



THE ROLE OF COMPARTIVISTICS IN MODERN LITERATURE

Mirzakulov Uktamjon Almardanovich

Lecturer at the Denau Institute
entrepreneurship and pedagogy

Tel : +998912379249

E-mail: mirzakulovuktamdjan@mail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7233072>

Annotation: Literary comparative studies are an important trend in philology along with the history of literature, theory and criticism. It began to take shape in the middle of the 19th century. There are terminological discrepancies in the modern classification of comparative studies. Researchers differ in the content plan of concepts: comparative studies, comparative historical literary criticism, comparative literary criticism, comparative literary criticism, etc. This leads to a different understanding of the subject of science, and there is a need to overcome this.

Key words: literary comparative studies, comparative literary criticism, comparative literary criticism, typological comparison.

Literary comparative studies are an important direction in philology along with the history of literature, theory and criticism. It began to take shape in the middle of the 19th century. and was marked by such names as I.G. Herder (1744–1803), J. Benfey (1809–1881), F. Buslaev (1818–1897), A. Veselovsky (1872–1919), etc. In the second half of the XIX century. studies are becoming more diverse and deep, and comparative literary criticism is being promoted as an independent branch. This is facilitated by the works of literary scholars H. Poznett (1882–1901), M. Koch (1855–1931), F. Brunethier (1848–1907), J. Text (1865–1900) and others.

Further development of comparative literature was facilitated by updating the methods of historical and literary research by the works of F. Baldansperger (1871–1958), P. Azar (1878–1944), P. van Tigema (1871–1948). They divided literature into "influencing" and "perceiving" and reduced the comparative analysis of literary phenomena to the elucidation of "foreign influences." Later, scientists realize the need to expand the objects of comparative analysis by involving in it literary phenomena that are not united by direct contact or genetic links. This was facilitated by the work of the American R. Ouelleck (1903–1995) and the Frenchman R. Ethamble (1909–2002).

In Europe and Russia, along with contact connections, they are beginning to study typological connections due to similar processes of historical development. For example, the decadent attitude in the work of foreign and Russian writers: C. Baudelaire , O. Wilde, on the one hand, and Z. Gippius, F. Sologub, on the other. In the work of these artists of the word, there is a commonality of motives, aesthetic and poetic principles. In Russia, the comparative-historical branch of literary criticism as an independent branch took shape at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. A. Veselovsky played a big role in comprehension. He also proposed the terminology "comparative historical poetics", "comparative historical literary criticism".

For many years in Soviet Russia, for objective reasons, comparative literary criticism of Russian and Western literature was not encouraged. The activation of the comparative study

of literatures begins in the 70s. 20th century works of such scientists as V. Zhirmunsky (1891–1971), N. Konrad (1891–1970), I. Neupokoeva (1917–1977), M. Khrapchenko (1904–1986), N. Kravtsov (1906–1934) and etc. Obviously new in the works of our scientists was that they proposed to compare the literature not only of similar historical communities, but also literature in many ways far removed from each other. This new aspect of study will be reflected later in the modern classification of comparative studies.

The need to single out comparative studies is dictated by the expansion of mutual influences of cultures, the processes of erasing the boundaries between national cultures and, accordingly, their literatures. According to scientists, such studies are necessary, since the perception of a particular work, the writer's creative heritage in a foreign language environment has its own characteristics [1, p. 6].

An interesting task of typological literary criticism is to study the literature of peoples with a historical commonality. An example is the literature of England and Germany, the emergence of romanticism in them as a special cultural movement of the 19th century. It seems even more interesting that a typological commonality is revealed when comparing the literatures of peoples who do not have a historical commonality. An example is the knightly epic in the literature of different peoples: in Western Europe, among the Arabs, Iranians, in the literature of Georgia and Japan. The condition for its appearance, of course, was the existence among these peoples of what is only a generalized definition of chivalry.

The world is changing, teaching paradigms are changing. The disappearance of ideological prohibitions in a number of countries has had a significant impact on the development of modern humanities in recent years. In connection with the changes that have taken place in Russia in recent decades, there is a change in the old terminological base. The base created in Soviet times needs to be updated, and some concepts have to be abandoned altogether, since they are no longer relevant. The change of scientific paradigms is influenced by the sociocultural context, interdisciplinary approaches, intermediality, globalization, etc. The new methodology includes both old and new norms and concepts. And here terminological discrepancies open up. Researchers differ in the content plan of concepts: comparative studies, comparative historical literary criticism, comparative literary criticism, comparative literary criticism, etc.

Differences in content naturally lead to a different understanding of the subject of science. Comparative studies are not limited to binary comparison. At the same time, some scholars believe that comparative studies and comparative literary criticism are one and the same, while others, on the contrary, distinguish between them and consider them to be completely different branches of literary criticism [2].

It seems most correct to believe that the term comparative studies denotes the most general discipline that explores the connections, changes, common and different between literatures, the peculiarity of inter-literary connections and influences, as well as the features of literary development that extend beyond linguistic boundaries and determine the originality of literatures. She makes comparisons between national literatures, within one literature, a comparison of creative individuals, a comparison of literary phenomena with phenomena from other types of arts, such as music and painting. Comparative studies are based on a set of comparative methods.

Comparative literature studies various national literatures in their general and specific content, literary relationships and mutual influences, as well as the interaction of national

literatures with the world. For example, at the turn of the XIX - XX centuries. one can observe an obvious increase in the mutual influences of Russian and Western European literatures. Mutual influences of G. Flaubert and I. Turgenev, the influence of E. Zola's aesthetics on domestic "naturalists" A. Amfityatrov, P. Boborykin and others. The influence of M. Gorky's work on B. Shaw, J. London and others. Influence French "damned" _ formation aesthetics Russian modernism .

This branch concentrates its efforts on literatures that are closer to each other in general historical and cultural terms; it is enough to point to the literature of the Slavic peoples. For example, a typical image of a hero is singled out, found in the epic songs of all Slavs (Serbs, Bulgarians, Russians, Belarusians, Poles, Czechs, etc.). There are a number of curious similarities in the description of the hero, his extraordinary strength, in the description of the hero in custody, and in his cunning release. Depending on the research methodology, the comparative method can be comparative-historical, comparative-typological, structural-functional, formal-stylistic, etc.

Bibliography:

1. Academic schools in Russian literary criticism / Ed. ed. P.A. Nikolaev . - M.: Nauka, 1975. - S. 15 - 299.
2. Bart R. Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics: trans. from fr. - M.: Progress: Univers : Rhea, 1994. - 615 p.
3. Bart R. Mythologies / R. Bart . - M.: Publishing house im. Sabashnikov, 1996. - 314 p.
4. Bakhtin M. Issues of literature and aesthetics: studies of different years / M. Bakhtin . - M.: Artist . lit., 1975. - 502 p.
5. Bakhtin M.M. On the methodology of literary criticism / M.M. Bakhtin // Context-1974: literary and theoretical studies. - M.: Nauka, 1975. - S. 203 - 212.91
6. Bakhtin M.M. To the philosophy of the act / M.M. Bakhtin // Philosophy and sociology of science and technology. Yearbook. 1984 - 1985. - M.: Nauka, 1986. -S. 80 - 160.
7. Bakhtin M.M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity / M.M. Bakhtin . - M.: Art, 1979. - 424 p.
8. Berkov P.N. Problems of the historical development of literature / P.N. Berkov . - L.: Artist . lit., 1981. - 495 p.