

## IMAGES OF HEROINES IN THE WORKS OF I.S. TURGENEV

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7452943>



ELSEVIER



Received: 17-12-2022

Accepted: 18-12-2022

Published: 22-12-2022

Chjen E.V.

Associate Professor of NamSU,

Muxitdinova U.O.

Master's student of NamSU



**Abstract:** The article deals with one of the least developed issues of Leo Tolstoy's creativity - the reflection of Russian history in the works of the writer. The author reveals the chosen problem from the very origins, reflections on the historical past, the origin of the image of Peter I.

**Keywords:** International relations, forum, attitude, cooperation, trade and investment. Russian historiography, the work of L. Tolstoy, the historical hero, Westerners and Slavophiles, Peter I, disputes with S. Solovyov about the role of personality in history.

**About:** FARS Publishers has been established with the aim of spreading quality scientific information to the research community throughout the universe. Open Access process eliminates the barriers associated with the older publication models, thus matching up with the rapidity of the twenty-first century.

The enduring significance of Leo Tolstoy's work in Russian literature and, more broadly, public life gives each generation of readers the opportunity to open the pages of his works in their own way.

In modern literary criticism, there is a view of Leo Tolstoy as the author of unsurpassed artistic creations, but very little is known about Tolstoy as a historiographer. And, besides, it was difficult to systematize the data on the views of a writer who is in constant search, in motion.

While working on "War and Peace", Tolstoy gradually entered into historical material, philosophical and historical problems. Even before the end of "War and Peace", in 1867, he began to look for a suitable historical hero for himself. At that time he wrote to P. I. Bartenev (publisher of the Russian Archive): "Write to me, if it will not be too difficult for you, materials for the history of Paul the Emperor" [6, 123].

Tolstoy's idea of Pavel as a suitable historical hero was formed, obviously, on the basis of materials published in the Russian Archive in 1864 and 1866: "Curious and memorable Deeds and Anecdotes of Emperor Pavel Petrovich" and "Stories of General Kutlubitsky about the times of Emperor Paul I" [4, 38-42].

The project of a novel about Pavel soon disappeared, but the search for a "historical hero" continued, as did general reflections on history and historical science.

Russian scientific historiography was born out of the polemic of Westerners with Slavophiles, and the central point of this polemic was the question of the role of Peter I – about ancient Russia and new Russia. The main difference in the views

of Westerners and Slavophiles affected the question of the state, about the transformation of the old tribal and communal Russia into the Russian state. Westerners were pathetic defenders of the state, centralized system of Peter and his reforms. They were the main creators of Russian scientific historiography, which opposed the openly journalistic and in this sense amateurish "attacks" of Slavophile thinkers. Slavophiles put forward the ancient period of Russian history (up to the XVI century) and elevated the Old Russian community to the degree of an ideal – as a kind of "union of people based on the moral principle." Westerners, on the contrary, studied Russian history mainly from the XVI to the XVIII century – as a period of gradual growth of the state principle and the transformation of specific Rus into great-power Russia. In 1849, a typical study by P. Pavlov appeared in this sense – "On the historical significance of the reign of Boris Godunov" [1]. In the history of Russia, he identifies two epochs – central, decisive, although opposite in their aspirations: the Time of Troubles, which Pavlov calls very characteristically "stateless", and the Petrine era.

The comparative characteristics of these two epochs clearly contain hints of a topical polemic with the Slavophiles. Pavlov writes: "The desire of the belated people of the beginning of the XVII century to make a turn in society to the legal ancestral way of life, which has already outlived its time, should have turned out to be quite impossible. Haters of state development and spiritual improvement were dreamers. Their ideal was not in the future, but in the past: they tried to turn history back" [4, 54]. At the end of the book, these two epochs are compared: "Both historical periods were an energetic attempt by Russian society to escape from the stifling embrace of an untenable reality and morally revive.

Both attempts at social revival were made according to practical views, completely different. At the time of the stateless Russia tried to turn to its past; in the era of Peter's transformation, it rushed to its great future. In the first case, it turned out to be hostile to an irresistible historical development, chasing a ghost; in the second, on the contrary, it appeared quite unreasonable, pursuing a positive reality. In the era of stateless Russia was carried away mainly by imagination, in Peter's more obeyed the suggestions of simple common sense. Curious times! How much life, energy, movement there is in the whole society! How many bright, noble, selfless characters! A subject worthy of diligent, careful study..." [4,258].

In his memoirs, S. M. Solovyov treats Slavophile historians as ignoramuses and dreamers unfamiliar with the factual material. Struggling with their anti-state "fantasies", he made special polemical articles in 1857-1858, in which he called their historical views "anti-historical" and, attacking their "negative direction", exclaimed: "Poor, poor Russian history! The last hundred and fifty years should be erased from it: there is corruption due to the domination of alien education, but at least the ancient pre-Petrine history remains with us? – No, two centuries should

be excluded from it, the XVI and XVII, the most brilliant, the most curious, the most fundamental centuries! – because there is also damage from the Byzantine form... And such destruction of history is made in the name of love for her!" [5,97].

Based on these topical analogies and associations, by the mid-60s, an extensive literature of historical essays, novels, novels and plays was developing. The historical genre becomes characteristic and popular.

The question of Peter I and his reforms arose anew in connection with the frontiersman sentiments among the nobility, in connection with the determined impoverishment of the landed nobility. Considering this situation, Kavelin wrote in his article: "We treat Ivan the Terrible, the era of Impostors, Alexei Mikhailovich calmly and objectively; all this has long passed, forgotten, and for some reason we naively imagine that the interests and issues of those times have long disappeared without a trace. But Peter seems to be still alive and is between us" [2,55].

Kavelin correctly notes the difference in the attitude of modernity to the themes of the Time of Troubles and the Petrine era: the first theme is used only along the lines of general analogies and artistic symbolism (hence its spread in literature and in the theater), while the second exists as an acute topical problem.

The question of the fate of the nobility (and precisely about the fate of the kondova, the landed aristocracy) has long troubled Tolstoy: thoughts on this topic are already found in his youthful diary. Talking about Tolstoy's first appearance in the literary milieu (1855-1856) and about his disputes with Turgenev, Fet writes: "With the attraction of our intelligentsia to the ideas that caused the liberation of the peasants, the noble literature itself reached in its enthusiasm to the opposition to the fundamental noble interests, against which the fresh, unbroken instinct of Leo Tolstoy was so indignant in "Anna Karenina."

One can find clear traces of this "instinct" - anxiety for the landed aristocracy, which Tolstoy in these years still considers the social base of Russia. Levin is indignant that Oblonsky sold the forest to the merchant Ryabinin: "You will say again that I am a retrograde, or some other terrible word; but still it annoys and offends me to see this impoverishment of the nobility, to which I belong, and despite the merger of the estates, I am very glad that I belong [7, 9, 163]. When the conversation turns to Vronsky's aristocracy, Levin bursts into a tirade: "You say: aristocracy. And let me ask you, what is this aristocracy of Vronsky or anyone else – such aristocracy that you can neglect me? You think Vronsky is an aristocrat, but I'm not.

A man whose father got out of nothing by sneaking, whose mother God knows who was not in touch with... No, I'm sorry, but I consider myself and people like me to be an aristocrat, who in the past can point to three or four honest generations of families who were at the highest level of education (talent and intelligence are another matter), and who have never, in front of anyone, never, in

anyone they were in need, as my father and my grandfather lived... We are aristocrats, not those who can exist only with handouts from the powerful and who can be bought for two kopecks" [7,9,247].

The whole tone of this tirade shows how closely Tolstoy was affected by these questions. Oblonsky, Vronsky and Levin are, as it were, representatives of those three parts of the nobility that Meshchersky wrote about: the servant, the court and the land. But in *Anna Karenina* these issues are pushed to the background; the work on the Peter the Great era that preceded this novel was fundamentally connected with worries about the historical fate of the Russian landed nobility.

On December 17, 1872, Tolstoy writes to Strahov: "I'm still not working. I am surrounded by books about Peter I and his time; I read, I note, I rush to write and I can't. But what an era for an artist. No matter what you look at, everything is a task, a riddle, the solution of which is only possible with poetry. The whole knot of Russian life is sitting here. It even seems to me that nothing will come of my preparations. I've been trying it on for too long and I'm too worried. I won't be upset if it doesn't work out" [6, 83]. These confessions shed light on the very idea.

The Peter the Great epoch was finally defined in Tolstoy's mind as the "knot of Russian life", i.e. as an epoch with which modernity is connected by unbreakable threads. The novel was supposed not only to reveal the Peter the Great era, but also to show the roots of modern Russia: solve the problem of nobility and peasantry, cities and villages, civilization, etc. The defining moment for the construction of the novel was Tolstoy's own difficult situation: the position of an aristocratic landowner who disagreed neither with the official bureaucratic system, nor with the transformation of Russia into a bourgeois capitalist country, nor with the ideas, theories and behavior of the revolutionary democratic intelligentsia.

No wonder Tolstoy tried on it for so long and was so worried: the task was too difficult. The words "I won't be upset if nothing comes out" indicate that he himself has become aware of the excessive difficulty of this task. The "details" did not help: historical painting, as such, was a foreign matter for Tolstoy, a writer.

The winter of 1872-73 was spent trying to take up writing a novel. The "funny war" is described – military maneuvers in the autumn of 1694 near the village of Kozhukhov (near Moscow). Peter's time is already coming into its own: Peter calls for the "military doctrine" of serving landowners from twenty-two cities. The very historical "knot of Russian life" is being tied, about which Tolstoy wrote to Strakhov: Peter's struggle with the nobility begins. Some sketches relating to this period receive a special and characteristic title: "Old and New".

The novel "Old and New" was supposed not only to reveal the Peter the Great era, but also to show the roots of modern Russia: solve the problem of nobility and peasantry, cities and villages, civilization, etc.

The defining moment for the construction of the novel was Tolstoy's own difficult situation: the position of an aristocratic landowner who disagreed neither with the official bureaucratic system, nor with the transformation of Russia into a bourgeois capitalist country, nor with the ideas, theories and behavior of the revolutionary democratic intelligentsia.

No wonder Tolstoy tried on it for so long and was so worried: the task was too difficult. The words "I won't be upset if nothing comes out" indicate that he himself has become aware of the excessive difficulty of this task. The "details" did not help: historical painting as such was a foreign matter for Tolstoy.

A thorough study of the materials not only did not help, but made it difficult: Tolstoy feels in the "magic circle of falsehood". He is not a historical painter at all, who only needs to assemble the details and mount them; he took up the era of Peter in order to unravel it with "poetry", the method of "history-art", and this did not work out in any way. Tolstoy was very worried that the faces from the Peter the Great era, dressed up in costumes of the XVII century and planted in their places, had not yet breathed and moved. Subsequently, he will return to the work he started.

This is how Tolstoy's historical thought was born and developed – the artist in his first novel, where he tries to comprehend his own views on Peter 1, the significance of his transformations and his historical role.

## LITERATURE

1. Bolotov A. T. Notes and letters - M.: Mir, 2004
2. Kavelin V. Historical notes.-Moscow: Russian Archive, 2000
3. Meshchersky N. Memoirs – M.: Knowledge, 2013
4. Pavlov P. On the historical significance of the reign of Boris Godunov. Historical materials and information – Moscow: Russian Archive, 2003
5. Soloviev S. M. Memoirs and letters – M.: Historical Sciences, 2001
6. Tolstoy L. N. Memoirs, notes, diaries – M.: Nauka, 2014
7. Tolstoy L. N. Collected works and letters. In 22 volumes - Moscow : Fiction, 2010