LITERARY ASPECT OF MODELING A WORK OF ART

Khairulina N. F.

INTRODUCTION

Analogies and hypotheses reflect that the existing world must be substantive and reduced to established logical schemes. We mean those that simplify reasoning and logical constructions or provide an opportunity to implement experiments to clarify the natural phenomenon. They are called models. In the general sense, a model is a specific substitute object for the original, which provides the study of some essential features of the original.

The term "model" is widely used in science and art, and depending on the context, it is given a different meaning. The word "model" comes from the Latin "modulus", which means measure, sample, and norm[1].

Today, in the terminological apparatus of linguistics, mainly structural linguistics, the concepts of "model" and "modeling" are actively functioning, but in literary studies, we see some caution in their use. In a broad sense, the model can be defined as an image (mental or conditional) or a prototype of an object in isolation or a system of objects ("original" of this model), used under certain conditions as their "substitute"[2].

Accordingly, the models could be divided into two groups: the first embodies the idea of "imitation" of what exists, a specific "nature," which is primarily concerning the model; others, on the other hand, act as the primary ideal prototype for the objects that will become their absolute embodiment.

In general, the term "model" means a separate image of an object (imaginary or conditional) or vice versa – a prototype of a particular object or system of objects. For example, a photograph is a model of the object depicted on it; a map is a world model from a geographical point of view. For example, speaking about the functioning of the model as a prototype, we can talk about the model of the aircraft exhibited at the

---

[1] Тюпа В.И. Анализ художественного текста. Москва : Академия, 2006. С. 173.

[2] Гастев Ю.А. Модель II. Большая Советская Энциклопедия: в 30 томах / гл. ред. А.М. Прохоров. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1974. Т. 16. С. 399–400.

exhibition, and in the future, should begin mass production of such aircraft.

Modeling is understood as the analysis of objects of knowledge not directly but indirectly, i.e., through the study of particular auxiliary objects.

An analogy is the judgment of any similarity between two objects. Determining the level of significant similarity or difference of objects is conditional and relative, which depends on the individual perception of the observer and is determined by the specific task. The concept of "model" is widely used in various fields of knowledge with a kind of correction for specifics, distinguishing its definition depending on the specific application. According to Victoria Yartseva's linguistic encyclopedic dictionary, a model (French: modèle) is a model that serves as a standard (standard) for mass reproduction; the same as "type", "scheme", "paradigm", "structure", "composition", etc. (for example, "worldview model", "space-time model", "word-forming model", "sentence model", etc.)[3].

In the natural sciences (physics, chemistry), the model is considered a specific system of equations, algorithm for solving, formula, a fragment of theory, or the whole theory.

1. The definition of the term "model" and its types in literature

The integration of the semiotic approach into the methodology of literary studies has determined the functioning of the concept of «model» in its terminological apparatus. Representatives of French structuralism are K. Levi-Strauss, R. Barth[4].

Moreover, others, taking into account the experience of Russian formalists (significant, in our opinion, is the works by Yu. Tynyanov[5], B. Eichenbaum, V. Shklovskyi was translated and studied in France in 1965 in connection with the intensification of the work of the group «Tel Quel»), made a solid attempt to simplify personal "understanding" scientific "explanation", hermeneutic interpretation – structural analysis. "Hermeneutics establishes subject-subject", dialogical, "and science

---

[3] Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. Москва : Сов. энциклопедия, 1990. С. 304.

[4] Барт Р. Нулевая степень письма. Москва : Академический проект, 2008. 431 с.

[5] Успенский В.А. Прогулки с Лотманом и вторичное моделирование. Лотмановский сборник. Москва, 1995.

establishes subject-cognitive relations, – says G. Kosikov, – herme-neutics speaks to literature, while science speaks about it"[6].

The basic ideas about the structure of humanitarian objects reflect the ideal theoretical models, which are formed due to specific thought experiments. Traditional examples of structuralist models include the model of mythological thinking proposed by K. Levi-Strauss in The Structure of Myth (1955) and the narratological model of A.-J. Greimas, represented in the study "Structural Semantics" (1966). Genetically structuralist theoretical models derived from the well-known binary oppositions derived by F. de Saussure: language – speech, synchrony – diachrony, phoneme – sound, which in literary studies are presented as differences between meter and rhythm, plot and plot.

Specific scientific methods of structural analysis are conditioned by the understanding of art in general and literature in particular as a unique poetic language, a "secondary modeling system": Thus, art can be described as a specific secondary language and a work of art – as a text in this language"[7]. This idea can be considered the starting point of the structural-semiotic concept of J. Lotman. Although the term "secondary modeling system" was once proposed by V. Uspensky, it was openly conditional, defiantly anti-censorship; for J. Lotman it meant a special kind of semiotic (sign) system designed to create artistic models of reality. A prerequisite for the existence of a literary work is the unity of literary analysis and literary synthesis. At the same time, achieving a balance between analysis and synthesis is quite problematic. The use of variable literary models is hugely productive in resolving this issue.

Yu. Lotman, thinking that "the object in the process of structural description is not only simplified but also reorganized, becomes more organized than it is"[8].

Justifies the creation of dynamic models of semiotic objects and systems provided that the artistic text in the researcher's reception is a semiotic system, the static model of the structure becomes the result of the analysis of the artistic text and the construction of a dynamic model taking into account diachronic relationships between systemic and extra systemic elements. On the contrary, it is connected with the interpretation of a literary work.

---

[6] Крістєва Ю. Полілог / пер. з фр. П. Таращука. Київ : Юніверс, 2004. С. 3–48.

[7] Лотман Ю.М. Об искусстве. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2000. С. 22.

[8] Ibid. С. 546.

Overcoming the methodological disharmony between the analysis of a literary text and the interpretation of a work of art is perceived as an inevitability of the development of modern literary criticism in the tradition of methodological pluralism. In this case, the actualization of general scientific and methodological concepts of "model" makes it possible to exacerbate the divergence of existing methodological contradictions in literary science to neutralize them.

Thus, the basis of our study is the concept of "model" proposed by J. Lotman, which is consistent with his concept: "The model is analogous to the object of knowledge, which replaces the object in the process of cognition"[9].

The model of any object of cognition belongs to the external world as objectively existing, but at the same time is evidence of human cognitive abilities, a manifestation of its epistemological potential, and an indicator of indicators of its change. Art as artistic modeling of reality and a work of art as an artistic model created by it occupy a proper place in the spiritual life of humanity are perceived as an achievement of cultural heritage that cannot be lost.

Unlike scientific models that require particular explanations specifics in their existence, the literary model embodies the mechanisms of personal spiritual and practical experience of the recipient, necessary for the intended use of the possibilities of the literary model, and evaluates the effectiveness of such use.

The artistic model of reality (model of interaction of the world and man) reveals the essence of culture as a sphere of conscious conformity of human activity to the essential laws of existence of the natural world.

Taking the artistic model as a model of epistemological modeling, which overcame centuries of trials, absorbing only the positive experience of cognitive interaction between man and the world, we can discuss creating models in literary studies as a distinct type of scientific modeling, based on artistic modeling, self-aware. The concept of "model" which was adopted in literary studies with the development of structuralism, may be flexible and multifunctional enough to implement such self-awareness and at the same time suitable for controlling the use of «creative forms» in the process of literary cognition.

The scientific interpretation model is aimed at the literary work in the unity of material and ideal components. The description of the structure

---

[9] Лотман Ю.М. Тезисы к проблеме «Искусство в ряду моделирующих систем». Об искусстве. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2000. С. 387–399.

of an artistic text presents its static model. Interpretation is his dynamic model.

Analytical static model, which reflects the system-structural features of the literary text as a particular material, the objective fact is scientific. On the other hand, a dynamic interpretive model is close to a playful or artistic one; it can become a kind of intermediate link between artistic texts, genetically or historically related to each other.

The process of the existence of a literary work can be considered as a kind of epistemological model of general existence.

Thus, at each stage of development, literary studies oscillate between awareness of the importance of subjective and objective in creating literary works and their scientific explanation (the essence of the subjective and the criteria of objectivity are rethought clarified). Therefore, the most productive is a combination of different trends, their coexistence on the principle of complementarity[10].

The concept of "model" which entered the literary terminology in connection with the development of structuralism, may be flexible and multifunctional enough to implement this principle. However, in the most general form, we can distinguish the following levels of its functioning:

1) artistic model as a definition of a literary work in terms of its relationship with reality;

2) analytical model of the literary text as a functional characteristic of its structure and its internal contradictions;

3) interpretive model of a literary work as a form of its actualized existence in the process of reader reception;

4) theoretical model as a description of literary facts, mechanisms of their generation, patterns of development of the literary process based on a theoretical and literary methodology;

5) semiotic-culturological model as an intertextual interpretation of the "significance" of literary theories[11].

The correlation of these levels, particularly the analytical model of the literary text and the interpretive model of the literary work, will be the subject of further theoretical and literary reflection.

---

[10] Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2001. С. 153.

[11] Астрахан Н.І. Буття літературного твору: Аналітичне та інтерпретаційне моделювання : монографія. Київ : Академвидав (Серія «Монограф»), 2014. С. 12.

2. Poetic level of formation of artistic-interpretive model

In the context of theoretical and methodological substantiation of literary knowledge of a literary work as a modeling of the concept of "interpretation of a work of art" it is advisable to replace the concept of "artistic and interpretive model of the work".

The interpretation of artistic and interpretive literary models presented above gives grounds to conclude that these categories reproduce and transform reality in its entirety, programming the possibility to comprehend this integrity from an artistically constructed point of view, which potentially opens for each reader through poetic analysis.

An artistic interpretation of reality reveals its essence in such infinity that corresponds to the infinity of being itself. It is acutely felt first of all by artists: infinity forces them, having finished one work, to pass to the next or to consider the works finished but not finished.

In practice, the analysis of the artistic-interpretive model of a literary work is to identify the relationships between the author's interpretive models of the literary work, highlighted in the structure of the literary text in the process of its analytical modeling as a system of writing a literary work. Interpretation of a set of variable authorial interpretive models that build a hierarchy of values is carried out by a specific subject. The leading intention, which tries to get as close as possible to the author, seeks to implement a fixed in the form of literary work dialogic situation by itself.

The model is not a traditional artistic image. It can be ideal or material, and in combination with the symbol, the model creates an image that contains elements of artistic conventionality and direct and immediate reflection and reproduction of the object. The authors model images by analogy with reality and certain ideals while complementing their vision and understanding.

If a literary work is an artistic model of reality, then a literary critic creates a model. Modeling of the studied object has proven itself as a general scientific method, the actualization of which began in literary studies after a similar methodological extrapolation in linguistics, "after Saussure"[12].

Indicative in the interaction between the system and its model is the ability to "transitivity (i.e., the model of the model is the model of the original system)".

---

[12] Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2001. С. 153.

If the work is considered a model of reality on the principle of transitivity, the literary model should be considered a kind of return of the literary work to reality. Analysis of the literary text is a kind of reproduction of the structure of reality. The interpretation of a work of art reflects the integrity of reality due to the integrity of the event of interpretation, which is manifested through time, perspective, and subjectivity.

At the poetic level, the dynamism of the functioning of the artistic-interpretive model depends on the perception and a careful reading of the work. Perception is a complex and dynamic process for which the reader's reading, individual interpretation and microanalysis of the work of art are basic concepts. This process necessarily involves emotional experiences is always holistic and direct.

The basics of interpretive modeling come from the hermeneutic tradition, which has a highly relevant methodology of philosophical knowledge of a literary work. In our opinion, the most rational idea of interpretive modeling is the concept of the German thinker F. Schleiermacher. At the heart of this theory is the dualistic nature of the interpretive model, which realizes itself in the harmonious interaction of psychological and technical interpretations during the poetic analysis of the work.

"Psychological interpretation is aimed at the time of the idea and its connection with the life of the author, and technical – to transform the idea directly into the text"[13].

The concept of "plan" is on the border between psychological and technical interpretation; there is the concept of "plan". Psychological research ends with a review of the idea, and technical begins with it.

Having combined psychological and technical interpretive modeling methods, the researcher manages to define the work's idea clearly and comprehensively depict all the author's guidelines and moral values. Thus, having considered in detail the novel "City" by V. Pidmohylnyi, philosophical views of the writer, we can say that the work "City" (1928) – is an urban novel, the theme of which is the conquest of the city man. Furthermore, each page of the work affirms the philosophy of vitalism that reproduces the relationship between man and the urban

---

[13] Бровко О.О. Основи компаративістики : навч.-метод. посібник для орг. Самостійної роботи й підготов. до модульної роботи студентів / Державний заклад «Луган. нац. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка». Луганськ : Видавництво ДЗ «ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка», 2012. С. 39

space in which the protagonist sacrifices higher moral values for material goods. In this way, an artistic-interpretive model of "life-fair" is formed, containing the above provisions.

A distinction must be made between the object of expression and the subject of expression in a work of art. The object of expression is everything that the author depicts and everything that he says: people, objects, circumstances, situations, events. Instead, the subject of speech (native speaker) is the one who portrays and tells. Spatio-temporal parameters are time and space as the essential characteristics of the artistic image, which provide a holistic perception of artistic reality and organize the work's composition. Literary image, developing in time as a sequence of text, its content reproduces the spatio-temporal picture of the world in its symbolic, value aspect.

Spatio-temporal parameters of the artistic picture of the world vary depending on various factors. At the same time, it is not the socio-historical circumstances that matter, but the state of culture, science, and priority worldviews in a given period in a particular country. The specificity of space and time in a country or some countries, in addition to historical circumstances, is due to the general guidelines and trends in the ideological and cultural spheres of life.

Necessary for our study is the opinion of literary critic B. Meilach: "Spatial-temporal representations, while maintaining their objective basis, become not only a means of transmitting thoughts, feelings and experiences of heroes and authors, but also serve as a figurative generalization of the most complex processes of reality"[14].

3. Space-time determines the artistic unity of a literary work with reality

Analyzing the chronotope as a system of ontological and axiological coordinates, a kind of unity of time and space, which seeks to comprehend and reproduce through the prism of existential and spiritual existence of heroes, becomes especially relevant in identifying artistic and interpretive model at the poetic level.

In V. Pidmohylnyi's novel The Little Drama (1930), the functioning of the internal chronotope is an expression of such fundamental values as love and freedom and serves as a representative of the author's values.

---

[14] Мейлах Б.С. Проблема ритма, пространства и времени в комплексном изучении творчества. Ритм, пространство и время в литературе и искусстве. Львів : Наука, 1972. С. 106.

This gives grounds to assert the dominance of the artistic and interpretive model "love and freedom – an illusory world".

The next segment, which helps to single out a specific artistic and interpretive model, is the heroes of the work. Analysis of the characters' lifestyle of any work immersion in their inner world allows the researcher to form a paradigm of individual or group vision of the world of heroes. Based on these criteria, the following artistic and interpretive models of the existence of heroes are distinguished in literary works: 1) illusory model of existence (O. Wilde's "Portrait of Dorian Gray" 1891), 2) pragmatic model of existence (T. Dreiser «An American Tragedy» («An American Tragedy» (1925), 3) irrational model of life (I. Franco "For the hearth" in 1897) and so on.

Determinant for forming the artistic and interpretive model is the presence of authorial digressions of philosophical and historical nature, which help create the appropriate mood, understand the author's position on events and characters, and immerse the reader in the historical atmosphere of a specific era.

Contrast can be an artistic tool that helps to define the leading interpretive model. The juxtaposition of characters, interiors, and exteriors, natural conditions create a certain mood and give grounds for a deeper understanding of the content of the work.

Analysis of the psychological saturation of the work by identifying the effective functioning existential categories, such as sadness, sadness, fear, loneliness, insecurity, longing, contribute to the dominant mood in work and form a specific artistic and interpretive model. Among such models are the following: 1) the model of human loneliness in the world; 2) the model of uncertainty in the future; 3) the model of fear of death; 4) the model of conflict with objective reality, etc.

M. Kodak, in his monograph "Poetics as a system" identifies five aspects of the poetics of the work of art (pathos, genre, psychology, chronotope, narration), which effectively contribute to the identification of a particular literary model at the poetic level.

Thus, the concept of art is concretized at the genre-compositional and chronotopic levels. Essential indicators are the means of reproducing the inner world of the hero and the features of the narrative. Their separation is decisive in studying the poetics of a particular artistic text and selecting the artistic and interpretive models.

The model is not a traditional artistic image. It can be ideal or material, and in combination with the symbol, the model creates an

image that contains elements of artistic conventionality and direct and immediate reflection and reproduction of the object. Thus, the artistic-interpretive model can, first of all, be considered as an informational verbal model. It is possible to form a specific artistic and interpretive model of portrait, character, picture of the world, society, etc., by highlighting the key moments of the hero's behavior, appearance, the individual vision of the world, which the author presents with appropriate stylistic means of language.

4. Functioning of the semiotic model at the interpretive-cultural level

One of the main features of poststructuralism is the desire to explore the process of interpretation of a literary work, leaving behind its dynamics, depriving it of its character, and opening it to infinity.

Today, the view is relevant that culturology as a science of the origin and development of culture, its structure, mechanisms of development, and research methods began to take shape long ago and finally formed in the second half of the twentieth century. At this time, culturology was institutionalized as a field of scientific knowledge. The origin of the term "culturology" is traditionally associated with the American philosopher L. White (1900–1975). It is believed that his work "Science of Culture" (1949) contributed to the separation of culturology in a separate area of research and initiated a holistic approach to the study of cultural phenomena.

At the culturological level, culture is studied as a complex pheno-menon in the aggregate of its value-semantic, normative-regulatory, and sign-communicative characteristics. The latter's reception in the literary work is the subject of research in this section.

Effective means and the information accumulated with their help are necessary components of any culture. Taking this into account allows us to consider culture as a world of signs through which social information is stored and accumulated in human society (in other words, as a world of social information stored and accumulated through manufactured symbolic means). This is the essence of the information-semiotic approach.

"Culture is a collective element and collective memory, i.e., a supra-individual mechanism of storage and transmission of messages (texts) and the production of new ones"[15].

---

[15] Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2001. С. 150.

Signs and sign systems serve as structural elements of this mechanism. In order to understand their nature and mechanisms of functioning, it is necessary to consider the phenomenon of culture in three aspects: 1) as a world of artifacts; 2) as a world of meanings; 3) as a world of signs.

Artifacts (from the Latin Arte – artificial and facts – made) – are objects and phenomena artificially created by man. The concept of «culture» covers what is outside man and the changes he makes in himself, his body and soul, and his own physical and spiritual essence. Thus, culture is a world of artifacts, a world of human activity and its products. This is its first important characteristic. It is vital in determining the semiotic model in the work because its substantive component is material culture – a description of things, houses and buildings, technology, and in general everything that forms a "second nature" in work.

People practically and spiritually «produce» the objects of their activity, endowing the latter with what they objectively do not have or cannot have. Such objects, becoming more active in the sphere of human activity, acquire a new, "supernatural" quality: the ability to embody human meaning (content), bear the imprint of the human spirit, and serve man's reflection. Thus, they act as objects of culture due to the spiritual activity of man.

The most apparent ability of man to endow his creations with a specific meaning is manifested in language. Words and works of art, etiquette, scientific research, certain rituals related to religion, sports, education, etc., are meaningful. The meaning of any object that people deal with is expressed at least in its purpose, role, or function. Thus, culture is not just a set of products of human activity, artifacts. Culture is a world of meanings that a person invests in his words and actions, or the case of a literary work; it is a container load of heroes' actions, portrait functions, behavior, landscape, contrast, etc. Every writer purposefully uses. This is the second most important characteristic of culture.

Culture has historically consisted of various systems of signs (codes). Phenomena of culture encode social information, specific content, consisting of signs or a set of signs (texts). The fact that the phenomenon acts as a sign, symbol, and text, which must be observed and realized, makes it a fact of culture. Therefore, we perceive culture as the unity of material and spiritual. Thus, the sign is a sensory, material object, and it is meaning (content, information) is a product of the spiritual activity of

people. Signs can be interpreted as a "material shell" of human thoughts, desires, and feelings. In order to preserve the spiritual activity of man in culture, its transmission from generation to generation must be a kind of encoding in the symbolic shell. The unity of meaning and sign, that is, the information and the code in which it is recorded and transmitted, determines the close connection between culture's spiritual and material aspects.

Based on the above, we can conclude that implementing the semiotic model at the culturological level involves the consideration of symbolic means of culture and interpretation of cultural phenomena embedded in the work of art and have an informative load.

According to A. Solomonic, the literary semiotic model is a "complex configuration consisting of the functioning of signs of different kinds"[16].

Therefore, to trace the essence of a specific semiotic model at the interpretive and cultural level, it is necessary to distinguish all its possible primary and secondary symbolic elements.

One of the primary sign systems is natural. Natural signs are endowed with a minimal quantum of abstraction; they signal the essence and signs of conditional reality. These semiotic codes in work are space and time, which carry information about the world and man's presence in this world. Man is a temporal being, his being, based on Heidegger's reasoning, can be defined primarily as "being, existence in time, which involves the constant expansion of space, just as non-being can be defined by the maximum narrowing of the space of existence"[17].

The natural signs of the semiotic model are not transferred to the work directly; they only imitate nature utilizing the pictorial possibilities of the word.

The following basic system, which is always present in the semiotic model, is figurative. This system reproduces the image, which always has a referent on the principle of isomorphism – partial correspondence, similarity. Creating the artistic imagery of semiotic models is the path that works on the emergence of the "picture". Thus, epithet, comparison, synecdoche, and metonymy appeal to the inner vision, encourage one to see what is depicted.

---

[16] Соломонік А.Б. Позитивная семиотика (о знаках, знаковых системах и о семиотической деятельности). Москва : МЕТ, 2004. С. 81.

[17] Гайдеггер М. Дорогою до мови / пер. з нім. В. Кам'янець. Львів : Літопис, 2007. С. 112.

Unlike the figurative sign, which is isomorphic to the referent, the verbal sign has a conventional character. This measure of distance from the referent and at the same time preserving a kind of semiotic connection with him gives the word a powerful epistemological potential, allowing using the processes of awareness, evaluation, and understanding of the multicolor world ensures the realization of all spiritual life. The artistic word acquires a special meaning that distinguishes it from natural language. For this reason, the role of the artistic word in a literary work cannot be exaggerated.

The next sign system of the semiotic model is the recording system. According to the classification of A. Solomonic, these signs are called hieroglyphs. The primary purpose of recording systems as a sign system is to reflect in writing other encoded signs, i.e., the reality they reflect is other sign systems.

The projection on the definition of the functioning of the semiotic model at the interpretive level is not about letters, even though they are the material of the written word, but the artistic text, which consists of organized verbal masses. Particular importance in the process of the ontology of a literary work is textualizations, fixations on writing – "phylogeny" and "ontogenesis" of a literary work.

The highest abstract sign system is symbolic. The symbol is not directly related to its specific referent but at the same time depends on the internal laws of a particular semiotic model.

The projection of this level of semiosis on a literary work may seem impossible, which contradicts the tradition of contrasting the humanities and sciences like their objects and subjects. However, the practice of literary criticism of the twentieth century, in particular the works of Julia Kristeva, Y. Lotman, A. Solomonic, refute this tradition.

Thus, the process of semiosis of the literary model at the interpretive and cultural level is carried out with the help of natural, figurative, verbal, code, and symbolic sign systems. The paradigmatic nature of the semiotic model allows us to consider its components as a whole and separately. The reader moves from the most abstract level of the literary work as a model of sign generation (from the title as a program of the semiotic-interpretive model of the work) to the least abstract, most closely related to ontological referents of art word as a kind of sign activity. They are first of all, man and the world. Different sign systems appear to the reader in a literary work not in the order of origin but a mirror image.

5. Comparative aspect of semiotic and poetic analysis

The perfection of a literary work determines the level of its art. Distinguishing the content and form in a work of art, the researcher understands that their boundaries are too conditional. However, such a distinction is necessary for an adequate understanding of the work. The main thing in it is to determine the semantic component. The relevance of the content is due to the importance of those phenomena and ideas of life that are represented in work. Nevertheless, the reader correctly perceives the important content only if it is revealed embodied in a perfect and appropriate form.

In this aspect, the opinion of the literary critic A. Tkachenko attracts attention, who states: "Any content is formed, and the form is meaningful"[18].

The validity of these considerations is not in doubt, but Hegel did not recognize two equal principles that are not reduced to each other – spirit and matter, ideal and material. The essence of Hegel's dialectic is in the assertion of their interpenetration. The philosopher proceeds from the existence of a fundamental idea and its unfolding in reality, which enters into unity directly. The idea "as artistic beauty is an idea with the specific property manifested through forming a particular reality and acts as an ideal"[19].

Thus, by art, we mean the artistic quality of the work, which consists of the harmonious combination of meaningful content and the corresponding perfect form. Only the work in which there is a complete correspondence between all its components has a harmony organized by the ideological content, and it can be called highly artistic.

Art as a feature of a literary work directly determines the way of its study, i.e., analysis. The analysis of the text is its mental comprehension, research of components, the definition of themes, ideas, motives, a way of their representative embodiment, and comprehension of means of creation of images.

The process of revealing the art of the text is realized through the implementation of poetic and semiotic analysis. Involvement of both types of literary analysis contributes to the completeness of the study, the most adequate, as close as possible to the author's intention to read a

---

[18] Ткаченко А.О. Мистецтво слова: Вступ до літературознавства: підр. для студентів гуманітарних спеціальностей вищих навчальних закладів. 2-е вид. випр. і доповн. Київ : ВПЦ «Київський університет», 2003. С. 87.

[19] Гегель В.Ф. Эстетика: в 4 томах. Т. 4. Москва, 1974. С. 389.

work or series of works. In the latter case, we can observe the functioning of the comparative (comparative) aspect in literary theory.

Thus, the comparative analysis aims to study interdisciplinary, inter literary, intertextual connections and relationships.

Comparative studies as a scientific discipline consist of many components with different classifications. D. Nalyvayko identified several classifications that cover the following problems: "1) literary connections and influences; 2) analogies and differences in the field of topics and issues; 3) typology of literary trends and genres; 4) national and international"[20].

V. Budnyi and M. Ilnytskyi consider the main sections of modern literary comparative studies: "1) comparative-historical literary criticism (study of genetic and contact relations); 2) receptive aesthetics, in particular, critical reception and translation studies; 3) typological study of literature; 4) intertextual studies; 5) intermedia explorations (inter-artistic comparison – 'clarifying the links between literature and other arts); 6) intercultural studies, in particular postcolonial, as well as imagology (a section of comparative studies that studies the images of peoples in the literary reception of other ethnic groups and regions)"[21].

At the end of the XIX – first third of the XX century, focusing on genetic contactology, the first thoroughly developed scientific, comparative literary studies system was formed. The methodologies of twentieth-century literature that are most widely and most productively used in modern comparative studies include hermeneutics, cultural anthropology (imagology), receptive aesthetics, and intertextuality. The active development of comparative studies in Ukraine is associated with the second half of the XIX century, in particular with the names of M. Drahomanov and I. Franko. Research shows that recourse to foreign language art material in theoretical works, reviews, previews, and original works became a typical phenomenon in the second half of the nineteenth century. The development of literary thought stimulated the emergence of comparative studies, in which foreign language samples, traditionally, remained the highest criterion and model to be followed.

Comparative literature in the days of Soviet ideology and its integration into all scientific fields was not very popular because it was challenging to balance the border of "own" and "foreign" in the cultural space of "brotherly

---

[20] Національні варіанти літературної компаративістики / Національна академія наук України; Інст літератури ім. Т.Г. Шевченка; Д.С. Наливайко, Т.Н. Денисова, О.В. Дубініна та ін. Київ : Видавничий дім «Стилос», 2009. С. 113.

[21] Будний В.В. Порівняльне літературознавство : підручник для студ. вищих навч. закл. Київ : Києво- Могилянська академія, 2008. С. 114.

peoples". Nevertheless, the Ukrainian tradition, founded by I. Franko, confidently paved its way among scientific research in theory and the history of literature. In 1958 O. Biletskyi attempted to outline a new paradigm of domestic, comparative literature, which should focus on the problem of typological comparisons of artistic phenomena and the world literary context: determining the place of Ukrainian literature among other Slavic literature, we cannot limit languages of Ukrainian literature with non-Slavic or comparison of Ukrainian literature with the literature of Eastern, Western and Southern Slavs. Instead, we must ask questions about the individual originality of Ukrainian literature, about the features that have secured its place in world literature.

D. Chyzhevskyi is considered to be a prominent figure in the history of Ukrainian literary comparative studies.

In the early 1970s, G. Verves summed up the achievements of Ukrainian comparative studies on the study of inter-Slavic literary relations. He singled out the following areas of research in domestic science:

1. The problem of mastering Ukrainian literature artistic phenomena of other literature.

2. The role of outstanding Ukrainian writers in strengthening inter-Slavic literary contacts, the world resonance of their ideological and aesthetic concepts.

3. Ukrainian-non-Slavic relations of historical epochs, fixing the interaction of Ukrainian literature with other Slavic ones at the main stages of development, the main differences of ideological and aesthetic concepts of writers of different literature.

4. The problem of the comparative study of the method and style of Slavic literature.

The first stage of comparative scientific studies was marked by the dominance of genetic contactology, which led to its close connection with the history of literature. At this stage, comparative studies were considered appropriate and possible only based on textual coincidences and documented contexts of literary phenomena embodied in the subject of study. Comparativists emphasize that the Ukrainian school of literary studies focused mainly on genetic connections, identification and study of their sources, dissemination, and transformation. The theory of migration of motives and plots, mainly of folklore and mythological origin, became very popular[22].

---

[22] Будний В.В. Порівняльне літературознавство : підручник для студ. вищих навч. закл. Київ : Києво- Могилянська академія, 2008. С. 145.

In the middle of the XIX century, the direction of comparative studies, based on positivist methodology, is in deep crisis; it is replaced by comparative typology, which focuses on the study of communities and analogies of literary phenomena, their systems, and contexts. Moreover, genetic contactology is integrated mainly by comparative typology. This reorientation of the general paradigm of comparative literary studies caused a change in its direction.

The second stage in the development of comparative studies is associated with the typological method, which strengthened the theoretical and generalized approaches to the literature study and expanded the range of comparative research. The dominance of comparative typology leads to significant changes in the functioning of comparative studies in the system of literary disciplines; it gradually acquires significance and meaning of the integrating component of general literary criticism. These processes and tendencies prepared the ground for the transition of comparative scientific studies to its new, modern stage, marked by the emergence of new trends and vectors.

The third stage of development (last decades of the XX century) is characterized by the construction of a new comparative paradigm with such, according to D. Fokem, determinants as 1) a new concept of the object of literary research; 2) introduction of new methods; 3) a new vision of the scientific value of the study of literature; 4) a new social justification for the study of literature. V. Budnyi and M. Ilnytskyi emphasize that it was at this stage that a large-scale subject-thematic expansion of comparative studies took place, even its peculiar doubling. The essence of progress is that earlier (until the last decades of the last century), the subject of comparative studies was the study of interliterary ties and relations, but beyond its competence was such a large and significant area of relationships and interactions of literature with other arts and spiritual, creative activities, such as history, religion, philosophy, sociology, and other humanities and social sciences.

Another fundamental feature of modern comparative studies is its close and active connection with the theory of literature. Hermeneutics, receptive aesthetics, cultural anthropology, and intertextuality can be added to the methodologies that have the most active and productive application in modern comparative studies.

The fourth stage of development of comparative studies in Ukraine is characterized by its methodological pluralism, which sees a natural phenomenon correlated with the era of postmodernism, the form of its

worldview and thinking, in contrast to previous stages of comparative scientific studies, when each of them dominated on the first and comparative typology on the second), at its present stage we do not find such a dominant.

The gradual evolution of the comparative approach in literary studies has initiated a comprehensive literary analysis, which is realized through the comparative aspect.

In our opinion, it is in the process of combining semiotic and poetic analysis of works that the researcher realizes the comparative aspect to a sufficient extent. By this, we mean the separation of standard and distinctive features of the elements of poetics and semiotics of literature. Moreover, emphasis on the comparative aspect makes it possible to trace analogies and differences at the level of the plot, characters, and views of different nations on people's moral qualities and determine the individual author and national identity of works.

The scheme of complex semiotic-poetic analysis with elements of comparative comparison has become the basis for our study and has the following algorithm: 1) determining the time of writing works; 2) coverage of socio-political circumstances that contributed most to the creation of relevant research objects; 3) focus on literary trends, schools, which the authors followed; 4) mentality; 5) the psychotype of the nation, which plays a crucial role in shaping the national picture of the world in the minds of the artist; 6) biography of the writer, which is an integral part of any literary analysis; 7) psychology of artistic creativity, which contributes to the deep comprehension of the work; 8) definition of the plot, theme, ideas, and problems of the work; 9) determination of the genre based on preliminary conclusions; 10) systematization of composition and artistic means.

One of the main conditions for the implementation of comparability in the semiotic-poetic analysis of works is the idea of the integrity of the work of art both in isolation and in the context of the existence of other works of art.

A work of art is a specific form of fiction that has a systemic nature. The eidological (figurative) system of the work – the state of the relationship and interaction between different images – determines the ideological and aesthetic system. This system emphasizes the dominance of three main types of images: microimage, macroimage, and megaimage. The study of each of them is possible only in the dualistic application of poetic and semiotic analysis.

Under the microimage, the smallest elementary artistic quantity is the original unit of measurement of artistic thinking, which figuratively depicts the structural part of life. Such a phenomenon can be expressed in a word, sentence, paragraph, or supra-phrase unity. Macroimage is a hierarchically higher artistic quantity, in the structure of which homogeneous microimages are organically combined. A megaimage is the presence of macro-images and separate micro-images in one work of art, which act as separate artistic details and have their principles of functioning.

According to the Ukrainian researcher O. Potebnia, there are external and internal forms of literary work. The procedure of semiotic analysis fully reveals the latter: it structures, articulates, and unites artistic images and their elements. On the other hand, the poetic analysis examines the external form and interprets the expression and image in detail. We consider their combination to be the most favorable for implementing a comprehensive literary analysis of our works.

Semiotic analysis is based on a structuralistic approach. The basis for the emergence of structuralism was the transition of the humanities from descriptive-empirical to the abstract-theoretical method of research: modeling, formalization, and mathematization of the results achieved. The essence of the structuralistic method of cognition consists in 1) isolation of a certain number of objects (array), "corpus" of texts, in which it is possible to predict the existence of a single structure, invariant; 2) division of texts into small components, in which homogeneous pairs of elements connect typical relations; 3) complex systematization of relations and construction of abstract structure by modeling; 4) selection from the structure of all theoretically possible consequences and their verification.

Artistic texts contain several semantic layers. The level of their understanding depends to a greater extent on the cultural training of the reader. In this case, we face the problem of so-called semiotic codes.

The leading criterion in the process of creating a semiotic picture of a work of art is the observance of four key stages: 1) to consider the text of the work as a system; 2) identify the source systems and subsystems; 3) identify the source elements of each system and subsystem; 4) consider their interaction and dynamics in the process of plot development. It is also necessary to classify signs, dividing them into intentionally laid by the author and spontaneous. The result is the formation of a semiotic picture of the work. Selected signs have variable

components. For example, when we talk about people, we need to consider the symbolic function of the portrait, clothing, behavior, speech, gestures, facial expressions, color, and so on. This category must be classified in advance. The process of allocating individual characters is conditional because they are included in the system in any case.

Unlike semiotic analysis, the object of which is the sign system of the work, the poetic analysis examines the artistic frame, the language of the work. It is necessary to pay attention to the author's selection of types of syntactic constructions because this selection can be determined by the subject and general semantics of the work.

6. Theoretical foundations of semiotics and poetics of literature

The phenomenon of a literary work vividly combines aesthetic and general philosophical problems to create conditions for effective interaction of literary studies with other humanities. Comprehensive analysis of a literary work involves the researcher's appeal to the theoretical modes of poetics and semiotics of literature.

The definition of the theoretical foundations of poetics is characterized by the debatable nature of the interpretation of this term. Moreover, although poetics is one of the oldest aspects of literary criticism, the horizons of its terminological apparatus are pretty blurred. Therefore, we consider it necessary to consider the stages of evolution of the concept of «poetics» in literary discourse and to identify the most critical poetic segments for further practical research.

Modern Ukrainian literary criticism is marked by a systematic approach to the study of poetics. Defining for us is the opinion of G. Klochek that a comprehensive approach to the study of poetics involves the analysis of the work as a study of the whole system. The researcher believes that the main task remains to analyze "how the techniques (means) that are functional components of the literary text affect the reader, charging him with the feelings and meanings encoded by the author in the text"[23].

G. Klochek proves the dynamism of the term "poetics" which is due to the various definitions of this concept. The researcher identifies such as: normative, descriptive, historical, functional, and general, i.e., theoretical poetics.

---

[23] Клочек Г.Д. Енергія художнього слова. Кіровоград : Ред.-вид. відділ Кірово-градського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка, 2007. С. 117.

N. Bualo is considered the founder of normative poetics (The Art of Poetry, 1674). Comparative study of the literature of different countries or individual works is the basis of descriptive poetics. On the other hand, historical poetics explores the evolution of species, genres, and artistic means. The founder of historical poetics is O. Veselovsky, who defined its subject as "the evolution of poetic consciousness and form" which undoubtedly includes the genesis and development of an aesthetic object, its manifestation by the evolution of art forms. The two previous poetics are based on the comparative-historical method, which was used in our study as follows:

– determining the nature of the dynamics of the "life-fair" model in Ukrainian and English literature in the late nineteenth – first third of the twentieth century (on the example of works by V. Thackeray, O. Wilde, V. Vynnychenko, I. Franko, V. Pidmohylnyi and others.) by comparing the author's position;

– definition of standard and unique in the idea of dominance in life of material goods over moral values, represented by artists from different countries by comparing certain authorial ideologies.

Practical poetics studies the literary work as a system. Its initial and final material is a specific work, and the task is "reading" i.e., analysis of the existence of artistic means and the disclosure of their meaning in a particular novel.

Theoretical (general) poetics determines the fundamental laws of art, considers the problematic status of the work, and studies the figurative specificity of art.

As G. Klochek notes, the perception of the term "poetics" as a system of creative principles allows poetry to enter the system of categorical concepts of such arts, where its use until recently seemed impossible. As a result, it began to be used in the field of cinema, theater, music, and architecture.

According to G. Klochek, Poetics includes such "permanent meanings" as art, a system of creative principles, an art form, integrity, system, the skill of the writer.

Thus, it can be argued that the modern definition of the term "poetics" is part of the context of the philosophy of postmodernism and is interpreted as a collective system of views formed by worldview experiences over many generations: "Experiences time"[24].

---

[24] Каллер Дж. Теория литературы : краткое введение / пер. с англ. А. Георгиева. Москва : Астрель, 2006. С. 112.

The active integration of structural analysis into literary studies has made the transition from "superficial" to "deep" levels of analysis of the work. It can be argued that this technique has revealed the interdependence and interdependence of the elements of the literary text structure as a whole object. This indicates the "unconscious" nature of this structure, which is similar to the "unconscious" nature of the language structure and is manifested in its semiotic nature.

CONCLUSIONS

A literary work's actual existence is impossible without considering the mechanism of its analytical, interpretive (artistic), and semiotic modeling. Therefore, the manifestation of the artistic-semiotic model, which would satisfy all levels of functioning of a literary work, is a critical stage and a guarantee of successful scientific research of confident (speaking of a comparative approach) works of fiction.

The theoretical discourse of the study points to a current trend in literary criticism – the use of the methodology of structural analysis of literary texts with a harmonious combination of analysis of plot-thematic and genre-creating features of the work.

The transdisciplinary nature of the studied model of «life-fair» directly indicates the indivisible unity of literature, philosophy, and psychology to study the world-modeling principle.

The procedure of identifying any artistic-semiotic model in work or series of works involves overcoming the complex analysis of a literary work at the poetic (artistic, interpretive) and semiotic (symbolic, detailed) levels.

That is why carrying out a comprehensive comparative analysis of prose works of English and Ukrainian literature, and we should focus on the constant and transitional elements of the work of art, which shape its poetics and semiotics.

SUMMARY

The article under consideration reveals the nature of modeling in literature. The term "literary model" is analyzed through various prospective: starting the meaning and finishing the classification. The author pays great attention to the model's functioning on different levels of the work of art and its interaction during the poetological and semiotic analysis. The comparative semiotic analysis chosen as the basis of the work overcomes the established contradiction between the concepts of

"text analysis" and "interpretation of the work of art". This means that the result of the analysis of both the artistic text and the interpretation of the literary work is the construction of their models.

References

1. Астрахан Н.І. Буття літературного твору: Аналітичне та інтерпретаційне моделювання : монографія. Київ : Академвидав (Серія «Монограф»), 2014. 432 с.

2. Барт Р. Нулевая степень письма. Москва : Академический проект, 2008. 431 с.

3. Бровко О.О. Основи компаративістики : навч.-методичний посібник для орг. самостійної роботи й підготов. до модульної роботи студ / Державний заклад «Луган. нац. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка». Луганськ : Вид-во ДЗ «ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка», 2012. 214 с.

4. Будний В.В. Порівняльне літературознавство : підручник для студ. вищих навч. закл. Київ : Києво- Могилянська академія, 2008. 430 с.

5. Гайдеггер М. Дорогою до мови / пер. з нім. В. Кам'янець. Львів : Літопис, 2007. 232 с.

6. Гастев Ю.А. Модель II. Большая Советская Энциклопедия: в 30 томах / гл. ред. А.М. Прохоров. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1974. Т. 16.

7. Гегель В.Ф. Эстетика: в 4 томах. Т. 4. Москва, 1974. 667 с.

8. Каллер Дж. Теория литературы: краткое введение / пер. с англ. А. Георгиева. Москва : Астрель, 2006. 158 с.

9. Клочек Г.Д. Енергія художнього слова. Кіровоград : Ред.-вид. відділ Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Винниченка, 2007. 447 с.

10. Крістєва Ю. Полілог / пер. з фр. П. Таращука. Київ : Юніверс, 2004. 480 с.

11. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. Москва : Сов. энциклопедия, 1990. 683 с.

12. Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2001. 704 с.

13. Лотман Ю.М. Об искусстве. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2000. 704 с.

14. Лотман Ю.М. Тезисы к проблеме «Искусство в ряду моделирующих систем». Об искусстве. Санкт-Петербург : «Искусство – СПБ», 2000. С. 387–399.

15. Мейлах Б.С. Проблема ритма, пространства и времени в комплексном изучении творчества. *Ритм, пространство и время в литературе и искусстве.* Львів : Наука, 1972. 298 с.

16. Національні варіанти літературної компаративістики / Національна академія наук України ; Інст літератури ім. Т.Г. Шевченка ; Д.С. Наливайко, Т.Н. Денисова, О.В. Дубініна та ін. Київ : Видавничий дім «Стилос», 2009. 750 с.

17. Соломонік А.Б. Позитивная семиотика (о знаках, знаковых системах и о семиотической деятельности). Москва : МЕТ, 2004. 191 с.

18. Ткаченко А.О. Мистецтво слова: Вступ до літературознавства : підручник для студентів гуманітарних спеціальностей вищих навчальних закладів. 2-е вид. випр. і доповн. Київ : ВПЦ «Київський університет», 2003. 448 с.

19. Тюпа В.И. Анализ художественного текста. Москва : Академия, 2006. 336 с.

20. Успенский В.А. Прогулки с Лотманом и вторичное моделирование. Лотмановский сборник. Москва, 1995.

21. Brunel Ph. Précis de littérature comparée (French Edition) Kindle Edition. 2018. 400 p.

22. Eliot G. Middlemarch: an authoritative text, backgrounds, criticism Hornback ed. (Bellarmine College). 2nd ed. New York, London : W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2000. 678 p.

23. Garret P.G. Thackeray: Seeing Double. The Victorian Multiplot Novel. Studies in Dialogical Form. Yale University Press. 1980. 134 p.

24. Gekker M., Volosova T., Doroshevich A.. Part II. Тернопіль: Вид-во Карп'юка, 2001. 268 p.

25. Lubbock P. The craft of fiction.L. Faber, 1957. 276 p.

26. Lubbock P. The craft of fiction. L., 1957. 274 p.

27. McMaster J. Thackeray's Things. Time's Local Habitation. Ed. Richard Levine. Ohio UP. 1976, 206 p.

Information about the author:
Khairulina Nailia Farytivna,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at The Department of Foreign Languages
Luhansk State University of Internal Affairs
named after E.O. Didorenko
1, Donetska Str., Sievierodonetsk, Luhansk region, 93408, Ukraine