

Problem of Buildup of Literary Scholar's Scientific Sense

Rinat Albertovich Bakirov and Alexei Nikolayevich Pashkurov
Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kremlyovskaya Str. 18, Kazan, Russia

Abstract: The study deals with different aspects of buildup of literary scholar's scientific sense and demonstrates this problem with the help of several examples. The researchers reveal connections between a scientist and a surrounding context in different form of its expression. The researchers analyze factors influencing, among other things, modern perception of scientific viewpoint of a literary scholar. At first, the authors study general regularities of scientist's world view buildup. They single out several concrete factors, among which there are historical context, literary studies school influence, national specificity, peculiarities of a scientist's personality (e.g., religiosity, education etc.). Particularly, they present how literary studies as a field of science depend on a specific era's ideology. The researchers provide examples of such interaction both in XIX-XX centuries and today. They postulate sequence and repetitiveness of general principles of development of this dependence.

Key words: Literary studies, scientific method, context, determinism, development

INTRODUCTION

Russian literary studies is intrinsically a unified system with lots of structural elements which mutually determine each other. One of such elements is specificity of buildup of scientific viewpoint of each particular scientist. The problem of finding of determinants of various "forces" is nonsolvable, more precisely it has an infinite aggregate of solutions. Practically any element of the universe influence any person in some way and is reflected in his/her thoughts and actions. Of course, a literary scholar is no exception and therefore, the task of finding all factors which have directed a scientist's thought is doomed to failure in advance. But, we can at least, outline a certain range of main factors and with their help understand, even though in the broadest strokes, peculiarities of scientist's scientific viewpoint development. So, we set the task not to make a complete overview of all aspects of buildup of literary scholars conceptual provisions but just to highlight their components which are the most interesting and the most important from our point of view (which is certainly inevitably subjective in this case). Relevance of our research is associated with several points:

- Modern science is oriented towards interdisciplinarity it imposes the necessity for research of interdisciplinary contacts history too, and in this regard understanding of any literary scholar's scientific work is a vivid example of such synthesis of research methods and conceptions

- Tendency towards construction of literary studies history on the basis of revelation of general regularities of scientific process, introduction of forgotten findings of literary scholars of the past to the scientific community anew, return to academic literary studies conceptions, revival of regional traditions in science
- Modern science is concerned with various prognostic constructions which can exist only with due consideration of all components of the previous scientific process buildup

Above referenced relevance determined our work's novelty too. Up to now literary studies history works have not presented a general conception of all components of the scientific process at different stages of it. "Literary studies survey", taken in diachrony will allow to outline composition of literary studies as a system in general.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For research, generalization and analysis of the data we obtain we need a complex of scientific research methods. First of all, comparative methods are important. Thus with the help of relative comparative method we can and should study the phenomenon of literary scholar's world view in the context of other culture factors. Relative typological method is oriented towards creation of a theoretic paradigm of research-on-research view dynamics analysis.

Along with comparative analysis methods, we also consider genetic method data to be essential. Its main task is to explore a phenomenon in historico-evolutionary perspective that is to reveal and analyze main regularities of its rise, development, modern state and prospects.

One of determinants in human sciences methodology is Historico-Functional Method used in this study. This method is oriented towards studying of dynamics of social cultural life response to some process which takes/took/will take place in culture.

Finally, systematic approach allows to generalize and interpret obtained results as a whole and also to plan perspectives of future research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Literary scholar viewpoint buildup as a systemic problem: If considering literary scholar viewpoint buildup as an integrated system (“text”), we should reveal first of all the most general elements of it and then particular ones. When composing a general typological scheme, we can accept systems components conventional division into two wide planes: the first one will be called “real and chronotopic”, the second one will be called “discursive”. In the first case by the concept which was introduced by M.M. Bakhtin with reference to literary work architectonics, we mean a specific historical and topographical context; “discursive” plane means influence on buildup of scientist’s viewpoint on content of texts with which he/she works. Of course, a borderline between these two planes are quite indistinct, they are rather profoundly interdependent than opposed to each other and only with the help of analysis of their unity, we can reveal main peculiarities of any literary scholar viewpoint buildup and later on we will study “impact factors” in the context of unity of expression of both planes in them. Just owing to these planes’ complementarity and interaction, brand new structural elements, informative fertility and distinctness of each literary scholar’s view can arise (on the problem of ratio of sources of “universality” and “uniqueness” in the course of such processes in the light of topical paradigm of comparative literature see recent research (Amineva, 2014).

We think that the most important component of the scientific viewpoint buildup system is a “historical context” which is traditionally singled out in the course of analysis of both literary and literary studies facts/phenomena. That said, spectrum of possible contexts and informative elements here is very wide from “era context” to biographical context from ideological background to journalistic disputes (in view of analytical

survey of achievements of Kazan Literary Studies Academic School at the turn of XIX-XX centuries (Voronova, 2014).

We should remember that historical context is a living, agile phenomenon. As was already noted by many scientists, each specific moment of history has its own paradigmatic structures; factors which influence culture pass from the category of peripheral ones to central ones and vice versa (Pashkurov and Razzhivin, 2014). In this sense, we should talk about importance of certain historical events’ influence on scientist’s viewpoint; these events seem to be a driving force of these structural paradigms changes. One can not doubt increase of importance of this factor in XX century which was full of various large-scale changes. Russian history is full of such moments which have essentially changed evolution of literary studies. It was the “revolutionary spirit of the era” which became a catalyst of rise of formalism, a philological trend which was dramatically new against the previous “academical” tradition to a large extent determining the whole further evolution of Russian literary studies.

The opposite kind example in subsequent period is a long-term influence on Stalin period science (a particular case in the war period is reputed to be an obvious and understandable slowdown of the humanities research at this time, including partial cease of learning and teaching of Russian-German relationships in literature, German and Romance culture and literature, etc.). Along with this, the war’s influence on researcher’s personality evolution, complement of “knowledge base” and therefore scientific viewpoint of scientists who personally participated in military actions is not less important. The most illustrative example is U.M. Lotman passed through the whole war as a frontline signaller. On the one hand, the war encouraged invigoration of his endurance and stamina and moral value system, on the other hand in a certain way it even developed some his scientific and aesthetic interests. In this regard, further dominating of references specifically to German and French speaking researchers in Lotman’s researches is very illustrative as well as preferential attention to French and German literature in literature comparative analysis.

Post-war period was characterized by a relatively small number of large-scale historical events in the USSR and a whole series of various disturbances in European countries history. A vivid example of influence of historical changes during the first decades after the World War II on literary studies evolution is “revolutionary” changes of the French society in the middle of XX century. Students unrest in France considerably coincided with ascent of theoretical ideas in

literary studies and here we can rightfully raise a question of degree of determinateness of the first case in relation to the second case, it is worthy of note that among famous theorists whose works sparked interest at this time, a conspicuous place is taken by Michel Foucault, well-known also as an active public person; his scientific methodology is also characterized by reflection of his points of view on vital problematic issues of the society of his days). We should single out the factor of personality of a scientist, specificity of his/her spiritual psychological qualities as a separate element of the scientific sense buildup system. Personality's evolution per se goes through the whole researcher's life but a special place here is taken by the factor of family education. At one point, we can talk about "boosting" and voluntary "upbringing" of a philologist in a family there are many examples of this.

Another expression of a "spiritual world" of a researcher, the world which is bound up with his/her scientific researches is religiosity in its different manifestations. On the one hand, we can speak about presence of researchers putting their beliefs into their works steadfastly-conference "Orthodoxy and Russian literature" which is conducted regularly, illustrates this quite well. On the other hand, religiosity can be expressed implicitly, found when reading researcher's works profoundly and correlating with certain religious provisions. Christianity and atheism as important basics of scientific world view of M.M. Bakhtin and U.M. Lotman correspondingly are marked out by B.F. Yegorov in his words about world outlook attitudes. Similar thoughts are outspoken by K.G. Isupov; he said about importance of religiosity of literary scholar-commentator regarding his knowledge of necessary context; Isupov traced this tradition to hermeneutical seeking of Jewish interpreters.

The matter of religion is bound up with another determinant of scientific viewpoint evolution, but it is rather social (the problem of researcher's nationality) than "emotional". Here, we can say about researchers' doubtless thematical orientation towards studying of literature of their people because it is the most comprehensible and understandable one. At the same time, nationality is expressed also in relation to literary studies method development. I.U. Svetlikova in particular, notes importance of a Semitic component in development of not only material resources of formalists' new coterie, but also of conceptual filling up of its theoretical provisions.

Regarding formalists the matter of literary studies schools is also important. Schools are important components of chronotopic plane of scientific viewpoint buildup (together with historical context mentioned

earlier). Here we should talk about diachronic movement within a confined space. Each literary studies school on the one hand, should have its teachers and students that is evolution, on the other hand a certain topographic centre, within which its buildup takes place (Bogdanov, 2006). Researching of literary studies schools is one of the main branches of modern science of literary studies history. And one of the main factors of arising of a certain school is scientists group concentration around solving of some matter, which is topographically conditioned by this school's location (Milyugina and Stroganov, 2008) or presence of some great scientist, who is able to join forces of his/her flock, colleagues around a certain scientific vector, at the wellsprings of it. Detailed and adequately generalized analytical data is represented in summary of the work of Kazan group within the frames of grant project of the Federal Targeted Programme "Regional model of buildup and development of Russian academic literary studies: Kazan scientific school".

Literary studies and ideology: Now, let's pass on study of the problem at the joint of literary studies, ideology (implemented under the influence of social political requests) and "pure history" as components of time axis of above mentioned scientific chronotope. There at we should consider general conventionality of division of these two categoric units. As well as understanding of history is impossible without considering of era's ideology, ideology is impossible without historical context as a matter of fact, it exists only in a context and is implemented and explained only in the binding with specific historical events. The most recent typical example of such interaction is Perestroika and USSR breakup as phenomena of historical life which radically changed ideological milestones in science. In the field of literary studies, it became possible to carry out researches on topics which had been forbidden before (See for instance, appearance of digests and monographs and also republication of pre-revolutionary researchers' researches on topics "Erotic in Russian literature", "Russian literature and Freemasonry", "Christianity and Russian literature", etc., about negative perception of this phenomenon (as "harmful" for philology). Besides, conferences which had been impossible before took place (for example, "Bath readings", organized by "New literary review" magazine) to use "Western" or native methods (earlier considered to be marginal) of literature analysis openly.

We can note such special feature of Russian literary studies since 1990's years until first decades of XXI century in this context as for example, outburst of researchers' interest in the phenomenon of Silver age (about range of regularities of modern vision of the problem-see (Krylov, 2014)).

However as is known change of ideological vectors, “release of minds” from previous mentality models necessitates, especially at the initial stage, radicalism of negation the past scientific and aesthetic experience. “Freedom of everything”, total pluralism and revision of findings of Soviet literary studies in 1990 led to on the one hand, an obvious increase in number of researches which were pseudoscientific or claiming to be a new “true vision and understanding” of world order rules, on the other hand almost complete cease of studying of certain topics, works, writers and a tacit prohibition against Lenin-Marxist analysis practicing and that has essentially emasculated literary studies as science which presupposes plurality of methods and approaches. Here an example from Chekhov studies is illustrative: “the end of the century has been studied in Soviet literary science of subspecies Chekhov for so long that the new literary studies, which concentrated its efforts on reconstruction of Russian symbolism and postsymbolism and on exploration of avant-garde, stayed away from it instinctively”. Similar pattern of social political ideology’s influence on literary scholars was observed in history of Russian science more than once.

The “intellectual” background of an era appears to be a kind of subconscious palimpsest on the basis of which scientist’s thinking is built.

In this aspect also to a considerable extent it is a special context of a certain era which is a dominant prism through which for instance, the scientific personality of Kazan literary scholar N.N. Bulich was built. It is definitely important in this case that the common background of scientific researches in the second half of XX century was philosophy. As for Bulich, for instance, this fact is twice important: Kazan literary scholar at first defended a philosophy thesis and only then started concern himself actively with literary studies where he gained laurels. In a more global sense, it is H. Taine’s positive philosophy which in this period became the basis for development of a major Russian literary studies branch cultural historical school.

In the same degree, we can talk about certain importance of a scientific context in relation to the situation in literary studies in the early XX century. Global psychologism became a dominant “scientific factor”, prevailing in human sciences. Often, at the turn of the century psychology and philosophy were not separated and were considered to be one whole science. Eventually, “it was supposed that psychologists created a certain base for human sciences which in their turn could shed light on the psychology matter”.

As for further history of Russian literary studies in Soviet period, we can say about primary importance of

“scientific trends” which were implemented in methodological approaches change for science. This scientific context was directly bound with state ideological context too. Here, it is easy to trace development of these categories in relation to their influence on a certain research subject’s disclosure from different sides. From this viewpoint in particular, E.G. Etkind studied the history of research of “Eugene Onegin” in Soviet era; he noted several stages of development of “worldview of eras which changed one another”. By the end of the XX century previous ideological attitudes crisis led to domination of synchronous structural researches, on the one hand and on the other hand to increase of archival findings, new publications, various real comments with the help of accumulation. Breakaway from Marxist or rather, Hegelian historicism resulted in negation of materialistic as well as historical explanation of both objective reality and its belles reflection. Literary studies works were published; they were full of mysticism, mostly of Christian, Orthodox kind. Of course, historico-literary researches continued to be published (like for example, articles and books by N. Eidelman or U. Lotman) but they were often considered to be strange anachronisms; works of V. Turbin and V. Nepomnyashchiy appeared to be typical for poststructuralism era.

However, literary studies history works demonstrate another approach to study of the phenomenon of interaction of ideology, methodology and science too we can mention a very illustrative study by M.L. Gasparov dedicated right to interaction of these components in U.M. Lotman’s works: “Ideology of Marxism that has won drastically was out of phase with the method of Marxism that is fighting, but this was meticulously hidden. Lotman took the Marxist method seriously and the ideology in the way it deserved. And it is well-known that the most dangerous person for a dogma is the one who takes it seriously. Semi-official newspapers felt that. When Lotman was beginning an analysis of a poem with describing of its lexis, rhythmic and phonics, he held to the materialism rule strictly. No content, even the most sublime, of a freedom-loving or love poem by Pushkin cannot be understood in circumvention of its verbal expression. Marxism method indeed required proofs from a researcher (Marx’s album motto: “doubt everything”). But ideology preferred to work with obviousnesses: otherwise it would be forced to prove its right to exist”. As we see, Gasparov notes right that “clearance” between ideology and method from where literary studies knowledge, embodied in this case in Lotman methodology, grows.

Finally, even if judging from not numerous given above examples, we can talk about doubtless importance and necessity of understanding of multicomponential and nonuniform “ideological” factor as an integrated system composed of many structural elements. At first sight, these elements-“contexts” can seem to be external to ideological field (like for instance, “scientific context” of an era) but upon a closer view one finds their doubtless belonging to the sphere of ideology, though in a somewhat changed understanding of it.

CONCLUSION

Plurality of structural components if considering literary studies to be an integrated system conditioned by several determinants, defined a somewhat specific “higgledypigglediness” of aspects taken by us for studying. Of course, the literary scholar’s scientific viewpoint buildup peculiarities used by us for representing as the main ones are far from being everything in the list of such influence factors, even on the contrary they are just some kind of an “exciter” for further intensive study of this problem. In particular, we can talk about necessity of understanding of such additional aspects which develop literary scholar’s scientific works as: specificity of scientist’s teaching activities (let us remember here A.N. Pypin; researchers explain tremendous number of his texts with the scientist’s freedom from teaching activities and therefore possibility to concentrate all efforts and time on science); relationships between a scientist and art (a typical example: complementary synthesis of artistic researches of formalists and futurists); gender aspect (advanced to the forefront just lately and already showed that in “purely gender” works women often write about women-writers); possibility and skill of a scientist to master and use in his/her works new technical aids (the hottest topic in the sphere of prosody which made a great

leap in the computer era due to simplification of calculation with the help of a mechanism) etc. Thus, as we can see, we need a further research of the subject declared by us in most various aspects which can reveal peculiarities of literary scholar’s scientific viewpoint buildup better.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers was prepared within the frames of implementation of “Plan of measures on execution of the Program of competitive recovery of FSAEI HVE `K(V)FU` among leading world scientific educational centres for 2013-2020”.

REFERENCES

- Amineva, V.R., 2014. Universal and unique as the categories of comparative literature. *Middle-East J. Scient. Res.*, 20: 2094-2098.
- Bogdanov, K.A., 2006. About crocodiles in Russia. *Essays from History of Borrowings Exotisms*, Moscow, Pages: 352.
- Krylov, V.N., 2014. History of Russian silver age literature-centrism crisis. *Life Sci. J.*, 11: 399-401.
- Milyugina, E.G. and M.V. Stroganov, 2008. *Genius of Taste: N.A. Lvov. Results and problems of studying: Monograph*. Tver State University, Tver, Pages: 278.
- Pashkurov, A.N. and A.I. Razzhivin, 2014. *Literary culture as a dialog of contradictions and reconciler (basing on review of poetics of Russian literature of XVIII-beginning of XIX century)*. *Life Sci. J.*, 11: 120-124.
- Voronova, L.A., 2014. *Problematics and types of literary studies researches of A.S. Arkhangelskiy in pages of Scholarly notes of Kazan University*. *Scholarly Notes of Kazan University*, Volume 156, pp: 7-17.