

Научная статья /
Research Article

<https://elibrary.ru/ROVPOL>
УДК 82.0
ББК 83

КАТЕГОРИИ ПОЭТИКИ: ОПЫТ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ РУССКОЙ ШКОЛЫ

© 2024 г. Лин Цзяньхоу

*Институт мировой литературы факультета
иностранных языков, Пекинский университет,
Пекин, Китай*

Дата поступления статьи: 01 марта 2024 г.

Дата одобрения рецензентами: 20 апреля 2024 г.

Дата публикации: 25 июня 2024 г.

<https://doi.org/10.22455/2500-4247-2024-9-2-10-23>

*Работа выполнена в Пекинском университете при финансовой поддержке
Китайского государственного фонда гуманитарных и общественных наук,
проект № 22&ZD286: «Исследование Русской школы поэтики»*

Аннотация: В статье обосновывается теоретический подход к интегральному исследованию различных возникших в России направлений поэтики, связанных с понятием «Российская школа европейской поэтики», или «Русская школа классической поэтики». Эта школа обеспечила пионерскую модернизацию европейской поэтики на рубеже XIX–XX вв., ее кросс-культурное расширение и основные завоевания в 1960-х и 1970-х гг. В работе обсуждаются четыре основных вопроса. Во-первых, почему западные ученые предпочитают развивать русскую теорию литературы, возводя ее до ранга «Теории», но не отдавая при этом должного русско-советским достижениям в области поэтики? Во-вторых, как выявить главную линию развития русской поэтики от ее генезиса до стадии зрелости? В-третьих, почему модернизация европейской поэтики произошла прежде всего в России? В-четвертых, какие специфические характеристики обнаруживаются у Русской школы поэтики на фоне бурного всплеска интереса к этой дисциплине в западных странах в последние десятилетия? Автор данной статьи считает, что попытка реконструировать Русскую школу поэтики и проанализировать ее роль может послужить ценным исследовательским примером для возрождения китайской традиционной культуры, в том числе древнекитайской поэтики, в контексте актуальной модернизации.

Ключевые слова: Европейская поэтика, Русская школа поэтики, теория литературы, Теория, сайентификация, модернизационная трансформация, кросс-культурный диалог.

Информация об авторе: Лин Цзяньхоу — доктор философии, профессор, Институт мировой литературы Факультета иностранных языков, Пекинский университет, ул. Ихэюаньлу, д. 5, 100871 г. Пекин, КНР.

E-mail: lingjh@pku.edu.cn

Для цитирования: Лин Цзяньхоу. Категории поэтики: опыт исследования русской школы // Studia Litterarum. 2024. Т. 9, № 2. С. 10–23.
<https://doi.org/10.22455/2500-4247-2024-9-2-10-23>



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Studia Litterarum,
vol. 9, no. 2, 2024

CATEGORIES OF POETICS: A STUDY OF THE RUSSIAN SCHOOL

© 2024. Ling Jianhou

Institute of World Literature, School of Foreign Languages, Peking University, Beijing, PRC

Received: March 01, 2024

Approved after reviewing: April 20, 2024

Date of publication: June 25, 2024

Acknowledgements: The present work was carried out at Peking University with the financial support of the Chinese National Humanities and Social Science Foundation, project no. 22&ZD286: “A Study of Russian School of Poetics.”

Abstract: This paper substantiates a theoretical approach to the integral study of various directions of Russian poetics associated with the new concept of the “Russian School of European Poetics” or “Russian School of Poetics,” which is distinguished by its pioneering modernization of European classical poetics at the turn of the 20th century and its cross-cultural development and expansion in the 1960s and the 1970s. Four questions are also discussed: firstly, why do Western scholars prefer to develop modern Russian theory of literature into “Theory”? Secondly, how to identify the main line of modern Russian poetics from its genetic origin to maturity? Third, why was the modernization of European poetics initiated in Russia? Fourth, what specific characteristics are found in the Russian school of Poetics in the state of “overflowing” of poetics in Western countries? The author of the present paper believes that an attempt to reconstruct the Russian school of poetics can serve as a valuable research example for the revival of Chinese traditional culture, including the ancient poetics of China, in the form of modernization.

Keywords: the European poetics, the Russian school of Poetics, theory of literature / literary theory / Theory, scientification, modern transformation, cross-cultural dialogue.

Information about the author: Ling Jianhou, PhD, Professor, Institute of World Literature, School of Foreign Languages, Peking University, Yiheyuan Road, 5, Haidian District, 100871 Beijing, P.R. China.

E-mail: lingjh@pku.edu.cn

For citation: Ling, Jianhou. “Categories of Poetics: A Study of the Russian School.”

Studia Litterarum, vol. 9, no. 2, 2024, pp. 10–23. (In English)

<https://doi.org/10.22455/2500-4247-2024-9-2-10-23>

In Book Zilu of *Analects*, Confucius is recorded to have once said “If the name is not right, then speech will not be in order, and if speech is not in order, then nothing will be accomplished.” That is to say, in order to rationalize the development of oneself, it is a prerequisite to have one’s name rightly established. In the same vein, the scientization of literary studies in Russia at the turn of the 20th century, is precisely hallmarked by a naming-based debate on which of the four essential concepts, i. e. history of literature, poetics, theory of literature and science of literature¹, should best represent its proper disciplinary territory. A debate on naming is not only a controversy on methodology, but also one on ideology. Such a debate that took place in Russia in the area of literary studies culminated in “science of literature” coming out the winner. The establishment of the discipline of literary science is not only driven by an inner need for an independent disciplinary status of literary studies, but also closely connected with the radical changes taking place in the outer political climate. By this time, history of literature, poetics and theory of literature had all “transferred their right of property” to science of literature [31, vol. 6, p. 477]. The distinctive feature of modern disciplinary consciousness is marked by externally delimiting the boundaries of the discipline and internally defining the specific areas of study within the discipline, which later exerted a double-edged, or positive as well as negative influence on the study of poetics. Positively, various schools of literary studies gained further strength in such a modern spirit; negatively, such a modern

1 The Russian word “literaturovedenie” (литературоведение, наука о литературе) is translated into Chinese “文艺学” (wen yi xue, its literal translation in English is “learning and knowledge about literature as an art”). There is no equivalent word in English. It is often translated as “literary science / science of literature.”

mentality of “divide and rule” inevitably dismissed the possibility of “blend and merge.” Consequently, this has so far made impossible the existence of a volume of *A History of Poetics in Russia*.

The concept of “theory of literature” first appeared in the book, *The Basic Principles of the Scientific Theory of Literature* [6], yet it truly came into being, in the words of Galin Tihanov, between the WWI and the WWII [16]. The term “science of literature” was first introduced to Russian from Germany in 1895 [3] and was promoted to a great height by the Soviets. Those two concepts had been the products of Russia’s initiation in the scientification of literary studies. As Barsht (К.А. Баршт) points out, Veselovsky (А.Н. Веселовский) and Potebnya (А.А. Потебня) have both contributed to the promotion of the independent disciplinary status of theory of literature through their studies in poetics [17, p. 28–29, 46]². The tradition of poetics originated in ancient Greece and Rome is commonly inherited in European countries [11]. The modern transformation of Russian poetics might have given rise to a certain intellectual impact on the Western academia, yet it had hardly constituted a “revolutionary overthrow” of the European tradition [26]. What had truly caused disturbances among the Anglo-Saxon scholars were, unexpectedly, the two aforementioned concepts, “theory of literature” and “science of literature.” Those disturbances included a dissatisfaction over Russian-Soviet monopoly on the power of discourse, and a criticism of the “self-enclosure” of modern disciplinary consciousness. The former is connected with the field of ideology, the latter has to do with scholarship proper. Yet, both antipathies blended into each other in the academia of Western Europe and North America in its various critical voices about USSR. Specifically, the self-binding tendency of the internal study of literature led to its developmental stagnation, which accordingly necessitated a more vigorous multi-disciplinary approach to rediscover the potentials for further growth of literary studies. Therefore, there emerged a division between “theory of literature” and “literary theory,” a division greatly appreciated by Antoine Compagnon [18, p. 16]. Though the latter concept “literary theory” was originated from the former concept “theory of literature,” yet “literary theory” became a counteraction against modern disciplinary consciousness which put literariness at its theoretical

2 In this article, the author has specially used the works of Euro-American scholars translated into Chinese in order to introduce readers with information about their Chinese perception from the point of view of “References.”

core. Such a counteraction finally led to the re-naming of “theory of literature” into “Theory” in the West. Again, “meta-literary science (металитературоведение)” [4, chapter 1] is a response from contemporary Russian scholars to the aforementioned “counteraction.” In general, whereas the scientification of literary studies initiated by Russia’s reformation of poetics received critical attention from the Western scholars, those scholars’ more intense responses had been straightforwardly directed at the two “game-changing” concepts, “theory of literature” and “science of literature.”

There is a Chinese proverb, coined by the fictional character Granny Liu in *A Dream of Red Mansions*, saying, “A camel that is starved to death still looms larger than a living horse.” It implies that a powerful person, though down and out, is still a stronger bulk compared to average people, and his strength should never be underestimated. On the surface, the disintegration of the USSR, according to Francis Fukuyama, symbolizes the end of socialism, yet in effect, it is more of a secret wish of his followers or those upholders of “endism” that all the ideological elements that represent socialism should fall. Theory of literature is definitely one of such ideological elements, if not the most important one. And the Russian study of poetics has played a special role in the modern transformation of the theory of literature, and even in the establishment of the independent disciplinary status of literary studies as a whole. Some scholars have become aware of the special role fulfilled by the Russian study of poetics, but contributed no monographs yet to a further discussion of this important issue. One possible reason might be the comparatively narrow scope of the categories of poetics, which is consequentially insufficient to highlight Russia’s significant contribution to the development of the humanities in the 20th century. The concept of “School of Russian Philology,” put forward by Shaytanov (И.О. Шайтанов), is a fairly inspiring gesture for native Russian scholars, more importantly, it stays in line with their unique understanding of philology. Such a concept is considerably different from Chinese philology – namely the study on language and words, its core tradition originating from Xiao Xue (小学) in Han Dynasty – that has existed since ancient times (202 BC – 8 AD), therefore, for the Chinese scholars, the concept of “School of Russian Philology” is only too grand an idea that it throws one into bewilderment as to where to begin to justify the presence of such a scholarly tradition. From the perspective of linguistics or literary science? Or from a comprehensive point

of view that integrates literature, history and philosophy into a closely-knitted whole? Not only is it hard to determine the nature of the concept of “School of Russian Philology,” but it might raise the suspicion that this concept is “a grand masquerade for a trivial topic.” Another possible reason is the “iron curtain” in the Cold War, which prevented Western scholars from applauding the modern transformation of classical poetics in Russia and the Soviet Union. For instance, the article “*What is Poetics?*” [13] adopted a position of “blocking” the discussion of Russian and Soviet poetics. After the disintegration of the USSR, Western scholars began to take a selective view of the materials from Russian poetics. Influential works from the Western Europe such as, *La poétique: Introduction à la théorie générale des formes littéraires* (1993) [19] written by David Fontaine, the two-volume *Histoire des poétiques* (1997) [20] edited by Jean Bessière, Eva Kushner and the others, only showed enough respect to a few Russian formalists and Bakhtin (М.М. Бахтин). Such neglecting or selective treatment of Russian poetics by native scholars of Western countries (instead of Slavic scholars), deliberate or not, only proves that Russian contribution to poetics has become a driving force for the scholars of Western Europe and North America to reexamine the tradition of the European poetics originated from the ancient Greeks. This conclusion can also be supported by the entry “poetics” from an authoritative specialized dictionary of literature edited in English language:

Traditionally, the term refers to the theory of poetry, in particular emphasizing principles of composition and structure, with the Poetics of Aristotle (384–322 BC) being the earliest, most well-known, and most influential formulation. Since then, various poets, critics and writers have expounded upon the topic, their treatises often marking a specific literary movement or philosophical trend. Notable examples in the history of poetics include Horace’s *Ars Poetica* (18 BC); Longinus’s *On the Sublime* (1st / 3rd C.); Sir Philip Sidney’s *Defence of Poesie* (1595); Alexander Pope’s *An Essay on Criticism* (1711); and William Wordsworth’s ‘Preface’ to his *Lyrical Ballads* (1801, 1802). The term has been expanded in contemporary theory to comprehend the application of a hermeneutical aesthetics to various cultural practices, political discourses and social phenomena, as in Peter Stallybrass’s *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (1986) and Morris Meyer’s *The Politics and Poetics of Camp* (1993) [35, p. 545].

Such is the full length of the entry, summed up just in one brief paragraph. There seems to be, according to the given entry, a giant leap from poetics as traditional theory of poetry to becoming poetics as contemporary theory, and another huge developmental gap between poetics in the early 19th century and that of the 1980s. While Anglophone scholars simply abandoned about 180 years in the developmental history of the European poetics, the emergence and development of modern Russian poetics is just needed to bridge this gap. It is worth noticing, though, the aforementioned *Histoire des poétiques* does give a detailed account of a fuller historical development of the Western poetics, yet in it poetics of the 20th century was clearly substituted by the term “Theory.” Here, what J. Kristeva [24] means by “the destruction of poetics” is in effect calling for a resurrection of poetics in another form, i. e. poetics as “theory of Intertextuality.” Similarly, G.S. Morson and Caryl Emerson try to resurrect poetics in the form of a new concept “prosaics,” Galin Tihanov attempts to materialize the resurrection of poetics by his proposition that the theory of literature is still exerting an influence, dispersively or surreptitiously, on contemporary literary studies under a new paradigm, while Alastair Renfrew excavates the inherent cross-disciplinary properties of the theory of literature for the resurrection of poetics. A bold idea is to realize the resurrection of poetics in the contemporary context of China, though such a resurrection is not that of the “body of poetics” proper. It is rather, through the construction of the Russian school of poetics, to gain a glimpse of the conditions, causes and characteristics of the modern transformation and development of European classical poetics. Traditional Chinese culture is in the process of renewal with an unstoppable momentum, but there is still a long way to go, and so much to do, because the modern transformation has been in stagnation for more than 100 years since the late Qing Dynasty. The Chinese, though not lacking in courage to strive for self-improvement and self-striving, but have been short on maintaining cultural confidence. This is especially the case in the realm of the humanities, where there has been no successful precedent of modernization of traditional Chinese theory of literary. It is undoubtedly of great practical significance for the construction of Chinese theory of literature to take the Russian school as a case study in analyzing the external conditions and internal mechanism of the modern transformation and development of European classical poetics.

The transformation and development of the Russian poetics has undergone a torturous course, especially because of the challenging, if not impossible,

task of a systemic reorganization of the abundant works of Russian poetics. However, it should be possible to take a glimpse of this evolutionary process via influential works by renowned authors and authoritative academic dictionaries of different periods. For example, *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, vol. 24, book A [34, p. 837], *Literary Encyclopaedia: Dictionary of Literary Terms* [32, p. 633], *Literary Encyclopaedia*, vol. 9 [31, vol. 9, p. 215], *Brief Literary Encyclopaedia*, vol. 5 [29], *Literary Encyclopaedic Dictionary* [30, p. 295], *Literary Encyclopaedia of Terms and Concepts* [33, p. 785], etc., all contain the long entry “poetics,” and all include a large amount of classics on poetics of Tsarist Russia and the USSR, all of which provide a basic grounding of knowledge for us to outline the developmental course of the Russian school of European poetics from its infancy to its maturity in the last hundred years.

Why it is the European classical poetics that pioneered modernization of Russia? The author of this article has initially identified four possible reasons. The first is the general tendency of scientification in Europe. The scientification of art studies (*Kunstwissenschaft*) first emerged and came to fruition in Germany, from which in the field of literary studies *Literaturwissenschaft* branched off and began to blossom in Russia. Secondly, a general social climate of “literary centrism” began to take shape since the 18th century in Russia [9; 26]. This social tendency led the Russians to develop a special affection for literature, which was for a long time occupying a pivotal position in the intellectual, political and everyday life of Russia. Such a central position of literature ushered in the pursuit of an independent disciplinary status for literary studies spearheaded by the study of poetics [8]. Thirdly, the flourishing of literature and art and academic activities during the Silver Age laid down a solid intellectual foundation for pushing literary studies into the orbit of modern disciplines. Fourthly, many scholars with erudition of both past and present, domestically and abroad — Shevyrev (С.П. Шевырев) [11] in the first half of 19th century, Veselovsky [23] and Potebnya [7] in the second half of 19th century, formalists and their ally Zhirmunsky (В.М. Жирмунский) [2], Vinogradov (В.В. Виноградов) [1], Freidenberg (О.М. Фрейденберг) [10] and Bakhtin [12; 21; 22], to name a few — were dedicated to humanities studies, or were active in academia of Russia and Soviet Union. If Russian poetics had pursued “scientificity” at the initial stage of its modern transformation, then, between the 1960s and the 1970s, it turned to the pursuit of “ino-scientificity (инонаучность)” that is based on scientificity, eventually forming a three-pronged pattern

in the study of poetics, i. e. historical poetics, theoretical poetics and applied or concrete poetics [5]. These three areas of poetics and the various academic trends within them all share some common features, for example, they all probe into the question of literary specificity, discuss the relationship between literature and language, and explore the factors of artistic impression in the aesthetic activity of literature, etc.

In the mid-20th century, especially since the 1980s, in Western academia, the scope of poetics continuously expanded beyond literary theory into philosophy and other fields of the humanities, and academic resources, relevant or not, were deeply excavated within the framework of poetics [15; 25; 27]. This process was synchronized with the movement of literary theory toward cultural theory or “Theory,” and poetics as “craftsmanship” became synonymous with “Theory,” with the successive emergence of Film Poetics, Architectural Poetics, Sound Poetics, Political Poetics, Anthropological Poetics, Cognitive Poetics, among others. Sandra Richter’s *A History of Poetics: German Scholarly Aesthetics and Poetics in International Context, 1770–1960* deduced more than a dozen kinds of poetics, such as Transcendental Poetics, Pre-Empirical and Empirical Poetics, Epistemological Poetics, Post-Idealist Poetics, Logos theological Poetics, Poetics as Life Science, Processual Poetics, Evolutionary Poetics, and poetics with the properties of literary studies is called Literary Poetics [14]. The word “overflowing” is very apt to describe the status quo of poetics, but it also must be recognized that behind the semblance of “overflow” lies the dissatisfaction of the Western scholars with the fact that science of literature is sealed off within its own boundaries, shows the appeal of those same Western scholars for the self-consciousness in a multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary approach toward academic studies, and reveals, however suggestively, their intention of gaining a greater control over the power of discourse in the study of poetics. However, the answer to the question of how to achieve the interdisciplinary self-consciousness is often a matter of opinion. In 1970, Bakhtin offered a prescription of intercultural dialogue for the “young science of literature,” comprising at least three dimensions: inter-historical dimension, interdisciplinary dimension, inter-ethnic dimension [21, p. 403–411]. Intercultural dialogue is not aimed to dissolve the properties of theory of literature on which poetics is based, but rather to help poetics “maintain its unity and open-ended integrity,” to help “dissolve the closedness and one-sidedness” of poetics through promoting dialogues between the ancient and the modern, between

the internal and the external, and between disciplines, in order to push onward towards the complete demystification of the laws of literary and artistic creation. Three features of the Russian school of poetics can be summarized at this point. Firstly, from scientificity to ino-scientificity, the pace of the scientification of poetics has never stopped, leading this discipline to become increasingly rigorous in its development. Secondly, the tendency towards interdisciplinary studies combining both internal and external perspectives has become progressively prominent, demonstrating vitality and dynamism that closely keeps up with the trend of the times. Thirdly, the Russian school not only adheres to the tradition that takes literature proper as its object of study, but also highlights the front-line achievements of the iterative development of poetics.

While poetics is, under the umbrella of “Theory,” galloping like a wild horse on the boundless field, Russian scholars are cautiously reining in the scope of poetics, fixing it firmly in the realm of literature and art, establishing for it a more scientific definition. The Russian school of poetics, though deeply rooted in its tradition, is gaining new ground and making new progress in cross-cultural dialogues, not to be confused by any kind of rational or irrational “cacophony” from the outside. The Russian school’s practice of integrating tradition with innovation, and its gesture of seeking progress while maintaining stability, is very much in line with the intrinsic needs of the rejuvenation of traditional Chinese culture in contemporary China, especially in the field of its a long historical standing poetics and theory of literature [28].

Список литературы

Исследования

- 1 *Виноградов В.В.* О теории художественной речи / послесл. Д.С. Лихачева. М.: Высшая школа, 1971. 240 с.
- 2 *Жирмунский В.* Вопросы теории литературы (статьи 1916–1926). Л.: Academia, 1928. 358 с.
- 3 *Зоргенфрей Г.* Понятие о литературоведении и его задачах // Гимназия. 1895. № 8. С. 411–427.
- 4 *Курилов В.В.* Литературоведение: метанаучные и теоретические проблемы. Ростов н/Д: Южный федеральный ун-т, 2020. 411 с.
- 5 *Лихачев Д.С.* Поэтика древнерусской литературы. 2-е изд., доп. Л.: Худож. лит., Ленингр. отд-ние, 1971. 412 с.

- 6 *Плотников Вл.* Основные принципы научной теории литературы: методологический этюд. Воронеж: Тип. В.И. Исаева, 1888. 89 с.
- 7 *Потебня А.А.* Теоретическая поэтика / сост., вступ. ст., коммент. А.Б. Муратова, М.: Высшая школа, 1990. 344 с.
- 8 *Сакулин П.П.* К вопросу о построении поэтики // Оттиск из журнала «Искусство». 1923. № 1. С. 79–93.
- 9 *<Сиповский В.В.>* История литературы как наука. СПб.; М.: Т-во М.О. Вольф, 1906. 60 с.
- 10 *Фрейденберг О.М.* Поэтика жанра и сюжета / подгот., общ. ред., предисл. и послесл. Н.В. Брагинской, послесл. И.В. Пешкова. М.: Лабиринт, 1997. 448 с.
- 11 *Шевырев С.* Теория поэзии в историческом развитии у древних и новых народов. 2-е изд. СПб.: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук, 1887. 271 с.
- 12 *Morson G.S., Emerson C. Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990. 530+XXI p.
- 13 *Olsen S.H.* What is Poetics? // *The Philosophical Quarterly.* 1976. Vol. 26, no. 105, Oct. P. 338–351.
- 14 *Richter S.* A History of Poetics: German Scholarly Aesthetics and Poetics in International Context, 1770–1960. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2010. 455+XIV p.
- 15 *Swingewood A.* Sociological Poetics and Aesthetic Theory. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1987. 163+VII p.
- 16 *Tihanov G.* The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2019. 258+XI p.

Translit / References

- 17 巴尔什特: 《20世纪俄罗斯文论: 学人·学派·学说》, 杨可、李昂等译, 北京: 北京大学出版社, 2023.
(*Баршт К.А.* Русское литературоведение XX века: школы, концепции, направления / пер. с рус. Ян Ке, Ли Ан и др. Пекин: Изд-во Пекинского ун-та, 2023. 249 с.)
Barsht, K.A. *Russkoe literaturovedenie XX veka: shkoly, kontseptsii, napravleniia* [*Russian Literary Criticism of the 20th Century: Schools, Concepts, Directions*], trans. from Russian by Yang Ke, Li An et al. Beijing, Peking University Publ., 2023. 249 p. (In Chinese)
- 18 安托万·孔帕尼翁: 《理论的幽灵: 文学与常识》, 吴泓渺、汪捷宇译, 南京大学出版社, 2017.
(*Компаньон Антуан.* Демон теории: литература и здравый смысл / пер. с франц. У Хунмяо и Ван Цзеюя. Нанькин: Изд-во Нанькинского ун-та, 2011. 284 с.)
Kompan'on, Antuan. *Demon teorii: literatura i zdravyy smysl* [*The Demon of Theory: Literature and Common Sense*], trans. from French by Wu Hongmiao and Wang Jieyu. Nanjing, Nanjing University Publ., 2011. 284 p. (In Chinese)

- 19 达维德·方丹：《诗学：文学形式通论》，陈静译，天津：天津人民出版社，2003 (Fontaine, David. *La Poétique: Introduction À La Théorie Générale Des Formes Littéraires* / пер. с франц. Чень Цзин. Тяньцзинь: Изд-во Тяньцзиньского народа, 2003. 141 с.)
Fontaine, David. *La Poétique: Introduction À La Théorie Générale Des Formes Littéraires* [*Poetics: Introduction to the General Theory of Literary Forms*], trans. from French by Chen Jing. Tianjin, Tianjin People's Publ., 2003. 141 p. (In Chinese)
- 20 《诗学史》，让·贝西埃、伊·库什纳等编，史忠义译，天津：百花文艺出版社，2002，第1版；郑州：郑州大学出版社，2010，第2版，修订版。
(*Histoire des poétiques* / сост. Jean Bessière, Eva Kushner и др., пер. с франц. Ши Цжунъи. 1-е изд. Тяньцзинь: Байхуавэньи Чубаньше, 2001; 2-е изд. Чженчжоу: Изд-во Чженчжоуского ун-та, 2010. 705 с.)
Histoire des poétiques [*History of Poetics*], comp. by Jean Bessière, Eva Kushner et al., trans. from French by Shi Zhongyi. 1st ed. Tienjin, Baihuawenyi Chubanshe, 2001; 2nd ed. Zhengzhou, Zhengzhou University Publishing House, 2010. 705 p. (In Chinese)
- 21 《巴赫金全集》，第4卷，钱中文主编，石家庄：河北教育出版社，2009。
(*Бахтин М.М. Собр. соч.*: в 7 т. / гл. ред. Цянь Чжунвэнь. Шицзячжуан: Хэбэй Цзяюй Чубаньше, 2009. Т. 4. 501 с.)
Bakhtin, M.M. *Sobranie sochinenii: v 7 t.* [*Collected Works: in 7 vols.*], vol. 4, ex. ed. Qian Zhongwen. Shijiazhuang, Hebei Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 2009. 501 p. (In Chinese)
- 22 托多罗夫：《巴赫金、对话理论及其他》，蒋子华、张萍译，天津：百花文艺出版社，2001。
(*Тодоров Ц. Mikhail Bakhtine, le principe dialogique et Autres Essais* / пер. с франц. Цзян Зихуа и Чжан Пин. Тяньцзинь: Байхуа Вэньи Чубаньше, 2001. 341 с.)
Todorov, Ts. *Mikhail Bakhtine, le principe dialogique et Autres Essais* [*Mikhail Bakhtin, the Dialogical Principle and Others Essays*], trans. from French by Jiang Zihua and Zhang Ping. Tienjin, Baihua Wenyi Chubanshe, 2001. 341 p. (In Chinese)
- 23 维谢洛夫斯基：《历史诗学》，刘宁译，天津：百花文艺出版社，2002。
(*Веселовский А.Н. Историческая поэтика* / пер. с рус. Лю Нина. Тяньцзинь: Байхуа Вэньи Чубаньше, 2002. 610+38 с.)
Veselovskii, A.N. *Istoricheskaia poetika* [*Historical Poetics*], trans. from Russian by Liu Ning. Tienjin, Baihua Wenyi Chubanshe, 2002. 610+38 p. (In Chinese)
- 24 朱莉娅·克里斯蒂娃：《符号学：符义分析探索集》，史忠义等译，上海：复旦大学出版社，2015。
(*Kristeva, Julia. Semeiotike: Recherches Pour une Semanalys* / пер. с франц. Ши Цжунъи и др. Шанхай: Изд-во ун-та Фудань, 2015. 308+13+11 с.)
Kristeva, Julia. *Semeiotike: Recherches Pour une Semanalys* [*Semeiotike: Research For a Semanalys*], trans. from French by Shi Zhongyi et al. Shanghai, Fudan University Publ., 2015. 308+13+11 p. (In Chinese)

- 25 加斯东·巴什拉：《空间的诗学》，张逸婧译，上海：上海译文出版社，2009。
(*Bachelard, Gaston. La Poétique de l'Espace* / пер. с франц. Чжан Ицзин. Шанхай: Шанхайское переводческое изд-во, 2009. 263 с.)
Bachelard, Gaston. *La Poétique de l'Espace* [*The Poetics of Space*], trans. from French by Zhang Yijing. Shanghai, Shanghai Translation Publ., 2009. 263 p. (In Chinese)
- 26 《批评理论在俄罗斯与西方》，阿拉斯戴尔·任甫卢、加林·吉哈诺夫编著，汪洪章译，郑州：河南大学出版社，2016。
(*Critical Theory in Russia and the West* / ed. by Alastair Renfrew and Galin Tihanov; пер. с англ. Ван Хунчжана. Чженчжоу: Изд-во ун-та Хэ Нань, 2016. 315 с.)
Renfrew, Alastair, and Galin Tihanov, editors. *Critical Theory in Russia and the West*, trans. from English by Wang Hongzhang. Zhengzhou, He Nan University Publ., 2016. 315 p. (In Chinese)
- 27 勒内·韦勒克：《批评的诸种概念》，罗钢、王馨钵等译，上海：上海人民出版社，2015。
(*Wellek, René. Concepts of Criticism* / пер. с англ. Луо Гана, Ван Синьбо и др. Шанхай: Шанхайское изд-во народа, 2015. 367 с.)
Wellek, René. *Concepts of Criticism*, trans. from English by Luo Gan, Wang Xinbo et al. Shanghai, Shanghai People's Publ., 2015. 367 p. (In Chinese)
- 28 刘颢：《文心雕龙校证》，王利器校笺，上海：上海古籍出版社，1980。
(*Лю Се. Вэнь синь дяо лун* [Резной дракон литературной мысли] / текстологические корректирование и коммент. Ван Лици. Шанхай: Шанхайское изд-во древних книг, 1980. 370 с.)
Liu, Se. *Reznoi drakon literaturnoi mysli* [*Carved Dragon of Literary Thought*], textual correction and comm. by Wang Liqi. Shanghai, Shanghai Ancient Book Publ., 1980. 370 p. (In Chinese)

Источники

- 29 Краткая литературная энциклопедия: в 9 т. / гл. ред. А.А. Сурков, М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1968. Т. 5. URL: <http://feb-web.ru/feb/kle/default.asp?feb/kle/kle/kle.html> (дата обращения: 12.01.2024).
- 30 Литературный энциклопедический словарь / под ред. В.М. Кожевникова, П.А. Николаева. М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1987. 750 с.
- 31 Литературная энциклопедия: в 11 т. М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1935.
- 32 Литературная энциклопедия. Словарь литературных терминов: в 2 т. / под ред. Н. Бродского [и др.]. М.; Л.: Л.Д. Френкель, 1925. Т. 1. Стб. 577–1198, [7] с.
- 33 Литературная энциклопедия терминов и понятий / гл. ред. и сост. А.Н. Николюкин. М.: Интелвак, 2001. 1600 с. (разд. паг.)
- 34 Энциклопедический словарь. СПб.: Ф.А. Брокгауз, И.А. Ефрон, 1898. Т. 24а: Полярныя сияння – Прая. II, 476–958, II, [6] с.
- 35 A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory. Ed. J.A. Cuddon. 5th ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. 802 p.

References

- 1 Vinogradov, V.V. *O teorii khudozhestvennoi rechi* [On the Theory of Artistic Speech], afterword by D.S. Likhachev. Moscow, Vysshiaia shkola Publ., 1971. 240 p. (In Russ.)
- 2 Zhirmunskii, V. *Voprosy teorii literatury (stat'i 1916–1926)* [Issues on the Theory of Literature (Essays of 1916–1926)]. Leningrad, Academia Publ., 1928. 358 p. (In Russ.)
- 3 Zorgenfrei, G. “Poniatie o literaturovedenii i ego zadachakh” [“The Concept of Literary Criticism and Its Tasks”]. *Gimnaziia*, no. 8, 1895, pp. 411–427. (In Russ.)
- 4 Kurilov, V.V. *Literaturovedenie: metanauchnye i teoreticheskie problemy* [Literary Criticism: Metascientific and Theoretical Problems]. Rostov on Don, Southern Federal University Publ., 2020. 411 p. (In Russ.)
- 5 Likhachev, D.S. *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury* [Poetics of Old Russian Literature]. 2nd ed., enl. Leningrad, Khudozhestvennaia literatura, Leningradskoe otdelenie Publ., 1971. 412 p. (In Russ.)
- 6 Plotnikov, Vl. *Osnovnye printsipy nauchnoi teorii literatury: metodologicheskii etiid* [Basic Principles of the Scientific Theory of Literature: A Methodological Study]. Voronezh, Tipografiia V.I. Isaeva Publ., 1888. 89 p. (In Russ.)
- 7 Potebnia, A.A. *Teoreticheskaia poetika* [Theoretical Poetics], comp., introd. and comm. by A.B. Muratov. Moscow, Vysshiaia shkola Publ., 1990. 344 p. (In Russ.)
- 8 Sakulin, P.P. “K voprosu o postroenii poetiki” [“On the Issue of Constructing Poetics”]. *Ottisk iz zhurnala “Iskusstvo,”* no. 1, 1923, pp. 79–93. (In Russ.)
- 9 <Sipovskii, V.V.> *Istoriia literatury kak nauka* [History of Literature as a Science]. St. Petersburg, Moscow, Tovarishchestvo M.O. Vol’f Publ., 1906. 60 p. (In Russ.)
- 10 Freidenberg, O.M. *Poetika zhanra i siuzheta* [Poetics of Genre and Plot], prep., ex. ed., introd. and afterword by N.V. Braginskaia, afterword by I.V. Peshkov. Moscow, Labirin Publ., 1997. 448 p. (In Russ.)
- 11 Shevyrev, S. *Teoriia poezii v istoricheskom razvitii u drevnikh i novykh narodov* [Poetics in the Historical Development of Ancient and New Peoples]. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg, Tipografiia Imperatorskoi akademii Nauk Publ., 1887. 271 p. (In Russ.)
- 12 Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford, Stanford UP, 1990. 277 p. (In English)
- 13 Olsen, Stein Haugom. “What is Poetics?” *The Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 105, Oct. 1976, pp. 338–351. (In English)
- 14 Richter, Sandra. *A History of Poetics: German Scholarly Aesthetics and Poetics in International Context, 1770–1960*. Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2010. 455+XIV p. (In English)
- 15 Swingewood, Alan. *Sociological Poetics and Aesthetic Theory*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 1987. 163+VII p. (In English)
- 16 Tihanov, Galin. *The Birth and Death of Literary Theory: Regimes of Relevance in Russia and Beyond*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2019. 258+XI p. (In English)