

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
 GIF (Australia) = 0.564
 JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
 ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
 ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
 SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
 PIF (India) = 1.940
 IBI (India) = 4.260
 OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 04 Volume: 108

Published: 15.04.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Rano Rakhmatulloevna Kasimova

Bukhara State University

PhD, a senior lecturer,

ranokasimova77@mail.ru

Aziza Akmalovna Ziyadullayeva

Bukhara State University

2nd year master student of

Literary Criticism (English) Specialty

aziziyodullayeva@mail.ru

THE PECULIARITIES OF COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL METHOD AND ITS TYPES

Abstract: The comparative historical method took shape in the last third of the 19th century. The paper is dedicated to the clarification of comparative historical method, its peculiar features and types. The works of well-known scientists associated with the development of the method as a science are discussed as well.

Methods. The genesis of poetic thinking and style dates back to “psychological parallelism”. The similarity of conditions led to the similarity of “expression”, the selection of images in the literatures of remote regions differed significantly. In ancient literature remote from each other, two links corresponded to each other: “collective author” and “reality”.

Results and discussions. A motive is an “indivisible unit of a plot,” for “the similarity is explained not by the genesis of one motive from another, but by the assumption of common motives, which are as obligatory for human creativity as language schemes for the expression of thoughts. In this sense, a fairy tale can be as much a reflection of a myth as sediment from an epic song or a folk book. At the same time, this is the basis for typological correspondences. Experiencing the world “apart” leads to the loss of synthesis. However, there is needed a common consciousness of vital synthesis i.e. multiple feedbacks in the chain of author ↔ work ↔ reader. Dialogue, comparison, juxtaposition are among the most general principles of culture and life.

Conclusion. The principle of the equivalence of influence and perception is one of the most important ideas of modern comparative literary studies. More precisely, we talk about a single process of “impact-perception”. V.M. Zhirmunsky identified two types of comparisons such as historical-genetic and historically typological comparison.

The two main mechanisms of reception can be denoted by the terms “re-construction” and “re-creation”. A text lives only when it comes into contact with another text (context). This point of contact of texts is the main subject of “comparative literary studies”. On the basis of any “comparison” and “juxtaposition” are the mechanisms of “identity” and “distinction”.

Key words: historical poetics, comparative literary criticism, comparison, repetition, impact, culture, genetic connection, psychological parallelism, motive, quality of relations between images, plot, dialogue, comparative studies, “ours and others”, reception, aspects of reception, spontaneous generation, typological correspondences, perceiving environment, intertextuality.

Language: English

Citation: Kasimova, R. R., & Ziyadullayeva, A. A. (2022). The peculiarities of comparative historical method and its types. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (108), 336-345.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-108-42> **Doi:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS>

Scopus ASCC:

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 3.939	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.771	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Introduction

UDC: 39(=512.133):811.111'25

The comparative historical method took shape in the literary schools of Russian universities in the last third of the 19th century. Academician Alexander Nikolaevich Veselovsky became its founder.

Veselovsky Alexander Nikolaevich (1838-1906) is an outstanding historian and theorist of literature, academician of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, author of major research on historical poetics and the history of world literature; the scientific horizon of the researcher covered large and small cultures, folklore traditions prevailing on different continents.

A.N. Veselovsky as the creator of the comparative historical method compared epic forms and motives, novels and stories of different eras and peoples. The scientist laid the foundations for the genetic and typological study of literature, showing that "migration" and "spontaneous generation" of motives complements each other.

Scientific ideas of A.N. Veselovsky were accepted by representatives of various literary methods and schools, his historical poetics was of the greatest importance for the formation of a new method. He sees the history of literature "as the history of social thought in figurative and poetic forms". Later in the "Introduction to Historical Poetics" and in a series of university courses and articles by A.N. Veselovsky outlines a theoretical generalization of the vast material studied by him and by ethnographers, linguists and literary scholars using the achievements of the cultural-historical school. Having considered the genesis of poetic categories, A.N. Veselovsky was the first to show that they were "the essence of historical categories"[29;20-21].

A.N. Veselovsky argues that each cultural area has its own specifics of development, and therefore it is incorrect to talk about "lagging behind" or "stagnation" of non-European peoples. Comparing "parallel series of similar facts" on the widest literary material, A.N. Veselovsky looks for typological correspondences in the culture of different "races" and eras. Also he emphasizes the connection that exists between "major phenomena" and "everyday trifles".

Methods. The context of literature with its linguistic and psychological components, which provide a rich "material for comparisons" along with "Tradition", "Reality" is one of the most important elements of the "literature" system in the "Historical Poetics" of A.N. Veselovsky [30;5-31]. Since the beginning of the 80s, the theme of "Historical Poetics" has been formed. The titles of the works "From the History of the Novel and the Story" (1886), "Epic Repetitions as a Chronological Moment" (1897), "Psychological Parallelism and its Forms in the Reflections of the Poetic Style" (1899) trace the idea of the artistic word as a special sphere of the spirit, and

the idea of the need to find regularities in the literature, "parallels" not only historical, but it is possible to compare series of similar facts only if there is a principle of repeatability, in general basis for comparison. Already on the material of Greek antiquity, the scientist notes that for all the historical sequence of the development of literature, "the similarity of mythical, epic, and finally, fairy-tale schemes does not necessarily indicate a genetic connection". And the genetic connection, in principle, without denying, A.N. Veselovsky finds similarities in plots in different literatures.

In the section "The Language of Poetry and the Language of Prose" (three chapters from Historical Poetics, 1898), the researcher examines the mechanism of the emergence of the simplest poetic forms, comparisons, symbols, motives that "stood outside the circle of mutual influences". These ancient elements of imagery could have arisen independently, caused by the same mental processes and the same phenomena of rhythm. The genesis of poetic thinking and style goes back to "psychological parallelism". The similarity of conditions led to the similarity of "expression", the selection of images in the literatures of remote regions differed significantly. This is easily explained by the divergence of life forms, fauna and flora. The brilliant discovery of A.N. Veselovsky consists in pointing out the similarity of the "quality of relations" between these images. The very foundations of comparison, categories and signs (movement, volitional activity, etc.) are coming closer. In a different terminological language, in ancient literatures remote from each other, two links corresponded to each other: "collective author" and "reality".

Having set himself the task of classifying the plots of world literature, the researcher nevertheless sees that it is incorrect to compare works, having clarified related plots. The most similar plots have their own moves, conditioned by the national and historical specifics of the work, and the scientific approximation of A.N. Veselovsky, a supporter of positivist philosophy, an admirer of Ten, was deeply alien. This is how the thought is born to find a motive as an "indivisible unit of a plot," for "the similarity is explained not by the genesis of one motive from another, but by the assumption of common motives, which are as obligatory for human creativity as language schemes for the expression of thoughts; creativity is limited to the combination of these schemes. In this sense, a fairy tale can be as much a reflection of a myth as sediment from an epic song or a folk book". At the same time, this is the basis for typological correspondences.

Results and discussions. Most of all, A.N. Veselovsky is concerned with the question of the relationship between "tradition", "personal initiative", and "individual creativity". If the basic communicative scheme is projected onto the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Historical Poetics, it becomes obvious that it is not the work that occupies the central place here. The main link in the “literature” system is “forms, images, plot”, self-generated or migrating. The “literature” system takes the following form:

Tradition in this case is the main work here, the fruit of the development of literature and culture. The author and the reader are predominantly engaged in communication with the “legend”, which sets limits to their romanticism and impressionism. This position goes back not only to the positivist views of the academician, but also at the same time to the basic concepts of the Russian cultural world. So, in the work “From the Introduction to Historical Poetics” (1893), personal intonation is guessed. A.N. Veselovsky warns his contemporaries against experiencing the world “apart”, which leads to the loss of synthesis with their own time. However, great poets need a “common consciousness of vital synthesis”. In other words, a genius becomes such only if there is a stable, multiple feedbacks in the chain of author ↔ work ↔ reader.

The relative immutability of tradition and the mutability of reality limit and expand the freedom of the author’s creativity. “New demands of life” suggest to the author new content for old, “ready-made” forms. For a long time, the Russian scientist is less concerned with the individuality of the artist, he is interested in “types”.

A.N. Veselovsky brings together the processes of creativity and the processes of perception, distinguishing them only by their intensity. We can say that the author of “Historical Poetics” pays close attention to direct and feedback in the system of tradition ↔ collective reader. In his work “Definition of Poetry” the scientist noted that in the course of the evolution of poetry, the content changes, “... but the formal element” remains the same. The persisting “agreement of formal elements is necessary for the artist to be able to create”.

According to V.M. Zhirmunsky, the creator of historical poetics is a genius. His idea is the highest achievement of literary criticism of the 19th century. More recently, I.O. Shaitanov published “Historical Poetics”, “from the chronology of lifetime publications, but following the logical plan of the author, correlating with this plan what he had done”. Reconstruction of the concept of “Historical Poetics” opens up the possibility of a new point to the ideas of A.N. Veselovsky, far beyond the framework of the comparative historical method.

Dialogue, comparison, juxtaposition are among the most general principles of culture and life. In the later sketches “Towards the Methodology of the Humanities” (1974) M.M. Bakhtin noted that “... a text lives only when it comes into contact with another text (context). Only at the point of this contact of the texts does the light flash, illuminating both back and forth, bringing the given text into dialogue”[2;384]. This “point of contact” of texts is the main subject of

“comparative literary studies”. Comparison is the most important tool for “understanding”, it is widely used by hermeneutics.

The term “Comparative Literature (Komparatistika, Litterature Comparee, Comparative Literature)” indicates “comparison” as the basis of the method. On the basis of any “comparison” and “juxtaposition” are the mechanisms of “identity” and “distinction” between one’s own and another’s. These mechanisms are inherent in both artistic creation and scientific thinking. In creativity, the principle of “comparison” leads to the emergence of figurative meanings, ultimately associated with metaphorization and symbolization.

In science, comparison reveals the recurrence of different signs and phenomena, demonstrating their significant similarities and differences. We can say that the comparative historical method has a general scientific modeling value, containing one of the most important motives of human thinking in general.

The principle of comparison is widely used for the study of social sciences (political science, sociology, pedagogy, international law), as well as cultural studies, art studies, literary criticism and linguistics (contrastive linguistics). Based on the comparative historical method like any translation from language to language, from space to space, from time to time, from culture to culture is most directly related to the existence of a person in the sign space of culture, which has as its axis the problem of identity and difference and with function of culture”.

One should consider, for example, the interaction of various arts with literature. So, D.S. Likhachev studied Old Russian literature “in its relationship to the visual arts”, emphasizing that “...interpenetration” was a fact of their internal structure [21;286]. For example, A.V. Mikhailov wrote about the ‘musicality’ of the literature, understanding by it the tendency “... ‘to compose’ ‘the material according to a law higher than the law of the material itself’, ‘lyrically’ ‘transform the material, raise it above its literal meaning to a higher level ...’[24;346]. Thus, the “dialogue” of the arts has different levels. In a transformed form, “picturesqueness” and “musicality” are included in the structure of literary works. “Literary”, on the contrary, penetrates into picturesque and musical texts. By comparing the similarities and differences of different types of arts, their specificity, and dissimilarity and, at the same time, their relationships are revealed.

In the “literature” system, the principles of the comparative historical method are used to analyze any part of the communication chain. A special area of comparative literary studies is the comparative study of phenomena belonging to different literatures. It is clear that the methods of comparative analysis are widely used to study eras, authors and works within the same national literature (“A. Beliy and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

A.S.Pushkin”; “A.S.Pushkin and Old Russian Literature”, etc.). For the history of literature as a science, comparative literary criticism has general methodological significance. It is believed that the subject of comparative literary studies is the entire development of world literature [12:419-439; 3:212; 28:65-73; 11:71-95; 34:7].

Comparative literary studies have a long history. As a conditional starting point, one can neglect the comparison of ancient and Shakespearean theater undertaken by Herder. As you know, the German philosopher compared these phenomena “... from the genetic and historical-comparative point of view” [14:255-257]. Proceeding from the fact that the “genesis” and historical “transformations” of the drama in the North and South are different, Herder concluded that Shakespeare cannot be judged by the standards of the “great Sophocles”. “World perception”, traditions of the heroic past, music, poetic expression, the degree of theatrical illusion and all of this separate Shakespearean theater from antique one [33:208]. Their “basis” is not comparable. The “differences” between Sophocles and Shakespeare formulated here are needed by Herder in order to indicate the “Shakespearean path” of contemporary German literature.

The idea of the differences between eras and “... the progressive movement of the human race” lead Goethe to the famous concept of “universal world literature”. Each nation, each literature takes part in this movement, gradually revealing the “inner world” of the people with the help of language [6:568]. In the course of this development, there are “crossings”, “mixture” of various thinking styles and dialects. Due to the correct remark of W. von Humboldt, often “new ways of representation are added to the existing ones,” and other people’s adverbs are perceived as formulas in general. Getting into a new context, the perceived “... begins to be rethought and used according to other laws” [8:316-319]. Based on the judgments of Herder, Goethe and W. von Humboldt, we can say that comparative literary criticism has as its subject the comparison of “inner worlds” expressed in literary works using various natural and poetic languages.

The closest source of comparative literary studies is the aesthetics of romanticism, with its characteristic principles of historicism and universality. The concept of romantic poetry as a synthesis of all literary genders and arts, poetry and philosophy, literature and a special way of understanding everyday life, enthusiasm and irony prepares the emergence of comparative studies. These tendencies find their completion in the aesthetics of G.F.V. Hegel, who subjects to a holistic analysis of all the epochs, styles and genres of world art known in his time [5].

The term “comparative literary criticism” appears in France by analogy with Cuvier’s term “comparative anatomy (anatomie comparee)” [34:19].

This natural science orientation continues to be significant for French comparative studies of the 19th century, developing in the works of F. Brunettier and I. Tain.

The first Department of Comparative Literature was established in France, in 1896. For the genesis of comparative literary studies, one can mention the famous book of the French writer Madame de Stael “On Germany” (1810), “Readings on Dramatic Art and Literature” by A.V. Schlegel, as well as lectures on the history of European literature by F. Schlegel.

The spiritual-historical school in Germany engaged in controversy with the positivism and biology of French comparative studies. V. Dilthey, the founder of the school, who was also one of the most important theorists of hermeneutics, defended the specificity of the humanities, their special “integrity” and independence alongside the natural sciences. The German philosopher pointed out the need to study the “spirit of the artist” and the “spirit of the era” (Zeitgeist), relying on the category of “experience” (Erlebnis) [9:108-135].

The principle of the equivalence of influence and perception is one of the most important ideas of modern comparative literary studies [11:71-95]. More precisely, we should talk about a single process of “impact-perception”. “Impact” and “perception” is another example of the action of direct and feedback in art. The famous theory of “influences” is perfectly correct, since “influences” have always existed and will continue to exist. However, it immediately raises doubts as soon as comparativists try to present it as the only possible research perspective. Comparative literary studies based on the theory of dialogue, emanating from the representation “Impact”, changes the artistic thinking of the recipient. The creator of the “impact aesthetics” W. Iser thought about this in an interesting way. However, the dialogue that took place leads to the fact that the “sender” also becomes different. In the process of reception, new, previously hidden, semantic facets are revealed in the perceived phenomenon (author, tradition, text).

Zhirmunsky Viktor Maksimovich (1891-1971) is one of the founders of the comparative historical method of studying world literature, academician of Sciences Academy who developed the ideas of A.N. Veselovsky. V.M. Zhirmunsky is the author of fundamental works on comparative literary studies. He participated in the work of many research institutions such as the Institute for the Comparative Study of Literatures of the West and the East (1921-1935), the Institute of Language and Thought (193-1935), the Pushkin House (1935-1950). He developed global projects (“History of Western European Literatures”, the cycle “Poetics”, the study of the epos of the Turkic peoples, a cycle of linguistic works, works on general linguistics and comparative grammar). Laying the foundations of modern comparative studies, V.M. Zhirmunsky specially

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

highlighted the comparison, "... establishing international cultural interactions, "influences" or "borrowings" due to the historical proximity of these peoples and the prerequisites for their social development".

Inherent in V.M. Zhirmunsky universal knowledge determined the breadth of his scientific horizons, the idea of the need to study literature and language in the context of other layers of culture. V.M. Zhirmunsky deeply developed the problems of historical poetics, linguistic poetics, and comparative literary criticism (literary connections, comparative study of the original and translation, delimitation of "contrast", and "comparison" from influence (cross-currents). Following A.N. Veselovsky V.M. Zhirmunsky identified two types of comparisons such as historical-genetic and historically typological comparison:

1. "Historical-genetic, considers similar phenomena as a result of their relationship in origin and similar phenomena as a result of their relationship by descent and subsequent historically determined discrepancies;

2. "Historically typological comparison" explains the similarity of genetically unrelated phenomena with similar conditions of social development"[17;75].

It is clear that Goethe's Calderon differs significantly from Hoffmannsthal's Calderon, and Voltaire's Shakespeare is fundamentally different from Hugo's Shakespeare. However, Calderon and Shakespeare become different as a result of this reception. Moreover, the essence of the "circle of communication" does not at all consist in declarations of sympathy or literary enmity. The hidden connections that emerge against the backdrop of critical reviews, literary manifestos, adaptations, translations and theatrical performances are much stronger. Submitting to the repulsive mechanism, Voltaire tries Shakespeare's tricks on completely different material. "Removing" from Shakespeare brings significant artistic results.

The second principle of comparative literary studies points to the presence of "opposite currents" (A.N.Veselovsky) as a condition of perception. The "perceiving environment" and the perceiving author must be prepared to assimilate the external impulse. Then gradually from an external factor it turns into an internal factor. In the process of perception, "their own questions" are asked; their own line of processing, "re-creation" of the material is outlined.

The two main mechanisms of reception can be denoted by the terms "re-construction" and "re-creation". The term "re-construction" has its own long history and more than a century of theoretical comprehension. G.V.F. Hegel referred to it as "an invasion of immanent rhythm of concepts". V.M. Zhirmunsky wrote that "re-construction" represents "... new creativity from old materials"[13;76]. Hence

it can be seen that in typological terms V.M. Zhirmunsky considers perception to be akin to creativity. According to L.Ya. Ginzburg, "reconstruction" also involves projecting onto another author your picture of the world and the ways of its embodiment [7;192].

"Recreation" means a different type of dialogue. Here the influence of the lyric element, the expansion of the perceiving "I" is limited. "Recreation" presupposes a historical approach, a sense of distance, the discovery of the "alien".

"Re-construction" and "recreation" practically do not occur in their pure form. Any reception presupposes "double explication", "interweaving", "superposition" of principles arguing with each other. The recipient notices and cuts off certain facets of the perceived phenomenon.

The ideas of A.N. Veselovsky characterized the patterns that shed light on the potential "similarity – dissimilarity" of the compared phenomena. Let's start with the obvious case where the similarity arises as a result of direct contact, has a genetic origin. A. Dima refers to such contacts as "direct" ones [10;121]. The personal acquaintance of contemporary writers plays an important role here. So, V.Ya. Bryusov was personally acquainted with the Belgian poet E. Verhaeren, whose works he knew well and translated. Bryusov considered Verhaeren as one of his teachers. Heine knew Tyutchev in a completely different way rather than Tyutchev towards Heine. Their meetings had different meanings for them, since Heine perceives Tyutchev only as a Russian diplomat[27;350-397]. The personal acquaintance of A. Bely with the German poet Christian Morgenstern had a completely different meaning. This episode was an important milestone in the internal development of the Russian poet. During the meeting, not a word was spoken. After a lecture given by their common teacher R. Steiner, the poets looked at each other and exchanged a strong handshake. However, for A. Bely, this moment acquired a symbolic meaning. Later, this meeting became an important motive for his poetry. A. Bely linked his interpretation of modernity with K. Morgenstern [20;466-472]. Thus, personal acquaintance, an external factor, can be associated with internal moments of perception and creativity.

Very often, the bonds of deep sympathy bind the writers of distant eras. For example, O.E. Mandelstam felt attracted to Dante Alighieri. It is well known what significance Shakespeare had for the young Goethe. In this case the great authors of the past Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Voltaire, Rousseau, Dickens, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Proust Joyce, Kafka become factors in the literature of other eras. So, along with Byron and Walter Scott, Shakespeare decisively influenced the development of European literature in the first third of the 19th century. The works of the writers of the past are thus involved in the dynamic,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

“today’s” development of culture, moving from the axis of diachrony to the axis of synchrony [1].

Sometimes there are myths associated with the personality of the poet. They also become factors in literature. The biographical figure turns into a mythological one. The myth of Novalis, Byron or Kafka is created according to the laws of artistic creation. The collective perception of such phenomena, leading to the mythologization of the image of the writer, makes one recall the mechanisms of folklore. Tradition, legend, possible scenario are given a decisive preference over facts.

There are cases when a work that did not have much significance for its own literature is mythologized in other literature. Such a fate befell, for example, the works of R. Giovagnoli “Spartacus” and E.L. Voynich “Gadfly”. In literature, they were assimilated with particular intensity, since they coincided simultaneously with the social and artistic demands of the time. Beides E.L. Voinich was a propagandist of Russian culture.

For comparative literary studies, the question of knowledge of foreign languages is of great importance. This determines the range of sources that the author (critic or reader) could rely on. If the author does not know a given foreign language, then he must use translations (into his native language or other languages known to him). The foregoing does not mean at all that such a perception will be superficial or primitive. A bad translation sometimes gives an artist a lot, opening up his imagination, begins the process of “negotiating”, “finishing up”, “co-authorship”.

Often information about a particular artist reaches the “perceiving environment” with the help of “mediator literature”². So, A.S. Pushkin got acquainted with German romanticism from the books of Madame de Stael, as well as from the French translations of lectures on dramatic art by A.V. Schlegel. It is clear that A.S. Pushkin’s contemporaries had a different relationship to French. They knew this language from childhood; they began to write in it earlier than in Russian. It is quite understandable that the name of Voltaire, for example, is well known to the Lyceum student Pushkin. It is found in the diaries of that time. The poetic message “Gorodok” (1815) gives a detailed description of “Father Candidus”, who “... Phoebus was brought up, // From childhood he became a poet; // Read more of all, // Tears less of all; (...)”. It is noteworthy that in the poetic list of poets, placed in Gorodok, Voltaire, the “symbol of freedom of love,” is placed in the first

place³. One can note that the “Russian Byron” had a French appearance at first. According to P.A. Vyazemsky, fluency in English was an exceptional phenomenon (indicated by S.V. Sapozhkov). However, much more often, when speaking of the “acquaintance” of this or that author with a foreign writer, they mean not personal communication, but the reading circle, theatrical impressions, translations. The highest form of “contact” between two authors is an original work of art, created based on a perceived sample. A literary critic, theatrical aesthetics, stage activity, translation, censorship, types of publications, as well as the assimilation of the experience of the perceived author in the original work constitute the *main aspects of reception*.

Comparative historical research is often based on the aspect principle. All types of responses of one author to the work of another are considered in interconnection, in a system. At the same time, much attention is paid to the chronology of reception. It is important to answer the question: when, in what context and what moments of the work of a foreign author were perceived? For example, the German romantic L. Tieck reflected on Shakespeare in his diaries, letters, wrote a number of articles about him, turned to his biography and work in the romantic “Letters about Shakespeare” (1800). L.Tieck’s comedy “Puss in Boots” is intricately linked to the comedy tradition of the English playwright⁴.

“Shakespearean layer” is complicated in L. Teak’s mystery drama “Genoveva” (1799). Here Shakespeare’s mastering is intertwined with Calderon’s reception. Very interesting is also the translation of the tragicomedy “Pericles” undertaken by Tieck (1811). Comparing the version of the German romantic with the arrangement by I.J. Eschenburg (1782), one can observe how approaches differ, how sometimes eras confront in the transmission of only one word. So, I.J. Eschenburg, a literary man of the Enlightenment, consistently translates Shakespeare’s “imagination” (imagination) with the verb “denken” (to think, to think). Here we are dealing not only with a translation from one language into another, but also with a translation into another aesthetic code. For the one who leans towards I.J. Eschenburg’s rationalism “denken” seems organic. L.Tieck translates Shakespeare’s “imagination” in a different way. The noun “Einbildung” (imagination) appears in his text. As it is obvious the concept of “imagination” defines the era of Romanticism.

¹ Мандельштам Осип. Разговор о Данте // Осип Мандельштам. Сочинения: в 2 т. Т. 2. / Сост. С.С. Аверинцева и П.М. Нерлера. – М., 1990. – С. 214-254.

² Дима А. Принципы сравнительного литературоведения. – М., 1977. – С. 123-124.

³ Томашевский Б. Пушкин: в 2. т. Т.1. – М., 1990. – С. 69.

⁴ Жирмунский В.М. Из истории западно-европейских литератур / Отв. ред. М.П. Алексеев. – Л., 1981; Карельский А.В. Драматургия немецкого романтизма первой половины XIX века: Эволюция метода и жанровых форм: дис. д-ра филол. наук. – М., 1985.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Undoubtedly, translation is one of the most important forms of text interpretation, and comparative translation studies are one of the most important branches of comparative studies. Comparison of multilingual translations of key texts of a certain era brings us closer to understanding the “concept” of national culture⁵. When comparing two works, one should take into account the followings:

- ✓ ratio of genres;
- ✓ the way of storytelling;
- ✓ composition;
- ✓ system of characters and methods of their construction;
- ✓ theme and motivational structure.

Further evidence for genetic links is verification at the level of style and language.

The presence of textual connections is revealed through the study of allusions, serious and parodic allusions, epigraphs, quotes, variations, filiations, reminiscences, adaptations, collages, pastiches, significant defaults⁶.

Often the terminology of other arts helps to comprehend the phenomena of literature. Although the material of music - sound - differs from the word as a material of literature, nevertheless, artistic thinking, the principles of processing and arrangement of material by composers and writers may have common features.

In connection with the problem of citation, the terminology offered by the great composer of the 20th century A.G. Schnittke (1934-1998). Formulating the concept of “polystylistics” in music, he gives his understanding of the principles of “quotation”, “allusion” and “adaptation”. In the work “Polystylistic Tendencies in Contemporary Music”(1971) “The Principle of Citation” is understood as a whole “scale of techniques” associated with the use of “stereotypical microelements of someone else’s style (characteristic melodic intonations, sequences, cadence formulas)” belonging to another era or another national tradition. At the level of artistic thinking, text construction and intonation structure, the listed moments are significant for literature, primarily for lyrics, where similar terminology is used (melody, intonation, harmony, formulas for the completion of segments of a poetic text rhyme, stanza schemes). Another level of citations is exact or revised citations, as well as pseudo-citations. A.G. Schnittke explains “The Principle of Allusion” in relation to “quotation”. The allusion “manifests itself in the subtlest hints and unfulfilled promises on the verge of

a quote, but not overstepping it”. The technique of adaptation is understood as “retelling of someone else’s musical text in their own musical language (similar to modern adaptations of ancient subjects in literature), or the free development of someone else’s material in their own manner”⁷.

It seems that these provisions have a general theoretical meaning. Let us also pay attention to the fact that Schnittke relies on the term “device”, the key concept of Russian “formalism”. Further stages and levels of analysis involve the study of “stereotypical microelements of someone else’s style”; techniques for combining one’s own and another languages during adaptation-retelling; observing the deployment of someone else’s material using their own stylistic techniques; identification of direct quotes and “pseudo-citations”; an attempt to identify allusions up to significant omissions of elements, “lack of methods”.

Subject of a contrastive analysis also becomes a comparison of similar (or contrasting) genre structures, compositional schemes, types of conflict, combinations of motives and themes, ways of constructing and arranging characters. At the same time, it is necessary to remember the fundamental polygeneticity of literary phenomena, which often dates back simultaneously to many different sources. The found similarity should not be absolutized. In the course of the analysis, it is necessary to raise the question of the system of similarities and differences, of the artistic meaning that this comparison reveals⁸.

Another type of comparative historical research is often called typological. A.N. Veselovsky connected it not with the “migration” of folklore motifs and images, but, on the contrary, with their possible “spontaneous generation”. In this case, the similarity arises, as a rule, without direct contact. In principle, we are talking about phenomena that have similar features, but are not related to a common origin. V.M. Zhirmunsky denotes such cases as “stage analogies” or “stage parallels”⁹.

D. Dyurishin notes that “pure cases” of stage analogies arise through a large-scale comparison of the ancient literature of the East and West¹⁰. It is difficult to suppose that the authors or later performers of Homer’s Iliad, the Kyrgyz Manas, or, say, the Armenian David of Sassoon communicated with each other. Undoubted features of similarity in this case go back to the general ideology of the epic age, heroic military ideals. Epic heroes in ancient monuments of different people have similar features, and related

⁵ Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка // Русская словесность. – С. 280-287.

⁶ Дюрин Диониз. Теория сравнительного изучения литературы. – С. 153-159.

⁷ Шнитке А.Г. Полистилистические тенденции в современной музыке // Беседы с Альфредом Шнитке / Сост. В. Ивашкин. – М., 1994. – С. 143-144.

⁸ Жирмунский В.М. Эпическое творчество славянских народностей и проблемы сравнительного изучения эпоса. – М., 1958; Жирмунский В.М. Введение в литературоведение. – С. 435.

⁹ Ibid:435.

¹⁰ Конрад Н.И. Запад и Восток: статьи. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М., 1972.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

motives and plots unfold in poems. It seems, however, that in typological studies it is almost impossible to definitively exclude a genetic explanation. Most of the work in the field of comparative literary studies is a simultaneous study of genetic and typological relationships. Texts are more often compared on a genetic basis. As a rule, contexts are correlated using the techniques of typological analysis. However, the principle of the multiple approaches to interpretation remains valid here as well. Sometimes a typological comparison of the works of authors of new and recent literature, which is not so far from each other in time and space, turns out to be more productive. Peering into the history of culture and language, scientists reconstruct a common source for a variety of contexts that, at first glance, have nothing in common.

In XX century, in the era of strengthening contacts and growing globalization, a new phase of comparative studies is emerging. Relying on the concept of intertextuality, modern researchers fundamentally depart from the concept of genetic and typological connections. The starting point is the assertion that the text is incapable of being “representative”, i.e. cannot “representationally replace” either reality or any other text¹¹. Comparativists of this direction often use the terms “dialogue” and “dialogicity”. However, in this context, the concept of “dialogue” loses its connection with the “sociophysical reality” that has M.M. Bakhtin. What the author of “Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics” understood as “an extra-textual intonation value context” that determines the “dialogizing background” of the perception of the work is denied.

The contemporary Austrian literary critic Zoran Konstantinovich ponders on the intertextual understanding of comparative studies in a slightly different point. In his opinion, the new approach implies, first of all, going beyond the “verbal boundaries”, studying equally the categories of the author and the reader.

Conclusion.

Modern comparative studies cannot be limited to one text of one author, but seeks to cover all texts that are “condensed” in the text under study. In this case, the text is considered as “palimpsest”, i.e. conversation with all other texts with which “they” (both the author and the text) came in contact during their life. Z.Konstantinovich is interested in “correlations” of various signs and codes that arise when different cultures come into contact. By connecting to the analysis all “areas of life”,

comparative studies, in his opinion, study the changes in the consciousness of people caused by the interaction of different cultures. It is obvious that the social component brings Z. Konstantinovich closer to M.M. Bakhtin and his understanding of “dialogue”¹². Let us add that the “polystylistics” of A.G. Schnittke represents “an impulse to expand the musical space”, a musical tool “for the philosophical substantiation of the connection of times”. The author of “Concerto grosso No.1” puts forward the idea of the “absolute”, “non-associative value of the work”, which is not reduced to a play of quotation.

At this point, the aspirations of modern comparativists diverge. Some understand “intertextuality” as a step forward in understanding literary interrelationships, as the entry of comparative studies into the context of modern semiotic cultural studies. Others, as already noted, cut off a number of levels, putting forward the thesis about the “unrepresentative nature of the artistic word”. It seems that this opposition is partly removed due to the approach to literature as a system. Different links of this system, having different functions, must acquire their own language of description. Direct and reverse connections, making the system of literature fundamentally open, “remove” the question of the only possible language of description.

A number of comparative works based on the intertextual approach are known¹³. Carried out by talented scientists, these studies are beyond doubt. However, it is very difficult to learn comparative analysis from them. The problem of “adequacy of comparison” from the point of view of intertextuality is meaningless. Meanwhile, literary technique emerges gradually. And here the limiting moments can play not only a negative role. Knowledge of the comparison criteria can serve as the foundation for acquiring skills of comparative analysis. Then, having passed this stage and convinced of its insufficiency, the researcher can try his hand at intertextual comparative studies. Let us refer to a specific example of a genetic comparison undertaken by Academician M.P. Alekseev and dedicated to the theme “Emil Zola and N.G. Chernyshevsky” (1940)¹⁴.

The author begins his research with a reminder of the fact that E. Zola “has never been to Russia” and did not know the Russian language. However, Russia was in the writer’s field of vision. Zola corresponded with Russian correspondents, was friends with I.S. Turgenev, six years collaborated with the magazine “Bulletin of Europe”.

The next step in the analysis is to identify the reading circle of E. Zola, to determine the degree of

¹¹Смирнов И.П. Порождение интертекста: Элементы интертекстуального анализа с примерами из творчества Б.Л. Пастернака. 2-е изд. – СПб., 1995.

¹²

¹³Жолковский А.К., Щеглов Ю.К. Работы по поэтике выразительности: Инварианты – Тема – Приемы – Текст/ Предисл. М.Л. Гаспарова. – М., 1996.

¹⁴Алексеев М.П. Сравнительное литературоведение / Отв. ред. академик Г.В. Степанов. – Л., 1983. – С. 414-426.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

his acquaintance with Russian literature. French literary scholars have long noticed the fact that E. Zola read in translations of works by L.N. Tolstoy and I.S. Turgenev, responded to them.

Obviously, M.P. Alekseev begins with characterizing the context, the “basis” of reception. Knowledge of the Russian language, translations, personal contacts, correspondents, cooperation in Russian publications and reading circle are the main questions of the first stage of the study.

Further, the analysis is connected with the reconstruction of the history of translations of the works of N.G. Chernyshevsky into French. M.P. Alekseev turns to the personality of the translator of the novel, restores the remarkable context of his first publication into French “What is to be done?” translated by A.N. Tveritinov, “an ardent admirer of Chernyshevsky”. The translation, released “in a limited number of copies”, nevertheless served as the basis for subsequent editions of the novel in European languages. M.P. Alekseev traces the fate of a number of books donated by Tveritinov to famous writers. So, he also notes the fact that one copy was received by I.S. Turgenev. In search of further evidence of E. Zola’s possible awareness of the novel by M.P. Chernyshevsky M. Alekseev addresses critical responses to What is to be done? in the French press.

And yet the researcher is inclined to the cautious conclusion that it was not possible “to establish with all accuracy when and through whom the novel by

N.G. Chernyshevsky, of course, in the French translation by A.N. Tveritinova, became known to Emil Zola”. We add that the mediator in this case was the “perceiving environment”: the presence of interest in Russia in E. Zola’s circle, friendship with Turgenev, who facilitated Zola’s contacts with Russian writers.

Textual coincidences are also important. One of them, M.P. Alekseev sees in the word “phalanster”, which is used by the heroine E. Zola. Another indisputable quote is connected with the sign of the new store on Nevsky, which is being opened by Vera Pavlovna and Mertsalova: “Au bon travail. Magasin des Nouveautés”. The store in E. Zola’s novel is called “Au bonheur des dames. Magasin des nouveautés”. At the end of his article, M.P. Alekseev once again returns to the idea that E. Zola’s novel had many sources. However, the novel What is to be done? should also be included. However, the scientist also poses further questions, outlining the prospect of new research. “Shouldn’t we look for traces of N.G. Chernyshevsky and in the later works of E. Zola, for example in “Trud (Labour)” (1901), with his story about the new principles of civic consciousness, with his ideas of solidarity and vigorous social labor?” “Slow reading” of the article by M.P. Alekseev shows that genetic comparison requires from a literary critic a great deal of knowledge, discretion, accuracy and caution in conclusions.

References:

1. Alekseev, M.P. (1983). *Sravnitel'noe literaturovedenie* / Otv. red. akademik G.V. Stepanov, L., pp. 414-426.
2. Bahtin, M.M. (1979). *Jestetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* / Sost. S.G. Bocharov. 2-e izd. (p.384). Moscow.
3. Verli, M. (1967). *Obshhee literaturovedenie*. (p.212). Moscow.
4. Veselovskij, A.N. (1939). *Izbrannye stat'i* / Vstup. stat'ja V.M. Zhirmunskogo, L..
5. Gegel', G.F.V. (1977). *Jestetika*: v 4 t. / Sost. Mih. Lifshic, Moscow.
6. Gjote, I.-V. (1975). *Ob iskusstve* / Sost. A.V. Gulyga. (p.568). Moscow.
7. Ginzburg, L.Ja. (1979). *O literaturnom geroe*, L., (p. 192).
8. (1984). *Gumbol'dt Vil'gel'm fon. Izbrannye trudy po jazykoznaniju* / Pod red. G.V. Ramishvili. (pp.316-319). Moscow.
9. Dil'tej, V. (1987). *Vvedenie v nauku o duhe. Zarubezhnaja jestetika i teorija literatury XIX XX vekov* / Sost. G.K. Kosikova. (pp.108-135). Moscow.
10. Dima, A. (1977). *Principy sravnitel'nogo literaturovedenija*. (p.121). Moscow.
11. Durishin, D. (1979). *Teorija sravnitel'nogo izuchenija literatury* / predisl. Jy.V. Bogdanova, (pp.71-95). Moscow.
12. Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1996). *Vvedenie v literaturovedenie* / pod red. Z.I. Plavskina, N.A. Zhirmunskoj. (pp.419-439). SPb..
13. Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1981). *Iz istorii zapadnoevropejskih literatur* / otv. red. M.P. Alekseev, Jy.D. Levin, (pp.114-119). L..
14. Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1972). *Ocherki po istorii klassicheskoj nemeckoj literatury*, (pp.255-257). L..
15. Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1958). *Jepicheskoe tvorchestvo slavjanskih narodnostej i problemy sravnitel'nogo izuchenija jeposa*, Moscow.
16. Zholkovskij, A.K., & Shheglov, Jy.K. (1996). *Raboty po pojetike vyrazitel'nosti: Invarianty* -

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

- Tema - Priemy - Tekst/* Predisl. M.L. Gasparova, Moscow.
17. Zinchenko, V.G., Zusman, V.G., & Kirnoze, Z.I. (2011). *Literatura i metody ee iz uchenija. Sistemno-sinergeticheskij podhod. Uchebnoe posobie*, (p.75). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo «Flinta», Izdatel'stvo «Nauka».
18. Karel'skij, A.V. (1985). *Dramaturgija nemeckogo romantizma pervoj poloviny XIX veka: Jevolucija metoda i zhanrovih form*: dis. d-ra filol. nauk. Moscow.
19. Konrad, N.I. (1972). *Zapad i Vostok*: stat'i. 2-e izd., ispr. i dop, Moscow.
20. Lavrov, A.V. (1976). *Andrej Belyj i Kristian Morgenshtern. Sravnitel'noe izuchenie literatur*: sb. statej k 80-letiu akademika M.P. Alekseeva, (pp.466-472). L..
21. Lihachev, D.S. (1997). *Istoricheskaja pojetika ruskoj literatury. Smeh kak mirovozzrenie i drugie raboty*. (p.286). SPb..
22. Lihachev, D.S. (n.d.). *Konceptosfera russkogo jazyka*. Russkaja slovesnost', pp. 280-287.
23. Mandel'shtam, O. (1990). *Razgovor o Dante. Osip Mandel'shtam*. Sochinenija: v 2 t. T.2 / Sost. S.S. Averinceva i P.M. Nerlera, (pp.214-254). Moscow.
24. Mihajlov, A.V. (1997). *Varianty jepicheskogo stilja v literaturah Avstrii i Germanii*. A.V. Mihajlov. Jazyki kul'tury: ucheb. posobie po kul'turologii/predisl. S.S. Averinceva, (p.346). Moscow.
25. Smirnov, I.P. (1995). *Porozhdenie interteksta: Jelementy intertekstual'nogo analiza s primerami iz tvorчества B.L. Pasternaka*. 2-e izd, SPb..
26. Tomashevskij, B. (1990). *Pushkin*: v 2 t. T. 1, (p.69). Moscow.
27. Tynjanov, Jy.N. (1977). *Pojetika. Istorija literatury*. Kino/Izd. podgotovili E.A. Toddes, A.P. Chudakov, M.O. Chudakova, (pp.350-395). Moscow.
28. Ujellek, R., & Uorren, O. (1978). *Teorija literatury /Vstup. stat'ja A.A. Aniksta*, (pp.65-73). Moscow.
29. Frejdenberg, O.M. (1997). *Pojetika suzheta i zhanra / Podgotovka teksta i obshh. red. N.V. Braginskoj*, (pp.20-21). Moscow.
30. Shajtanov, I. (2009). *Zachem sravnivat'?* *Komparativistika i / ili pojetika*. Voprosy literatury, sentjabr' - oktjabr', pp.5 - 31.
31. Shajtanov, I. (2002). *Klassicheskaja pojetika neklassicheskoi jepohi. Byla li zavershena «Istoricheskaja pojetika»?*. *Voprosy literatury*, № 4.
32. Shnitke, A.G. (1994). *Polistilisticheskie tendencii v sovremennoj muzyke. Besedy s Al'fredom Shnitke/Sost. V. Ivashkin*, (pp.143-144). Moscow.
33. (1978). *Herders Werke*: In 5 Bd. Bd. 2, (p.208). Berlin und Weimar.
34. Zima, P. V. (1992). *Komparatistik*. (p.7). Tübingen.