

МЕЖДИСЦИПЛИНАРНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

UDC 75.03

**Comparing Literary Criticism and Art History:
The Problem of Sentimentalism in Russian Historiography***I. A. Abramkin*Russian State University for the Humanities,
6, Miusskaya pl., Moscow, 125993, Russian Federation**For citation:** Abramkin, Ivan. "Comparing Literary Criticism and Art History: The Problem of Sentimentalism in Russian Historiography". *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 13, no. 1 (2023): 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu15.2023.109>

The article is devoted to the historiography of sentimentalism in the Russian scientific tradition. The purpose of the research is to compare the methods used in literary and art studies to overview this phenomenon. The uncertainty of ideas about sentimentalism in the visual arts requires an appeal to literary studies. A careful analysis of works on sentimentalism in this field revealed the special role of the works of M. M. Bakhtin and G. N. Pospelov, who created original concepts of this phenomenon, and has made it possible to state a wide range of methods. Consideration of the sentimentalism problem in the history of art has demonstrated not only the generality of ideas and a small number of methods in comparison with literary criticism, but also the main principles inherent in the scientific tradition. Firstly, the idea of sentimentalism is based on abstract theses. Secondly, the main approach is to compare sentimentalism with classicism and Romanticism, which prevents determining its place in the art of the 1790s. Thirdly, the pictorial system of sentimentalism is considered in the most general form and turns out to be devoid of a thorough art historical description. A critical analysis of historiography allowed to identify promising areas of modern research of sentimentalism in art criticism: a careful analysis of the artistic features of works, the study of the metamorphoses of the portrait genre as well as a comparison of the Russian portrait with European art of the 18th — early 19th centuries.

Keywords: historiography, sentimentalism, literary studies, art criticism, Russian art, 18th century, portrait painting, problem of style, classicism, pre-romanticism, romanticism.

The object of the article is the study of the historiography of Russian sentimentalism in art and literary studies. Such a statement of the question is due to the obvious at first glance

affinity of these phenomena. In the scientific literature, the emergence of sentimentalism is associated with the crisis of Enlightenment's ideals in the 1790s, which manifests itself in a rethinking of the tradition of the ceremonial image in the field of painting [1, p. 48]. In the same years, the design of the program of this artistic direction takes place. V. L. Borovikovskiy becomes the main representative of it in painting, and N. M. Karamzin becomes the main one in literature. The parallel development of sentimentalism in literature and fine art, as it seems, gives grounds for comparing these phenomena, but a closer look at the problem allows us to see significant difficulties for such a study. Firstly, the impact of sentimentalism in literature was longer, which allows researchers to come to the conclusion about the different proportion of the presence of this trend in the general literary and pictorial context of the era [2, p. 68]. One important aspect should be noted here: some researchers associate the origin of sentimentalism in painting with the work of F. S. Rokotov in the 1760s [3, p. 128], which thereby completely coincides with the period of the emergence of this trend accepted in modern literary studies and allows us to talk about the parallelism of both the phases of the heyday of phenomena and their origins. Secondly, the idea of sentimentalism in portraiture is characterized by generality and uncertainty of features in comparison with literature [3, p. 124], which makes it difficult to study this topic.

In this regard, the purpose of the article is to overview the historiography of sentimentalism in order to compare scientific approaches used in literary and art studies. The need for such a comparative analysis is due to the greater elaboration of the problem of sentimentalism in literary researches and their significant impact on the tradition of considering portraiture in the history of Russian art. The identification of methodological features in the survey of this direction in such different humanities disciplines will make it possible to comprehend the current state of the scientific problem and evaluate promising areas for further study of sentimentalism in portraiture, which determines the relevance of the article.

The analysis of sentimentalism in literary researches is distinguished by a long tradition and a variety of scientific concepts, which makes it possible to use the chronological principle for several reasons. Firstly, a consistent study of publications from earlier to later contributes to the identification of the original corpus of ideas and their development in the further scientific tradition, which seems necessary for understanding the main aspects related to the problem of sentimentalism. Secondly, the appeal to the chronological principle is also due to the specifics of Russian historiography, which includes several stages that are different from each other: the study of sentimentalism inevitably has fundamental differences in the studies of the imperial (1883–1917), Soviet (1917–1991) and modern (1991–2021) periods. A chronological review of sentimentalism studies will make it possible to comprehend the entire course of development of this topic in the scientific literature and identify the specifics of various methodological approaches in the final part of the historiographical review, which relates to the field of literary studies.

It should be noted that the initial difficulty of studying sentimentalism as an artistic phenomenon at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries is due to the term itself, which appears after the 1820s. That is later than not only other terms of that era (classicism and romanticism), but also its own heyday [4, p. 243]. The close attention of researchers to this phenomenon arises at the end of the 19th century, when a special interest in the culture of

the 18th century is emerging, and is largely due to the works of A. N. Veselovsky. In the most famous book “Western Influence in Russian Literature”, published in 1883 and withstood several editions until 1916, the scientist identifies the sources of Russian sentimentalism: L. Sterne, J. G. Herder and J.-J. Rousseau [5, p. 102–3]. This list of authors demonstrates the most important feature of Russian sentimentalism — the appeal to different national traditions, which will show the difficulties in determining its essence in later publications. Consideration of sentimentalism in the pan-European context was continued by monographic studies on important personalities in the works of A. N. Veselovsky himself, as well as V. V. Sipovsky [6] and M. N. Rozanov [7]: in these works, the phenomenon is considered as an important stage in the enrichment of personality. In a book about V. A. Zhukovsky, A. N. Veselovsky identifies two categories in the philosophy of feeling [8]: sentimentalists (*chuvstvitel'niki*), peaceful enthusiasts absorbed in their feelings, and admirers of genius enlightenment, people of struggle and heroism, which demonstrates the kinship of sentimentalism and romanticism.

After the Great October Revolution, the study of this direction is undergoing significant changes. Sentimentalism, due to its noble basis, is perceived as a conservative trend, and the weakening of interest in public life characteristic of it does not correspond to the situation of the 1920s, which is distinguished by the struggle of various literary trends. An important place in historiography is occupied by the work of P. N. Sakulin “Russian Literature. A Socio-synthetic Review of Literary Styles” [9], which will determine the nature and direction of further discussions. In this study, the author expresses a rather bold idea about the emergence of sentimentalism (sensitive moods) already in Peter’s time, and also identifies three lines in its development: sensitive, didactic and social.

Such a radical expansion of this phenomenon boundaries will significantly affect the scientific tradition of the following decades (1930s–1940s), for which the question of the period of the emergence of sentimentalism becomes the main research problem. Thus, G. A. Gukovsky attributes the emergence of sentimentalism to the 1770s in connection with the collapse of the worldview of the classicists and the uprising of E. I. Pugachev [10, p. 246], and also considers it the first stage of Russian noble romanticism. In addition, the scientist gives an extremely negative assessment of the N. M. Karamzin’s work. He turned the individualism of Western European sentimentalism into vague emotionality. In another work, G. A. Gukovsky formulates the bipolarity of revolutionary (J.-J. Rousseau — A. N. Radishchev) and conservative sentimentalism (L. Sterne — N. M. Karamzin), which is transferred to romanticism (the Decembrists belong to the first direction, and V. A. Zhukovsky — to the second) [11, p. 303]. L. V. Pumpyansky calls sentimentalism a pre-romantic trend that arises from translations of foreign works of “petty-bourgeois drama” and tearful comedy (*comédie larmoyante*) [12, p. 437]. But at the same time it differs in a declarative nature due to the absence of contradictions in the Russian bourgeois society of that time. G. N. Pospelov in his work agrees with L. V. Pumpyansky and demonstrates the emergence of a new worldview and poetic style in M. M. Kheraskov already in the 1760s, thereby challenging the position of G. A. Gukovsky [13, p. 17]. The scientist justifies the emergence of sentimentalism at such an early period by the fact that certain features of creativity manifest themselves before the formation of a stable ideological and aesthetic program.

A kind of watershed in the literary historiography of sentimentalism is M. M. Bakhtin's note "The Problem of Sentimentalism", which was published posthumously in the complete collection of his works as a draft material. The scientist's interest in sentimentalism arose in the 1930s and was embodied in the creation of a work that, unfortunately, has not survived to this day. The problem of sentimentalism occupied an extremely important place in the scientific activity of M. M. Bakhtin, corresponding to the two poles of his work — the study of F. Rabelais and F. M. Dostoevsky. Various documents related to the scientist's life allow us to conclude that this text appeared in the period 1958–1959. The small size of the text and the concise manner of presentation are not able to minimize the role of this work for the study of sentimentalism.

Firstly, the scientist expresses the idea of the uncertainty of the boundaries of this phenomenon, which simultaneously merges with romanticism and realism [14, p. 304]. Nevertheless, such transitivity does not mean that sentimentalism is devoid of a clear program. Secondly, M. M. Bakhtin characterizes it as a "genuine discovery": it is this direction that for the first time develops such topics as the value of inner life, the debunking of brute force, the importance of empathy and compassion, the hero going beyond the scope of the work. Thirdly, the scientist clearly distinguishes between sentimentalism and sentimentality, which is its by-product. All of the above allows M. M. Bakhtin to conclude that the merit of sentimentalism is the artistic development of previously unknown aspects of reality: "Overestimation of scale, exaltation of the small, weak, close, overestimation of ages and life positions (child, woman, eccentric, beggar)" [14, p. 305]. The innovative significance of this work is that M. M. Bakhtin considers sentimentalism not in the context of the struggle of literary trends and schools, but in the light of the most important processes from the history of language and within the framework of his own philosophical concept: the word exists, being colored and imbued with tone, laughter and tears. This work, despite its concise form, will have a significant impact on the most conceptual and fundamental studies of sentimentalism in the second half of the 20th century.

The study of sentimentalism in the middle of the 20th century (1950s–1960s) was marked by the clarification of some provisions on the origin and development of this trend. In the book *The History of Russian Literature of the 18th Century*, D. D. Blagoy expresses the idea of continuity between A. P. Sumarokov and sentimentalists and notes a prominent change in attitude to the word: prose with the ambiguity of expressing thoughts and feelings comes to the place of poetry with the conditional determinism of the classical language [15, p. 232]. The thesis about the special role of A. P. Sumarokov for the development of sentimentalism is confirmed in the article by K. A. Nazaretskaya on the extensive material of publications in magazines of that time. So, it was A. P. Sumarokov who expressed the idea of the absence of innate concepts, thereby agreeing with the thought of J. Locke, and supported the development of such topics as demonstration of feelings, appeal to nature and folk lyrics, reflection on death, humility before life and a contemplative look at it in magazines [16, p. 14–5]. Research by L. I. Kulakova's study of the history of aesthetics allowed us to state a large number of translations of foreign literature in the 1770s, which demonstrates not only the intensity of the development of sentimentalism, but also the diversity of its national variants (French, German and English) on Russian soil [17, p. 184–5]. The seriousness of the foreign literary works impact on the Russian public is manifested in the emergence of a sentimental cult of friendship with a woman who feels

more deeply and subtly compared to a man and therefore is able to ennoble the soul of the interlocutor [17, p. 202].

The works of G. N. Pospelov, written in the early 1970s, are the important milestone in the historiography of sentimentalism. In the book called “Problems of Literary Style”, the scientist conducts a thorough analysis of the genre specifics and poetic style of M. M. Kheraskov, N. M. Karamzin and V. A. Zhukovsky. It allows him to prove the thesis about the emergence of sentimentalist tendencies already in the 1760s [18], expressed in an early work of the 1940s in a polemic with G. A. Gukovsky. In addition, G. N. Pospelov refers the early work of V. A. Zhukovsky to the peaks of Russian sentimentalism. An even more conceptual study of the scientist is the book called *Problems of the Historical Development of Literature*, which offers a new perspective on the study of sentimentalism. The main attention in the monograph is paid to the issues of poetics and is reflected in the author’s programmatic statement: “The poetics of content, reflecting the stable properties of artistic content in different epochs, can become a means of transition from the factual level of research of individual writers and works to an in-depth study of the literary process as a whole” [19, p. 6]. G. N. Pospelov considers the pathos of the work to be an important aspect of the content — the author’s personal attitude to the events and the nature of their reflection. Consideration of the poetics of the content leads the scientist to identify six forms of pathos: heroics, tragedy, drama, sentimentality, humor and satire.

According to G. N. Pospelov’s concept, the first three forms of pathos are generated by internal and external conflicts with dynamic actions, while the fourth is created not by actions, but by the inconsistency of the heroes’ characters, their lives and their consciousness. Of course, the pathos of sentimentality is most fully reflected in sentimentalism, but it can manifest itself both at an earlier and later time, which resembles the breadth of approach to this phenomenon in the works of M. M. Bakhtin. Moreover, G. N. Pospelov explains in more detail the difference between sentimentality and sensitivity: “the second arises from weakness of nerves, irritability or enthusiasm, and the first is a personal psychological phenomenon caused by ideological comprehension of a certain inconsistency in people’s social characters: the ability to see in external insignificance a manifestation of moral and internal significance presupposes the presence of mental reflection” [19, p. 95–6]. No less significant is the distinction between sentimentality and romance, which is defined by the scientist as “the ability of a human personality not only to rise to emotional self-awareness and self-determination, but also to accept an exalted, superpersonal, social ideal” [19, p. 118–9]. Thus, the understanding of sentimentality proposed by G. N. Pospelov not only gives it a universal character and historical seriousness, but also actualizes the question of the specifics of its manifestation in the very direction of sentimentalism.

It seems indicative that the period of the 1970s–1980s is distinguished by the deepening of the problematic and the appearance of monographic studies on sentimentalism, demonstrating different approaches to this phenomenon. In his book on sentimental prose, S. E. Pavlovich conducts a detailed analysis of its content, plot, motives and notes the heterogeneity of sentimentalism: the appeal to feelings was manifested in their diversity among various authors, and increased sensitivity combined with less variability of stylistic and genre forms in the work of epigones led to the impoverishment of works and the disintegration of the sentimental story [20, p. 193–4]. In addition, the author highlights romantic features in the work of N. M. Karamzin, which, taking into account the

long coexistence of sentimentalism and classicism, allows him to conclude about a small number of sentimental works. Another monograph is the study of P. A. Orlov, who presents sentimentalism as an integral phenomenon in culture at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. The rationale for this view is to identify the commonality between sentimentalism and classicism, which have a normative ideal that goes back to enlightenment thought [21, p.28]. The scientist identifies four stages of the development of sentimentalism in literature (1760–1775, 1776–1789, 1789–1796 and 1797–1811) and considers it in various fields of literary creativity (poetry, prose and dramaturgy). In addition, P. A. Orlov identifies noble and democratic trends: the scientist attributes the work of M. M. Kheraskov, M. N. Muravyov, I. I. Dmitriev, N. M. Karamzin, N. A. Lvov and P. I. Shalikov to the first, and the work of A. N. Radishchev, N. S. Smirnov A. M. Martynov to the second.

Such a large-scale approach of P. A. Orlov, including all the art of the era under study in the mainstream of sentimentalism, causes the need to clarify the boundaries between different trends at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, especially between sentimentalism and pre-romanticism. V. I. Fedorov considers the work of N. M. Karamzin and M. N. Muravyov as a transition from sentimentalism to romanticism, but at the same time does not identify specific features related to different directions [22; 23]. V. A. Fedorov considers the work of N. M. Karamzin and M. N. Muravyov as a transition from sentimentalism to romanticism. V. A. Zapadov notes the absence of a developed definition of pre-romanticism and still sharply separates it from sentimentalism, which for the scientist turns out to be the reverse version of classicism: the replacement of the ideal of citizenship with the cult of sensitivity is combined with the preservation of the former system, demonstrating the predominance of middle genres. All this allows V. A. Zapadov to conclude that sentimentalism was a dead-end development option compared to pre-romanticism, which led either to romanticism or realism [24, p. 148–9]. The reverse tendency to expand the boundaries of sentimentalism is distinguished by V. I. Kaminsky's article. He includes various writers in this direction: V. Hugo, R. L. Stevenson, Ch. Dickens, E. M. Remarque, F. M. Dostoevsky, L. N. Tolstoy and A. P. Chekhov. The scientist obviously relies on the ideas of M. M. Bakhtin and G. N. Pospelov about sentimentalism as a universal phenomenon in the history of literature. But he also considers the topic without the necessary level of validity of conclusions in this case. Abstract phrases such as the harmonization of reason and feelings, the defense of humanism and the transitivity of art [25, p. 137] do not allow the author to argue the commonality of the method of writers belonging to different countries, epochs and literary trends.

The problem of determining the essence of sentimentalism is supplemented in the scientific tradition of the 1980s by a more careful study of the English literature role for the development of this trend in Russia. It was this period that was marked by the post-humous publication of the famous scientist V. M. Zhirmunsky's collection of works. He reveals the typical features of English sentimentalism [26] and pre-romanticism [27]. An important place in this direction is occupied by the fundamental work of Y. D. Levin on the reception of English influence in Russia. The scientist calls the disillusionment of the advanced nobility in the ideals of enlightened absolutism and the growing popularity of Masonic organizations in which the cult of feeling was established as the origins of Russian sentimentalism [28, p. 141]. At the same time, Y. D. Levin notes the prominent specificity of the Russian version of this trend: the idyllic image of rural life, embodied in English

literature, becomes an arbitrary pastoral in Russia under the conditions of serfdom [28, p. 168], which determined the social system of the state and the peculiarities of cultural development.

Modern studies of sentimentalism (since the 1990s) take into account the achievements of previous stages and combine the detail of the consideration of the material with great attention to methodological issues. Special attention should be paid to the study of N. D. Kochetkova, which is the most fundamental consideration of sentimentalism in the field of literature. The author's methodology is based on the idea of the importance of studying different layers of sentimentalism from the largest representatives to epigones, which often most clearly express the essence of the entire trend [29, p. 10]. Kochetkova pays considerable attention to the reconstruction of the worldview peculiar to the main figures of sentimentalism in literature. The philosophical paradigm of this trend is characterized by a combination of the ideas of R. Descartes, who is considered the founder of rationalism, with the thoughts of J. Locke, who belongs to the prominent representatives of sensualism [29, p. 34]. The understanding of progress demonstrates some independence of Russian writers from the philosophy of J.-J. Rousseau: the idea of a "natural man" meant the ability to appreciate nature and at the same time preserve the benefits of an enlightened lifestyle [29, p. 48].

The scientist offers a thorough analysis of the categories that make it possible to determine the aesthetic program of sentimentalism. Of particular importance is the interpretation of the problem of imitation: on the one hand, representatives of sentimentalism retain the classicist idea of "elegant nature", and on the other hand, they defend simplicity, naturalness and proximity to nature [29, p. 93]. Such a rethinking of the role of rules and authorities leads to a more complex concept of taste, which is completely beyond the control of reason and has an emotional nature [29, p. 103]. This, in turn, determines the change in attitude to the category of the sublime, which is based on the deep emotional impact of art [29, p. 118]. In this regard, in the domestic tradition of sentimentalism, an extremely original definition of beauty arises, which not only assumes the relationship of goodness and happiness, but is also the source of both [29, p. 136]. The importance of the ethical moment, which goes back to the traditions of Russian culture, affects the question of the purpose of art: the preservation of the criterion of benefit is complemented by the idea of the imperceptible influence of morality and the dependence of the evaluation of the work on the moral qualities of its author [29, p. 149].

No less significant merit of N. D. Kochetkova is the consideration of the problem of personality in sentimentalism, which manifests itself in the understanding of both the author and the hero of the work. This direction creates a new idea of a person, which demonstrates the strengthening of the role of the narrator responsible for expressing the author's ideas [29, p. 74]. In accordance with this idea, the image of the creator is also formed, which is distinguished by selflessness, remoteness from secular life, sensitivity of the heart and the ability to compassion [29, p. 149]. When discussing the problem of the hero, the scientist refers to the scientific concept of M. M. Bakhtin and also expresses the idea that the psychologization of characters makes it possible to overcome the one-linedness so characteristic of the literature of classicism [29, p. 156]. One of the main features of a character in sentimentalism turns out to be love for a book: reading during a lonely walk helps to recognize the hero, and reading together brings the participants of the

scene closer together, which allows you to uncover the problem of experiencing a literary image in your own life [29, p. 159]. Another feature is the great attention to portrait and landscape in the literature of sentimentalism. Beauty is understood as an internal quality (replacing “beautiful” with “dear”) and is manifested in gestures and facial expressions and eyes, which indicates the richness of inner experiences. Nature occupies a key place in a person’s life, helping to understand himself and leave everything artificial for the sake of the true and natural: this leads Russian writers to deify nature and to carefully depict its national characteristics [29, p. 215–6]. Thus, the monograph of N. D. Kochetkova is distinguished by thoroughness and exhaustive completeness, allowing identifying the philosophical origins, ideological foundations, aesthetic principles, genre-thematic features of sentimentalism as the most important literary trend at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries.

M. V. Ivanov offers a problematic approach to the study of sentimentalism. He published a book with the characteristic title “The Fate of Russian Sentimentalism”. The scientist carefully and in detail examines the historiography of the issue and identifies the reason for the uncertainty and unexplored sentimentalism: in relation to classicism, he destroyed normativity, but in relation to romanticism and realism, he is only a transitional stage, all the features of which seem weakly expressed in comparison with them. In this regard, the positive qualities of sentimentalism are common to all subsequent literature, which complicates the task of highlighting them [30, p. 44]. The approach to the consideration of sentimentalism turns out to be extremely fruitful: the author combines G. N. Pospelov’s ideas about poetics to study the problem of “style and method” with the concept of “idyllic chronotope”, which dates back to the works of M. M. Bakhtin. Chronotope refers to the unity of spatial and temporal relations aimed at expressing a certain meaning. The term was first introduced in the theory of relativity (A. Einstein), then used in psychology (A. A. Ukhtomsky) and transferred to literary studies (M. M. Bakhtin). An idyllic chronotope is such a space-time organization of the text that embodies “idyllic time”: it combines the predominance of values of the heart and the displacement of evil outside, which determines the opposition of the small world of home comfort to the big world of falsehood. Thus, relying on the two most fundamental approaches in the historiography of sentimentalism (M. M. Bakhtin and G. N. Pospelov) allows M. V. Ivanov to develop the potential of the ideas embedded in them and present the essence of this phenomenon in a conceptual form.

The main characteristic of sentimentalism in Russian culture, according to M. V. Ivanov, is the artistic design of the existence of a small group (family, circle of friends), which manifested itself in the development of estates, contemplation of nature, the elaboration of feelings, the explore of past epochs (antiquity, Renaissance, Baroque). This allowed Russian culture not only to restore the unity of man with nature, but also to join the European tradition. Such a functional understanding of the direction contributes to the rethinking of the entire system of artistic trends at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. Attention to a small group, embodied in sentimentalism, complements the development of a large group in classicism (the state) and opposes the artistic cosmos of individuality in romanticism [30, p. 173]. Such a clear understanding of culture at the systemic level leads to clarification of two important problems in historiography — the relationship of sentimentalism with classicism and pre-romanticism. M. V. Ivanov notes that “pre-romanticism (if

it is worth highlighting it) implies a sharp subjectivization of behavior in the context of a large group. Pure classicism, as well as pure sentimentalism, strives for universality: the first one is civil, rational, culturally unified, the second one is emotional, family, friendly” [30, p. 169]. As a result, the scientist concludes that these trends were not just analogues of European trends, but artistic worlds that absorbed the cultural experience of Europe from antiquity to the present.

In addition, M. V. Ivanov examines figurative models and narrative structures characteristic of sentimentalism and subsequent literature. Firstly, this direction occupies a special place in the development of the Russian language, largely preparing the work of A. S. Pushkin: “precision”, often associated with this style, in historical perspective turns out to be a means of simplifying the language compared to the “high style” of the previous time [30, p. 35]. Secondly, sentimentalism is cyclical in understanding the category of time: a clear sequence is characteristic not only for nature (times of day — seasons), but also for human life (child — old man) [30, p. 63]. Thirdly, the appearance of naturalness as a criterion for assessing reality modifies not only the circle of heroes, but also the subject matter of works: attention to female and child characters actualizes family and pedagogical issues, which are reflected in most works of this direction [30, p. 131–2]. Fourthly, the poetization and aestheticization of everyday life leads to sociocultural changes in society: principles such as freedom of feelings, warmth of relationships, inviolability of intimate life and the importance of empathy allow us to measure the phenomenon of large groups (society, nation, state) by the scale of humanity [30, p. 164]. Thus, M. V. Ivanov reveals the historical validity and philosophical essence of sentimentalism, largely realizing M. M. Bakhtin’s idea of the usefulness and significance of this trend in the history of world culture.

An interesting view of the problem is found in the methodological articles of A. S. Kurilov, who considers the transition from the reflection of the general to the particular to be the fundamental boundary between classicism and sentimentalism [31, p. 200]. This allows the author to propose a new principle of separation of sentimentalism: an original work reflecting national traits and themes becomes sentimental, and imitating Western European samples (regardless of their origin) becomes classicistic due to compliance with the theory of imitation inherent in this direction [31, p. 202]. Changing the classification principle makes it possible to expand the range of terms used: thus, romantic and sentimental classicism arise, which is defined as imitation of already known clichés. However, an increase in the number of concepts does not guarantee a detailed understanding of each of them individually and the identification of their artistic specifics. A curious trend is the study of sentimentalism poetry in the works of A. N. Pashkurov [32], who combines careful consideration of works with their philosophical understanding.

Thus, the study of the historiography of sentimentalism in literary studies has revealed the origin and development of the main ideas in accordance with the chronological principle. As a result, such important problems as the time of the emergence of sentimentalism, the influence of foreign literary works on its development, the correlation of the direction with other trends of the era, its aesthetic program and genre-thematic structure of works have received significant development in scientific literature. The chronological principle can now be supplemented by a problematic understanding of the main methodological approaches used by scientists of different generations. The most widespread

in literary studies is the historical approach to the study of sentimentalism, which was especially actively present in the scientific tradition of the late 19th — first half of the 20th century in different variants. The origins of the sentimentalism study at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries are characterized by a combination of genetic and monographic perspectives.

The genetic method aims to determine the causes and sources of Russian sentimentalism, which was significantly influenced by Western European literary traditions: the main personalities and directions associated with them were identified in the works of A. N. Veselovsky and M. N. Rozanov (L. Stern — England, J.-J. Rousseau — France, J. G. Herder — Germany). During the Soviet period, the attention of researchers was attracted by the problems of translation of foreign works (works by L. V. Pumpyansky and L. I. Kulakova) and reception of English influence (works by V. M. Zhirmunsky and Y. D. Levin). Review of Russian sentimentalism in the context of European culture is the advantage of this method, and the disadvantage is the shift of emphasis from the phenomenon under study to the causes of its occurrence or sources: such a situation can lead to the absolutization of the influence factor and insufficient study of the Russian sentimentalism specifics.

The monographic method is characterized by a thorough study of the creative biography of an individual writer or poet of the sentimentalism era. Already V. V. Sipovsky and A. N. Veselovsky were striving for a comprehensive representation of the work of the main writers at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries — N. M. Karamzin and V. A. Zhukovsky. This tradition was continued during the Soviet period and led to the scientific study of all prominent representatives of the sentimentalism literature: N. M. Karamzin [33], A. N. Radishchev [34], M. N. Muravyov [35; 36], I. I. Dmitriev [37], V. V. Kapnist [38], N. A. Lvov [39], G. P. Kamenev [40] and S. S. Bobrov [41]. This method allows us to determine the features of the creative approach on the basis of all available materials, but hardly contributes to the creation of ideas about the literary direction as a whole, which is necessary to identify its role in the culture of the second half of the 18th century.

The third important direction is the chronological method, which involves determining the period of the emergence of sentimentalism in Russian literature. It should be noted that this issue was especially actively discussed in scientific circles in the first decades of the Soviet period (1920s–1940s). Scientific publications of this time demonstrate the discussion between the early (era of Peter the Great in the works of V. V. Sipovsky) and the late (1770s in the works of G. A. Gukovsky) variants, which culminates in a convincing attribution of sentimentalism to the 1760s in G. N. Pospelov's concept. This question loses scientific interest in the second half of the 20th century and practically does not attract the attention of modern researchers. In other words, this method is an important milestone in the history of the study of sentimentalism, but it lacks scientific relevance due to its factual nature.

The fourth direction is a concrete historical method that seeks to directly study sentimentalism as a phenomenon of a certain era. A small volume of research is devoted to clarifying important aspects for understanding this literary trend: for example, D. D. Blagoy notes a new understanding of the word in the literature of sentimentalism, and K. A. Nazaretskaya notes the role of A. P. Sumarokov's creativity in its development. The large-scale study (P. A. Orlov's monograph) is characterized by an exaggeration of the role of sentimentalism in the artistic situation of the time when all the art of the era under

study is included in its framework, which indicates some limitations of the concrete historical method due to insufficient attention to both other factors of cultural development and methodological issues.

Consideration of various methods of the historical approach to sentimentalism demonstrates not only the objective significance of the results in specific issues (sources, main personalities, time of origin, features of development), but also some limitations, which manifests itself in an unexpressed tendency to problematic coverage of the topic. The creation of more promising concepts turned out to be possible when going beyond the strict historical approach. A special role in this context belongs to the scientific research of M. M. Bakhtin, who offers a philosophical approach to describe sentimentalism. This concept lacks the accuracy of historical facts, but has enormous ideological potential, denoting the essence and significance of sentimentalism as a special phenomenon in the history of world culture. It is Bakhtin's idea that will have a serious impact on the scientific research of sentimentalism in the second half of the 20th century.

An important place in the historiography of sentimentalism is occupied by G. N. Pospelov's research, which can be attributed to a general theoretical approach. The study of the poetics of the content leads the author to identify six forms of pathos of the work, among which sentimentality is described. G. N. Pospelov understands sentimentality as a universal category that can manifest itself in a variety of epochs and at the same time differs from both sensitivity and romance. Such an interpretation of sentimentalism strengthens the scientific problems of the phenomenon and determines the emergence of new approaches to its study.

One of them is the genre-thematic approach embodied in S. E. Pavlovich's research. Consideration of sentimentalism as an artistic system allows the author to identify the range of interpretation of feelings in the works of major writers, minor authors and epigones by analyzing the content, plots and motives. This approach not only demonstrates the essence of sentimentalism at the systemic level, but also describes the artistic structure inherent in the works of sentimentalism. A further development of the idea can be considered A. N. Pashkurov's approach, which analyzes the genre-thematic features of works of sentimentalism with a great emphasis on formal analysis, which has been marked by increased interest of scientists since the 1990s. Another direction is the methodological approach, which is reflected in the writings of A. S. Kurilov. The scientist seeks to create general principles of classification that will allow distinguishing such complex concepts as classicism, sentimentalism and romanticism in a consistent way. This approach helps to clarify the nature of each phenomenon individually, but the appearance of additional definitions (for example, romantic classicism) can lead to a complication of the overall picture of artistic development in the culture of the 18th century.

The productive development of numerous methodological approaches in the second half of the 20th century resulted in the creation of two fundamental studies that differ in the conceptual unification of various scientific traditions — the works of N. D. Kochetkova and M. V. Ivanov. Kochetkova's work combines the traditions of a historical approach with attention to methodological issues (identifying the specifics of sentimentalism against the background of classicism and Romanticism) on the extensive material of literary monuments. The author's goal is to reconstruct the ideological foundations of representatives of Russian sentimentalism, which makes it possible to call her approach historical and

aesthetic. N. D. Kochetkova not only thoroughly examines the key aspects in the chosen perspective (the category of beauty, understanding of nature, the concept of man), but also reveals the characteristic features of the national tradition reflected in the development of Russian sentimentalism.

Ivanov's research offers a completely different approach to the study of this phenomenon. The combination of Bakhtin's philosophical ideas and Pospelov's general theoretical propositions allows the author to propose a non-historical approach, which is characterized by a detailed description of sentimentalism as a universal phenomenon of world culture (the first attempt — Kaminsky's work — is characterized by insufficient persuasiveness). Such a statement of the question determines the shift of emphasis from the period of the immediate heyday of sentimentalism to the literary tradition of a later time, in which the ideals and artistic principles of this trend are embodied. Ivanov's research cannot be called exhaustive in the sense of historical fact, but it is a unique example of understanding sentimentalism as a timeless phenomenon.

Thus, the historiographical review allows us to conclude that Russian literary criticism has formulated a large number of approaches to the study of sentimentalism. The first important direction is the historical approach, which was especially actively developed in the late 19th — first half of the 20th century and includes several angles:

- 1) genetic method (A. N. Veselovsky, M. N. Rozanov, L. V. Pumpyansky, L. I. Kulakova, V. M. Zhirmunsky, Y. D. Levin);
- 2) monographic method (V. V. Sipovsky, A. N. Veselovsky and a significant group of Soviet and modern authors: G. P. Makogonenko, Y. M. Lotman, V. N. Toporov and others);
- 3) chronological method (V. V. Sipovsky, G. A. Gukovsky, G. N. Pospelov);
- 4) concrete historical method (D. D. Blagoy, K. A. Nazaretskaya, P. A. Orlov).

The second direction arises in the middle of the 20th century and is characterized by the rejection of a strict historical approach to strengthen the problems in the study of sentimentalism. Within the framework of this direction, the following scientific approaches should be distinguished:

- 1) philosophical approach (M. M. Bakhtin);
- 2) general theoretical approach (G. N. Pospelov);
- 3) genre-thematic approach (S. E. Pavlovich);
- 4) methodological approach (A. S. Kurilov);
- 5) historic and aesthetic approach (N. D. Kochetkova);
- 6) non-historical approach (V. I. Kaminsky and M. V. Ivanov).

Against the background of such a long and fruitful tradition of literary criticism, the study of sentimentalism in art criticism remains limited: there are currently no large-scale works on this direction in painting. Separate judgments about this phenomenon can be found in numerous Soviet monographs devoted to the work of V. L. Borovikovsky, as well as in studies on romanticism, which pay some attention to sentimentalism to compare the two directions. In this regard, the reconstruction of scientific views on sentimentalism in painting will require not a chronological, as was the case with literary studies, but a problem-thematic approach, which includes several aspects: a general idea of the phenome-

non, its correlation with stylistic categories at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries and the characteristic of the pictorial features of this direction.

To understand the general thought, the idea that sentimentalism emerged in the end of the 18th century as a reaction to the excessively rational nature of the Enlightenment thinking system and sought to rethink its principles is important. The prominence of emotional perception and the moral principle demonstrated some limitations of the views of the enlighteners, who encouraged the improvement of only the intellectual abilities of a person to the detriment of the feelings field, which hindered his harmonious development as a whole personality. Therefore, the rehabilitation of the emotional sphere of human activity was an important achievement of this artistic direction [42, p. 51]. The increased attention to the feelings of the individual was justified by the representatives of sentimentalism by their simplicity, naturalness and comprehensibility for everyone, regardless of age, gender and education, due to their innate nature [3, p. 130]. Moreover, the inner world of a person included not only stable feelings, but also fleeting moods, the comprehension of which was another merit of sentimentalism [43, p. 9]. Interest in the fleeting was expressed in a more subtle understanding and feeling of works of art and nature, which, according to the ideas of that time, sharpened the senses and the ability to perceive [44, p. 247].

The appeal to the inner world of a person and his feelings was combined in sentimentalism with attention to social relations, which were recognized as unfair because of social inequality, which determined the elitist nature of culture. An important idea of the supporters of this trend was to rethink the attitude towards the common man, who ceased to be perceived as part of an uneducated people and could have greater spiritual wealth than a representative of an enlightened society [42, p. 50]. In other words, sentimentalism had a certain ethical program that arose to express current problems at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries [1, p. 51]. Perhaps the main one was the deepening of the conflict between the individual and society, which consisted in the desire to engage in spiritual self-improvement and spend time in the family circle or in nature, and most fully expressed in the field of fine art in portraiture.

If we talk about the approaches of Soviet scientists to the portrait of the era of sentimentalism, then the question of its compliance with the concept of “style” comes to the fore — a question that has no methodological certainty today and causes an ambiguous attitude to this phenomenon. At the same time, it should be noted that the very idea of correlating the portrait genre with stylistic categories poses many difficulties to the researcher throughout the 18th century [45]. N. N. Kovalenskaya denied the existence of the sentimentalism style, since “it was not only not associated with monumental art, but also did not create any new forms for its expression” [46, p. 246]. A. M. Kantor was less categorical, expressing the idea that there was no need for a special stylistic design, which did not cancel the presence of some features [47, p. 27], and O. S. Evangulova noted in it the lack of completeness of unique features [48, p. 84]. V. S. Turchin paid the greatest attention to the problem of sentimentalism in painting in numerous works. The scientist wrote about the uncertainty of the stylistic face of sentimentalism [49, p. 11], but at the same time, recognized the complexity and importance of its scientific study [50, p. 146], as well as its presence in all significant artistic phenomena at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries [44, p. 136]. The latter idea was confirmed by the main researcher of Borovikovsky’s creativity,

T. V. Alekseeva, who wrote about the influence of sentimentalism on masters who worked in other directions [42, p. 54].

Such ambiguity of judgments about sentimentalism reflects its duality, which is simultaneously expressed in sadness about the past and in a dream about the future [3, p. 378]. This direction was the basis for the education of young people in the 1790s, who later became neoclassics or romantics with equal success [44, p. 378]. It is precisely the borderline position of sentimentalism in the system of stylistic trends at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries that explains the desire of researchers to identify its specifics by comparing it with artistic trends that have definiteness of concepts and a stable tradition of study — with classicism and romanticism.

Supporters of the rapprochement of sentimentalism with classicism noted their parallel development and similarity in general attention to the human personality and in recognition of the right to inner peace, despite the different understanding of the relationship between man and society [51, p. 111]. In this case, the idea of their similarity is based on the predominance of classicism at that time and on the belief that any portraitist had a certain ideal of personality, inevitably attaching him to the neoclassic [51, p. 251]. T. V. Alekseeva found common ground between classicism and sentimentalism in the presence of a moral and didactic social tendency, which gives restraint to the artistic features of the works [52, p. 8]. Nevertheless, T. V. Alekseeva's reflections had a contradictory character: on the one hand, this direction continues the achievements of Enlightenment culture, deepening the sensual aspect, which was not the most developed in the previous time [42, p. 51], and on the other hand, it completes the enlightenment era, thereby acting as an old rather than a new art [53, p. 10]. D. V. Sarabyanov justified the similarity of these trends by the factor of influences, which manifested itself in stable ties with English culture [54, p. 106].

Supporters of the rapprochement of sentimentalism with romanticism attributed both directions to those who reinterpreted the tradition of the 18th century and thereby expressed the creative quest inherent in the new art. V. S. Turchin wrote that sentimentalism acted as an opposition to classicism: based on the principles of Enlightenment, it strengthened feelings and developed Rococo stylistics [1, p. 50–1]. The connection of these trends is also due to the birth of romanticism in the depths of sentimentalism, which determined the commonality of important themes: “the cult of virgin nature, interest in the individualization of feelings, emphasis on human existence, subjectivization of the artistic form” [3, p. 376]. It is curious that even the “English factor” gets a different reading: O. S. Evangulova believed that the fascination with England and sentimentalism can be assessed as a kind of Fronde and a claim to exclusivity in the noble environment with the existing pro-French orientation of culture [55, p. 195–6].

The less convincing expression of the inner state of the model in sentimentalism explains its association with pre-romanticism existing in the scientific literature, which forms one common stage of art for the development of the romantic movement in the early 19th century [56, p. 130], although there has long been a position separating these two phenomena [46, p. 251–2]. The desire to see pre-romanticism in the art of sentimentalism can be explained by the influence of the aesthetic views of the romantic era, which perceived earlier works as its own prehistory, demonstrating stylistic continuity: “the facts

preceding this system, described in its terms, can naturally lead only to it and only in it find unity and certainty” [57, p.95].

Nevertheless, the presence of separate features that demonstrate the commonality between sentimentalism and romanticism does not negate their fundamental differences in some important aspects. Firstly, a characteristic feature of romanticism is the creation of works against the background of great social upheavals [3, p. 36], as well as their increased internal dynamics, contributing to the fixation of the brightest moment of the internal state of the model [58, p.194]. Secondly, sentimentalist portraiture is characterized by naturalness in depicting a person in a landscape [58, p. 185], whereas in romantic art, the relationship between the model and nature in the space of the work is expressed through the opposition of a person and the world around him [3, p.245]. Thirdly, these trends relate differently to allegory, which occupies a significant place in the artistic system of classicism: if in sentimentalism it receives a more intimate meaning, then in romanticism it is absent as a technique used [3, p.252].

In other words, the desire to explain the specifics of sentimentalism through comparison with classicism or romanticism inevitably turns out to be unsuccessful, being based on the idea of the initial dependence of this phenomenon on more well-known trends. Moreover, this approach does not imply a careful study of the artistic features of sentimentalism portraiture, which does not allow determining its place in the Russian visual culture of the late 18th — early 19th century. All of the above is confirmed by the characteristic of sentimentalism painting, which has established itself in the Russian scientific literature. So, T. V. Alekseeva expressed the idea of combining increased emotionality with the ideality of artistic language, which causes some restraint of images [58, p. 185]. The most general idea of sentimentalism in painting was formulated by V. S. Turchin, who attributed to his typical features “interest in the emotional world of man, the motives of nature, the difference in the interpretation of male and female images, the rejection of the representative form” [3, p. 131] and wrote about their further development in the era of romanticism.

Such abstraction of ideas about sentimentalism painting in the modern historiography of Russian art, which is characterized by an insignificant number of unlit subjects, demonstrates the obvious complexity of studying this phenomenon in accordance with the scientific approaches of the previous time. Moreover, it allows us to conclude that the difficulties of the Soviet scientific school were due to the methodological principles used in the study of sentimentalism. Already in the first half of the 20th century, the idea of sentimentalism as an antisocial movement was widespread [51, p.234], which was associated with the inclusion of A. N. Radishchev and N. M. Karamzin in this direction (without sufficient differentiation of their views that currently exists) and determined a weak interest in its study. However, the works of T. V. Alekseeva and V. S. Turchin had a greater influence on the degree and nature of the study of sentimentalism.

T. V. Alekseeva was the main specialist in the work of V. L. Borovikovsky and largely determined the scientific approach applied to the whole direction. From a methodological point of view, the scientist’s concept had internal contradictions: calling for seeing in individual creativity the features of the historically natural and thoughtfully using generalizing definitions when considering individual works [58, p.197], she at the same time considered the expansion of factual material to be the main condition for enriching theoretical thought [53, p.17]. In addition, the actual material meant a database of sources, and not

a collection of works of art, which was not subjected to a formal description, “replacing a genuine insight into artistic features, into the meaning of the monument” [53, p. 7]. In other words, the portrait of sentimentalism, characterized by a variety of picturesque shades in the works of different masters, turned out to be devoid of an attentive art history description due to prejudice against the formal method of H. Wölfflin, which was generally characteristic of the Soviet scientific tradition.

The approach of V.S. Turchin seemed potentially more promising. In his numerous works he aspired to a problematic consideration of art at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries as an integral epoch, which is especially interesting in the context of the research topic, taking into account the convergence of romanticism and sentimentalism as trends of new art. Nevertheless, the scientist considered these phenomena quite generically, justifying this by the elusiveness of romanticism for historical analysis. Turchin proposed to study the art of the romantic era on a large scale, which meant attracting a literary context, since “the descriptive method of characterizing romanticism, no matter how detailed, is now failing” [3, p. 11]. It is curious that such a panoramic approach was applied not only to paintings, but also to aesthetic texts [3, p. 48], as well as to legends about artists [3, p. 87]. As a result, the scientist contradicted himself: the era of romanticism made a great contribution to the analysis of the artistic form and the development of formal categories [3, p. 49], but at the same time it cannot be studied by means of its own methodology.

So, the historiographical review demonstrates that, the consideration of sentimentalism in the history of Russian art is characterized by generalization of ideas and a small number of scientific approaches, in comparison with literary studies. On the one hand, in the scientific literature, portrait painting of sentimentalism is understood as an important and self-sufficient phenomenon in the artistic situation at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, possessing a certain ethical program. On the other hand, the statement about the existence of stable artistic features that distinguish sentimentalism from classicism and romanticism often remains declarative and devoid of the necessary specifics, which determines the lack of knowledge of this phenomenon at the present stage. This state of affairs can be explained by the specifics of the scientific tradition used in Soviet times to study sentimentalism. Firstly, consideration of this phenomenon in the context of trends with more pronounced features (classicism and romanticism) is difficult, due to both the variety of artistic trends in painting of the 1790s, and a certain independence of the portrait genre from stylistic categories in general. Secondly, the main methodological attitudes peculiar to scientists of the past are characterized either by the denial of the formal method, or by the recognition of its uselessness in the study of art at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries.

All of the above gives the author the opportunity to conclude that a more attentive attitude to the artistic features of the works will potentially allow us to determine the pictorial system and the portrait concept of sentimentalism, and furthermore we can concretize its features in comparison with works defined as classicism or romanticism. Moreover, the works of some modern authors testify to the rehabilitation of formal analysis in the visual arts after the Soviet period [59, p. 8], which corresponds to the latest studies of sentimentalism in literary criticism (works by A. N. Pashkurov). Nevertheless, close attention to the issues of art form is far from the only method for studying portraiture at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries.

Firstly, a rather promising direction is the consideration of the metamorphoses of the portrait genre in typological terms for the study of how the techniques of ceremonial and chamber images are combined in the works of this time, which also correlates with the genre-thematic study of the literature of sentimentalism (works by S. E. Pavlovich). Secondly, another relevant approach is the research of the Russian portrait of the 1790s in close relationship with European artistic processes, which not only corresponds to works dedicated to sentimentalism on literary studies, but also implies the development of the concept of D. V. Sarabyanov, applied to the art of the 19th century [60], for an earlier period. Thirdly, turning to modern concepts of sentimentalism in the field of literary studies for the history of art seems to be a logical step to update approaches. Thus, Kochetkova's historical and aesthetic approach allows reconstructing the ideological principles of sentimentalism, and Ivanov's non-historical approach makes it possible to comprehend it as a universal phenomenon in the history of world culture. These ideas have a high scientific potential for the study of portraiture, which not only reflects the attitude of the individual, but also gives an idea of the ideological foundations in the culture of sentimentalism (understanding of beauty, nature and man).

References

1. Turchin, Valerii. "Russian Portrait of the Romantic Epoch". PhD diss., Moscow State University, 1969. (In Russian)
2. Lapshina, Natal'ia. *Russian Art of the 18th Century*. Moscow: Akademiia Khudozhestv SSSR Publ., 1963. (In Russian)
3. Turchin, Valerii. *Epoch of Romantism in Russia: to the History of Russian Art of the First Third of the 19th Century*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 1981. (In Russian)
4. Berkov, Pavel. *Problems of Historical Development of Literature*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura Publ., 1981. (In Russian)
5. Veselovskii, Aleksandr. *Western Influence in Russian Literature*. Moscow: Kushnerev i K Publ., 1916. (In Russian)
6. Sipovskii, Vasilii. *Karamzin — the Author of "Letters of Russian Traveller"*. St Petersburg: Tipografia V. Demakova Publ., 1899. (In Russian)
7. Rozanov, Matvei. *J.-J. Rousseau and Literary Movement in the End of the 18th Century — Early 19th Century*. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1910. (In Russian)
8. Veselovskii, Aleksandr. *V. A. Zhukovsky. Poetry of Feeling and Hearty Imagination*. St Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Akademiia khudozhestv Publ., 1904. (In Russian)
9. Sakulin, Pavel. *Russian Literature. Socio-synthetic Review of Literary Styles*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk Publ., 1929, vol. 2 (In Russian)
10. Gukovskii, Grigorii. "At the Origins of Russian Sentimentalism". In Gukovskii, Grigorii. *Ocherki po istorii russkoi literatury i obshchestvennoi mysli XVIII veka*, 235–314. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura Publ., 1938. (In Russian)
11. Gukovskii, Grigorii. *Russian Literature of the 18th Century*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura Publ., 1939. (In Russian)
12. Pumpianskii, Lev. "Sentimentalism". In *Istoriia russkoi literatury*. 10 vols, ed. by Grigorii Gukovskii and Vasilii Desnitskii, 430–45. Moscow; Leningrad: Akademiia Nauk SSSR Publ., 1947, vol. IV, part 2. (In Russian)
13. Pospelov, Gennadii. "At the Origin of Russian Sentimentalism". *Vestnik MGU*, no. 1 (1948): 3–27. (In Russian)
14. Bakhtin, Mikhail. "The Problem of Sentimentalism". In Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 7 vols, 304–5. Moscow: Russkie slovari Publ., 1997, vol. 5. (In Russian)
15. Blagoi, Dmitrii. *The History of Russian Literature of the 18th Century*. Moscow: Uchpedgiz Publ., 1960. (In Russian)

16. Nazaretskaia, Konkordiia. "About Origin of Russian Sentimentalism". In *Voprosy estetiki i teorii literatury*, ed. by Nikolai Guliaev, 3–32. Kazan: Kazanskii universitet Publ., 1963. (In Russian)
17. Kulakova, Liubov'. "Russian Sentimentalism and Its Rivals". In Kulakova, Liubov'. *Ocherki istorii russkoi esteticheskoi mysli XVIII veka*, 180–263. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie Publ., 1968. (In Russian)
18. Pospelov, Gennadii. "Formation of Literary Style in the Work of Russian Sentimentalists". In *Pospelov, Gennadii. Problemy literaturnogo stilia*, 163–244. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1970. (In Russian)
19. Pospelov, Gennadii. *Problems of the Historical Development of Literature*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie Publ., 1972. (In Russian)
20. Pavlovich, Selima. *Ways of Development of Russian Sentimental Prose in the 18th Century*. Saratov: Saratovskii universitet Publ., 1974. (In Russian)
21. Orlov, Pavel. *Russian Sentimentalism*. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1977. (In Russian)
22. Fedorov, Valentin. "From Classicism to Romanticism: Formation of New Literary Style". In *Istoriia romantizma v russkoi literature (1790–1825)*, ed. by Aleksandr Kurilov, 42–70. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1979. (In Russian)
23. Fedorov, Valentin. "From Sentimentalism to Romanticism: Searches of New Poetic Content and Forms if Its Expression". In *Istoriia romantizma v russkoi literature (1790–1825)*, ed. by Aleksandr Kurilov, 70–88. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1979. (In Russian)
24. Zapadov, Vladimir. "Sentimentalism and Pre-romanticism in Russia". In *Problemy izuchenii russkoi literatury XVIII veka: Ot klassitsizma k romantizmu*, ed. by Vladimir Zapadov, 135–50. Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii universitet Publ., 1983. (In Russian)
25. Kaminskii, Vladimir. "To the Question of Sentimental Artistic Method in Literature". *Russkaia literatura*, no. 2 (1984): 124–37. (In Russian)
26. Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "Poetry of English Sentimentalism". In Zhirmunskii, Viktor. *Iz istorii zapadnoevropeiskikh literatur*, 125–48. Leningrad: Nauka Publ., 1981. (In Russian)
27. Zhirmunskii, Viktor. "English Pre-romanticism". In Zhirmunskii, Viktor. *Iz istorii zapadnoevropeiskikh literatur*, 149–74. Leningrad: Nauka Publ., 1981. (In Russian)
28. Levin, Iurii. "English Poetry and Literature of Russian Sentimentalism". In Levin, Iurii. *Vospriiatie angliiskoi literatury v Rossii*, 134–230. Leningrad: Nauka Publ., 1990. (In Russian)
29. Kochetkova, Natal'ia. *Literature of Russian Sentimentalism (Aesthetic and Artistic Searches)*. St Petersburg: Nauka Publ., 1994. (In Russian)
30. Ivanov, Mikhail. *The Fate of Russian Sentimentalism*. St Petersburg: Eidos Publ., 1996. (In Russian)
31. Kurilov, Aleksandr. "Classicism and Sentimentalism: Correlation of Terms". In *Zhivaia mysl'. K 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia G. N. Pospelova*, ed. by Petr Nikolaev et al., 188–204. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1999. (In Russian)
32. Pashkurov, Aleksei. "Genre-thematic Modifications in the Poetry of Russian Sentimentalism and Pre-romanticism in the Light of the Category of the Sublime". DA diss., Kazanskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2005. (In Russian)
33. Lotman, Iurii. *Creation of Karamzin*. Moscow: Kniga Publ., 1987. (In Russian)
34. Makogonenko, Georgii. *Radishchev and His Time*. Moscow: Goslitizdat Publ., 1956. (In Russian)
35. Toporov, Vladimir. *From History of Russian Literature. Vol. 2: Russian Literature of the Second Half of the 18th Century: Researches, Materials, Publications. M. N. Muravyov: Introduction to the Creative Heritage*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury Publ., 2001, part 1. (In Russian)
36. Toporov, Vladimir. *From History of Russian literature. Vol. 2: Russian Literature of the Second Half of the 18th Century: Researches, Materials, Publications. M. N. Muravyov: Introduction to the Creative Heritage*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury Publ., 2003, part 2. (In Russian)
37. Makogonenko, Georgii. "Introductory Article". In *Dmitriev I. I. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, comp. by Georgii Makogonenko, 5–68. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel' Publ., 1967. (In Russian)
38. Gromova, Tat'iana. "Poetic Work of V. V. Kapnist and His Literary and Social Positions (1780–1820)". PhD diss., Kievskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut imeni A. M. Gor'kogo, 1973. (In Russian)
39. Lappo-Danilevskii, Konstantin. "Literary Activity of N. A. Lvov". PhD diss., Institut russkoi literatury Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1988. (In Russian)
40. Valeev, Emil'. "Sud'boiu prervannyi poet". *G. P. Kamenev in Russian Literature at the Turn of the 18th and 19th Centuries*. Kazan: Nasledie Publ., 2001. (In Russian)
41. Korovin, Vladimir. "S. S. Bobrov. Life and work". PhD diss., Moscow State University, 2000. (In Russian)

42. Alekseeva, Tat'iana. *Vladimir Lukich Borovikovsky and Russian Culture at the Turn of the 18th and 19th Centuries*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 1975. (In Russian)
43. Mikhailova, Kira. *V. L. Borovikovsky*. Leningrad: Khudozhnik RSFSR Publ., 1968. (In Russian)
44. Turchin, Valerii. *Alexander I and Neoclassicism in Russia*. Moscow: Zhiraf Publ., 2001. (In Russian)
45. Abramkin, Ivan. "A Problem of Style in Historiography of Russian Art of the 18th Century". *Dekorativnoe iskusstvo i predmetno-prostranstvennaia sreda. Vestnik MGKhPA*, no. 1, part 1 (2021): 153–64. (In Russian)
46. Kovalenskaia, Natal'ia. *Russian Classicism. Painting. Sculpture. Drawing*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 1964. (In Russian)
47. Kantor, Anatolii. "Art of the 18th Century. Part I". In *Malaia istoriia iskusstv. Iskusstvo XVIII veka*, 6–27. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ.; Dresden: Verl. der Kunst, 1977. (In Russian)
48. Evangulova, Olga. "Ermenev and Problems of Stylistic Development in Russian Art in the End of the 18th Century". In *Russkii klassitsizm vtoroi poloviny XVIII — nachala XIX veka. Sbornik statei*, ed. by Gleb Pospelov, 78–84. Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo Publ., 1994. (In Russian)
49. Turchin, Valerii. "Main Problems of Western European and Russian Art in the End of the 18th — Early 19th Century". DA diss., Moscow State University, 1989. (In Russian)
50. Turchin, Valerii. "Problems of Russian art in the Second Half of the 18th — Early 19th Century in the Context of Studying Western European Classicism". In *Russkii klassitsizm vtoroi poloviny XVIII — nachala XIX veka. Sbornik statei*, ed. by Gleb Pospelov, 138–46. Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo Publ., 1994. (In Russian)
51. Kovalenskaia, Natal'ia. *History of Russian Art of the 18th Century*. Moscow; Leningrad: Iskusstvo Publ., 1940. (In Russian)
52. Alekseeva, Tat'iana. *Borovikovsky*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 1960. (In Russian)
53. Alekseeva, Tat'iana. "Some Problems in Study of Russian Art of the 18th Century". In *Russkoe iskusstvo XVIII veka. Materialy i issledovaniia*, ed. by Tat'iana Alekseeva, 7–19. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1973. (In Russian)
54. Sarab'ianov, Dmitrii. *Russia and West. Historical and Artistic Relations of the 18th — early 20th Century*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ., 2003. (In Russian)
55. Evangulova, Olga. *Russian Artistic Mentality of the 18th Century and Art of Western European Schools*. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli Publ., 2007. (In Russian)
56. Karev, Andrei. "About the Interaction of Word and Image in Cultural Space of Derzhavin-Lvov's Circle. N. A. Lvov and V. L. Borovikovsky". In *Russkoe iskusstvo Novogo vremeni. Issledovaniia i materialy. Sbornik statei*, ed. by Igor Riazantsev, 125–37. Moscow: NII teorii i istorii izobrazitel'nykh iskusstv Publ., 2008, iss. 11. (In Russian)
57. Lotman, Iurii. "Dynamic Model of Semiotic System". In Lotman, Iurii. *Izbrannye stat'i. 3 vol. Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury*, 90–101. Tallinn: Aleksandra Publ., 1992, vol. 1. (In Russian)
58. Alekseeva, Tat'iana. "Russian Portrait at the Turn of the 18th and 19th Centuries". In *Problemy portreta. Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii*, 179–98. Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik Publ., 1973. (In Russian)
59. Daniel', Sergei. *Rococo. From Watteau to Fragonard*. St Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika Publ., 2007. (In Russian)
60. Sarab'ianov, Dmitrii. *Russian Painting of the 19th Century among European Schools*. Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik Publ., 1980. (In Russian)

Received: December 13, 2021

Accepted: November 14, 2022

Author's information:

Ivan A. Abramkin — Senior Lecturer; ivanabramkin@list.ru