

Interparadigmatic Aspect of Tolstoy's Dispute with Shakespeare

Alexander N. Avdonin, Gennady V. Bondarenko,
Hanif S. Vildanov, Natalia V. Vinogradova
Department of philosophy, history and social engineering
Ufa State Petroleum Technological University
Ufa, Russia

Roza A. Tukaeva
Department of philosophy and political science
Bashkir State University
Ufa, Russia

Abstract—In the study of literature, there is a fact that L. Tolstoy severely criticizes Shakespeare's works. The article proposed and substantiated the structure of the artistic paradigm with the categorical apparatus of the philosophy of science, and revealed the artistic, socio-philosophical and methodological grounds for classifying the works of Tolstoy and Shakespeare to different artistic paradigms. The lack of understanding of Shakespeare's works and his significance in the world literature is explained by the unconscious clash of different literary paradigms in Tolstoy's mind.

Keywords—*Paradigm; Art paradigm and its structure; Status fetishism; Existential universals; Mental and artistic-imaginary experiment*

I. INTRODUCTION

The great playwright Shakespeare was criticized by the adherents of classicism, led by Voltaire [13], and by other great writer and playwright L. Tolstoy. Shakespeare and Tolstoy have long been at the top of the list of the best writers of all time. They took these places both in the eyes of prominent literary critics and writers and in the eyes of the whole reading world. The paradoxical fact is that at the end of life L. Tolstoy came down with excessively harsh substantive criticism of Shakespeare and his works, saying that: 1) the actors are put in tragic situations, that are unusual for their characters, time and place, not arising from the natural course of events; 2) all persons speak as living people never spoke and could have never spoken; 3) all the characters speak identically [10]. A large literature is devoted to L. Tolstoy's dispute with Shakespeare, highlighting its complex "social, philosophical and aesthetic prerequisites" [5].

Therefore, when at the intersection of philosophy and science there was a radical renewal of epistemology and the birth of the philosophy of science, there was a desire to use its results in solving problems in other areas, in particular, the problem of criticism of Shakespeare by L. Tolstoy. Philosophy of science is a special philosophical discipline, the subject of which is the structure and development of the socio-cultural context of scientific knowledge. Philosophical and general scientific discourse was supplemented by new concepts, such as paradigm, mental experiment, idealization and others

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The task of our work is to apply scientific and philosophical concepts to the solution of the literary problem of L. Tolstoy's dispute with Shakespeare. To solve it, it is necessary to establish the similarities between the subjects of philosophy of science and literary criticism. Therefore, the main methods of research are the analogy and ways to identify functional and causal relationships.

III. DISCUSSION

Let us consider the similarity between science and literature, which is expressed in relation to the nature of development between science and literature. In particular, assume that the difference in the realism of Tolstoy and Shakespeare, as a basis of misunderstanding of the latter by the former, has interparadigmatic character. According to T. Kuhn, the creation of scientific knowledge takes place in communities of scientists who bring into the created scientific knowledge specific group value orientations in relation to knowledge as a result of research activities. Therefore, real scientific knowledge turns out to be a holistic unity of knowledge and values, descriptions and prescriptions, i.e. a paradigm. The scientific community turns out to be a group of scientists united by the recognition of one paradigm. The development of science, over time, leads to a scientific revolution, i.e. to a change of paradigms and scientific communities that recognize them. In the scientific revolution, the foundations of scientific knowledge are changing qualitatively, so there is a formal-logical incommensurability and nonderivability of the new paradigm from the previous one. Absolutizing the incommensurability of paradigms, T. Kuhn denies the progressive development of scientific knowledge [6].

A higher level of integrity of art phenomena suggests that Kuhn's concept more accurately describes the development of art than the development of science, if the paradigms and artistic communities of art are understood as, for example, literary trends. A literary trend is a concrete historical form of literature realized by a literary community, based on a special artistic and creative method [3]. Literary trends include baroque, classicism, sentimentalism, romanticism, realism, symbolism, modernism, socialist realism and postmodernism.

A broader concept, close to the concept of artistic paradigm, is the concept of artistic style: "the commonality of the figurative system, means of artistic expressiveness, creative techniques, conditioned by the unity of the ideological and artistic content. You can talk about the style of a particular work or genre..., about the individual style of an individual author, as well as the style of entire epochs or major artistic trends, since the unity of social and historical content determines the commonality of artistic and figurative principles, means and techniques in them..." [8].

In our opinion, between artistic paradigms there is a difference in their bases, a value "barrier". Taking into account the defining importance of values in artistic activity and reality, we will "translate" the structure of the scientific paradigm into the structure of the artistic paradigm. As is known, the scientific paradigm includes symbolic generalizations, sometimes taking the form of laws; "metaphysical", scientific and philosophical provisions on its subject area and prescriptions to scientific activity of the participants of the scientific community caused by it; values adopted by this scientific community; examples of problem solving [6]. In the first place of the artistic paradigm, due to the value-semantic essence of art, there are artistic values that form the specificity of the paradigm in art. Then the structure of the artistic paradigm will look as follows: dominant artistic values; socio-philosophical views; creative method; samples of artistic works.

Let us consider the paradox of Tolstoy's criticism of Shakespeare through the "prism" of the structure of the artistic paradigm. Criticism of Tolstoy expresses the principled positions of his specific realism, which is closer to the sensually perceived social reality. Realism of the 19th century is characterized, firstly, by the creation of diverse and multilateral characters; secondly, by the discovery of historical conditionality of feelings, thoughts and actions; thirdly, by the discovery of social contradictions caused by the opposite aspirations of the estates and classes [2]. In this artistic trend the historical truth was important; if a literary work is portraying, for example, the seventeenth century, all household items must be taken from the seventeenth century, and not from the author's century. The psychology of the characters, their speech and actions should also relate to the same century. That is why Tolstoy, unlike Shakespeare, in his criticism pays great attention to the analysis of the sources of Shakespeare's plots and the correspondence of the characters' actions to the historical circumstances of that time.

The art of the Renaissance (and Shakespeare) abandoned the medieval belief in God and the idea of the divine pre-establishment of human nature, began to recognize the self-value of the earthly, bodily and sensual content. It depicts human characters as an infinitely diverse manifestation of the ancestral human nature, affirms the artistically high ideals of humanity. But the content of the art of the Renaissance has preserved the medieval extra-historicity as some universality, independent from the specific historical time and specific historical social environment. Therefore, the method of the Renaissance art should be called a universal realism, in which the creative reproduction of artist's contemporary life is carried out as a specific-sensual manifestation of the universal

nature of the human race or as alien and hostile to it – as a rule, with the creative use of the ready-made, universal forms of artistic imagery [3].

The artistic embodiment of the crisis of Renaissance humanism at the turn of 16th and 17th centuries in England [1] demanded a decisive separation from the specific historical moment of the author's life and English society and the flight "into space" of universal values and meanings, but in close connection with the directly perceived moment of historical reality. The paradigm of Tolstoy's realism reproduces sensually observed or reconstructed from social and historical sources Russian society of the 19th century. That's why a specific historical and psychological truth about the motives, behavior and speech of the characters of literary works is so important to him.

IV. RESULTS

Shakespeare was solving another problem, the problem of expressing the directly unobserved social reality of all times. In scientific knowledge, this corresponds to the difference between empirical and theoretical knowledge. If empirical knowledge is based on observation and experiment, then theoretical knowledge is based on mental experiment, idealization. Empirical knowledge is generated by abstraction, theoretical knowledge - by idealization. Idealization refers to the method, by which certain properties of the investigated object are brought to their logical limit [11].

Shakespeare faced the problem of expressing the directly unobservable social reality, so we should expect similar methodological solutions. Of course, the dramatic reality is different from the reality of scientific knowledge, firstly, in emotional clarity; secondly, in the specificity of the events presented and the relationship between the characters of the play. As a source of conceptual tools for further research let's take a general scientific concept of "situation", introduced in this aspect by N.M. Solodukho. By the situation we will mean "a set of factors that determine the state and change of the object" [9]. Let's consider the tragedies "Hamlet" [12] and "King Lear" [12] in the situational aspect.

Contrasting social appearance and social reality beyond it, in "Hamlet" Shakespeare reflects the mega-situation of the collapse of the humanistic worldview. Hence the need for, firstly, consistent identification of the mega-real state of affairs, hidden by a specific false semblance, and its reliable justification with concern for the preservation of Prince Hamlet's own life while investigating the secret murder of his father; secondly, the collapse of the Renaissance humanism.

Shakespeare solves the problem with the help of sublime metaphorical speech of the heroes of his tragedies, separating it from the specific historical characters, time and places. Shakespeare reaches the level of social and philosophical problems and brings his spectators and readers to it; in that kind of speech, as an analogue of the idealization discussed above, lies the artistic method of universal humanistic realism of the Stratford on Avon genius. L. E. Pinsky even suggested using this method to call the realism of the Renaissance "idealizing"[7].

V. CONCLUSION

Thus, the understanding of the "Hamlet" tragedy in the paradigm of universal humanistic realism explains both the peculiarities of his speech and the sequence of his actions, incomprehensible to the great Russian writer L. Tolstoy says: "Shakespeare, putting into Hamlet's mouth the speeches that he wants to express and forcing him to do the things that the author needs to prepare spectacular scenes, destroys everything that makes up the character of Hamlet as a legend" [10]. True, the author uses the method of idealization to bring to a zero logical limit the specific historical character of the hero of the legend of Hamlet and thereby creates a universal character, allowing each subsequent historical era to see in Hamlet his contemporary, making him an eternal companion of mankind, especially in the critical periods of its development.

L. Tolstoy reproaches Shakespeare with the concrete historical lack of motivation of the division of the Kingdom in the "King Lear" tragedy. [10]. But he does not take into account the fact that the play gives a picture of society after the collapse of humanism, in which blissful external visibility is opposite to the inhuman internal content. Therefore, Shakespeare needed a situation of "explosion", throwing off the outer shell of this society and exposing its true essence. This idea was consistent with the artistic and imaginary experiment of throwing the king from the very social "top" to the very "bottom" of the Kingdom. The division of the country between his daughters was to take place in the form of erratic decision of King Lear to disinherit the youngest daughter due to her sincere disposition. Hence, the unmotivated decision of the king is the first signal of the tragedy going beyond the specific historical situation.

Shakespeare tore off the masks of the concrete social phenomena by creating empirically false situation, through the artistically imaginary experiment, similar to the scientific mental experiment, which is used to create theoretical laws in the science of modern age while "breaking through" to the essence of cognizable reality. The motivation of Shakespeare's heroes is not in the interactions of people in a particular historical situation, but in the fact that Shakespeare, with the help of an artistic and imaginary experiment, "breaks through" the apparent social reality to the essence of the successive mega-forms of social life of his time, becoming an eternal companion of mankind. Thus, L. Tolstoy incorrectly judges Shakespeare and his works made in the artistic paradigm of universal realism from the position of the paradigm of concrete historical realism. We believe that the same incorrectness took place in the interparadigmatic criticism of Shakespeare by Voltaire's classicism.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Brandes, *Unknown Shakespeare. Who, if not him.* Moscow: EKSMO: Algoritm, 2012.
- [2] "Introduction to literary criticism. Fundamentals of the theory of literature", V. Meshcheryakov, Ed., Moscow, 2012.
- [3] "Introduction to literary criticism", L. Chernets, Ed., Moscow: Akademia, 2012.
- [4] I. Volkov, *Creative techniques and artistic systems.* Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1978. Retrieved from: <http://topuch.ru/tvorcheskie-metodi-i-hudojestvennie-sistemi/index5.html#pages>.
- [5] E. See Zinner, "Treatise 'On Shakespeare and the drama' by L. N. Tolstoy", in *Shakespeare and Russian culture*, M. P. Alekseev, Ed., Moscow: Science, 1965. Retrieved from: <http://www.w-shakespeare.ru/library/shekspir-i-russkaya-kultura31.html>.
- [6] T. Kuhn, *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Moscow: AST, Ermak, 2003.
- [7] L. Pinsky, *Shakespeare: the basic principles of drama.* Moscow, 1971.
- [8] A. Prokhorov, *Russian encyclopedic dictionary (in 2 volumes).* Moscow, 2000.
- [9] N. Solodukho, "Situations and their classification," in *Situational studies*, vol. 2, *Typology of situations*, N. Solodukho, Ed., Kazan: KSTU Publishing, 2006.
- [10] L. Tolstoy, *What is Art? Shakespeare and drama.* Moscow: LIBROKOM, 2012.
- [11] E. Ushakov, *Introduction to philosophy and methodology of science.* Moscow: Knorus, 2008.
- [12] W. Shakespeare, *Works (in 8 volumes), vol. 1, 2, 7.* Moscow: INTERBOOK, 1997.
- [13] Voltaire, "Letters Concerning the English Nation," in *The Library of the World's Best Literature. An Anthology in Thirty Volumes*, Walter Charles Dudley et al., Eds., 1917. Retrieved from: <http://www.bartleby.com/library/readersdigest/1184.html>; "Voltaire's attitude towards Shakespeare," in *The Cambridge History of English and American Literature in 18 Volumes (1907-21), vol. V.* Retrieved from: <http://www.bartleby.com/215/1205.html>.