



The Definition of “Female Style” in Literature

N. Parmonova

National University of Uzbekistan

E-Mail address: nasibaparmonova@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article is dedicated to that in the Middle Ages, the history of the issue of gender in art actively developed the hatred of women, which was reflected even in literature, and in various types of art. By the twentieth century, feminism in the US and Great Britain already occupies a very strong position in the public consciousness, so the works of many writers are clearly studied from the point of view of their feminism simplicity. It should be noted that everything that is written with a woman's hand does not automatically fall into the definition of “women's literature”. A number of critics point out this kind of female prose, which includes features outside the gender literature. Gender-free literature is considered to be written with a female hand, but does not place itself as a “female”, that is, a “male speech” appears in it.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 4th March 2022

Revised: 6th April 2022

Accepted: 21st May 2022

KEYWORDS: Gender, Literature, Consciousness, “Women's Literature”, Female Prose, Feminism, Author's Gender.

In the Middle Ages, the history of the issue of gender in art actively developed the hatred of women, which was reflected even in literature, and in various types of art. For example, in the horror court scene at the Church of San Lazarus in the city of Oten (XII century), only two women were sent to Paradise, four to hell. If in ancient times a woman had a number of rights, then during the period of the coming of the carols (715-th year) to power, women begin to lose their rights, their activity is sharply reduced, the places of residence of women are limited only to houses and monasteries. Therefore, in the Middle Ages it was already difficult for a woman to understand herself creatively - she was not recognized as a creative person. Only by the XIX century the woman gradually enters a more open creative path. The researchers Associate, this fact with the emergence of the flow of feminism.

By the twentieth century, feminism in the US and Great Britain already occupies a very strong position in the public consciousness, so the works of many writers are clearly studied from the point of view of their feminism simplicity. For example, the prose of the American writer Rand was studied feministically. It should be noted that everything that is written with a woman's hand does not automatically fall into the definition of “women's literature”. A number of critics point out this kind of female prose, which includes features outside the gender literature. Gender-free literature is considered to be written with a female hand, but does not place itself as a “female”, that is, a “male speech” appears in it. Russian researcher M. Zavyalova believes that this type of writing is characteristic of Russian writers. In particular, she writes about Irina Polyanskaya: “the male letter, which persistently goes to different issues of female identity and female nature, is restored.” Russian poet and literary critic Zinaida Gippius called on writers to abandon sexual relations, he supported the intervention of a man and a woman in the intrigue and creativity of literature. “If a man is a woman, after all, sometimes says, thinks and develops— it is the male principle that is involved in it creates.” Gippius often referred to herself as “Z.” for the sole purpose of which the signature gender has become ambiguous. About Gippius's step researcher K. Ekonen writes: “Gippius talks

about the experience of women in male culture, but at the same time he destroys himself from the number of women.” And continues: “there must be an ideal harmony between the male and female elements in Man (which Gippius considers herself), and in most women only feminism dominates.”

A number of other researchers still recognize the existence of “women's literature”, but note that the gender of the literature is relevant only under certain circumstances. For example, according to Penza O. V. “it is not important for the author's gender, literary criticism, if it does not affect the content and meaningful parameters of the texts.” But there are also researchers who, without any conditions, divide “women's literature” into separate types and perceive literature and art as “an individual creative act that directly determines the personality of the artist, his characteristics, psychological painting, the shape and content of the work.” In addition, in psychology and philosophy, separate psycho types – male and female, their characteristic features are not reflected in the “product” they create. As there are two beginnings in life, in creativity there are both male and female characteristics – male and female, so in creativity there are two different beginnings. English writer and theorist of female creativity V. Woolf points out that “poetry needs parents: the mother is not inferior to the father”. In science, many people talk about the metaphysical basis of both sexes, the specific gender characteristics of creativity that lead to creation, which in any creation have both female and male characteristics. Each sex adds its own component to the creative process: a man is heroic, strong and a woman is a sacrifice, contributes to something weak. There is a basic dichotomy (the division of the whole into two parts, then each part is further divided into two, etc.), which is accepted in society and extrapolated to creativity (a scientific research method consisting in the distribution of the conclusions from the observation of one part of the phenomenon into another part; scientific forecasting of events). So, two main types of speech: - patriarchal, typical, classical – masculine and other speech, poorly studied - female. Among those who recognize the existence of “women's literature”, it is necessary to distinguish those who have a positive attitude to this phenomenon and those who have a negative attitude to it.

In the middle of the XIX century (in 1834 year) V. Belinsky expressed his sharply negative attitude towards a woman as a creator. A well-known critic wrote about women: “their creations are short-lived, because a woman will not only eat when she creates, but also become a poet when she loves.” Nature sometimes gives them a spark of talent, but never gives them genius. In a word, a female writer with talent is sad, and a female writer without talent is funny and disgusting.” Among the most famous thinkers who adhered to this point of view, the philosopher O. Vayninger, who at the beginning of the XX century clearly expressed his negative attitude to women's creativity and said that the female creator is weak. N. Abramovich, also expressed a similar attitude to female creativity in the book “the world of female and male culture”. Analyzing the works of the writers, he noted that “female creativity really does not exist, the manifestation of the human spirit, the specific inner “I”, “female participation in the intellectual life of the world is insignificant”. Z. Gippius adds to these thoughts. He in the essay “The God of animals”, dedicated to women's creativity: “women's creativity” is the biggest nonsense, because “Woman” includes neither the mind nor the power of creation, and at its root it is immobile. Weininger stressed that “it is true again. So until the middle of the XX century, not only the jerks, but also the women themselves had a negative attitude to women's creativity. We read about the negative attitude to female creativity by Khrynyk: “in relation to literature, the definition of “female” was taken in a negative way, the irony label was, “secondary”, “worst”. The norm is that the starting point was always considered “male” literature. “Man as a creator is always non-sexual, because he is accepted for the norm of man, for the bearer of consciousness, the burden of superstition and inclination is not burdened. Yes, he is exactly asexual. In Russian literature, sex is not problematic. But it always existed, and the gender code of the era was placed on any individual.”

In fact, there are objective reasons for such an attitude to women's creativity. Women were not allowed to receive higher education for a long time, they constantly engaged in everyday life and family issues and did not have time to eat and devote to creative self-awareness. And it was possible to answer the question of why women's literature is so opposed to the “real”: because there was confusion in the public consciousness, this led to the substitution of concepts, women showed themselves as the creators of low-level romantic novels, so it is very difficult for women to deliver real, high-quality literature to the reader. For example, “in France, 30% of writers are women.” Nevertheless, it should be noted that there are also

researchers who have a positive attitude to the phenomenon of “women's literature”. V. Woolf wrote in his essay “own room” (1929) about his contemporaries-writers: “women today write almost on an equal footing with men.” Among those who highly rate women's literature, there are also men. For Example, M. Voloshin notes about the poetry of French women at the beginning of the XX century: “in some respects, female lyrics are more interesting than men... A woman feels herself deeper and more detailed than a man, and this affects her poetry. But nevertheless, the standard attitude to a woman as a creative subject has long been negative. Therefore, the only way for a woman to penetrate into the creative environment was to hide behind her male name, “to be a man”. For a very long time, the highest praise for writers was the definition of “he writes like a man”. The task of the woman was to imitate for a man, to hide behind the male mask (especially behind the male pseudonym). The complexity of the mask is that a woman created an unusual symbiosis by creating her own unique literature, fearing for objectionable reasons, or not wanting to show the essence of a woman: a woman under the guise of a man. Writer and poet or poetess many female writers consider the words “writer” and “poetess” insulting and humiliating, because these words not only indicate the gender of the author, but also have the property of evaluation. The low rating of the word poetess was obvious to representatives of early modernism. Some scientists even suggested that the word “poetess” should be excluded from everyday life.

In addition to rejecting such definitions as “poetess” and “writer”, female writers also used the cunning of a special writer to minimize the originality of the genus-they hid behind nicknames, thereby creating a “false personality”. We also have a tendency to change our personality, which among other things is about the connection between the change of gender mask and we read in P. S. Gurevich: “today, people do not want to be themselves, but look for another race, nationality, gender.” It was not only the discrimination of women in political and social issues, but also in the creative environment, and it was precisely this “creative discrimination” that lasted the longest in the public consciousness.

References:

1. Sergeev V.A. Sexual polarity as the basis of the world // *Philology: scientific research.* – 2014. – No. 3.
2. Yangirov R. The body and the reflected light: Notes on emigrant women's prose and on the unwritten book by Zinaida Gippius "Women and the Feminine" // *UFO* 2007, No. 86.
3. Belinsky V. G. Victim... The composition of Ms. Montborn // *Belinsky V.G. Sobr. op. In 9 vols.* – M.: Art. lit., 1976. Vol. 1. With 407.
4. Weininger O. *Gender and character.* Kharkiv: Folio, 2009.
5. Piast VI. *Meetings.* M.: *New Literary Review*, 1997. (1st ed. 1929)
6. Martelli D. *Scrittrice o scrittore? Una ricerca di genere sulla creatività letteraria.* Padova: Coop.Libraria Editrice Università di Padova, 2015.