor and a method, enabling authors to critique dominant ideologies, challenge epistemic norms, and unveil the often-hidden structures of repression.

In semiotic terms, madness in *The Mad Gathering* and *Ward No. 6* serves as a cultural sign — a coded expression of abnormality that is socially constructed rather than medically diagnosed. It operates within a binary system: sanity vs. madness, reason vs. irrationality, conformity vs. devian-



ce. However, both authors subvert this binary. In their dramatic universes, those labeled as —mad|| often exhibit greater moral clarity and existential insight than those accepted as —sane.|| Thus, madness is deconstructed and re-signified — transformed from a pathological condition into an epistemological privilege.

This subversion of meaning challenges the authority of institutional discourse. In Chekhov, the psychiatric ward becomes a linguistic regime: it defines what can be said, by whom, and with what consequences [2]. Ivan Dmitritch's articulate critiques are dismissed not because they lack logic, but because they threaten institutional authority. His classification as mad is not an objective observation but a politically motivated silencing.

In Mammadguluzadeh's dramaturgy, madness is similarly a weaponized label. Molla Abbas's behavior violates social norms — not due to delusion, but because he refuses to participate in the collective performance of hypocrisy. His monologues *carry layers of irony, indirect criticism, and moral disgust* [3]. The more sharply he speaks the truth, the more readily he is declared mad. Here, madness is a semiotic shield, protecting the speaker from censorship while simultaneously granting them a license to critique.

While both authors use madness to critique their respective societies, their stylistic approaches differ markedly.

The speech patterns of his mad characters, especially Molla Abbas, blend lyrical emotion with cutting sarcasm. These characters laugh, cry, gesticulate, and interrupt themselves — not out of incoherence, but as a deliberate dramatization of their moral urgency. His madness is performative, theatrical, and often confrontational. Through comic exaggeration, he constructs a moral grotesque that mirrors the monstrous contradictions of society itself.

Thus, while Mammadguluzadeh's stylistic approach externalizes madness — making it visible, loud, and symbolically loaded — *Chekhov's style internalizes it, using madness as a lens to explore alienation, isolation* [1, p. 32], and the erosion of personal agency.

In both authors' works, madness is not only a metaphor but an ethical stance. It marks the individual's refusal to remain complicit in a world that has normalized injustice. By declaring the morally sensitive as mad, society absolves itself of guilt and suppresses dissent. Therefore, madness becomes a space of ethical resistance.

From an aesthetic perspective, madness provides a form of narrative liberation. It frees characters from the constraints of rational discourse and allows playwrights to invent new modes of speech, new symbolic structures, and new emotional registers. In the hands of Mammadguluzadeh, madness becomes a poetic mask that unveils truth; in Chekhov, it becomes a philosophical veil that deepens ambiguity.

Additionally, both authors blur the boundaries between madness and performance. Their characters often adopt madness strategically, as a means of communicating with an unhearing world. This introduces a meta-theatrical layer to the plays: the audience is forced to ask whether madness is real, performed, or both — and whether, in a world so unjust, madness may actually be the most rational response.

The semantic and stylistic deployment of madness in the dramaturgy of Jalil Mammadguluzadeh and Anton Chekhov functions as a complex literary tool that goes beyond individual pathology. It becomes a symbol of truth in exile, a voice of resistance, and a mirror of collective dysfunction. Through divergent styles — one satirical and public, the other introspective and private — both authors elevate madness into a language of its own.

Critical realism, in this context, proves itself not only as a method of social depiction but as a vehicle of semantic subversion and ethical imagination. It challenges what society deems normal, decent, or rational, and reveals that beneath these facades often lies violence, corruption, and hypocrisy.



In this dramaturgical cosmos, madness is not the end of reason — it is its rebirth. Not a fall from truth — but a desperate grasp for it.

CONCLUSION

Through an in-depth analysis of Jalil Mammadguluzadeh's *The Mad Gathering* and Anton Chekhov's *Ward No. 6*, this article has demonstrated that madness in critical realist literature is not a sign of personal instability, but rather a philosophical and aesthetic response to systemic injustice. Both authors use the motif of madness to challenge institutional authority, redefine rationality, and critique the moral contradictions of their respective societies. The typologies of the —little man and —surplus person serve to expose the alienation and disempowerment of individuals trapped in a morally bankrupt world. The stylistic contrasts between Mammadguluzadeh's satirical grotesque and Chekhov's introspective realism reflect different yet complementary approaches to representing existential crisis. Ultimately, the article affirms that critical realism — far from being a dated literary style — remains a powerful lens through which to interrogate the relationship between the individual and society, especially in times of ideological decay and cultural transformation.

REFERENCES

1. Adil, D. 366 gün və ya uzun ilin inancı. – Bakı: Elm və Təhsil, – 2023. – 190 s.
2. Çехов, А. 6 №-li palata. <https://ru.scribd.com/doc/263635877/Anton-Cexov-6-No-palata-pdf>
3. Definition of monologues. <https://literarydevices.net/dramatic-monologue/>
4. Həbibbəyli, İ. Cəlil Məmmədquluzadə. – Bakı: Çinar-Çap, – 2002. – 60 s.
5. Qarayev, Y. Azərbaycan realizminin mərhələləri. – Bakı: Elm, – 1980. – 260 s.
6. Məmmədquluzadə, С. Əsərləri, [Dörd cildə]. – Bakı: Öndər Nəşriyyatı, – 2004. – c. 4. – 472 s.
7. Monologues by Anton Chekhov. http://www.monologuearchive.com/c/chekhov_anton.html
8. Маникас, П. Т. Критический реализм и социальная теория // – Москва, – 2009. – № 11. – С. 3–14.
9. Характеристика монолога как вида речевой деятельности. http://studopedia.ru/8_95744_harakteristika-monologa-kak-vida-rechevoy-deyatelnosti.html

DƏLİLİK VƏ DAHİLİK TƏNQİDİ REALİST DRAMATURGIYADA SOSİAL TƏNQİD MOTİVİ KİMİ: CƏLİL MƏMMƏDQULUZADƏ VƏ ANTON ÇEXOVUN YARADICILIĞI ƏSASINDA

Ş.Ş. Əliyeva

Məqalədə tənqidi realizmin dramaturji çərçivəsində —dəliləkl obrazının estetik və fəlsəfi funksiyaları araşdırılır. Cəlil Məmmədquluzadənin *Dəli yığıncağı* və Anton Çexovun *Palata №6* əsərləri əsasında aparılan müqayisəli təhlildə —kiçik adam və —artıq adam tipajlarının 20-ci əsrin əvvəlləri Azərbaycan ədəbiyyatında necə formalaşdığı və onların sosial ziddiyyətlərin, ideoloji iflasın və mə-nəvi tənəzzülün simvolu kimi təqdim olunduğu izah edilir. Dəliləkl burada klinik pozuntu yox, mü-qavimətin, əxlaqi oyanışın və biliyə qarşı çıxışın metaforası kimi şərh olunur. Məqalədə hər iki ya-zıçının dramaturji üslubu və semantik yanaşmaları təhlil edilir və dəliləkl obrazının normativ davra-nışa və institusional gücə qarşı necə kritik alət kimi istifadə olunduğu göstərilir. Nəticədə, tənqidi realizmin intellektual və estetik dərinliyi vurğulanır və onun bu gün də aktual bir ədəbi-bədii təhlil üsulu olduğu təsbit edilir.

Açar sözlər: *tənqidi realizm, dəliləkl, kiçik adam, artıq adam, tragikomediya, dramaturgiya*



БЕЗУМИЕ И ГЕНИАЛЬНОСТЬ КАК ЭСТЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ФОРМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ КРИТИКИ В ДРАМАТУРГИИ КРИТИЧЕСКОГО РЕАЛИЗМА НА ПРИМЕРЕ ДЖАЛИЛА МАМЕДКУЛИЗАДЕ И АНТОНА ЧЕХОВА

Ш.Ш. Алиева

В статье рассматриваются эстетические и философские функции мотива безумия в рамках критического реализма, на примере пьес «Собрание безумцев» Джалиля Мамедгулузаде и «Палата №6» Антона Чехова. В ходе сравнительного анализа исследуется, как в азербайджанской литературе начала XX века формируются типы «маленького человека» и «лишнего человека», раскрывающие социальные противоречия, идеологическое обесценивание и моральный упадок общества. Безумие интерпретируется не как клиническое отклонение, а как метафора сопротивления, этического пробуждения и разрыва с навязанной рациональностью. Особое внимание уделяется стилистическим и семантическим особенностям драматургии обоих авторов, где безумие выступает как инструмент критики норм поведения и институциональной власти. В результате подчеркивается глубина интеллектуального и эмоционального воздействия критического реализма и его актуальность как метода художественного осмысления общества.

Ключевые слова: *критический реализм, безумие, маленький человек, лишний человек, трагикомедия, драматургия*