

TRAVEL WRITING: J. W. GOETHE AND N. M. KARAMZIN

Comparative analysis allows revealing the typological and genetic convergence and differences in the works of various authors. They are representatives of different cultures. This essay's novelty is the method of comparative analysis that has been used, first of all, on matter of travel writing. The research objective was to find out a semantic dominant of Germany, to reveal specifics of a travel genre, as well as typological similarities and differences in works of German and Russian authors. The objectives have been achieved by means of a comparative method. By comparison of texts, the specifics of a genre of V.A. Shachkova have been used. Mechanisms of emergence of similarities were analyzed based on D. Dyurishin's classification. The examples given from the works served as a proof of convergence and distinction at the different levels of structure and influence of Germany on the Russian writers. The method of a multileveled comparison of works researches, developed by us, allows us to reveal properties and distinctions at different levels of works structure, as well as to carry out their classification.

Introduction

The genre approach to traveling literature of the 18-19th centuries is relevant in the perspective of modern literary criticism. The research of travel writing as separate art forms, from a historical point of view, creates wide opportunities for understanding the general tendencies of literature of the 19th century. It is a well-known fact that there are various opinions about the genre essence of a traveling report. Travel report writing is a genre based on a traveler's descriptions and authentic data, presented in the form of notes about any country or people unfamiliar to the reader. Various researchers addressed the question of genre essence of travel writing: V.M. Mikhaylov [10], E.A. Stetsenko [14], M.G. Shadrina [13], V.A. Shachkova [12].

One should note that the fundamental value for this essay consists in the comparative method. Of great importance for us is the highlight to comparative researches. Comparative research was conducted by Russian literary critics such as A.N. Veselovsky in his work "Poetics of plots" [1913] and V.M. Zhirmunsky in his work "Comparative literary criticism" [1936], the Slovak literary critic D. Dyurishin

in his "The theory of comparative studying of literatures" [1979], as well as the German literary critic Birus in his "Germanic studies and a comparative study" [1995]. The concept and definition of a semantic dominant were introduced by Jan Mukarzhovsky. The dominant is that component which sets in motion and defines the relations of all other components [11; p. 113].

We should also point out the fact that nobody compared together Karamzin and Goethe. The novelty of this essay is defined by the attempt to consider the originality of travel writing on the example of certain works. They are representatives of different cultures and J. W. Goethe's literary works such as "Italian Journey", with N.M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler" have been taken in consideration. The art originality of both texts was revealed.

The hypothesis was that the concept of Germany influencing travel writing in N. M. Karamzin's creativity on various levels (subject, motive, idea, composition, style, plot). It should be noted that the research objective is identification of peculiar features of travel report writing in the works of J. W. Goethe "Italian Journey" and N.M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler". The content of term "travelling report" must be defined. The main characteristic features of traveling report as a genre in literature must be revealed. Similarities and distinctions on signs of genre must be revealed in the works J. W. Goethe's "Italian Journey", and N.M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler". The typological convergence and distinctions must be revealed in both these works.

Such typological convergence and differences were considered in our essay, while a genetic convergence can be examined in a further research. The comparative method was based on the approaches of A.N. Veselovsky, V.M. Zhirmunsky, D. Dyurishin and G. Birus. It is caused by the fact that the studied texts have general starting points. One cannot deny that the bases will be every time new. But only the existence of common features grants the right for comparison and search of originality in art.

Literature review

Travel as a genre in literature

There are many definitions of travel writing as a literary genre, but V.M. Gumin'sky's definition is actually considered to be the most complete and exact one. According to V.M. Gumin'sky (1979), travel writing is a genre based on travelers' descriptions of authentic data about any unfamiliar countries, lands or people little-known to the reader in form of notes, diaries, journals, sketches and memoirs. V.M. Gumin'sky's work "The problem of genesis and development of travel writing in Russian literature" [1979] describes the main characteristic of travel writing. This characteristic is "the idea of freedom". The author owns the widest selection of subjects for his work as well as the ability of transition from one subject to another at will. [4, p. 114].

V.M. Mikhaylov, in his work "The evolution of travel writing in works by Russian writers of the XVIII-XIX centuries" [1999], offers another definition of the genre. According to him, travel writing is a genre of fiction based on the description of real or imaginary movement of a traveling hero-character in a real or fictional space. The eyewitness describes the unknown foreign realities, narrates the events that have taken place during his travel, and offers his own thoughts, feelings and impressions [10]. This is a modern definition.

In the Soviet period, literary critics didn't consider travel writing a literary genre. Travel writing was considered only as a kind of sketch. However, attempts to reveal its essence were made. Such an attempt was undertaken by N.G. Tchernyshevsky in 1949. He claims that travel writing as a genre has united elements and forms of other genres [Tchernyshevsky 1949: 222 - 232].

E. Stetsenko, in her work "History written on the way" [1999], suggests that travel writing arises in the form of non-fictional reports. The elements of the genre are travel as a basis of the plot, the autobiographical character, description of nature, the central image of the author, diaries and letters, as well as oral stories [14, p. 98].

M.G. Shadrina, in her "Evolution of the language of 'travel'" [2003] offers still more classifications of travel writing. The author distinguishes between religious literature, scientific travel, and literary travel. M.G. Shadrina analyzes features of texts which are written in this genre. According to her, the genre has the following

features: a route, repeating motives, and the chronological order of events. M.G. Shadrina's classification, in my opinion, is not complete. Other features are also present. These include a synthetic character, a clearly expressed stance of the author, the subjectivity of the author's approach etc. [15].

V.A. Shachkova is a current researcher of travel report writing genre. In her work "Travel writing as a fictional genre: theoretical issues" [2008], the author identifies and characterizes the limits of this genre. She refers to the following characteristic features: freedom as genre's principle, the author's active role, and the obligatory documentary elements. The author's approach is constituted by subjectivity, explicit fictional characters as integral parts of the text, explicitness of the author's stance. The genre has a synthetic character, a route, and the possibility for the author to develop an individual style. The travel is a response to demands of the audience [12, p. 280].

Comparison parameters: genetic and typological similarities

In the first half of the 19th century, German literature achieves popularity in Europe, earning a spot within world literature. Comparative study is a sphere which allows to state parallels and a convergence [7, p. 195].

V.M. Zhirmunsky, in his work "Comparative literary criticism" [1979], offers a definition of typological communications. Typological are to be considered the objective communications between literary phenomena determined by related or similar conditions of the public irrespectively of a writer's understanding of this communication [17, p. 87].

The purpose of comparative study, according to D. Dyurishin, is to establish the genetic and typological essence of a literary phenomenon. A convergence of the genetic and typological shows the main differentiations of forms within inter-literary processes. Genetic linkages point to the existence of the general history and cultural traditions. They arise when representatives of various literatures interact with each other. In genetic linkages, the Slovak scientist D. Dyurishin allocates two types of contacts: external and internal [2, p. 121].

D. Dyurishin, in his work "The theory of comparative studying of literatures" [1979] offers for consideration a classification of a typological convergence:

1. Socially – typological (the circle of the phenomena connected with an ideological perspective, socially – political views, religion, morals, philosophy);
2. Literary – typological (similar or distinctive features are considered from the point of view of the characteristic of characters, a plot, composition, motive, art means);

The Russian literary critic A.N. Veselovsky, in his "Poetics of plots" (1940), understood the simplest narrative unit which is semantically complete as the concept "motive".

3. Psychology based – typological (the repeating motives in fantastic plots of people strongly differing from each other);
4. Contact based – typological conditionality of literary communications and a convergence (influence of a literature on another literature).

D. Dyurishin's work is important for my study because when comparing works of the Russian writers and German writers I will address this classification. [2, p. 126].

The German scientist H. Birus, in "Germanistik und Komparatistik" (German and comparative studies) [1995], comes to the conclusion that genetic and typological comparisons of works are devoted to comparative study of texts from different authors and eras under the influence of their historical and individual conditions. H. Birus discussed forms of interaction of texts with each other [1, p. 74].

The modern studies specialist K. Hoffman, author of "Preservation in comparative literary criticism" [2013], pays attention to the comparative literature interacting with other art forms: music, painting, architecture. Comparison of writers and their creativity matters for the explanation of a convergence within a national and international literary context. In the history between Russian and German literary communications, this is confirmed on the example of J. W. Goethe, E. T. A. Hoffman, N. M. Karamzin creativity. The Russian writers acquired and adopted a lot from works of German writers: names of heroes, motive, subject, description of nature. I agree with the statement of K. Hoffman, as without a comparison of writers

as representatives of different cultures, convergence and differences in their creativity cannot be found.

Notion and term of the semantic dominant

The concept of semantic dominant was introduced in 1932 within the Prague linguistic circle by Jan Mukarzhovsky. As the scientist claims in his work "The literary language and poetic diction" [1967], the dominant is that component that sets in motion and defines the relations of all the other components [11, p. 113].

The purpose of analysis of a literary work is to reveal deep layers of its contents, to understand and interpret them. Between language means and contents there is a certain communication. This communication is called a semantic dominant. According to V. V. Volkov, this concept is necessary to emphasize that the language unit isn't important. The intra text sense, is born through the language unit, is important by itself [16, p. 51].

The semantic dominant, according to V.V. Volkov's, is a basic unit of the analysis of art work representing markers of concepts. They are the common language and that of the author. A concept is related to perceptual–cognitive–affective phenomena. They constitute a basis of collective and individual language consciousness and reflect a considerable part of unconscious and superconscious structures. [16, p. 55].

The artistic text is a figurative subjective reflection of reality bearing emotional and semantic loading. In relation to it, it is possible to speak not just about a single dominant, but about an emotional and semantic dominant of the entire text. The dominant is an emotional and semantic orientation and expressiveness within the text of characteristic lines of the author's identity. In the art work, the emotional and semantic dominant acts as the organizing principle predetermining a selection by the author of certain plots, heroes, syntactic and lexical-semantic means [16, p. 57].

The understanding of the concept of a semantic dominant helps to find out a required component, in our case motives of Germany in N. M. Karamzin's work.

Methods

The object of our research are the works of J. W. Goethe "Italian Journey", as well as N. M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler". The comparative method based on comparative researches has been used on the works of A. N. Veselovsky "Historical poetics" (1913), V. M. Zhirmunsky "Comparative literary criticism" [1936], D. Dyurishin "The theory of comparative studying of literatures" [1979], and H. Birus "Germanic studies and comparative study" [1995]. This is due to the fact that the comparison of two authors, as representatives of two different cultures and literatures, has been carried out: J. W. Goethe and N. M. Karamzin.

During the research on the works J. W. Goethe's "Italian Journey" and N. M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler", the specifics of travel writing have been revealed as described by V. A. Shachkova. On the specifics of genre, we looked for the common and distinctive features in the structure of works of German and Russian authors. The first feature of a genre for V. A. Shachkova is the principle of genre freedom. The second one is the special active role of the author. At travel reports writing there should be obligatory documentary elements too. In the works written in travel writing, author's fiction can prevail. The evaluative elements and synthetic character are also characteristic for a genre. In such works, there is always a route taking place. The individual style of the author allows creating an illusion that the reader travels together with him. The travel is a response to inquiries of the audience.

For identification of similarities and distinctions between the works of J. W. Goethe "Italian Journey" and N. M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler", D. Dyurishin's classification has been used. The Slovak literary critic allocates four types of a convergence. The first look D. Dyurishin considers the social–typological convergence. When authors lead the narration at the same time, this is related to the existence of a literary–typological convergence. The literary critic allocates with the third type of a typologically based convergence psychology. D. Dyurishin considered the influence of one or another literature in a contact based typological convergence [2, p.145].

After the identification of peculiar features of travel report writing, the semantic dominant of Germany which is traced at various levels of structure of

"Letters of a Russian traveler" has been revealed: motive, subject, idea, composition, style and plot.

We understand after A. N. Veselovsky the smallest significant unit of a plot as a motive. Under a concept plot, as stated by A. N. Veselovsky, we understand the sequence of events and states. We understand the creation of a plot which can coincide with a causal and investigative order of a branchy of events and states that can break it in one way or another as a composition. We understand relying on Yu. I. Mineralov the special trend of thought, inherent in these people. We understand relying on V. P. Meshcheryakov, A. S. Kozlov, N. P. Kubareva and M. N. Serbul the main idea of the work. We understand the subject as the main problem and the main circle of the vital events represented by the writer.

Results

The travel report writing as a literary genre has its own characteristic features. The specifics described by V. A. Shachkova have been revealed in the works written in a travel report genre. This includes J. W. Goethe's "Italian Journey" and N. M. Karamzin's "Letter of a Russian traveler". The principle of genre freedom is manifested in the lack of strict literary conventions. The author plays an especially active role. He is an eyewitness of the events. Both works of J. W. Goethe and N. M. Karamzin have been written within the educational tradition. The authors couldn't exaggerate the phenomena in the description of what was seen. In these works, a specific place is held by the autobiographical facts. The individual style of the authors allows creating the illusion that the reader travels with them together. J. W. Goethe informs his compatriots about the life of Italians, their traditions and art. The travel is a response to inquiries of the audience. The Russian people knew very little about the West. N. M. Karamzin informs his own compatriots about life in the West.

J. W. Goethe and N. M. Karamzin adhered to a certain route. J. W. Goethe has gone to a trip from Carlsbad. He has gone to Italy through Munich, Mittenwald and Brenner. Trento was the first Italian city visited by Goethe. After visiting Trent, Goethe would travel to Torbole, then to Verona, Vicenza, Padua and Venice. J. W. Goethe has visited other Italian cities as well: Ferrara, Bologna, Perugia, Naples,

Sicily and Messina. Rome made a special impression on the writer. The travel is a response to inquiries of the audience.

N. M. Karamzin began his travel from Tver. From St. Petersburg, he went to Riga. Then he visited the German cities of Königsberg, Marienburg, Danzig and Stargardt. N. M. Karamzin visited the capital city of Germany. From Berlin, he went to Dresden, then to Leipzig, Weimar, Erfurt, and Frankfurt am Main. N. M. Karamzin has visited also Mainz, Mannheim, Rheinfelden. After visiting Germany, Karamzin went to France. Strasbourg was the first city Karamzin visited there. Then he visited Lyon, Macon, and the capital city of France. From France, Karamzin traveled to Switzerland. There he visited Basel, Zurich and Eglisau. N. M. Karamzin did not pass through the cities of Bern and Geneva. From Switzerland, he went to England. There he visited Dover, London and Windsor. From England, he returned to Russia.

Convergence between J. W. Goethe's "Italian Journey" and N.M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler" is thus to be found out relying on D. Dyurishin's classification.

The hero traveler is attentive, tolerant, educated and is characterized by an alien amazement. His travel purpose is to inform the own compatriots about life in other countries. The traveler J. W. Goethe feels interest in the world, tests his own ability to observe. He writes that only the competent speech of the main representation hero pleases Italians. N. M. Karamzin's traveler speaks with his interlocutors about travels and China. He notices that in Bern, the customs are not such strict as in Zurich.

Coming to the narration, it is to be remarked that the valid letters and traveling notes constitute the cornerstone of both works. An example from "Italian Journey": "I sit in a reception in front of a fireplace". Example from "Letters of a Russian traveler": "Six successive days, at ten o'clock in the morning, I go to St. Jacob Street". This does not belong to a literary and typological convergence.

The works' authors act as travelers and they share feelings and experiences with the reader on behalf of their hero. J. W. Goethe considers as a second birthday

the day of his arrival in Rome. N. M. Karamzin shares with his readers the warm grief connected with a heavy rain.

N.M. Karamzin visits Germany, he meets many famous figures. Karamzin was called the Russian – the European. In Germany he visits Immanuel Kant and Ramler. Karamzin calls Ramler the most respectable German.

Besides similar lines, differences between the works of German and Russian authors have also been established. For J. W. Goethe, Italy is a place of a shelter, rescue from genuine moral crisis. He writes that in Rome he has found himself and has come to consent with himself. A special value is given by J. W. Goethe to religions. The traveler recognizes the existence of a great number of Saints for the benefit. He explains it with the fact that each believer can choose for himself a Saint to try out and address him with an absolute trust. He characterizes him as attentive, devoted, good-natured person with a great artistic talent. J. W. Goethe feels close to the national Italian spirit. He enjoys the communication with Italians.

N. M. Karamzin's residence in Europe is also to be examined. He writes that not everything around him pleases him. He misses his own homeland. For N.M. Karamzin is Europe the foreign land. Example from "Letters of a Russian Traveler": "Coast! Fatherland! I bless you! I am in Russia!..." [5, p. 532]. A specific place in N.M. Karamzin's work is held by history, including events of the French Revolution. This event, according to N.M. Karamzin, was not an exit from a difficult situation. He calls the revolution a violent change of an essential social system. N. M. Karamzin attaches particular importance to landscape sketches. The traveler describes in details the road and the rich meadows. He writes that the air was fresh and pure.

Thus, we come to a conclusion: Germany is a semantic dominant in the work of N. M. Karamzin "Letters of a Russian Traveler". Germany is shown in the work in motive, plot, composition, subject, idea and style. At the work, there is the motive of Germany expressed in a genre. Karamzin visits many German cities (such as Berlin, Erfurt and Frankfurt) as well as German personalities like Herder, Wieland, professor Beck etc. Karamzin makes a trip to Germany, until then unknown to him, pursuing

the idea to show to the Russian reader the German mentality, culture, as well as the traditions of the country.

Conclusion

In the research of travel report writing in J. W. Goethe's "Italian Journey" and N. M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler", specific similarities and differences were revealed. Similar lines are explained through the influence of Germany on Russian literature. Further, a convergence and distinctions at different levels of works structure have also been revealed.

The examples from the works of J. W. Goethe "Italian Journey" and N. M. Karamzin's "Letters of a Russian Traveler" show a certain influence of Germany at all levels of works structure. After the identification of similarities and distinctions, they were found at different level based on D. Dyurishin's classification in the works of German and the Russian authors.

This essay can be useful to literary critics in the analysis and comparison of the works of authors that are representatives of different cultures and literatures. Comparison of the works of representatives of different cultures will help to reveal national specifics. It helps to see the reflection in text of household details, as well as speech characteristics of different people. Comparison of the art works manifest their being close on subject, plot, composition, and shows specifics of art perception in the world.

This model can be used on seminar classes in disciplines such as "History of foreign literature in foreign language learning" and "History of foreign literature in second foreign language learning". The model is important for a deeper study of German literature. The conducted research concerns the identification of a typological convergence. In further researches it may be possible to reveal a genetic convergence.

References

1. Birus, H. Germanistik und Komparatistik / H. Birus – Stuttgart.: J. B. Metzler, 1995. – 623 p.

2. Dyurishin. The theory of comparative studying of literature / D. Dyurishin – M.: Progress, 1979. – 320 p.
3. Goethe, I. V. Italian Journey / J. W. Goethe – M.: RIPOL classic, 2017. 414 p.
4. Guminsky, V.M. Puteshestviye / V.M. Guminsky//Literary encyclopedic dictionary. M.: Modern encyclopedia, 1997. P. 314 – 315.
5. Karamzin, N. M. Letters of a Russian Traveler/ N.M. Karamzin – M.: However, 1980. 606 p.
6. Lotman, Yu. M. "Letters of a Russian Traveler" Karamzin and their place in development of the Russian culture//Karamzin N. M. The letter of a Russian traveler. Leningrad, 1984. P. 501 – 546.
7. Loshakova, G.A. "The American discourse" within a concept "world literature" J. W. Goethe and Ch. Silsfield//Philology and culture – 2013. - №. 3 (33). P. 195 – 200.
8. Maslova, N. M. Travel notes as publicistic form: Thesis. doc. phil. sciences. M, 1977. –115 p.
9. Mineralov, Yu. I. Comparative literary criticism / Yu.I. Mineralov – M.: Youright, 2018. – 387 p.
10. Mikhaylov, VA. Evolution of travel writing in works by the Russian writers of the XVIII-XIX centuries: Thesis. doc. phil. sciences. M, 2010. – 199 p.
11. Mukarzhovsky, I. Structural poetics / Ya. Mukarzhovsky – M.: Languages of the Russian Culture school, 1996. – 480 p.
12. Shachkova, VA. "Travel" as fiction genre: theory questions//Philology and art criticism. 2008. №. 3. P. 277 – 281.
13. Shadrina, M. G. Evolution of language of "travel": Thesis. ... doc. phil. sciences. M, 2003. – 396 p.

14. Stetsenko, E.A. History written to ways / E.A. Stetsenko – M., IMLI RAS, 1999. – 312 p.
15. Veselovsky, A. N. Historical poetics / A.N. Veselovsky – Leningrad.: Fiction literature, 1940. – 652 p.
16. Volkov, V. V. Fundamentals of philology: anthropocentrism, the language identity and a pragmatistika of the text / V.V. Volkov – M.: FLINT, 2014. – 149 p.
17. Zhirmunsky, V. M. Comparative literary criticism / V.M. Zhirmunsky – Leningrad.: Science, 1979. – 492 p.