



ROMANTICISM IN THE CRITICAL HERITAGE OF APOLLON GRIGORIEV

Djurayeva Z. R* & Gudzina V. A**

Uzbekistan, Bukhara, Bukhara State University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Cite This Article: Djurayeva Z. R & Gudzina V. A, "Romanticism in the Critical Heritage of Apollon Grigoriev", International Journal of Scientific Research and Modern Education, Volume 4, Issue 2, Page Number 18-20, 2019.

Copy Right: © IJSRME, 2019 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract:

The article deals with the contribution of Russian writer and critic of the XIX century Apollon Grigoriev to the development of romanticism theory.

Key Words: Russian Literary Studies, Romanticism, National Character, Synthesis, Value, Worldview, Organic Criticism, Rebel Romanticism, Artistic Consciousness, Gnosiological Nature, Spirituality & Psychology

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается вклад русского писателя и критика XIX века Апполлона Григорьева в развитие теории романтизма

Ключевые Слова: русское литературоведение, романтизм, национальный характер, синтез, ценность, мироощущение, органическая критика, бунтарский романтизм, художественное сознание, гнесеологическая природа, духовность, психологизм

The principles of romanticism in the 40-50s of the XIX century were given much attention in the Russian criticism. The subject of study was increasingly becoming not only the work of individual writers, trends and issues of the literary process, but also fundamental problems relating to the gnosiological nature of these forms of art. The interest to theoretical and cognitive questions of art, to an art method in particular, was connected with traditions of criticism of V. G. Belinsky.

However, the concepts of the great Russian critic organically intertwined philosophical, aesthetic, and sociological aspects of research, while later they were separated and developed independently. Representatives of so-called "aesthetic criticism" considered works of art only from the artistic side. It was important for Apollon Grigoriev to establish that this work, compared to others, "brought a new mass of knowledge of man's heart and to the secrets of life", how faithfully and truthfully it captured the features of national life and national character.

Apollon Grigoriev, whose critical legacy includes romantic issues as one of the leading figures in the history of Russian literary criticism, is known to have made a significant contribution to the study of romanticism theory. The principle of infinite reflection and interpenetration is the basis of "organic criticism" [9]. In his general philosophical and aesthetic views on artistic creativity, he is close to V.G.Belinsky. In Grigoriev's formulation of the questions of the typology of romanticism, the specifics of the romantic, "ideal worldview", the synthesis in the art of the real and ideal beginnings and their solution, much remains relevant in our time in connection with the emerging discussions about romanticism. And some of the conclusions and positions of the critique can provide some assistance to the researchers of the theory and history of romanticism. But if Belinsky's teachings are covered by scholars with a sufficient degree of clarity, then the same cannot be said for Grigoriev's critical heritage.

Apollon Grigoriev gives romanticism "a place in the realm of titanic forces", because romantic consciousness by its nature is spontaneous, "gloomy, vague, there is some feeling". In essence, Grigoriev notes a very important generic feature of romanticism, close to the concept of romantic quality of outlook - a peculiar psychological state of the soul [8]. This state, or romantic outlook, by virtue of its only spontaneous nature, is qualified by the critic as one-sided and even painful, as it opposes the "whole, direct worldview", the ideal of "truth of the human soul" - the main requirement of "organic criticism".

"Organic Criticism" sees the work of art as a reflection of the moral spirit of the era, the people through the "nature" of the artist. Thus, the complex, rich and contradictory content of the artwork is reduced to a unique gnosiological denominator - "the truth of the human soul". Thus ethical is identified with aesthetic, truth with truth and beauty. Hence, the main attention is paid to Grigoriev's characterological content of the image, the identification of its national specifics.

The artist's task, according to "organic criticism", is not to analyze the phenomena of public life, consciousness and culture as natural processes, but to establish and define their "value" from the point of view of general historical, universal goal, norm, ideal. The artist's truthfulness and sincerity, according to Apollon Grigoriev, depend on the degree of awareness and expression of this integral ideal. Consistent with the

requirement of truthfulness and sincerity, Grigoriev introduces the concepts of "organic", "born", on the one hand, "made", "artificial", "painful" - on the other hand [1].

Speaking of the aesthetic significance of the romanticism of the "disturbing" (Byron's rebellious romanticism), Apollon Grigoriev rightly leads from it to realism, to the anticipation of the ideal, while completely refusing to "dreamy" romanticism in any vitality. In the quest for an ideal, or on the path of spiritual perfection," writes Grigoriev, "two pitfalls await anyone who aspires: despair of the consciousness of his own imperfection, from which there is still a way out (rebellious romanticism), and a wrong, indirect attitude to his imperfection, which is almost impossible. Apollon Grigoriev understands the romantic quality of human consciousness as a whole, which is based on eternal dissatisfaction, eternal desire and search, most clearly and vividly manifested in the "tipping points of consciousness".

It is symptomatic that the critic constantly divides the romantic sphere into "romanticism proper" or "romantic idealism" and romanticism as a certain and peculiar "perception of the world".

Grigoriev's romanticism as a kind of "worldview" is given an artistic and psychological justification for its universality and universal character, for its passion, dissatisfaction, spirituality and rebelliousness. This is romanticism of Byron type. The critic notes that it is very easy to execute selfishness, but it is very difficult and even impossible to resolve the matter with that charming poetry, which is and probably will be concluded for a long time in Byron for mankind, to execute that anxiously feverish, passionate and gloomy feeling, with which this poetry is imbued.

There's an eternity in Byron, which is why he's a complete spokesman. Thus, Byron's romanticism is becoming closer to romanticism as a general historical beginning ("peculiar perception of the world"); another matter is "romanticism proper" ("dreamy romanticism"). Historically, it is specific, but in terms of its aspirations it is negative.

Apollon Grigoriev also raises the question of the evolution of the romantic worldview, linking it to the stages of artistic consciousness, making it dependent on the degree of development and expression of subjectivity, the content of "spirituality" in the feeling of love. In his opinion, each of the temporary and national varieties of romanticism went upward in terms of enriching "spirituality", strengthening subjectivity and deepening psychology. This idea was illustrated by Grigoriev's analysis of the evolution of the feeling of love in poetry from troubadours and minnesingers to Zhukovsky and German poets of the new time.

In terms of artistic-psychological, strength and sincerity of expression, the disturbingly romantic image, according to Grigoriev, is almost equal to the realistic image. In this regard, the analogy between Gogol's realism and Byron's romanticism is interesting. Acknowledging that the artistic method of each of them is conditioned by certain circumstances of social life, Grigoriev sees in Byronov's images "the truth, beauty and power of his poetry" and believes that "not immorality, that is, lies, but the truth, he has fascinated generations and has so far fascinated with it". In turn, in the living images of Gogol, the critic finds the answer to the demands of life. "Let these images, - he stresses, - were only negative: their negativity was affected by the new forces of life, the power to reject all forms that turned out to be untenable, to break everything false-heroic in the ideas of the soul" [2].

That's why Grigoriev's question is quite understandable and justified. It comes down to finding some common denominator for "ideal" and "real" art: "Isn't it not the truth of life depicted to us and wasn't it the truth of life and sincere that Byron, Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Lermontov were; wasn't it the truth of life and the merciless truth of human heart that was analyzed in front of us... by Zand the woman poet? Wasn't she quite sincere in her own way always and everywhere? [3].

The romantic "worldview" (a typological property of human nature), possessing stable signs, undergoes evolution and changes in the process of evolution and growth of consciousness. In this regard, the critic draws a line between the "romantic trends" of ancient poets, romantic in the medieval world, romantic in the new world, romanticism of Byron, French romanticism of the 30's and insists on a differential interpretation of the concept of "subjectivity": it turns out to be "ideal when expressed by an alarming, byronic quality, and "false" when closed in itself (as in the French romanticism of the 30's). The critic connects the stages of development of "subjectivity" with the strengthening of lyricism and deepening of psychological analysis in art.

Speaking of romanticism in Greek literature, Grigoriev only expansively interprets Belinsky's thesis about his one-sided nature, and the origins of romanticism in Greece leads to the philosophical idealism of Plato, and from them stretches the threads of modern German romanticism. The critic's identification of mysticism and philosophical idealism as sources of Greek romanticism has a certain basis and pursues a rather definite goal: the Hellenic "direct" synthetic art's consideration of the innermost and potentially destructive forces, somewhat resembling the poetry of Lermontov and Byron, which, in the words of A. Grigoriev, contained the "grains of its own destruction". The mysticism of Greek poetry, according to Apollon Grigoriev, later passed to the romantics

into a "whole" sense of love for all living things and the earthly, and philosophical idealism, in turn, contributed to the emergence of the concepts of "dvumiriya" ("here" and "there"), the division of the world into two parts and the opposition to the world of a real independent substance - the imaginary world, the world of "ideal".

Thus Apollon Grigoriev deduces the second very essential sign of romanticism - a re-creation of the beginning, constructing "elements of a special life". The thought, the critic goes on to say, "is hostile to life: the former would like to stop the natural flow of the latter, the latter destroys the dreams of the former and shows all the hastiness of the vows a man makes to himself. This dialectical process is the justification for the constant emergence of the "twofold". In addition, Grigoriev introduces an interesting caveat that gives an idea of the fundamental difference between "romantic" antiquity and "romantic" in contemporary art. In antiquity, it was determined by the specifics of mythologized view.

"If we take art as a reflection of the life of society, in the sense of changing ... we will have to recognize as art all the immoral literature of the XVIII century (?!), and all the feverish literature of the beginning of the XIX century in France (!) and many common phenomena of our modern literature ...". [5].

Based on the ideal, Grigoriev expresses a very valuable idea that every historical epoch should be measured with its own measure, rather than looking for something in it that is inherent in the new time. Characterizing in general terms the works of Derzhavin, Karamzin, Fonvizin and trying to establish their role in the history of Russian literature, the critic argues for the need to correlate them with time, the era, with those social conditions that served as the basis for the formation of their aesthetic and social views. "What they did not give in life, they did not give - neither contemplation, nor ideals," he summed up [6]. Here Grigoriev also demands an objective study of the roots of romanticism, a historical approach to this phenomenon, the need to explain it by specific historical circumstances and to identify in it all the positive, rejection and criticism of the inflammatory, harmful. However, if we apply the Grigoriev principle of historicism to the analysis of the literary process, it turns out that it is not devoid of some contradictions associated with the view of the course of development of literature as a change of stages, each of which seems to be internally immobile. And this reveals the difference between Grigoriev's critical method and Belinsky's sequential-historical method. For Grigoriev in the literary process is more important stable, universal than changing. Belinsky's general historical aspect of art, in the background, focuses on the historically variable, while Grigoriev's eternal, constant prevails over the historically variable.

Romanticism as an artistic aspiration," Grigoriev asserts, "contains a tendency to approach life, while romanticism as an aspiration to the past (Polevoy, Kukolnik), and the "poeticization" of Catholicism (Shatobrian) are barren and false. It is the romanticism of "pure dreams" and "pure abstract reality", although its source is in the same human heart. And, as the critic believes, both romanticism in different forms contributed to the preparation and emergence of realistic art. "One way or another, romanticism as declared not the beautiful nature, but simply the nature of art as a measure of art - and this is his great merit" [7].

References:

1. Григорьев Ап. Критический взгляд на основы, значение и приемы современной критики искусства// Собрания в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
2. Григорьев Ап. Взгляд на русскую литературу со смерти Пушкина// Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
3. Григорьев Ап. Реализм и идеализм в русской литературе // Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
4. Григорьев Ап. Лермонтов и его направление // Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
5. Григорьев Ап. О правде и искренности в искусстве // Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
6. Григорьев Ап. Народность и литература // Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
7. Григорьев Ап. Александринский театр. – «Репертуар и пантеон» // Собрание в двух томах. Том второй. Статьи. Письма. – М.: Художественная литература, 1990.
8. Гуляев Н.А. Типология романтического мировоззрения. Типологические черты художественного мышления романтиков // Вопросы романтизма: Сборник. Выпуск 4. Казань, КГУ, 1969.
9. Островских И.Н. Лирика Апполона Григорьева // автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. – Барнаул, 2001.