

**The concepts of "I" and "We" and their relationship with the concept of "personality in history" in the epic novel "War and Peace"**

**A.K. Rashidov**

Associate Professor of  
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan.

**Annotation:** It is in this law, in my opinion, that the meaning of the concept of personality in history lies, brightly and colorfully reflected in Tolstoy's epic novel War and Peace.

**Keywords:** concept, Christian tradition, idealistic philosophy, "swarm principle", historical concept, psychological law, concept of personality in history.

Tolstoy's main thesis, based on Christian tradition and idealistic philosophy, was the thesis of non-resistance to evil by violence. This thesis was taken by Tolstoy from Christ's Sermon on the Mount. That is why Tolstoy perceived the war precisely as a bloody massacre, contrary to human essence. In the novel "War and Peace" he wrote: "A war has begun, that is, an event contrary to human reason and all human nature has taken place."

Tolstoy's attitude to the historical process and the personality in it was peculiar: he adhered to fatalistic views. Tolstoy completely rejected any justification and prerequisites for the historical event. History (according to Tolstoy) is an unpredictable, spontaneous phenomenon, and all historical events are destined from above. Tolstoy writes the following about his understanding of history: "For us, descendants, who are not historians who are not carried away by the process of research and therefore contemplate the event (meaning the war of 1812) with an unobscured healthy sense, its causes appear in innumerable numbers. The more we delve into the search for causes, the more they are revealed to us, and any single cause or a whole series of causes seems to us equally just in itself, and equally false in its insignificance in comparison with the enormity of the event, and equally false in its invalidity (without the participation of all other coincident causes) to produce an accomplished event."

Many researchers believe that history is made by individuals. A. J. Toynbee, for example, believed that the main role in history is played by the creative minority, that is, a small group of people, individuals. But Tolstoy is of the opposite opinion. He believes that individuals in history mean practically nothing, and all historical events take place regardless of the will of individuals. This concept is most clearly displayed in the novel "War and Peace" in the image of Kutuzov. Kutuzov "will not invent anything, will not undertake anything, but he will remember everything, put everything in its place, will not interfere with anything useful and will not allow anything harmful. He understands that there is something more significant than his will ...". Or we read elsewhere: "Kutuzov knew ... something else that should have decided the matter - something else, independent of the mind and knowledge ..." So what does Tolstoy mean by this "other knowledge"? This is nothing but the morale of the army, which decides the outcome of any battle.

Tolstoy believes that any nation is a collection of individuals, and until a critical, catastrophic situation arises (natural disaster, war, revolution), each individual lives his own life in his own world, in his own shell, limited to a circle their own, sometimes very selfish, problems and aspirations. But as soon as a critical situation arises, the so-called (according to Tolstoy) "swarm principle" wakes up in each personality. The people (that is, the totality of all the individuals of a given nation, regardless of social status), like a disturbed beehive, defend their homeland together, "with the whole world." And the stronger this "swarm principle" among the people, the more chances he has to win.

The main historical figures in the epic novel are Kutuzov and Napoleon. The images of these warlords opposed to each other clearly embody the above historical concept of the writer in the

novel. Kutuzov appears before us as an exponent of the "swarm principle", the national spirit, the will to win. He understands and subtly feels the spirit and mood of the army, he knows his army, and most importantly, his people. Prince Andrey says about Kutuzov: "And most importantly, why you believe him is that he is Russian ..."

Unlike Kutuzov, Napoleon is petty, conceited, arrogant, selfish, power-hungry, "for him the conviction was not new that his presence at all ends of the world, from Africa to the steppes of Muscovy, equally strikes and plunges people into the madness of self-forgetfulness." Napoleon is unnatural and divorced from the people's milieu. War for him is nothing more than a chess game. He is convinced that it was up to him "to shed or not to shed the blood of his peoples." In this, he completely denies the author's position on the role of the individual in history. But the ambitious man bows before Kutuzov after the battle of Borodino, sending one of his generals to the commander-in-chief of the Russian troops with a letter, where Bonaparte expresses "a feeling of respect and special reverence" that has been fed to Kutuzov for a long time.

In the article "A few words about the book" War and Peace ", L. N. Tolstoy writes about the role of the individual in history, that such epoch-making events, in which millions of people kill each other, could not depend or be caused by the will of one person, just as one person cannot dig a mountain. The author does not attach importance to the activities of those people "to whom it seemed that they control events," but in fact, less than others, they contributed "free human activity" to them. Their activities are of interest to the writer-philosopher only as an "illustration of that law of predestination" which, in his opinion, governs history, and of that psychological law that forces a person performing the most unfree act to forge in his imagination a whole series of retrospective conclusions, "aimed at prove to him his freedom."

#### Used literature:

1. Gobozov I.A. Social Philosophy. M.: Academic project, 2010. 352 p.
2. History of Eastern Philosophy: textbook / ed. M.T. Stepanyants. Reviewers N.I. Isaeva, M.S. Kozlov. M., 1998.
3. Kirilenko G.G., Philosophy / G.G. Kirilenko, E.V. Shevtsov.M.: Philol. Society "SLOVO": LLC "Publishing house "EKSMO", 2003. 672 p.
4. Kolyadin A.P. Approaches to the study of "I-concept" in the psychological Science // Proceedings of the North Caucasian State Technical university. Series "Humanities" No. 1 (13), 2005.
5. Spirkin A.G. Philosophy. M.: Gardariki, 2000. 368 p.
6. Аюпов, Тимур Рустамович. "Специфика интертекстуальных связей в раннем творчестве во пелевина (на материале романов " омон ра" и" чапаев и пустота")." Art Logos 1 (14) (2021): 63-72.
7. Ayupov, Timur Rustamovich. "The Specificity of Intertextual Connections in Pelevin's Early Works (based on the novels "Omon Ra" and "Chapaev and Emptiness")." Art Logos 1(14) (2021): 63-72.
8. Sheraliyeva, M. Sh. "Internal Synonymy of Adjectival Phraseological Units of the Russian Language." Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices 8 (2022): 201-204.