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This guidebook is dedicated to the key features of literary fiction. It is unique in both its concept and structure. All theoretical literary problems are treated from the viewpoint of philosophical aesthetics to be further translated into the issues of the philosophy of literature. The author emphasizes the anthropological nature of literary studies and sheds a new light on a number of cornerstone problems of literary theory: cohesiveness, artistry, imagery and multilevelness of a literary work; the problems of the literature types, genres and styles are analyzed with the use of an unconventional approach. The guidebook discusses important issues that have not been properly addressed by literary studies: the matters of psychologism in literature, the national specifics of literature, the criteria of artistry; and finally, the artistic mode category. They all get a novel interpretation, which brings forth such new concepts, as persona-centric valency, persona-centrism, sociocentrism, etc. A theoretical foundation is provided for the methodology of a comprehensive analysis of fiction.

The guidebook is designed for professors and students of philology. It is also a valuable resource for students of the humanities, as well as for anyone interested in literary studies.
INTRODUCTION

One of the central and most topical problems of the literary theory today is a systematic development of the very concept of a literary work.

The brilliant idea of distinguishing the content-related and the form-related aspects of a literary work established the major tendency in the study of fiction once and for the centuries to come. Content is traditionally regarded as containing the elements related to the semantic field of creativity (understanding and assessment of reality). The plane of expression, or the concept the phenomenological level, is referred to the form. (The basics of architectonics of a literary work have been most thoroughly developed by G.N. Pospelov\(^1\), who, in his turn, relied on Hegel’s aesthetic ideas\(^2\).)

Meanwhile, the same foundational idea provoked a simplified approach to the analysis of fiction. On the one hand, scientific analysis of the content is often replaced by the so-called interpretation, i.e., by an arbitrary application of subjective aesthetic impressions, when the value lies not with the objective knowledge of the principles of creation and functioning of a work of fiction, but with the originally expressed personal attitude to it. A literary work in this case is the point of reference for someone who interprets and reevaluates this work in the context topical for them. On the other hand, the necessity and possibility of understanding the work’s meaning is denied. The literary work is then treated as a merely aesthetic phenomenon, allegedly devoid of any meaning, only as a pure phenomenon of style.

The main reason for this tendency resides in the fact, that after having identified the content-related and the form-related poles (the poetic “world of ideas”, the spiritual meaning and the means of expressing it), our discipline has not yet managed to overcome, or to “take down”, these contradictions, to offer a convincing version about the “coexistence” of contradictions. Throughout the whole history of the literary theoretical thought, either hermeneutically oriented concepts inevitably came to life (i.e., a literary work was interpreted in a certain socio-cultural vein; some hidden meaning was searched for, and its identification required a relevant methodology of decoding it), or aesthetic and formalistic schools and theories studying poetics sprang up (i.e., studying not the meaning of literary fiction, but the means of conveying it). For some – a work of fiction was by all means a “phenomenon of ideas”, others regarded it as a “phenomenon of language” (thus a literary work was viewed predominantly either from the standpoint of the literary sociology or historical poetics, respectively).

To the first group of interpreters indicated above we can refer “realistic criticism” of the 19\(^{th}\) century Russian revolutionary democrats, the cultural-historical,

Geistesgeschichte (‘history of mind’), psychoanalytical, mythological schools, the Marxist (pansociological) literary school, and post-structuralism. To the other group – the aesthetic theories of “art for art’s sake”, “pure art”, Russian formalism, structuralism and the aesthetic concepts “servicing” modernism and postmodernism.

The pivotal issue of all literary theory – the issue of cross-representation of the content in a certain form and vice versa – has not only been unresolved, but has probably never been set. Not refuting the principal approach to the literary work as an actual ideological construct by its nature, which possesses a specific plane of content and a plane of expression, aestheticians and literary scholars nowadays often cultivate the idea of multilevelness of an aesthetic object.

Meanwhile, the understanding of the very nature of the work’s unity is changing. Some achievements in the field of general scientific methodology, namely, the development of such notions as the structure, the system, the unity – make the humanities scholars move from the macro to the micro level, not neglecting, at the same time, mutual integration of these levels. The development of dialectical thinking is becoming vitally topical for all the disciplines in the humanities. Evidently, this is the only way to reach a profound understanding of the object under study and to adequately represent its qualities.

An innovative methodological approach to a literary work as a holistic phenomenon has become a systematic subject comparatively recently (among the first works of this kind we must refer to the mentioned monograph by V.I. Tiupa). An comprehensive anthropological approach is becoming very productive and increasingly reputable. If truth be told, the first steps in this direction were made by the Geistesgeschichte school (W. Dilthey, R. Unger), as well as the Russian philology of the 1920s (works by V.B. Shklovsky, V.V. Vinogradov, P. Sakulin, et al.). As a scientific theory, however, these scholars’ profound observations have never been systematized.

The recognition, on the one hand, of the fact that the phenomenon under study is representative of a summary of all historical phases of its development, and on the other – a non-scholastic, flexible interpretation of the instances of mutual conversion of the content into form (and back) – both make literary theoreticians take a different approach to the object of their research. The essence of the new methodological approach to studying unities (such as personality, society, a work of fiction, etc.) lies, firstly, in the recognition that a unity cannot be broken down into elements (in terms of the information structure of a unity). Rather than a system built out of elements, we are facing a unity with fundamentally different internal relations. Each element of a unity, each “cell”, retains all properties of that unity. Studying a “cell” (“a drop in the ocean”) necessitates studying the unity, while the latter is a multicellular, multilevel structure. Secondly (this time in terms of the contents of an abstract information
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structure), it lies in acceptance of the fact that the very nature of the phenomenon of artistry is adequately described by the language of the unity: the multilevel unity of a work of fiction emerges when the moral and philosophical (non-artistic) strategies develop into artistic ones (modes). In other words, a unity is a philosophical version of the relation between the problems of personality and the text.

This book treats those “cells of artistry” as consistently defined levels of a work of fiction, such as persona-centric valency, pathos, characters’ behavioral strategies, metagenre, type, genre, as well as all stylistic levels (situation, plot, structure, artistic detail, lexico-morphological, prosodic/syntactical text levels, literary phonetics and rhythm). This approach evokes a critique of the existing literary concepts and a new interpretation of seemingly stable categories.

What should one mean, first of all, by fictional content, which can only be expressed with the help of a multilevel structure?

We estimate that the core of any kind of artistic content consists not just of sensually perceived ideas (in other words, imagery). An image, after all, is just another means of conveying some specific artistic information. All this information is focused in the image-based form of the personality concept (to express it, we need artistic modes which function as the strategies of artistic typification). This notion has become central and overarching in the proposed theory of a literary fiction. It is through the personality concept that writers reproduce their vision of the world, their belief systems.

Clearly, the key terms of the theory of literary fiction – unity, the personality concept and others – do not originate in literary studies. The logic helping resolve literary problems induces us to address philosophical anthropology, psychology, and culturology. As we are convinced that literary theory is but the philosophy of literature, we deem those touch points between the disciplines to be not simply useful, but also inevitable and essential.

Before we start speaking about personality in fiction, we need to have a clear idea about personality as it is in life, as well as from the point of view of sciences. The ideas underlying the works of S. Freud, E. Fromm, C. Jung, V. Frankl, etc., constitute the basis of contemporary thinking about personality. We have attempted to outline the necessary scope of such notions as personality, character, human spiritual activities, the psyche, consciousness, etc. Because personality is a holistic object, it is essential to define the nature of interdependence between the psycho-physiological and spiritual aspects in humans, as well as the conscious and the unconscious. Finally, we also deem it necessary to clarify the issues that will follow below, for without their resolution it would be unreasonable to raise the questions about personality in fiction: what makes the content of an individual consciousness, and what is its structure? We were guided in this matter by the fact that the individual consciousness is tightly connected to the social consciousness, one does not exist without the other.
This is the key, in our view, to understanding personality as the subject and object of aesthetic activities. A work of fiction, as presented in the interpretation proposed, is an act of creative birth of the personality concept, which is rendered with the help of specific artistic modes, or “artistic typification strategies” (V.I. Tiupa). The major ones being a method (as a consubstantiation of the typological and a concretely historical side, i.e., the unity of persona-centric valency and pathos, on the one hand, and a character’s behavioral strategies, on the other), metagenre, type of literature and, partly, genre. Style is a representational and expressive embodiment of the selected strategies through plot, structure, detail, speech and, further on, through the verbal levels of the style (prosodic and syntactical, lexico-morphological, phonetic and rhythmical).

Thus, if all the presuppositions of the proposed concept are correct, we can come closer to the scholarly and theoretical understanding of this literary truth which was figuratively outlined by Alexander Blok in his article “The Destiny of Apollon Grigoryev”: “The humour of a true poet transpires through everything, even punctuation”.

An innovative comprehensive anthropological approach should ideally be applicable to all the traditional problems without exception. As a result, many of these problems appear in a totally different light. Namely, the content/form dichotomy loses its “absolutist” character. In the multilevel structure, the content or the form on any level becomes relative: everything will depend on the relation to the upper and lower levels.

We also revise the treatment of a literary work’s genesis problem and the associated issues of literary traditions. The succession of such parameters of the personality concept as personacentrism or sociocentrism cannot be placed next to stylistic adoptions. A demarcation line should be drawn between their spheres of functioning.

We are changing the approach to the historical-functional aspect of literary fiction as well. In particular, we have attached both a moral-psychological and artistic grounding to the mass literature phenomenon.

A theoretical basis for a comprehensive study of psychologism in literature is thus created. This concept makes it possible to fully grasp the consistent pattern of turning the ethical and psychological make-up of a fictional character into the aesthetic one.

We have attempted to analyze the national as a factor of artistry in literature. We have tried to eschew the descriptive method in the study of a work’s national specifics and identify the content-related level.

The issue of artistic value criteria of a literary work is presented in a new light. The objectivity of these criteria seems to lie in the “potential of artistry” which is directly associated with the notion of a “human dimension”.
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It goes without saying that the concept we maintain is neither faultless nor exceptional. It is by no means separated from various contemporary and previous schools and trends. We attempt to reasonably synthesize the historical record of such schools. We are convinced that the existing literary study methodologies can and must be united under a common denominator. It is the dialectical logic that prescribes this approach. Essentially, the complexity is in being really dialectical, in correctly setting up and interpreting topical problems. We presume that a truly dialectical methodology has not been extensively introduced into literary studies yet, which have just stepped into their initial stage on the way to the philosophy of literature.
1. THE NATURE OF ARTISTIC THINKING AND OF LITERARY FICTION AS THE OBJECT OF ACADEMIC STUDY

The manner and means of setting up and resolving all the problems of literary theory depend on the point of departure – the question of settling the argument about the necessity and objective logic of the existence of arts (and fiction as one of them).

If literature exists, does it mean that there is someone who needs it?

Basically, this prosaic rewording of a poetic line presents an essentially materialistic question. An academic rewording of this question may read: why is human spirituality expressed (consequently, cannot help being expressed) in an artistic form which contrasts with that of science? A person’s spiritual composition can well become the subject of a scientific study. That alone has proved to be insufficient for a human being who made Art his “eternal companion”.

Without addressing all the complexities of philosophical-aesthetic problems of the literary art, we must point out some crucial factors. First and foremost, art, in contrast to science, makes use of a totally specific way of representing reality and comprehending it, in a certain sense. This is a fictional image, i.e., actual, tangible medium, containing information about certain objects and phenomena. An image is individualized, moreover, it is unique and appeals to the senses by means of its tangibility.

But this comprises only one half of what needs to be said about the nature of an image. The second half will run contrary to the above. The uniqueness of an image displays universality, the universal being a feature of these phenomena, the feature irreducible to sensually perceived information in principle. An image (behold this springhead of creativity!) incorporates both the tangible and supersensory, or the information which is not addressed exclusively to the feelings (psyche), but to the abstract and logical thinking (consciousness).

What name can we give to this “something” which is contrary to an image in its informational nature?

The supersensory element perceived by consciousness, but not by the senses, is called a notion.

An image in this capacity (image + notion) plays the role of a specific language of culture whose specificity is synthetic and ambivalent towards the “soul” (psyche) and the “mind” (consciousness).

Both science and literary studies make use not of the images, but of the concepts. Their function is to denote substances maximally abstracted from any individual attributes\(^1\). Substance per se cannot be sensually perceived, because it can only be appreciated with the help of abstract and logical thinking.
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\(^1\) In fact, between the polar categories "concept — image" there a few more intermediary formations. In the gnoseological sense, a concept "gradually" transforms into its opposite – an image – via a number of stages. Among these, one must mention first of all, ideas, signs, images-signs (as well as symbols-signs), proper images and, finally, artistic imagery (attaining the level of symbols-images).
Concepts also perform the function of a special language of culture whose aim is to handle a strictly designated volume of meanings, describe processes and relationships which appear in their substantive aspect. As to the concepts, there can be no information ambivalence; they are “soulless” (hyper-sensual), and for that reason, they address “the cold mind” (consciousness). Hence, scientific papers are almost devoid of emotions which could “obscure” the essence. Concepts may be arranged into a chain of conclusions, hypotheses, theories, but they cannot create an image, or anything artistic. In the same way, an image cannot be helpful in explicating a scientific theory.

The principle of artistic typification in art is based on the feature of reality to “respond” to the imagery, to be reflected adequately not just with the help of concepts, but images as well. The more individualized and unique an artistic image is, the more potential does it harbour to represent the general and the universal.

What has been said above about an image is more or less common knowledge in the theory of art.

Other, no less important questions bother scholars much more rarely, such questions as: why is “thinking in terms of imagery” possible at all, the thinking which makes up the basis of artistic creativity, and further, constitutes a relevant perception of creative arts – the reader’s “co-creative empathy”?

Why is an image, which is distinct from a concept, always “more than an image” (image + concept)? In what situations do we need thinking in terms of images? What is the gnoseological potential of such thinking? Why can’t we do without it?

Such kind of “image-based” (artistic) activity must be somehow explained from the perspective of the functioning of consciousness, which “legitimately” represents human needs on behalf of culture.

It was observed long ago that the world outlook of a personality, i.e., what is decisively essential for literature, evolves in the stress field emerging between the two poles: the “worldview” and the “theoretical activity of consciousness”

Translating this terminology into the language of philosophy, we can say that it means the difference between the psyche and consciousness. How do these categories relate to each other? And in what way do they interact?

Only by answering these fundamental non-literary questions can we understand the nature of imagery and unity, and explain the laws regulating their emergence and functioning.

We shall keep in mind that the issue from which literary theory begins, is of gnoseological nature, not solely literary of artistic (!).

Strictly speaking, the matter is not limited to images and notions as such; it is important to consider the psyche and consciousness which cognize the world in
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In literary fiction we deal with different types of images. However, in order to stick to the central concept, we consciously do not focus on the shades, concentrating on the polar categories out of the entire spectrum of “concepts and images”. This is certainly a simplification which we can justify only by the educational character of this course.

\(^1\) About these aspects in the worldview of the artist, see: G.N. Pospelov. An Integral Systemic Appreciation... p. 150.
different ways, and therefore use different discourses. In order to understand and adequately appreciate literature’s language of images, we should possess an idea about the tools literature uses to comprehend the world, as well as literature’s gnoseological potential.

We shall start with the following principal thesis.

The information which is apprehended through the psyche and the senses constitutes the foundation for the existence of the psyche (from Greek: Psyche – soul) and serves as a tool of man’s adaptation to the world.

**What is the meaning of adaptation as a type of relation to reality?**

In a psychological sense, it means seeing not the real thing, but what one wishes to see (i.e., taking illusions for reality). In a scientific sense, it means distorting the view of what objectively exists, making one’s subjective perception absolute. Adaptation requires the language of “emotionally compelling” images.

If the task is to comprehend the world (not to adapt to it), then one has to address one’s consciousness which is capable of providing an objective idea about the world with the help of concepts.

As a result, the one who adapts oneself to the world, and the one who comprehends the world represent two different types of relation to this world, including one’s self as a constituent of the universum. These types of relation clearly contradict each other. The information which is apprehended in an abstract and logical form tends to be systematized (this type of information is structured following “from the general to the particular”), and it ideally acquires the form of a law. Cognition is based on laws by which science makes a living. As far as adaptation is concerned, it appears more effective with an enhanced professing of the cult of “lawlessness” – that of haphazardness, chaos, the world’s incomprehensibility (including the self). From the point of view of the one who “adapts”, man and the world are not to be known in principle. One solution is left: to believe in the things one wishes to believe (seeing not the real thing, but what one wishes to see).

The picture becomes drastically complicated if we take the following into account: the adaptation and the comprehension types of relation, which are contradictory, are also inseparably interconnected; moreover, being the opposite sides of one whole, they intermittently “flow” into each other. Therefore, they are easy to confuse.

Hence we come up with the following outcome: to use the language of images means partially adapting and partially comprehending. With this, the literary artistic activity presupposes comprehension to the extent it is commensurable with the scientific activity (it is not accidental that some writers, especially novelists, are called philosophers). The language of literary fiction is ambivalent: the imperfection of the comprehension type of relation is compensated by the power of an emotional impact. This is the gnoseological niche of literature.
Furthermore, different literary types and genres initiate the relation of adaptation-comprehension in different ways. A clearly defined cultural tendency exists nevertheless: the development of literature means an unswerving development of the comprehension type of relation (alongside the improvement of the adaptation type of relation: feelings become wiser, and the mind gains the qualities of the soul).

Literature becomes a companion to those who strive to discover personality in themselves. To this thesis statement we shall yet return. It is worth noting though, that from the standpoint of the comprehensive approach, it seems impossible to expound everything in relation to one particular local problem right here and now, to cover the issue exhaustively or to define this or that category. It is because there are no local problems, no separate questions or categories in a comprehensive academic discourse. One “cell” (question, category) is always marked with the qualities of the whole, and it is possible to apprehend a part only through keeping the whole in mind.

We therefore shall go back to the already “investigated”, or expounded, categories in a new context, which in itself shall constantly enrich the given category from the point of view of meaning. Such a principle of relations – “to apprehend the whole via an instance of this whole” (to apprehend the ocean via a single drop) – dictates this very scientific strategy.

Thus, the relation of adaptation and the relation of comprehension work together as a prerequisite of artistic creativity. In science, we rely on consciousness which operates with substances and tends to eliminate emotions and feelings. In art, an emotion contains a thought, and a thought contains an emotion. An image is a synthesis of consciousness and the psyche, of the thought and feeling, of the abstract and the concrete.

This is how we view the basis of artistic creativity which is made possible only because consciousness and the psyche, being autonomous spheres, are simultaneously and inseparably connected. It is impossible to reduce an image to a thought: in such case we shall have to distract ourselves from feelings and emotions. To reduce an image to an immediate feeling means “neglecting” the reversibility of the psyche, its capacity to be fraught with a thought, i.e., the composite of notions.

We now have the grounds to state the unity of an image, and, in a broader sense, the unity as an objective premise of an aesthetic relation. From this point on, we shall automatically regard an image as something originally whole; there is no image which would not be whole; so, in our interpretation, the phrase “a whole image” becomes a kind of tautology.

The unity of an image, however, is not simply a quality which facilitates a sensual perception of a thought (concept). An image is also a mode of simultaneous existence of several concepts (a system of concepts). An image is essentially polysemic, it embraces several aspects (why it is at all possible – we shall discuss in the ensuing Section). Science cannot afford it. Concepts simply reduce a subject (phenomenon) to a singular aspect, a singular instance, with a conscious distancing.
from all others. Science explores phenomena analytically, with a subsequent synthesis, cross-checking all the points of interconnectivity. Art operates with the aggregates of meanings (“drops in the ocean”). Moreover, having an aggregate of meanings is another essential condition of the “life” of an artistic image. It appears difficult or even impossible at times to decide which meaning is true or “uppermost”. Throughout this work, we shall come back again and again to the problem of actualization of meanings.

Here are two sides of the unity of an artistic image: firstly, we mean the unity of two types of relations, that of adaptation and that of comprehension – making up this wholeness; secondly, we emphasize the synthesis of the comprehension type of relation in an image.

One should bear in mind here that any artistically reproduced “world view” is a reduction (the world as a whole is impossible to represent). In order to represent that reduced world view, and to create a “life pattern”, we need a specific artistic code. This code should reduce the world so that an author could have a possibility to express his/her world perception.

An image per se cannot be such a code. An artistic image (a whole, as we understand it) with all its unique capacities, still remains a means, a tool, and a form.

**What makes the meaning of an image so rich?**

There can only be one answer, as we see it, and it is personality.

At least, cognitive possibilities of the comprehensive anthropological approach dictate this answer.

Thus, the key words describing the methodological concept of a “comprehensive literary analysis” are *information* (more precisely, *information structure*) and *personality* – the words which do not “originate” in literature (we have to mark this contradiction).

The key word to describe this specific information structure which becomes, eventually, the subject of a comprehensive analysis, is *contradiction*. The oxymoronic notion of a “comprehensive analysis” is totally contradictory: the word “comprehensive” means indivisible, not lending itself to be divided into parts; the word “analysis” means a consistent and targeted breakdown of the whole.

At the beginning, we specifically stressed contradictions, one more reason being that any specialist’s traditional treatment of them is a constructive principle of any theory, by all means describing the theory of a “comprehensive analysis”. A loyal attitude to contradictions helps to correctly define the research subject. The points of departure in literary studies (and in its main part – literary theory – which is “responsible” for methodology) are the following.

On the one hand, a work of fiction is viewed as a “phenomenon of ideas”, as problem- and meaning-containing formation, which, being by nature dependent on images, is in need of rationalization: abstract-logical and scientific commentary (i.e.,
translation of the information expressed through imagery into the language of concepts).

On the other hand, it is regarded as a “phenomenon of style”, as some aesthetically closed, self-identical whole. The first approach mentioned is often called interpretation, whereby its subjective and arbitrary character is emphasized, which cannot be reduced, in essence, to any definite, scientifically grounded and consistent patterns (because a free, essayistic interpretation is not tied to the universal scale of higher cultural values). It is clear that the “meanings of reality”, unsystematically dispersed, having given life to a work of fiction, appear more topical than the work itself. This is exactly the case when it deals with everything and nothing.

The second approach, concentrating on the problems of the text as such, tends to completely disengage itself from reality and absolutize the formal properties of the signs as truly intrinsic elements of all cultural phenomena.

The pivotal problem facing literary theory (and indeed, all of the aesthetics, the area which is, in fact, literary theory) is the following: what is the way through which moral-philosophical (non-fictional) strategies (meaning) turn into artistic strategies (artistic modes) – and, eventually, produce a style?

How is it possible to reconcile, and combine, extreme methodological positions each of which is in a sense independent?

Here one cannot do without such notions as an information structure (an integrated one, if we mean artistic phenomena) and a contradiction.

It stands clear then that the nature of the object of study for literary scholars turns out to be much more complex than it has been deemed until recently. A compromise between the two extreme points of view does not lie in-between, but in a different plane: we have to approach comprehensively neither the text nor the poetic “world of ideas”, nor the artistic and the non-artistic strategies taken separately, but a work of fiction, carrying, on the one hand, the ideal and spiritual meaning which can possibly exist, and on the other hand, this can only be achieved in an exclusively complex form which is a fictional text.

A work of fiction thus becomes the subject of study.

To substantiate the given thesis, some new concept is necessary, one that would explain the way the problems of personality are connected with the problems of the text. Such a concept does exist, and we can provisionally define it as a comprehensive anthropological approach to artistic phenomena (work of fiction, thinking, and creative art). To put it short, a comprehensive analysis. In fact we may be witnessing the formation and consolidation of, perhaps, the most original and currently promising literary theory that would turn the study of literature into the area of comprehensive anthropological literary studies.
2. UNITY VS SYSTEM
AS A FEATURE OF AN INFORMATION STRUCTURE

Unity, as we shall prove further, acts also as a feature of a specifically “human dimension” (not limited to the artistic). Unity characterizes not only imagery, but also of what imagery contains – personality.

An object perceived as a whole possesses at least two qualitative attributes. First, unity presupposes convergence of the opposites – the sensually perceived and the abstract logical (this relates to the nature of unity which we have mentioned above); second, the type of relations between the components within a holistically arranged object is crucially different from that which is arranged systematically (and this is related to the structure of a unity).

Unity is a description of an object which is not only a unit of information “on the whole” (a perception of the inner contradiction as a unity), it also characterizes a type of relation between components comprising the information structure of the object (perception of the inner structure). Unity can certainly be “touched”, i.e., felt with the senses; the type of relations, however, cannot be perceived with the senses, but only with the help of scientific tools.

What are the types of relations between the components comprising the information structure of an object?

We shall take interest in two types of relations capable of forming the following structures: a system or a unity. A system comes out as a result of the part – whole type of relation (we shall term this type of relation as systematic). A unity is created as a result of the instance-of-the-whole – the whole type of relation (a drop – the ocean). We shall call this type of relation holistic.

Why do we single out these particular types of relations?

It is because objects in the humanities can be comprehended as systems or as unities. All scientific classifications and typologies come down anyway to these basic types of relations. A comprehensive approach seems to be more contemporary, more result-oriented, and, which is the main thing, more corresponding to reality (i.e., ultimately more science-oriented).

How can one describe in scientific language the subject and the object, an inseparable information symbiosis, a unity (an artistic one) which aspires for infinite autonomy, turning itself into an idiosyncratic “thing in itself”?

There is only one way to do it: by identifying and describing relations between the components (levels) of the whole, which (the relations) can be either holistic or systematic.

So, until now, the unity of a fictional work has been studied as a system, in other words, each cutoff, each plane of the holistic object has been studied individually, as an element or part of the whole; however, now we suggest they be apprehended as an instance of the unity, possessing all the properties of the whole. “Pure” features of a
single quality are complicated by a range of features of all other qualities. Any component of a style (situation, plot, detail, speech, the linguistic plane of the text) becomes the vehicle for the entire spiritual and aesthetic paradigm, without losing its autonomous specifics.

It becomes clear that analyzing the style means identifying relations of the stylistic components to all the content-related levels of the fictional work; a quality analysis of the conceptual plane can only be possible under the condition of treating the ideas through the lens of the style. In a work of fiction, there are no ideas outside the style – and vice versa.

The notions of the content and the form have lost their dichotomy and fictitious identity and have turned into fully relative properties. For example, the plot in a holistically organized text may be treated as both an instance of the form and an instance of the content – depending on the set of relations and functions it performs.

The dialectical approach to a unity implies the following:

1. Each instance of a specific unity may simultaneously be an instance of another specific unity (it may be viewed from a different angle, with other interconnections; for example, the plot basis of *The Queen of Spades* is revisited in a new light in *Crime and Punishment*).

2. Each specific unity *per se* may be, in its turn, an instance of a unity of a different order (for example, Leo Tolstoy can well be an element of Russian literature, and Russian literature – an element of world literature).

Consequently, each specific instance of a unity is an instance of infinity, and of universality. It is necessary and possible to study scientifically a *specific unity* only. One cannot study “everything” simultaneously, though one can, nevertheless, “immediately grasp” this “everything” to some extent, and it is possible to do so through imagery. An image localizes universality, imparting to it the qualities of the whole; and this wholeness should be of such making, that through it, the germs of other unities transpire. In other words, only an image allows for immediate comprehension of the universum, or its total unity. This is the only way to tame the “malign infinity”.

The trickiness of a unity as a property of the subject (object) we are studying here lies in the fact that this unity cannot be bound within the confines of an artistic model; this model itself is but an instance (a mode) of the unity of a different level and order. The instances of a unity (in various degrees) may be represented by a personality, an epoch, an author, a work, a reader, a tradition, contemporary context and so on. In other words, a scholar, in a sense, creates a whole (holistic) subject for him/herself; he/she judges it within the scope of their methodological competence, if one prefers. To grasp the wholeness of the subject, i.e., to embrace the unembraceable, constitutes the art of science. Hence, the familiar subjectivism of the humanities (and not only the humanities, for sure); with that, subjectivism is understood as a mode of objectivity.
The essence of a unity is in the aptness to change its own essence. From the major to the secondary is but one qualitative leap, and vice versa.

A unity is a dialectical cluster which is embodied in an information structure. This also includes the fact of the inner (qualitative) characteristics being “picked up” by consciousness (which transforms an object into a subject, and a person into a personality), while the outer (quantitative) characteristics are “picked up” by the psyche, and they are expressed, accordingly, by the concepts and images.

This comes to mean the following: for the psyche, the unity as an information segment of the universum is not comprehensible in principle. It may be as simple as that: such an object is non-existent for the psyche and can never exist, because the psyche does not possess the informational capacities to be transformed into a subject.

Without the perception of its immanent integral attributes, however, the unity cannot become an “object” for consciousness. The psyche perceives what is non-existent for it.

The world is hardly cognizable as a whole, and if it is cognizable at all, then only as a whole. For this very reason, a unity turns into a universal category, signifying a correlation of the comprehension and the adaptation aspects in the information object.

A question arises: is scientific understanding of holistic artistic phenomena possible (an image, a literary work, creative art), is there a conceptual equivalent for artistry, and where is the maximum limit for such understanding?

Theoretically, an artistic content may be reduced to scientific content, or to a logically extended system of concepts. However, it is unfeasible in practice, and there is no need for it. We deal here with a bottomless realm of meanings. Some thought is also given to the problem of emerging new overtones of meaning, new deeper meanings, spontaneous re-accentuation of sense-bearing dominance points, and even to “self-production” of meanings in classical literary works. Since a work of fiction can be fully comprehended only on condition of total logical unfolding of the imagery, one can state that comprehension of a highly artistic literary work is an endless process.

In conclusion, an image, a fictional work and personality (to be discussed below) are not dissociated (but a whole). An adequate perception of holistic phenomena should also be holistic: as a thought process, as a sensually perceived substance (here is another meaning of a unity as a category). Therefore a scientific analysis of a fictional work is an “ambiguous relative” comprehension of an artistic unity: besides the fact that the inexhaustibility of meanings is not to be reduced to a system, with this comprehension an adequate perception of emotions – or empathy – is taken “out of the context”. A maximum comprehension of an aesthetic object is always multifaceted: empathy, co-creation, as well as an approach to a unity with an academic dialectical logic. This is what makes up an aesthetic (inseparable – holistic, once again) perception. It is always an instantaneous and one-act process.
While being fully aware of the fact that the unity of a work of fiction cannot be exhaustively described with the formal language of science, we still envision one single approach to a scientific understanding of this unity: it needs to be studied as a system aiming at its own limit (i.e., transforming itself into its own opposite – a unity). A literary scholar has no other choice but to analyze a work of fiction as though it were a system while constantly keeping in mind that he/she is dealing not with a system, but with a unity. Another approach, an intuitive one, to a work of fiction is possible and even necessary, but it is not scientific, however. These approaches must be complementary to each other, not mutually exclusive.
3. PERSONALITY AS THE SUBJECT AND OBJECT OF AESTHETIC ACTIVITY

Now we are ready to engage in a discussion of personality, that is, of a holistically organized information structure that surely envelops certain content.

This matter gets infinitely more complicated by the circumstance of personality being not solely the subject of an aesthetic comprehension of the world (i.e., being the one who comprehends the world with the help of imagery), but also an object (i.e., being what is comprehended), and besides, being the subject of perception (i.e., the one who perceives this creative production). Personality speaks of a personality, for a personality, and by means characteristic of a personality. An image serves as both a means of comprehending and transmitting purely human information, and also reflects the very nature of a personality’s existence.

All the issues of a properly aesthetic or artistic order deal, in this or that manner, with the problem of personality: we shall note it as a specific feature of literary studies, the discipline of the humanities, and the science of man.

It makes sense therefore, first, to clarify what we mean by personality, and to define a scientific idea about the concept of personality. The research logic forces us to briefly abandon at this point the course of literary studies and invade the terrain of philosophy and psychology, which deal more thoroughly with the personality-related problems in the context that interests us.

What is personality?

We are now witnessing a gradual involvement of sciences (biology, anthropology, psychology, ethics, philosophy, et al.), which can be provisionally called “the science of man”\(^1\). Besides, as we have mentioned before, personality is in the focus of arts. Moreover, what sciences focus on individually, arts, on the whole, focus on simultaneously. This proves possible just because a person is one single whole. Clearly, personality is a hypercomplex object, extremely multifaceted, demanding comprehensive scientific approaches.

What determines this complexity of a personality structure?

What makes up the content of a personality characterized by wholeness?

The answers to these and similar questions are to be sought in man’s complex nature. There are three clearly distinguishable spheres, or three levels, irreducible to one another and autonomous, regardless of their close interrelatedness: the bodily, the psychic and the spiritual. In other words, the body – the soul – the spirit (mind). If we make man’s “projection” onto the plane of biology, psychology and consciousness\(^2\),

---

2 Let us make a reservation: the “spiritual” is not synonymous to consciousness, but is the “spiritual” of the soul. These pairs of concepts are not the same. Consciousness is the basis of spirituality, the psyche – of the soul. However, the spiritual is a synthesis of the intellectual and psychological aspects (the former one being dominant), and conscious organizing aspects are tangible in the soul (though on the whole the soul is a psychic chaos, “darkness”). The emergence of the concepts of the soul and spirituality is highly characteristic. Their presence stresses the fact that there is no “bare” psyche as well as there is no “pure” consciousness; those may be regarded as only scientific abstractions.
then he will correspond to these reflections which, however, shall contradict one another. On the biological level, man’s reflection will be that of a closed system of reflexes, on the psychological level — that of a closed system of psychological reactions, and on the spiritual level — an ideal autonomous world. Voila, contradictions in action.

It is impossible to produce man’s projection onto the plane of lower, self-locked psycho-physiological dimensions; man’s essence is in his openness to the world, or “self-transcendental” (V. Frankl), it is his becoming separated from nature and making a cultural being.

The highest (cultural) dimensions incorporate the lower (natural) ones. Becoming a spiritual being, man still remains in a sense, an animal, and a plant, and a stone. A person is a single being (or one whole, in our terms). Psycho-physiological layers in a person transpire through the spiritual dimension.

**What is the correlation between the dimensions mentioned above?**

Human spirit is certainly predetermined by its psychophysical capacities, no more, no less than that! This means that a smoothly running human organism posits a condition for the development of one’s spirituality, but it cannot conceive spirituality itself. Human spirituality, i.e., the freedom of self-development, one’s attitude to the world, an ability of being responsible for one’s behavior — is determined by innate psychophysical factors (“vital essence”, according to V. Frankl) and the milieu (environment, social status). This “vital essence” together with the social status constitute man’s *natural predeterminacy*. This predeterminacy can always be established and placed on record by means of different sciences: biology, psychology and sociology. One, however, should not overlook the fact that man’s proper existence begins where any sort of determinacy or fixity ends, any categorical and ultimate determinacy. And this existence begins where there is man’s *personality position* in place, his orientation, his personal attitude to all that, to any “vital essence”, and to any situation, with man’s natural predeterminacy at the core. This orientation cannot, by any means, be an object of any of the sciences mentioned; rather, it is embodied in a special dimension. Besides, this orientation is free in principle; it eventually comes out in a form of some sort of decision. And if we expand our frame of references due to this latter conceivable dimension, then the possibility of existential transformation will be thus realized, ever present due to the freedom of a personality’s position

Personality is sometimes understood as “an aggregate of all social relations” (K. Marx), “an ensemble of social relations”, to quote the original text, as the famous Soviet philosopher E.V. Ilyenkov thought. Marx considered personality to be a cultural historical phenomenon, not a physical-natural one (which, truly speaking, absolutized the social principle to the detriment of the spiritual/existential).

---

It is of crucial importance for us that a personality is irreducible neither to the “natural predeterminacy” nor to any kind of “ensembles of social relations”, or even to a certain spiritual and existential orientation. Intrinsically, sociality or spirituality as super-natural, cultural qualities can never be decisive features of personality.

Personality is an informational-philosophical characteristic of a person.

Personality begins where conscious and sensible management of information takes place, the information related to the human dimension (to the triad of the body-soul-spirit).

The “person – personality” divide runs in the sphere of the separation of the kind “the unconscious versus conscious” (soul – mind). Personality begins to take shape where the unconscious regulation gives way to the conscious one – we shall emphasize, the rationally conscious one, because the intellect, this double agent between the psyche and consciousness, can efficiently serve only an unconscious adaptation type of relationship, loading itself with the adaptation functions of the psyche, because the intellect is a higher instance in the informational context.

The personality cult presupposes the cult of a rational relationship, the cult of cognition, and it rejects the cult of an unconscious adaptation as a way of comprehending the world (let’s stress, just as a means of cognition; adaptation as a means of survival is quite effective).

Because only reason, and nothing else, is responsible for the higher cultural values which are traditionally defined as Truth, Goodness, Beauty, the rational beginning is associated with the cultural one.

Thus, the human psycho-physique (including the human mind) is related to the personality in the same way as the words are related to the content of a fictional work, as the metal the money is made of is related to the pattern of pricing, as a clock is related to Time.

We can discern a range of oppositions that may help us make sense of the core of the matter: nature – culture, the psyche (“extended” to the intellect, making the intellect perform the functions of the psyche) – consciousness (the intellect transferring itself into mind, now performing the functions of consciousness), person – personality.

Philosophy as a scientifically superior dimension, integrates literary studies. The latter discipline is incapable of identifying the specificity of the object of its examination while relying only on its internal possibilities. It is our crucial task to identify man’s highest dimension, because literature deals with this very dimension. A person remains a person to the point he/she is capable of transgressing both their own determinacy and social determinacy. The spiritual in a person is that very instance which eventually shapes his/her personality. A person can rise above everything, even above his/her own selfhood – this is what makes the basis for a personality’s self-development.
Foreshadowing what we shall say further, we may remark that what enables humans to express their understanding of the world, it is merely the representation of personality. The potential for the existence of literature as a form of social consciousness rests exactly in the fact that personality comprises all human problematics. If one would like to discuss everything, they should discuss personality (to be more exact, the transformation of a person into a personality).

It is for this reason that fiction can be defined as “thinking in terms of personality-related categories”.

A personality can realize his/her spiritual potential only through a psychophysical organization. We can judge about a personality’s type of spirituality even by appearance. Literature and arts very widely explore this potential. Another personality hypothesis is equally widely represented in literature, and it is character. A personality develops a range of psychological mechanisms allowing for the adaptation to the milieu, for becoming “an aggregate of social relations”. Through character a personality fits into a social environment, through character a personality fulfils him/herself. Let’s note that a character is irreducible to temperament – that is, to the speed and intensity of psychological reactions. Character gives shape, first of all, to such psychological peculiarities which implement the world view orientation of a personality.

Realism, for the first time, consistently revealed the connection between the circumstances – the character – and the personality. Character in fiction, as well as in life, is a mode of existence of personality. Personality is dialectically linked to character. “I only own a type or character”, writes V. Frankl, but what I am is personality”. In the long run, personality always shapes the character it possesses. A personality may change its character any time. But character also produces a feedback, shaping personality. As a result, the dialectical formula may be expressed in the following way: “Not only do I act in compliance with what I am, but I become the way I act as well”.

Thus, temperament is a biological aspect of personality; psychological character is its social characteristic; a properly spiritual nucleus of personality cannot be ultimately established by man’s natural determinacy, but it actively resists it, when necessary, and shapes itself in accordance with its ideal orientations (with the highest cultural values). It is the spiritual that creates the human in a person, overcoming the outer man.

What has been so far said is quite enough to get an idea about personality and character in literary fiction. (We have been using the term character as related to social psychology; from now on we shall use the notion of character as the structure of a personage, i.e., we shall use the term in the context of literary studies, see Section 9.)

---

1 V. Frankl. Man’s... p. 112.
2 V. Frankl. Man’s... p. 114.
Finally, we have to touch upon one more set of questions connected with the problematics of personality: **what is the content of a spiritual personality, and what is, in this connection, the structure of an individual consciousness, and what shapes it?**

This range of questions has never, in fact, been touched upon in the discussion of the problems of literary theory – this philosophical branch of literary studies as part of the humanities, while these issues are pivotal for the clarification of the category of artististry. We shall briefly discuss them.

The idea of a unity is, so to say, a commonly shared one. It signifies the deep-lying quality of not only literary fiction or personality. If fully relates to the public consciousness. Imagery does not fully describe the specificity of the aesthetic consciousness, though it is a fundamental characteristic of the latter. Imagery is always content-related. This content-relatedness (in terms of culture, content always represents ideas) comes from the forms of social consciousness. Artistic creativity is just one of these forms of social consciousness. An aesthetic form of social consciousness, in its turn, also functions as “a cell of a unity” of a different nature, a specific “item of a unity”.

**What are the relationships of the aesthetic with other forms of social consciousness?**

It is evident that without an idea about the patterns and laws of functioning of social consciousness in general, it is impossible to study any one of its forms. The solution to aesthetic problems proper lies in the philosophical plane of their comprehension. That is why all the attempts to solve general aesthetic issues as local problems could not have led to impressive success in the creation of the theory of literary fiction.

Thus, studying a work of fiction we are eventually faced with the problems of consciousness (social or individual). (Let us note, that the issue of all issues – that of the correlation of being and consciousness – as well as fundamental questions about the origin of consciousness, interrelation between consciousness, the psyche and language, et al., are not in the focus of this book. Those are philosophical questions proper, the questions which have no direct reference to the immediate subject of the study. We stress, however, that it is nevertheless impossible to “overlook”, or avoid these questions. The solution of these and all ensuing questions requires grounding in a certain philosophical system. For us, such a system is dialectical materialism based on the methodological facilities of the total dialectics, which enabled the study of holistic phenomena.)

Let us refer to experts in the problems of consciousness and make some most important summaries which would enable us to pose the most essential questions on the theory of literary fiction. An original and comprehensive interpretation of the problems of consciousness is to be found in the work of A.V. Yegorov.

---

We shall reproduce a chart from this work which reflects the structure of social consciousness. **Chart № 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLE OF THE PSYCHE</th>
<th>Aesthetic consciousness</th>
<th>Moral consciousness</th>
<th>Religious consciousness</th>
<th>Legal consciousness</th>
<th>Political consciousness</th>
<th>Economic consciousness</th>
<th>Scientific consciousness</th>
<th>Philos. consciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHICAL CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENTIFIC CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEOLOGY-DRIVEN CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNDANE CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the whole of our work we shall “keep in mind” this chart, and we shall continually go back directly to it.

Let us first of all single out the most evident things.

Aesthetic consciousness is one of the oldest forms of social consciousness. In the developmental process of its historical formation it has gone a long way from a pre-artistic sensual-emotional reflection of different phenomena to the most complex emotional-intellectual reproduction of the whole spiritual paradigm of the individual (and social) consciousness. Contemporary arts are empowered in posing and solving practically all the questions of the spiritual self-identification of a personality in the world. At that, aesthetic consciousness does not replace its scientific form, but rather complements it.

As seen from the chart, the philosophical level of aesthetic consciousness contains all the previous levels starting from the psychological (along the vertical axis). Aesthetic consciousness (individual) is far from reaching the level of the philosophical and world view generalizations, although certain points of generalization are already present on the lower levels as well.

On the other hand, aesthetic consciousness contains, to this or that degree, on this or that level, all other forms of social consciousness (along the horizontal line). In its turn, each of the levels may be “aestheticized” in case of necessity. The chart, in fact, can be virtually rolled into a circle, linking the levels horizontally and vertically.

Such interpenetration of the forms of social consciousness makes it clear why literary works can become “life encyclopedias”, why they deal with the sums of meanings. At the same time, the irreducibility of one form of consciousness to another is evident, too, as well as the independence of the said forms.

One should specifically pay attention to the fact of aesthetic consciousness neighboring with moral consciousness. The world of interpersonal relationships has been topical for arts since their origin. To study personality is the major task of arts,
and it means studying the patterns of its formation. And personality is always formed in interaction with other personalities.

In order to tailor the chart to our objectives, we shall look at the idea of a spectrum, i.e., gradual transition from one pole to the other. If we single out (for the purposes of discussion), aesthetic consciousness and place major art forms within it, according to the degree of building up of rationalism, we shall get the following chart. **Chart № 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLE OF THE PSYCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLE OF CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literature as an art form can also be located in a similar spectrum: from the lyric to the epic. **Chart № 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITERATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLE OF THE PSYCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “conceptual” lyric (love, nature, philosophical lyric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLE OF CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any movement, trend or tendency, on various grounds, may be subject to “spectral analysis”.

We have found it convincing that the thesis statement – “personality constitutes the centre of the meaning of literary fiction” – does not tell the whole truth. We shall significantly approach closer to it, if we keep in mind the following: the personal in literary fiction is a correlation of the personal and the super-personal, or socially significant. We always deal with not just a man, but a “collective man” (C.G. Jung), not a personality – but a “collective personality”. Personality as such is an “internal sociality” and, by definition, is a form of the social being. In other words, the structure of an individual consciousness is analogous, in fact, to the structure of social consciousness (another matter is the content of the structure). “Personality is exactly an aggregate of a person’s relationship with one’s own self as with some kind of ‘OTHER’ – relationships of the ‘I’ with one’s self as with some kind of ‘NOT-I’”¹.

¹ E.V. Ilyenkov. What is Personhood?... p. 329.
We believe that this fantastic gift of man – the gift of objectively treating oneself, contemplating, comprehending, turning from a person into a personality – is not always valued according to merit. This gift is indeed that decisive prerequisite facilitating the process of transforming artistic creativity into a form of social consciousness.

In this connection, it is crucial to have a clear idea about the difference between a personality and a person (individual), for, as we shall try to convincingly show further, there is pre-personality-oriented literature (sociocentric and individuocentric) and personacentric literature.

What distinguishes a socio/individuocentric character from a personacentric one?

The body, the soul, and the spirit are the three informational spheres capable of combining new meanings. The body-soul beginning (the psyche) plus the soul-mind beginning (consciousness) make up the components of spirituality.

Intellect in this informational space is a double agent, as it has been mentioned before: it serves the needs of the psyche and meanwhile strives to transform itself into the mind/reason (highest degree of consciousness). The final step from nature to culture is a step from the psyche to consciousness, from intellect to reason, but it is a step not captured with the radars of the psyche, a totally real one in man’s informational space.

Reason in this context can be defined as specific kind of intellect, reckoning with the logic of the unconscious, getting enriched with this logic and thanks to it, turning itself into a tool of the total dialectics, into an instrument of modeling an ideal sense which is commonly called the truth.

If this is the case, what is the difference between a personality and an individual?

A brief answer may read: there is a gap between them, the gap located within a narrow space, separating the mind from the intellect. Another type of managing information invokes this gap.

The language of a personality is the mind, the language of an individual is feelings. A personality is a subject of the rational type of information management; an individual is an object of an unconscious application of unconsciously obtained information (and the intellect intensifies manifold the impact of the unconscious).

Hence, personality is a multifaceted phenomenon, characterizing man as a cultural being.

From the informational point of view, personality is understood as a type of information management.

From the point of view of the cultural context, personality is both the subject and the object of the implemented Truth – Goodness – Beauty moral-philosophical triad, (properly, the subject and the object of humanization).
From the *gnoseological* perspective, personality is an idea about the truth in “human terms”: man is not aware of the existence of the Truth, but with the appearance of the personality category he finds it easier to navigate around the map of knowledge – realizing in *what direction* to move and *what* to look for.

From the *socio-moral* perspective, personality is mistakenly taken for a utopian projection of a god-man or an ideal, *positively wonderful* person, thus refusing the personality its right to a real existence.

Thus, personality in the light of the comprehensive anthropological literary studies may be understood as a composite of bio-psycho-socio-spiritual relationships, a complex spiritual-psycho-physiological symbiosis, a complex (informational unity), the dominant capacity of which is a spiritual and *rational* management of the entire informational complex. The wholeness of personality is secured by the unity of its consciousness and the psyche. Besides, the very essence of personality is also holistic, including its reflection and perception.

This is the key for the understanding of personality which is *the subject of study in literary fiction*.

It is the “personality cult” that defines the personacentric character of literary studies.

The task of a fictional work is to represent the image-based concept of personality. Consequently, a literary artist primarily represents the personality’s spirituality lying in the stress field between the psyche and consciousness; spirituality is ambivalent: on the one hand, it can be sensually perceived, or we may say, it is “psychical”, on the other – it is rational, i.e., it can be described as a system of ideas.

The meaning of spirituality comprises, on the one hand, the integration of all forms of social consciousness; on the other hand, this integration contains all the levels of consciousness – from the mundane to the philosophical. The “super-sensitive” nature of spirituality can only be rendered through imagery; imagery, however, in order to be represented, requires special strategies for a targeted artistic selection of a personality’s manifestation signs which are consolidated in the style.

This is exactly the vein for the literary work which is the *subject of research in literary studies*.

With that, the *object of research*, whether we like it or not, is not literature as such, but a *conflict of the types of information management*, the conflict between thinking in “images” and “conceptual” thinking – between, strictly speaking, the psyche and consciousness; and to be more exact: between the *adaptation type of relation* and the *comprehension type of relation* which build up that same information structure. These relations are the construction material of the personality’s spirituality.

Hence, we have a new actualization of the imperative: if you want to understand literature, make sense of personality.

**Which spiritual components of personality bear the primary artistic load?**
In this context it seems appropriate to touch upon the seemingly local problem, which, in the context of the whole, will acquire a universal character (and this is true of all problems without exception in literary studies). We call this problem *the criteria of artistry* (we shall deal with it in due time and in a different context – see Section 11).

Due to the fact that the quality of spirituality defines aesthetic parameters, not vice versa, the criteria of artistry are a sum-total of the assessed plane of content (in particular, the philosophy of morality) and the associated plane of expression (style). It is here that we see the *guaranteed objectivity criteria*. The old and quite integral formula – “Beauty–Goodness–Truth” thus acquires its scientific grounding.

It is also true, however, that in the light of the total dialectics, this formula reveals a plethora of nuances. Notably, artistic practice has demonstrated that Beauty, as a relatively autonomous component of the triad, possesses its intrinsically valuable potential of expression. Alongside this, Beauty cannot be radically severed from the meaning (from the sum of meanings systematically organized).

The principle stating that “the dialectic multidimensionality of ideas determines the quality of their expression” becomes a scientific criterion of artistry. The deeper the meaning, the more original the style is.

We have come to something incredible: literary studies, not endowed with any exclusive philosophical authority, must, if not to substantiate the universal character of spiritual values (to do this, we have to change the subject of study and transform this discipline into the philosophy of morality), then at least rely on an acceptable scientific version unambiguously *grounding the universal (sic!) character of spiritual values*. The mentioned total dialectics of the methodology binds literary studies to deal with the issues of a non-literary nature, but which are of the utmost importance just for literary studies.

The following result comes out: comprehensive anthropological literary studies, making use of comprehensive methodology, is fully endowed with the authority of philosophy.

A comprehensive analysis establishes the universality of spiritual values not in the existence of the axiomatic triad “Beauty–Goodness–Truth” (an absolute and irrationally set reference point), but in the fact that: 1) the spiritual and aesthetic triad “Beauty–Goodness–Truth” is an outcome of informational interaction between the psyche and consciousness; 2) as a result of that interaction, personality became the reference point in the informational landscape as a concentration of the natural and cultural information which is arranged with the help of the total dialectics; 3) the main element in the personality structure implementing the comprehension type of relation – which, in its turn, contradictorily incorporates the adaptation type of relation – is the *mind* – the subject of culture, regulating a person’s entire strategically relevant information with the help of “conscious awareness”, in other words, of the laws (the *intellect* being for the major part the extended lever of the psyche, and in this
connection, a subject of nature, efficiently regulates the adaptation type of relation); 4) the opportunity for the personality to exist in principle, while the functions of the psyche, intellect and mind are divorced and harmonized, has led to the emergence of the phenomenon of artistry and, further, of important artistic modes (of personacentric valency, in the first place – or, sociocentrism, individuocentrism and of personacentrism).

As a consequence, if man is doomed to undergo evolution towards personality (from nature to culture), then, artistic creativity couldn’t help coming to life: the wholeness of personality, as we see, can only be represented with the help of imagery – which is also ambivalent, super-sensitive by its origin. Comprehension and reproduction of the spiritual essence of personality through imagery rightly constitutes the meaning of a literary work.

Considering the fact that personality can most adequately be represented through imagery, we arrive at a good number of crucial conclusions. We shall mention the most vital of them. Artistic creation must exist if only for the reason that it satisfies one the most fundamental needs of a human personality, namely: the need for “self-actualization” (the term was coined by the American psychologist Maslow), which we shall understand as an ability for spiritual realization through irrational (unconscious) technologies.

An individual personality can exist because of its interaction with other personalities, and the environment. Individuality is elaborated via a contact with other individualities. Being oneself means constantly borrowing something from others. Outside interaction with an object, the formation and existence of a subject is inconceivable, otherwise, the emergence of the human community can hardly be explained without resorting to the “higher forces”.

Consequently, besides the fact that personality is split within – the coexistence of “I” and Non-I” – it is incessantly subjected to external ideological influence from other personalities. With that, for the personality to preserve its self-identity, it needs its own “integral spiritual self-definition” (G.N. Pospelov), repeated confirmation of the validity of the chosen worldview “reference frame”, and the spiritual reference system in the world. These instances in the life of personality (the spiritual need!) are the very moments of self-actualization.

Based on this need, personality appears to get (again, can’t help getting) “an aesthetic mindset” as a prerequisite of one of the most efficient ways in self-actualization – aesthetic activity. Self-actualization is not merely a rational act, but mostly an act of adaptation, being psychological in its basis. This act is not a scientific, but an intuitive, image-related comprehension of the world. Aesthetic activity (including its highest form – creative art, as well as its perception) matches that mindset in the best possible way. By apprehending imagery in arts, a personality resolves much more than particular artistic issues, but also the problems of adaptation.
and the world view, thus creating the effect of the *catharsis*: I am not alone, and my ideal is also the ideal for many others, the validity of my choice is confirmed by the fact that it is also the choice of the heroes, the one eschewed by the villains.

To some extent, this certainly constitutes the knowledge of the world, extra-rational kind of knowledge, the *ultimate result* of which appears to be the *personality concept*. Artistic knowledge seems to be irreducible to the elaboration of a image-based personality concept, given that a peculiar artistic world is thus created, a new, previously non-existent artistic reality. Yet, artistic knowledge is, so to say, *anthropological* knowledge of the world as the personality’s life environment, knowledge by means of personality, for the personality and with the help of the tools characteristic of personality. It is an attempt to understand and express oneself, and therefore, all other personalities.

**What does it mean to show a human “personality nucleus” in literature?**

It means to reproduce his/her “frame of orientation and devotion” (E. Fromm), a world view system, and a program of one’s self-actualization. The reverse is also true: to represent some kind of world outlook and some kind of “frame of orientation and devotion” would mean representing the bearer of the world outlook, that same personality. In this sense, the newly re-created artistic reality can be reduced to the value-bearing nucleus which is at the core of the image-based personality concept.

It is right here that we discover the origins of the wholeness of a work of fiction. Adding to that, it is here, that the origins of the idea of “destroying the wholeness” reside, destroying it by breaking into “units of the wholeness”, or levels (“drops in the ocean”). Holistic phenomena are immediately and intuitively grasped. But any intuitive act can be reasonably formalized, logically developed (becoming some kind of analogy to a super-slow-motion picture of the function of consciousness). If we proceed from the idea that to know the world is impossible in principle, then it appears natural and necessary to “highlight” mental layering in a holistic object.

The personality concept as a wholeness is both reflected and perceived accordingly: not through an analytic break-up into elements, but all at once, as a whole. Like one drop bears the image of the entire ocean, in the same way, “one unit in a whole” reflects the entire wholeness. The wholeness is not to be broken up into elements, therefore it is represented not element by element, but with a different, comprehensive method (we shall go back to the starting point in our discussion of personality).

**What means are used to aestheticize spirituality in a literary form? How can the spiritual content (particularly, the ethical) be transformed into the aesthetic?**

To answer these questions, we shall resort to the idea of multilevelness, a specific philosophical and literary “mechanism” to implement a special comprehensive methodology (the pertaining discussion is further below).

Philosophically, the answer to the above question may be this: one has to do what is impossible at first sight; one needs to make the ideas (concepts) perceptible
for the feelings which, by definition, are not meant to grasp the information of an abstract logical character (those same ideas).

However, in light of what has already been said, the answers to these “deadlock” questions lie beyond the field where consciousness, that unscientific and, in fact, artistic agency, is searching for them.

The problem now requires a vintage point that can be prompted by the total dialectics. The aesthetic and the spiritual are inseparable, because, eventually, they are the modes of the psyche and consciousness. The spiritual is, if you wish, a culminative characteristic of that ideal meaning which is produced directly by imagery in the arts. It is impossible to withdraw the spiritual beginning from the arts (a complex of ideas) and leave them with something purely aesthetic (only that which pleases the senses). The aesthetic poses as a mode of arranging the spiritual agency. If we lack the material and there is “nothing” to arrange, the aesthetic quality of the material cannot spring up from nowhere. Beauty cannot exist a la the Cheshire Cat smile – in and of itself, depending on nothing and expressing nothing. Otherwise, Beauty becomes indescribable, resistant to becoming the category of literary studies, into style, and rather grows into a cynical kept-mistress of the meaning.

There is no secret mechanism to render the sensually perceived information into the abstract logical form (and the emotions – into a system of ideas); there is interconnection and interdependence between the psyche and consciousness. That is the whole point. The two languages of culture, the language of consciousness (concepts) and the language of the psyche (images) form a unified informational whole, thanks to being the two poles of drastically opposing capacities.

In this way, the spiritual indirectly outlines the style whose ephemeral beauty and virtuosity are, in fact, the other side of spirituality. The main point of this novel – comprehensive – view of literary fiction and of the phenomenon of artistry as such lies in identifying and thorough detailing of the pointed essential interrelation.

This is why the proposed approach sets a whole range on non-literary questions to literary scholars: we are in need of a version about the coexistence of the aesthetic with all other forms of social consciousness; the personality problem is in need of clarification (as well as the associated range of questions, the main one being about the relationship between the psyche and consciousness); in light of the personality-related and social problems, the phenomenon of artistry and the phenomenon of the arts reveal their new facets, in particular, the problem of objectivity of artistic criteria is foregrounded, together with the issues of the national as a factor of artistry, and psychologism in literature. Clearly, in the context of the proposed problematics, literary studies lose their positivistic and empirical character and evolve into a philosophical and culturological discipline, and into anthropological literary studies.

It goes without saying that we are running the risk of dissolving literary specifics in more general problems. Nevertheless, intensive philosofization will initiate the long awaited definiteness and specificity from the perspective of the humanities, not obstruct it, though on a different basis from the one anticipated before. As practice
proves, concentration exclusively on the “text” and “style” (or, vice versa, on the interpretation of ideas only) does not allow literary studies to have serious claims for the status as a science. The “phenomenon of style” recognized at the reverse side of the “phenomenon of ideas” is this very strategic direction in the evolution of the science of literature. The key to the solution of literary problems is in the field of philosophical anthropology.

Renovations on the ways of philosophical aesthetics is the next required stage in the development of literary studies as a science which is evolving as the philosophy of literature.
4. ARTISTRY AND A MULTILEVEL STRUCTURE OF A LITERARY WORK

Now we have to directly discuss the comprehensive methodology of the study of literary fiction. Personality as a super-complex holistic object can be represented only with the help of some kind of analogy – another multilevel structure, multi-plane model. While the main meaningful instance in a work of fiction is personality, the work itself in order to represent personality must possess the quality of multilevelness. A work of fiction is, on the one hand, an overlapping of different parameters of personality, and on the other – an ensemble of personalities. All this is feasible within an image as a focused combination of different parameters, which requires the stylistic (aesthetic) parameter for its embodiment.

Let us recall M.M. Bakhtin’s famous expression: “Great literary works take centuries to be written, and in the epoch of their creation it is merely a matter of picking the fruit that is ripe after a lengthy and complex process of maturation”\(^1\). Within the framework of the defined methodology, this judgment, as we see it, can also be interpreted in the following sense: “the process of maturation” is the process of “development” and “reseating” of different levels, testifying to the historical process that the aesthetic consciousness has undergone. In each level, specific traces, specific “codes” have been marked, together they constitute the genetic memory of literary fiction.

Taking sides with the methodological approach outlined by the supporters of the comprehensive-systemic appreciation of a fictional work, let us try to cover all possible levels, while preserving the two-fold orientation:

1. The levels identified should help realize the regular patterns of the transformation of the reality reflected in fiction into the linguistic reality of the text. This reflection is achieved by means of a special “system of prisms”: through the prism of consciousness and the psyche (the worldview), further on, thorough the prism “of artistic modes” (“artistic typification strategies”) and, finally, – the style. (Clearly, the reverse movement is also possible: the reconstruction of reality based on the text).

2. The levels must help to comprehend the work of fiction as an artistic whole, “living” only at the point of intersection of different aspects; the levels are those very particular cells, or “drops”, which preserve all the properties of the whole (but never a part of the whole). This comprehensive perception can only be ensured by a comprehensive type of relations.

Let us also note that such an orientation will finally help us find the way to overcome contradictions between the spiritual, immaterial artistic content and material means of its fixation; between the hermeneutic and “erotic”\(^2\) approaches to works of art; between hermeneutic schools of various kinds and formalistic (aestheticist) concepts which accompany the artistic creative process at all times.

---

To avoid confusions, one point should be immediately clear, the one connected with the personality concept. A literary work may have a lot of personality concepts. Which one are we dealing with?

We by no means have in mind searching for and analyzing one central character. Such naïve personification might turn all the other characters into mere statistical data. Literature is evidently not like this. Nor do we mean a sum-total of all personality concepts: the sum-total of characters cannot by itself determine the artistic result. Nor do we speak about the unfolding of the image of the author: it is the same, in fact, as a search for the central hero.

The point is to be able to discover “the author’s attitude”, “the author’s frame of orientation and devotion”, which can be embodied through some optimal ensemble of personalities. The author’s vision of the world is that highest instance in a work of fiction, “the highest view point of the world”. The process of the author’s worldview reconstruction, i.e., understanding of the original “super-consciousness”, super-personality”, is an integral part of fictional analysis. But the “super-consciousness” itself, however, is very rarely personified. It is invisibly present only in other personality concepts, in their actions and states.

Thus, “thinking in terms of personalities” always presupposes the one who does the thinking: the image of the author which is commensurable with the flesh-and-blood author (sometimes they can significantly coincide, as in, say, Leo Tolstoy’s “The Death of Ivan Ilyich”). There is no artistic truth which would not be related to the subject of this very truth. It is spoken by someone, it belongs to an author, it has its creator. The artistic world is the world of personalities, biased and subjective.

A paradox begins to come through: there is some kind of a possibility for an author to be immaterial with the obvious effect of his/her presence.

We shall try to make sense of it.

Let us start with the fact that all personality concepts are marked with, so to say, the author’s catch-mark. Each character has its creator who makes sense and evaluates his/her heroes, meanwhile revealing him/herself. Artistic meaning, however, cannot be reduced merely to the author’s personality concepts. The latter are only the means to express the author’s world perception (both conscious and unconscious). Consequently, the aesthetic analysis of the personality concepts is the analysis of those phenomena that lead to a deeper essence of the author’s world view. It becomes clear from what has been said that all the personality concepts are to be analyzed while reproducing the integration point, showing the common root from which all concepts spring. This is true, as we believe, of the “polyphonic novel”. A polyphonic picture of the world is also determined by personality.

In the lyric, the symbiosis of the author and character has a special term to define it – it is a lyrical persona. As far as the epic form goes, the term of the “author’s image” is often employed by analogy (or a “narrator”). The notion of the personality concept can be generally used for all the types of literature to express the unity of the author and
character, including the author (writer) as a category of literary studies (as character) behind whom there is a flesh-and-blood author (writer).

The most difficult thing here is to understand that behind a complex and possibly contradictory picture of the characters’ consciousness, the author’s deeper consciousness may see through. An overlapping of one consciousness with the other takes place.

Meanwhile, the phenomenon described can appear quite possible, if we remember what we mean by the structure of consciousness. The author’s consciousness possesses the same structure as the consciousness of the characters. It is understandable that one consciousness can include another, and yet another, etc. Such a “nest-doll” can appear endless on one binding condition. As follows from chart № 1, the values of the highest order organize all other values in a certain hierarchy. This hierarchy is the very structure of consciousness. It may be most vividly seen on the examples of complex and contradictory characters, obsessed with the search for truth and meaning of life. Such are the characters of Turgenev’s, Leo Tolstoy’s, Dostoyevsky’s, Goncharov’s, etc. The philosophical layer of the heroes’ consciousness shapes their political, moral and aesthetic consciousness. No matter how complex the world view of the character is, his thoughts are always transformed into ideas and further, into behavioral strategies.

A structured internal sociality is not an optional, but an immanent sign of a personality. The author’s internal sociality, in principle, always appears as more universal than the internal sociality of his/her characters. Therefore the author’s consciousness is capable of accommodating the consciousness of the characters.

The reader’s system of values should be equal to that of the author’s, so that the artistic meaning could be perceived relevantly. And sometimes the reader’s internal sociality may be even more universal than the author’s.

Thus, the relations between the world views of different characters, between the characters and the author, between the characters and the reader, between the author and the reader –make up that zone of spiritual contact where the artistic meaning of the literary work resides.

This multilevelness is reflected in chart № 4.
A further task shall be to show the specifics of each level, and, at the same time, to integrate it into a single artistic whole, its determinacy, in spite of its autonomy – which ensues from the principle of holistic relations.

Thus, the worldview and its form of expression, the basic one for the artist – the personality concept – are non-artistic factors of creative activity. Here all the “non-
artistic typification strategies” originate: various philosophical, socio-political, economic, moral-religious, national and other teachings and ideologies. The personality concept contains all these ideologies being a form of their simultaneous existence.

However, the worldview in its vital aspects is a decisive prerogative of artistic creativity as such. The personality concept, meanwhile, can be regarded as the source of any creative process and as its outcome (depending on the point of departure: either we move from reality to text or vice versa). If we comment on and interpret only these upper levels without showing how they “grow into” others and are refracted in them – such an approach is, unfortunately, the dominant one in the practices of contemporary literary scholars – then we deal with a superficial study of a literary work (giving preference, yet again, to either the ideas or style). One should be able to see the wood behind the trees (and vice versa). A generalization on the level of the personality concept is the final stage in the analysis of a literary work for a literary scholar.

However, one should also begin with it.
5. ARTISTIC MODES (ARTISTIC TYPIFICATION STRATEGIES).

5.1. Artistic method: personacentric valency

If we take the concept that has been treated so far as the cornerstone in the foundations of the literary fiction theory, we need to go over to the next stage.

Some essence, as we know, is originally present in different phenomena. To know the essence means gradually moving from the essence of a higher order to the essence of a lower order, and so ad infinitum. To get an idea about the spiritual meaning of personality, there need to be relevant specific manifestations of the personal beginning. Without them, a personality will ever remain “a thing in itself”, unknown and inconceivable.

How can personality manifest itself?

The answer is this: through emotions and thoughts which are transformed into behavioral strategies (acts and actions). All this is only possible through contact with other personalities (this contact can have a form of conflict). To have all the actions, thoughts, the inner character, the hero’s appearance purposefully represent this particular personality type, all the manifestations of personality must be brought into correspondence with the inner ideal, by whose image and likeness a character’s personality is built. The author must him/herself personate into the personality to which he/she gives a fictional life. In other words, there needs to be a strategy for recreating a personality, a certain inwardly coordinated plan, an artistic typification strategy. The strategy itself is surely determined by the personality concept.

There are several artistic modes (artistic typification strategies) without which it is impossible to recreate a personality which has been made with the help of creative imagination. We shall enumerate them here: personacentric valency, pathos (the components of the historical-typological aspect of the method), behavioral strategies of a character (a specific historical aspect of the method), metagenre, type, genres (in part).

The main artistic typification strategy is a method in two modes of existence. A method is related to the very essential nucleus of personality, and it makes “the first” original manifestation of the essence of personality.

First, we have to get rid of terminological indeterminacy which creates incredible confusions, and then, to amend the meaning of such terms as “method” and “artistic modes”. A method is often understood as a set of principles of “practical and spiritual exploration of life”, “the basic principles of transformation of the substance of reality into an artistic substance”\(^1\). In this case, a method is a specific historical, stage-specific and individual aspect of the content, in other words, historically specified principles of personality typification. A method, however, as we shall show further, also possesses a historical-typological aspect.

---

The question of a creative method appears to be more complex if compared to the way it is treated in contemporary sources. The monograph by V.I. Tiupa that we have mentioned before, mostly discusses the historical-typological (not stage-specific) “modifications of artistry”, such as the heroic, satirical, tragic, idyllic, humorous, dramatic, and ironic (comic, tragic, sarcastic and romantic irony). This is perfectly justifiable: we have, as a result, trans-historical types of artistry (“artistic modes”, as the author defines them). Thus, a convincing “genetic formula” of “modes” can be derived, the one which authors, trends and epochs inherit. The nature of this literary-genetic code has been discovered in various correlations between the “personal” and “super-personal” (in Tiupa’s terminology) which, even with individual diversity, can be narrowed down to several basic types (two triads: one comprising the heroic, the satirical and the tragic, and the other – the idyllic, the humorous, and the dramatic).

The concept of an “artistic mode” appearing in the semantic nucleus can be justified in case the meaning, or rather, the message of a literary work, is built, in this or that way, around the “personality concept”. From our point of view, if the personality concept exists, there inevitably emerges a range of artistic modes as means of transforming it into a fictional form.

In case the meaning of a literary work is understood not from a philosophically humanistic, or human perspective, then, obviously, the discussion of artistic modes in the suggested context becomes devoid of any scientific sense.

Artistic modes serve as a mechanism of transformation of the spiritual-moral (initially non-aesthetic) information into the aesthetic, and behavioral strategies – into artistic ones. The phenomenon of artistry comes to life in the process of such transformation. This said, the phrasing of the term, “artistic modes”, seems quite appropriate, in spite of the fact that the meaning of the notion is contradictory, because it includes several systematic paradigms with diverse origins and different scientific traditions.\(^1\)

We shall leave aside the history of the genesis of this notion, which is also intriguing in a way; we shall recount our own interpretation of this notion which is included into the methodological system called the comprehensive analysis of literary fiction.

From our point of view, there are several levels within the content of a literary work, with can be quite justifiably named artistic modes, functioning, in certain respects, already as artistic typification strategies. What we are developing in this work does not comply, in part, with the theory developed in our guidebook, Literary Theory.\(^2\) Well, everything in the world is subjected to some sort of system, but nothing is perfect though, i.e., nothing is in itself an ideal system; our guidebook is


not perfect, either. Now we shall get down to the process of improving some theses, i.e., identifying their potential disposition to systematicity.

Let us itemize the levels of artistic meaning: (also capable of functioning as both artistic modes and artistic typification strategies).

1. Personacentric valency.
2. Varities of pathos (historical-typological characteristics).
3. Specific-historical principles of spiritual and aesthetic (artistic) exploration of life, shaping the behavioral strategies a character.
4. Metagenres.
5. Types.

Before we comment on the creative potential of modes and strategies, which will eventually allow us to turn the information from a non-artistic form into artistic, let us offer our own understanding of the nature of artistry.

Artistry is a mode of existence of the abstract-logical information (ideological-spiritual content) organized in conformity with the laws of beauty by the sensually perceived images; this mode of organization finally appears to be a tool (mode) of understanding and evaluating this meaning, i.e., this organization (style) is part of the meaning, actually is meaning. The degree of artistry is the degree of the significance of ideas (here we are guided by the scientific-philosophical criterion, the criterion of the truth), which directly depends on the degree of individuality and expressiveness of images (it is here that the aesthetic criterion comes properly into play), in which – and in which only! – these ideas reside. In other terms, this is always the process of identification and emphasis, in the material organized in line with the laws of image-based thinking, of such aspects and relations which do not contradict universal laws of objective reality; this is an image-based comprehension of reality, the highest point of which is the philosophy operating through imagery.¹

Thus, the level of artistry or the degree of perfection of literary fiction is determined not by the quality of idea-related material as such, nor by the arsenal of the expressive means, but, primarily, by the degree of correspondence of expressiveness to the embodied system of ideas. Artistry is a category which registers the relations between the artistic content and style. An organic and integral existence of the conceptual systematicity (moral-philosophical strategies), artistic strategies and sensually perceived stylistic expressiveness constitute the universal criterion of artistry; the relative criteria (not universal) can be themselves the potential of systematicity (the depth and significance of the worldview concepts) and potential expressiveness (mastery of the elements of style). Paradoxically, artistic information which is assessed by the philosophical and aesthetic criteria proper (there are no others in the informational space in which the psyche and consciousness interact),

cannot be objectively assessed within the framework of their relatively autonomous systems. Artistic information is assessed by the artistic criteria which, in a paradoxical manner, deal with those same philosophical and aesthetic components.

Now let us go over to the artistic modes.

The mode of personacentric valency can be defined as the worldview archetype; the emotional-psychic component here withdraws to the background, and the conceptual worldview-associated relationship becomes crucial (systematic, logocentric, cognitive), establishing moral-philosophical strategies of behavior.

This is a major mode defining the specifics of an artistic method, as well as humanistic strategy of all other artistic modes. The major mode is tripersonal. This involves three components: sociocentrism, individuocentrism and personacentrism, the three varieties of one single mode.

Personacentric valency comprises the semantics of polar relationships of nature/culture-centrism. The psyche and consciousness, person and personality, nature and culture, adaptation – comprehension, behavioral strategy – artistic strategy – these are the field of relations feeding the new term with meaning. Here we have in mind the index of personacentrism, the index of the cultural potential of the meaning of a work of fiction, and it signifies an original personacentric valency, the ability of the personal beginning to combine with other artistic modes, which, eventually, determines the originality of the style. In particular, we speak about the coefficient of subjectivity, a philosophical category, adapted for the needs of literary studies. This category expresses the extent of prevalence of the comprehension type of relation over the adaptation type.

Whay have we chosen the personacentric valency, and not, say, sociocentric valency? Both enclose, to different extents, reversely directed vectors.

Sociocentrism is oriented towards the collective unconscious and normative public morality which become the “building bricks” of heroic mentality.

Indivuduo centrism is oriented towards the individual unconscious which opposes a person’s collective unconscious (morality). Indivuduocentrism as an absolutized form of the egoistic beginning is immoral, anti-heroic, its authentic mentality is total irony, it acts destructively towards both sociocentrism and personacentrism. Alongside all this, it is related to sociocentrism by the unconscious regulation of behavior, which lies at the basis of the adaptation type of relation, and it is also related with personacentrism by its orientation towards the individual (ideally, a person is related to the cult of reason). It is evident that there is more in common between indivuduo centrism and sociocentrism than with personacentrism; generally speaking, socio- and indivuduo centrism are the varieties of the unconscious exploration of man’s relationship with the world, while personacentrism is a rational-philosophical, cultural type of relationship.

Personacentrism is oriented towards a conscious relationship which includes, no doubt, both the collective and personal unconscious, but only as an instance of the
scientific-philosophical discourse. And even an artistic discourse becomes part of the scientific-philosophical (never ceasing to be the artistic discourse as well)! While a sociocentric type of harmony is represented by the heroic, the personacentric is represented by the idyllic personality cult; it is idyllic, because it reveals a universal type of harmony, facilitating adequate integration of the interests of a person, an individual and society.

The subject of socio- and indivuduocentrism is a person; the subject of personacentrism is a personality; a moral regulator of man’s behavior is a system of morality inclined towards non-ambiguity, and a personality’s system of mores is morality (organized already as an inwardly contradictory system).

Thus, an integral systemic improvement (that is, abstract-informational, abstract-scientific), along with the spiritual and aesthetic, develop increasingly from nature to culture, from person to personality, from adaptation to comprehension, from sociocentrism to personacentrism. Consequently, personacentrism is the highest stage of human evolutionary (both philosophical and artistic) development in comparison with an increasingly outdated sociocentrism, and, clearly, indivuduocentrism. The vector of technological, philosophical and the worldview-related progress moves from sociocentrism to personacentrism.

In this context, socio- and indivuduocentric valency becomes a form of manifestation of a more meaningful personacentric valency. We can also put it this way: socio- and indivuduocentrism are the lowest, basic stage of personacentric exploration of the universum. Sociocentric valency is a precondition for the emergence of personacentric valency.

5.2. Artistic method: pathos

Pathos, as it is presented in the context of this theory, should be understood not as merely a variety of “idea-based emotional assessment” (G.N. Pospelov), but exactly as an artistic typification strategy.

While we have defined the mode of personacentric valency as the worldview archetype, pathos then can be defined as an ideological archetype, as the nucleus of the world outlook where the characteristics of the worldview are not so important as those of the world perception, i.e., within pathos, the emotional (unconscious) component strives to dominate over the logocentric one, that is, over the system of ideas. Pathos is represented by such varieties as the heroic, the satirical, the tragic, the idyllic (the idyllic personality cult), the humorous and the dramatic, as well as four varieties of irony (tragic, comic, romantic, sarcastic).

Why can we consider the listed varieties of pathos as artistic modes?

It is because pathos is the basis of the aesthetic, but not the aesthetic itself, and in this capacity pathos functions just as an artistic mode, as an original embryo of artistry that can become an instance of artistry, having turned into an artistic
The relation between a mode and a strategy is the relation of two different functions, therefore it would be evidently reasonable to preserve the two functional capacities of pathos varieties.

The classification of pathos types is nothing but the classification of historical programs and frames of mind related to the world outlook. As an aesthetic category pathos is also an artistic mode likely to turn into an artistic typification strategy, the strategy of an aesthetic origin, development and final shaping of a certain type of personality.

As we see, the forms of manifestation of the personality nucleus are easily subject to classification. The preliminary basis is a type of emotional-evaluative, ideological attitude to the world.

For literary studies, this kind of treatment of what is traditionally called “pathos” is new and uncustomary. However, the kind of typology within the paradigm of the “personal” (P) and a diversified nature of the “super-personal” (Infra-P and Ultra-P), undertaken by V.I. Tiupa, is quite within the framework of this very theory of literary fiction, with the central concept of an image-based personality concept.

All the major premises stated by V.I. Tiupa (the author’s terminology preserved) are those related to the Heroic, the Satirical and the Tragic, and they function as the forms of interrelationship of the P with the values of the IP range: natural, religious, cultural-historical and socio-political. The super-personal values have priority for a personality, they are imperative and they strictly subordinate the P. Heroic, satirical and tragic conflicts are a form of testing the personality for its capability of self-sacrifice, disavowal of the P.

The Idyll, Humor and the Dramatic are those values related to “private life” where love, mundane affairs, loneliness and death dominate. The P, when liberated from the authoritarian ideals of the IP range, cannot exist without ideals altogether. The historical formation of the UP range values coincides with the real Personality cult (the epochs of Sentimentalism and Romanticism).

We have to make a digression at this point before we proceed with this train of thought. Some terminology requires clarification. As it was mentioned in Section 3, the “personal” is also “super-personal”; all personal ideals, world views, life programs – they are super-personal by definition (“man is a sum-total of social relations”).

The nature of personal ideals (i.e., super-personal, social), however, can indeed be diverse. At different stages of European civilization, there were different ideals, and they evolutionized alongside the development of society. We can agree with the idea of “classification” of ideals.

We deem it more precise and proper to term the IP ideals as Authoritarian Ideals (AIs), and the UP ideals – Humanistic Ideals (HIs). We have borrowed this denomination of different systems of ideals from E. Fromm’s work¹. Let us characterize these ideals.

¹ E. Fromm. Man for Himself, pp. 16-21, 139-166.
Everything we shall say about them and their association with aesthetic categories is fairly hypothetical. Anyway, we have no knowledge of a more convincing version explicating the genesis and functioning of aesthetic categories.

If the meaning of progress is applicable to personality and society, and if we accept the vector for the direction leading a personality to attaining higher levels of internal and external freedom, the direction from person to personality, *from sociocentrism to personacentrism*, in that case a range of significant stages can be discerned on the way. At this point we are interested in the moral-philosophical aspect of this progress.

Because personality, as we have already said, consists of several “I”s, internal conflicts are likely to take place, which possess the potential of causing a personality split-off. Intra-personal conflicts are, in fact, conflicts between different individualities nesting inside one personality. But as there is nothing strictly personal which would not be also social, the conflicts inside personality bear a social character as well.

Two poles can most certainly be identified, which give rise to diverse social ideals and conflicts between them: Authoritarian Ideals (sociocentric) and Humanistic Ideals (personacentric). The AIs in the Eurocentric civilization dominated during quite a long time, up to the early Modern Age (the epoch of the first bourgeois revolutions). These ideals characterize the personality’s need of an authority (parents, state, religion, etc.), on which basis the personality’s integrity was formed. “Authoritarian conscience is the voice of internalized external authority”¹. Good conscience is “consciousness of pleasing the (external and internalized) authority; guilty conscience is the consciousness of displeasing it”².

What can an authority, “irrational authority” (E. Fromm), be displeased with? An authority which is intolerant to a critical attitude and striving towards unconditional submission of a personality?

It is with the personality’s evasion from authoritarian dogmas. Adam and Eve’s sin consisted primarily in their disobedience to authority; their behavior was a challenge to God. There is too much of the personal in the desire to taste the fruit from the tree of knowledge.

Freeing itself from the authoritarian binds, what does a personality begin to worship? It the idea of one’s own human mission which denies irrational authorities that empower it. Man grows independent, becoming the “measure of all things”. It is already a humanistic – personacentric – orientation. Clear humanistic conscience is an awareness that one serves his/her highest mission and realizes the inherent abilities; a guilty conscience is the awareness that one has betrayed him/herself. In this sense, the replacement of the authoritarian (sociocentric) orientation by the humanistic

¹ Ibid. p. 139.
² Ibid. p. 142.
personacentric) one was undeniably progressive in the development of human personality.

Clearly, the HIs are never isolated from the AIs. Moreover, they are in mutual need of each other. The HIs, however, may be combined, for the most part, with the “rational authority” (E. Fromm), which does not suppress humanistic aspirations, but helps to realize them. The AIs are in need of an “adversary”, (a heretical, sinful beginning, the HIs), for the purposes of an intense suppression thereof, and hence – self-aggrandizement.

It remains to add, that between the above named poles, there is a whole spectrum of possible combinations; in each of these, one of the systems of ideals dominates. Axiological eclecticism in life is quite possible, but for an artistic typification strategy, an indistinct orientation is a serious artistic flaw.

**What is the connection between differently directed systems of ideals and the spectrum of aesthetic categories?**

The thing is, the essence of each pathos type lies in the manner of interrelations between the AIs and the HIs.

Let us make use of the idea presented in the chart, where aesthetic categories are classified. We shall get the resulting chart of the “formulas” of pathos types. **Chart № 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarcastic irony</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Idyll</th>
<th>The Dramatic</th>
<th>Romantic irony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
<td>HIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
<td>AIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here is a spectrum of possible correlations between the AIs and HIs. The sign between AIs and HIs means a type of their interrelations: HIs>AIs – HIs “greater than” AIs; HIs<AIs – “smaller than”; HIs^AIs – harmony, balance; HIvAI – a break between HIs and AIs, the personality does not accept any of the systems of ideals.

In the lower triad, the AIs are above HIs, because the former make the basis of personality (correspondingly, in the upper triad, the same place is occupied by the HIs in relation to AIs). The formula of the tragic, for example, does not mean that the HIs become dominant. Rather, it means that the former harmony between authoritarian and humanistic potentials is broken, although, the AIs remain “above”, as before, and they dominate.

We shall briefly explain how pathos varieties depend on the correlations between the AIs and HIs.
The essence of each particular pathos type has received numerous treatments in scientific literature. We would like to focus our attention on the fact that pathos is but a type of some common life orientation. And as such, it has managed to become a means of “initial typification”, a most common strategy of personality (or individual) typification – an artistic mode – and, further, a strategy of character typification, embodying this very type of personality (individual) – an artistic typification strategy.

The heroic, for example, is characterized by the following correlation of the contradictions which are the leading factors in shaping of the world outlook: HIs^AIs. This is a conventional sign of harmony, provided there is unconditional dominance of the AIs. The HIs in a personality do not protest, they willingly “dissolve” in the AIs. A person sees his/her natural mission in the service to the AIs. It makes his/her own dignity, it does not humiliate, but elevates a person. There is nothing higher for a hero than serving the Duty (whatever it may mean). To betray this mission means betraying oneself. The pointed “gene of the heroic” is always the same. If such social-historical conditions arise, when it is inappropriate to place the “personal” above the “social”, the heroic beginning is actualized in people under these circumstances. The heroes of Homer, The Tale of Igor’s Campaign, the heroes of the novels of Socialist Realism (The Mother, How the Steel Was Tempered) are all “twin brothers”. These are the well-doers, selflessly serving the duty. The heroes’ conscience is an authoritarian conscience. The hero’s life does not belong to him/her, but to Authority (fate, God, kin, motherland, nation, etc.). Therefore a hero constantly accomplishes some feat, the actions “pleasing to God”.

Clearly, the heroic undergoes development, becomes psychologized, the meaning of Authority changes as well, in other words, the heroic undergoes an evolution. Its types become more complex and more elaborate. With all that, however, the formula of the heroic remains rigid. Judging by the contemporary condition of the world, there are hardly any grounds to prophecy an approaching death of the heroic attitude to life.

As far as the tragic is concerned, it is the “product of decomposition” of the heroic, its reverse side. Authority is still firm, but there is an awareness of one’s own humanistic mission. The formula of the tragic is: HIs^AIs.

There is no choice for a hero, because there is no alternative to the AIs. A tragic hero acquires such an alternative. He finds him/herself in a situation of choice making. His/her tragedy is not in the fact that any choice cannot provide harmony for the hero. His/her “I” and “Non-I” are split. “Denying” either “I” or “Non-I”, the hero does not achieve the sought-for integrity, but destroys his/her personality. “To be or not to be” can only formally remind of a possibility to find a way out of the situation. In essence, “to be” for a tragic hero is the same as “not to be”. There is no way out of a tragic blind alley. In fact, the tragic can be happily resolved as the harmony of the heroic or as a personality of completely new, unheard-of type: a personality with the
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1 Among recent works we shall single out: V.I. Tiupa. Artistry of Chekhov’s Short Story. Moscow, 1989.
HI$(s)$ predominating over AI$(s)$ (a personality of this type is a product of a lengthy historical evolution). To become a hero, however, is to sacrifice one’s principles to some extent, to give up some part of oneself. Romeo, Hamlet, Phaedra, Katerina Kabanova, Bazarov, Raskolnikov – all mastered this truth, they experienced such a level of personal freedom which a hero would better never know. A tragic character, unlike a heroic one, has tasted of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He/she cannot become a hero now without tangible moral damage. A tragic personality perishes, as a rule: it is the only way to preserve human dignity.

Before switching over to satire, we shall say a few words about a more common problem – the types of the comic in fiction. Satire, humor and irony as the phenomena of the comic are related by an instance of mismatching of the HI$(s)$ and AI$(s)$ (due to different reasons, as we shall see further). Satire is phenomenon of the “comic reduced”. Its other source is the decomposition of the heroic. The basis of satire, however strange it may seem, is made by that same heroic ideal, yet, a satirical hero cannot correspond to it. A satirical hero is exaggeratedly heroic, “too much of” a hero to be “just a hero”. Behind heroic manifestations, he/she hides one’s inability to be such a hero. There is indeed just a step from the great to the funny, and this is a step from the heroic to the satirical. The formula of satire is: HI$(s)< \text{AI}(s)$.

Satire is a caricature of a hero. As it often happens to a caricature, it frequently ridicules not the ideal, but unjustified claims on it. A satirical kind of laughter is very serious therefore, up to the point of the absence of laughter from satire altogether (as in The Golovlyov Family, in The Death of Ivan Ilyich). A satirical hero lacks anchorage, lacks a niche for moral dignity: the HI$(s)$ are in their embryonic stage, and the AI$(s)$ have ceased to be a sanctity. A satirical hero is already bordering on an ironic mindset, but his/her ideal is still a heroic ideal. The inviolability of the AI$(s)$ often leads the heroes of satire if not to repentance, then to self-divestment. The greatest examples of satire are Molière’s satirical comedies, Gogol’s The Government Inspector.

The heroic, the tragic and the satirical are sociocentric pathos types in their essence.

Approximately up to the 18$^{\text{th}}$ century, personality was mostly oriented towards the AI$(s)$. Because we are not interested here in the background of the problem, but in the necessary “working” orientation, or the most general phrasing of the hypothesis, we shall note the following. The weakening of the authoritarian (sociocentric) beginning inevitably strengthened the non-authoritarian (personacentric) aspect. Finally, the 18$^{\text{th}}$ century saw a cultural situation when the AI$(s)$ waned to such an extent, that the integrity of personality could be restored only on a conceptually different basis. A person’s private life comes into the foreground, and an epoch a true personality cult begins (i.e., the cult of the HI$(s)$). Human values change drastically. There begins as artistic exploration of not the heroic, tragic or satirical sides of personality, but of the naturalness, inherent human value. On the basis of the HI$(s)$,
some conceptually novel personacentric pathos types emerge: idyllic, dramatic, and humorous.

These are the variants of a new ideology of life. The above triad is made of the heroic, tragic and satirical a contrario. The HIs and AIs have changed their places and formed the integrity of personality on a different basis. The artistic results cultivated on the “malt” of a new ideology turned out to be astonishing. New artistic typification strategies laid the foundations of Romanticism, and then – Realism.

The Idyllic occupies the central place among the newly sprung pathos types. A new triad is placed above the old one. The idyll is a harmony of the intrapersonal world when it appears possible to align the AIs and HIs, with no damage to the latter and without a customary aggressiveness of the former (because the “irrational authority” gives way to the “rational” one). It is in this way that the formula is to be deciphered.

The principal characters of Tolstoy’s War and Peace (first of all, Andrei Bolkonsky and Pierre, or Pyotr Kirillovich Bezukhov) dialectically resolve the problems of “idyllic harmony”: the more of a personality they are, the more do they realize the necessity to serve the AIs which do not suppress them, but, vice versa, make them extremely sensitive to private life. “The concealed warmth of patriotism” becomes the component of the most intimate representations of the characters. It must be admitted, however, that the idyllic beginning of Tolstoy’s characters is made strongly heroic, to such an extent, that it ceases to be idyllic. Eugene Onegin (this character, perhaps, serves as a starting point in the modest gallery of personacentric characters) resolves his private problems in a most dialectical manner: without denouncing his personality, he recognizes the rightness of Tatyana’s down-to-earth “heroism”. “I thought to myself: freedom and rest are better than all that happiness. My God! My God! How was I mistaken! And how has the heart within me been stricken!” “Freedom and rest” in the given context are individuocentrism, the result of overcoming sociocentric dependence; and “happiness” – the result of overcoming a personacentric, idyllic ideal.

The theme of idyllic harmony is one of the least researched in aesthetics, culturology and literary studies. The significance of these problems is really huge. The ideals of this pathos type, with all their seeming “obsoleteness”, are extremely topical.

The dramatic, paradoxical as it may seem, is one of the most common pathos varieties in fiction, which is most likely to be understood in the following way: writers do not discover any happiness (idyll), but they poeticize aspiration towards it. The formula of its [happiness's], AIs> His, proves that man lacks the necessary strength so far in order to move towards himself, to his personality; authoritarian conscience turns out to be stronger than humanistic beliefs. But a dramatic hero does not doubt his own humanistic orientation and, in the long run, can conquer his doubts. A “parallel” (but subordinate) tragic hero is convinced in the opposite: that it is the
AI's that make up a person; nature, however, claims its own right, and he commits a sin, yielding to the natural desires of the heart. A “dramatic sin” consists in the temptation not to be responsible for oneself, to shift this responsibility to authority. A dramatic hero, unlike a tragic one, faces a hindrance which he can, in fact, overcome, but cannot find the necessary strength inside himself (or finds it, conquering his doubts and returning to his own true self). To put it short, a tragic hero does not know what he should do; a dramatic hero knows perfectly well what he should do, but does not know how. The paths of Oblomov is dramatic (a perfect example of the dramatism!), as well as of many of Chekhov’s stories and plays.

It is worth mentioning though, that new and culturally young pathos types are less sustainable than the classical heroic, tragic and satirical ones. “Humanistic” pathos types often function on the borderline with other pathos types, in close alliance with them, and they can be aesthetically resolved into the shape of this or that dominant idea. This fact constitutes personacentric valency.

A humorous hero (AIσ< HIs) possesses an “excessive” drive towards personacentrism, the fact being always a deviation from the accepted norms of behavior causing laughter. This laughter is ambivalent though: a jibe does not denounce so much as it affirms a humorous hero, giving its due to his/her human sufficiency.

Like the dramatic, humor is also internally inclined to an idyllic ideal. Both these pathos types are by-products of decay of the essential harmonious world outlook – the idyll. A humorous hero is a nice eccentric fellow (a crackpot, according to Shukshin who has quite a few humoristic stories, by the way). As a human being, it is a striking and quaint personality who naively judges about everything by the standards of human dignity, and who cannot accept the conventional wisdom. It is an “outsider” person, in a sense.

Let us, finally, address irony, a pathos type, which explicitly realizes individuocentrism. This pathos type exists in four modifications, each drawn to the nearest “maternal” pathos. The ironic pathos options are at the borders of in between the lower and upper “authoritarian” and “humanistic” spectrums. The gradual quantity-to-quality transformation works out, as it does in any spectrum. Irony is quantitatively different from satire, humor, the dramatic or the tragic. The four unique hybrids form an accent-rich ironic block in the palette of pathos forms. In our mind, we can scale the diagram down to make its edges meet. And we can watch one type of irony smoothly turn into another.

What initially strikes one, is the gap between authoritarian and humanistic irony. The AI's gave a start to two irony types: comic and tragic. Both classic pathos triads, the heroic and the idyllic, are rather serious in their own ways: the first – in the sociocentric manner, the second – in the personacentric manner. Irony as such cultivates a principally lightweight attitude to both the AI's and HI's. This “carefree” formula of comic irony (turning into the tragic one at its other pole) – HIvAI – speaks
of the hero’s rejection of any productive personalistic ideology and orientation. The ideology of irony is not constructive, but destructive. The concept of an ironic personality – and comic irony first of all – is a corporeal person. And such a person is finite, mortal, so his merry cynicism is expressed in the inclination to bodily pleasures. Such an individuocentric personality concept dates back to folk festivals, while the folk-carnivalesque kind of laughter adequately represents a comic-ironic world perception. This variant of the culture of laughter was for the most part explored by M.M. Bakhtin.

The cult of the corporeal beginning is by all means a life-asserting, “biophilic” orientation which is attractive. Still, this is also the cult of spiritless flesh – and here lies the danger of the destruction of a personality’s integrity. An ironic personality of the authoritarian type needs the AIs only to deny them. The deep meaning of irony is in negation. An ironic character lives while there is something to be denied. Procreative objectives do not match the ironic world perception.

Satire that has passed into comic irony dominates in the poetry of Villon, Boccaccio’s novellas, Rabelais’s work. The famous prose of Ilf and Petrov is an obvious approximation to comic irony as well.

Tragic irony emphasizes a different shade in this pathos type. We feel it in Shakespeare’s Othello, in Calderón’s play Life is a Dream. Irony of Cervantes’s is bipolar: from the comic pole (Sancho Panza) to the tragic one (Don Quixote). Pechorin in A Hero of Our Time is tragically ironic. There is ground to suppose this very pathos type functioning in Gogol’s best prose works: The Overcoat and The Dead Souls. An outstanding expression of this kind of world outlook is to be found in Blok’s poem “The Garden of Nightingales”.

This type of the world outlook became very popular in the 20th century in diverse “artistic systems” (which were indeed representations of a wholeness). The tragic-ironic pathos features in the works of Hemingway, Remarque, Kafka, Nabokov, et al.

The following two types of irony, brought about by humanistic ideals this time, to be more exact, by a disappointment in them, are: romantic irony and sarcastic irony (all these terms are rather relative). The object of total negation here is first and foremost the HIs of a personality, and an ideological platform making total negation possible is a spiritless person, unable to become spiritual in principle (intellectually developed, but fatally non-reasonable with all that). The Romantic personality cult turns its reverse side to be observed. The exaltation of the “I” with further self-denial in romantic irony, partially inheriting a dramatic personality concept, is primarily connected with the theme of love. Love, the feeling that unites people in the closest manner, in romantic irony acts ever as something disintegrating, which, according to Yu.M. Lotman, “is characteristic of the Russian romantic tradition from Lermontov to Tsvetaeva”.

The hero of sarcastic irony is a personality that reduces the humorous humanistic beginning to the state of “depersonalization”. Instead of a bright and original
personality there comes “empty pride in a subjective personality” (Hegel), or narcissism. It is emptiness that is revealed in a personality that unjustifiably considers him/herself prominent and meaningful. The “Darling” from Chekhov’s eponymous story is a bright example of a character presented in a sarcastic-ironic vein.

Ironic artistic typification strategies in the 20th century became an ideological foundation for Modernism (to some measure) and, to a greater extent, for Postmodernism. Both in the aesthetic and in the worldview-related context, these are the strategies that lead from personality to person (from culture to nature). Total irony in Postmodernism has logically resulted in the denial of the Great Ideas, and then – the denial of personality and, finally, a formalistic dead end. The cult of the individual (lacking ideas and the spiritual meaning), as opposed to the personality cult, has naturally turned into the cult of the game. Contemporary playful literature which poses as a “cultural alternative” to classical literature (we may recall that it used to serve as “a means of human spiritual production”, i.e., reproducing the process of transforming a person into a personality), has become a tool of dehumanization of literature. The cult of the individual “alone” – as opposed to the personality cult – is an actual means of the destruction of culture; this is the price to pay for the neglect of the most vital thing in literature, and that is artistry.

**What is the correlation between personacentric valency and pathos types, these different kinds of artistic modes? What is the connection between them?**

Pathos types are obviously different on the level of personacentric valency. Those based on authoritarian ideals (the heroic, the tragic, and satire) are sociocentric; those based on humanistic ideals (the idyll, the dramatic, and humor), are personacentric; ironic pathos types based both on authoritarian ideals (comic and tragic irony) and humanistic ideals (sarcastic and romantic irony) are individuocentric.

As we can see, the concentration of a personalistic beginning entirely determines the specifics of an artistic method (we are ready to recognize it at this point in relation to the typological aspects of a method; however, as we shall convincingly show further, this will also be true in relation to concrete-historical aspects of a method, that is, behavioral strategies of a character).

It is crucial to regard each pathos type as an instance of a spectrum. Then certain laws regulating its gravity and harmonious resolution become clear. In a “chemically pure” state, pathos types are always extremely rare (suchlike aesthetic norms were a feature either of the early artistic stages in the development of humanity, or those stages which saw a univocal dominance of some kind of ideological doctrines). With the modifications of the possibilities of the aesthetic range, the tragic, for example, could acquire not only a heroic, but also an ironic and even dramatic shade. Moreover, Realism legitimizied the unprecedented usage of different pathos types: characters of different aesthetic nature could appear in the same literary work.
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Besides, an individual character could change his/her performance within a certain pathos type throughout the entire work.

The principle of artistic typification strategies, nevertheless, the principle of a dominant, a distinct aesthetic tonality of each character and the work on the whole, has remained inviolable. Formally, an abundance of pathos types in Realism did not overshadow the meaning of the dialectical association of different beginnings and the tendency towards dominance of one of them. In *War and Peace*, there are satirical, tragic, idyllic, dramatic, and humorous pathos types. However, we do not doubt the prevalence of the heroic dominant in this great novel, which comes onto the surface in the souls of major characters and, accordingly, in the aesthetic range of the work. The very situation in this novel, its plot and architectonics – in short, all the stylistic levels – are structured in such a way as to let the heroic system of values (with a palpable idyllic bias) triumph, which is the author’s worldview ideal.

We evidently have to pause here, because a further unfolding of our hypothesis will require special research for literary scholars, culturologists, and philosophers. We recommend the sources listed in the present footnote to all interested in these problems.¹

### 5.3. Artistic method: a character’s behavioral strategies

As suggested in the given interpretation, personacentric valency and pathos types constitute the real aesthetic memory of art, a true source – and a guarantor – of artistic wholeness of the future work of fiction, a real “cell” of artistry.

We deem, however, that personacentric valency and pathos types can be implemented only by means of what has been defined above as a “method” (see I.F. Volkov’s interpretation, *Section 5.1*¹). Personacentric valency and pathos are dialectically connected with a “method” (behavioral strategies of a character), and without these strategies they are impossible to fathom. The formulas of pathos types, personacentric or sociocentric, always overgrow with concrete-historical auras (which also have, as we shall demonstrate below, their own “formulas”); without this “zeitgeist” and without the flesh of concreteness, pathos types become a bare abstraction.

It may be more reasonable therefore to define a method as a sum of two abovementioned sides in their integral, inseparable unity and interaction. Personacentric valency and pathos are the typological aspects of a method, and what I.F. Volkov calls a “method” is, in fact, quite a different aspect – a concrete-historical one. (Let us note that V.I. Tiupa does not discuss “artistic modes” (pathos types) as a method. He shares the understanding of a method with I.F. Volkov).

In spite of their integral inseparability, both the aspects of a method are quite easily distinguishable in practice. Thus, a predominantly concrete-historical specifics of a method is discussed in the works of L.Ya. Ginzburg, in *Dostoyevsky’s Poetics* by M.M. Bakhtin, in the mentioned work of I.F. Volkov, as well as in the studies dedicated to a “method” in Romanticism, Classicism, et al.

Addressing the principles of the world comprehension which will be realized in an artistic method afterwards, Ginzburg writes: “One of the most essential (principles – A.A.) is determinacy which governs human behavior and defines the choice of human values. The socio-historical and biological determinism of the 19th century literature is a decisive prerequisite for representing a person in its system. This system had a great many artistic varieties, but the prerequisite has remained effective”1.

It is hard to agree with the idea that “sociohistorical and biological determinism” governed the 19th century literature. How shall we come to terms with the properly spiritual determinism containing personacentric valency? It is hard not to agree, either, with the fact that determinism became a “prerequisite”, the worldview “program” for the representation of a concrete-historical character.

Behavioral strategies of a character, which are determined by momentary motivations, make up the core of a concrete-historical specificity of method. It is this aspect of a method that sorts out what was traditionally described as *thematics*; while problematics, for the major part, is fixed in the non-historical aspect of a method. It is clear that behavioral strategies as such cannot make an artistic method for the realists – Leo Tolstoy, Chekhov, Bunin, etc. Their artistic method, realism, was composed out of two types of determinacy: the non-historical and concrete-historical.

A method – a system of certain principles of artistic determinism – specifies the structure of a fictional character. *The constructive principle* of building up a character simultaneously expresses his/her *personalistic essence* as well. The aesthetic and the ethical (and, further, religious, philosophical, etc.) in the artistic make-up of character are inseparable2. They reveal different aspects in a character’s personality. As a result, to know the aesthetic essence of a character would mean knowing his/her personalistic essence.

Once again, let us focus our attention on the issue which might contain the greatest mystery of various artistic phenomena. If we realize that the philosophical-ethical structure (and all other levels of consciousness behind it) becomes the aesthetic one without losing its ethical specifics, it will enable us to make a huge step forward in the understanding of the mysteries of art.

We would point out that we are discussing the nature of determinacy, the elaboration of behavioral strategies of a character’s *personality*. The author’s personality, meanwhile, is outside the parenthesis, so to say. Indeed, the inner logic of a character’s development, especially in Realism, looks as if it were independent from
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the author’s will and intention. Personages follow the logic of the given character even “despite” the author’s will. Among the well known examples of the characters’ “disobedience” is Pushkin’s Tatyana (Eugene Onegin), at the moment when she, in the author’s words, unexpectedly, even for him, “got suddenly married”.

Alongside all that, a method, which implements the personality concept, also implements, as we remember, not only the personality of a character, but, in part, of the author, too. The character’s autonomy therefore is limited by the character’s own territory. And the author makes use of this autonomy in order to express his/her sovereign personality. The thing is, the concrete-historical aspect of a method includes not just impersonal behavioral strategies, “principles of determinacy of a character’s behavior”, but also the strategies which were observed and reproduced by the author. But these rules are to be seen, digested and then realized. “An objective character”, as a result, acts exactly as the author wants him/her to act, without violating his/her objectivity and rootedness in reality. And the choice of this very character testifies to the author’s priorities.

Hence, the “determinacy governing a person’s behavior” is related to the character behind which there is inevitably the author himself. This interpretation of the “nature of determinacy” complicates the concrete-historical aspect of a method, in line with the given version regarding the nature of artistic meaning.

The concrete-historical determinacy of behavior motivations determines to a large degree the aesthetics of artistic “systems” (trends, in a different terminology) and separates Classicism from Romanticism, Romanticism from Realism, Realism from Modernism, Modernism from Postmodernism, etc.

We shall look at the example of Classicism to demonstrate the way social consciousness characteristic of an epoch (concrete historical time) is reflected in the aesthetic consciousness, and, in particular, in the concrete-historical aspect of a method in literature.

The basic level of social consciousness of the heyday of Classicism was grounded in the Cartesian philosophy, with its aphoristic postulate: cogito ergo sum. The cult of thinking, the cult of the rational was expressed in an utterly distinct way. Reversing the formula, we shall get the following: if I do not think, I therefore do not exist?

The implied answer was exactly this: as a matter of fact, you do not exist. Human spiritual world was reduced the intellectual basis which was to perform the function of regulating the whole spiritual cosmos.

The rationalism of philosophy certainly relied on the scientific data, and the leading science was Newton’s mechanics. It also ascertained the idea of orderliness and mechanistic dependence. The mechanistic picture of the world in philosophy was grounded in the scientific consciousness of that time.
A corresponding analogy in the political consciousness was expressed through the concept of the highest form of hierarchy in the political pyramid: the king, the nobility (strictly submitted to hierarchy), the Third Estate, and peasantry. The priority of those superior over the inferior ones was unconditional.

The political superstructure had a relevant equivalent in the field of economic relations. The legal awareness legislatively drafted property and political relations.

The moral-religious consciousness was also in the service of those relations which strengthened the structure of absolute monarchy, and in the spirit of strict coordination it regulated interpersonal relationships. The Bourgeois Gentleman caused laughter and a sense of disapproval, being a sort of structural incongruity.

It goes without saying, that the human spiritual cosmos was also interpreted in a mechanistic key (at that time it seemed to be universal), the personacentric aspirations of which were limited by the unconditional priority of thinking over feeling.

This type of life activity could not help being reflected in the aesthetic consciousness, too, which held its own peculiar focus of the ideas of the time. It was for the first time in the world literary practice that an artistic program appeared (by Boileau) which strictly prescribed any artistic activity, orientating the artists towards the inviolable canons: genres, character types, conflicts (in tragedy, it was between duty and passion, and duty was equaled to the reasonable, and hence – rational beginning! – always triumphed), poetic language – all these were thoroughly itemized, and the aspect of creative freedom stepped into the background.

The peculiarities of Classicism aesthetics are clearly derived from the peculiarities of the social consciousness of that time. In its turn, the arts of Classicism had an impact on the minds and on the social consciousness, also shaping it.

The principle of determinacy, this speculative normativism, was borrowed from that epoch. But behind the concrete-historical principle it is easy to discern the trans-historical archetype of the heroic and sociocentrism. Rationalism, the dictates of the time, offered its own interpretation of the eternal values (the heroic). That is why the artistic method of Classicism as an artistic system was composed of these two elements: the concrete-historical and typological.

Similar patterns in the functioning of social consciousness can be observed in any epoch when great artistic “systems” emerged.

As it follows from the above discussion, the researchers saw the specifics of a “method” of such “systems” in mainly the concrete-historical aspect of the method. It is quite explicable: this very aspect reflects the mindset and the state of the soul which would fit the topical life contradictions best. Nevertheless, if we keep in mind the methods of Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, etc. in full scale, we should also analyze the historical-typological aspect of these methods, which is inextricably connected with the behavioral strategy of the characters. It stands to reason, that artistic “systems” can be characterized also from the point of view of the pathos and personacentric valency. In Classicism, the great sociocentric triad is the major thing –
the heroic, the satirical and the tragic. The normative poetics was perfectly in compliance with the normativity of the ideals.

Romanticism was characterized not just by the change of the style, but rather by those colossal shifts in the field of pathos, in the area of elaboration of new life strategies. In Romanticism, with its specific cult of the irrational in a personality, irony began to prevail – tragic, romantic, sarcastic irony – as a consequence of disappointment in man as a rational being.

Finally, Realism committed an unprecedented deed. Due to the significance of this trend for literature, let us focus on its description in more detail. Radical novelties in the sphere of poetics and pathos were possible at the cost of bringing dialectics into the artistic consciousness. The representation of human multifaceted and “fluid” features, corresponding to man’s true nature, allowed achieving the uppermost stage in the development of literary-fictional consciousness of humanity. At last, the entire aesthetic spectrum became visible in a person: an individual human being in his/her development reproduced, in an accelerated manner, all the stages of the evolution of humanity. The integrity of this kind of strategy lay in the tendency itself, not in the total prevalence of only one pathos type. For Realism, the whole spectrum of artistic possibilities appears manageable.

The peculiarity of Realism should be found not in the artists’ skill to represent “everything exactly like in life”, or “life as it is”. It is impossible in art in principle. Mere facts, “bare facts” do not exist in literature (and not only in literature). Any fact related by a person is ever “a fact + point of view”. To tell about something in an artistic sense always means taking the liberty and onus in creating the personality concept and assessing it. The absence of this directive renders artistic creation and self-expression infeasible. As far as the role of fantasy and artistic imagination is concerned, Realism is no less literary fiction, than Romanticism or Classicism are. Even more so! An immense degree of life-likeliness, which is believed to be achieved by checking one’s creative imagination, an urge to “imitate life”, to make “a replica of life” – all these are rather the pluses than the minuses of Realism. They testify to the fact that the mechanisms of molding a personality have been mastered in an unbelievable scale. That has not killed artistic thinking, but produced the premises for its fantastic soar.

Realism is an exceptionally original and unique artistic wholeness that has reflected a person in such profound measure, that has neither before nor afterwards been accomplished by any artistic “system”. Human spirituality is shown as the product of natural material evolution of an earthly man. Man’s wholeness – the corporeal beginning, character, personality – has become the subject matter of Realism.

Realism, as well all the other trends, strictly speaking, was embodied in a type of personality, in a certain worldview (axiological) orientations. To be more exact, in a type of managing information. The zone in which human behavioral motivations are
shaped is where realism springs from. In this understanding, realism is a vintage point to look at a person, an interpretation of a person, the philosophy of a person. Realism managed to identify personality in a person. This is why realism and personacentrism, in a certain sense, are synonymous.

Classicism and Romanticism appeared to be the means of absolutization of only one “channel” of managing information – the unconscious, though, rhetorically, Classicism advocated intellect and thinking, and Romanticism worshiped the soul and the feelings. Further on, the most commonplace and unpredictable step was negation of the negation, leading, according to logic, to the synthesis of Romanticism and Classicism (the synthesis, in a sense, gnoseological, rather than poetical). More precisely, to an attempt of combining in a speculative and abstract-logical manner what in fact long ago – and always! – was combined in a person: the mind and the heart, the mind and the soul. Something had to be “made up” at this point. It was Realism that discovered courage and the means to implement it. Convergence, feasible combination of informational layers in a person became its historical mission. It found out a new type of relationships which was intensively breaking through in life. Firstly, there had to be an end to pretending that the soul is not in any way connected with the mind, and the zones and “technologies” of their actual contact had to be discovered; and, secondly, there was a need to see an obvious link of the soul not just with the mind, a numinous beginning, but with the body as well – that aspect which, by cultural norms, is abjective. A human being turned out to be complex and multidimensional (in the informational sense, first of all). However, the accumulated cultural experience played a nasty trick on classical realism. The underlying (irrational) directive towards the hierarchy of values, the “upper-lower” levels in the world which is made by God, resulted in the reversion: the informational lower level (soul) took place of the upper one (mind). The function of the psyche became the major one in the information structure, replacing that of consciousness. A huge informational breakdown brought about fantastic artistic results (Leo Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky) – and confused a person completely. The wise soul chastises the foolish mind: this most productive cultural plot, thoroughly worked out in fiction, is still waiting for its hour to come, and waiting for an army of scholars to study it. This is going to be a milestone event in culture.

It is of importance to us here to point out the achievements of Realism, and not its astuteness (more precisely, the astuteness of its artistic consciousness, which (the astuteness) has a different impact on different “trends”; the functional connection here is this: the “cleverer” the trend, the more impressive is the scale of an informational setback, resulting in distortions at the output). The type of relations mastered by Realism enabled a different human scale to be seen: a personality in a person. If we add to the above that the “body – soul – spirit” dimension appeared to function as quite scientific personality parameters, it will become clear that Realism was moving in a scientific direction, and the entire global artistic thinking worked its way to
Realism as a specific type of management of multi-complex information. Realism is a maximum contingency of artistic and scientific activity, it is that type of art which made ample use of the function of consciousness.

Hence, if by Realism we understand a concrete-historical artistic system, then we must treat Realism as a historically by-gone stage which will never be repeated again (alongside Classicism, Romanticism, etc.). However, if by realism we mean a mastered type of relations (from person to personality), then this type, due to its universality, will ever dwell on. Realism invented nothing. The term itself was not lucky enough: it acquired a double meaning (realism, as we can see, is fatally subject to informational overloads). All of the post-realistic experiments, as well as the pre-realistic quests, are just wiles and strayings around realism, the only difference being, that everything that had happened “before” is marked by sincerity and naivety, and everything “after” – rather mimics, if parodies, this sincerity (maybe, except Socialist Realism, which, however, has not gained artistry because of sincerity). All the super- (sur-) and metarealisms, symbolisms and modernisms do not approach Realism, but become estranged from it following the way paved either by Classicism (rational point of departure), or Romanticism (the cult of the irrational). But one cannot get away from Realism, as that would mean the alienation from the well-grasped harmony in the informational balance of a personality, estrangement from artistry. Realism is the most complete expression of artistry. To get away from Realism inevitably means now “making believe”, in particular, that one does not understand something. Artists part with their childhood reluctantly, but realism dictates its own laws.

There is certainly a big temptation to spot neo-scholastics in what has been said about Realism, an appeal to hypostasis, antagonism to novelty, and even an attempt to belittle the dialectics. We proceed, however, from something directly opposite: a person that is realistically comprehended, a person of the “personality’s” scale possesses endless possibilities for self-expression. Personality is an informational cosmos of such an order which makes any new means of expression and original poetics ever topical and unpredictable. We are dealing with the information that cannot be exhausted in principle. Having said that, the given scale (type of relations, type of information management) is an already mastered unit, a conquered cultural peak, and it is silly to make believe one cannot see it at point blank. Realism is a benchmark of arts, a departure point, but not a common equalizer. We do not pose a question about the spirit of the mechanistic logism (neoclassicism): when Realism arrived, arts came to an end. We regard the issue in the following way: the epoch of Realism began in the 19th century, the epoch of new, unprecedented possibilities, which, due to their complexity, are not in great demand today.

Postrealism (Modernism, Postmodernism, etc.) is, in our opinion, the loss of the contradictory wholeness of man, sliding into the aesthetic of one-dimensionality – to the borders of the aesthetic spectrum. If we take this zigzag movement as an instance
of the spiritual development of man, then such hesitations which reflect the logic of this movement, are quite natural. Nevertheless, the fact remains: departure from realism has not been marked by masterpieces so far, which could be juxtaposed with the best creations of the realist writers.

Artistic methods are the most common platform, but not a manifest-proclaimed program (and starting from Classicism, it becomes manifest-proclaimed). The most general program principles, issuing from the ideal of a progressive personality, so to say, an enlightened contemporary citizen, are always realized in a number of artistic variants. The concept of “realism” does not exhaust the specifics of the methods of Stendhal, Turgenev, Proust. The dialectics of an artistic “system” and an individual artistic method lies in the forms of its manifestations growing more and more complex (especially starting from the epoch of Realism). The sense of this process remains the same: each unique artist, in this or that way, fits the parameters of an artistic “system”, it is a realm of depersonalized laws. We shall take into account the fact that methodological creative accessories have been build up for centuries. The methods are mastered, devices are transformed, modified, but never disappear without trace. The writers of the 20th century – realists, modernists, postmodernists – absorbed the school of classicism, romanticism and psychological realism.

Thus, a method (as a unity of its two components) turns out to be a form of manifestation and simultaneously a strategy, of the implementation of the personality concept, the main artistic typification strategy which penetrates all the ensuing levels, up to the punctuation marks.

What ensures the unity of the typological and concrete-historical aspects of a method?

This unity is ensured by the holistic character of the relations of the named aspects.

5.4. Metagenre

There is one more aspect of the artistic content to mention, which can be considered a form of manifestation of a method, and, eventually, the personality concept.

Here we mean metagenre, whose peculiarity resides in the plane of immediate division of personacentric and sociocentric beginnings (in more detail, see further), and this relates it to artistic modes. Personality (“internal sociality”) always possesses character (external sociality, forms of adaptation to the environment). Neither the “internal” nor the “external” sociality are given at birth. They are acquired and elaborated in the process of interaction with the environment.

Characters, depending on their relations to the environment and the spiritual orientation of personality, can be divided into two types. First, there are characters that belong to personalities, asserting themselves in spite of the “psycho-somatic
condition and social circumstances”\textsuperscript{1}. In this case, an artist represents a personality in a duel with the environment, and quite often, a “breaking out” of a personality from the environment takes place in this or that form. Here we are faced, as a rule, with rebellious personalities of a tragic and dramatic disposition (the spiritual in them turns out to be “broader” than a character). Normally, the whole positive program of a literary artist is associated with that kind of characters, in which the comprehension type of relation begins to dominate over the adaptation type of relation: those former ever searching, doubting, asserting the HIs in any case.

Second, there are “personalities that have never managed to become personalities”: their spiritual landmarks fall under the pressure of circumstances, and they are “eaten up by the environment”. These personalities – through character – are downplayed by the circumstances, trying to adapt to them up to the point of becoming part of these circumstances themselves. The adaptation type of relation appears to be in more demand than the compresenasion type of relation. Sociocentric valency overruns the sprouts of personacentrism.

Depending on which personality type is in the centre of attention, an artist realizes one of the possibilities given to him/her: either concentrate on the process of personality and its character formation, on the personacentric potential, or leave this process “behind the screen” and make an accent on the description of a character who has already adapted him/herself to the environment, on the sociocentric aspect. Clearly, the first possibility is meant, mainly, for a “strong” character (to a great extent, personacentrically oriented), the second one – for a “weak” character (oriented towards dogmatic ideals of sociocentrism).

All the above listed aspects of artistic content require their own terminology. Because there is no generally accepted terminology, let us turn to the experience of theoreticians. G.N. Pospelov calls the first aspect “romantic”, and the second – “ethological”, or “novel of morals”\textsuperscript{2}. (Cf. M.M. Bakhtin on epic and Menippean satire.) The general, typological notion for both the aspects is, we believe, appropriately marked by the term “metagenre”\textsuperscript{3}. G.N. Pospelov considers it to be not a genre-related, but super-genre, or “metagenre” aspect of the fictional artistic content. At the same time, the metagenre-related type of content is realized in the novel genres (novel, novelistic tale, novella, tragedy, dramatic comedy or “light drama” (G.N. Pospelov), some lyrical genres) and ethological ones (satire, ethological tale, sketch, fable, satirical comedy, et al.).

Thus, the metagenre-related specifics is in the plane of “thinking in terms of characters”. Therefore this artistic typification strategy should be referred, first of all, to the epic or to drama, though it can also be observed in the lyric – to the extent of appearance of characters there.

\textsuperscript{1} V. Frankl. Man’s Search for Meaning. Moscow, 1990. p. 111.
\textsuperscript{2} G.N. Pospelov. Problems of Literature’s Historical Development. Moscow, 1972.
It seems quite natural that novels prefer a rebellious type of personality. The entire 19th century, having marked the connection between personality, character and circumstances, showed the struggle of a personality with the circumstances and the self. In the epicenter of this struggle are the HIs. The most famous characters of the most literary of all centuries (realistic ones with all that!) were shown in the process of spiritual evolution. Having undergone a series of conflicts which were powerful enough to shake any personality to its core, those characters, reevaluating their values, are drastically changed by the end of the literary work. Such are Eugene Onegin, Grigory Pechorin, Julien Sorel, Yevgeny Bazarov, Katerina Kabanova, Anna Karenina, Andrei Bolkonsky, Pierre Bezukhov, Ilya Oblomov, Dmitry Gurov, Prince Myshkin, Rodion Raskolnikov, et al.

It is evident that novelistic conflicts capable of changing “the system of orientations”, of a personality, should be intrinsically existential. Novels are placed in the right-hand side of the “pathos-related” aesthetic spectrum, overlapping with its centre (the idyllic, the heroic, the dramatic, the tragic, and tragic and romantic irony). Relevant requirements are put to the plot where conflicts unfold, and to the genre as a type of literary unity.

The characters annihilated by the environment and appearing as part of the “typical circumstances” constitute both: a certain backdrop for strong natures, and can themselves act as central characters. The age of Realism presented an endless gallery of “typical characters” – average, dull, mediocre personalities. One can refer to them the representatives of the gentry from Gogol’s Dead Souls: Kabanikha, Dikiy, the Kuragins, the Drubetskiyes, the Bergies, Ionych, Belikov (“the man in a case”), etc. This type of characters requires moral conflicts, often mundane, those which do not touch upon the deeper human problems. In this situation, the plots of a chronicle-like, sketch-like type prevail. Ethology is inclined towards the left-hand side of the aesthetic spectrum (satire, humor, irony).

Thus, the metagenre-related orientation of a literary work, being an artistic mode and an artistic typification strategy, predetermines the choice of major poetic (stylistic) means.

5.5. Type

The specificity of literature according to its division into types can be regarded as an essence of a lower order in relation to a method. Type is one of the forms of the manifestation of a method, it is a necessary moment for the objectification of personality, another stage of a personality’s realization.

In fiction (and not only in fiction) a type of relation to the world, which makes the essence of each method, is manifested in two forms (which was true of the Ancient aesthetics as well). First, it is through actions, deeds, gestures and so on, i.e., each inner “psychological gesture” gets externalized, translated into the language of
the outward physical gesture (the former performs the role of the “text”, the latter – of the “subtext”). Consequently, any external manifestation is a symptom of life, or a hint thereof (“secret psychologism” was established in literature on this basis).\(^1\)  
Second, it is in the emotional-contemplational states (which became basis for “open psychologism”)\(^2\). It goes without saying that it is not the type of psychologism that serves a type-related criterion, but the thing that defines this type: the personality concept, reproduced as a “personage” or a “psychological state”.

An action and a state are the extreme “chemically pure” modes of the character’s existence. Clearly, this practically never happens in fiction. Nevertheless, the dominant way of existence in the epic is the first one mentioned, and the second – in the lyric. (The specifics of drama is defined by its intended use, which is for the stage. The entire originality of its poetics is dictated by this very circumstance. According to the type-related criterion, drama is closer to the epic.)

Thus, an action and a state do not determine the spiritual essence by themselves, but significantly realign its manifestations (either limit or stimulate). The absolutization of either the action or the state leads to the cult of the adaptation type of relation (which is the essence of strategies of individuo- and sociocentrism); the action “enriched” by the state creates the preconditions for analysis, for the comprehension type of relation (the essence of personacentrism). That is why we have the right to treat literature types as artistic modes.

In the epic, we often witness immediate emotional experience, direct manifestations of different inner states (for example, in the interior monologues), however, this fact does not turn the epic into lyric. The epic presents to us the inner world of a particular personality that lives in particular circumstances. This inner world is molded by this very reality, and, in its turn, helps to understand the general reality. In the epic, the life of a character, his/her being is organized in the forms of life as such, and the verbally detailed and “objective” pictures of life are created.

In lyric, the concentration of the subjective beginning, or the “typification of consciousness”, in G.N. Pospelov’s words, not only prevails, but becomes a tool for building the personality of a character. The inner world of a person is important in the way it is, and the external world is left outside the parenthesis.

The principal margin which separates the epic from lyric runs within the personal space. The epic is a way of thinking in terms of characters (in this case, by characters we mean the structure of a character, see Section 9). This definition, by the way, is applicable primarily to the epic type at the highest stage of its development – in the realistic prose. Before this period, the thinking that preceded character dominated the epic, being a sort of its embryo: first, characters-masks, and then – socio-moral types (see Section 9). (To preclude any misunderstanding, we shall repeat the well-known thesis that poetry and prose can be the forms of both the epic and lyric. It is doubtless,
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2 Ibid. p. 192.
However, that the essence of the epic is revealed namely in prose, and of the lyric — in poetry.

The purpose of the epic is the embodiment of human multi-complexity, reflection of human wholeness made up of the tree aspects: the bodily, the psychic and the spiritual. The human “vital essence” demands a sort of earthening in the world of things and objects: it is impossible to imagine the existence of a particular person outside the spatial-temporal coordinate system, outside everyday life, clothing, etc. The spiritual essence of man within the epic has always been more closely connected with his corporeality, in comparison to this parallel in the lyric.

The inherent possibilities of the epic did not unfold immediately, of course. The epic and drama have long remained relative from the point of view of the later realist requirements. This, perhaps, explains the intense rejection of Shakespeare’s work by Leo Tolstoy. We can recollect Queen Gertrude in *Hamlet* speaking of Ophelia’s death. Her speech, evidently, is not determined by the situation and the circumstances, it is rhetorical, “excessively” beautiful and relative. The news of Petya Rostov’s death in *War and Peace* and the reaction of different characters to it are presented in conformity with the requirement of the truth of life, and with taking into account the spirited, yet “natural determinacy” of man. The characters are presented here on a full scale.

Nevertheless, the “characters” like Gertrude are personages of clearly not the lyrical, but the epic-dramatic type. The degree of development of her moral and social-psychological characterization is such, that the queen represents a type with some elements of a character.

Unlike the epic and drama, the lyric is poetical in principle. This poetic stance can be characterized as an orientation towards “overcoming” the materiality of the world. A special poetic tonality of the talk is achieved through the concentration on spirituality as such, often without its conditioning by the external world. The mediated links, “earthening” the spirituality of a personality (e.g., in the form of external sociality), are redundant for the lyric, they fit poorly its heightened pathetic character. While “prose requires thoughts, thoughts and thoughts” (Pushkin), “poetry, God forgive, should be a little foolish” (Pushkin). The analytic character typical of the nature of prose poorly matches the pathetic of the lyric. Even the so-called philosophical lyric (Pushkin, Tiutchev) is a very elevated order of feelings accompanying our comprehension of human “existential dichotomies” (Fromm).

The philosophical lyric and philosophical prose, however, are not the selfsame, but even partially opposite concepts. The lyric is in maximum proximity to the psychological pole and in maximum remoteness from the rational pole (see charts № 2 and № 3). In the epic — the opposite is true. Consequently, the shares of the rational and the psychological in the epic and in the lyric are negatively related. This ratio is characteristic of the epic and the lyric on the whole.
Certainly, there are a great number of transitory forms between the epic and the lyric, which in different measure are driven either to the one or the other type-related core. There are openly “hybrid” lyrical-epic formations (ballad, fable). As Pushkin famously noted, between “the novel” (a developed epic form) and “the novel in verse” (by its type, a lyrical-epic form) there is a “devilish difference”. This difference is located in the disparate nature of the epic and the lyric.

As a result, the lyric is a form of thinking in terms of “spirituality”, without the mediating role of character. The lyric is aimed at disengagement of spirituality from the “vital core”. Contradictions of the spiritual order in the lyric are often devoid of genesis, social shell, psychological analysis – those qualities which come into focus in prose. Therefore, the aesthetic preconditions for the thriving of the realist prose have not become the same preconditions for the flourishing of the realist poetry. The heyday of the world poetry did not coincide with that of fiction – the aims, objectives and possibilities of these two major literary types were so much diverse. The flourishing of poetry coincided with the topmost achievements in music (the epoch of Romanticism). It is not accidental. Poetry, like music, relevantly expresses the romantic character of the spirit – the emotional-psychological aspect, the element which does not “reason”. The epic uncovered its inherent possibilities surprisingly late – only in the 19th century! That was the epoch of the crisis of romantic consciousness and the epoch of a dialectical perception of man.

It is quite understandable that the epic and drama which is closely related to it, on the one hand, and the lyric, on the other, have become special tools of the artistic typification strategies. A lyrical hero can never be the hero of the epic – if only as an “idea” of personality, its grain. Basically, the epic and the lyric are different arts within literature.

Depending on the chosen literature type, prose writers, poets and playwrights select the relevant inventory of tropes and figures of speech. The stylistic dominants in the epic, the lyric and drama do not overlap. In the epic, the personality concept requires its realization through the chronotope, the system of characters, type of conflict, principles of plot structure, subjective composition, specific “epic” (related to objects) details, the characters’ speech, diction, and syntax. The epic orientation is a narration of someone about something.

The stage specifics of drama rejects the epic narrative principle. The major thing in drama is the speeches of the characters themselves (in a monological or dialogical form).

The lyric as it is represented by the lyrical hero implements the emotional-expressive element of human speech. The lyric, as far as stylistic expressiveness is concerned (see Section 7), first and foremost, actualizes the layer of details (details become symbolic), as well as the verbal facet of the artistic form (the prevailing role belongs to the rhythm and phonetics, which are of comparatively little significance).
6. GENRE

The genre specifics of literary fiction enjoys various interpretations by scholars, sometimes, very contradictory. In any case, the concept of the genre relies on the following.

The majority of contemporary researchers agree on the position that the genre, on the one hand, is a “tool of literary classification”\(^1\), on the other, it is a “regulator of literary continuity.”\(^2\). Such are the two basic functions of genre. They are closely interrelated.

In any case, genre is no longer a tool of typification of the personality concept, or an artistic mode (except, perhaps, for one point which is almost neglected; we shall discuss it later).

Genre is no longer a feature of the type of artistic wholeness (like method, type, and metagenre), but a characteristic of the organization type of the artistic whole. This, if you wish, is an instance of immediate transition of the content into the forms in a fictional work, an instance of separation of plane of content from the plane of expression.

Indeed, what can precisely constitute an artistic typification strategy, let us say, the genre of a short story? A short story can enable the functioning of all the pathos types, any behavioral strategies of the character, any metagenre. Genre, not being an artistic mode, “is not responsible” for the artistic typification strategy. Genre is of course not the same as style, but it tends to share the same functions with the style rather than with a typification strategy.

As a “navel cord”, which connects the genre with the “superior” artistic typification strategies and personality concept, there comes an aspect which is little noticeable, rather natural and therefore escaping our attention: the specifics of the reproduction of artistic contradictions. Back in the 1930s, I.A. Vinogradov, with the reference to the dialectical thesis stating that art reveals the contradictions of reality, came to the conclusion: “... a novella presents these contradictions in a concentrated form, as if reduced to a sharp and distinct opposition. (...) A novella, if we can say so, demonstrates (italics are mine – A. A.) a contradiction, while a novel unveils it broadly and circumstantially”\(^3\). (All the speculations of I.A. Vinogradov about the genre essence of the novella are completely applicable to the short story, as well as to the small prose genre at large\(^4\.) V.G. Belinsky, being very precise about the aims of the small genre and not dividing it into the tale and the short story, wrote: “There are certain events and occurrences that, so to say, would not suffice for a dramatic work, they would not be adequate for a novel, but that are so profound, that in a single instance (italics are mine – A. A.) they concentrate so much life that it cannot be lived
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\(^{2}\) Ibid.


\(^{4}\) Ibid. p. 245.
up in centuries – a short novel would capture and fix them in its *tight* (italics are mine – A. A.) frame.1

Thus, a short story (small prose genre at large) always “demonstrates” a contradiction, i.e., concentrates, bares and pits the opposing principles “in a single instance”. A tale analyzes the process of development and resolution of the contradiction. Scholars believe that the peculiarities of the thought process in the novel are expressed in the search of the common linkage between phenomena, in the demonstration of the semantic polyphony, in the investigation of a tangle of contradictions in their cause-and-effect relationships. The thought in the novel is some kind of analogy to the symphonic thinking in music, while the short story is analogous to the thinking in terms of melodies.

Thus, the novel “spits it out to the end” (Pushkin), and the short story congests everything to the maximum, to a single instance. It is neither the semantic nor the expressive side of artistic content, but its either thesis-like or extended form that regulate the genre continuity, and the genre genetic code. This function of the genre is associated with the issue of *inter-genre* classification of literary works. The question is about the correlation of this function and the personality concept, which we shall discuss later.

As far as the problem of *intra-genre* classification goes, i.e., one more function of the genre, we deal with the following. Let us address this problem on the example of the short story genre. (We have chosen prose here first of all because the problems of the genre in it are most complicated and topical, and, secondly, because the patterns we are studying are best represented.) Normally they distinguish three forms, or small genre variations: *the novella* (a story of a romantic content with specific principles of plot structure: there is suspense and, obligatorily, an unpredictable paradoxical outcome, which makes the reader see all the previous events in an unexpected light); *the sketch* (a story of ethological content; the principle of the sketch writing has nothing in common with an orientation towards documentalism; a sketch, as a rule, is a plotless description of the morals); and finally, *the short story proper*: it is something in-between the two identified poles; a story may be ethological in different ways, it is not limited by tough poetic norms. The number of genre forms increases for the story sharply, if we take into account the fact that stories, novellas and sketches have their genre varieties as well. Strictly speaking, each short story is a form of individual manifestation of the genre essence. There is no genre canon as such. There is only a demonstration of a contradiction in different forms. Shall we consider, then, the sketch, the novella and the short story, as well as their varieties, to be independent genres?

This is often the case, when any original genre variation is declared a new and independent genre. Sometimes, there would be a reference to a maxim: any talented literary work is an invention of genre. In addition, the selection of the attributes of this
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“genre” follows very different criteria: thematic, related to the type of literature, structural, pathos-related, line of character, etc. It seems, in each particular case, that the attribute of a “genre” is singled out (content-related or formal) which manifests itself most vividly and originally. It is then taken as the basic one for a classification. Thus, they speak of a monumental story, an adventure story, a humorous story, a parable story, an anecdote, a one-act story, vignette, etc. The range of short stories may be extremely broad: from an anecdote to a long short story.

We hardly have enough grounds to consider these genre variations as new genres. Their main genre-related function is to demonstrate a contradiction, and it remains ever unchanged. Genre is changing in the sense it represents different specific contradictions which require a relevant genre form to be realized.

Thus, it is impossible to overlook ideological-aesthetic and structural peculiarities of genre varieties. Besides, there are sustainable borders of the genre – they are represented by this very function which is the main regulator of literary continuity. The genre undergoes an evolution, it changes, but remains permanent in its essence. Clearly, every time we have to identify the genre variation together with the genre – or, the type of the short story (monumental, etc.).

The study of a short story type always appears to be the study of a genre through its concrete variety. Thus, the genre has its own vertical line (typological instance of the content) and horizontal line (historically specific instance of the content). The principles conditioning a character’s behavior will ever change, but the genre cannot be indifferent to an artistic method.

The genre, while being stable within historical borders, still continues to change constantly. This double nature of any genre invalidates all the attempts to unequivocally formalize this category. The genre is as ambivalent as a literary work on the whole. There is noting surprising about it: the ambivalence of the whole means ambivalence of all its levels.

Everything that relates to the short story can equally be true of the novel. Certainly, when defining such a complex genre as the novel, one cannot be governed solely by the specific nature of contradictions. There is a huge amount of literature written about the theory of the novel. And if we think about it, the researches are mainly interested in the type of arrangement of contradictions and their problematics. But before addressing the typology of the novel, we should mention its essence. And the essence of the novel which is inclined towards the right-hand side of the aesthetic spectrum (the idyllic, the heroic, the dramatic, the tragic), lies in the fact that only the novel can reflect the dialectically linked contradictions in their development. This is the reason why the novel has become the “epic of the new age”, the most accredited genre of the last two centuries. It is in the novel that a method (and even methods – within the frames of one work) is extremely significant, as it arranges the content. There is no specific novel structure to speak of. Searching for it reminds of the search of a philosopher’s stone. The fully fledged sides of a method, “petrified” however in a
multilayered style, materialize the samples of the novel-related thinking (symphonic, polyphonic, dialectical). These very specimens are regarded as the novel structure in an attempt of identification of the components of the structure. A structure is ephemeral. It completely regenerates with the change of a method, though the quality of novel-related thinking remains the same.

The development of the novel brilliantly and impressively exemplifies the general logic of the development of culture, as well as the subject and the object of culture and personality – from the psyche to consciousness. We might name the novel a kind of literature rather than a genre, due to its significance for culture.

“From the psyche to consciousness”, in terms of the cultural super-task of mastering the universum, means: from the adaptation type of relation (I see what I wish to see) – to the comprehension type (I see what there is).

The novel as such, with its cultural-literary merits, has nothing to do with it: it did not create this logic, it just reflected the laws underlying the process of informational exploration of the surrounding world. It became a form, and the laws (content) determined the possibilities of the form.

The following must be noted however: it was for the novel, i.e., its inherent artistic-gnoseological possibilities, to reflect the universum in a general way. The novel managed to become a form, to adapt to the cognitive needs, to remain the prominent cultural unit.

The thing is, the novel, like no other genre of the literary fiction, appeared to be compatible with philosophy which is the immediate product of consciousness, the result of cognition, and therefore it is hard and “painful” to align it with the arts, for they are the tools of adaptation.

Here is our reference to the gnoseological thesis statement: the evolution of the novel is a process of adapting the genre to cognitive needs. The novel allowed to “feel” the materiality of philosophy (though its ideal meaningfulness is to be understood and perceived by consciousness), it has to be “touched” by the senses, and at the same time, not to turn into a variant of philosophy, i.e., not to lose its self-identity.

The less the novel looked like its original specimens, the more it revealed its inherent possibilities. The novel’s self-identity (its essence) had its expression just in the aptitude to modifications, which, as it seems, wash away its self-identity. But in reality, those possibilities help to reveal it.

Thus, the novel, which is a form of art by genesis, tended towards “anti-art”, to philosophy, the science of all sciences. It was not an art form already, in a sense, but far from philosophy in essence: this is the cultural niche of the novel. Marginality, ambivalence, double nature – these are the mode, the status and the essence of the novel.
Les us pay attention to this: it was neither the volume, nor the type of character, nor the way of presenting the material that were becoming the pivotal feature; but the cultural functions of the novel became this characteristic.

Based on everything mentioned so far, let us single out four stages in the development of the novel.

1. **The novel of events.**
2. **The novel of characters.**
3. **The novel of situations.**
4. **The novel of cognition (gnoseological novel).**

The names for these stages are provisional, as well as the massive scope of terminology in contemporary humanities; the “terms” acquire meaning (i.e., define a real type of relations between categories) only within context.

The tendency in the novel evolution, on the whole, is evident, and, as they say, is clearly seen even with a naked eye: starting from the novel of the picaresque and adventure to the “gnoseological” novel (the basis of this tendency is the same pattern: from the psyche to consciousness, or, if one prefers, from person to personality).

Clearly, all the four artistic-gnoseological attributes that we have identified are present in any type of novel. Nevertheless, the structure-generating aspect in the four cases mentioned can be fundamentally different.

1. In the “novel of events” (to this category we can, with absolute ground, refer a detective novel, a helpless narration with the rudiments of a comprehension type of relation: here is the form of degradation and dehumanization of contemporary literary fiction) the focus is unambiguously shifted from the personal to the impersonal. It is just so. Even in Cervantes’s great *Don Quixote*. The sensual, pre-cultural, and therefore nature-bound perception (visual, auditory, olfactory, tactile) prevails here over the contemplative-reflective, the passions and “simple human feelings” dominate over “clever feelings” and thoughts.

A kaleidoscopic flickering of life, giving it a carnivalesque shade, a simple flow of life (life is always a holiday, in a sense, at least because it is not death) becomes an inherently worthy, “spiritual” act (quasi-spiritual, in fact). An external event becomes a structural unit which turns almost into a unit of “human dimension”. Here the world perception dominates over the worldview to such an extent, that the personal (cognitive) beginning is practically absent, as it is submitted to the unconscious beginning, that of adaptation. This is why there is no character to speak of in the “novel of events” and a picaresque novel, there are still types.

Let us clarify the terms. By “type” we mean not the assemblage of characters, but the structure of a character, which is realized through a set of unidirectional socio-moral – not yet spiritual! – attributes, or even through one single attribute (see Section 7). There is a direct way from type to character. Character does not denounce the type, but it is built on the latter’s basis. By character we also mean the structure of
a character, which differs from the type, as *character always begins where there is a simultaneous combination of several types.*

It is a character, not a type, which is the means of personality manifestation.

2. In the “novel of characters”, the events do not disappear, of course, but they become a way of a personage’s character expression. What used to be a minor function of the events, that of creating character, becomes the predominant one. The major structural unit which submits the entire space of the novel, is a person who, to this or that extent, expresses the qualities of personality.

With this particular type of novel the major achievements of the genre are associated, and they are so significant (let us recollect at least Russian, French and English literature), that the novel itself is often identified with an ability to represent “characters”, placing them either into a family or historical context, et al. Socio-moral – and now they are already spiritual-moral! – flaws and virtues – these make the philosophical cosmos of this development stage of the novel. “Character, strictly speaking (not in a literary, but in a psychological understanding), is the social aspect of personality or, in other words, a means of adaptation of the spiritual to the social.

And further, let us pay attention to the novelty: the development of consciousness predetermined the development of psychologism (exactly in this order, not vice versa; see Section 7). These increasingly more refined “soul studies” set more complex tasks before consciousness, which, in its turn, transmitted the fertile thought impulses to the feelings, making them noble with conceptual amendments. Properly speaking, this is what they mean by the education of feelings: there is merely no other. And the matter was not just in ennobling the feelings, by the way; the feelings discovered their subtle unaccountability to the mind-intellect. The human dimension was becoming less and less schematic, and more and more contradictory. Hence, one more unjustified identification researchers produce, or absolutization of one single possibility of the novel: the novel is a way to demonstrate “the dialectics of the soul”.

3. Not any events, however, were capable of revealing the personal beginning of a character (existing in fiction as character). Among the events we can come across those that concentrate the eternal in the instantaneous, that place a person into the “marginal” situation of choice, and where, choosing death, the person in fact chooses life, and vice versa. These events, which would sound more adequate if called “existential situations”, on the one hand, allow a personality to come onto the surface, in particular, to demonstrate the freedom of will; and on the other, they negate personality, bringing in an element of fatality, un-freedom, a fateful dependence of a personality on the situation, and make the personality become aware of one’s own nullity and helplessness. Situations weigh upon personality and become a sort of “super-events” (and voila, the manifestation of the law of negation of the negation: the events give away the novelistic space to characters only to become those characters in the form of a “situation”). The dialectics of relationships between the “super-events” and personality is expressed in the way a personality, while attaining
the highest freedom and control over the situation with the help of the mind, is aware of the degree of his/her unfreedom and dependence on the “situation”. The example thereof is brilliantly presented in existentially oriented novels.

These relations precipitously stimulate the shaping of the worldview in the philosophical sense, particularly in the sense of dialectic materialism, or the progress in the worldview, which, by overcoming the unconscious stimuli of the world perception becomes the system of spiritual protection of personality from existential challenges.

4. That is why the emergence of the novel of cognition, or the gnoseological novel, was inevitable, and the origin of it, in our opinion, coincided with Eugene Onegin (it had happened, undoubtedly, long before the flourishing the “novel of characters”: the dialectics here is revealed in the type of relationships, which can be defined as a “foreshadowing”, a kind of “getting ahead” of the “missing” stage, paradoxically “before the due time”; the first sure sprouts of what should have sprung to life much later by the laws of the genre.

In the novel of such type we have everything: the events-situations, the characters determined by the spiritual, socio-moral and purely natural factors (reflecting the informational structure of personality: body – soul – spirit). These factors turn into cause-and-effect strings, thus creating a polyphonic, internally contradictory texture of the work’s “plane of content”.

However, the inherent worth of the characters and situations here gives way to a certain inner value of the process of (self)-knowledge. Actually, this process turns into an endless and global existential situation. (Once again, let us note the presence of ubiquitous intrigues of negation of the negation: we have returned to the “characters and events” on the level of a “personality and a situation”. In fact, the discovery of the codes, or the “traces” of this dialectical law in the evolution of the phenomenon we are dealing with, even being indirect, is but the necessary proof of the objectivity of scientific knowledge.)

Let us clarify this position. By knowledge (artistic or scientific) we do not mean the reflections of different intensity, nor the demonstration of the art of ratiocinations, which are in abundance in the intellectual, or “thinking” novels. Very often “deep reflections” become a form of delusions. Let us say, the reflections about the philosophy of history have not turned the greatest novel of characters, War and Peace, into a gnoseological novel; moreover, these abstracted and speculative reflections can be painlessly removed from the novel, which will only benefit from this as an artistic whole. By knowledge we mean an adequate representation of reality (essence) with the help of a tool of knowledge, that is consciousness, and this process is made possible through a specific language, abstract-logical concepts growing into systems, inclined towards unities. Knowledge, as a rule, takes the form of articles, essays, monographs, but not the form of novels, which is essential.
The integration of the system of images and that of concepts produces the formal signs of the novel of cognition. In it, the articles and essays “implanted” into the texture of the novel, may purposefully complement artistic discourse, engage into it as an integral component. We shall stress that we are speaking of the formal signs. These signs make up the novel of cognition as created by Hermann Broch, partially Robert Musil, Milan Kundera, Michel Houellebecq. But an artificial hybrid of “a grass snake and a hedgehog” (i.e., two different languages of culture, imagery and concepts) does not yet make a gnoseological novel, nor a discovery, and let alone a breakthrough; it is a variant of commonplace eclecticism, often dictated by an aspiration for superficial originality.

For this fusion of the two informational flows – the artistic and the scientific – to be organic, integral and natural, one principal condition is to be observed: namely, artistic thinking, never ceasing to be artistic, must turn into scientific, into a form of knowledge (and not an arbitrary artistic reflection). In the outcome of its activity, the artistic should not contradict the scientific-philosophical, it must be in the streamline of the newly discovered laws, and moreover, it should confirm them: this is an essential sign of a gnoseological novel.

“A writer and a philosopher should come as one person” – this has already happened before, and, at best, it was the case of Dostoyevsky or Leo Tolstoy. There were too many delusions with them, and all of these – on the level of philosophy which traditionally has ever been the writers’ (and artist’) weakest spot.

What we mean here is the fusion of contradictory properties of consciousness in the capacity of a qualitatively new informational “field” or formation. A writer becomes not just a bearer of cognitive emotions; unconsciously, he/she (subjectively, if you prefer) follows the consciously learned and mastered laws, which objectively reflect the essence. It is appropriate to mention that a philosopher discovers an artistic gift, or a writer – a philosophical one. In Eugene Onegin, a gnoseological novel in verse (we draw attention to this: the contradictory elements come gradually together: the lyrical one with the epic, a novel with the philosophy of man), the cognitive element comes in the form of philosophical digressions-improvisations or in the form of philosophical aphoristic maxims in verse. In terms of quantity, there is not much philosophy there, however, in terms of quality, it penetrates the entire novel, communicating to it literally scientifically proven solutions to the problem of the spirituality of homo sapiens. A human being, as an informational creation, is doomed to evolutionize towards the parametrics of personality; the struggle of the soul and the mind, the psyche and consciousness, nature and culture – this is what makes a universal theme discovered and developed, the theme that has become the core of the contemporary novel, to accomplish this, this great genre has covered a long way of centuries.

This theme, if you prefer, makes a synthetic novel of cognition a contemporary specimen, a gnoseological novel. The rest is just out of date from the position of
culture. It is archaic, as the word went in the good old days, when there was no novel to speak of.

What has been so far said about the types of novel allows us to build a “model of the genre” in the holistic context. The novel can be interpreted not only from the position of cultural and humanistic meaning, exactly what we are doing here, but also from the position of the meaningfulness of this content, the position of the “brief – detailed” presentation of material, from the position of its dialectical intensity. In this respect, the novel does not demonstrate contradictions, as a short story does – the small prose genre, but rather reflects the process of emergence, development and resolution of a contradiction; moreover, is not just a single contradiction, but a whole “bunch” of contradictions, integrating into a holistic “model of the world”, into a universum, which holds on to certain fundamental laws. The total dialectics of the world is relevantly represented with the tools and possibilities of the novel.

Thus, if we strictly follow the principle of scientific rigor and move from the general to the particular (from the essence to the phenomenon), the genre model will consist of the following content-related and formal ingredients.

1. First and foremost, the genre of the novel is determined by its “abstract-logical” characteristic of the “brief – detailed” presentation of material: an ability to deal with contradictions (deviating from the humanistic meaning of these contradictions), existing in the dynamics and perpetuity of motion. In this sense, the novel is not equaled by anything is the arts.

2. A potential possibility for a detailed presentation of material is revealed in the “types of novel” (on the first level of the form), without which the discussion of the “brief – detailed” presentation becomes devoid of sense.

3. Further on, there goes an internal classification of the types of novel (the next levels of the form), including that based on the socio-moral and moral-spiritual problematics, on the types of characters and conflicts, on association with this or that “method”, this or that stylistic dominant, devices and even the volume. We pass here from the “novel as such” to specific genre varieties, which would enable the interpretation of each particular literary work. “A phenomenon”, a concrete novel with a specific set of concrete attributes, does not overshadow the “essence”, and, besides, provides space for its realization.

The connection between genre functions and the personality concept reveals itself distinctly in a particular historical-literary sense – and even broader that that – cultural phenomena. Its meaning is in the following: certain genres come to life at certain stages of social life. It was noticed quite a time ago, that the flourishing of the small genre coincides with the so-called transitory epochs in the life of the nations. The heyday of the novella in Europe was connected with the initial period of the Renaissance. Besides, the prevalence of the genre of the novella in different countries of Europe was concurrent not chronologically, but at certain stages, i.e., it was
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predetermined by the emergence of the tendencies characteristic of the Renaissance at different times in different counties of Europe. Boccaccio’s *The Decameron* and Geoffrey Chaucer’s *The Canterbury Tales* appeared in the 14th century. *Exemplary Novels* by Cervantes were written half a century later: with the beginning of the Renaissance in Spain. The novella in France (novellas de la Sale (15th C), then *The Heptameron* by Marguerite of Navarre (16th C) sprang under similar conditions.

The small genre soared in Germany during the period of Romanticism (L. Tieck, Hoffmann, Kleist).

It seems, the same pattern – the profound correspondence of a certain genre system to a certain zeitgeist – is also true in relation to the development of the small genre in Russia in the 19th century. This tendency showed in an unusually prominent way in the Russian literature of the 20th century. With the end of the cataclysms of the second decade, the 1920s, the “new” Russian literature begins with the short story (Vs. Ivanov, Sholokhov, Babel, Zoshchenko, Zamyatin, Pilnyak, Romanov, Prishvin, Fedin, Bulgakov, etc.).

As a result, during the transitory periods, when the reevaluation of former values takes place, when the worldview changes and a new personality concept can only be just a hint, only begins to take shape, the short story comes into the foreground of the literary process. **Why?**

Scholars specifically distinguish such properties of the short story as promptness and mobility. These qualities enable the short story, much faster than the other genres, to concentrate on the burning issues of the day. In the historical struggle of the genres, the short story would not have competed with the novel, the tale, and drama, if it had not possessed the properties characteristic only of the short story and which are indispensable for the artistic understanding of the period.

The peculiarity of the short story is that it develops when contradictions are undeveloped, and it comes as the result of these. The mobility of the short story ensues from its genre essence, and not from its length. A short story is “woven” from the air of the epoch. Consequently, the epoch itself must, in some way, correspond to the short story. The post-revolutionary (the Russian revolution of 1917) epoch is the most salient proof of this thesis. Besides, it can also be proved with the similar logic of genre systems developing in similar conditions not only in Russian, but in Belarusian and Ukrainian literatures of the same period. The well-known formula that reads: “The brightness of events makes people pale” – best characterizes the civil wars of that epoch. There were no customary instruments at the time to measure the events. The October Revolution, that set the course for the development of the history of humanity in the 20th century, could not have been perceived unequivocally and evaluated adequately on the spot. Some time must elapse before there are grounds for a comprehensive assessment of the events through the lens of highest humanistic values.
The short story begins to flourish at a time like that. Brevity – the main characteristic of the short story – was as if scattered throughout life itself. Life consisted of the fragments which were not linked among themselves with any obvious bonds. The essence of the small genre remained for some time in correlation with the character of social life.

A short story often represents only the grain of the character, the idea of this character, and the most general contours. Time makes sketches of characters. The elaboration of such sketch-like material is not available in equal measure for all the genres. This sketchiness, poor development of contradictions in life give rise to the short story.

However, a contradiction, as it has been shown, can always be unfolded. This is the inevitable development of the meaning which brings to light its deep-lying essence and manifold nature. Then the time of large genres comes – of the tale and the novel. The latter one makes a synthesis of multiple contradictions that have already elicited, showing the personality concept in all it complexity and depth. Finally, the genre of the epic novel can crown the literary process of a certain period. There need to be preconditions for that, the presence of generalized concepts and the philosophy of history. This law which works in the formation of the genre system, is clearly observed in Russian, Belarusian and other literatures of the 1920s.

What has been said so far does not mean, that only short stories get written during the transitory periods, that the time for tales arrives later on when short stories are not produced, and, finally, there comes the time for writing only novels. In any epoch (including the transitory ones, especially in the past two centuries) the works of different genres are created. However, there is noticeable prevalence of literary works of some particular genres, and, what is most important, they are conspicuous in artistic terms. This cannot be overlooked. In the historical-literary process there are periods which are more favorable for the flourishing of these or those genres. It does not mean that these genres will inevitably come to life: the subjective factor needs to make it happen. However, their prevalence is connected with the objective factor as well, i.e., a certain period.

The above said leads neither to the conclusion that the short story is an “embryo” of the novel. Besides, the view of the correlation between the short story and the novel as part and whole is totally archaic. To regard short stories as work pieces, as essays or sketches, to allocate a secondary, or subsidiary role to them – would mean an inadequate interpretation of the “mission” of this genre in the literary process. The genre links are impossible to reduce to a simple hierarchy. Thinking in terms of genre is a feature of a special type of artistic thinking. Alongside the objective factors of realization of genre mentioned above, we must have in mind the subjective factor, too: when a writer has the gift of thinking in terms of novels, short stories, drama or lyrics.
Any material, in fact, can be interpreted through the lens of various genres. A genre is a “magic crystal”, an original vintage point to view the world and man. It may seem that a short story can be made longer, and the novel – shorter. In reality, though, there is quite a natural volume of artistic information. Having selected the degree of reduction of artistic reproduction of personality, you are bound by it: you will inevitably keep to the genre “matrix”, genre “canon”. And this is not a whim, but the result of the “natural” artistic selection.

Ignoring the borders of the genre entails large artistic costs. Let me note that the hybrid, marginal genre formations are totally feasible, when it is impossible to decide what we are dealing with: a short story or a tale, a tale or a novel, etc. This issue demands a special study.

There is not any special genre structure or scheme. A genre, in the form of a particular variation, like all the previous strategies, is realized through style. There is no specific material of “genre medium” outside style whatsoever. Another thing is, the peculiarity of thinking in terms of genre determines some stylistic patterns (the novella, sketch, ethological tale, epic novel, et al.). Genre as a combination of its two functions facilitates the realization of artistic typification strategies of a personality through style, acting as a link. It is neutral to specific artistic content, as far as its major function goes, but at the same time, the genre determines some optimal artistic volume within the artistic content. Any specific type of short story (tale, novel) depends on the representation of the personality concept. Eventually, it is the method that becomes the main factor of genre evolution.

A talented literary work (always a unique conception of man) is an invention, not of the genre though, but of a genre variation. A genre is actualized in the process of a long historical making. In the genre, unlike in any other category, behind everything new, the never forgotten old things transpire.

Consequently, a genre, taken out of its concrete-historical stylistic cover, is an abstraction, like all the pre-genre levels. The genre and its types have the same correlation as the essence and the phenomenon. Therefore it appears quite logical that on the whole the genre is characterized not only by the specifics of the reproduction of contradictions, but also by the special features of the problematics, thematic points, pathos, type, metagenre orientating, as well as by all possible stylistic peculiarities – words, combination of descriptive characteristics, overlapping of the attributes with reliance on the content-related or formal dominant. All this does not alter the major function of the genre – regulation of the literary continuity. In this sense, genre is a typological category, which arranges certain ideal content within the frames of a “genre structure”, which is a type of a literary unity.

Genre turns into an artistic mode thanks to its specific functions.

It is neither the semantic nor the expressive aspect of the artistic content, but its brief or detailed presentation that is the regulator of the genre continuity, the genre-based genetic code.
It is clear that the brief and the detailed material presentation, as well as an action and a state, do not determine the moral-philosophical essence of characters; however, the quality of artistic discourse cannot help having its toll on the spiritual quality. The comprehension type of relation is much more organically combined with the analytic discourse than with brevity. Therefore, the genre of the novel provides more opportunities for the representation of personality than the small genre. And vice versa: the adaptation type of relation exercises its most prominent and complete presence in the “small” genres, in comparison with the novel.

This circumstance allows for distinguishing the properties of the artistic mode within genre.

Genre, along with the type, can be regarded a technological archetype which serves the archetypes related to the worldview and ideology.

Genre rounds up our contemplations on the conceptual and terminological system, which helps to describe the phenomenon of artistry – its essential aspect and, as a result, to describe the aspect of the artistic modes which, with the change of their functional quality, turn into artistic typification strategies. Artistry is the characteristic of a particular correlation – between the type of content and the type of style; this kind of correlation is regulated by the general dialectical code of the relation between the “content” and “form”: artistic content (“unnatural”, but logical synthesis of the moral-philosophical and artistic strategies) predetermines (“forecasts”, orders) stylistic patterns. A particular type of content capable of existing within the frames of stylistic logic (the most general stylistic principles) – this is what artistry is; artistic modes act as original semantic-aesthetic paradigms – “holistic” formations.

An artistic mode is the relation of personacentric valency to artistry; personacentric valency reflects the comprehension type of relation to that of adaptation in the process of turning a person into a personality; artistic typification strategies are a type of relation of artistic modes to the artistic structure of a literary work; the artistic structure of a literary work is a multilevel structure, where a systematic approach to the unity is realized.

This is why the varieties of artistic typification strategies – personacentric valency, pathos, metagenre, type and, to some extent, genre – can also perform the functions of artistic modes. However, these functions are varied: if personacentric valency can rightfully be called the chief artistic mode, then the type and genre perform the functions of modes and strategies only in part.

It is understandable that personacentric valency is also a non-historical category, and it is realized in a particular literary work with the help of those concrete-historical principles of spiritual and aesthetic exploration of life (behavioral strategies of a character). Personacentric valency in realism is one thing, in romanticism – another, and in postmodernism – still another.
The common scientific principle – *from the general to the particular* – is observed, the artistic mode has found its place in the structure of the content and thus has transformed into a tool of analysis of that same content, to be more exact, that *mode of content*, which we have defined as artistry.

To conclude, a gradual transition from the world perception to the worldview, from person to personality (and vice versa), from behavioral (moral-philosophical) strategies to the artistic ones – is realized through all the artistic modes mentioned. In terms of the analysis of a literary work, artistic modes provide a gnoseological possibility to connect the artistic typification strategies with style.
7. STYLE. COMPONENTS OF STYLE

Artistic typification strategies, as we have seen, remind of the underwater part of an iceberg. These levels as the factors of a well-regulated artistic content, do not materialize themselves, they are as if hidden in a literary work, but without them the fictional work is unfeasible. The lack of this kind of artistic reductions – reducing the universum to the personality concept, and the latter, in its turn, to several other aspects – makes the universum impossible to regulate and to represent it in the light of an artistic concept.

Artistic typification strategies serve as a mechanism of mediation, they further organize lower sub-systems of the poetics. It is impossible to convey the personality concept directly through the plot, detail, word choice, etc., neglecting the method, type, and metagenre. The internal form (i.e., invisible, ideal levels) is a gradual and consistent crystallization of the spiritual content, which finally gets fixed in the external, sensually perceived form – in the style.

Style, as a result, is a method of implementation of the selected strategies, an original artistic tactics. Style is “an integral unity of all the principles of artistic representation and expressiveness”\(^1\). Style is that very “beauty” of a literary work, its highest aesthetic quality. Style is style for the reason that it possess internal organization, everything fits together. There is almost nothing accidental in style. Life, on the contrary, does not posses the qualities of style, and therefore it is chaotic. Life which is molded by style ceases to be life. The most prominent potentially stylistic possibilities in life characterize an extremely ritualized behavior (for example, military and religious ceremonies, jurisdiction, etc.).

Artfulness, the manmade quality of literary fiction, consists in the presence of a style. Art, therefore, contradicts life in a certain sense. It is a dead matter, if you prefer. But it is capable of regeneration. And it lives only at the moment of perception (sometimes, through an intermediary agent): at the moment of empathy, analysis, interpretation. A literary work resuscitates only the perceiving consciousness. It becomes evident, that the analysis of the style of a literary work and the analysis of the life behind it are by far not the same things. One must not allow for the exchange of these notions. The analysis of a literary work is, first and foremost, an aesthetic analysis of the dissected and “adjacent” phenomena of life.

Thus, a work of fiction which posses a style is like a life, or an imitation of life. The work sorts out and organizes the manifestations of life. The internal unity of style is made up of the unity of all its components without exception. A fictional style reflects the integrity of fictional images.

*Situation.* We believe it to be worthwhile to use this term in G.N. Pospelov’s interpretation\(^2\). A situation is a conflux of the worldviews, placing of the characters
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around a particular type of conflict. The purpose of thus placing them is to identify the interrelations of the characters, as they always make up an original ensemble of personalities. It is from the situation thus understood that an artistic individualization of the “personality and circumstances” begins, and also the implementation of all the previous strategies. As an example, the situation in Woe from Wit, a comedy by A.S. Groboyedov, is characterized by the opposition between Chatsky, the central character, and the “Famusov society”. They are opposed on the basis of their contrasting, diametrically antithetic worldview drives. At that, this kind of conflict does not exhaust itself with “fathers and sons” type of conflict in the Russia of the early 19th century; it is marked by universality: this is the conflict between sociocentrism and personacentrism. In the same way, in another concrete-historical situation – there is a withstanding of “fathers and sons” in many other literary works of the Russian classical literature: in I.S. Turgenev’s novel, where the situation is taken into the title; in The Storm, a tragedy by A.N. Ostrovsky, et al.

Thus, in a given situation, both the major conflict and characters differently associated with it, become visible. Conflicts and situations are always universal in some way, and, at the same time, specific. In the lyric, a situation may be intimate, but it cannot fail to be there: a lyrical persona is always related in some manner to the world of different values. Sometimes, the meaning of the situations may be implied, and we might not witness an open and explicit opposition of ideas (as, for instance, in Chekhov’s plays). It is often the case for the situation to be shaped in the exposition – a specific element of the plot, whose purpose is just to outline the situation.

The situation unfolds in the plot. By plot, we traditionally mean a range of events which are associated either through a chronological or causal link. There can be some other kinds of link (associative, transcendental, et al.). But anyway, all other kinds of links adhere to the principle of a chronological or logical conditionality of the events. Accordingly, there are chronicle-like and concentric plots. The former – make the plot basis of the ethological genre group, the latter – of the novel genre group.

This level involves a much more distinct degree of concreteness than the previous one. A plot here consists of episodes – sections of the text characterized by a “triunity”: being in the same time, place (space) and action (the role-playing dramatic personae). This unity just outlines the borders of an episode.

Human relations are always the relations of some activity, or active interaction. The development of a personality outside the relations of activity is impossible. Plot structure therefore has always been the most important part of epos, and for a long time is was this part that made up for the lack of development of detail. Human actions take place in space and time. Therefore the spatial-temporary feature of a work of fiction (the so-called “chronotope”) is an inseparable part of characterizing plot structure.
The composition of the plot – the *fabula* – is of great significance. This brings about different phases of plot: the exposition, initiating action, rising action, climax and resolution.

An artistic text, however, consists not just of episodes. It can be broken down into other pieces of the unity – or *fragments*. And this is quite a different level of style – or *composition*. With all the seeming simplicity and clarity of the notion, terminologically, it is very blurred. Thus, we may speak of the composition of a plot, character, image, phrase, etc. Let us refer to the definition of the composition in V.I. Tiupa’s work: “A composition of a literary work as a form of *verbal* art is building up a whole through an arrangement of word “blocks”, stretches of speech, or building up a whole out of *fragments*. A unit of a composition for a literary scholar is a section of the text characterized by the unity of the subject of utterance (a narrator, story-teller, character) and a mode of utterance (narration, description, explication, tale, meditation, speech, remark).

While analyzing a *fictional composition*, the central issue to deal with is not the problem of the point of view (this is the level of the detail), but the problem of the external (the beginning and the end of chapter) and the internal (fragmentariness) borders of the text. Let us add to this, that the arrangement of a literary work on the level of the external borders of the text, to avoid confusion, would preferably be named *architectonics*. That latter is the “global” aspect of the composition.

Plots, which are “burdened” by a composition, switch the reader’s attention just to the latter layer. The works “refined” from the composition – “bare” plots – tend to be on the periphery of literary fiction (detective narratives, science fiction, etc.).

Thus, plot structure and composition make the “skeleton” on which the “flesh” of a literary work builds up, all the “devices and means”, more precisely, all the other levels of style. (Can we speak here about the coincidence in the scope of the notions of *style and a writer’s technique*, meaning by technique the mastery of devices and the means of expressiveness? It is evident that there are no such devices that would be the devices only and not be the style. Any device is absorbed by the notion of “style”, and in this respect, these are identical. But while the style is an aesthetic category, technique is an art of creating a style.) Plot and composition are “woven” from *details* – details of objects, psychological, symbolic details. Moreover, the selection and arrangement of details do not happen randomly, but from the position of a certain character, story-teller or narrator. Eventually, a subjective organization of the fictional work is realized through the details.

The layer containing details is the flesh of a literary work. In the literary fiction of the New Age and contemporary history (especially in the epoch of Realism) a detail often performs a double, triple and even more complex function. A detail often performs a double, triple and even more complex function. A detail provides a

---

multifaceted characterization not only of the object, but also of the subject of perception. The multifunctionality of detail turns out to be a necessity to realism, because it helps to reveal the contradictory inner integrity of a person. Here is an example, in which different details (of objects, psychological and symbolic details) perform several functions: “A house-painter walked across the desolate square; he was all smudged in paint, with a bucket and brush – and then again, there were no other people. A yellow leaf, with holes in it, suddenly came off a pelted poplar, and, dancing, flowed down and – like in a whirlpool, in the head there swirled the wave of a white handkerchief, the gunshots, the blood. The unnecessary particularities arose: how he was preparing the handkerchief for the signal. He had taken it out of his pocket in advance and, pressing it into a tight little ball, was holding it in his right hand; then he carefully spread it and quickly waved, not with an upward movement, but forward, as if he was throwing something. As if he was throwing bullets. And at this point he stepped over something, over some high but invisible threshold, and an iron door with a loud screech of iron hinges banged shut behind him – and there was no way back”. (L.N. Andreyev, The Governor.) The desolate square, the painter smudged in paint, the pelted poplar, the yellow leaf with holes – these are not just social, common and aesthetic marks, but also the features of the psychological state of the one who perceives the scene. The details perform the role of an instrument of psychological analysis. The governor’s consciousness is presented from the third person perspective – by the narrator, or the image of the author. For this reason, the details convey the personality concept of not the character alone, but that of the narrator as well. Besides, the yellow leaf with holes in it also embodies several chains of associations: it is yellow – and this is a complex color symbolism; there are holes in it – even nature may be aesthetically ugly, and such perception is a symptom of uttermost inward discord; the holes in the leaf are clearly associated with the holes made by bullets in the bodies of the killed men; the leaf is falling – it is a plain symbol of dying; the leaf is dancing in its fall – and this detail evokes a new chain of associations: it reminds of a wave of the handkerchief which served as signal for the shooting. Other interpretations of these details are possible, too. It is crucial to note, that all this information is concentrated on one single stylistic level – on the level of details.

A detail – any detail – is not just an object as such or its verbal equivalent, a verbal denotation of the “non-verbal” reality. The most vital role of a detail is in its performing the function of a mediation link between people. Any detail is socially charged, it acts as a symptom of relationships, of associations between a personality and others (or with one’s own self). This is why the comprehension of the underlying laws of human life actualized the external world, “external things” (E.V. Ilyenkov), which are full of deep meaning for a personality. A verbal detail (and fictional discourse at large) in this range is also an “external thing”. A human relationship always presupposes a mediated tool of communication, which is an external thing.
For a person to “talk” to himself (to treat himself as other), there must be three bodies: I – an “external thing” – Non-I. A human dimension emerges only in this system.

A detail is almost always linked to the “centre of ideas” of the literary work. The fact that this level has been intensively developing in the last two centuries testifies to the rise of human spirituality, that man is ever is search of himself. If we imagine a “silent man”, if we deprive man of the ability to speak, then the only way to comprehend him would be trough detail. A detail is very sensitive to the most complex manifestations of human personality.

But man speaks. And only a “speaking man” can open up to very profound depths. *Speech* is “vocal detailization”. The system of points of view is complicated by the system of speech characteristics. Words appear, and a work of fiction acquires its own material image.

This level of style has also been developed intensively in the past two centuries. And a true revolution in the field of verbal behavior of characters was executed by realism\(^1\). An artistic speech cannot belong to no one, it is always somebody’s speech. The speech attribution determines its peculiarities a great deal. Speech has the final say in materialization of the subject-related organization as well. In Realism, the speech of the characters was separated from the author’s speech for good (from the speech of the narrator and the image of the author). Moreover, there was a functional separation the *inner monologue and the speech* of the characters proper (of the narrators and lyrical personae). *Direct speech, as it happens*, was changing its forms and functions.

The main varieties of direct speech are *dialogue, monologue and an utterance*. These were preserved in realism. But while the pre-realistic functions of direct speech were mostly characterological, moral and plot-related, in Realism direct speech, having preserved the previous functions, explores the new ones, and in an unprecedented scope. The characterological function is drastically altered. A full-scale character requires bright, individual, socio-psychological speech attributes. Besides, the order of speech was to reflect the worldview program in the process of creation.

The realistic method brought about an *analytic dialogue* with the author’s indispensable commentary which often changed the meaning of the dialogue into its direct opposite. Such are characteristically Tolstoy’s dialogues. One more type of dialogue appeared – a *dialogue with the implication*, with double motivation, where various types of context performed the functions of the author’s analytical commentary. Such a context also appeared in Leo Tolstoy for the first time. The apogee of this type of dialogue was achieved in Chekhov’s plays. In the 20\(^{th}\) century it was characteristic of Hemingway’s prose. Finally, we shall mention *intellectual dialogues* expressing different ideological positions (Gorky, *The Life of Klim*

---

Dialogue adapted itself to the reflection of the person’s behavior which was conditioned not only by consciousness, but also by subconsciousness.

The same is true of monologue. The modernization of monologue was caused by the same reasons: focus on the dialectical contradictions of the soul and mind, by the psychologization of the characters’ actions and states. A confused consciousness finds an analogy of itself – *an irrational* monologue or the *stream of consciousness*. The paradigmatic example is that of Anna Karenina’s monologue before her death. Chapter 18 of J. Joyce’s *Ulysses* presents an elaborated form of the stream of consciousness, which, in fact, already denies its own existence, because a monologue turned from a tool into the goal of and in itself. Despite Joyce’s seeming stupendous novelty, his stream of consciousness in its functions differs little from that of Tolstoy’s: we are faced with the same imitation of the texture of the “pre-verbal” indiscrete stream of consciousness unveiling the uncontrollable “secretum secretorum” (Vs. Ivanov) of man.

A conscious and purposeful behavior makes sense in logical and articulate monologues. Both the types of monologue can be well combined (we can recollect Karenina’s monologue).

The phenomenon of a “split personality”, torn by inner contradictions, has discovered a specific form of inner speech – a *monologue in the form of a dialogue*. We can point out the example of a “conversation” between Ivan Ilyich with himself (Leo Tolstoy, *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*).

Special emphasis should be given to the tale-like manner, the *tale* (a first-person narrative which reproduces oral speech as stylization, and which is aimed at miming the genres of folklore), which was so brilliantly implemented in Russian literature (Leskov, Shmelyov, et al.).

Finally, let us mention *indirect speech*, which also performs several functions simultaneously in realistic prose.

As a result, speech *per se* becomes the object of depiction. The speech of characters turned out to be identical with the subject of depiction. This is a unique peculiarity of literary fiction, which increases immensely the possibilities of having an impact on the reader. The illusion of a “seeming life” becomes ultimate.

However, speech is arranged in the same manner as all the other levels of style. There can never be anything arbitrary in it.

*The verbal side of style*, the linguistic reality of the text, possesses relevant and specific aspects. Words are carefully selected (*lexical-morphological* aspect), they are arranged in a certain order (*syntactic* aspect), the semantic side is reinforced by the phonemic aspect (*literary phonetics*), *rhythm* and *intonation* (alteration of the pitch of the sound). We should not forget about the allegorical possibilities of artistic speech either, which is connected with the polysemantic aspect of the usage of words. All these linguistic possibilities become artistic means. The verbal side materializes all the previous levels. It makes no sense to analyze the verbal texture, disengaging from
the artistic charge of a word. Being an aggregate of the elements of style, the verbal side embodies the speech and object-related psychological detailization which is located on the levels of the composition and plot. A *stylistic dominant* is further determined by the factors of style: method, type, metagenre, and genre. In their turn, typification strategies are determined by the personality concept.

The verbal aspect therefore should not be examined in isolation (this can only be reasonable for the educational-methodological purposes), but viewed as a level which is conditioned by all the other levels and which, at the same time, represents and focuses on them all. If we “touch” the verbal level (that is, change an epithet, a punctuation mark, a suffix, replace the iamb with a dactyl, etc.), this change will immediately impact all the other levels – and that would mean, change the personality concept as well.

A word, which is an “external thing”, performs an artistic function – the function which is prescribed by the artistic content. A fictional word is an “external thing” between the author, the author’s image (narrator), character and the reader in all possible combinations: between the author and the narrator, the author and the character, the author and the reader, etc.

All the aspects of the fictional word are studied quite thoroughly in their major functions. We shall allow a little space here to address rhythm and metaphor as special stylistic levels of a literary work. The most adequate definition of *rhythm* we believe to be the following: this is an “arrangement of a verbal movement, which relies on recurrent frequency of individual elements of this movement and envelops the patterns of breakdown into separate verbal units, of making these units follow each other, of their mutual correlation and uniting them into higher unities”\(^1\).

Rhythm as a “recurrence of elements” can by no means refer to the composition. It is a unique arrangement of speech in terms of its sounding. Intonation, sound and rhythm are the least significant components of style in rational terms, which are aimed at conveying of some vague, inarticulate, mainly psychological information. Behind them lies an ineffable psychological abyss, pre-verbal stream of consciousness.

*Metaphor* also establishes an original relationship with the pre-verbal stream of consciousness. During the whole of the 20\(^{th}\) century metaphor was and still remains the subject of study of different disciplines. We might single out the three main approaches to metaphor\(^2\). It is studied as:

1. A specific quality of thinking, a feature of a mode of thinking (philosophers, culturologists, psychologists).
2. A mode of creating meaning (mainly in the linguistic aspect).

---


3. One of the means of figurativeness and expressiveness, as a figure of speech which is located in the system of tropes, as the level of style of a literary work (an aesthetic approach).

Thus we might face potential danger in identifying metaphorical thinking and figurative thinking. Literary scholars must be interested not in the heuristic possibilities of metaphor (it is wrong to regard metaphorical thinking as a synonym to figurative thinking), but rather in its expressive-stylistic possibilities in various fictional systems.

Metaphor is related to the technique of creating meaning – and this is very important for the literary theory, however, from that specific, artistic angle. Metaphor functions on the “categorical shift”, and it can be described as a “conscious mistake in the taxonomy of objects”. The meaning of such mistake is to point out the likeness of objects.

Metaphor is laconic, it curtails speech while increasing the scope of its meaning. The specificity of meaning in metaphor is the expression of a durable likeness pointing at the essence of the object, at its permanent, non-arbitrary attribute. At that, metaphor discovers the most distant and unexpected links between objects.

Such “bridging the gaps” is certainly an intuitive and not strictly logical operation. Due to the pointed properties metaphor acts as one of the most prominent and original poetic means. The main area of the usage of metaphor is the lyric.

Metaphor is a symptom of figurative, intuitive thinking, although an image can also be created without a metaphor. This fact alone does not allow for the identification of a metaphor and an image. Image and metaphor are merely different categories. Metaphor has narrow semantics, it is not conceptual (as a detail, for example). That is why we can define metaphor as a means of conveying an image-based personality concept. This is a mode of representation of an image, but not the image as such. The place of a metaphor as an element of style is in the chain of other tropes. It can be of different kinds: from a metaphor which is close to the rationality of metonymy – to the most sophisticated “super-sensual” specimens.
8. GENESIS OF A LITERARY WORK AND LITERARY FICTION

Chart № 4 demonstrates that the unity of a literary work is characterized, first of all, by the historical-genetic aspect (a combination of non-fictional and fictional factors which facilitate the emergence of a literary work), and secondly, by the historical-functional aspect (the laws which determine the life and functioning of a literary work in society). The work as if dissolves in the reality which brought it to life. The circle is locked, symbolizing the unity of a universum.

What possibilities open up for researchers when we approach a literary work as a whole while examining different aspects of the genesis of the work?

Absolutization of individual aspects of the genesis used to cause the dominance of the schools of the hermeneutic type, or a lopsided concentration on the “immanent origins of literary evolution”¹. The forthright and simplified understanding of the relation of literary fiction to reality in different historical epochs induced the view of a fictional work as a reflection of the problems of the time in a fictional form: ideological, national, philosophical, religious problems, etc. The position of a writer as a citizen, a writer as a Christian, as a fighter was valued most. An artist’s mission was seen as fictional encoding of these problems. For the literary scholars of this trend, ideas were unambiguously discerned behind the pictures, and it was the ideas that predetermined the pictures. Generally speaking, art was treated as the servant of politics and ideology, and its role was reduced to the functions of illustrating, if not propaganda. The problems of man and society prevailed and eclipsed the properly artistic problems. The criterion of artistry was based on those same ideas: their depth, progressiveness, novelty, etc. Because literary fiction was regarded as the vestige of the phenomena that had caused it, analysis was applied no so much to the fictional works, but to the external phenomena. Hence, close attention of the proponents of different missions of the arts (social, psychoanalytical, et al.) to the issues of the authors’ worldview development, to the fictional response to the burning “social mandate of the time”, to the dependence of fiction on the “zeitgeist”, etc.

Thus, the study of a literary work in the paradigm of historical epoch – author – work of fiction – reader became the source of a hermeneutic approach to literary fiction, i.e., a fictional text “was decoded” with the help of a certain ideological, socio-cultural or some other code. The search for a relevant ideological dominant was exactly the search for a code to a work of fiction.

We can’t fail to admit that to a certain extent such an approach to a literary work is justified (its content provides for hermeneutic aspirations). However, the absolutization of external factors caused underestimation of the aesthetic peculiarities of a fictional work. Nowadays, more and more literary scholars tend to recognize the inadmissibility of a lopsided hermeneutic perception of literary fiction, which (this

perception) never took artistry into account. The question about the national, ideological and philosophical beginnings in the art of writing is the question about the way and degree of these non-fictional factors of becoming (or not becoming) aesthetic factors. If we consider any non-fictional factor per se, without regard to its aesthetic assimilation by a work of fiction, then this cannot be considered the criterion of artistry, no matter how attractive or indisputable this concept might be. The presence or absence of any non-fictional factors does not constitute a direct criterion of artistry.

A similar approach is presented clearly and consistently in the works of I.F. Volkov, G.N. Pospelov, V.E. Khalizev, et al. They show how the ethical, socio-psychological, historical-cultural principles of people’s relationships during concrete historical epochs become the aesthetic, structural principles of representing characters.

In the history of art, the same consistency is present in the cultivation of a different, directly opposite approach to the genesis of literary fiction. Such theories as “art for art’s sake”, “pure art”, formalism, structuralism, the postmodern aesthetics, etc., concentrate on the formal aspect of fictional works, ignoring their ideological and meaningful impulse in principle. While in one case a mainly human stance of the artist and his/her work is in the focus of study, in another – the criterion is: “the poet begins where the man ends” (Ortega y Gasset).

A work of fiction for the proponents of “pure art” is an “adventure in writing”, a “promenade through the text”, the “pleasure of the text” (the terms of French structuralists). A literary work is viewed as an exclusively aesthetic phenomenon, as a selfless game – with latent thought – play of words and devices. Good and evil are no more than material for the game. There is no life behind the words. There is … nothing behind the words. Words, words, words… A senseless play with the language, beauty for beauty’s sake are proclaimed as the aim and meaning of art. A literary work is severed from life, from a person, and is treated as a self-contained system of “means and devices”.

We can have also a “condescending” attitude to such an aesthetic creed, if artists advocate it. A creative program is one thing, but creativity is another. A creed does not mean that the “aesthetes” are incapable of producing a masterpiece; artists who focus on civil and other ideological values are not “insured” against masterpieces, either. Artists often violate their own voluntary aesthetic taboos in their art. Why does it happen is a special question which we do not venture to explore in this book. The fact remains: aesthetic programs that do not stand scholarly criticism, sometimes turn out to be brilliant literary achievements in actual artistic practice (suffice to recall the phenomenon of Nabokov).

However, for literary scholars, such as “aesthetic ideology” means distancing from the fundamental theoretical problem: to identify the mutual representation of reality in the text, and the text in reality. The central contradiction of the theory of literary fiction, in this case, as we see it, also receives a simple resolution: by
withdrawing one of the members of the contradiction, namely, the reality and the associated personality concept. While the consistent cult of the “truthful” content brings literary fiction to naturalism and journalism, and turns fictional images into exemplary-publicistic ones, then the cult of form made into an aesthetic principle also destroys the artistry, transforming a work of fiction into a senseless “play of words”.

As a result, an inadequate perception of the holistic nature of literary fiction inevitably causes distortions in its treatment and a one-sided interpretation of artistic phenomena.

8.1. A fictional work as the object and subject of the impact of literary traditions

Depending on the manner we resolve the problems of the genesis of an individual fictional work, so shall we solve the problems of the literary process. A fictional work exists always as an instance of movement, and therefore poses as the object and subject of the impact of traditions and influences. We shall consider a fictional work as a link in the literary process.

A conceptual approach to literary traditions, ensuing from everything we have said about a fictional work in the context of a comprehensive analysis, will be the following. All the traditions, with all the diversity, can be broken into two types. First, the non-fictional category: the worldview, concepts, ideas, conditions of life, the character of historical events, and so on and so forth – in short, all conceivable impulses which run from reality through a creative personality and become factors of artistry. These traditions belong predominantly to the factors which shape the personality of an artist. An artist’s dependence on ideological (and other) influences is most elusive and invincible. And a flesh-and-blood writer, as we remember, becomes a writer-character. The influences of this type affect first of all the level of the method. The writer’s method, undoubtedly, grows under the influence of the listed factors. Therefore the proponents of social determinacy of art see the basis of the literary process in the external, non-fictional factors. Hence, there are such “units of measure” of the literary process, as a “movement” and a “trend” (according to “ideas” and “creative programs”\(^1\)).

Second, traditions can be fictional, most notably genre-stylistic ones, including also all possible “devices and means”. The adherents of the formalist school (in the broad sense) stand by the position that defines the literary process as a revision of the previous creative experience and proceed from it (and not from the concrete historical reality). The literary process, as a result, appears to be a chain of endless modifications of literary techniques and forms.

These are the two major methodological tendencies in the understanding of the genesis of literary fiction and in the interpretation of the laws of the literary process – the tendencies that have determined the development of literary theory. Above, we

\(^1\) G.N. Pospelov. Problems of the Historical... Moscow, 1972.
have already expressed our attitude to these tendencies, but let us stress the following. It is possible to find the right direction in the literary process dynamics, when the sources of traditions are correctly identified and understood, together with the role of the tradition in the creation of unique artistic works. The influence of, say, Nietzsche’s ideas on literary artists is one thing, but the influence of Hemingway’s stylistic manner is completely another. Nietzsche’s ideas can become the basis of the artist’s worldview, and, further, get reflected in the behavioral strategies of his/her characters, the ideas can become the aesthetic and structural dominant of his/her imagery. This influence is always significant, as in the long run it helps to find the key to the work’s poetics. We can note that the source of ideological influences may be presented not only by philosophers, but other writers as well, or parents, friends, etc.

A stylistic borrowing is the reception of the traditions of a totally different level and different nature. They are equally important for the understanding of the work’s genesis, however, they reveal the writer’s artistry from a different, “technical” side (no only “technical” though).

For example, Solzhenitsyn admitted that he had borrowed much of his vigorous and dynamic syntax from Zamyatin’s prose and Tsvetaeva’s style. It is the syntax that we are speaking about, and not the system of ideas¹.

The source of the ideas, the power of their impact, their depth and character are only the preconditions of artistic creation. All the more so, as a literary artist’s strength is not only (more often not so much) in consciousness, but in subconsciousness, too. The most complex mental symbiosis of consciousness, subconsciousness, psychology, philosophy, as well as the modes of representing this symbiosis, bring around a holistic artistic creation. It is impossible to copy it, but it is very easy to copy a device. Stylistic discoveries become common property very quickly. And the borrowed devices per se cannot be regarded as a mark of an epigone. If we deal with the original personality of a writer, gifted, among other things, with a creative literary talent (an ability to record “the state of the soul” in specific signs), his/her art is not perceived as secondary, although the traces of literary mentors can be clearly visible. Moreover, a writer becomes original, only when he/she adopts and digests all the spiritual traditions and adopts a good literary school.

The question of traditions and influences is extremely complex and multifaceted. The influences may be mediated, and the object and subject of artistic impact may be separated by whole centuries. Though there can never be writers outside traditions. (Mayakovsky, when asked if Nekrasov had ever influenced him, replied: “Impossible to know”. The same answer could come from numerous literary artists if they were ever asked about the influence of their predecessors.)

To make the discussion of literary fiction utterly precise, we need to clearly mark the upper and the lower borders (see chart № 4) of the subject of our research in

¹ Literary Newspaper. № 12 от 27.03.91
literary studies (this is also directly related to the issue of traditions). We believe that the common factors in the formation of a personality as such, the development of the natural gifts, the “composition” of a genius, culturological analysis of the relevant historical moment and other similar issues often transcend and go far beyond the borders of the literary scholars’ competence. These are the issues of interpretation, that belong to the junctions of different sciences and disciplines, or even crossover to the area of competence of philosophy, psychology, pedagogics, etc. Therefore we share the opinion that the study of fictional works from the perspective of their genesis, while being an important task for literary studies, is still secondary in regard to the examination of the works themselves.

From the position of a literary scholar, the interpretation of “ideas”, bypassing aesthetic analysis, the interpretation that is in no need thereof and leads one directly to the ideas – is not just a huge deprivation in the understanding of a fictional work, but, in fact, substitution of the subject of research. Interpretation makes sense only to the point it facilitates aesthetic analysis. The latter, in its turn, is not an aim it and of itself, but a “tool” for high quality interpretation.

Interpretation is a moment of connection and transition of one form of social consciousness to others. The borderline between the humanities and literary studies, history, philosophy, etc., is transparent and relative. For the benefit of the truth it is crucial not to lose one’s subject of research and to observe the moment of mutual transition.

Certainly, the so-called philosophical criticism, sometimes represented by brilliant names (A.N. Berdyaev, et al.), has all the right to exist. But its aim is to “measure” the depth of the ideas as such, to write them into a specific – philosophical – context. This kind of criticism is little concerned with poetics, the inherently aesthetic side of the matter. And no matter how profound Berdyaev’s evaluation of Dostoyevsky's ideas might be, the philosopher’s works cannot replace the studies by literary scholars. Dostoyevsky as a literary artist possesses also an aesthetic facet which is as autonomous as the religious-philosophical ideas that he delivered. Bakhtin’s famous work may rather serve as a specimen of a qualified approach to Dostoyevsky’s creative art from the position of a literary scholar.

The point of departure for a literary scholar is the writer’s personality, which is embodied in the works produced by him/her. The personality of a writer is always refracted through the principles of a character’s behavior determinacy. In other words, what can be convincingly referred to the formation of the aesthetic side of the method is of importance to a researcher.

The upper threshold is mobile. Scientific biographies of writers, documentary testimonies of their contemporaries, philosophers and politologists, as well as other studies in each particular case can be necessary in a different measure. Nevertheless, what was the real process that helped shape the personality of a writer, what were the true stimuli of their creative art, who, in all verisimilitude (and why, and to which
extent) was able to exercise an influence on their work – to these and similar questions it is not always possible to get definite answers (and this, in particular, is the expression of relativity of literary scholarly knowledge). The pseudo-scholarly versions and forecasts often lose ties with the science and become belles letters.

Therefore, neither the position of the proponents of the non-fictional “primary impetus” of creative art, nor the position of the “formalists”, can help to exhaustively, or even comprehensively enough, find out the genesis of complex literary phenomena. For different cases, there may be different determinants in the tangle of diverse traditions. Any literary process has so many components (different ones for each case), that it renders it impossible to work out a universal approach. There should be a clear understanding that the common factors we have pointed out can produce directly opposite results in different cases. However, it is impossible to write off these common factors, too. The entire art that a literary historian is in possession of consists in the case-specific application of these common factors to a concrete historical moment in the national literary process. The unique character of the results is the ultimate outcome when we follow universal patterns.

The principle that states that “everything new is only just the well forgotten old” turns from its commonplace application to the essence of a creative process in art. Because a fictional work is a whole, any crucial modification of the content-related aspect leads to the reconstruction of the entire wholeness. The evolution of the “superfluous” type of people in the Russian literature of the 19th century is good proof thereof.

Such is the dialectics of traditions and innovations in literature. It is impossible to bypass or cast away the fundamental artistic laws. A relative reducibility of the writers’ creative art to certain common baseline messages, in this or that manner touching upon the problems of personality and artistry, is the principal foundation of different typologies: artistic systems, movements, trends, artistic methods, and styles.

Contemporary literary studies are intensively looking into the problem of genesis of fictional works. One of the branches – comparative literary studies – investigates the cross-cultural influences specifically (both stylistic and those related to the spiritual meaning, and typological). Thus, this branch is responsible for only one source of the genesis. Comparative studies focus on the instance of an openness of a fictional work in the world, they allow for seeing the work as well as the writers’ creative art in general, not only in the frame of national literature, but also as the subject of the regional, and on a broader scale – the worldwide literary process. The juxtapositions on the level of the method, identification of a stage-specific affinity in the development of literatures produces such units of the measure of “inter-literary affinity”, as a movement, a trend, an artistic system. Romanticism, Classicism, Realism, etc, are the notions used not only in individual national literatures, but also in the stages (epochs) of the literary development of regions and humanity at large.
Keeping in mind what we have said above, a fictional work seems to discover two different axiological dimensions: on the scale of the national literature and on the scale of the world literary process. The concepts of the “world” and “national” classics are totally acceptable. We shall come back to this issue in Section 10.

Any prominent fictional work, in fact, is the crossroads of various influences: personal, national and international. A fictional work, to be absolutely exact, contains the traces of all temporally varied contacts, the traces of all civilizations, traces of entire humanity and, simultaneously, the traces of one’s individual personality. The emergence of comparative studies is symptomatic. Actually, this means an acknowledgement of the importance of not merely interpersonal, national, but also international factors of the formation of the spiritual meaning. Comparative studies are aimed at dealing with culturological problems of literary studies (and not breaking the connections with literature). However, the absolutization of some single factor is unacceptable. Every time we must speak of the balance between multidirectional factors, having different “complementarity”, “valency”, i.e., a different degree of susceptibility to holistic formations.

In recent years, an integral approach to literary fiction is becoming more influential – both on the level of an individual fictional work and on the level the literary process. The coining of such term as “inter-literary affinity” testifies to the approach to “literary zones” and “literary regions” (Durishin’s terminology) as a wholeness resisting a one-dimensional segmentation. The basis of the comparative studies methodology should be the comparison of not the systems, let alone the elements of systems, but of integral, indivisible levels, resistant to localization – fictional works, artistic destinies of artists in general, histories of individual national literatures, inter-literary affinities, which together constitute a unity of a different order – world literature. It is because we deal with holistic objects, the subject of comparative studies cannot be individually treated “histories of ideas” or histories of the “migration” of plots, motifs, devices, etc.; first and foremost, the very logic of the development of national literatures and tendencies in the development of world literature should make the subject of study, with the consideration of the maximum of multidirectional factors.

To conclude, comparative studies as the exploration of interactions in the literary regions do not currently see it as their goal to study the whole spectrum and context of influences, to establish all the sources of the genesis of fictional works. Meanwhile, only a comprehensive approach to the genesis of fictional works allows for making an objective picture of the rootedness of the work in the individual, and, further, social consciousness of the people, region, epoch and humanity.

8.2. A fictional work in historical-functional aspect
Artistic wholeness can be read in the system of reality – author – work – reader, considering this work as an object of perception and studying the common patterns of perception. The subject in this case is the reader. Beyond the reader as the closing link of the system, the fictional work cannot exist. The ideological potential of art is realized in this system.

Because the artistic content of a fictional work integrates all the forms of social consciousness, it can be the object of study from the vintage point of any form of social consciousness. A fictional work can be studied from the standpoint of sociology, psychology, pedagogics, criminal science, etc. Such an applied study of the works of art, their reduction to one or two pragmatic aspects can be immediately excluded from our concerns: it is a mere use of the illustrative potential of the works of art. Artistic images in this case lose their depth and are functionally relegated to being illustrative-publicistic. Leo Tolstoy then can be regarded as the “mirror of the Russian revolution”, and Balzac’s work – a treasure-trove of political-economic wisdoms (we mean here, respectively, V.I. Lenin’s and K. Marx’s judgments about these writers).

We are interested in the perception of the cultural potential of art in the most crucial and, as it were, justifiable aspects.

Firstly, as a fictional work represents a world outlook program in any case, it can be viewed in a broad cultural context. Personality, as we remember, may be partially considered as an ensemble of social relations. Consequently, in order to explain a particular personality, we need to consider the social medium. The history of the development of personality (and society) is the history of a logical replacement of one kind of “frames of orientation and devotion” by others. The history of literature therefore is an original history of elaboration and mastering of new world outlooks, it is also the history of philosophy and the philosophy of history – only in terms of imagery. A broad culturological view of a fictional work is appropriate only where it is necessary: when all the forms of social consciousness make sense in their unity. This view, however, immanently ignores the inherent artistic specificity of a fictional work (as has been discussed above).

As a vehicle of broad cultural information, a fictional work can be the subject of civil history, aesthetics, of philosophy, et al. However (again and again), literary studies not just consider the presence of all the forms of social consciousness, but also an attempt to connect them into a holistic worldview-artistic system. Thus, while exploring the aesthetic specificity of the method of Classicism, we had to deduce it from the peculiarities of social consciousness of that time (see Section 5.3.).

Secondly, we must single out the area of interpersonal relations, the zone where the moral orientations of a personality are shaped and realized. This level, in particular, possesses a huge significance when applied, notably, to the purposes of education.
Thirdly, as all the ideas are realized through the actions of a personality, a lot of information is connected with the psychological level of a person. It has been long known that classical literature produced a universal set of types: both corporeal (somatic), psychological (typology of temperaments) and personal (the socio-moral and moral-philosophical typology). All the intuitive knowledge of man which has recently become the subject of sciences, has long been within the range of vision of writers. Literary artists have always possessed the ability to make out the personality of a person behind his/her appearance, and to convey their inner essence via the external manifestations. Let us emphasize that they conveyed the true, not a seeming personality. Any scientific classification of appearances and temperaments easily matches those in literary fiction, let alone the personality types which any classical work brightly represents. Undoubtedly, there can be no discussion of human integrity without psychology.

Let make a summary. We deem the following judgment to be deeply true: not every great psychologist can become a writer, but every great writer is a great psychologist. Self-actualization in the psychological sense is so important for the reader, that we can single it out as a special level of the perception of a work. Jung’s observation is relevant here: “literary products of highly dubious merit” are of greater interest to the psychologist than outstanding psychological novels. “Considered as a self-contained whole, such a novel explains itself. It has done its own work of psychological interpretation...”¹. In such fictional works the psychologist’s job has been done, they are originally built on a psychological design. This design can be interesting even in itself.

Fourthly, let us stress the properly artistic level. It is important here to perceive all the richness of the content through stylistic mastery. Besides, the reader’s aesthetic education lets them see all the levels. And the ability to see them provides an opportunity to adequately evaluate the artistic quality of literary fiction.

It is quite probable that we might identify some other levels in the perception of a work. But we have attempted to outline the major ones.

The theory of literary fiction that we have discussed allows for considering the perceiving consciousness as co-creative, i.e., to regard the reader as a “passive” writer. (A writer, in a certain sense, is the first “reader” of his/her own works, and an “active” reader. The mechanism of an aesthetic perception of a fictional work is identical in these cases anyway.)

If we take this into account, many paradoxes in the perception of fiction by “mass” readers, broad public, will become clear. The elitist concepts of art only recorded this evident fact that a fictional work can be fully perceived only by the connoisseurs and devotees of art. Ideally, by its creators. Much less attention has been paid to the mechanisms of “co-creative empathy”. The theory of a fictional work as an artistic whole gives a possibility to stress these important moments in this context.

What happens to a spiritually and aesthetically undeveloped consciousness, when it perceives the fictional works of the highest classical level?

When routine consciousness perceives a philosophically arranged spiritual content, the former strives, at first, to simplify the latter to the maximum.

Such readers see an “imprint” of life in the fictional work, life as it is, an anonymous analogy of life. They actively sympathize with the hero, feel compassion for him/her, and treat the described events as if they had taken place in reality. The reader communicates with a character, but not with the author. It means that the reader primarily comprehends the plot and a strongly pronounced emotional-evaluative attitude (i.e., psychological and ideological implications of the imagery). The composition, the complexity of plot structure, the subtle and polysemantic details, sophisticated figural and expressive language means – in a word, all those levels, which “litter” the plot and the author’s direct attitude and by this “interfere” with the enjoyment of the work – all these aspects are merely reduced. The moment of empathy completely pushes out the moment of co-creation. It is not surprising by any means that detective or melodramatic read has ever been more preferable to the mass consumers than serious literature. The latter kind of fiction is never an entertainment, nor elementary psychotherapy, but a complex and ambivalent act of self-actualization, intense work of reflective consciousness, and, at last, a mode of spiritual production. The more developed the reader’s personality is (including, in the aesthetic sense), the more they appreciate the moment of co-creation. In such a case, the layers of detail and formal-linguistic means will never eschew attention. Vice versa: the information located on these levels, “hidden” from an idle view, becomes the most vital.

The statement that reads that “in any writer there lives a reader, and in any reader – a writer” can be brought to the edge of paradox: a reader may even be more gifted as an artist than a writer. There is only one difference between them: the reader is deprived of the semiotic ability to convey, within a certain sign system, the self-created inner world. With the view of the above, the following thought would not seem so paradoxical: ingenious writers exist, because of the existence of ingenious readers. Such readers and writers – if not equal – they are quite comparable in the scales of personality. “Co-creative empathy” is a privilege of artistically gifted natures, personalities, who, among other things, have adopted an aesthetic school. Only learning, unfortunately, is not enough to mold a “literate” reader. Therefore, such notions as the “reading elite” and “mass readers”, “classics” and “mass literature” (the read), “the writer” and “the author of books” should not be regarded as the fruit of a snobbish attitude to art, an invention of the “aristocrats” of the arts.

Let us remark, however, that the named categories of readers and fictional works are not divided by an impassable chasm, they intercommunicate. The border line between them can sometimes become relative. Spiritual upswings are often the result of the desire to break free from the bog of vulgarity, mean taste, the desire to overcome life’s and man’s imperfection and to find a worthy course. We must
“thank” poor literature even for being the factor of the appearance of good literature. “I wish you were aware from what stray matter springs poetry to prosper without shame” (A.A. Akhmatova) – this looks very close to the truth. Aesthetic snobbery (even the playful literature) and aesthetic primitivism (the read) are the two sides of one medal. The absolutization of either one of them testifies to the loss of human integrity.

Approaching a fictional work as a systematically arranged hierarchical structure will evidently enable an extensive explanation of both the common patterns of the reader’s perception and the historical-functional side of the existence of literary fiction. Sartre’s idea that “we read a novel, and the novel reads us” is perfectly reasonable. A fictional work always presupposes the presence of a reader, it is meant to exercise an impact on a different personal consciousness. In certain cases literature is capable of greatly influencing both individual and social consciousness. However, the issues of a pragmatic influence of literature on personality, on the shaping of social consciousness present a secondary task for literary scholars, they are to be addressed by psychologists, pedagogues, sociologists, etc.

Why are some people talented and even of genius, and others are mediocre? Can one develop the reading talent or is it inborn? Is everyone capable of becoming a personality? Why do we have so few personalities, and what is to be done to increase their number? And it is worth striving for that? What is the role of works of art in the spiritual making of a personality, a nation, and humanity?

These and similar questions are outside the competence of literary studies. Here is the lower “threshold” of the subject of study for a literary scholar. The “Sociology of literature” is not so much about literary studies, but rather a properly sociological discipline.
9. PSYCHOLOGISM IN LITERATURE

Interest in man’s psychic life, in other words, psychologism (in a broadest sense) has always been a feature of literature. This is quite natural. The psychological (psychic) is one of the levels of personality, and the study thereof, bypassing it, is simply impossible. Everything related to the ways of manifestation and realization of personality is always connected with the psychological.

What is the concrete meaning, nevertheless, of psychologism in fiction?

Psychologism in literature can have at least three different aspects, depending on what we have as the object of study: the psychology of the author, the character or the reader.

Let us explain it straight away. Art cannot be considered as a section of psychology. Therefore “…only that aspect of art which consists in the process of artistic creation can be a subject for psychological study, but not that which constitutes its essential nature. The question of what art is in itself can never be answered by the psychologist, but must be approached from the side of aesthetics”¹. Psychology of creative art and psychology of the reception of art are excluded from the scope of the analysis. We shall focus on the “psychology of a character” to the extent it will constitute “art’s proper essence”. Psychologism can not be the analysis of a fictional work. It is the analysis of the psychological aspect, not spiritual. We consider neither the technology of the creative process nor the technology of its reception (repression of the unconscious, its break-through, the impact of the unconscious on consciousness, the transition of one into the other, et al.).The result will be something which has spiritual value, something created by the laws of beauty. We are interested in the psychology of a character as a way of conveying spirituality in literature, in the fusion and conversion from the psychological into the aesthetic structure.

Thus, psychologism in literature is the study of the characters’ psychic life in its profound contradictions, which becomes the structure of the character.

The existence of such terms as a “psychological novel” and “psychological prose” calls for more precision in the definition of the notion of psychologism in literature. Actually, the terms mentioned have been long adopted in literary studies to be applied to the classical literary fiction of the 19th -20th centuries. (Flaubert, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Proust, et al.). Does that mean that psychologism appeared only in the 19th century, and before that it had not been the property of literature?

We need to repeat once again: literature has always been interested in the inner life of a person. However, the scope of psychologization of literature was unprecedented just in the 19th century, and the main thing was that the quality of the realistic psychological prose was drastically different from all the preceding literature.

As we see, interest in the inner life and psychologism are the concepts which are far from identical.

Realism as a method brought about a new and totally unusual structure of a character. Briefly, the pre-realistic evolution in the structure of a fictional character may be described in the following way. Let us start from the statement that the process of transfer of the personality concept from life into literature has always taken place (and the reverse process as well). However, in different epochs the correlation between art and reality was viewed differently, and different principles of aesthetic personality modeling were available. Pre-realistic principles of personality modeling inevitably distorted and simplified reality. Historically different forms of building characters are, if you prefer, different principles of distorting reality in correspondence with the prevailing world perception, and it is always some kind of absolutization of a certain property and quality. The search for a model of a personality which would combine opposite qualities in a contradictory being led to realism.

Archaic and folklore literature, like folk comedies, first created a character-mask. The mask had a permanent fictional role to play, and even a permanent function in the plot structure. The mask was a symbol of a particular quality, and this structure of a character did not help to examine this quality per se. To compete the task in hand, a different structure of a character was necessary, and that happened to be a type. So then the time for the type came. Classicism crystallized what could be called a “socio-moral type” (L.Ya. Ginzburg). Tartuffe’s hypocrisy, Harpagon’s stinginess (The Miser, “L’Avare” by Molière) are morality-related qualities. The Bourgeois Gentleman (“Le Bourgeois gentilhomme”) is vain. But in this comedy the social attribute overshadows the moral one, which is reflected in the title. Thus, the key principle of typification in the comedy is the prevalence of a socio-moral quality. This principle – with the dominance of one of the two beginnings – was fruitfully employed in literature throughout centuries, including the period of early realism. We can find socio-moral types even in Gogol, Balzac and Dickens. Gogol puts the moral aspect of his types into the foreground (Gogol’s types are: Nozdryov, Khlestakov, Sobakevich, Manilov, et al.), and Balzac foregrounds social types (Goriot, Rastignac, et al.).

Let us stress this: in relative, pre-realistic systems, personality is not represented through character (this notion is not yet the property of literature), but through a set of monodirectional attributes, or even through one such attribute. The type paved a direct way to character. Character (here we use this term not as a psychological notion, but as a literary term: cf. Section 3) did not discard the type, it was built on its basis. Character always begins where there are several types combined simultaneously. At that, the “basic type” within character is not washed out to the amorphous state (it is always seen through character), however, it is sharply complicated by other “typical” qualities. Character, as a result, is a set of
multidirectional attributes acting with the tangible organizing dominance of one of them. Sometimes it is difficult to discover the facet behind which a type ends and character begins. In Oblomov, for example, the principle of socio-moral typification is very salient. Oblomov’s laziness is the laziness of landed gentry; oblomovism is a socio-moral notion. Stoltz’ energy is a quality of a German-intellectual. Turgenev’s characters represent the reflective liberal nobility, intellectuals are much closer to character than types. Character, as we remember, is a social registration of personality, an external shell, but not the personality itself. Character shapes personality, and at this, it is shaped by it. Character is now an individual combination of psychological attributes. The developed multidimensional characters required psychologism to be realized.

There is a chain of interconnected concepts: character – psychologism – realism.

The characters of Classicism were very well aware of the contradictions of psychic life. The contradictions between duty and passion determined the intensity of the inner life of the classical tragedies characters. However, the hesitations between duty and passion did not take the position of psychologism in the contemporary understanding of this term. The “binary” principle of spiritual contradictions has a “formal, logical basis” (L.Ya. Ginzburg). Passion and duty are divided and are mutually impenetrable. Duty is studied as duty, passion – as passion. Their speculative contrasting determined the rational means of studying. The rational poetics has a rational approach to psychic life as well. “Binarity” did not become the “unity of opposites”, and the formal did not become dialectical. A person, understood rationally, was not an integral personality. To achieve this integrity, the formal-logical determinism of contradictions was to be replaced by the dynamic, dialectical logic. It would be more proper to view psychologism as a study of the dialectics of psychic life determined by the dialectics of spiritual life. Without dialectics, there may be interest in psychological life, but there is no “psychologism” in its specific meaning adopted by literary studies.

Thus, psychologism is connected in the first place with the multidimensionality of character, which is molded simultaneously by nature, environment and personality. This was made possible and necessary due to the following reasons. Realism, as was mentioned above, grew out of the pathos that explained life, of the conviction that the real, earthly and comprehensible determinacy of a character’s behavior exists. The very determinacy of behavior by the bodily-psychological and spiritual-social poles became to a great extent the subject matter in Realism. The apex of Realism is, namely, the work of L.N. Tolstoy. It may be considered as an encyclopedia of the psychological life of the people of various social strata and life orientation: psychological gestures (internal and external), the psychology of verbal behavior. It was Tolstoy who “brought the realistic determinacy ad maximum both in its broadest socio-historical outline and in the micro-analysis of the minutest impressions and
impulses”\(^1\). It means that personality, as it was interpreted by a psychological novel, now consisted of not one, but several features which determined behavior. Personality depends on a great number of factors at the same time. Man is overrun by the “jumble” of thoughts and feelings, which is, according to Chekhov’s heroine, “as difficult to unravel as to count a flock of sparrows rapidly flying by” (A Misfortune).

Man’s behavior is inexplicable (read: mysterious). To solve this mystery, we have to establish the subordination of man’s behavior to numerous motives and motivations which are often incomprehensible even to himself\(^2\). Man’s activity becomes poly-motivated. And then we are faced with an absolutely original personality concept. At first intuitively, and later (like in Tolstoy) largely consciously, the writers start to distinguish three levels in a person, which we have discussed in Section 3: the bodily level, which is the sphere of primary biological drives; the psychic level, the psychological one, closely connected with social values, and with the rules of life; the spiritual level, which is genuinely human, depending on the two first levels, but nevertheless, free and even preconditioning the two first ones. Tolstoy’s famous “dialectics of the soul”, “the fluidity of consciousness” is but criss-crossing of the motives from different spheres. And the criss-crossing of the motives and their struggle are possible due to the fact that “psychological prose” had discovered the mechanisms of the genesis and functioning of various behavior motives long before psychology did it. The prose found out that behavior is defined not by consciousness alone, but also by subconsciousness, the unconscious. In pre-realistic literature a motive and an action were directly and unambiguously associated: a deceiver lies, a villain weaves intrigues, the righteous one is crystal clear in thought and action. In the focus of psychological analysis are the contradictions between one motive and another, a motive and an action, incongruity between behavior and the wishes and desires. Psychological analysis was aimed at unveiling the infinitely differentiated determinacy of behavior. Nowadays science is also actively engaged in the study of the hierarchy of motives and suggests different “principles of scaling motives”\(^3\).

However, it is not the psychological mechanism as such, as a final goal, that was in the focus of realistic prose. It just helped to set moral and spiritual problems and to solve them in a new form. (Besides, it is curious to note this common pattern: the greatest psychologists of the 20\(^{th}\) century– Freud, Fromm, Jung, Frankl, et al. – came to philosophy not accidentally. They established the dependence of psychology on the “frames of orientation and devotion”. Frankl even founded a new direction in science – logotherapy which aim is to cure intrinsically psychic diseases by the spiritual kind of therapy. A new understanding of man and a new attitude to him as a character rather than a type, as a multilevel personality radically changed the poetics of

---


\(^3\) Ibid. p. 203.
psychological prose). A principal sign of a socio-moral type is a quality, a result of the external perception of a person. A categorical formula for the types is an outside perspective. However, what looks like a quality or an action from the outside, is a process, or a motive from the inside. Psychological analysis replaced the depiction from the outside by the depiction from the inside. “The (nineteenth-century novel – A.A.)... set up the apparatus of psychological analysis on the inside, so to speak, in order to see the spiritual phenomena exactly as they would appear to the person himself in the process of his own self-observation. Depiction from within (in conjunction with the new principle of conditionality) changed the ethical status of the novel, and not merely because analysis replaced evil, but because good and evil no longer appeared in pure form. Instead, they were seen as deriving from a variety of different sources set in motion by a variety of different motives”¹. Tolstoy began to show evil thoughts of good people, and good thoughts of bad people. The moral qualities of a person turned out to be not the properties given once and forever, but a dynamic process. Evil in Tolstoy turns into good only by conquering evil, and withstanding it. Without evil, the existence of good appeared inconceivable. The unity of opposites in Tolstoy really became the source of inner development, of the characters’ spiritual growth. Such an approach allows for a comprehensive explanation of the entire person in principle. Man found out he could turn his weakness into a strength, and a strength into a weakness. The principles of a contradictory determinacy of a character’s behavior examined through the lens of psychologism started to show an infinite complexity behind the superficial simplicity.

We shall attempt to mark the dominant behavior principles of one the most complex of Tolstoy’s characters, Pierre Bezukhov. These principles can briefly be outlined in this way: the search for the universal truth, for one common source that would explain all the facts, all the ungraspable phenomena of being, the search for the sole comprehensive sense which would be deduced from reality by a real person. Bezukhov’s task is so “simple” (a drop!) that it engages us in the study of the ocean (war and peace). On a side note, the image of a drop and the globe-ocean, which reveals the interconnection of all and everything most organically, is explicit in Tolstoy's novel.

A wholeness reflected manifold is Pyotr Kirillovich’s direction of movement. There is no end on this way, as there is actually no beginning. The novel demonstrates human integrity (the unity of the rational and the irrational in man) in numerous variants. Practically, we have the entire spectrum from the rational pole (German generals, Napoleon, the old prince Nikolai Andreyevich Bolkonsky, and Andrei Bolkonsky) to a gradual transition to the irrational and intuitive pole (Kutuzov, Princess Maria, Nikolai Rostov, Platon Karataev). The climactic, harmonious element, balancing the two poles, is represented by Bezukhov (male variant) and Natasha Rostova (female variant). The choice of the names only marks the tendency

of course, but never exhaustively involves all the characters of the novel, of this or that plane. Human wholeness penetrates through the wholeness of a different order: the wholeness of family, city, nation, humanity (the world). How could Bezukhov (together with the narrator and Tolstoy himself) solve this problem of biblical complexity?

Bezukhov found the only thing that could help build the worldview, he discovered a methodology. “The hardest thing” (Pierre thought or heard in his dream) “is to know how to unite in one's soul the significance of the whole. To unite the whole?” Pierre said to himself. “No, not to unite. One cannot unite one's thoughts, but to harness together all those ideas, that's what's wanted. Yes, one must harness together, harness together,” Pierre repeated to himself with a thrill of ecstasy, feeling that those words, and only those words, expressed what he wanted to express, and solved the whole problem fretting him”. To harness together means seeing the mediated linkage of all and everything in this world. To harness together means thinking dialectically. This is the reason why Tolstoy needed a personality in history and history in a personality. War and Peace contains the unity of opposites and wholeness already in its title. The novel’s title is the shortest formula of reality. According to Tolstoy, it is a hard way full of dramas and tragedies that leads to the heroic-idyllic harmony. If we imagine Tolstoy’s task which was dictated by a new vision of man, it becomes clear that psychologism cannot be interpreted only as a new inventory of poetic means. First, Psychologism became a new philosophy of man, his worldview and moral structure, and only afterwards – the aesthetic one. The “thought experience” becomes Bezukhov's pivotal point. The motives from different spheres are subjected to the spiritual demands of a free personality. Literature has not betrayed itself: it still exhibits its interest in personal problematics. But within the dynamic structure, a personality appeared as fluid, carrying both good and evil.

Discussing psychologism in literature, it is impossible, briefly as it may be, to touch upon Dostoyevsky's work. It seems to contradict in many ways what we have said about the essence of psychologism. Not specifying the genesis of Dostoyevsky’s “novel of ideas”, we shall only note that types and characters did not make its basis. Dostoyevsky was known to have renounced social determinism. According to Dostoyevsky, the environment could never “eat out” the essence of man. The personalities of the writer’s personages are not shaped by character, and character depends little on the circumstances. Personality in Dostoyevsky is ultimately autonomous, independent from the environment. The writer’s psychologism did not unveil the connections between personality – character – circumstances, but directly disclosed the nucleus of personality. For Dostoyevsky, the precursor of Modernism, the main thing was metaphysical understanding of the freedom of will. A character’s
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behavior was directly governed by the idea. “Existential dichotomies”, using Fromm’s words, constitute the basic complex of Dostoyevsky’s characters’ ideas. The conditions that determine a person’s behavior, reside neither in the biological nor in the socio-psychological sphere, though his characters also inhabit this context. He took down all the coverings from personality, those of social connections, kinship, psycho-physiological aspects – to get to the very core of personality. A thought, an intellectual product, for Dostoyevsky's heroes turns into an idea, which, unlike the thoughts, is fraught with the impulse of the will triggering action. This is why all the events in ideological novels are conditioned by ideas. A question arises: should we consider Dostoyevsky's novels of ideas as psychological novels in the sense we speak about Tolstoy’s novels?

Dostoyevsky's characters-ideas, characters-symbols are dramatically different from Tolstoy’s “flesh and blood” characters. In any case, without writing the characters into the environment, without deducing the personality features from the environment, Dostoyevsky equipped his novels with a most perfect “psychological technique”. Man’s simultaneous and divergent drives – via subconsciousness – govern the characters’ behavior. “The dialectics of ideas” in Dostoyevsky’s novels is realized through the psychological structure of the characters. This was the factor that built the concrete-historical side of the writer’s method¹.

Let us makes some preliminary conclusions.

1. Psychologism is not merely emotions (of any intensity), but the world perception that will inevitably be transformed into the worldview (or the primary stage of the worldview: the world comprehension). The psychic is bound to grow into the spiritual, which is made in accordance with the laws of beauty: such is the mode of the classic triad Beauty-Goodness-Truth.

2. In this context, psychologism is not merely an emotional aspect, but the aesthetic structure of a character.

3. Psychologism comes to life where there are deep contradictions of psychic life – contradictions between the mind (which helps to shape the worldview and to systematically arrange the world of ideas) and the soul (for which, the world perception is the same as “the worldview”), between the two types of managing information. It is these contradictions that are the generic feature of psychologism.

Undoubtedly, psychologism is only possible where there is a contradiction, – but a contradiction, as we have already mentioned, of a specific kind, woven out not of the opposition of the “psychic moments” (within the frame of a single psychic field and “composition”), but out of the dialectical unity and struggle of consciousness and subconsciousness as two different human dimensions, two different heterogeneous informational layers – between culture and nature, generally speaking, for the human
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spiritual (cultural) possibilities contradict man’s natural determinacy (by the natural environment).

This is not the whole matter, however. A contradiction itself between the two components of spirituality, cultural and natural, does not yet generate psychologism, it does not reveal its main function – the function which transforms the multifaceted emotion into psychologism. Psychologism as a literary aesthetic and spiritual phenomenon (not merely psychic) emerges and lives on where the contradictions between “the heart” and “the mind” indicate a great spiritual problem. Psychologism is such a mode of the existence of the frame of soul, which corresponds to the deep-lying frame of mind. Psychologism is the soil which cultivates what is well-known not the psychological, but conceptual matter. Psychologism is made not merely out of emotions and excitement, but the feelings of such kind that result in a different worldview or generate the presence of a “new” person within the “old” and well-known one. Psychologism becomes the tool for identifying the hidden link between an action and its cause, a mode of uncovering the hidden working of consciousness. And this hidden working of consciousness is indeed the secret weapon of the psyche, the wisdom of the soul. In this context psychologism becomes a tool of transforming a person into a personality.

Such association of psychologism as a system of functions and the worldview and spiritual problematics, as well as the structure of character, sharply restricts the presence of psychologism in literature. Interest in the soul, its endless whims, emotional disturbances and fluctuations has always been a feature of literature, from the very moment of its emergence. In fact, the movements of the soul which are recorded by means of reason, have been the proper internal plot of fiction. Psychologism however, is not merely a psychic turmoil, but a different quality of emotion which reveals a different quality of spirituality. What is hidden behind this common pattern?

Psychologism in European literature appeared only at the moment of transition from the sociocentric ideals, from the worldview prioritizing the social – to personacentrism, or to such kind of worldview, where the ideological focus was not on the social interest with its depersonalizing authoritarian morality, but on a personality. Psychologism mirrors a person’s readiness and possibility to turn from the character that does not reflect (or reflects in a metaphysical and doctrinaire manner), from an “iron” character (a function of the socium) – into a reflective personality, to feel for and discover a new type of harmony – humanistic harmony (replacing the heroic).

Such a spiritual way and process are very much saturated with the dialectics – the dialectics of the mind; and only in connection with it, and only in the second place— with the dialectics of the soul. The dialectics of the soul by itself (moving around the soul circle, with no attempts at breaking through into the area of consciousness) is cheep psychologism representing its primary and undeveloped forms.
As a result, psychologism is a tool, a method for introducing a specific humanistic system of values which attracts any reasonably (and intellectually) progressive personality.

Let us note that psychologism and *psychological analysis* are the notions, if not identical, but concurrent to a large extent. Analysis, aiming at the discovery of a hierarchical order of values, is the overarching goal of any kind of psychologism. This is an enlightenment, a clearing of the soul’s darkness, which occurs, certainly, with the help of the mind. Psychologism, as paradoxical as it may seem, is ultimately connected with the mind; without it, the movement of the soul takes place, but psychologism is absent.

The lyric is surely less subjected to demonstrating psychologism, though its proper purpose is the exploration of a person’s “psychological states”. Lyric’s feature is meditativeness, it is focused on the soul’s states, and due to this, it is psychologically insufficient.

Prose – analytic, psychological prose – is the most promising field of applying psychologism in literature. Besides, it is the prose of the past two centuries, the 19th and the 20th, and predominantly realistic prose. It is quite understandable: it was Realism that saw in a person convergent and interdependent natural layers (the body, the soul) and the cultural one (the soul, the spirit). Psychologism has consequently become the mode of implementation of the realistic potential, a method of representing a new structure of a personage – *character*. Character in literature acquires the status of a form of personality manifestation. Mature realism is unthinkable without psychologism, which speaks for the humanistic orientation of realism as the most advanced of all the artistic-informational systems mastered by mankind.

It is important to note that Tolstoy’s work did not mark the end of psychologism (neither did it mark its beginning). Because psychologism is only an intermediary that actualizes the direct linkage and feedback between the “systems of orientation” and behavior, the changes in the worldview have an immediate impact on the type of psychologism. Intellectual psychologism of M. Proust, Joyce, the attempts at making the world look “absurd” and dissolve a human being in it have significantly altered the face of psychologism. The psychological process as such starts to attract literary artists in the 20th century. Man’s spiritual quest shifts to the background, if not still more behind. It is striking that only by the mid 20th century humanistic “philosophical psychology” was able to coherently explain what Tolstoy had grasped in the mid 19th century. Tolstoy’s overwhelming discoveries are surprisingly contemporary. Leaving aside his aesthetic program, we shall observe that the 20th century exacerbated and sublimated such discoveries of Tolstoy’s, as the phenomenon of the inference and the irrational interior monologue. However, man’s dialectical wholeness was thus lost.

Postmodernism, with its specialization in a modest spectrum of ironic perceptions of the world, with its apparent decreased interest in personality (for a personality is an
organized hierarchical system of values, priority of the worldview over the world perception) lost interest in psychologism, too – understood here not as a device, nor as a stylistic shade, but as an artistic typification strategy, which results in the creation of a worldview-marked character. In postmodernism, with its cult of the world perception, which contemptuously and ironically dominates over the worldview, it was not personality to which “spiritual strategies” were applied, but an “unconsciously reflective” person, i.e., an unthinking person. In the cultural (not stylistic) sense, it is an obvious step backwards.

As a result, psychologism as a serious cultural achievement of literature becomes an original index of the level of artistry (however, it does not guarantee this). The paradigm “culture, personacentrism, personality, realism, the mind, the worldview, psychologism” points at the cultural value and artistic potential of psychologism.

Having explained our interpretation of the essence of psychologism in literature, we shall now address the issue of the forms and means of conveying it. A type of psychologism is a way of realization if the ethical and, on a broader scale, the worldview-related program. It follows that a psychological mechanism which realizes ethical norms and ideals is definitely a characteristic feature of the method. This psychological mechanism appears to be the principle that determines a character’s behavior. But the means of conveying a specific psychological mechanism refer to the level of style. This is the thread which connects the method to the style, and the psychological structure of a character turns out to be, on the one hand, an ethical (in terms of the content), and on the other – an aesthetic structure (in terms of formalizing this content). The major stylistic levels, the vehicles of psychologism, are, first of all, speech and detail, which convey the character’s state (including that of the narrator and the story-teller), as well as the plot, reflecting the behavior and actions.

It seems possible to make a typology of the forms of psychological analysis based on different initial grounds. We distinguish two basic forms of psychological analysis: “explicit psychologism” and “implicit psychologism”. (The terminology here, as it were, can vary. We follow the conventions of the Russian philological school.) Explicit psychologism is that very “verbal psychologism”. Where else, if not in the characters’ speech, can the deep psychological processes find the most adequate expression? The main forms of characters’ speech were mentioned in Section 7. Implicit psychologism mainly conveys the inner states of characters through detail. Oftentimes, these two types of psychologism follow the complementarity principle in their combinations: characters cannot either think and speak, or only act in silence.

That said, it seems appropriate to outline a system of terms which are related to psychologism in literature.

Psychologism, in the broad sense, is a study of the interaction between the psyche and consciousness; in a more narrow understanding, psychologism is a system
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of functions which connect the two types of managing information and make them mutually interdependent: psychologism emerges where and when the unconscious aspires for self-identification through consciousness, and the world perception tries to find an embodiment in the form of the worldview.

Psychologism, understood in this way, is realized, or finds an embodiment, with the help of *psychological analysis*, which, in terms of content, becomes the feature of the method (an artistic typification strategy), an in terms of style – a mode of conveying the process, which we can call the “transformation of the world perception into the worldview”. This interpretation allows referring psychological analysis directly to the *structure of a character (or character)*.

As far as the *modes of psychological analysis* are concerned, such as, for example, the *direct mode* (open, “explicit”) or *indirect “implicit”*), they are directly connected to the *means of psychological analysis* (detail, speech, et al.).

There are, by all means, different modes of psychological analysis which can be defined with the term a *type of psychologism*. The typology of the modes of psychological analysis is not sufficiently worked out: perhaps, to develop such a typology, new terms might be needed, such as *psychological representation* (as different from analysis proper), psychological description, psychological dynamics, etc.

**10. THE NATIONAL AS A FACTOR OF ARTISTRY IN LITERATURE**

In order to single out the national, its functions and modes of representation in a fictional work, it is necessary, first of all, to decide what we shall mean by the national, and, secondly, how we shall understand the work and its nature. The first task mentioned has received enough consideration to enable our discussion of the second one. To begin with, it is necessary to note that the category of the national, as not an aesthetic category in a proper sense, must be explored in several planes. It is vital to concentrate on those which can be directly associated with the fictional work. The subject of our study is not the national so much *per se*, but the national as a content-related and formal side of a fictional work. The issues of the national in literature should also be considered with a view of the specific character of the aesthetic as a form of social consciousness. The national *per se* is not a form of social consciousness (and, consequently, of the individual consciousness). The national is a specific property of the psyche and consciousness, which “colors” all the forms of social consciousness. The very fact of a person possessing the psyche and consciousness is, by all means, extra-national. The ability of creative and scientific thinking is also extra-national. However, a fictional world produced by creative thinking can have prominent national features. **Why?**

The national distinctiveness is composed from socio-cultural and moral-psychological features (the commonality of labor processes and skills, traditions, and,
further, social life in all its forms: aesthetic, moral-religious, political, legal, et al.), which are established on the basis of natural/climatic and biological factors (common territory, natural conditions, ethnic peculiarities, et al.). All this leads to the formation of the national characteristics of people’s life, to the creation of an a national mentality (the unity of the whole complex of the natural/genetic and spiritual qualities). National characters are thus formed historically (as well as holistic formations).

**What are the ways for their representation in literature?**

It is via an image-based personality concept. Personality, being an individual manifestation of human spirituality in general, acquires individuality to a large extent as a national characteristic. National distinctiveness, not being a form of social consciousness, is primarily an adaptive psychological phenomenon. This is a mode and instrument of man’s adaptation to nature, of a personality to society. Considering this fact, imagery and an image-based personality concept have become the most adequate form of representation of the national. The nature of imagery and the nature of the national resonate in a way: both are perceived mostly sensually and represent holistic formations. Moreover: the existence of the national is only and exclusively possible in a figurative form. Concepts are in no need of national specifics.

**Which part in the structure of a fictional image refers exactly to the content, and which – to the material medium of the subtle national spirit?**

Or, in other words: what do national meanings stand for, and what are the means of their representation?

The material for molding the “spirit”, i.e., the inventory of poetic figurative means, has been borrowed from the environment. To be “registered” in the world, to humanize it, a necessity sprang up to inhabit it via mythology with gods which were often represented as anthropomorphic creatures. At this, the mythological material, depending on the type of civilization which was being formed – agricultural, stock-raising, maritime, et al. – also varied. An image might be mimicked only from the reality of the surrounding world (flora, fauna, nonliving matter). Man was surrounded by the moon, the sun, water, bears, snakes, birch-trees, et al. All the images in the great-artistic mythological thinking were overgrown with specific symbolic planes, speaking volumes to one particular ethnic group, and almost devoid of informational meaning to another. That was the way a certain national picture of the world and national vision were created. The holistic unity of principles of organization of the national material backed by some dominants characteristic of national life we can call a national-artistic style of thinking. The formation of such a style was accompanied by the crystallization of literary traditions. Later on, when the aesthetic consciousness attained highly developed forms, national mentality, for its own reproduction in the literary-artistic form, was in need of some specific representational and expressive means: a circle of themes, characters, genres, plots, chronotopes, cultural details, language means, et al.
However, the specifics of the imagery texture alone cannot be the core of the national meaning. The national, which is also a feature of individual consciousness, is but a form of the “collective unconscious” (C.G. Jung.). We believe that Jung in his concept of the “collective unconscious” and its “archetypes” was maximally close to the concept which can help elucidate the problem of the national meaning in a fictional work. Quoting the words of G. Hauptmann, "Poetry evokes out of words the resonance of the primordial word", Jung writes: “The question we should ask therefore, is: "What primordial image lies behind the imagery of art?"\[^1\] If we, as literary scholars, are interested in the national in fiction, our question is certain to be put in the same way, with one obligatory addition, however: what is the artistic structure of this image? Our addition shifts the focus though: we do not take an interest in the collective unconscious so much, but rather in the artistic expression of the meaning. We are interested in the connection between the type of artistry and the sense which is hidden in the collective unconscious. An image grows out of the psychological depths (we shall not dig into the most complex problematics of the psychology of artistic creation). It (an image) therefore requires a relevant “apparatus” of perception, appeals to the “depths of the soul”, to the unconscious layers of the human psyche. And besides, to the collective rather than the personal unconscious. Jung strictly delimits these two spheres of the unconscious in man. The collective unconscious is based on a prototype, or “archetype”. It makes the basis for typical situations, actions, ideals, mythological figures. An archetype is a kind of invariant of emotions which are represented in particular variants. An archetype is a groundwork, matrix, a general outline of emotions repeated within the endless range of predecessors. This is why we so easily respond to the archetypes we experience, the voice of the race is born in us, the voice of the entire humanity. And this voice which makes us part of the collective paradigm, gives utter confidence to a literary artist and the reader. Whoever speaks in archetypes, speaks with “a thousand of voices” (Jung). Ultimately, an archetype presents an individual image of universal human emotions. It is quite natural that the collective unconscious, in the scope of its resonance, goes far beyond the national frames in the literary masterpieces. These fictional works resonate with the spirit of the whole epoch.

This constitutes one more, psychological, side of the impact of arts on society. Here, perhaps, it would be appropriate to quote Jung, thus exemplifying the way an archetype can be linked to the national. “And what is Faust? Faust is (...) the expression of something profoundly alive in the soul of every German, which Goethe helped to bring to birth. Could we conceive of anyone but a German writing Faust or Thus Spake Zarathustra? Both of them strike a chord that vibrates in the German psyche, evoking a "primordial image," as Burckhardt once called it – the figure of a healer or teacher of mankind, or of a wizard. It is the archetype of the Wise Old Man, the helper and redeemer, but also of the magician, deceiver, corrupter, and tempter.

This image has lain buried and dormant in the unconscious since the dawn of history; it is awakened whenever the times are out of joint and a great error deflects society from the right path”\(^1\). Developed nations that posses developed literature and culture, also possess the inventory of figurative means which is infinitely enriched, gets more sophisticated, internationalized, preserving, nevertheless, recognizable national codes (mainly of the sensual-psychological origin). It is easy to provide more examples. In the Russian literature of the 19\(^{th}\) century, the figure of a “superfluous” person, a contemplator, who does not see a way out either from the contradictions of the epoch or from the contradictions of human nature – is one of the major archetypes. Another example: the genesis of the fictional characters, the brothers Karamazov, is rooted in the folk tales. One more example: L.N. Tolstoy’s concept of in *War and Peace* is, in fact, a national concept of a defense war, represented in the Russian war tales of the 13\(^{th}\)-17\(^{th}\) centuries. And Napoleon (in Tolstoy) is a typical invader, the type borrowed from those tales.

To conclude: the core of practically any fictional character, not just an individual character, but a national one as well, is a socio-moral type (a miser, a hypocrite, et al.), and even a mask, which lays a foundation for a type. Behind even a most complex and original combination of psychological qualities, there is always a national variant of a common human type to be discerned. It is not surprising therefore that the simplest mythological or fairy-tale motifs can be “echoed” in the most complicated artistic-philosophical canvases of the contemporary period.

Let us discuss now the hottest issue of the national identification of literary fiction. The relatively independent issues in a literary work may be mentality, and the imagery that expresses it (internal form), and the language which gives shape to imagery (external form). (This thesis statement, by the way, lies behind the principles and schools of fiction translation: some schools are inclined towards a maximally precise conveyance of the “spirit”, the mentality, of the original; and others try to scrupulously convey the original “letter for letter”, be precise with its language.) The autonomy of mentality in the imagery is well observed, for example, in Tolstoy’s *Hadji Murad*. Mentality, as we can see, can be expressed not just by means of using one’s “native” material, but also through a relevant interpretation of the foreign national material. It is made possible, because any exotic material is conveyed by means of detail; the details are sorted out, arranged and evaluated by the subject of narration from his/her national perspective and in their national language.

However, these cases are quite rare. It is a more frequent case, when the mentality and imagery are inseparably conjoined. In their unity, they may “peel off” from the language, demonstrating their relative independence. This is hard to dispute. There are such literatures as Anglophone, Hispanic, Germanic, Francophone, Russian – the literatures of different peoples and nations in the same language. On the other
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hand, national mentality can be expressed in different languages. Finally, there are literary works, for example, by Nabokov, which are difficult to identify on a national basis, as they are devoid of any palpable national ideology.

We can afford a short digression. The independence of the material and language may have rather curious aspects. Any original, or even unique national material, harbors artistic potential in itself. Moreover, this potential is ever different. Because imagery demands individual expressiveness, some original material has self-value, i.e., in a sense, inherent worth. For this reason, as a matrix for the future type of artistry, different national material is not of the same value: on account of different artistic tasks, the material, if we can say so, can be of more or less profit. The richness of the national life and history, different aspects of the national character, the treasure of the literary language – all this cannot fail to influence literature. The material, however, should be in demand, and only an individual literary artist imparts it with the qualities of artistry.

As for the language, we shall refer to one curious circumstance. A famous Rumanian literary scholar, A. Dima, gives a general opinion of French scholars about the problems of translating Shakespeare into French: they “spoke about the “metaphysical difficulties” of translation (...), and meanwhile, they noted the “profound differences of the ontological nature between the French and English languages”. English, they think, “underlines specific, singular, individual aspects, radiating with a peculiar “poetic luster”; French conveys more essential, general, rational aspects, less poetic ones, which makes the translation of Shakespeare into French so complicated!”

However, let us remind of the holistic nature of a fictional work, from which it follows that the national language is most adequate in conveying the relevant mentality. In the given examples, the languages is not the same, it always has a vivid “accent” (there are various national varieties of English, French, et al.); the affinity of types of mentality is not to be ignored. The literary reminiscence of Solzhenitsyn is remarkable: “... I had in mind to write A Calf in the Wind, a play based on the contemporary, but nationally neutral (highlighted by me – A.A.) material...”. The play was not a success. “Is it only for the reason, the writer asks himself, that I refused Russian specifics? (...), – and without the Russian soil, was I to have lost the Russian language, too? But others write freely in this impersonal, tongueless manner – and they get it, but why it is like this in my case? ...Well, it means you cannot make a step and a half in abstraction, and the rest – to write in concreteness” (A Calf was Butting an Oak).

Nationally neutral material repulses a “very national” language – such resistance of material is very familiar to fiction translators. Translation is always overcoming contradictions between the material and the language, the process which cannot be without losses (often substantial ones). Therefore, ideally, a fictional work asks for
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reception in the language of the original. The “transplantation” of the national images into an alien verbal tissue takes place with inevitable distortions. In the process of translation, it the material medium of imagery that is subject to “re-coding”, as a rule, – the language, but not the fabric of imagery. One way or another, a creative translation is capable of producing a relatively artistic equivalent. In any case, the very phenomenon of the “convertibility” of national literatures is not called into question.

Let us ask ourselves: what makes us capable of apprehending the images of “others”?

The point is that we apprehend not merely an exotic, foreign cultural range of images, but rather a thought expressed through imagery. If not for a thought in a “psychological covering”, it would be impossible to convey pure images (i.e., “bare psyche”). We would have to deal with inarticulate “mumbling”. Therefore, to translate a fictional work means adequate conveyance of the movement of a fictional thought rather than simply the translation of words.

In view of the above, the following common pattern may be elucidated. The more rationality (analytical properties) the national figurative thinking contains, the higher is the “degree of convertibility” of this literature. (Here, in part, lies the reason why it is far more difficult to translate a lyric without distancing from the original, than to translate analytical prose). We can put it in a more challenging statement: the more artistic the fiction is, the more accessible it is for other cultures to apprehend (about the criteria of artistic value, see Section 11).

As distinct from translation, literary art, say, of a Kyrgyz writing in Russian, or a Belarusian writing in Polish, is a more subtle issue. As mentality cannot be indifferent to a mode of its verbal expression, it seems to be not totally correct to state that Mickiewicz, for example, or Husoŭski expressed Belarusian mentality. Language is not indifferent to imagery either, it has accreted with it, it is not something exterior to an image, it is the living flesh of imagery, too. Belarusian mentality, expressed by a literary artist in Polish, is not exactly Belarusian mentality, but its specific modification. A writer, while choosing a language, independent from his/her wish, foregrounds cultural layers which are behind this language, he/she appeals to national consciousness of native speakers. The artistic word never fulfils a purely nominative function. Any such word resurrects universal images, the national “collective unconscious”; the artistic word is burdened with the myriads of associations, which, in a fictional text, perform – and cannot do otherwise! – the function of creating meaning. Nabokov called it a private tragedy that he had had to “abandon my natural idiom, my untrammeled, rich and infinitely docile Russian tongue for a second-rate brand of English, devoid of those apparatuses – the baffling mirror, the black velvet backdrop, the implied associations and traditions – which the native illusionist, fractails flying, can magically use to transcend the heritage in his own way” (“On a Book Entitled Lolita”).
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Aitmatov grafted a Russian and—broader—a European scion on the Kyrgyz mentality. In the artistic sense—it is a unique and fruitful symbiosis. Approximately the same is also true of Polish, Latinophone literature in Belarus. The argument on the national identification of literature—either by language or by mentality—looks largely scholastic and speculative. The “either/or” principle does not work. Mentality, imagery, the artistic word are all different facets “of the collective unconscious”. Consequently, when mentality organically inhabits the foreign word, the overlapping of one collective unconscious onto the other takes place. A new organic whole comes into being, a nationally ambivalent symbiosis.

In this case, how do we resolve the issue of the national identity of the symbiosis? Is it by searching for a greater share of the collective unconscious—either in the language or in the imagery?

With the question thus posed, an inadequate approach to the problem is provoked. This reminds of a well-known unsolvable dilemma about a hen and an egg. It is evident that the language, which is not the main factor in conveying national distinctiveness, is decisive in relating the fictional work to this or that national literature (the concept of a national literature can be supplemented in this case with the concept of Anglophone, Russian literature, etc.). A literature in a single national language, giving voice to different types of mentality (including the cosmopolitan one), is characterized by a greater extent of organic unity than a literature of “a single mentality” in different languages.

Literature, according to Nabokov, is the “phenomenon of language”. This is not entirely so, but it is not an empty declaration either. Arguably, language involves you in a cultural milieu like nothing else would, it actually builds this space and, in this sense, is a relative border line of the national in literature. Because a literary work always exists in the national language, we can assert that the national, in a sense, is an immanent quality of a literary work.

Industrial society and the development of urban culture have marked the tendency of leveling out national differences in culture in general and in literature in particular. One of the trends in the development of literature is characterized by the emergence of literary fiction which is more and more super-national, trans-national, cosmopolitan (but far from being more artistic). This trend has its own accomplishments, which cannot be neglected—it would be suffice to name that same Nabokov. The “nature” of the artistry of this fiction, its material and means of expressiveness are totally different. In principle, there is an inherent logic in the extra-national tendency of literature’s development. Human spirituality cannot be restricted by the orientation solely towards the national specimens of culture. However, spirituality cannot be expressed generally, outside any specific literary language. And in this case it is the language that becomes the criterion of referring the writers to this or that national literature. One case is highly characteristic: when Nabokov was still Sirin and was writing in Russian, he was considered to be a Russian writer (though he
did no side with the Russian spiritual tradition); when he moved to the USA and began writing in English, he became an American writer (though the American spiritual and literary tradition was alien to him as well).

As we can see, literature can be national, and international, and trans-national. We are definitely far from offering a schematic recipe for all occasions. We have only outlined the common patterns that can be manifested in different ways in various cultural-linguistic contexts. “The degree of participation of the national in literature” depends on many factors. The development of Belarusian self-awareness in the Polish language has its own features. The origins of certain Belarusian literary-artistic traditions (characters, themes, plots, et al.) might have originated in Polish literature. The factors of both linguistic and cultural affinity are of importance here. And if, let’s say, a highly professional Pushkin scholar must know the French language and literature of the relevant period, then it is quite possible, that for the best understanding of the work of some Belarusian writers, one has to know certain Polish authors. The latter writers become the factor of Belarusian literature. But it is a highly forced argument to view the works of some Polish writers as Belarusian literature.

Finally, let us address the issue of the national as the factor of artistic value of a fictional work. The national per se is the property of imagery, but not the essence thereof. And therefore art can be both “more” and “less” national: neither makes it stop being art. However, the question of the quality of literary fiction is closely linked to the question of the degree of the national in it. A “groundless” denial of the national on lower levels of consciousness can hardly be beneficial to art, in the same way as the hypertrophic national. To deny the national means denying the individual expressiveness, singularity, and uniqueness of an image. To overemphasize the national means denying the generalizing function (notionally-speculative) of an image. Both are detrimental to art’s imagery.

The national by its nature is attracted to the pole of the psyche, it in fact mostly consists of the system of psychological codes. Scientific knowledge is far less national than religious consciousness, or ethical, or aesthetic consciousness (if the nationality of scientific knowledge is at all conceivable). Literature, as a result, can well be placed in the national spectrum: from the cosmopolitan pole (where, as a rule, the rational dominates over the sensual-psychological, but not necessarily) to the national-conservative pole (where, respectively, everything is directly opposite). Neither pole can qualify for being the artistry.

At the same time, the national picture of the world can be a form of solution to universal human problems. The national-individual, with that, can emphasize universal human problems more distinctly. The nationally-colored aesthetic consciousness, “working” on the philosophical level (or inclined towards this level), takes down its national limitation in a way, because it is well aware of being a form of the panhuman. The closer national consciousness is to the ideological and psychological level, the more there is in it that resists representation, that “unfolds the
so‖, the more there is of the nationally “preserved”. For this reason, “very national” writers can often be very difficult to translate. In Russian literature, such examples are, to different degrees, Gogol, Leskov, Shmelyov, Remizov, Platonov, et al.

The national relates to the panhuman in the same way a phenomenon relates to the essence. The national is beneficial to the extent it allows for the panhuman to manifest itself. And bend to phenomenology, exaltation of a phenomena as such with reference to its essence which a phenomenon is bound to express, turns the national into an “informational noise”, muffling the essence and obstructing its comprehension.

Such is the dialectics of national and panhuman. It is crucial not to slip into a vulgar extreme and not to pose the question about a refined “dosage” of the national. It makes as little sense as overemphasizing of the national or as its denial. The issue is about the proportions of the rational and sensual-emotional (the national is exactly one of the sides of the latter). A literary artist guesses “the golden section point” which proves proportion approximating it to harmony, but never calculates it. It is unacceptable to advocate the “rationalization” of a creative act. Aesthetic perception is unbreakable. It is impossible to evaluate “the beauty” of an artistic creation, deviating from the national specifics. An instance of national self-actualization is part of the perception “of beauty”. It is impossible to get rid of the national material and leave “something” created according to the laws of beauty. Artistic value becomes the property of the national material (the unity of the fictional work is also revealed in this).

It is not surprising that we come across a substitution of the artistic criteria by the national ones, or, in any case, we witness their indiscriminability. It is unarguable that great artists become symbols of a nation – and this is a convincing testimony to close ties of the national and artistically significant. However, great works become national treasure no so much for the reason that they express national mentality, but rather because this mentality is expressed in a highly artistic form. The presence of the national issue (or the absence thereof) in a fictional work is not yet proof of its artistic value and is not a direct criterion of artistry. The same should be said about the ideological, moral criteria, et al. We deem it impossible to throw these judgments aside and at the same time remain outside the hermeneutic extreme in the evaluation of a fictional work forgetting its fundamental attribute – its unity.

The national problems and poetics were especially topical in the arts of Realism. It is not accidental. It is first of all connected with the fact, that, as it were, “classicists” or” “romanticists”, due to the peculiarities of the method and poetics did not have a possibility to reveal in their works the contradictory complexity of the national character of their heroes belonging to different social strata, embracing different ideals that are manifested in literature in a clear and non-canonical manner.

In conclusion, we shall note the following. The national in literature at its fullest can only reveal itself in aesthetic emotions. Scientific analysis of the artistic unity
does not allow for an adequate perception of the “national potential” of a fictional work. The extra-rational, psychological comprehension of the national code of a work is the most difficult problem of the sociology of literature. The actualization of the collective unconscious itself plays a crucial role in the life of a nation. It is true though that it can both serve as the means of productive self-identification and “feed” the complex of national superiority.

In the long run, the issue of the national in literature is the question about the relation between language, psychology and consciousness; it is a question about the collective unconscious and its archetypes; it is a question about the power of their impact, man’s inability to do without them; it is a question about the cultural potential of the collective unconscious, et al. These problems are, perhaps, among the most scientifically unresolved in science. The registration of the collective unconscious, its rationalization, its translation into the language of concepts – all these present the problems unresolved so far. Meanwhile, one of the mysteries of art is in its effective influence on society.

Nevertheless, the national makes literature a form of human spiritual activity. The spiritual nucleus in man has to reckon with the collective unconscious, however, the latter is far from fatally restricting human freedom. Spirituality in its supreme form is rational, it opposes the spontaneity of the unconscious, but does not deny it.
11. CRITERIA OF ARTISTRY OF A LITERARY WORK

The theory of literary fiction will have clear outlines only when we understand how the suggested theory relates to the problem of artistry, the latter being an axiological-normative category. (By artistry they have meant so far the genetic quality of literature and arts contributing to the level of a work’s perfection – see the category of artistry defined in Section 5.1.)

The question about the criteria of artistry is as little regulated as the question about traditions and influences. At the same time, this issue is quite firmly determined. (In fact, the same is also true, in a different measure though, of any category considered in this work.) To understand the common aspects of this determinacy means getting maximum “freedom in literary studies”, the lack of which makes scientific endeavors impossible.

We think the common aspects, which are of interest, to be the following.

The criterion of artistry, most generally, has long been defined. Here is its essence: deep and original artistic meaning embodied in a very prominent and relevant artistic form. In other words, artistic perfection stands for the harmony of meaning and sensually perceived form of its existence.

There is no need in revising this criterion, but it is necessary, nevertheless, to comment on it, specify and clarify this definition due to the changing views on the nature of artistry. Then this general and very vague formula fills with specific meaning.

Thus, the degree of harmony, adequacy, organic fusion of the poles of a fictional work into a qualitatively new and holistic formation is the measure of artistry. As the factors of artistry we can name both the depth and original content (at this point our view coincides with that voiced by hermeneutically oriented scholars), and the virtuosity of a form (here we share the viewpoint with the scholars of the formalist and aesthetic schools). However, the philosophical, political and any other depth of comprehending reality does not equal artistry, and it is therefore evaluated by philosophical, political and other criteria which are scientific by definition. The absolute virtuosity of form is equally far from genuine artistry.

Artistry becomes really obvious when profound meaning is implemented in a perfect form. It actually comes to mean the following. The criterion of artistry is only topical when virtuosity acquires the quality of the depth of meaning, and the depth of meaning can be revealed only through the virtuosity of form. Therefore even the “most profound” meaning devoid of a clear and well-wrought form loses the quality of artistic meaning, to be more exact, it will never get to that level. In other words, there is no depth in the artistic meaning without a perfect form. Raising the question about a “deep meaning” which does not have a relevant form of expressing it – has no sense from the perspective of artistry. The bulk of ideas and images that illustrate these ideas is not yet artistry. The latter comes to life only with the thinking in terms
of images, when ideas are inseparable from images and are an incarnation of the former. To start from the ideas means following a scientific rather than artistic criterion. A philosopher, no matter how paradoxical it may sound, can be a very doubtful compliment for a writer.

Therefore, being rather categorical, we can formulate the following “law” of literary studies. It is impossible to analyze artistic content in detachment from the form. To analyze artistic content means analyzing the form (and, accordingly, vice versa).

Here we can contradict ourselves by stating the following: a philosopher is the most superb compliment one can pay a literary artist.

The contradiction is taken down in the following way.

It goes without saying that artistic ideas, in principle, are irreducible to the scientific ones, that is, to concepts. However, artistic ideas can match relative scientific equivalents (even philosophical), and then we can evaluate the depth and originality of these ideas. Ideas which are expressed in an artistic form don’t cease being ideas. The philosophical, worldview-related level of the apprehension of the problems of man, i.e., the highest form of intellectual activity, which is carried out through using imagery – this must be a writer’s ideal and measure.

If we consider the highest form of intellectual activity to be philosophical orderliness, identification of the relation of “all and everything”, putting all private problems into the context of the worldview, at attempt to build a holistic picture of the world – it remains unclear then why this same criterion cannot be equally applied to literature, as it is a phenomenon based on ideas?

Literature enjoys a unique status among other arts in the context of “relatedness” to ideas. A word is always an “instrument of thought”. To think – to think scientifically – means putting ideas into the flesh made of words. We have always had a high respect for the power of the word, which, in our understanding, is related to thinking. Articulated speech is by and large a generic feature of human beings. The word, therefore, casts an “intellectual shadow” on those areas where it is used most actively, in particular, on literature. Literature is blessed with the intellectual authority of the word; it offers colossal intellectual potential for the world comprehension.

Alongside this, the word harbors other possibilities thanks to which it has become a means of creating imagery in fiction. The word can be not only a means of conveying thoughts, but feelings as well – as an antithesis to thoughts, the soul’s turmoil, vagueness and obscurity.

So we get, on the one hand, the fact that literature cultivates thoughts, ideas, tames chaos, helps to comprehend, to get to the very core of matters; on the other – literature offers to us a cult of sensuality, chaos, a wish to enjoy “the soul’s turmoil”. The inner contradictions of the artistic word, short of compromising its own intellectual possibilities, make these possibilities rather specific. Literary fiction is a paradoxical coexistence of the word which conveys the thought and the word which
kills the thought. Verbal images that embody this paradox are capable of conveying a sensually perceived thought. The deeper this thought is, the more distinctly it shows through, the more perfect is the image. Intellectual advantages are directly related to the elegance of the form: those rare instances of harmony is what we mean by artistic perfection. The artistic word is potentially ambivalent.

It follows that the cult of form in literature is the cult of the “sensual”, metaphorical word, allergic to the “why”, an actualization of the most rationally insignificant components of style (rhythm, assonance, alliteration, et al.). And vice versa: the cult of ideas is an artistically detrimental neglect of the listed features of the “sensual” word. It remains to add that the cult of the thought and the cult of the form in a truly artistic fictional work coexist with the cult of a healthy moral beginning.

As we can see, aesthetic consciousness, as a form of social consciousness, cannot apprehend its own specifics “out of itself”, and to deduce, “out of itself”, the criterion of artistry. The resolution of the aesthetic problems proper rests on the way of their philosophical comprehension as private problems, written into another, philosophical context. We are convinced that the fundamental theoretical problems of artistry can be resolved only with the help of philosophical aesthetics.

Thus, making sense of the aesthetic criteria would mean making sense of the human values, of the hierarchy of values.

What has been discussed in this chapter can also be put into other terms which will shed light, in a different way, on the potential stored in arts. The philosophical nature of art lies in the tendency towards the search for truth (T). The sensual perception of T is beauty (B). T and B turn out to be the components of an image and embody, respectively, the rational pole and the emotional-psychological pole. Goodness (G), the moral criterion, defines the direction of T. It is only T which is worth poetization (B), because it strives towards G. T and B make up the unity of the philosophical and psychological origins, they assert the positive moral program – G.

The formula of artistic values can be drawn this way:

```
B <-> G <-> T
```

Without exaggeration, one can say that it is also the formula of a harmoniously developed personality ideal. The “pure” aesthetic per se, being part of the formula or one of the aspects of artistry, cannot be a universal, comprehensive criterion of artistic values. Man as the “measure of all things” is also the measure of artistry. The concept of artistic values which is also a philosophical concept (not an exclusively narrow concept of literary studies) encompasses the notions of the value of life, highest intellectual values and, finally, proper aesthetic values.

The mentioned concept asks for a substantial grounding. If we take upon ourselves the courage to be coherent and definite, then we should start with the basic question of philosophy. If the world is material, a human being is the product of
evolution. In this case, it is a human that makes the benchmark and measure of all values. The evolution of man acquires the sense, and to put it this way, the goal of the world history.

The guarantee of objectivity of man-made norms and values is likely to be in the fact that they are derived from nature, they are determined by nature. And they cannot be brought down without risking life as such.

Consequently, there are no values higher than life-asserting values, humanistic values. The reasonable in this context is the same as life-asserting. The generic attribute of a human being – his consciousness – turns out to be the source and criterion of everything created by man, including arts. And the highest intellectual activity is philosophy, comprehensive worldview systems. Literature as the phenomenon of ideas, in any way, cannot do without applying the criteria of the highest intellectual activity, if we want to be thoroughly consistent and logical. Know the truth and the truth will make you free – this slogan can be applied to literature as well.

But to learn the T is also the slogan of science. Paradoxical as it sounds, but we get the scientific criterion as one of the criteria of artistic perfection. The scientific principle is the principle of progressive differentiation and increasing complexity reaching up to a dialectically understood systematicity; it appears to be quite applicable to the T which arts discover. T is one for all, yet the means of knowing it can be different.

We must treat the moral beginning which is part of the aesthetic in the same key. (We mean here not the constructive function of the ethical beginning, but purely axiological.) If we are set to follow the scientific criteria, then the “uppermost” one, the philosophical level of thinking, asserts the moral beginning in a person. All talk about whether goodness is an immanent capacity of art, or G and B can be “divorced”, is mere conjecture made possible due to the lack of clarity as to the structure of consciousness, clever negation of the hierarchy of values. I shall point out just one more time that attraction to G is a necessary but not self-sufficient condition of artistry. The existence of the “immoral tendency” in literature only testifies to the fact that the aesthetic and the ethical are relatively autonomous and independent. This tendency might always be in existence (in one form or another), but it will never reach the highest level of generalization, the level which is responsible for the elaboration of worthy worldviews and theories. It is because this level is in itself sentences “immorality”. That tendency is devoid of any prospects. One can cultivate self-destruction and entropy, aestheticize evil either for lack of mind or out of “being not one’s own self”. Man’s goal – to gain maximum freedom (in the broadest sense) while retaining the values of life – is merely incompatible with the ideology if immorality.

The aesthetic (B) is the property of specifically arranged material, but not the material itself. It is impossible to withdraw the material and leave B in place. There is
not any special aesthetic content. The content may contain the entire human problematics, all the forms of social consciousness. Though, of course, the aesthetically arranged material alters in a way: it is then perceived in the light of a certain ideological-emotional assessment. To arrange something means assessing something, making a choice, means not being neutral. In any case, a modest wish to be just an artist, not associated with human self-sufficiency and without any claims for knowing the world, is, in the long run, a claim for a different system of values than the one we back in this work.

**A question may arise: why do these very named components constitute the triad in the formula of artistic values, and why are there only three of them?**

The matter is in the fact that the provisional activity chart, chart № 1, can be utterly reduced to these “three whales”. Further reduction is impossible, as it will reduce the overall unity. BGT is the gene of spiritualized life, the quintessence of all forms of social consciousness, their syncretic condition. It goes without saying that BGT is a criterion for any form of social consciousness. However, it is only in arts that the “formula of life” finds its adequate implementation.

In order for this formula to become dialectical, it is insufficient to be aware of the synthetic character of the triad’s existence.

It is not less important to understand that the artistry potential of different artists can be different. And the very ratio of the components, BGT, in each triad is different as well. Some component may prevail, but not outside the three peaks of the highest artistic value.

One can be a genius in the artistic sense. But, generally speaking, this is not enough. There need to be both the intellectual and the psychic genius! The intellectual genius in combination with the aesthetic can lead to a sophisticated aesthetization of evil. Outside the aesthetic gift, all human qualities will never become a precondition for the creation of arts. The harmony of BGT is not just the golden mean, but *the golden section point*.

Good literature is always about everything, i.e., about the truth (however, it may be reflected through a different lens). Simply put, it is about the development of personality.

Still more simply put: good literature is clearly *personacentric* (and in this sense, *elitist, aristocratic*).

In this context, it is reasonable to touch upon the most wonderful, and, consequently, the darkest problem in the philosophy of art: the problem of a genius and talent.

An artistic genius describes *informational abilities to create beauty*, and these help to *discover personality* in a person.

A genius is an ability to register a thought by means of images, i.e., to convey a thought via the tools which not only bring the thought to life, but also destroy it – the ability which enables fixing a rarest natural/social/spiritual phenomenon, i.e.:
discovering a harmonious balance between the psyche and consciousness – the state of harmony leading to the emergence of ingenious spirituality. A genius at the apex of the development of one’s own spiritual and creative potential is capable of grasping such a unique informational balance, when consciousness, reinforced manifold by the resources of the psyche, enables the psyche’s realization to the maximum of its capacities at the cost of its own “conscious” resources.

The feelings that a personality experiences become “clever” (or sublime, in different terminology), a philosophical view of the world presupposes the presence of a feeling as a precondition for the existence of philosophy per se.

The phenomenon of a genius is a phenomenon of meaning (a timeless ferment), and the latter can only come to life through an exceptionally expressive phenomenon of style (an ephemeral aesthetic chain which renders the zeitgeist). The human “here and now” is fixed by the superhuman (personal) “for ages”.

A genius is a gift of apprehending and representing a person from the positions of personality.

We must add that an artistic talent is made of the informational abilities to create beauty which help to foresee a personality in a person. As far as artistic abilities are concerned, the definition of their essence in the context of “a genius” and “talent” appear to us as a natural informational gift to register a thought in imagery (to create beauty).

The difference between abilities, on the one hand, and talent and genius, on the other, is not quantitative, but qualitative. They are phenomena of a different informational nature. Abilities as a gift to create forms, as some kind of a technological thing in itself, grow into skills which can develop to a point of being a feature of talent or genius.

A natural conclusion may be: while juxtaposing artistic phenomena, it makes no sense to compare works, styles, methods, types or genres individually. Even the potentials of artistry can be compared to a relative extent; these potentials may be analyzed with the help of the formula of artistry.

The 19th century Realism (Russian, in particular) appeared to be the apogee of the literary development of humanity not by chance. The Golden Age Russian literature whose founder and pillar is Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin by rights, emerged and developed as an aristocratic, personacentrically-oriented literature. It is during the Golden Age period that Russian literature became aware of a spiritually close “cultural code” and its mission; moreover, Russian literature unconsciously formed the program of its development, because it immediately hit its “vein of gold”: the elitist personacentrism as an extremely prospective vector of culture, the one that became the decisive factor of worldwide recognition of Russian literature.

Let us recollect in this context just three remarkable literary works: Woe from Wit, Eugene Onegin and A Hero of Our Time.
The world achievements of Russian literature seem to be connected, first of all, with the contradictory cult of an outsider, i.e., a character extremely vital for culture. The dialectics of the soul is inseparable from the dialectics of consciousness, and both are the existence modes of a personality, ever an outsider from the perspective of the socium.

Moreover, we must put it directly and unambiguously: the world achievements of any literature are linked to the humanistic law of personacentrism; the personacentric valency of advanced literatures is higher than the personacentric valency of the epoch which brought about these literatures. It is the difference in the potentials of the two systems of ideals – humanistic (personacentric) and authoritarian (sociocentric) – that provides literature with the necessary artistic passionarity based on an existential matter, specifically, the will to the truth. A cultural explosion is always a breakthrough in the area of personacentrism.

And vice versa: deviation from the personacentric way, the weakening of personacentric valency or misunderstanding of the cultural value of personacentrism – are the cause of the crisis in all national literatures of the world without exception.

The dialectically-oriented quest of the congenial literary classics of the 19th century, who aspired for the highest humanistic values, enabled the creation of a whole range of brilliant masterpieces. Everything of value (or potentially everything) ever accumulated by human culture was, in all probability, produced by the literature of that century. In any case, the concept which is substantiated here allows for making the following conclusions. Some conclusions do require a different concept.

The 20th century, with its specific absurdist, apocalyptic world perception, the loss of the life-asserting prospects, brought about a special individuocentric literature. Not claiming for the explanation of the world absurdity, literature just recorded it. The pathos of causality in the explanation of the world, which had been the feature of the personacentric orientation, was abandoned in the 20th century literature. Instead, the principle of functionality took its place. Functionality is indifferent to the beginnings and endings, it is interested in the mechanisms of functioning as such, not the “why” and “wherefore”, but “how”. Literature began (in its dominant tendency) to incessantly mimic, model the catastrophic, anti-rational, that which “did not explain” the world perception in principle. “The big ideas” which bothered a personality ceased to be of interest to a “a small person” (individual) and, accordingly, literature, where such a person became a central character.

The “switching off” of reason led to the immersion into chaos, to the celebration of the destructive tendencies, to total irony – and eventually, to the cult of form, and the cult of form, sooner or later, causes the cult of play. The poetic language of the 20th century arts is adapted for recording just those uncontrolled, liberated emotions. This element, really characteristic of man, clearly confused the 20th century literature. However, no formal twists and turns, no new techniques of construing most incredible images from psychological depths can make up for the rejection of the philosophical
element. In our point of view, it is the Literature of Big Ideas that is the benchmark. The literature of the 20th century rarely rose to the level of philosophical comprehension of the problems facing it. This literature is great in its own way, but also “flawed”. The 20th century is hardly the Golden Age in the literary history of humanity, but, undoubtedly, as far as originality and the renovation of means of the poetic language are concerned, this literature has no equals in history.

The breakthrough in literature was possible at the cost of massive expenses and disavowal of Big Ideas. A conscious (or unconscious) distancing from the thought pole and approximation to the psychological pole (and, accordingly, a transformation of a literary artist from an intellectual into mainly an artisan of plastic arts, a craftsman of depiction and expression) lessened the philosophical potential of literature and, besides that, the potential of artistry. This needs to be straightforwardly stated.

If we agree with what has been said in this chapter, we should put a direct question about the literary typology.

Such works where the level of personacentric valency allows for the components of the triad “B – G – T” to co-exist as one whole and autonomously at the same time, deserve to be named literary fiction as a form of art, as a form of social consciousness. Such literature is a mode of spiritual production, spiritual activity, and even, if you wish, a mode of spiritual compensation. It is specifically the Literature of Big Ideas which resolves pivotal spiritual problems of man. The phenomenon of ideas and the phenomenon of language in such literature are inseparable. We have in mind classical world literature and the literature, figuratively speaking, of the second, third rate following the classical trend. The creed of classical literature is: if you have something to say, say it beautifully. This is the literature of geniuses and talents.

True literature possesses one unmistakable attribute: it is always the result of the art of life. All the world masterpieces “smell of the blood” of their creators. It is not a game, not trifles. It is an intense quest for the T. The art of life is superior to literature, in the same way as life is superior to art. The art of life is not necessarily reflected in the fictional form. Only a happy coincidence of the rarest human talents produces genuine poets and writers. The criterion of such literature is always the personality of the creator and inherent artistic qualities (BGT).

When literary art is the result of the art of life, a given human phenomenon cannot be regarded only from the perspective of artistic proliferation. We deal with the giants of the spirit. Such personalities should be viewed holistically: as a phenomenon of human culture of a definite stage and culture in general.

A literature which consciously opposes itself to the classical type, which finds it offensive to deal with Big Ideas, and which prioritizes absolute aesthetic perfection, in a word, the literature, consciously contrasting itself to the art of life, – such literature, on a closer view, can nevertheless, contrary to the declarations, turn out to be “ideological”. In any case, such literature has not succeeded in being spiritless in
its outstanding specimens. If it is really “devoid of ideas” and meaningless, then such literature is unworthy of the “golden shelf”. It is customary to regard it as the phenomenon of style. In one the novels by R. Gary (Lady L.) we read: “In life, as well as in art, style is the only salvation for those for whom there is nothing else to be offered”. In relation to life, this is, perhaps, true, but with some reservations. In art, however, it is those who have “something to offer” that possess a strongly pronounced style. Therefore, the style that has nothing to support it is either not a style at all, or there is still “something” behind it.

If you have nothing to say, say it beautifully. This creed has long become the aesthetic religion of tricksters who turn belles letters into playful literature, or a verbal show. This is the literature produced by capable and gifted writers, almost talents. However, let us give credit to realities: the proper aesthetic gift is by no means concurrent with the gifted soul and intellectual gift. We must admit that there are a great many talented literary works which are created by the writers who “can write” but who “have nothing to say”. In the end, the major figure in literature is the writer, i.e., a person who “can write”.

In detective fiction, in the literature of adventure and in science fiction, neither serious spiritual problems nor the absolute beauty of style become dominant. The quality of being an entertainment – literature’s secondary quality – here becomes prevalent. The highest level of consciousness – philosophical consciousness – is reduced. It is only present in the form of popular maxims, commonplace moral doctrines and truisms. At best, this is peripheral literature, if at all. It is not accidental that it is always known as the literature for “children and adolescents”, meaning its entertaining and primitively moralistic character. The laws of the genre of such language arts repulse serious spiritual activity.

Finally, there is mass literature, paraliterature, commercial literature, a read, etc. (there are a lot of names for it). All this is definitely beyond arts. Melodrama, violence, sex, horrors and nightmares – this is the range of “interests” of such ersatz literature. Commercial concerns, playing on “basic instincts”, simple tackling of the nerves, playing up to mass prejudices and stereotypes – it is the aim and meaning of this ignoble type of activity. To characterize such production is no longer possible within the categories of art. Combinations of clichéd devices only superficially resemble art. It is an imitation of art, but not art itself.

Nevertheless, paradoxical as it may seem, there is no unbridgeable chasm between the listed forms of artistic activity (and those which are totally non-artistic). What unites these different spheres?

Ersatz literature parasitizes on artistic literature. The devices and stylistic innovations of serious fiction are pilfered by paraliterature which turns them into stock phrases and clichés. In other words, fictional hacks and botchery exist only thanks to artistic literature. The latter constantly feeds the former. Perhaps, the reverse may be true as well. “Humanological” literature can have its origin in mass literature,
it can associate itself with as a shield from spiritlessness. *Crime and Punishment* can be read as a parody of a detective novel.

Literature and paraliterature are two extreme poles. Between them is a spectrum of an infinite number of variants, relying in different degrees on the spiritual or spiritless beginnings.

Thus, the objective criteria of artistry rest in the plane of apprehending artistic literature as a form of social consciousness. In order to work out those criteria, we need to rely on the concept of consciousness and, further, on the personality concept. Only this approach can guarantee objectivity. Otherwise, the shift towards the “judgment call” and limitless subjectivity is unavoidable. All talk about the qualities of fictional works becomes devoid of scientific meaning.

The criteria of artistry that we have put forward are certainly schematic and speculative. Real artistic and research practice produces different types of creators and scholars who tend to prefer one of the poles in a different measure. Relative formalism or relative “overloadedness with ideas” is quite a common thing in the work of writers. Literary fiction on the whole is placed within the spectrum between these poles.

This fact can chagrin only the puritans in science, those who hold schemes and models above life. In reality, life copes with the schematic contradiction wonderfully. It can occur to no one, for example, to alienate the literary super-virtuoso stylistic masters from the literary process as a “mistake” or a “mishap”. Some of them grow into prominent phenomena who enrich artistic palette with original colors. And who would take upon themselves the courage to assert that the emergence of artistic giants happens outside them mastering that literary testing area where the “sorcerers” and “tricksters” used to improvise?

On the other hand, let us emphasize that the depth of comprehending reality is an indispensable component of the artistic criterion proper. The superior artistic harmony marks, as a rule, the pinnacles of artistic “systems”. And the great artistic “systems” of mankind – the Antiquity, the Renaissance, the Age of Enlightenment, Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, and Modernism – are not accidental phenomena. They implement aesthetically, as we have already said, special types of the exploration of life, which have also manifested themselves in all other forms of social consciousness.

Consequently, besides the gift of a genius, a creator of a masterpiece also needs objective preconditions, namely: titanic moves in the epoch in the ideas about the world and man. Only in this case the subjective factor becomes actual: an artist’s ability to grasp these moves, comprehend them and record in a fictional form. A happy coincidence of all the necessary conditions can result in the emergence of a gigantic artistic figure.
12. PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS OF A LITERARY WORK. METHODOLOGY OF COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

This Section may be viewed as an exception to the proposed lecture course (a single academic discourse, a code of universal and local concepts) which the author has worked on for his entire academic life.

It could also be viewed as a preface to the above-mentioned discourse, naturally, assuming that it would be in demand in future. We still believe that in situations of a methodological crisis in literary studies the comprehensive anthropological analysis theory could gain attention of scientifically minded literary scholars.

The discourse turns so complex and contradictory that in the end we need to ask ourselves and try to give answers to some basic questions which can be understood even by outsiders.

Let us start with the “killer” question. Why do we need to boil down the complex to the simple, by the way?

This method is applied in cases that are totally hopeless for any wide audience, e.g., with the hadron collider or Kant’s philosophy, when the research process and essence can be commented on only through special means, such as a special language, specialist mentality, in the long run, a special philosophy linked to the research subject. The subject ostensibly concerns us all, thus, people are entitled to know about it, like about the starry skies above their heads, or our internal mores; however, since that subject falls within the exclusive competence of specialists, i.e., specially gifted and trained people, it should be explained in such a way that those who understand it would not be severely offended by the ABC version, and those who don’t understand it, would have an illusion that the topic is open for all, like, for example, pedagogics, medicine, football, love, literature, where anyone can be an expert, if there is a will.

Developing in the same area as the philosophy of literature, literary studies turn into an increasingly more “closed science”, or a discipline open to specialists only. Popularization is then necessary, at least, to promote public treatment of theoretical literary studies as a humanities discipline, where research is associated, this way or other, with the sacred imperative of public good, rather than as a thing in itself, which is questionably academic and speculative. This is, so to say, the outer motive.

As regards the inner motive, I myself would like to know these simple answers – at least to make clear what I have been working on during all my years of literary research. And the second, and most important objective, is identifying key links in the academic discourse in order to streamline the knowledge-transfer process. To that end, the key parameters of the methodology and of philosophy of literature should be translated from the language of science into the plain language of common sense, at the same time determining whether it is feasible in principle.
Having achieved the methodological task, we need to address the methods of learning the philosophical parameters of the discipline. A complex methodology should have a simple and rigid systemic frame. It is a set of methods that can help elucidate it.

1. The key words, characterizing the methodological concept of a “comprehensive literary analysis” are information (more specifically, information structure) and personality – the words of a clearly “non-literary” origin (let us note it as a contradiction).

The key word to characterize a special information structure, which becomes, eventually, the subject of a comprehensive analysis, is the word contradiction. The oxymoronic notion of a “comprehensive analysis” is contradictory through and through: “comprehensive” means impossible to divide and separate into parts; “analysis” means just consistent and purposeful segmentation of a whole.

Another reason why we would like to start with contradictions is: the relationship that a specialist has with contradictions is a constructive principle of any theory, and a “comprehensive analysis” all the more so. It may be useful to learn a careless handling of contradictions, this building material for concepts, from the classic expression: “there are too many contradictions, but there’s no wish to set them right” (the hopelessly contradictory Eugene Onegin).

Voila the first charm of a contradiction – a mystery of science, if you wish: I see “too many” contradictions, and nevertheless, I put them into the foundation of the theory (“no wish to set them right”); we witness a careless handling annoyingly transforming into a responsible one.

One could parade some sort of theoretic hard-headedness and claim: if facts contradict theory, so much the worse for the facts (thus we shall exhibit disrespect for the very principle of contradictions, this bread of the laws of science).

One can, however, formulate their scientific creed differently (which is more attractive to us): if facts contradict theory, consequently, the latter will acquire a wonderful chance for perfection. If there are more facts, uncomfortable and diverse, your theory will become dialectical: this is the mantra of a contemporary humanities scholar.

Conclusion. The first and decisive condition is: methodology and the very style of thinking today, when we have accumulated a great deal of contradictory facts and concepts, must be dialectical – moreover, totally dialectical. Two circumstances push to this: a contradictory – i.e., holistic – subject of study; consequently, the methodology must be adequate and dialectical.

A maximally brief and simultaneously utterly capacious characteristic feature of any science is its methodological parameters. The imperative of “scientific studies” reads: if you want to speak the essence – speak of the methodology. Methodological principles, no doubt, are of value per se, to the extent they allow to adequately define
the subject of research (which, in its turn, realigns the key moments of the methodology). Like the fish like the net.

2. A loyal attitude to contradictions helps to correctly form the subject of study. The baseline positions in anthropological literary studies (and in their main Section – literary theory, which is “responsible” for the methodology) are as follows.

On the one hand, fictional works are considered to be a “phenomenon of ideas”, a problem-containing meaningful structure, which, being based on imagery by its nature, requires rationalization: abstract-logical and scientific commentary (i.e., translation of the information given in images into the language of notions).

On the other hand, it is viewed as a “phenomenon of style”, as some aesthetically closed and self-identical whole. The first approach is more often called interpretation, with the emphasis on its subjective-arbitrary character, which cannot be reduced essentially to any definite scientifically grounded common patterns. Clearly, the “meanings of reality” that have generated a literary work turn out to be more topical than the work itself, and literature every time again and again appears in the role of a servant to politics, morality or to amorality, to faith or faithlessness, to pure beauty or the flowers of evil, et al.

The second approach which stresses the problems of the text as such tends to get completely abstracted from reality, absolutizing the formal sign-related beginning which is really a feature of all the phenomena of culture.

The vital problem facing literary theory (as well the entire aesthetics, the branch which is in fact literary theory), is this: how do moral-philosophical (non-artistic) strategies turn into the artistic strategies (into artistic modes)?

How do we reconcile and combine extreme methodological positions, each of which is self-sufficient to a certain degree?

We cannot do here without the notions of the information structure and contradiction.

It is evident that the nature of the literary scholars’ object of study has turned out to be much more difficult than it has been thought up until recently. A compromise between the polar points of view does not lie in-between, but in a different plane: we have to comprehensively treat not just the text or the poetic “world of ideas”, not the artistic and non-artistic strategies in isolation, but the fictional work which bears, on the one hand, ideal, spiritual content that can potentially exist, and on the other hand, only in an exceptionally complex formal arrangement – a fictional text.

To substantiate this thesis statement, we need a new concept which would explain the connection of the personality problems and the problems of the text. Such a concept exists and can be provisionally named a comprehensive anthropological approach to artistic phenomena (to a fictional work, to thinking, and to creative art). To make it short – comprehensive analysis. Actually we are witnessing the formation and development of a potentially most original and prospective literary theory at the present moment.
Conclusion. One can study an artistically organized text, having excluded, for convenience, the ideas (metatext, content) which arguably contradict the text’s nature. In this case, the substance of artistry should be recognized as a category from the area of wonders.

We can also act in an exactly opposite manner: to study and comment on the world of ideas, ideological strategies (in a social, political, moral, religious, philosophical aspect: depending on the choice), abstracting from the artistic strategies which are the result of the former (personacentric valency, pathos, behavioral strategies of a character), and the modes of expression of the latter (style, text, intertext, etc., which make up the “plane of expression”). In this case, the artistry of a fictional work becomes a redundant category. This is also a way to evade gracefully from the dialectical imperative: know the unity of contradictions.

One also can (and, evidently, must) study not the text, not artistic strategies per se, and not the ideas that live independently from the text, but a work of fiction, a complex informational arrangement, where the meaning (moral-philosophical strategies) determines the artistic strategies, and, afterwards, study the structure and quality of the text. It requires just a trifle to accomplish this, namely: to learn to explain philosophically (methodologically) and technologically (methodically) the way the spiritual turns into the aesthetic, the way the information of the conceptual order is conveyed via an image. The problem of comprehending the nature of a literary work (as well as artistic thinking and creative art) turns into the problem of identifying its informational nature.

Thus, the main subject of study is a work of fiction viewed purely in the light of the aesthetic which is determined by non-artistic factors.

At this, the object of study, whether we like it or not, appears to be not literature, but a conflict of the types of managing information, the conflict between “fictional” and “conceptual” thinking – between the psyche and consciousness, strictly speaking; and to be more precise: between the adaptation type of relation and comprehension type of relation.

These relations are the building material of a personality’s spirituality (where spirituality is the quality of a rational relation).

Hence a new topicality of the imperative: if you want to understand literature – make sense of personality.

3. How does personality become the subject and the object of artistic activity? Which spiritual components bear the essential artistic load?

In view of this, we would like to concentrate on the problem which seems to be a local one, but which acquires a universal character in the context of the whole (and this is true of all the problems of literary studies, without exception – such is the effect of wholeness!). This problem is called the criterion of artistry.

Because the quality of spirituality determines aesthetic parameters, not vice versa, the criteria of artistry come from the assessment of the plane of content (in
particular, the philosophy of morality) and the associated plane of expression (style). It is here that we see the guarantee of objectivity of the criteria. The old but quite integral formula “Beauty-Goodness-Truth” acquires its scientific substantiation.

It is true however, that in the light of the total dialectics this formula discovers a great number of nuances. In particular, artistic practice has demonstrated that Beauty, a relatively autonomous component of the triad, possesses a self-worthy potential of expressiveness. Together with that, Beauty cannot be radically separated from the sense (from the sum-total of the senses which are systematically organized).

The principle that states: “The dialectical multidimensionality of ideas determines the quality of their expression” – becomes a scientific criterion of artistry. The deeper the sense – the more original the style is.

As a result, we get something unheard of: literary studies, without any exclusive philosophical authority, must, if not substantiate the universal character of spiritual values (the subject of study needs to be changed for that, and there will be a transformation into the philosophy of morality), but then proceed from a fully scientific version which unambiguously substantiates the universal (sic!) character of spiritual values. And the mentioned total dialectics of the methodology obliges literary studies to deal with the non-literary issues which are exceptionally significant just for literary studies.

We come to the following: comprehensive anthropological literary studies, making use of the comprehensive methodology, are fully entitled with philosophical authority.

A comprehensive analysis establishes the universality of spiritual values not in the existence of the axiomatic triad “Beauty-Goodness-Truth” (an absolute and irrationally set reference point), but in the facts that: 1) the spiritual and aesthetic triad “Beauty-Goodness-Truth” is an outcome of informational interaction between the psyche and consciousness; 2) as a result of that interaction, personality became the reference point in the informational landscape (the unity of the “body-soul-mind”) as a milieu of natural and cultural information structured with the help of total dialectics; 3) the main thing in the structure of a personality that realizes the comprehension type of relation, conversely including the adaptation type of relation as well, is the mind, the subject of culture, which governs all the strategically vital information for human beings, via “a conscious necessity”, or the laws, in other words (intellect, being mainly the extended lever of the psyche (soul) and as such – the subject of nature, which efficiently regulates the relations of adaptation; yet, the intellect is a servant of two masters on whose premises the mind crops up and functions); 4) a principal possibility of personality existence where the functions of the psyche, intellect and mind are diverged and orderly arranged has resulted in the emergence of the phenomenon of artistry and, further on, topical artistic modes (primarily, personacentric valency – sociocentrism, individuocentrism and of personacentrism).
Conclusion. Artistic activity begins with personality, a complex informational arrangement. The culturally significant originality of literature is determined by the level of personacentrism it represents. The quality of artistry depends primarily on the quality of personacentric valency of a fictional work, which determines the properties of style. The problem of objectivity criteria of artistry is the problem of the quality of scientific thinking of a personality, but not the problem of taste or personal preferences.

4. What is the process of aesthetization of spirituality in a literary-fictional form? How is it possible to substantiate philosophically and methodologically the process of transformation of the spiritual (in particular, the ethical) into the aesthetic?

To accomplish this, one has to perform the impossible at a first glance: ideas (notions) should be made perceivable by the feelings which by definition cannot grasp the information of the abstract-logical order (the ideas, for example).

We need to view the problem here from the vintage point which the total dialectics can suggest. The aesthetic and the spiritual are inseparable, because eventually they are the modes of the psyche and consciousness. The spiritual is, if you prefer, a sum-total characteristic of that ideal meaning which the images in art bear in themselves. It is impossible to withdraw the spiritual beginning from art (the set of ideas) and leave something purely aesthetic (only what the senses might derive pleasure from). The aesthetic is the mode of arranging the spiritual. If the material is lacking and there is “nothing” to arrange, the aesthetic quality of the material cannot emerge from nowhere. “Beauty” cannot exist in the manner of the Cheshire Cat smile – by and on itself, depending on nothing and expressing nothing. Otherwise, the indescribable Beauty, i.e., resisting being transformed into the category of literary studies, into style, becomes a kept-mistress of the meaning.

There is no special secret mechanism in the transmission of the sensually perceived information into abstract-logical (the emotions – into the system of ideas); there is an interconnection and interdependence between the psyche and consciousness. This is the whole secret. The two languages of culture, the language of consciousness (concepts) and the language of the psyche (images), form a single informational whole due to the fact that they are two poles, diametrically different possibilities.

This is the way the spiritual indirectly programs the style, and its ephemeral beauty and virtuosity, in reality, are the reverse side of spirituality. The essence of the new holistic approach to literary fiction and to the phenomenon of artistry as such lies in the identification and careful detailed analysis of the pointed principal interdependence.

Conclusion. It is really hard to understand how different levels, the aspects of a single reality (aesthetic, ethical, philosophical, et al.) “grow” into each other, mutually reflect and determine each other. But the comprehensive anthropological methodology offers just such an integrative approach.
5. What is the technique of aesteticizing the spiritual?

How can one scientifically describe the subject and the object, an integral informational symbiosis, a wholeness, which strives towards infinite autonomy, towards becoming a specific “thing in itself”?

There is only one way to do it: to identify and describe the relations of the components (levels) of the unity.

If up until now a unity has been studied as a system, in other words, each cross-section of a holistic object has been examined in isolation, as an element or part of the whole, now they are viewed as an instance of the whole, which has all the features of this whole. The part-whole type of relations is replaced by the drop-ocean type of relations (an instance of the whole – the whole). “Pure” characteristics of an individual quality are complicated by a range of characteristics of other qualities. Any component of style (situation, plot, composition, detail, speech, the linguistic side of the text) becomes the vehicle of the whole spiritual-aesthetic paradigm, yet, at that it does not lose its autonomous specifics.

It becomes evident: to analyze the style means identifying the relations of stylistic components to all the content-related levels of the work; a qualified analysis of the conceptual side can take place only on the condition of examining the ideas through the lens of the style. In a fictional work, there are no ideas outside style, and vice versa.

The notions of the content and the form have lost their dichotomy and factitious identity and have turned into fully relative properties. For example, plot in a holistically arranged text can also be treated both as an element of form and as an element of content – depending on the set of relations and functions it performs.

From the position of the present-day humanities, this is the only technology for the transformation of the spiritual (ethical, in particular) into the aesthetic.

Alongside this, the comprehension type of relation can be fully realized in the drop-ocean type of relation (an instance of the whole – the whole). The adaptation type of relation in its contemporary mode is far from the chaos model; moreover, it elaborately cultivates systemicity, but its limit is the part – whole type of relation. The adaptation type of relation successfully imitates the comprehension type of relation, thus allowing the inherently psychogenic adaptation to present itself as a scientific relation. This is the reason why the “science” of humanities often lacks the core thing: a scientific attitude to the scientifically grounded object of knowledge.

Conclusion. The subject (which includes the object) of study is a multilevel formation in which each separate level must be studied as an instance of the whole. All in one and one in all. It is in this principle of a drop in an ocean that the essence of the comprehensive methodology resides.

6. The astuteness of wholeness as property of the subject (object) under study is that this wholeness cannot be limited by the frames of an artistic model; this model is but an instance (mode) of the wholeness of a different level and order. The instances
of wholeness (in a different measure) can be a personality, an epoch, an author, a fictional work, a reader, a tradition, contemporary context and so on. In other words, a researcher, in a certain sense, creates a holistic subject for him/herself – everyone has judgments in accordance with one’s own methodological level of competence, if you prefer. To grasp the wholeness of the subject, i.e., to embrace the un-embraceable, is already the art of science. Hence the familiar subjectivism of the humanities (and not just the humanities, of course); meanwhile, subjectivism is understood as a mode of objectivity.

This is why the suggested approach sets a whole range of non-literary problems in front of literary scholars: we are in need of a version about the coexistence of the aesthetic with all other forms of social consciousness; the problem of personality requires clarification (and the associated complex of questions with the major one in the foreground: relationship between the psyche and consciousness); in the light of the problem of a personality and society, there are new facets that transpire in the phenomenon of artistry and the phenomenon art – in particular, we analyze the problem of objectivity of artistic criteria, the national as a factor of artistry, and psychologism in literature. In the context of the suggested problematics, the anthropological literary studies apparently lose their positivistic and empirical nature and turn into a philosophical and culturological discipline.

There is some risk, no doubt, in dissolving the literary scholarly specifics in more general problems. However, a no less intensive philosophical tendency will initiate a long awaited humanistic precision and definiteness, not hinder it – however, there will be a new basis for that than the one assumed before. As practice demonstrates, the concentration exclusively on the “text” and “style” does not allow for literary studies to have serious claims for the status of a science. The “phenomenon of style” acknowledged as the reverse side of the “phenomenon of ideas” is the strategic direction in the evolution of the literary science. The key to the solution of literary problems is in the sphere of philosophy.

The renovations on the way of philosophical aesthetics is the next necessary stage in the development of literary studies as a science.

Speaking about the terminology characterizing holistic relations we must make a substantial note.

*The worldview strategies* are undoubtedly not a properly artistic parameter, but they are certainly the factors and a precondition of artistry, the thing whose absence makes the very phenomenon of artistry impossible. Sometimes it is simply unfeasible to cover the given meaning in one term. Terminology thus acquires certain relativity and, as it were, a pre-established incorrectness. A methodological “extension” of the terms becomes significant.

It is necessary to realize the following in this context: the commentary on the terms (which ultimately embrace the relations of categories) becomes no less, and even more important than the systematized terminology as such.
Conclusion. A scientific wholeness, i.e., the one organized with the help of the comprehension type of relation, is described as a system of systems, infinitely contradictory and aspiring for infinity (to the wholeness of all wholes, performing the function of the absolute – the very authentic truth, if one prefers). Comprehensive anthropological literary studies develop as the philosophy of literature.

7. The peculiarities of the subject and the object of study present serious requirements to a scholar. First, one has to be a talented reader, i.e., an outstanding personality capable of empathy and co-creation. Second, one also has to be simultaneously a scientist, i.e., a person who in a certain sense moves further than the writer and further than the reader: he/she reveals in a fictional work not only what transpires in terms of empathy and co-creation, but also what comes as the scientific knowledge of the whole. Clearly, this is the maximum available totality of apprehension of fictional information for a person.

Conclusion. One has to be born a literary scholar. One needs to have a command of two languages of culture at the same time, the language of the psyche and consciousness, which is an extremely rare, if unique gift.

8. And now we shall return to our doubts which we expressed at the beginning of the final section. Is it possible to translate the major parameters of the methodology and philosophy of literature from the language of science into the language of common sense which would also be comprehensible even to those who have no habit of understanding?

This is how we imagine the answer to this question. There is no sort of common sense which would exist separately from science, moreover, oppose it. Common sense is that very balanced academic discourse. If reasonable people wish to understand the scientific problems, they study them. It is a hopeless and unscientific venture, with a flavor of charlatanism, to get across the scientific parametric to the consciousness which lacks the necessary qualities of a scientific character. Why?

It is because the information existent in the language of consciousness cannot be decoded into the language of the psyche, avoiding with this catastrophic losses of the meaning. To speak about science in layman’s terms means eschewing the subject matter of the talk, speaking besides the point. The need to transfer the comprehension type of relation into the framework of the adaptation type of relation, to call a spade a spade, is a social order of mass consciousness. A pseudo-scientific adaptation relation undertakes to fulfill this order. Only a trick can serve as an instrument of transforming comprehension into adaptation. A hocus-pocus, a trick, dexterity of the psyche – this is what an ignorant consciousness will get in place of science. Actually it will get what it expects.

It is another thing when a scientist tries to present something complex in a simple way – in order to yet again complicate the laws which have been mastered. This “technological”, or methodological, aspect of “popularization” is an indispensable stage in the development of scientific knowledge.
To present the material in a “simple form” in the context of apprehension by a scientific consciousness means describing a complex subject of study in terms of the basic methodological parameters, by arranging the key characteristics in a methodologically consistent and correct way. To present something complex in simple terms is of utmost complexity. However, the mass non-scientific consciousness has nothing to do with this kind of “popularization”.

**Conclusion.** Popularization of science with the purpose of advancing scientific knowledge is an ideological act, but not a scientific one; good intentions might be discerned in the attempt to publicize what is going on in science. However, from the scientific perspective, from the positions of total dialectics, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. From the scientific perspective, it involves the needs of mass collective unconscious, which will take for granted any knowledge coming from authority.

Such popularization, by actualizing the mechanism of blind belief, encourages ignorance, opens up the way to the manipulation with social consciousness, as it is a form of implicit propaganda of anti-scientific attitude to the universum.
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