

Artistic system of author's thinking “Notes from the Underground” by F. M. Dostoevsky and “A Hero of Our Time” by M. Yu. Lermontov.

Ayupov Timur Rustamovich,

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute., Senior Lecturer.

Annotation: This article is devoted to the problem of the genesis of the "underground man" type, the transformation of the Lermontov type of hero, presented by Pechorin, in "Notes from the Underground" by F.M. Dostoevsky.

There is an opinion that any writer, as well as any "artist", has its own genealogy. In other words, every writer, portrait painter, architect, sculptor voluntarily or involuntarily draws on the experience of his predecessors and reflects it in one way or another in his work.

Key words: *F.M. Dostoevsky, M.Yu. Lermontov, Notes from the Underground, Hero of Our Time, art world, existentialism.*

The attitude of F.M. Dostoevsky to M.Yu. Lermontov was very difficult, besides, it has undergone some evolution over time. Dostoevsky left much fewer statements about Lermontov than about Pushkin and Gogol, but he always drew attention to the exceptional talent of the young artist of the word. The appeal to Lermontov's themes and images in Dostoevsky's work is not as obvious as to Gogol's and Pushkin's, it does not lie on the surface.

Dostoevsky, who has a great love for Pushkin's work for his attitude towards the Russian people, saw a certain potential in Lermontov. The writer believed that Lermontov was already on the right track and, if he had “stopped messing around” with Pechorin, he would certainly have managed to reach the point that A.S. Pushkin, namely, until the recognition of the need for a Russian folk soil [1, p. 78].

Dostoevsky, paying tribute to the Byronic trend, finding his own advantages in it, generally considered any borrowing from European civilization dangerous and unreasonable. It was Western thought that influenced the distortion of the consciousness of the Russian person, the distortion of his thoughts and the appeal to the aesthetics of "evil".

The novel "A Hero of Our Time" is the first Russian analytical novel, in which the greatest attention is paid to revealing the inner fullness of a person. It may seem no small paradox that the most ideologically controversial work of Lermontov gave the most fruitful impetus to Dostoevsky's artistic thought, his artistic manner. Dostoevsky is a direct follower of this trend, which took shape as psychological realism. [3, p. 148].

The influence of Lermontov's work on the artistic thought of Dostoevsky, as well as Dostoevsky's controversial attitude towards his predecessor, are considered in the works of such researchers as Kh.Sh. Tochieva, A.I. Zhuravleva, L. Allen, A. Valagin, M.G. Gigolov. In these works, the authors consider the convergence of views of both writers, as well as the reasons for a possible polemic between them. The most significant is the reason associated with the different attitudes of writers towards the image of Pechorin. The life position of Lermontov's heroes is rebellion and denial of the world, contempt for people who accept this world of evil and injustice. So, Pechorin is very proud, which serves as some reason for admiring Lermontov himself. But Dostoevsky considers pride to be a dangerous trait that divides people. A person, according to Dostoevsky, should not live only in denial, doubt. Such a position in life leads to the depletion of the vital forces inherent in a person by nature itself, and this, in turn, leads to the destruction of the personality.

The article by N.F. Budanova "Underground Man" in a series of superfluous people. In it, the literary critic considers the very type of "extra person", to which Pechorin is traditionally attributed. Budanova reveals common features between the two types. She also indicated the differences in the

origin of the characters, as well as in their attitude to rationalistic ideas. [3, p. 48].

The disease of the “underground” age, like Pechorin’s disease, does not lie in consciousness itself, but in the contradiction between thoughts and deeds, between beliefs and behavior, in remorse caused by the inability to confirm the word with deed. Lermontov himself, in the preface to the novel, indicated that he showed human vices in "their development." Dostoevsky showed their result.

Such allusions were noticed not by all literary critics. A special place among them is occupied by the concept of Lev Shestov, which laid the foundation for the activities of such scientists as L.P. Grossman, A. Dolinin, V.L. Komarovich. L. Shestov and his followers interpret Notes from the Underground as a confession of the writer himself. For them, the story is the "apotheosis of the underground", which allowed Dostoevsky to find his place among existentialist writers. All scholars note a radical change in the nature of Dostoevsky's prose, his disappointment in the humanistic ideals that he believed in in his youth. [4, p. 114].

Such literary critics as V. Kirpotin, M. Gus, A.P. Skaftymov, V. Levin, R. G. Nazirov and A.N. Latynin. Dostoevsky, following his predecessors: Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, continues and improves the tradition of psychological prose. One of the features of Dostoevsky's writing is not only a complete immersion in the human mind, but also a completely new alignment of the structure of the relations "author - hero", "author - reader", "text - extra-textual reality". So, it was this transition to a new level that misled many literary critics and made it possible to correlate the image of the author and his hero. All the listed literary critics prove the impossibility of the existence of such a concept, and also describe the artistic method “from the opposite”. So, A.P. Skaftymov, M.S. Gus and others believed that under the tragedy of the personality of the "underground" lies the positive program of Dostoevsky himself. But for A.N. Latynina Dostoevsky is primarily a "dialectician" who shows the "interaction of ideas" in their possible development.

In this paper, we refer to the article by V.I. Levin "Dostoevsky, the "underground paradoxist" and Lermontov", the only literary critic who examines in detail the connection between "A Hero of Our Time" and "Notes from the Underground". Refuting the version of the identity between the hero and the author, the researcher believes that the "Notes" exposes the demonic, immoral personality of Pechorin, turning into a low and nasty figure of the "underground". Levin writes that the features of a demon and an extra person merged in the image of Pechorin, which led him to extreme individualism, to an immoral attitude towards people and the world. According to the critic, Dostoevsky opposes this, considering any manifestation of demonism unacceptable. After analyzing the article, we came to the conclusion that Levin considers Dostoevsky's position radically and perceives Pechorin tendentiously and rudely. Between Notes from the Underground and A Hero of Our Time, we find not only polemics, but also a kind of creative dialogue. The connection between these texts seems to us more complicated than it is stated in Levin's article. [4, p. 118].

The starting point in our analysis was the consideration of the confessional principle in the works of Lermontov and Dostoevsky. A small study of the traditional genre of "confession", as well as its literary development, helped to determine the difference between the confessions of our heroes from the canonical ones.

Confession refers to the tools of "direct psychologism", because all the thoughts of the hero, his feelings are transmitted not indirectly, but directly. The author analyzed the form of the revelations of the main characters: the genre of the diary (magazine) and the genre of notes, as well as their main differences that affect the images of memoirists. Pechorin's revelation is self-oriented, its main goal is to comprehend the laws of being, the human psyche. The colloquial, spontaneous syllable of the "underground" characterizes him as a person seeking to assert his right to exist.

Analyzing the degree of frankness of the characters to themselves, we came to the conclusion that Pechorin remains himself in all situations, but puts different accents in the process of achieving a particular goal in a conversation with different people. The “underground” can also be sincere with

himself, but this sincerity is given to him with difficulty, he is forced out. In his sincerity, the hero comes to the conclusion that he is "nothing", and therefore his revelation is bitter and painful.

The desire to "appear to be someone", to make something out of oneself lies in the internal inconsistency of the characters. Pechorin's contradictions come down to his desire to kill his "feeling" half, to surrender entirely to the power of the mind. Pechorin raises rationalism to a cult, and it is he who determines most of his actions. But still, not outlived "heartfelt" impulses often pull the hero in the other direction, causing him to rush and feel lost. Both Pechorin and the "underground" stand out among other people, but they cannot be realized in the current life circumstances. In an effort to prove himself, to console his sick pride, the "underground" gives himself up to the theory of "independent desire", which is closely related to the concept of "the most profitable benefit". The individualism of the heroes, developed due to various aspirations, in both cases does not bring any fruit to the heroes.

Many of Pechorin's "weak points" under Dostoevsky's pen are hypertrophied, mutilated, turning into the features of a person who is wounded, offended by the whole world, consumed by his own malice. In our comparative analysis, we consider the internal contradictions of the heroes, their causes, consequences, and the attitude of the heroes themselves to some of their split.

A sensual beginning is found in Pechorin, but the hero is desperately trying to suppress it, drown it out, considering it "unsuitable", stinging. Like him, the "underground" in the depths of his soul is drawn to love, goodness, but he does not find a possible way out for them. All the hero's positive impulses are shattered by wounded pride, the desire for power. If Pechorin does not want to "be kind" (giving preference to feeling), then the "underground" simply cannot. [5, p.14].

Next, we analyzed the philosophical ideas of the "underground" and Pechorin, closely related to the contradictions in their minds. The fundamental concept in Pechorin's worldview is "freedom", and his experiments are aimed at finding its possible boundaries. Next to the concept of "freedom" is the problem of the existence of "predestination", as possible restrictions on the human will. In many episodes of the novel *A Hero of Our Time*, Pechorin is busy checking the existence of "fatum". However, the hero does not try to defeat fate, recognize it and go against it. He strives to explore and understand fate. Going to meet her, the hero thinks of himself as the executor of the inevitable sentence both in relation to himself and in relation to other people. If he knows that his love will inevitably collapse, then he will not wait until the feeling outlives itself and the situation resolves itself naturally. This shows Pechorin's pride. He wants love "eternal" or no. Destroying his feelings in the bud, not giving them development, the hero does not spare other people either.

In relationships with people, the "underground" also does not seek to limit his will. But if Pechorin's actions have a more philosophical orientation, then the rebellion of the "underground" is limited to recognizing its exclusivity, its intellectual and spiritual superiority over other people. [2, p. 134].

However, all the experiments set by Pechorin and the "underground" experiments, attempts to determine the limit of human capabilities or their personal ones, do not find a worthy way out. The hero of Lermontov, in view of his skeptical consciousness, cannot be sure of something for sure, and the "underground" one is not even able to guess about the possibility of the existence of a true, righteous path for him. This is the tragedy of the heroes. Both the "underground" and Pechorin are victims of unfulfilled ambitions, misunderstanding on the part of society, both are doomed to loneliness.

Given the ambiguity in the perception of the characters, their negative and positive sides, it is difficult to give them a specific description. The writers also took this into account, and therefore the very indication of the characters' belonging to these concepts is contradictory and ambiguous.

Bibliography:

1. Bakhtin M.M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. 4th ed. M., 1979. - 320 p.
2. Biryukov V. *Antihero: From "Dialectical Exercises on the Russian Theme"* / V. Biryukov // *New*

World: Monthly Journal of Fiction and Social Thought. - 2017. - N 2. - S. 141–149.

3. Budanova N. F. "Underground man" among superfluous people // Russian Literature. SPb.: Nauka, 2016. No. 3. P. 110–122.

4. Bulanov A.M. The ratio of "mind" and "heart" in the work of A.S. Pushkin and M.Yu. Lermontov. // Bulanov A.M. Artistic phenomenology of the image of "heart life" in Russian classics (A. S. Pushkin, M. Yu. Lermontov, I. A. Goncharov, F. M. Dostoevsky, L. N. Tolstoy): Volgograd, 2013. P. 32 - 44.

5. Shestov L.I. Dostoevsky and Nietzsche. Apotheosis of groundlessness: / Lev Shestov. - St. Petersburg, 2016. - 382 p.