

# The Paradigm Of Contemporary Russian Literary Process

Saodat Kamilova<sup>1</sup>, Berdieva Shakhnoza<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Department of World Literature, National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Termez State University, Termez, Surkhandarya, Uzbekistan

**ABSTRACT:** *In modern literary studies the problem of revelation and characterization of literary process of the early XXI century presenting itself as a social document and reflection of modern reality through artistic details and language is conceptually meaningful. The origin of new humanitarian trends topicalizes the elaboration and formation of new methodological approaches to the study of development of literary process at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. The research of modern literary process seems to be very important as it differed by complex, ambiguously discrepant and multilayer character, which specificity is conditioned by qualitatively new peculiarities defining inner regularities of development of modern literature. The present article is devoted to the characteristics and detailed analysis of main conceptions of contemporary Russian literary process. The conceptual models by M.Remizova, N.Ivanova, S.Chuprinin, Y.Yermolin are analyzed and generalized; personal opinion on conceptual tendencies of the development of Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries, represented in the scheme perturbation – climate – arena, is suggested. Such approach to the systematization of literary material allowed displaying the key tendencies of the development of modern literary process in Russia. Besides, the definition of conceptual lines of the development of Russian literary process of the early XXI century in the scheme perturbation – climate – arena allows revelation of general principle of comprising a full-fledged conception of literary process of the researched period that, in its turn, gives a stimulus for broadening horizons of researches in literary studies with the tide of renovation of terminological and categorical apparatus.*

**KEYWORDS:** *modern literary process, conception, multi-structural properties, discreteness, transformation, intensification of style, alternative literary studies, comparative-typological modelling.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The revelation of general regularities of world literary process and national specificity of certain literature at a modern stage in conditions of their interaction is one of the fundamental goals of modern comparative studies. The necessity of scientific analysis of general regularities of the development of Russian literature at the beginning of the XXI century is conditioned by the tendency to cognize the logic of development of world literature. Contemporary researches devoted to the specificity of development of Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries represent diverse points of view on the condition of a literary process at modern stage, which do not represent the complete picture of the development of contemporary Russian literature.

The article systematizes the main scientific conceptions of modern literary process in Russia, reveals general regularities in formation of theoretical aspects on development of contemporary Russian literature, as well as presents personal opinion of the authors considering the researched problem.

The aim of the present research is characterisation of modern literary process in Russia as well as its systematization, basing on the consequent consideration of social-political facts, literary-typological factors and phenomena that allows widening of the understanding of the regularities of world literature development as a topical problem of world literary studies.

The review of scientific literature on this problem reveals a number of researches characterizing either one of the tendencies of modern literary process in Russia (Merezhinskaya, 2001; Mankovskaya, 2000; Kasatkina, 2003) or creative work of one of the representatives of modern literature (Simmons, 1992; Woll, 1993; Shneidman, 1995; Haensgen, 2015), or literary devices and means used in the process of creation of modern Russian literature (Vojvodić, 2017; Bagration-Moukhraneli, 2017). Scientific researches in modern Russian prose (Mokrova, 2003; Yefremenkov, 2006; Vershinina, 2011; Pushkar, 2001; Budarina, 2010) present certain interest as they analyze epic genres through the context of revelation of characteristic tendencies and common problems of prose development on the whole, though the authors do not aim at elaboration of the holistic picture of contemporary literary process in Russia. The methodology of literary criticism and empiric analysis of conceptual models of modern literary process were represented in detail in the works by (Ivanova, 1988; Remizova, 2007; Chuprinin, 2009; Yermolin, 2015). Let us dwell on these issues in detail.

On the assumption of the abovementioned, in our opinion, the full-fledged conception of modern literary process in Russia at the early XXI century should be formed with the consideration of viewpoint of Russian literary process in the late XX century on the one hand, and empiric analysis of author's orientations in the early XXI century, on the other hand. Thus, the first stage of the formation of modern literature process conception in Russia at the beginning of the XXI century presents the separation of conceptual tendencies of development of Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries, which will be amplified with the appearance of new trends and styles in literature.

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The methodology of the research is defined by the totality of methods of comparative-typological, comparative-historical, and structural-semantic analysis.

In this way, within the systematization of modern process in Russia the methods of structural-semantic, systemic, and complex analysis of literature in the paradigm of artistic-aesthetic, ethic-philosophic, historical-social, and psychological realities of the XX century that presents the integral representation not only about evolutional development of modern literary process, but also epoch-marking world-view on the whole.

The achievement of the stated goals and objectives of the research is realized through comparative-typological and comparative-historical methods allowing defining the tendencies of the development of Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries; as well as the revelation of specificity of contemporary Russian literature in conditions of crisis of Russian culture at the end of the XX century were realized within the present research.

### 3. RESULTS

M.Remizova differentiates literature of the turn of the XX-XXI centuries into two rival trends: “The forces are strictly divided into two opposed camps: “modernists” and “traditionalists” (Remizova, 2007\_). “Modernists” are defined as writers “strongly attracted by theorizing on the subject of ontological final of the previous artistic system”, who are sure that “the creation of a literary text on the basis of old artistic principles is impossible” and oriented to the Chaos principle, where the world is conceptual construction, while a belles-lettres text is a type of an intellectual play; “they see only cultural approach, decoding of certain taboos, deconstruction of totalitarian discourse, aesthetic dodge exhorted to reveal some intertextual links”. The book’s author separates “modernists” into several streams according to the character of text representation: “postmodernism”, “creative modernism”, “dramatic literature”, “non-fiction”. “Traditionalists”, according to M.Remizova, are the followers of realistic style of writing, who are inclined to “appeal to the achievements of world culture”. Literature of realistic stream, in her opinion, is also divided into “two opposed camps, symbolically speaking, into liberals and patriots”. This opposition is based not only on the surface hatred, but also on the fundamental artistic principles. Besides, each of “traditionalists” camps is fractioned. Thus, “liberals” have factions “realism par excellence”, where the writers are in the search of new forms for organization and adequate representation of chaotic reality and chaotic personal world; hyperrealism, inclined to “hyperbolizing, dramatization (...). Sui generis expressionism approaching the prose of this trend to modernism appears”; aesthetic realism inclined to “aesthetisation of the narrated reality, which is achieved, first of all, through the style and wide attraction of citing-allusive apparatus”; women prose that is characterized by the highest level of subjectivity and exaggerated ego-centrism; youth prose realizing “free communication with the surrounding world, when personal impressions can shape the most fantastically in order to correlate (within the participation of author’s will) with the task of adequate rendering of real feelings”.

The “patriots” camp, inherited the traditions of social realism and “aggressive-oppositional protest mood” with the idealization and nostalgia for Soviet past, rejection of urban culture and as a consequence praising the rural culture, “inclination to verbosity resulting in the creation of large-scaled canvas” – is separated by M.Remizova into “ideological prose”, “military prose”, and literature of “God-seeking”.

Having given thorough and ingenious analysis of belles-lettres texts of two main literary streams of the turn of the XX-XXI centuries with their multiple trends and branches, the critic at the very beginning of the booklamentably states that “the common problem of both streams is almost absolute absence of really achieved peaks in both formal and content plan”. This approach, in our opinion, is somewhat simplified and works only with those texts which were analyzed in the book. Where we should refer the text corpus absorbing the peculiarities of both “traditionalists” and “modernists” or realists who used postmodernist writing techniques, as well as the problem of genre transformation and phenomenon of poetry-prose, the author leaves unclear. Nevertheless, M.Remizova managed not only systematize and sort out motley modern belles-lettres texts.

N.Ivanova suggests her own version of regulation of modern literary process (Ivanova, 1988). Having asked the question “What is modern in contemporary literature?” and debating with N.Leyderman and M.Lipovetskiy who considered modern literature as historical-literature phenomenon (Leiderman&Lipovetskiy, 2001) the researcher comes to the following conclusion:

- “modern literature” should be analyzed from the position of chronology, then phenomenon;

- modern literature can be divided into “two multidirectional conditioned streams ... into literature of actual implementation and literature of topical content”;
- modern belles-lettres texts should be adequate to time, have the quality of foreseeing, and aim at eternal topics.

The critic notes that the peculiarities of contemporary literature began their formation within the literature of “thaw”; by the mid-1980s it accumulated great aesthetic opportunities, and by the late 1980s – early 1990s “... the breakthrough was made influencing directly on the formation of postmodern literature, which included both postmodernist literature and literature of other aesthetic and viewpoint choices”. Within it, the author of the article states that realism as a metastyle of Russian literature seems disputable and the dominant of modern literary process is postmodernism. Analyzing general space of postmodern literature as “a complicated but not compound system” and defining the peculiarities of poetics of “postmodernist turn” (Ihab, 1987) such as “intertextuality, perception of the world as a text and a text as the world, decentralization, fragmentariness, playing with simulacrum, repercussions, “ambiguity”, double coding, time procrastination, correcting (“pending”) irony, semantic insolubility, parody modus of narration” and some other features and peculiarities, N.Ivanova suggests usage of terminology common for scientific world, thereby identifying Russian literary practice with the world one. It is fairly stated that the literature of new time “reveals the variety of ways of impasse development, splits up and capsules; polemics are made senseless and minimize... Literary imperialism is changed by literary democracy abolishing the concept of marginality. Critics suggest models of coexistence of multiple types of literature inside the Russian one, “multiliterature”, “literature rainbow””. Naming literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries as post-Soviet literature, N.Ivanova suggests her own systematization of that period:

1. Mass literature, including genres of domestic, pseudo-historical, political detective, thriller, fantasy, love-story.
2. High literature with the works of prose-writers and poets of different generations. Besides realism, postmodernist-conceptualists of different generations, social art, neobaroque are also included here.
3. Belles-lettres following realistic tradition; here such trends as neonaturalism, neosentimentalism, postrealism, “new youth realism”

The poetics of post-Soviet literature, according to the opinion of the researcher, is characterized by “scattering of overnarration, diffusion and shortening of the presence of traditional prose and poetic genres (novel, story, poem, rhyme); they are supplanted by interim genres (the term by L.Ginsburg) hybrid formations. Specific feature of intertextuality of Russian postmodernism is genre-formational principle of rhizome, explanations for footnote, the list realized in a number of texts created in the genre of endless commentaries, sets of “candy wrappers and stamps”, and so on (...) Fragmentary, mosaicity and minimalism, centonity, play with other styles colour not only postmodernist prose, but also traditional prose and poetry”. As a conclusion N.Ivanova states that postmodernism did not deplete itself: “... it is not the end, but crisis, by virtue of depleting the authors’ opportunities, not the method”, in other words, in modern prose a peculiar compression-wrapping of “technology” occurred, which the critic names involution – “wrapping and simultaneous complication”. Thus, within the conception of modern literary process though a talented attempt of generalization of modern literary process, however, the question about the opposition of literary trends is not stated; in the flourishing field of literature the author suggests existence of two modi – postmodernism and realism. The suggested classification of post-Soviet literature is represented as evaluative, but the criteria of evaluation are not stated, therefore, it is unclear according to which principle the selection should be made.

In basic questions S.Chuprinin is co-real with N.Ivanova and goes further, entering the problem of further perspective. Thus, opposing the literature of the 1990s to the literature of beginning of the XXI century, called “the Noughties”, he stated that “the 1990s were the years of broken social conditions, in which literature existed, as well as its inner construction” (Chuprinin, 2009), and in the 2000s the process of restoration of old and building of new literary space began. According to S.Chuprinin, it happened because of “double compromise”, which can be covered by the following:

- literature of the Noughties could absorb all previous processes in Russian literature: escape from political, aesthetic, and moral censorship, “temptation of permissiveness, radical linguistic, thematic, and genre experiments” and cluster into tradition. Moreover, it is stated that avant-garde or postmodernist practices stop being leading tendencies and are accepted like either individual manner of mature authors or the arsenal of stylistic devices that any author can use independently of a writing type. If the 1990s are characterized by the reproduction of artist’s luxuriant fancy, then in the noughties the reflection of “typical or the most extreme demonstration” of reality imagination is observed;

- in the Noughties the main opponent of literature was market and there was a choice between “commercial” and “non-commercial” art. It is noted that if in the 1990s there was the confrontation between “true” and “mass”, then in the noughties “not the strategy of conformism, but compromise between purely artistic interests of authors and market demands” is observed.

The young generation of writers, according to the critic’s opinion, do not try to overthrow the “idols of previous years”, “do not encroach on established hierarchy of values and authority, but try to build in it, find there some place for themselves”.

S.Chuprinin defines several literature tendencies growing in the noughties:

1. Mutual diffusion of realism and fantasy realized in the genre of anti-utopia in which writers of different aesthetic guidelines worked actively: realists, postmodernists, representatives of national-patriotic literature and mass-culture. The characteristic feature combining all these various literary artists is the fusion of life-likeness, satire, and fantasy.
2. In the noughties the fashion for literary biographies, considered in the 1990s as “the lowest”, democracy genre, was featured/
3. The ardent frondeurs of old times “inviting to the compromise when nobody asks to capitulate the others, mimicry or be unfaithful to their principles, except maybe the principle of artistic, ideological, and moral sturdiness”.

Therefore, the critic ascertains that “worldview and aesthetic struggle of the 1990s, their revolutionary excitement and violence of extremes were changed into peaceful living together”. The idea of “double compromise” looks attractive and convincing, though the question about the restoration of old sounds disputable.

Y.Yermolin accentuates differently (Yermolin, 2015). He states that in the XXI century “the Russian breakthrough” can happen only on conditions that literature will become the main text of Russian culture and its most important context: “literaturecentrism is paradigmatically necessary condition basis for Russian culture. It postulates the missioner participation of Russian authors – “Russian writers will have to restate the status of literature as main space of spiritual life of people”. In the situation of such a breakthrough the critic sketches the “main theme of Russian culture – the theme of sacrifice (...) when people scarify themselves”.

Characterizing the culture of the XX century as the epoch of Modern, Y.Yermolin claims that “... Artistic and life searches of modernism led to the formation of new cultural epoch. The epoch of Postmodernism is the situation in culture when the Modernist crisis became obvious, when New time depleted its spiritual and creative potential (...) The dialogue with Modern as a certain cultural value which border we have crossed and with

which we enter the relationship, partly partnership, partly antagonistic was opened (...) The situation of such a polilogue and conditioned cultural pluralism by it is the epoch of Postmodern...”

The scientist defines several ways of this cultural paradigm:

1. Neo-conservative – “... returning to old, tested verities”.
2. Reactional – “...distillation of one of old verities out of traditional context”.
3. Eschatology – “... premonition, presentiment of the end, and, maybe the appearance of verity”.
4. Decadence – “... absolutization of personal verity of a current moment, mood, or impressions”.

The epoch of Postmodern, according to Y.Yermolin’s opinion, promoted the type of plastic personality to the proscenium of culture – “the type of free, critically thinking intellectual recognizing and making himself in the space of not unnecessary, but possible”, though, as the critic mentions, some authors had a false understanding of common relativity and fictitiousness. It happened with Russian postmodernists, Y.Yermolin thinks, “...Unexpected freedom created charming phantom, pleasant temptation – created absolute idea of literature independence of everything in the world” that led to the transfer of writers “from spiritual aristocrats to the rank of actors of original genre”, who “perceived literature and its results as recreated space where there were neither serious ideas, which impose themselves, nor values in general”. Naming postmodernism as “a local phenomenon concentrated in the last Soviet generation, prolonged in the 1990s”, Y.Yermolin defines postmodernist plot of Russian literature as “a plot for newspaper-simulacrum”, which in the end turned into “non-determined ungrounded flying literature” revealing spiritual misery. Besides, he considers that “... Playing project of postmodernism lost its avant-garde message and drive and left for mass literature, having furnished it technically”, as well as blame postmodernists for discredit to literature as concentration of moral concepts.

Y.Yermolin considers the artechnique of Postmodernist epoch to be trans-avant-garde as aesthetic stream including the statement “... new picturesqueness, expressiveness, strongly expressed personal origin. Free combination of different artistic styles of the past and freedom of historical-cultural associations do not prevent from aspiration for originality in its aesthetics. As opposed to postmodernists modern trans-avant-gardists put forward a serious task of grasping objective reality” (Yermolin, 2015).

Using this concept Y.Yermolin expresses the regularity of literary and artistic traditions in world culture allowing all phenomena in Russian literature to build in world artistic context. According to the critic’s opinion, trans-avant-garde is “chronological post-avant-gardeis chronological post-avant-garde; though it is the “post”, which:

- exists in the situation of ineradicable artistic pluralism (as well as pluralism of means of expression, means of existence);
- as a result appeals to the most different traditions and is inspired by different projects including rather not avant-garde traditions of a big scale (realism, romanticism, etc.);
- does not refuse from any means of traditional avant-garde (including, for example, surrealism, Dada, and others);
- starts, first of all, from direct preceding paradigm of conceptualism within the framework of which the art lost its connection with life that led to the play with rational imaginaries”.

The scientist’s dual viewpoint on trans-avant-garde expressed in the conclusion as “postmodernism is a local, marginal phenomenon, instance (relatively-playing version) of trans-avant-garde”; “modern trans-avant-garde is overcoming of playing concept hypertrophied by artistic practice in the 1990s and basing on representations of self-sufficiency of playing manipulations, rational construction. Rejecting phantom-playing character of artistic reflection as axiom or dominant, trans-avant-garde of the early new

century in Russia is inspired by the ideals of “new seriousness”, “new realism”, pathos of responsibility and engagement, duty and mission” allows Y.Yermolin to define several conceptual “vectors” of development of modern literary process:

1. Variety of means and performances of writing that is declared through the freedom of author’s choice of sources and actives of narration when the whole volume of historically established practices and forms of reality reflection is used.
2. The accentuation of expressive origin of creative work, “neo-expressionism”, as indispensable aspect of trans-avant-garde, which inherited the traditions of lyrical, confessional literature of romantic trend and reflects the complexity, fragmentariness, pulled apart soul of a modern person. It is “... the attempt of reflection of elusive identity, search for the answer to the question “what is Me?””. The central character of modern works is a “person-trauma” trying to conceptualize the life as constant loss, sheer misfortune and failure. Consequently, here we see different means of “irrational mumbling, absurd grotesque, amplification of horrors, fears, and monstrosity”.
3. Neo-symbolism (mystic intuitionism) expressed in undisguised contacts with virtual worlds, the other worlds travellings and realized by surrealistic writing where the authors reject straight track to the Absolute and old frames.
4. Meta-authorship, that is the “vector of artistic self-determination and the author’s place in the world connected to the problematics of creative process and communication between the author and the reader exposed in the text canvas”, which appear on the level of the text about texts, semi-diary notes, etc.

Summarizing, Y.Yermolin emphasizes that “Trans-avant-garde” is a full-fledged artistic transit, universal vector, phenomenon of eternal topicality in artistic and general world context that became a literary constant. Not the option, but menu, or even keyboard of literature”.

In our opinion, the conception by Y.Yermolin is original, which let us observe the phenomena of Russian literature within a world context.

We have to state that nowadays the most common, adopted by all experts conception of modern literary process has not still been developed (though it cannot be developed as too little time has passed), however, it is possible to affirm that there were some attempts. Moreover, in the process of its structuring, in our opinion, there are several observable regularities. Thus, the formation of the abovementioned conceptions and models by different scientists concerning Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries are under the influence of several factors:

1. The crisis condition of culture in late XX century. Critics note that if previously in each crucial epoch literature, refusing from early orientations, as a rule suggests something creative – new conception of personality, the image of the world, then at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries it did not happen for the first time; literature did not develop new “algorithm of existence”. That is why M.Remizova and N.Ivanova evaluate modern literary process pessimistically, while S.Chuprinin and Y.Yermolin hope for more qualitatively successful turn in the development of literature.
2. The formation of paradigms of modern literary process in Russia was influenced by common philosophical theories. For example, the theory of Modern and Postmodern epochs; postmodernist knowledge about the world, and so on. Moreover, these scientific representations influenced not only on literary studies, but also sociology, aesthetics, culture studies, which allows to refer this tendency to the whole cultural context of that period. The most popular point of view is the change of Modern epoch into Postmodern. Some logics is observed here as if Russian literature of the XX century is considered by the researches as symbiosis of two joined styles of realism and modernism, then to the turn of the XX-XXI centuries pluralism triumphed and Russian literary process itself was interpreted as separated

formation deprived of unity and integrity. Consequently, M.Remizova suggests multiramose “streams” and analyzes certain author poetics, while N.Ivanova is guided by postmodernist principle of decentralization and S.Chuprinin and Y.Yermolin see the opportunity of synthesis of all positions (the first one, let us iterate, is connected with the idea of compromise, while the second is referred to “trans-avant-garde”).

3. In the analyzed conceptions we can see the reflections of both interpretations of literature development as a change of artistic systems though in somehow modified form (understanding of the development of modern literature according to N.Ivanova) and classic “archetypic structure” (the struggle of “traditionalists” and “modernists” according to M.Remizova or appearance of compromise after “chaos” according to S.Chuprinin)/ besides, the analyzed paradigms of modern literary process is based on aesthetic and theoretical-literary principles where the critics accentuate the contrast of “progression, logics, “linearity”/ discontinuity, nonlinearity” of the development of the literature at the turn of the centuries. Thus, N.Ivanovasees a gradual movement from culmination of the “thaw” to literary “burst” of the 1990s, while M.Remizova considers social realism to be a “gap” in the development of Russian literature that led to “low-grade prose”. Y.Yermolin bases on the V.Nabokov’s icon who, according to his opinion, personifies certain tendencies of modern literary process as benchmark of general picture of modern Russian literature.

On the assumption of the abovementioned we observe the following conceptual tendencies of the development of Russian literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries:

1. Modern literary process is a complex social-cultural phenomenon, which is the identifier of historical development of the “millennium” epoch and “touchstone” of morality of society. On the assumption of it, modern literature goes through several stages of development, which can be represented in the following scheme: **perturbation – climate – arena**. Thus, at the stage of “**perturbation**” the peculiarities of Russian mentality and search for personal identity are convexly exhibited, which is led to the formation of new national self-consciousness; at the stage of “**climate**” literature presents itself as a part of vibrational soul actively engaged into the process of formation of public opinion; at the stage of “**arena**” literature becomes a full-fledged element of spiritual life of the society and, maybe, the discovery of special (high) status.

2. At the stage of “**perturbation**” (the 1990s-2000s, though the time definition is conditioned) in conditions of aesthetic pluralism literature tries to personify multidisciplinary content (sizing up of Soviet, Russian history, realizing of consequences of the fall of the USSR, artistic introduction of new market reality with the attempts of understanding of current social processes, comment on the appearing the society of consumers, attempts of prevision of future, etc.), using all traditions of different creative methods, the arsenal of artistic means of expression and personification mixing them and combining incompatible that led to overcoming of canons, appearing of aesthetic freedom, formation of new conceptions of “the world and a human being”, excessive subjectifying. The stage of “**climate**” (first decades of the XXI century) presents the creation of new thinking structure defined by variability and polysemanticism absorbing wide spectrum of religious beliefs, philosophic and scientific, political views and opinions. It is revealed through different aspects on content-conceptual levels of modern texts (the ideas of nationalist trend, Orthodoxy, interest to oriental religions, revelation of Supreme Me in personality, philosophy of hedonism, accent on common humanistic values, etc.). Intense conceptual polilogue, trying to define the basis for human life, is going on. The stage “**arena**”, is thought, is the future of Russian literature as for Russian people “direct connection to the life of a word and necessity of expression, public speech and collective discussion of social concerns” (Kondakov, 2008) is characteristic.

3. In modern literary process there are two forms of writing: realistic and modernistic (first, they oppose, then they live parallel and nowadays they absorb traditions of each other, adopt artistic techniques, and are in the process of assimilation and reincarnation).
4. The specificity of literary process of this century is defined by intensification of individual styles, active transformation of different genres, stylistic forms and traditions.
5. Modern literature is the source reflecting mentality of new epoch, fixes modern reality, delicately feels it subliminally, and is the witness of our time, social document reflecting modernity through artistic details and language.

Thus, the definition of conceptual lines of the development of literary process at early XXI century in the scheme perturbation – climate – arena allows revelation of general principle of creation of a full-fledged conception of a literary process of the researched period that is, in its turn, gives a stimulus for the broadening of horizons of researches in the sphere of literature studies in the trend of renovation of terminological and categorical apparatus. It should be mentioned that the development of literary studies at the beginning of the third millennium is defined by common global tendencies of world evolution on the way of integration and globalization defining new way of thinking, which is only forming. On the assumption of the abovementioned, the research of modern literary process not only in Russia, but within the whole former Soviet Union republics, should be based on the updated methods of literary studies or alternative approaches to analysis of both literary process on the whole and literary text in particular.

In the late XX-early XXI centuries American philosopher Ken Willber introduces an integral theory and practice into scientific use that is based on the idea of variety of opinions and approaches in humanitarian science. Applying to integral theory of art and literature Ken Willber introduces integral hermeneutics as methodological pivot. In other words, any literary phenomenon (and modern literary process is literary phenomenon) should be considered basing on the method of “context inside of an endless context” (Willber, 2012). Uzbek researcher G.Garipova, basing on the conception by Ken Willber suggests “in the base of methodology of integral literary studies it is reasonable to set modelling approach”, which, in its turn, is divided into “problematic-conceptual, i.e. the construction of the model reflecting individual author’s conception in the text or in literary system on the whole” (Garipova, 2012).

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

Coinciding with the opinion by G.Garipova on the appropriateness of applying integral literary studies according to the method by K.Willbert and justification of suggested modelling approach, characterizing modern literary process we also based on these approaches, though we used comparative-typological modelling based on revelation of identity and differentiations of writing practices, as well as the means and techniques in the process of cognition of objective reality.

Within the analysis of the category “modern literary process” modern scholars suggest many approaches, methodologies for the process of modern literary studies: integral literary studies (Kamilova, 2015), psychological literary studies, anthropological literary studies, ontological poetics (Tarasova, 2005) and some others, conditioning the usage of methodologies of allied sciences: hermeneutics, history, ontology, psychology, philosophy, phenomenology, aesthetics. We agree with the scholars who state that methodology of allied disciplines “initiated overcoming of cultural closedness and conducting literary researches with the application of interdisciplinary approaches” (Fedoseyeva, 2016) and our approach to the definition and characterization of the tendencies of development of modern Russian

literary process from the point of view of literary comparative studies supplements methodology of modern literary studies.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The suggested scheme “perturbation – climate - arena” can be applied for the characterization of the tendencies of development of literary process in the former Soviet Union republics. In particular, in the analysis of modern literary process in Uzbekistan the scheme allows defining the following tendencies:

1. “Perturbation”, or “Transitional” period (late 1980s-early 1990s). That period was defined by several factors:

- abolishment of “blank spots” in history of Uzbek literature in connection with reconstruction of classical heritage (literature of XII-XIX centuries), publication of literature forbidden before;

- the increasing interest to religion evoked by the process of reconsideration of Sufjan values, spiritual-homiletical literature;

- rehabilitation of objective history of Uzbek people and its coverage in the texts of historical-biographical genre;

- decrease of the interest to the traditions of Russian classical literature, ardour for Mediterranean and American art;

- overcoming of “ideological vacuum” and definition of independent national idea in Uzbek culture and literature.

2. “Climate”, or “Re-orientation-analytical” period (the 1990s-2000s). In this period Uzbek literature was placed in the situation, which can be defined by such polar concepts as national identity – globalization, identic value – market economy. It seriously influenced on the picture of literary field. Uzbek writers began searching new forms of reflection of modern reality trying reconsider the existence from philosophic point of view. The stratification of literature into segments according to aesthetic principle and formal experiments is observed.

3. “Arena”, or period of “Verdandi” (since 2000). Modern conditions of literature are characterized by synthesis of traditions of classical Uzbek writing, traditions of realism, modernism and postmodernism tendencies. In other words, a literary situation depicts all processes and phenomena whenever occurred in the history of Uzbek literature, which are actively influencing on literature nowadays, while it, being renovated within the modern needs and requirements, forms the future of literature.

Consequently, the scheme “perturbation – climate – arena” allows characterizing the tendencies of development of modern literary process through the whole post-Soviet area, as well as stating that modern literature is the source reflecting mentality of new epoch that fixes modern reality, delicately feels it, witnesses our time, is a social document reflecting modern reality through artistic details and language. Belles-lettres at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries is the epoch of artistic searches, experiments, changing the character of literature on all levels of artistic-literary system. Within several decades literature made the most difficult way – from strict standards of social realism and censorship to the literature in the situation of freedom of speech and permissiveness, deposition of authority and legalization of “forbidden” themes, often spiritual and aesthetic vacuum, role change of a writer and a reader, lost of “literarycentrism”. It generalizes artistic-aesthetic searches in the XX century, recreates multi-aspect and disputable character of modern life with the trial-and-error method and approbation of new approaches projects the future of literature.

Reflecting modern life aesthetically, modern literature anyway helps modern people to realize their place in our disordered world.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Bagration-Moukhraneli, I. (2017). The Orthodox code of contemporary Russian prose. *Societal Studies*, 9(2), 187-200.
- [2] Budarina, A. N. (2010). Genre of story in the works by A.Kabakov. *Vestnik TGPU*, 2010, №4 (22). 204-210.
- [3] Chuprinin, S. (2009). The Noughties: the years of compromise. 'Znamya'. №2. 123-139.
- [4] Fedoseyeva, T. V. (2016). About literary anthropology and anthropocentrism of modern literary studies Ryazan State University Times ['VestnikRyazanskogogosudarstvennogouniversiteta'], №3 (52).
- [5] Garipova, G. (2012). Artistic model of existence in the literature of the XX century. Tashkent: MUMTOZ SO`Z, 90.
- [6] Haensgen, S. (2015). Kommerzialisierung der Literatur. Literarisierung der Kommerzes. *AnalysenzurKultur und Gesellschaftimostlichen Europa*, Band 13, 2015, Hrsg: Wolfgang Eichwede, ForschungsstelleOsteuropaan der Universitaet Bremen. Edition Temmen.
- [7] Ihab, H. (1987). *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture*. Columbus, 182.
- [8] Ivanova, N. (1988). About the prose of last years. Soviet author.
- [9] Kamilova, S. (2015). Conceptual model of Uzbek literature at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. *Foreigners in Uzbekistan*. №3 (7). 149-159.
- [10] Kasatkina, T. (2003). A Space, time in Russian literature of the late XX century.
- [11] Kondakov, I. (2008). Beyond the word (Crisis of literaturecentrism in Russia of the XX-XXI centuries). *Literature Questions*. №5. 3.
- [12] Leiderman, N. L., Lipovetskiy, M. N. (2001). *Modern Russian literature*. In 3 volumes. V.1. M.: URSS, 59.
- [13] Mankovskaya, B. N. (2000). Self-reflection of non-classical aesthetics.
- [14] Merezhinskaya, A. Yu. (2001). Artistic paradigm of transitional cultural epoch. *Russian prose of the 1980s-1990s*. Kyiv.
- [15] Mokrova, M. V. (2003). Genre of story in the works by B.M.Yekimov: traditions and innovation. Abstract of PhD thesis. Volgograd.
- [16] Pushkar, T. A. (2001). Typology and poetics of feminine prose: gender aspect: on the material of T.Tolstaya, L.Petrushevskaya, L.Ulitskaya. Abstract of PhD thesis. Stavropol.
- [17] Remizova, M. (2007). Only text. Post-Soviet prose and its reflection in literary criticism.
- [18] Shneidman, N. N. (1995). *Russian literature, 1988-1994: the end of an era*. University of Toronto Press.
- [19] Simmons K. (1992). *Plays for the Period of Stagnation: Lyudmila Petrushevskaya and the Theatre of Absurd*. Birmingham Slavonic Monographs, No. 21, Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1992.
- [20] Tarasova, Y. K. (2005). Modern German literary studies: traditions and changes // *Filologiya i kultura*. №2. 159-164.
- [21] Vershinina, M. A. (2011). The author and the character in the prose by V. Makanin of the 1990s-2000s. Abstract of PhD thesis. Volgograd.
- [22] Vojvodić, J. (2017). (Neo) mythological Elements in the Modern Russian Prose (through the Example of "Surgeon" by Marina Stepnova).
- [23] Willber, K. (2012). *The Eye of Spirit: An Integral Vision for a World Gone Slightly Mad*. M.85-93.

- [24] Woll, J. (1993). The minotaur in the maze: remarks on Lyudmila Petrushevskaya. *World Literature Today*, 67(1), 125-130.
- [25] Yefremkov, A. S. (2006). The peculiarities of psychological analysis in stories by V.Makanin of the 1970s-1990s. Abstract of PhD thesis. Tver.
- [26] Yermolin, Y. (2015). Mediums of timeless: Literature in the epoch of postmodern or Trans-avant-garde. Times.