



## Creativity of F.M. Dostoevsky in the Context of the Global Trend of Integration and Globalization of Scientific Knowledge

**Petruxina N.M.**

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Published Online: 30 January 2023 Corresponding Author <b>Petruxina N.M.</b>	This article examines the system of multi-level correlations between Dostoevsky's work, his artistic philosophical thought and Russian, Western European and Uzbek literary systems of the 20th century, explores trends aimed at the historical-literary, theoretical and methodological study of literature in the context of general and particular problems of intercultural communication.
<b>KEYWORDS:</b> Reception, intertextuality, intercultural aspect, cultural significance.	

In modern world literary criticism, as a result of global epoch-making cultural changes, there has been a transformation not only in the processes of identification and interpretation of classical literature, but also in approaches to the analysis of fiction in general. The most relevant and promising are research areas associated, on the one hand, with an attempt to rethink the worldview and aesthetic constants of the literary heritage of the past, and on the other hand, forming new methodological systems for interpreting and evaluating the modern literary process in the prism of the classical art system, emphasizing comparative aspects or intertextual receptive forms.

In the world of literary criticism, science and the humanities, the work of F. Dostoevsky not only continues to be in demand and relevant, but is also filled with new meanings, opening up the multiple infinity of interpretations: literary, philosophical, psychological, cultural. In this regard, when studying the receptive aspects of the manifestation of F. Dostoevsky's creativity in the world literary process of the 20th century, it seems justified and logical to identify a broad intercultural aspect of the analysis of not only textual literary communications, but also interparadigmatic intertexts. A comprehensive study of the specifics of the development of the world artistic consciousness of the 20th century, especially its axiological and ideological components, is impossible without taking into account the impact of the work of F. Dostoevsky, who stepped over national borders in his "cultural" significance.

At present, scientific studies of the creativity of outstanding writers—concentres with world status and recognition are being updated in Uzbek literary criticism.

The most significant and in demand for the world literary process of the 20th century are the code discoveries

of Dostoevsky's work, the author's "ethical imperative", which determine the relevance of F. Dostoevsky's work for the world literary process of the 20th century, conceptualized by F.M. Dostoevsky in the system of intertextual "dialogue" with the classics. The tradition of intertextual and receptive reading of Dostoevsky becomes the basis for the construction of modern methods of artistic and interdisciplinary research in the context of the multipolar system of the world literary process.

By the beginning of the 21st century, in the process of the historical development of the humanitarian sphere of knowledge in general and literary science in particular, the need to update a number of issues was developed due to the emergence of a new type of scientific and theoretical thinking, analytically complicated by the modern level of the dialectical and logical process of cognition, which was transformed as a result of global trends integration and globalization of scientific knowledge. As a result, there is a need to improve the system of scientific—theoretical, historical-literary and methodological trends as an integral system in the modern science of literature. Moreover, in recent years in world science there has been an increasing attention not only to the study of unidirectional issues of the history, theory and methodology of literature, but also to the synthetic process of generalizing these issues, and to the development of problems that are simultaneously aimed at the historical-literary, theoretical and methodological the study of literature in the context of general and particular problems of intercultural communication.

The problem of intercultural communication in the modern scientific and educational paradigm is actualized as a result of the processes of globalization and integration, which predetermined the formation of a completely new type of

thinking based on the perception of “one’s own through another’s” (M. Bakhtin). Moreover, speaking about the marginal status of modern culture as a whole, a number of researchers directly connect with this the conceptualization of the “dialogue of cultures” as the basis for research structures in particular, and for the development of an innovative paradigm of philological science in general. S.I. Sharina, for example, emphasizes that “the concept of a dialogue of cultures has become extremely fashionable in modern reality, and in various fields of knowledge—in cultural studies, in art history, in literary criticism as a border area between art history and philology, in linguistics, more precisely, in those sections that are related to the problem of “language and culture”, as well as in pedagogy related to the education of representatives of ethnic minorities or students who make up multinational teams, both in schools and universities”.

Moreover, this approach makes it possible to take into account the interdisciplinary aspect of the “dialogue of cultures”, which, according to A.P. Valitskaya, defines the aspiration of both culture in general and science in particular “towards a polyparadigm (interdisciplinary) dialogue”. It is this methodology that largely determines the basis for building a “dialogical” interdependence of research work on the problem of identifying the logic and patterns of development of the literary process of the twentieth century in the system of correlation with tradition, correlated, in our case, with Russian, Western European and Uzbek “interliterary” communities and various levels of the worldwide literary and cultural system.

The work of F. Dostoevsky in this methodological approach simultaneously performs the function of “dispersal (the work of a major artist, without losing its independent artistic value, dissolves in the subsequent artistic process) and “concentration” (a major artist integrates, absorbs the work of a galaxy of his predecessors and contemporaries).

In modern literary criticism, the problem of studying the comparative and receptive aspects of the work of a particular writer in the contextual field of world literature is directly correlated with the formation of the theory of “dialogue of cultures”, since only dialogically equal interactions can create the basis for creative processing or rethinking of tradition (and not reduce interaction to imitation or epigonism). Thus, considering the specifics of the interaction of modern literature with Russian classical literature, Y. Borev proceeds from the dominant aspects of the concept of “dialogue of cultures” and “cultural memory”, noting that Russian literature appears in this interaction: in its real form; in the form in which this direction of literature of the twentieth century sees it. (existentialism or critical realism or socialist realism, etc.); in the form in which the literature of the XIX century, comprehended itself (in particular, in critical articles and reviews of that time); in the form in which

the literature of the XIX century. imagined the ideal of literature.

It is legitimate to say that the work of F. Dostoevsky concentrates the dominant tendencies and aspects of the Russian literary tradition, in the process of creative rethinking centers them in the author’s artistic picture of the world and the aesthetic system, and then disperses them in the form of a background tradition in the receptive field of the subsequent Russian and, in general, the world literary process. In this regard, the statement of modern scholars about the bi-intertextual specificity of literary interactions, which provides a key condition for the development of “cultural memory”, is relevant: “In the artistic process, everything is intertwined: one type of influence cannot be found in its pure form. The scientific approach requires the identification of a typology of artistic interactions.

These interactions have two “collaterals”: “passive” (the artist is influenced) and “real” (the artist influences), two classes: intraspecies (for example, intraliterary) and interspecies (theater affects painting, music affects cinema, cinema – for literature and television). <...> Artistic interactions are observed at different levels: individual works, individual artists, artistic movements, trends and schools, and finally, at the level of entire literary epochs.

Building a receptive field for studying both the level of influence of Russian and, in general, the world cultural tradition on the formation of the creative concept of F. Dostoevsky, and the level of influence of F. Dostoevsky’s creativity on the evolutionary movement of the Russian, Western European and Uzbek literary process of the 20th century, it is necessary to take into account all the identified aspects of artistic interactions.

So, for example, artistic interaction at the level of a creative personality can be clearly seen in the system “Dostoevsky’s influence on M. Bulgakov (A. Camus, M. Zoshchenko, D. Galkovsky)”, at the level of trends – the realistic direction and baroque trends on Dostoevsky’s work, and then Dostoevsky’s critical “realism in the highest sense” for the entire subsequent realistic conception (especially in the Russian and Uzbek literary traditions); at the level of textual poetics proper, the influence of the form of Dostoevsky’s “polyphonic novel” on the entire novelistic tradition of world literature of the 20th century, which can be seen on the example of “polyphonic/ideological novel by F. Dostoevsky – novel by A. Kadyri”; at the level of an ideological constant – the influence of Dostoevsky’s “ethical imperative” on the moral and ethical paradigm of the author’s concepts of J.P. Sartre, W. Hamdam.

And the main level of influence “the artistic era of F. Dostoevsky – on the world artistic era of the twentieth century” (Dostoevsky’s system of correlations not only with the twentieth century, but also with a number of writers of the nineteenth century (N. Gogol, A. Chekhov), correlated with

the concept of “Russian the artistic epoch of post–Dostoevsky”.

Only such an approach will make it possible to identify all possible open/mediated/subtextual levels of F. Dostoevsky’s influence on the world literary tradition of the 20th century, to determine the functional role of the writer’s work in the development of his dominant tendencies, directions, genre forms, images and artistic concepts, and to identify the specifics of the formation of the tradition context of Dostoevsky in the system of the world literary process.

It should be noted that the realization of tradition can manifest itself in literature in the system of direct/citation inclusions in the “foreign” text of both proper aesthetic structures and directly ideological/ideological phenomena (concepts, theories, ideas proper). But the most interesting tradition functions as a “background” tradition, which is not explicitly expressed in the text of the work, but reveals the level of its innovation).

The “citation” tradition becomes the most open and manifested in the text, which can be presented at the level of reminiscences, direct and hidden quotations, intertextual / metatextual / paratextual / hypertextual / architextual concrete forms of correlation between tradition and innovation. And the invariant of the intercultural form (within the framework of this concept, “artistic (literary) communication” is actualized – the process of interaction between the author, the work and readers on the basis of direct and feedback links in the “literature” system) becomes the actual tradition, implemented in the system of attracting the modern in relation to the work literary background.

Almost until the end of the 20th century, all the presented “funds” of traditions were not the object of directly comparative literary criticism and represented particular cases of scientific research in the system of various methodological theories, most often within the framework of receptive aesthetics. In the modern scientific paradigm, these connections are designated as intertextual and constitute the sphere of interest of philological comparative studies. In this connection, it is quite logical to consider the methods of receptive aesthetics (Rezeptionsästhetik), which developed back in the 60s of the XX century and to a greater extent postulated by theorists as “impact aesthetics” (Wirkungsästhetik) and methods of comparative study of literature in direct correlation, since the categorical apparatus of their coincides in the system of dominant categories – “world literary process”, “dialogue of cultures”, “tradition”, “reception”, etc.

The methodology of receptive analysis of various literary phenomena in the system of “interliterary” and more broadly, “intercultural” communications is one of the promising lines of the modern comparative study of literary relations, but can also be quite actively included in the methodological schemes of historical–literary, hermeneutic,

conceptual, complex and other research philological strategies.

#### REFERENCES

1. Valitskaya A.P. How a general theory of education is possible, or on the interdisciplinary status of the concept of “dialogue” // Dialogue in education: Sat. conference materials. Symposium Series. Issue. 22. St. Petersburg, 2000. – p. 9.
2. Theory of literature. Volume IV. Literary process. – M.: Imli ran, “Heritage”, 2001. – p. 43.
3. Sharina S.I. The concept of “dialogue of cultures” and the educational process // Innovations and education: Sat. conference materials. Symposium Series. Issue. 29. St. Petersburg, 2003. – p. 511.
4. Sharina S.I. The concept of “dialogue of cultures” and the educational process // Innovations and education: Sat. conference materials. Symposium Series. Issue. 29. St. Petersburg, 2003. – p. 511.
5. Valitskaya A.P. How a general theory of education is possible, or on the interdisciplinary status of the concept of “dialogue” // Dialogue in education: Sat. conference materials. Symposium Series. Issue. 22. St. Petersburg, 2000. – p. 9.
6. Theory of Literature. Volume IV. Literary process. – M.: Imli ran, “Heritage”, 2001. – p. 43.
7. Theory of Literature. Volume IV. Literary process. – M.: Imli ran, “Heritage”, 2001. – p. 42.