

Flying into Infinity on the Wings of Stupidity

Toirova Dilfuza Fayzullayevna

Dcs in philological sciences, associate professor Head of the Department of "Languages" of the Samarkand branch of the Tashkent University of Information Technologies

ABSTRACT

The article examines the work of Flaubert, in which the most difficult problems are posed - social, psychological, scientific. The masses of human experiences have been investigated, explained in shades that had not previously attracted the attention of artists. And these explanations are so clear and often so true that the smallest detail acquires the extraordinary power of artistic typicality. The work reveals the broadest pictures of modern society. Of course, there is not that huge crowd of characters that moves in Balzac's "The Human Comedy". Flaubert's characters cannot be counted in thousands or hundreds. But in these comparatively few heroes, Flaubert embodied the typical features of his modernity with an amazing power of condensation. These are "deep" heroes, since behind them are hidden tendencies of social development, the fate of many people, something close and familiar to everyone. They are heroes that make one think, and these reflections lead the modern reader to conclusions that Flaubert himself did not think about.

A new view of the world, a new understanding of the truth, to which Flaubert came in the early 40s, forced him to join the fight against Musset's "sentimentalism". Lamartine and his "rump", this whole crowd of poets clanking on the lyre with eyes directed to the stars, all these confessions, inspirations and tears seemed to Flaubert something directly opposite to genuine art and at the same time to romanticism, which, in his opinion, in his manifestos and works of art he expressed the tendencies of "objective" art.

Despite its close connection with romanticism, Flaubert's creative and aesthetic system is something fundamentally different and completely new in French literature. Some elements of romantic aesthetics acquire a different meaning in Flaubert: romantic dynamics is replaced by naturalistic statics and romantic history by naturalistic nature.

Submitting his creativity to the task of cognition, penetration into the objective world, reincarnation, Flaubert considered aesthetics not as a sum of recipes and norms, but as a definition of the highest tasks of art and ways of artistic cognition of reality. Therefore, the concept of form in his aesthetics is expressed in categories of a cognitive nature, and questions of technology turned out to be ideological questions.

KEYWORDS: *life, movement, piles, awakening, creativity, flourishing, aesthetics, romance.*

Introduction

The idea of a new novel was prepared by long reflections during a trip to the East. Here, in essence, the question of the "modern theme" in art was resolved, and this creative "mood", the result of a great theoretical work, allowed Flaubert, in a pitiful provincial adultery, to see a magnificent plot for a novel from modern life.

The story of Madame Bovary is outwardly unremarkable. A boring husband, two lovers, similar to each other, debts - all this, even in spite of the tragic end, is highly "ordinary" and "simple", even vulgar.

The strict correspondence between thought and word, between the depth of content and the perfection of form, even musical and rhythmic, amazed Flaubert himself. He refuses to rationally understand the nature of the aesthetic feeling, which he experiences with extraordinary power. How do things that "say nothing" turn out to be full of meaning? "I remember that I felt a heartbeat and acute pleasure when I saw the Acropolis, a completely bare wall (the one on the left when you go up to the Propylaea). So there you go! I want to know if a book, no matter what it says, can make the same impression? Isn't there some kind of inner quality, some kind of divine power, something eternal, like a law (I put it as a Platonist), in the exactness of the combinations, the refinement of the parts, in the finishing of the surface, the harmony of the whole? How else to explain the indestructible connection between the true word and the musical word? Why is it always a verse when you compress the thought too much? So, the law of numbers determines feelings and images, and what seems to be external is simply internal?" [1]. Thus, in Platonic, even Pythagorean terms, Flaubert tries to define the law of the unity of content and form that strikes him.

By affirming this unity, Flaubert abolishes the concept of "external form" that exists separately from the content. This "external form" is a concept that comes from the era of classicism, approved by the entire system of its genres and "rules". In criticism, she leads to the fact that works of art are evaluated according to an unshakable, predetermined yardstick, in accordance with formal rules applicable to all works, regardless of their content and intention.

The understanding of the form was a fundamental contradiction between the classics and the romantics. The main objection of the romantics was against classical "formalism." According to the teachings of the new school, each work creates its own form, predetermined by its intention.

Flaubert fully shares these views. Even in the first "Education of the Senses" he gives a brilliant criticism of the "classical", that is, in his opinion, a vulgar and false view of art. "If he begins to study any work," Flaubert characterizes his hero, who has degraded to the state of a bourgeois, "he so carefully examines the external form soon ceases to understand it and almost always finds flaws in it; not grasping the necessity that created it, he condemns exactly what is important in it, and thus passes by without noticing the beautiful; he will not notice either the deep correctness of the wrong phrase, or the harmony of the broken rhythm He carries in his mind an indefinite pattern with which he compares everything that he sees in art and everything that he feels in the light; in his opinion, the tragedy should be built according to a predetermined model, the drama - only by certain methods, the novel should be written in a certain style ... He even knows the laws of humor, fantasy ... He knows no other fiction of Hoffmann, nor romanticism beyond Byron" [2].

Flaubert constantly returns to this question, which was of paramount importance to him. "Form arises from content, like heat from fire" [3]. "Style, form, indefinable beauty are a consequence of the design itself" [4]. He protests against the "external" criticism to which Louis Bouillet subjected some pages of Madame Bovary, since his remarks are "accidental." "No, maybe all this has not yet been sufficiently thought out, since this distinction between thought and style is sophism. It all depends on the idea. " To understand all this, Flaubert wants to finish the work and consider every detail from the point of view of the whole [5]. After all, "every conceived work contains its own poetics, which must be discovered" [6].

Thus, Flaubert is an ardent opponent of formalistic "rules". The form taken by itself, the "external" form, seems to him the same tyranny and violence against the spirit, like bourgeois despotism in the modern state. He is convinced that the form in art dies out, as state power dies out or withers away.

By "form" he understands genre rules and literary traditions that restrict creative freedom. Opposing form to spirit, he identifies it with matter or with the material of art. "The finest works are those with less matter; the more the expression approaches the thought, the more the word merges with it and disappears, the more beautiful the work. I think the future of Art lies along these lines. It is becoming more ethereal, evolving from Egyptian pylons to narrow Gothic arches and from Indian poems of twenty thousand verses to sketches by Byron. Form, becoming more skillful, comes to naught; it discards all rituals, every rule, every measure; she leaves the epic for the novel, the verse for the prose; now it does not know any institutions and is free, like any will that generates it. Such liberation from materiality occurs everywhere, also in state systems developing from Eastern despotism to future socialism "[7].

Consequently, work on an artistic form should become the destruction of formalism in art, and the task of this work is to free creative thought from the inert mass of traditions that restrains it, from rules that are extraneous to it. The extraordinary merit of "Don Quixote" is that it "lacks art", that is, genre rules and traditions do not interfere with the freely flowing content [8].

From the same standpoint, Flaubert resolves the problem of plot. A natural conclusion from the main philosophical positions of Flaubert was an extraordinary expansion of the thematic range of art, associated with the rejection of "good taste" and all kinds of external "rules". Indeed, Flaubert argues that there are no good or bad stories. The quality of the work does not depend on the plot, but on the performance. In 1847, that is, in the epoch of the first "Temptation of St. Anthony", having visited the still empty tomb of Chateaubriand in Saint-Malo, Flaubert wonders whether the ideas themselves can be stupid or great? The idea of Chateaubriand to build a tomb for himself during his lifetime had previously seemed childish to him, but at Cape Saint-Malo, when he looked at the future at the sea cliff, this idea appeared to him in a different light. Maybe the value of ideas depends on their implementation? [9]. Flaubert gladly noted in Fromentin's book the reasoning that the plot of the picture has little meaning. "There is nothing fairer!" - he exclaims in 1876 [10].

Choosing the plot of Madame Bovary, Flaubert was guided by this very thought. "If the novel succeeds," Flaubert wrote in the midst of work on it, "by fulfilling it, I will establish two truths that are axioms for me: first, that poetry is subjective, that there are no good plots in literature, and therefore I veto is worth Constantinople; that, therefore, you can write about anything as well as about anything else "[11].

Saying that "poetry is subjective", Flaubert repeats his old idea: poetry does not depend on the objective properties of the material, plot, theme, etc., but on the interpretation that the artist subjects this material, that is, on the personal qualities of the artist. For him, I veto is as good as Constantinople - after all, poetry consists in truth, in the discovery of the "eternal" properties of nature and man. A remote provincial town has these properties, just like the capital of the Ottoman Empire, which attracted so many tourists at that time.

Flaubert repeated the same in 1857, with excitement taking up the "good plot" of his Carthaginian novel: "The words" good plot "have no meaning, everything depends on the execution" [12].

And yet Flaubert sometimes talks about "good" and "bad" stories. "Why take on such stories? - he writes about the tragedy of Madame de Girardin "Cleopatra". "There are ideas that are so heavy in themselves that they will crush anyone who wants to pick them up. Good stories make mediocre pieces. " "Byron failed Sardanapalus. Which artist will paint Caesar? In addition, antiquity was able to create people who, by the very fact of their existence, surpassed any fantasy. Those who want to reproduce them do not understand them - that is the point "[13].

Here, the notion of a "good plot" presupposes a well-known tradition that has already sanctified or exalted a particular event or figure, so that the artist has to compete with the demanding imagination

of the reader. That is why Flaubert embraces Salammbô with trepidation: the plot is "too good" [14]. In other words, the requirements that the reader, accustomed to admiring antiquity, makes for such subjects are too great, and in order to satisfy them, special conditions and special qualities are needed. Flaubert often complains about the "disgusting", "terrible" subjects on which he has to work [15]. These are plots that contradict the established tradition, devoid of "interest" in the generally accepted sense of the word, or evoke "non-poetic" associations, too vulgar, mundane, philistine. Finally, there may be cases when the plot of the work or the subject in question helps the artist or phrase, such as the "roar of the Ocean" and "music" in Musset's colorless academic speech [16]. This does not in the least contradict what Flaubert said about the indifference of the plot.

In the same system of thought, one should understand Flaubert's words about a book without a plot. "I would like to write a book about nothing, a book without external fastenings, which would hold by itself, by the internal force of style, like the earth is kept in the air, unsupported by anything, a book in which there would be almost no plot or it would be almost imperceptible if it were possible" [17].

These arguments are rich in content, and the word "plot" in Flaubert's use is ambiguous. First of all, Flaubert wants to say that in art, material alone does not decide anything, that value lies not in the choice of a theme or a depicted fragment of reality, but in how this theme or reality is depicted. Further, according to Flaubert, the interest aroused by the plot is not artistic interest, and therefore does not determine the artistic quality of the work: on the contrary, it can even hide the deep truth of the work, its artistry, focusing the reader's attention on external effects and empty intrigue.

"That is why," Flaubert confirms his thought in terms characteristic of him, "there are no good or bad plots, and, taking the point of view of pure Art, one could accept as an axiom that there is no plot at all, since the style itself in itself there is a perfect way to see things" [18].

In the light of this provision, it becomes clear that the idea that ideas can interest the reader in the same way as facts, that is, a "disembodied" plot can be as exciting as a completely "material" plot: it is only necessary that the ideas "flow one from another, like a cascade from a cascade, and so that they carry the reader in the thrill of phrases and the boil of metaphors" [19].

Flaubert discussed most of the issues raised here in the 1840s and 1850s, and with particular strangeness while working on *Madame Bovary*. In this novel, which ended the years of Flaubert's youthful quest, almost all of these problems received their practical solution.

This springboard is necessary. Without credibility, truth cannot be discovered. Therefore, for the artist, every little thing matters, factual, pictorial, psychological, every detail that can convince the reader of the truthfulness of what is depicted in reality. This "realization" of the idea is a necessary stage in the development of the creative process. Hugo's "outcasts", according to Flaubert, lack such elementary truthfulness or plausibility. "Observation is a secondary thing in literature, but you cannot depict society so falsely if you are a contemporary of Balzac and Dickens. And it was a wonderful plot, but what calmness and what a scientific scope it demanded! It is true that Uncle Hugo despises science and proves it" [20].

Thus, in Spinozite terms and idealistic formulations, Flaubert tried to express his desire for "true" reality and to move away from superficial description of everyday life. To reveal the essential under the cover of the accidental, to overcome the fluid surface of phenomena in order to penetrate deep into the laws of human and social life - such is the philosophical and aesthetic meaning of all these remarks, which are stubbornly repeated in Flaubert's correspondence. At the same time, it was a polemic with empiricism and factography, widespread in contemporary literature and raised almost into law by the theoreticians of the so-called "sincere realism" Chanfleury and Duranty.

"Everything invented is true, be sure of it. Poetry is as precise as geometry. Induction is worth

deduction, and besides, having reached a certain level, one can infallibly judge everything that concerns mental life "[21].

However, there is nothing "classic" in the true, historical sense of the word here. Cousin's Cartesianism is not classicism, but essences and not even Cartesianism. The cousin turned to Descartes to find support for his "psychological method", which built the external world through introspection. This point of view was completely unacceptable to Flaubert. Not to impose one's ideas on the nature, but to cognize the essence of things in the system of their objective laws, obtained by rigorous scientific, experimental research - this is Flaubert's task, directly opposed to the "psychological method." Aesthetic cognition, free from addictions and clichés, from ideas imposed by tradition and one's own "interest", comprehends the essence through the fluid chaos of "finite" things. The artist recreates this essence in art. In this sense, "invented" is cognized; only in this sense is it true.

Comparing artistic creation with geometry, Flaubert compares the induction of his fiction with geometric deduction, therefore, he speaks of the empirical nature of artistic knowledge: the artist guesses the truth from disparate elements of experience, almost predicts it based on observed facts. Consequently, art, this "true fiction", is not an "expression" as it was for Musset or "Lamartine's rump." And the very task of art is not at all to express emotions.

But if art, according to Flaubert, cannot be an "expression", that is, a projection of the artist's subjective experiences into the objective world of reality, can one see in it an "imitation", an image of this objective world?

Bourgeois aesthetic thought moves between these two concepts, linking "expression" with romanticism, and "imitation" with classicism and characterizing these two styles as two primordial principles, the only two possibilities of art.

However, this truth is by no means "platonian", it is drawn from everyday life or historical reality. "Creativity" is to free ourselves from the empirical copying of reality and, in accordance with the laws of reality and, in accordance with the laws of reality, "invent" a reality in which these laws would be more distinct. Creativity is, in essence, the revelation of the laws of reality, clothed in the most typical and, therefore, regular form. Art is the world of the typical.

This is how artistic creativity comes closer to scientific knowledge, preserving all the immediacy of sensory perception.

The identification of beauty and truth is one of the most important points of Flaubert's aesthetics and at the same time the key to the question of form and content.

Thus, the guiding principle is the content, which is naturally and necessarily molded into the proper form. You need to know exactly what you want to say. One has to surrender to feeling and forget about the form in order to create the perfect form. You need to become different - a character, a thing, an object. You need to become simple, naive. In other words, do not think about style, about form as something external and self-sufficient, because such a form does not exist.

Already in the 30s, the complex intrigues and extraordinary adventures that led to the wide Flaubert, the "mass" success of the historical novel, are losing their attractiveness. Now they seem to be a "fiction", a craft device that is inconsistent with the true artistic truth. In the early 1930s, novelists are still trying to find in modern times the same "interest" with which historical novels of the 1920s were full. An example of this type of "modern story" may be Balzac's *The Story of Thirteen*. But soon the modern material began to be opposed to the historical, as the ordinary to the extraordinary and, therefore, as the truth - to fiction. In the ordinary they tried to find something more dramatic than battles and intrigues and the Middle Ages. Sorting through all this filth and insignificance, literature

found plots that are dramatic precisely because of its routine and external "ugliness." From now on, the search for drama will go exactly in this direction. Balzac, in his critical articles and prefaces, formulates the "aesthetics of modern life" that found expression in his novels. At the same time, he is trying to create a "simple" plot, "to build a palace on the edge of a needle." He is already embarking on this path in Eugene Grande, and even the complex action of his last novels arises thanks to the "explanation" of the extremely simple situation underlying the novel. Almost all of the serious literature of the era developed in this direction. Driven by a passionate interest in social issues, drawing on the experience of the generation of the 30s, finding support in the paintings of Courbet, in the works of Gavarnie, Monier and other caricaturists, the so-called "school of realists" of the 50s, headed by Chanfleury, with unswerving consistency requires only "Modern" art, only "low" themes, urban, peasant, provincial life, colorless destinies and stupid heroes. In such stories, representatives of the school find material for cruel satire, and a reason for sentimental tears, and the possibility of an impartial study of society.

Thus, in his ugly modernity, Flaubert sought material for high art. The ugliness did not scare him away, since even now he had a presentiment that his art would not be an embellishment of reality, but its exposure. He realized that the "gloomy grotesque" and the struggle of contradictions are characteristic of modernity, and romantic aesthetics helped him to comprehend this spectacle as a material for art. But in 1850 it still seemed to him that France was on the threshold of new, bright times. The past seemed to him decrepit, the future - unclear, and the present - a transition to some other order. He viewed his time as a pre-dawn twilight, and only after the establishment of the Empire did reality appear to him as a motionless darkness of the night. This look was expressed in Madame Bovary.

Flaubert dreamed of a more average hero, something that you meet at every step of your daily existence. He was looking for a plot of the ordinary and tragic at the same time: after all, only in such a novel would he be able to show his era, since its specific feature was vulgarity.

The novel, which, according to Flaubert's plan, was supposed to depict the grimacing, ugly and sad modernity, narrated about provincial adultery. This theme seemed particularly contemporary to Flaubert. Indeed, it was extremely common in literature. Novels and dramas have developed it with a passion and pathos that has not lost its strength for a century.

Flaubert does not want to express cheap indignation in the face of this tragic problem. He does not take the side of his wife or the side of her husband, since the causes of the tragedy lie, in his opinion, outside their will. He does not laugh at a misunderstood woman, since he understands her, and does not hope to resolve the fatal question by means of utopian socialism. The tragedy of adultery seems to him wider than adultery, and therefore, its meaning is not just adultery: it is a social phenomenon. The portrayal of "all this lie" was supposed to turn into an exposure of the society that created it by the system of its laws and customs. At the same time, Flaubert wanted to discover here that "unity of contradictions" and that "impossibility of happiness" which seemed to him an inescapable quality of life.

Having understood his task in this way, he seemed to have summed up what had been done by his predecessors, and, having considered the problem in all aspects, transferred it from the field of simple moralization to the field of philosophical and "scientific" research.

However, having sketched a plan, Flaubert abandoned this idea and again returned to the "Flemish novel" as more modern and "understandable." Developing it, he came to the plot of "Madame Bovary".

In her search and yearning, Emma goes through the same stages that the heroes of "The Diary of a Madman" and "November" went through. Joyful expectation of something big and beautiful in early

youth, then a "mistake" in Charles. Just like the hero of "Notes", she takes light excitement for "burning and violent love" and just tries "with all the power of her imagination to fan this weak, barely smoldering light." Her longing is just as vague, and her torment has no name: she does not know what she wants and what she should desire. She feels the same irresistible disgust for the environment and, like the hero of "November", falls into complete apathy, sitting in the room, lying on the sofa and watching the same boring landscape from the window. Her dreams also focus on love and lover, and the passion that takes possession of her is just as unconditional and imperative. She also dreams of long journeys, of Italy, Paris - these more accessible places replace exotic Sahara and India for the poorly educated Emma. She is also fond of "bad writers" - Musset, Lamartine, Walter Scott and, probably, many others, more secondary, but at the same time writers whom Flaubert himself always considered great - Byron, Victor Hugo. Immersed in her melancholy and despair, she becomes callous and cruel to her family and husband, and the disgrace of those around her, her daughter and Charles, seems to her almost a crime. She also "wants to die - and live in Paris" - in a word, she repeats all this martyrdom step by step, with shades that were so accurately depicted by Flaubert in his "personal" novels.

This is a real romantic melancholy, cultivated in various versions by the writers of the beginning of the century, the dream of a "blue flower" that changes its objects, but psychologically it is still the same. However, in *Madame Bovary*, this melancholy turns out to be not a personal experience of the author, but a subject of social research and a characteristic of modernity.

The French romantic ennui of the 1930s has complex origins. It includes not only the "Sehnsucht" of German romantics, not only the melancholy and "uncertainty of passions" of Chateaubriand and Senancourt, but also the philosophical concern of Faust and the violent protest of Byron. Originating from anger and hatred in the era of the Byron test. Arose out of anger and hatred in the era of the triumph of "shopkeepers", "fierce" longing retained all these elements. She was primarily a rejection of the surrounding reality, a stubborn, gloomy, albeit hopeless protest against her. No matter how personal her motives may seem, this melancholy had an impersonal character, which is expressed in the old and artificial term "world sorrow".

"For ten millennia, a hopeless cry of impotent desire has been heard on this cursed land."

But by lowering his heroine so cruelly, Flaubert made titanic anxiety "eternal". After all, the titans usually figured in a symbolic drama, in a plot, deliberately devoid of any everyday features, in order to emphasize the "philosophical" meaning of the poem with a conscious ahistoricity. Trying to make the images more capacious, the poets gave their theme a symbolic, speculative character and deprived it of "humanity". Mythological or legendary characters acting in interplanetary space, on a primitive earth or in the conditional "Middle Ages", made the protest too abstract. Their anxiety turned out to be an "exception", the lot of a rare, supernaturally powerful nature.

For Flaubert, this tragedy seemed common, ubiquitous and inescapable: it is the fate of every original nature, a beating environment of evil and violence.

The image of Emma Bovary acquires an enormous power of generalization. He becomes a symbol of modernity, one of those "gigantic" images that, according to Flaubert, embody entire epochs and ideas. The "modern" melancholy that breaks the heart of a provincial bourgeois woman and manifests itself in miserable adultery characterizes modern bourgeois life so deeply that Flaubert could be satisfied if this feeling was available to him: he created something similar to the heroes of Rabelais, Shakespeare or Cervantes, the image amazing in its grandiose simplicity and at the same time infinitely complex in content and structure.

Flaubert chose as his heroine a woman who was not accustomed to understanding her experiences, who lived not by reason, but by feeling, little educated in general. She lives in the power of her own,

for herself, not always clear instincts, regulated by equally obscure aesthetic ideals, traditional upbringing, and environment. Therefore, simple logic cannot explain such a psychology. It was necessary to abandon the method of the old masters, who discovered a strictly rational, logical system in the behavior of their heroes.

The main psychological method of the previous period, based on the materialistic psychology of the late 17th - early 19th centuries, was the "dominant passion" method. The character's psychology became the logic of this passion. The hero was "logical" by his very essence and straightforward, despite the complex combinations of motives. Balzac's psychological prowess was largely built on the territory of dominant passion.

Flaubert completely abandoned this method. First of all, Madame Bovary does not have a dominant passion, since the vexation of the spirit cannot be called passion, if only because of its principles. In addition, Flaubert avoids defining his characters, as, for example, Balzac or Hugo do. He does not characterize them, and this external characteristic indicates the caution with which he approaches the problem of character. Flaubert writes in small strokes, not giving final and solid outlines and presenting the hero to freely develop within the framework of the situation. In general, the character of Flaubert's heroes is not as cruelly outlined as that of his predecessors, and therefore allows more unexpected and outwardly "free" reactions, despite all the "fatality" of their fate and behavior.

At the same time, Madame Bovary's actions are losing that "logic of passion" that Balzac's heroes possessed. Emma does not do what her passion requires of her. The laws of psychology are not laws of logic, and in this sense, Emma's behavior is irrational. It is not so much even contrary to logic as free from it; Emma's actions cannot be judged from a logical point of view. And to give just a few examples that can be considered the greatest examples of psychological skill, let us point out the coldness of Emma, who pushed Leon away at the moment when she realized that they loved each other, and despite the fact that she wanted this closeness; on her behavior in the forest, on a letter to Leon, written before a decisive date and thrown out of the fiacre, on passionate outbursts of love after love has disappeared, on a long series of self-deceptions.

This is the originality of Flaubert's psychological skill: he introduced into fiction the psychology of logically incomprehensible motives, that is, what was called "physiology" in the language of the era.

Flaubert could find something similar at Stendhal. Brought up on materialistic philosophy and psychology, Stendhal closely followed the manifestations of passion and movements of the will that appeared as if apart from reason and in any case contrary to conscious desire. This happens especially often with his heroines, whose behavior sometimes turns out to be a solid ball of contradictions. However, Stendhal's rationalism often forced him to explain these seemingly illogical movements with the logic of instinct, similar to the logic of reason. For Flaubert, such permission was impossible. Refusing to consider the world by analogy with human "common sense", overcoming the old philosophical anthropomorphism, in the play of human passions, he willingly stated something "illogical", contrary to the usual bourgeois "common sense". In this case, he went in the same direction in which physiological and psychological research of his time went, from the German psychologists who laid the foundations of "experimental" psychology to the English psychologists Getchisov and Lewis. It was in "physiological psychology" that Flaubert found proof of psychological determinism, which for him was both a philosophical certainty and an immediate inner sensation. After all, it was all the same unity of matter and spirit, which seemed to him one of the most undoubted and most important provisions of modern science.

Flaubert did not want to punish his heroine or blame her for "bad behavior." The moral of the novel was different - not moralizing a respectable philistine, but sympathy for his victim. This "civilization" created by the bourgeoisie in its collision with nature constitutes a "necessity" in the

nets of which the "free" Madame Bovary, warped by her, beats.

And yet Flaubert treats Emma differently than he did to the characters in *Notes of a Madman* and *November*. The early novels are written in a tragic, serious manner, and the author is in solidarity with his heroes. In *Madame Bovary*, the situation is completely different: the author treats with cruel irony the heroine, for whom he sympathizes so much. This novel originated in a different aesthetic system developed by Flaubert over many years of thought and labor.

Bovary's mod is in disaster, just like the heroes of his early works. She evokes the sympathy of Flaubert because she is like them; but for the same reason it evokes his irony. This is the same "sentimental type" as Musset and Lamartine were. She sins in the same way that Flaubert himself sinned in his youth. She whips up herself to sharpen her sensitivity, in order to find happiness in this "vaunted" feeling. She seeks happiness in love, in passion, in the "poetry of life" outside, that is, she is looking for something that, from Flaubert's point of view, is completely inaccessible to a person with genuine, acute sensitivity. Real love, "lover" can only help temporarily [41]. Madame Bovary's "happy" love for Rodolphe turns into suffering, not only because it causes aversion to her husband and domestic life, but mainly because it requires even more complete possession, more perfect bliss. Almost the same is repeated in Madame Bovary's second "happiness". After dating, separation comes. Too demanding love scares and irritates lovers. Emma lies and goes into debt as her appetites grow and her thirst for happiness flares up more and more. Finally, love itself disappears, since the lover does not correspond to the ideal and since, from Flaubert's point of view, no passion, no desire can be satisfied.

You can escape desire only by abandoning it or transferring it to the ideal sphere of art. The fate of the heroine and the history of her internal catastrophes represent the development of this situation.

Pure laughter, not ironic, not "destructive" and not "satanic" is no longer captivating. French romantics combine, following the example of Byron, "passion" and "irony", but often completely rethink his work: Byron was a revolutionary poet, while French romantics in new social conditions create poetry of a different quality, assuming an anarchic character. This also expresses the bourgeois essence of this protest and disgust - the inability to find stable values in the future and support in the present, lack of faith in one's own strengths with an obvious individualistic overestimation of them, the desire to change society and fear of social change. The writers of the reactionary camp considered irony to be the main evil of our time, which destroyed Catholicism and the monarchy and gave birth to the revolution - an example is G. Druino's novel "Irony" (1833).

In the dark, "violent" poetry of the 1930s, irony was a means of introspection, uprooting "prejudices" and fighting the modern order. However, in the same period, it began to perform completely different functions in French literature: it was the overcoming of extreme subjectivism, a means of entering large, "objective" art.

Indeed, with the transition to new positions, with the rejection of Byronic "fury", from melancholic dreams and individualistic narcissism, the attitude towards the hero of the "personal" novel, towards the lyrical hero of tearful lamentations, "nights" and "reflections" should have changed. A melancholy young man who is not carrying the burden of "world sorrow" has turned into a ridiculous whiner, an unrecognized genius into a weak-willed and talentless sprinkler, a dreamer into a fool. The hero broke away from the author, from an exponent of his feelings he turned into an object of his ridicule, he became a phenomenon of objective reality that must be studied and described in order to overcome. At the same time, the creative process turned out to be not so much an "expression" as an "image". This struggle with the "personal" hero, which turned out to be a struggle for "objective" art, was accomplished by means of irony. Irony helped to break the close ties that connected the author with his hero, helped the writer to portray his hero "from the outside" and in his relation to the

outside world, to take the point of view of the reader. Sometimes this process testified to the decline of rebellious sentiments, to some reconciliation, even pessimistic and indignant, with the "world evil", more often it contributed to a sharper analysis of modern reality.

Emma wanted to find something significant in her husband, no matter how close to her book ideal. She babbled sentimental words to him and sang melancholic romances in the garden, in the moonlight, but even after that she felt calm as before, and Charles was neither more in love nor more excited. Operation cripple convinced Emma of her husband's mediocrity.

Madame Bovary finds in lovers the same as in her husband, and in adultery - all the same "vulgarity of marriage." Rodolphe is bored during her poetic outpourings and does not want to sacrifice anything, Leon is a weak character, bored with too much passion, almost a cautious person. She soon ceases to love him, she loves her love in him, or, rather, herself, and a few cynical remarks in the first "plan" bring this idea to full clarity.

At the same time, all this "poetry of love" turns into the most common adultery. Emma is forced to lie to her husband, invent many tricks and petty deceptions, and involve others in the sphere of her deceptions. She should be in awe of every neighbor. Out of love for luxury and sentimentality, she makes gifts to her lovers. In moments of emotional excitement, she is able to recite the well-known poems of Musset or Lamartine. Caressing the child, she indulged in "pathetic outpourings, which everywhere, except for Yonville, would resemble the recluse from Notre Dame Cathedral." Passionate love is expressed in the most hackneyed phrases borrowed from some well-worn novel, and to Rodolphe, who has heard all this many times in his life, feelings seem as commonplace as the words that express them: metaphors! After all, no one can ever give an exact measure of either their needs, or their thoughts, or their sorrows. After all, human speech is like a broken drum, and we beat out melodies on it, from which the bears could dance, while we would like to touch the stars. "

However, it is not only the expression of Emma's feelings that is funny, the purpose of her aspirations and her tastes are also funny. At the center of her desires is one object: "a handsome boy" - a traditional hero with a more or less Byronic appearance, dressed in black velvet, surrounded by luxury and power, full of all sorts of perfections. She gives her beloved sachets with mottos, decorates the room with some kind of curtains, demands from Rodolphe to think about her at exactly midnight. Bourgeois jewelry, beautiful jackets or boots are for her a necessary accompaniment of great passion, "poetry of life", without which happiness is impossible for her. She dreams of what every provincial lady, who has read a lot of second-rate novels, dreams of what seems unusually funny and, most importantly, banal to any more educated person, even to any "Parisian".

The novel ends with Emma's death. This ending is very traditional. Dozens of heroines, abandoned by their lovers or desperate in love, died from nervous fever, from despair, from other diseases, sometimes in great detail, with physiological details described.

Nevertheless, Flaubert was just at this time developing a plot in which the heroine is not comforted, but dies, as if his critical judgments were based on other aesthetic principles than his artistic work.

However, in essence, there is no contradiction here. The death of Madame Bovary is as prosaic as the life of any woman in the world. She is not dying of love or of a broken heart: lack of money turns out to be the reason for suicide.

The author has reserved another death for his heroine, otherwise motivated. Disappointed in the second lover, seeing a frightening emptiness around her, Emma does not die from this. The reason for the suicide is not a heartfelt catastrophe or a philosophical tragedy, but the Ionville usurer, threatening her with an inventory of property and fear of Charles's unbearable longsuffering. She offers Leon to rob the owner, she is ready to surrender herself to Rodlef after all the humiliation and

betrayal in order to get two thousand francs from him - she again tramples in the mud of low calculations, from which she wanted to escape. The more she made efforts to get into a real feeling of passion, the more she plunged into the abomination of the ordinary, and at the very bottom of it she found her death.

This death is also prosaic. The physiological details with which Flaubert describes the action of the poison may not have been ironic. But the nonsense that Homé and Bournisienne say at her coffin, a snack with a drink, a new wooden leg of the groom Hippolytus, the postures and faces of the Ionville inhabitants - all this comic is turning into a high tragedy. Emma dies in Yonville's arms, even in death she belongs to him.

During the last agony, drowning out the words of Latin prayers, the hoarse voice of the Blind is heard under the windows, singing his frivolous song. "Blind!" she screamed. And Emma burst out laughing, wild, frantic, desperate laughter, as if she had seen the hideous face of a freak, a scarecrow protruding from the eternal darkness.

The blind man takes on a symbolic meaning. In the eternal darkness that grips Emma, he remains alone, like a symbol of all life, all life in general, the eternal irony of human existence. For a moment, he takes on the role of the god of the grotesque, the monstrous Yuka from Flaubert's youthful drama:

In this regard, the novel, with unusual force depicting bourgeois France in her bourgeois everyday life, echoes Flaubert's dark, symbolic and "violent" drama.

The author did not save his heroine from any of the possible insults. He gave her no intelligence, no education, no subtlety of taste, no strength of mind. And only this ineradicable aspiration, the thirst for the unknown and forbidden, elevate Emma above all contented and happy and sharply, categorically and forever oppose her to the "environment".

Emma Bovary occupies a special place in Flaubert's work. Among the mass of images created by him in the previous period, we will not find a single one that is equally generalized and just as specific. In Flaubert's symbolic drama, the main character, in accordance with the traditions of the genre, was entirely subordinated to the philosophical task that he was called upon to solve. For this task, he freed himself from the laws of nature and life, he used the services of the devil, ascended into the sky, saw extraordinary visions and lived many fantastic lives instead of one real one. Fatal passions, too emphasized ugliness, too emphasized beauty, coincidence of circumstances, as if specially selected to create the necessary situation - these are sufficient means to confirm the thesis. Everything is sacrificed to the thesis - and external plausibility, and characters, and descriptions of the environment. The idea is too proclaimed, it triumphs over the work, it is, as it were, a signboard for it.

In the image of Emma there is a broad philosophical thought, but it is included in the content, it does not come out, as it was in the early works of Flaubert, as it happened in many of George Sand's novels. Psychology is embedded in the environment and is determined by it, therefore the events of the novel do not seem to be random, selected with a premeditated intention, they grow out of life itself, from everyday life, from reality in the broad sense of the word. The reader is struck by the truth of the details, reaching the point of illusion, beating like blows of a whip, everyday life, which is breathtaking. But this routine, which has become an aesthetic category here, expresses something more. It's not just Emma's disasters, shown as a special case of someone's private life. Behind the tragedy of adultery grows the tragedy of love and longing, to which a woman is doomed in the world of monstrous philistinism.

Flaubert wanted to smear the 19th century with his hatred, "like Indian pagodas are gilded with cow

ding." The image of Emma and for him had a social meaning as an exposure of modern society. But he doubted the possibility of a better future. He believed that always, under any system, a person would be dissatisfied in his desires, deceived in hopes, oskarbled and exhausted by the environment. Therefore, he explained the fate of his heroine by the fact that she was expecting her happiness from real life, she wanted to find her dream in reality.

Impossible desires and aversion to the environment, the gap between the dream and the given, have historical reasons and especially spread towards the middle of the 19th century, during the period of the triumph of the capitalist system, which created its reality on the ruins of educational illusions. We know who bears the blame, which Flaubert distributed evenly between nature and history. Therefore, the image of Emma over the century that has passed since the appearance of the novel, not only did not fade, but acquired an even sharper political meaning. Now it is more precisely addressed: the miserable suicide of the provincial Yonville accuses not nature, not the elements, not the "laws of life", but a society that has violated the natural rights of man and doomed him to a Tomitic, useless and tragic existence, to a "life like death."

However, let us believe Flaubert himself: he never painted portraits, he had no personalities. All these cases of his own biography, small observations, recollections of what he read were for Flaubert only material that lost biographical or personal meaning as soon as he fell into the orbit of his creative thought. Louise Colet was wrong: Flaubert did not ridicule her signet, because, having entered the concept, this signet with its motto and with all other associated associations was "objectified" and began to live its own special life, independent of Louise Colet and Gustave Flaubert. Exactly the same applies to other "muses" and models: and they and all the feelings that they experienced and inspired, became simple material and lost their personal and biographical meaning when Flaubert's artistic and objectifying imagination began to work.

Thus, the psychology of the protagonist includes the material of introspection. Observing himself in moments of passion, "in the best moments," Flaubert was essentially preparing material for his novel. "To a certain extent," Flaubert stipulates, since this subtle individual psychology was supposed to become the psychology of a philistine and a generalized psychology.

Madame Bovary suffers in her wilderness with the same disease that suffered all the "violent" heroes of the young Flaubert. She is pursued by inexpressible anxiety, longing for everything that she cannot find in the reality around her. She herself does not understand what she wants, since her melancholy "changes its shape, like clouds, and sweeps by, curling like a whirlwind." She goes from hope to despair and waits for something all the time.

Conclusion

In the work of Flaubert, the most difficult problems are posed - social, psychological, scientific. The masses of human experiences have been investigated, explained in shades that had not previously attracted the attention of artists. And these explanations are so clear and often so true that the smallest detail acquires the extraordinary power of artistic typicality. The work reveals the broadest pictures of modern society. Of course, there is not that huge crowd of characters that moves in Balzac's "The Human Comedy". Flaubert's characters cannot be counted in thousands or hundreds. But in these comparatively few heroes, Flaubert embodied the typical features of his modernity with an amazing power of condensation. These are "deep" heroes, since behind them are hidden tendencies of social development, the fate of many people, something close and familiar to everyone. They are heroes that make one think, and these reflections lead the modern reader to conclusions that Flaubert himself did not think about.

References:

1. Adain A., Lerminier G., Morot-Sir E. Littérature française: En 2 vol. –P.: Larousse, 1972.
2. Andréoli M. Esquisse d'un parallèle entre les philosophies de Balzac et de Hugo. // Romantisme. 2004. Vol. 2. №124.
3. Antropologies de la Littérature de la langue française. – Paris: Bordas, 1988. P.488.
4. Artaud M. Essai sur le génie poétique du XIX siècle. “Revue d'histoire Encyclopédique”, 1985, T/25. P-613.
5. Bailly R. Dictionnaire des synonymes. Paris: Larousse, 1947. P-169.
6. Brix M. Le romantisme français: esthétique platonicienne et modernité littéraire. Peeters Publishers, 1999. P.566.
7. Charles-Wurtz L. La poésie saxifrage // Revue des Lettres Modernes. L'écriture poétique. №6. Cain: Minard, 2006.
8. Chicherin A.V. Rhythm of the image. -M.: Science, 1980.P-239.
9. Ermatov B. French realist novel of the XIX century, translated into the Uzbek language: author. diss. ... cand. philol. nauk. - T., 1991. P. 36.
10. Freudenberg O.M. Poetics of the plot and genre. - M.: Labyrinth, 1997.
11. “Globe”, 1825. 17 mai. L'article de L. Maigron. P-150.
12. Guizot F. Cours d'histoire moderne. Histoire de la civilisation en France, T.IV, 1830.P-231.
13. Gusdorf G. Fondements du savoir romantique. – P.: Payot, 1982. P.299.
14. Gusdorf G. Du néant à Dieu dans le savoir romantique. – P.: Payot, 1983. P.311.
15. Gusdorf G. L'homme romantique. – P.: Payot, 1984. P.277.
16. Holbekov M.N. French art prose in translations into Uzbek (history and translation experience): Autoref. diss... sciences. – T., 1982. P.22.
17. “Journal des Débats”, 1823. 16 septembre.P-3.
18. “Journal des Goncourt”, vol. 1, p. 36.
19. Kondorskaya V.I. To the history of the image of Madame Bovary – “Learned Notes” of the Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute named after A.I. Gerzen, t. XXVI, 1939, p. 222.
20. Lesur G.L. Annuaire historique et politique pour, 1820.P-811.
21. Le petit Larousse illustre. – Larousse, 2011. P-1777.
22. Miller D.L. Le nouveau polythéisme. P.: Imago, 1979. Pichois C. Philarète Charles et la vie littéraire au temps du romantisme. – Paris, 1964. P.389.
23. Pichois C. Philarète Charles et la vie littéraire au temps du romantisme. – Paris, 1964. P.377.
24. “Réponse aux adieux de sir Walter Scott à ses lecteurs” // “Recueils poétiques”. – Œuvres complètes, IV, 1849. P-180.
25. Reizov B.G., The Work of Flaubert. Page 522.
26. Schweibelman N. F. Poetics of the prose of the French poets of the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. - Tyumen, 2003. P.36.
27. Tertaryan I.A. The History of world literature: in 9 volumes. - M.: Nauka, 1989.P.300.
28. Tolmacheva V.M. From romanticism to romanticism. - M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 1997. P.306.