

УДК 82.0

RELATIONSHIP OF THE ART OF WORD AND SCIENCE AS LITERATURE SYNTHESIS

Maria CHOBANYUK,

Ph. D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Linguistic and intercultural communication, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6047-4852>

Research ID: X-9269-2019 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-9269-2019>

Статтю подано до редакції / The article is submitted to the editorial board 11.09.2019.

Статтю опубліковано / The article is published 15.11.2019.

The purpose of the article is to investigate the issues of literary synthesis belonging to different spheres of humanities. Finding your own literary identity is a sign and a constant process. The debate on the new status and new quality of Ukrainian literature is not exhausted and is not over, but is breaking out with renewed vigor. Some scholars provoke its development, others point to the repetitiveness of arguments, others advocate Ukrainian opportunism and call for an end to all literary disputes, since they distract the writer from the main thing – writing texts.

It is proved that the idea of synthesis, its character and role in the science of literature is extremely blurred. Synthesis is explained by the notion of becoming a dynamic, open process, driven by the desire of art to approach the «true life». Synthesis results in organic unity, a complex integrity in which the correlation of part and whole emerges from the intrinsic objectivity of the object, from the «common» basis of the joined forms, which directs search and transformation.

The study analyzes the views of literary critics on the consideration of fundamental synthesis studies in contemporary literature on science, which are reflected in literary and critical practice.

Keywords: author; literary criticism; synthesis; methodology; creativity; text; criticism.

СПІВІДНОШЕННЯ МИСТЕЦТВА СЛОВА ТА НАУКИ ЯК ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВЧИЙ СИНТЕЗ

Марія ЧОБАНЮК,

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри мовної та міжкультурної комунікації, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net

У статті досліджено питання літературознавчого синтезу, що належать до різних сфер гуманітарної науки. Пошук власної літературної ідентичності – процес знаковий і постійний. Дискусія про новий статус і нову якість української науки про літературу не вичерпана й не закінчена, а раз у раз спалахує з новою силою. Одні науковці провокують її розвиток, інші вказують на повторюваність аргументів, треті виступають репрезентаторами українського опортунізму і закликають припинити усіякі навколо літературні суперечки, позаяк вони відволікають письменника від головного – писання текстів.

Варто відзначити, що уявлення про синтез, його характер і роль у науці про літературу вкрай розмиті. Синтез пояснюється через поняття становлення динаміки, відкритого процесу, зумовленого прагненням мистецтва наблизитися до «справжнього життя». Результат синтезу – це органічна єдність, складна цілісність, у якій співвіднесення частини й цілого виходять із внутрішньої заданості об'єкта, із «спільної» основи з'єднаних форм, що спрямовує пошук і взаємоперетворення.

У дослідженні проаналізовано погляди літературознавців щодо розгляду фундаментальних досліджень синтезу в сучасній науці про літературу, які знайшли своє відображення в літературознавчій і критичній практиці.

Хочеться наголосити, що, розбудовуючи простір українського літературознавства, можна і треба ходити не тільки колом, а й різними дорогами (зокрема методологічними), що тих доріг більше – то краще, головне – зосередити зусилля на текстах (писання, видання, обговорення), а не на деструктивних контекстах.

Ключові слова: автор; літературознавство; синтез; методологія; творчість; текст; критика.

Relevance of research. The search for one's own literary identity is a sign and constant process. The debate about the new status and the new quality of Ukrainian literature is not exhausted and is not over, but it is constantly erupting with new force. Some provoke its development, others point to the repetition of arguments, the third are the representatives of Ukrainian opportunism and call to stop all around literary controversy, as they distract the writer from the main one – the writing of texts. According to Y. Polischuk (Polischuk, 2004, p. 4), the self-consciousness of literature cannot be limited to a practical level, but requires theoretical abstraction and the construction of

certain intellectual concepts. Especially if you evaluate literature as an institution, which requires school and university humanitarian education.

Subject of study. It should be noted that the idea of synthesis, its character and role in the literature is extremely blurred.

The purpose of the article is to consider fundamental research on synthesis, which belongs to various spheres of the humanities, which allows us to talk about the main features inherent in the process. Synthesis is explained by the concept of the formation of dynamics, an open process, driven by the aspirations of art to get closer to “life”. The result of synthesis – is organic unity, complex integrity, in which the correlation of the part and the whole proceed from the internal object of the object, from the “common” basis of the connecting forms, which directs the search and interconversion.

In the Ukrainian literary critique, the problem of synthesis, or not for the first time, becomes a sign of systematicity in the lingula psychological theory of Alexander Potebnya. Methodological expediency of systematic and complex analysis of poetic phenomena O. Potebnya was substantiated by the very ontological nature of art: “Artistic, in particular, a poetic work, similar to man, plants, animals, are the cores of a wide range of sciences. It is impossible to say what kind of knowledge is not needed in explaining the composition, actions and origin of a poetic work» (Potebnya, 1990, p. 110).

Recognizing the fruitfulness of interdisciplinary study of artistic creativity, the scientist at the same time emphasized the fundamental difference in the methods of studying humanities and “exact sciences.” In science, he wrote, the completeness and accuracy of the analysis is a measure of the convincingness of the proof of the general situation. “In the poetry (and in general in art) the connection of the image and knowledge cannot be revealed. The image excite the meaning, not decomposing, but directly (Potebnya, 1990, p. 111).”

According to Oleksandr Biletsky, O. Potebnya is one of the forerunner of the future science, which synthesizes human knowledge – the “organizational science” that is thought to be hard on these days, but whose construction still remains in the future (Beletsky, 1922, 40). “The prospects of literary synthesis O. Beletsky (Beletsky, 1922, 56) saw the following methodological principles of Potebnya’s theory. First, to analyze the text must be impartial, without any pre-made aesthetic, general philosophical or journalistic conclusions. Second, it is first of all to study the text itself – its external and internal forms. Thirdly, the researcher must find out the conditions rooted in both the spiritual organization of the author himself and in the environment that formed him. And, fourthly, the literary image is not something definitely defined, it lives and changes in the perception of different categories and generations of readers, and this is also part of the content to be analyzed.

These, like many other ideas of O. Potebnya, O. Beletsky, creatively developed in their own literary and critical practice. Like the Potebnian concept of creativity, according to which “a poetic work is primarily a matter of the soul of the author himself, there is work on his own development (Potebnya, 1990, 129).” O. Beletsky in the work “Problems of synthesis in literary criticism” (1940), the complexity of the methodological The toolkit of literary research explains the specific nature of the history of literature itself, in which the objective is in unity with the subjective, recognizable with what it knows, and therefore “a great researcher needs a cadre, in order to establish the objects of aesthetic knowledge, he does not turned his work into a catalog of themes and motives, as has often happened (Beletsky, 1966,519).”

Detecting the incompatibility with the vulgar sociological “abolition” of personality and the difference in the interpretation of the problem of synthesis with O. Veselovsky, from the system of poetics which “fell the moment of creative individuality,” O. Beletsky developed a method of simultaneous study and “objects of verbal cognition,” and “the subject who knows – the creative personality of the poet (Beletsky, 1966, 520).”

In the process of determining the scale and content of personal aesthetic knowledge O. Beletsky (Beletsky, 1966, 520) identified three circles. In the first poet knows his own microcosm (“poetic knowledge is above all self-knowledge”). In the second circle, the whole environment, the closest to it, the world – its environment, its time, contemporaries, contemporaries. However, as the scholar specified, both the “small” and the “average” worlds are the ways of knowing the great world that lies beyond the confines of sensuality, the macrocosm, whose elements in the language of different eras and different classes have different names – “god”, “humanity”, “universe “. The study of these three circles of cognition, according to O. Beletsky (Beletsky, 1966, 521), brings the researcher closer to understanding “the mystery of the unity of the author with his characters,” “the secrets of the process of personal creativity.”

I. Dzuba in the literary theory of the Ukrainian scientist noticed the scientific prediction of the ways in which the Western literary-theoretical thought went. It is an echo of O. Beletsky’s thoughts in the four-layer structure of the work of R. Ingardin, the distinction between the potential and actual being of the aesthetic object in the phenomenology of O. Becker, and the “foreboding” of some ideas of hermeneutics by P. Ricker (Dzuba, 1977, 57). N. Shlyakhova (Shlyakhova , 2008, 5) believes that the article “The Problem of Synthesis in Literary Studies” O. Beletsky, or not the first, broke the calm that followed the “methodological storms” (the expression Methodological aspects of the literary synthesis of Y. Barabash) 20-30-ies and at the same

time he had a foretaste of growing interest in the problem of the relation between art and science and, more broadly, the literary and humanitarian and scientific and technical cultures.

Y. Barabash, recognizing the organic connection of the systemic nature of art with the problem of interdisciplinary study of it, without denying the suitability of psychological or structural-semiotic methods for the analysis of literature, has warned against the universality of these methods. It is precisely because the work of art is multi-valued and multilayered, “they are condemned to failure,” the scientist emphasized, “attempts to find a single, universal key to it, and moreover, a” catch “, here ... you need a whole bundle of keys, because not under one and even not under seven, and under many locks the secrets of creativity are kept (Barabash, 1977, 393)”.

The warnings of the scientist turned out to be quite right. Even then, in the same 70-s, attention to interdisciplinary study of artistic creativity is gradually reoccupied with the sociological aspects of literary methodology: the interpretation of literature is directly related to the choice of position in the ideological conflicts of our time. At the same time, the problem of synthesis is not supposed to be removed – only its meaning changes – not the elucidation of the general laws of literary science, and the generalization and selection of some of the main principles that have proven their advantages in the process of analyzing the ideological content and the form of literature.

According to N. Shlyakhova (Shlyakhova, 2008, 7), the real methodological breakthrough was the publication of the three issues of collective work “Theories, Schools, Concepts (Critical Analysis)” in 1975, which had to solve three interconnected tasks: informational – to give representation of the latest theoretical and literary processes in foreign science; scientific-theoretical – to conduct an objective scientific analysis of the most important theories and concepts of modern bourgeois theory of literature and aesthetics; ideological – to show the class background of these theories and concepts. Thanks to the first two tasks of this collective work that were professionally completed, the first question of the aesthetics of phenomenology, structuralism, existentialism, and others of E. Husserl’s conception, M. Heidegger, K. Jaspers was considered in the organic connection with literary problems.

The beginning of the twenty-first century was marked by the strengthening of the alleged O. Beletsky’s interest in studying “living and active people, which are writers and readers” (. Beletsky, 1966, 526). Indicative in this context are two solid monographs: “Fate. Los Fate Shevchenko and Polish and Russian romance “by E. Nahlik and “Homo legens: reading as a socio-cultural phenomenon” by M. Zubrytska. In terms of interpretive technologies, E. Nahlik considers it necessary in the introductory remarks

to clarify the consistent non-compliance of any fashion literary theory and methodology, but only the use of their certain achievements, refraining from formalistic extremes, associated with the complete depersonalization of the text, removing from him the subjectivity of the author. “On the contrary, in the proposed monograph the personality and creative personality of the writer – in a prominent position as the active creative force generating the text, gives him the uniqueness and contains the key to its solution (Nahlík, 2003, 9)”. So, the scientist emphasized, the text is explained through the author, the author – through the text he created. And further clarified: «At the same time in the center of research attention – the writers as personalities and creative personality» (Nahlík, 2003, 10).

As for the reader, with interest in the study of which O. Beletsky linked the prospect of the development of literary synthesis, at the beginning of the XXI century our scientific space was enriched with the major synthetic research «Homo legens: reading as a socio-cultural phenomenon» (2004) M. Zubrytska. Consequently, we have grounds to state certain signs of updating the paradigm of author’s and reader’s strategies in contemporary Ukrainian literary criticism. «It’s hard to say today – we agree with M. Zubrytska – how casual, and how logical it is that the literary theories after the idea of the author’s death and the proclamation of the thesis that nothing exists outside the text, again resonated his attention on the figure of the author... (Zubrytska, 2004, 121).»

I would like to emphasize that building a space of Ukrainian literary criticism can and should go not only in terms of circles, but also in different ways (in particular methodological ones), and what are their roads, the more – the better, the main thing – is to concentrate efforts on texts (writing, publication, discussion), rather than on destructive contexts.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

Барабаш, Ю. (1977). *Вопросы эстетики и поэтики*. Москва, Советская Россия.

Белецкий, А. (1922). *Потехня и наука истории литературы в России*. Харьков: Бюлетень Редакционного комитета.

Белецкий, А. (1966). *Проблема синтеза в литературоведении*. Собрание сочинений: у 5-ти т. Киев, Т.3.

Дзюба, І. (1977). *Олександр Білецький і проблема літературознавчого синтезу*. Слово і Час. 1, 53 – 58.

Зубрицька, М. (2004). *Homo legens: читання як соціокультурний феномен*. Львів, Літопис.

Нахлік, Є. (2003). *Доля. Los. Судьба. Шевченко і польські та російські романтики*. Національна Академія Наук України, Інститут літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка, Львівське відділення. Львів.

Поліщук, Я. (2004). *Постмодерна пропозиція і сучасна література*. Вісник, Львів. УН-ТУ 33. 3 – 11.

Потебня, А. (1990). *Теоретическая поэтика*. Москва, Высшая школа.

Шляхова, Н. (2008). *Методологічні аспекти літературознавчого синтезу*. Вісник. Львів. УН-ТУ 44. 5 – 12.

REFERENCES

Barabash, YU. (1977). *Voprosy estetiki i poetiki [Questions of aesthetics and poetics]*. Moscow. [in Russian]

Beletskiy, A. (1922). *Potebnyia i nauka istorii literatury v Rossii [Potebnyia and science of the history of literature in Russia]*. Kharkov: Byuleten Redaktsionnogo komiteta [in Russian]

Beletskiy, A. (1966). *Problema sinteza v literaturovedenii [The synthesis problem in literary criticism]*. Kyiv.[in Russian]

Dzyuba, I. (1977). Oleksandr Biletskyi i problema literaturoznavchoho syntezu [Alexander Biletsky and the Problem of Literary Synthesis]. *Slovo i Chas – Word and Time*. [in Ukrainian]

Zubryts'ka, M. (2004): *Homo legens: chytannya yak sotsiokulturnyy fenomen [Homo legens: reading as a socio-cultural phenomenon]*. Lviv [in Ukrainian]

Nakhlik, YE. (2003). *Dolya. Los. Sudba. Shevchenko i polski ta rosiyski romantyky [Fate. Los. Fate. Shevchenko and Polish and Russian romances]*. Lviv. [in Ukrainian]

Polishchuk, YA. (2004). *Postmoderna propozytysiya i suchasna literatura [Post-modern offer and contemporary literature]* *Visnyk – Bulletin*. Lviv [in Ukrainian]

Potebnyia, A. (1990). *Teoreticheskaya poetika [Theoretical poetics]*. Moscow [in Russian]

Shlyakhova, N. (2008). *Metodolohichni aspekty literaturoznavchoho syntezu [Methodological aspects of literary synthesis]*. *Visnyk*. Lviv [in Ukrainian]