

Textbook: Focus on Students' National Identity

Educational Books on Russian Literature and the Cultural Identity Problem

Elena Y. Poltavets (a), Galina I. Romanova (b), Alfiya I. Smirnova* (c)

(a) *Moscow City University, 129226, Moscow (Russia), 4-1, 2nd Selskokhoziastvenny Proezd*

(b) *Moscow City University, 129226, Moscow (Russia), 4-1, 2nd Selskokhoziastvenny Proezd*

(c) *Moscow City University, 129226, Moscow (Russia), 4-1, 2nd Selskokhoziastvenny Proezd,
alfia-smirnova@yandex.ru*

Abstract

The paper is devoted to a relevant problem: how literature influences the students' cultural self-identification in the process of its study. The purpose of this scientific work is to identify the criteria a modern literature textbook must meet, and to demonstrate the educational role literature plays in the cultural identity formation, illustrated with the example of books on literary theory and the Russian literature history of the 19th – 20th centuries. The most appropriate approach to the problem is the culturological one. Based on the statement that the personal involvement in society and culture within the literature studying course is a cultural identification, the authors put forward a number of recommendations aimed at updating the content in educational books related to the disclosure of their cultural context, inter-text, creative links, typological similarities, intermediate issues, media citations. The paper provides examples of textbooks that demonstrate the successful experience of combining a cultural approach with an immanent description of the writer's work, which is of practical value for creating new educational books on literature.

Keywords: identity, cultural approach, value-based system, literary education.

© 2021 Elena Y. Poltavets, Galina I. Romanova, Alfiya I. Smirnova

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Published by Moscow City University and peer-reviewed under responsibility of TSNI-2021 (Textbook: Focus on Students' National Identity)

Introduction

* Corresponding author. E-mail: alfia-smirnova@yandex.ru

In modern socio-cultural conditions, the most important functions in literary education are those that had not previously been brought to the fore. In particular, it is the influence of fiction on the formation of cultural identity in combination with a tolerant attitude towards other cultures. The development of students' abilities for "personal self-determination", "self-awareness of their Russian identity" is spelled out in the "Requirements for the results of mastering the main educational program of Russian Language and Literature". (*Trebovaniya k rezul'tatam osvoeniya osnovnoj obrazovatel'noj programmy` OOO. Russkij yazyk i literatura*, 2010). This provokes increased attention to this aspect of literature study.

Purpose and objectives of the study

The purpose of this paper is to determine the criteria that a modern textbook on literature should meet, and to demonstrate the possibilities for the formation of students' cultural self-identification by the example of textbooks on literature theory and the history of Russian literature in the 19th – 20th centuries.

Literature review

The need to preserve one's cultural identity in the course of learning a foreign language becomes an urgent problem in the conditions of foreign language learning, in the situation of dialogue of cultures. Accordingly, a number of works by foreign and Russian researchers have been considering ways to solve it. As a significant result of this kind of twentieth century research, one can name the book by M. S. Byram (Byram, 1998). In Russian science in the 21st century, R. P. Milrud gave a theoretical analysis of an individual cultural self-determination phenomenon in a foreign-language educational environment (Milrud, 2016). A. R. Murasova's monograph (2009) is devoted to the issue of pedagogical support of students' cultural self-determination. Although the author notes that "a promising direction for further research may be the study of students' cultural self-determination process in various disciplines of the humanities cycle" (Murasova, 2009, p. 92), the question of the Russian literature influence on cultural self-identification in the process of its study (in the research and, especially, in the pedagogical aspect) remains poorly studied. This makes this paper topic so relevant.

Methodology

The most appropriate approach here is the **cultural one** with its characteristic historicism, primary attention to the educational potential of world and national art masterpieces. Some methods of **interdisciplinary research** in the framework of **cultural studies**, though not distinguished by aesthetic demands, which are mainly aimed at "the role of social institutions in the culture formation" ("Cultural studies, interdisciplinary field concerned with the role of social institutions in the shaping of culture") (Encyclopedia Britannica) are applicable too.

Cultural research and *cultural studies* works have a number of terms and concepts in common, mostly borrowed from different spheres of humanitarian knowledge. These are such concepts as identity, identification, self-identification, cultural self-identification, which are of crucial importance in the topic we have stated. Combining the range of meanings of *identity* as a socio-cultural concept, we will underline the community awareness, group belonging as central. At the same time, the most important category for a person's identity, which determines how he/she sees him/herself and the world, is cultural and ethnic (national) identity (Guerrero et al., 2017).

The process of assimilation of cultural, also literary, phenomena recognized as exemplary, influential, and relevant in the society, the fact of human involvement in society and culture in the course of studying the art of words is called *cultural identification*.

Modern researchers believe that "the meaning of the term "identity" has lost its content value, because its subject area has moved to the sphere of microsociology, where it merged with the socio-psychological concept of "self" ("self-identity")" (Vyunnik, 2000, p.48). From this point of view, it is important that not only the group, but each member of the society is aware of him/herself as a Russian culture carrier and representative, in particular, the heir to literary traditions of world significance, i.e. the fact of *cultural self-identification*.

The value system of literature of a certain period, confirmed in the work of a particular writer, in the work chosen for analysis, appears as an exemplary, universal. In this its capacity it enriches and corrects the individual system of values. The task of literary education, from this point of view, is to preserve, develop and transmit the national artistic and scientific heritage. Textbooks on theory and the history of literature are primarily responsible for it.

Results

"Introduction to Literary Studies" textbook (2020) has been reprinted for almost a quarter of a century, the last edition is year 2020. Without going into a detailed analysis of the book, we will note only some things from the point of view of the stated topic. Special attention in the textbook is paid to literary terminology, which is basically of foreign language origin. The preamble of each section includes a translation of each term into English, French, and German. Still the emphasis is on explaining Russian words — the book traces scientific terms, in some cases, their etymology, and the formation of modern meaning. This refers to the explanation of such concepts as the artistic image, the creative history of the work (genesis), plot, composition, etc.

Reliance on the *achievements of Russian literary studies* can be traced in the direct citation of Russian science

classics that have won world fame (S. S. Averintsev, M. M. Bakhtin, M. L. Gasparov, D. S. Likhachev, Yu. M. Lotman, V. B. Shklovskiy, B. M. Eichenbaum, R. O. Jacobson, and many others). In addition, the theoretical material is supported by a solid auxiliary base – links to the main works on the topic of each section, with references to works that are mostly important for Russian literary studies (V. G. Belinskiy, N. G. Chernyshevskiy, S. D. Krzhizhanovskiy, A. G. Gornfeld, D. N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, N. K. Piksanov and many others).

The authors have to discuss the need to comply with strict rules for the design of the scientific apparatus in the textbook with their opponents who consider it an optional convention in the educational publication. The authors' fundamental position is that referring to the works of domestic scientists and specifying the maximum information about them gives students the opportunity to join a specific direction, methodology, group of scientists, i.e. to identify themselves with a certain scientific and *cultural tradition*.

Despite the fact that over the past three decades, the foreign science experience has been actively perceived and creatively assimilated, Russian literary criticism retains its **specificity**. The emphasis on this aspect is particularly important. So, although the analyzed textbook not only allows, but also assumes the use of various methods and techniques for analyzing literary works, the methodological basis is established there: the idea of literature as a self-valuable and independent phenomenon, indirectly connected with reality, subordinate to the author's will, largely predetermining the reader's reactions. The consistent implementation of this concept allows the authors of each section to show the difference between traditional and modern views on each problem solution. For example, the theory of inter-textual interactions shows the differences between the functions of quotations, allusions, and reminiscences, and provides examples from Russian literature. In the same section, the concept of intertextuality, with its characteristic shift of emphasis from the subject of writing to the writing itself, is considered to be a scientific reaction to postmodernism literature. This not only recreates the history of the literary phenomenon study, but also constructs the situation of approach and terminological apparatus choice. All this, ultimately, contributes to the awareness of their involvement in the domestic literary science and criticism, students' *cultural self-identification* formation.

Discussions

Let's consider what **universities' educational books on the history of literature** should be in order to promote the students' cultural self-identification (as a result, their spiritual growth). Fundamentally important and new in this aspect is a number of *genre-content features of educational books* intended for both higher and secondary schools.

The tasks of students' cultural and national self-identification could most of all be promoted by such

educational books that would actualize not only the ever-lasting artistic significance of the classics, but also reveal the main points of cultural and creative self-identification of these works creators with the greatest possible completeness. In other words, the process of an individual cultural self-identification can be launched, realized and reflected only to the same extent as to which the individual can feel an internal impulse to moral and spiritual growth. The *textbook should focus* not on the literary process itself and not on theoretical generalizations, not on facts and factors of changing aesthetic epochs and ideologies, but on the creator's unique personality, the process of its formation, especially those turning points when the "dark mind cleared up" and the starry hours came. Only that textbook will focus on cultural and national self-identification, the main task of which is to tell about the development of this side of the writer and his characters' personality.

An educational book on literature itself must be saturated with the "genre memory", and this genre is nothing but a novel of education, a genre that is essentially a hidden novel of self-education.

The space of educational books today remains ideologically and aesthetically closed. The idea that the characteristic of the person and author's creative individuality is more important than the enumeration of the "features of romanticism" or "stages of transition to realism" may sound heretical. Still it is impossible to keep from complaining that neither a schoolchild nor a student learns about the of N. V. Gogol's pilgrimage experience in Jerusalem from the textbook. Neither would they read there about what outstanding polyglots A. N. Ostrovskiy and L. N. Tolstoy were, about A. K. Tolstoy's extraordinary physical might and his ancestral curse resistance, about the legend of the Rosicrucian green wand and the cult of the trees in Yasnaya Polyana, etc. One should not forget that in the Russian classical heritage there is a special phenomenon "there is no one to put on a par with in recent centuries" (Mardov, 2020, p. 179), which causes in Russia and all over the world not only admiration, but sometimes dislike for its personal significance. "People of such significance as Tolstoy do not appear among us to prepare a delicious and nutritious artistic dish for the human soul or to proclaim an idea. They are needed in order to move the human spiritual consciousness forward" (Mardov, 2020, p. 179). "Tolstoy was trusted as the most authoritative, fair and objective representative of the Russian world. Artistic works, philosophical, sociopolitical, religious views of the writer were perceived as a valuable part of the Pan-European culture. Trying to get to know an unfamiliar country, foreigners largely relied on the ideas of Tolstoy's" (Romanova, Smirnova & Poltavets, 2020, p. 802). No one doubts that the condition for cultural and national self-identification is the expansion of cultural horizons. Yet monographic chapters in educational books tend to immanently describe the writer's legacy as the fruit of some kind of seclusion. Russian textbooks are still very poorly focused on the disclosure of the cultural context of works, intertext, creative connections, and typological similarities. Intermedial problems, ecphrasis and media citations are generally completely ignored. Still it is this aspect of the educational book that could give a powerful incentive for divination, could awaken the student's imagination, invite him/her to enter the road of independent search. Here is the seemingly

too extravagant topic of a scientific paper: "Leo Tolstoy and Edvard Munch: amazing convergences...". The author states: "The aim of this paper is to analyze how the great artists (contemporaries) of different nationality, origin and education, depict different concepts of the epoch: "Life", "Death", "Love", "Fear", "Faith", ("God"), "Woman" etc." (Arkhangel'skaya, 2018, p. 91). So why not bring similar goals to the textbooks?

Speaking about Russian literature textbooks for higher education, we would like to highlight "**The History of Russian literature. The twentieth century: The Silver Age**" (1995) as a successful example of combining a cultural approach with an immanent description of the writer's work in the context of a certain literary direction development. This volume is part of the seven-volume "History of Russian Literature", previously published in French by the "Fayard" publishing house. The volume devoted to the Silver Age history also reflects, in addition to literary ones, the processes that took place in philosophy, fine arts, and music and, along with literary ones, make up the general cultural process in Russia at the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century. The introduction to the Russian edition focuses on the originality of the seven-volume "History of Russian Literature": "In all the volumes of this work, devoted to both the twentieth and the preceding centuries, we sought to recreate not only the history of literature, in the circle of which problems there are writers, their works and trends, but also the history of culture (philosophy, art, theater, cinema)", as part of the literature context" (Nivat et al, 1995, p. 6). In the described "History of Russian literature. The twentieth century: The Silver Age" there is also a place for a special consideration of the "Writer's status in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century" (History of Russian Literature, 1995), which sheds light onto the specifics of Russian literature at the turn of the 19th–20th centuries.

The status of fiction and writing in Russia is still very high but the status of the literature textbook has fallen, obviously. The obsessive repetition of ideologues about Russian classics should be overcome like a neurosis, but we will not succeed if we do not change our point of view, twice. *First*, we should resist the restoration strategy of returning to the model of the ideological and sociological textbook. But neither the desperate throws from the steamboat of modernity, nor the Russian classics' transformation into an object of deconstruction, nor the high-minded ecstasy of abstract aestheticism are suitable for solving didactic problems or for overcoming ideological dictates. The emphasis on the "ideological meaning" should be not just overcome, but transformed (*and this is the second step*). An educational book should offer not so much information about a ready-made set of ideological characteristics about a writer (which are sometimes also mechanically imposed on the reading of literary texts), but an idea of a unique personal path of self-knowledge and self-education, acquaintance with world culture, and the disclosure of creative potential. In this aspect, both mythopoetic, intertextual, and even anagram analysis of texts, as well as the description of the motivic system, as well as the author's conceptsphere (especially in dynamics), come into contact with psychoanalysis, and therefore with the history of the soul and creative ideas. One example of such an approach is worth recalling: speaking about Tolstoy's

"War and World", the historian L. N. Gumilev saw the meaning and pragmatics of Andrei Bolkonsky's image not in "the advanced nobility features", "disillusionment with Napoleon", "the path to the people" depiction, but in the artistic embodiment of an absolutely harmonious personality, unprecedented in the world literature.

The view of the Russian classics as an apologist of impersonalism and a preacher of "swarm life" (the legacy of Leo Tolstoy, who is the author of the "swarm" concept, is especially distorted in this sense) is not only far from the truth, but also harmful for educational and upbringing purposes (if the goal is to educate the individual). One should not be afraid to recognize "the eccentric genius" in the writer (Hodgetts, 1892, p.4), as an English journalist E. A. Brayley Hodgetts (Edward Arthur Brayley Hodgetts, 1859-1932) called Leo Tolstoy. Finally, it is impossible not to raise the question of educational books' correlation to confessional self-identification. Forbidden in the Soviet era and returned together with the philosophy of the Silver Age and the Russian diaspora abroad, confession-oriented literary studies swung the pendulum to the other direction. From this point of view, the literary text began to be read through the dogmatic Orthodox code; for example, "swarm" in Russian literature was condescendingly declared a kind of unconscious "sobornost'" (collectiveness, religious unity).

The urgent calls for the absolutization of the confessional (namely, Orthodox) originality of Russian classical literature lead to a distortion of literary attitudes: literary studies are prescribed an Orthodox (and not literary) axiology. While declaring in every possible way that it is impossible to make objective scientific judgments in literary studies (which is in itself controversial), "pious" literary studies insists on the need to prioritize the Orthodox coordinate system for the researcher of Russian classics. Confessional affiliation in Russia has always dominated the national one (which is no doubt) and the researcher supposedly must be aware of his/her axiological attitudes as identical to the axiology of the research object (which, in fact, is absurd, since it is a requirement to impose the research subject's confessional system on the aesthetic system of the object — an artistic phenomenon). The very statement that Russian literature is based on Orthodox spirituality needs to be corrected. The text of a work can be based on, and more often – be in complex semantic connections with another text: the *texts* of Russian classical literature – Gogol's "Dead Souls", Chernyshevsky's "What shall be done?", Dostoevsky's "Crime and Punishment", Leskov's "Soboryans", and Tolstoy's "Resurrection", Chekhov's "Student". Both explicitly and at the reminiscient level, they reveal a powerful connection with the New Testament, but all these *works* are completely differently related to orthodoxy and Orthodox spirituality.

N. V. Gogol in "Dead Souls" has his own strategy of using the topos of evangelical miracles, when, for example, he calls the police chief, whose feast was provided "from the fish row", a "miracle worker". L. N. Tolstoy does not recognize evangelical miracles at all, and he has his own Christological concept, so the researcher's task can only be to reveal the artistic meaning of the author's appeal to sacred texts, hagiographic

and liturgical context, but not to assess the degree of adequacy and orthodoxy of this appeal. The tendency to ignore the demiurgic function of the writer-creator in general is characteristic of Orthodox literary studies. The opposite approach is expressed in the famous statement of the Dutch writer Toin de Vries: "In the 1930s, an older generation Dutch writer said: "If God wanted to write a novel, He wouldn't be able to do it without taking "War and World" as a model" (Vries, 1965, p. 224).

Currently, along with textbooks, author's courses of lectures are published and they have their own advantages. The textbook is created, as a rule, by a team of specialists whose scientific solidarity is not always certain, while the lecture course is conceptually unified. As an example, we can cite the publications of "University Courses of lectures" series opened by the MSU publishing house in 2005 with the publication of lectures by the oldest teacher of Moscow University, N. I. Liban. This series contains a course of lectures by **V. A. Nedzvetskiy and E. Y. Poltavets "History of Russian Literature of the 1840s-1860s"** (2010), reprinted in 2016 by Youwrite Publishing house. As the introduction to this publication states, "unlike the existing university textbooks on the history of Russian literature, the lecture course does not claim to cover absolutely all the artistic phenomena of the observed time period" (Nedzvetskiy, Poltavets, 2016, p.5). The course focuses on the most significant phenomena in Russian literature of the thirty-year period under consideration, on those achievements that allowed it to become a leader in the world literary process by the end of the century.

The problems of cultural and national identity in the twentieth century are particularly relevant in the culture of the Russian diaspora abroad, in the works of emigrant writers who considered themselves to be carriers and guardians of national culture, accumulated spiritual values, and historical memory. Since the mid-1920s, the emigrant press has been engaged in a long discussion about the fate and future of Russian foreign literature, about its "viability". A critic Mark Slonim expressed doubts about the possibility of its existence and development outside of the ties with the national culture and language. In 1924 he wrote: "Emigrant literature is only a branch on a common trunk. It is so far alive as the trunk is alive; it feeds on its juices, it blooms if this exchange is alive and full, and it withers as soon as it ceases. It is thus logical that the best writers in exile are those who have preserved an internal connection with Russia..." (Slonim, 1990, p. 385). Gleb Struve, the author of the book "Russian Literature in Exile" (New York, 1956), in which he studied the foreign literary process of the 1920s and 1930s, believed that it was about the very possibility of literature's existence in isolation from the motherland, from the living spoken language, without the influx of fresh creative forces — without the generations change.

In the 1990-ies — at the beginning of 2000-ies, University textbooks in Russian abroad literature were published: V.V. Agenosov "Russian abroad literature (1918-1996)", T. P. Buslakova "Russian abroad literature: a course of lectures", O. N. Mikhailova "Russian abroad literature", A. G. Sokolov "The fate of the

Russian literary emigration of the 1920ies". They revealed the laws of the Russian literary process abroad, its connection with the classics and modern literature in the homeland, the idea of "the great, unified and indivisible Russian literature of the twentieth century" (Mikhailov, 1995, p. 3). The books characterize the work of the most prominent Russian diaspora writers. The authors of the textbooks seek to cover the history of the Russian diaspora literature during the seventy years of exile – three waves of emigration. In line with the problem discussed in this paper, we will consider the collective textbook **"Literature of the Russian Abroad (1920-1990)"** (2006), recommended by the Council for Philological Educational and Methodical association for Classical University Education for higher educational institutions students studying within the direction 520300 and specialty 021700 – Philology.

The authors of the manual note that it is intended to fill the lack of those educational publications "where the material would be presented not only systematically, as a review, but also with the maximum possible consideration of its specifics and literary reception" (Smirnova, 2006, p. 9). The manual, based on the generally accepted periodization of the Russian emigration history, identifies three stages and consistently reveals each of them. Along with this, the writers of the first emigration wave (1920-1930), following Gleb Struve's differentiation, are divided into two generations – the older and the younger one, which allows us to identify the dynamics of the literary process in foreign countries and to reveal the specifics of the prose writers and poets' work, their continuity with the classical tradition and national culture, and the desire to preserve their cultural and national identity in exile. This task, being the main one for the textbook authors, is also solved in the review of the work of writers who found themselves in exile during the Second World War and the subsequent decade (the second wave), as well as in the analysis of the third wave representatives' prose and poetry (1960-1990).

Issues of cultural and national self-identity, coming to the fore, can be solved differently in modern textbooks and manuals, and on different literary materials. As an example of such educational publications, we will name two, prepared at the Department of Russian Literature of the Moscow City Pedagogical University. The first of them deals with the problems of cultural self-identification in connection with the formation of eco-philosophical consciousness and in the context of students' environmental education (**A. I. Smirnova "Russian Natural Philosophical prose of the second half of the twentieth century"**, 2009). The appeal to this perspective is dictated by the fact that "each nation and each epoch has a special way of thinking and the so-called spirit of the time is subject to constant transformation... Every age sees nature in its own way" (Bizet, 1890, p. 7). Artistic consciousness perceives nature, embodying its national view, manifesting its cultural belonging. In the manual, this aspect is revealed by analyzing different national world views, captured in the prose of Russian and Russian-speaking writers. "On the material of natural philosophical prose of the second half of the twentieth century, it is clearly visible how much the Russian-speaking authors enriched it,

demonstrating the uniqueness of the artistic worlds they created — thanks to their national mentality, "genetic" memory in understanding and embodying the sense of nature, aesthetic syncretism" (Smirnova, 2009, p. 13). In the second textbook, the study of foreign ethnic and cultural issues in modern Russian literature allows us to address the issues of cultural self-identification in various ethnic groups, to reveal relations with other cultures representatives, and promotes the upbringing of a tolerant attitude towards them (**E. F. Shafranskaya "Modern Russian literature: foreign ethnic and cultural issues"**, 2020).

The study of the literature allows us to reveal the "picture of national self-identification", to show the attitude to the foreign world in different historical periods" (Rybalchenko, 2007, p. 6). To a certain extent, both manuals solve this problem.

Conclusion

If we recall the Dilthean dichotomy, we can say that textbooks that are written on "natural sciences" boast of their imaginary objectivity in complete oblivion, that they themselves are an artifact that cannot be removed from observation. In contrast, textbooks devoted to the "sciences of the spirit" should remember that empathy leads to self-observation, and self – observation itself is the key to self-improvement.

The study of the traditional worldview transformation in the works of Russian literature of the 19th and 20th centuries. promotes cultural self-identification and spiritual self-improvement of the individual, the value focus development, ensures their continuity and succession, familiarity with traditional and avant-garde forms against the background of emotional perception, historical and literary understanding, transfer to the context of the modern life problems. Understanding the universal content and concretization of the national tradition is a prerequisite for national self-identification and involvement in world culture.

A modern textbook on literature for higher education needs significant modernization. In a textbook on literature, along with the enduring artistic significance of the great works of the classics, it is desirable to reveal as fully as possible the main points of these works creators' cultural and creative self-identification. An educational book on literature itself should be saturated with the "genre memory", and this genre is nothing but a novel of upbringing, a genre that is essentially a hidden novel of self-education. The content related to the works' cultural context disclosure, intertext, creative connections, typological similarities, intermedial problems, media citations has to be updated.

No educational books on literature can give knowledge about the subject, since no description of an art work can be full enough. Knowledge about the "Literature" subject can not be given without immersion into the subject itself — reading literature. "Art is the transposer of the ineffable; therefore it seems foolish to try to put

it into words again,"— wrote Goethe. Why do we need a textbook and all literary studies then? "And yet,"— the classic answers — "when we try to do this, our mind gains so much profit that it more than makes up for the fortune spent." The textbook should help to gain this profit, show the creative search for a harmonious personality and the upbringing of such a personality by the author in himself, and ideally — to reveal the archetypal and even numinous meaning of this author's search and contribution to the domestic and world culture.

References

- Arkhangel'skaya, Yu.V. (2018). Leo Tolstoy and Edvard Munch: amazing convergences of artistic worlds of the two great contemporaries. In *Naslediye L.N. Tolstogo v paradigmatkakh sovremennoi gumanitarnoi nauki* (pp. 91 – 97). Tula: TGPU im. L.N. Tolstogo.
- Bizet, A. (1890). *Istoricheskoye razvitiye tschuvstva prirody* [Historical development of the sense of nature]. Translated by D. Korobchevskiy. St. Petersburg: Publishing House "Russkoye bogatstvo"
- Vvedeniye v literaturovedeniye [Introduction to Literary Studies]. (2020). In 2 volumes. L. V. Chernets (Eds.). Moscow: Youwrite.
- Vyunnik, E. D. (2000). Problemy kultury i nazional'noi identichnosti [Problems of culture and national identity]. In *Kultura v sovremennom mire: opyt, problemy, resheniya* [Culture in the Modern world: experience, problems, solutions]. Issue 2. (pp. 48-60). Moskva: RGB.
- Istoriya russkoi literatury XX vek: Serebryanniy vek [History of Russian literature. The 20th century: The Silver Age] (1995). Zh.Niva, I. Serman, V. Strada, E. Etkind (Eds.). Moskva: Izd.gruppa 'Progress'.
- Literatura russkogo zarubezh'ya (1920-1990) [Literature of the Russian Diaspora Abroad (1920-1990)]. (2006). A. I. Smirnova (Eds.). Moskva: Flinta: Nauka.
- Mardov, I. B. (2020). L.N. Tolstoi o lichno-dukhovnoi i obtschedukhovnoi zhyzni [L. N. Tolstoy on personal-spiritual and general spiritual life]. In *Lev Tolstoy: Literatura i filosofiya*. (pp. 179-187). Moskva, St. Peterburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ
- Milrud, R. P. (2016). Kulturnoye samoopredeleniye lichnosti kak problema inoyazychnogo obrazovaniya [Cultural self-determination of the individual as a problem of foreign language education]. *Nauchniy dialog*, 2 (50), 404-415.

- Mikhailov, O. N. (1995). *Literatura russkogo Zarubezhya* [Literature of the Russian Diaspora Abroad]. Moskva: Prosveshchenie.
- Murasova, A. R. (2009). *Pedagogicheskoye soprovozhdeniye kulturnogo samoopredeleniya studentov* [Pedagogical support of students' cultural self-determination]. Ulyanovsk: UIGTU.
- Nedzvetskiy, V. A., Poltavets, E. Yu. (2016). *Istoniya russkoi literatury 1840-1860- kh godov. Kurs lektsiy* [History of Russian literature of the 1840s-1860s. A course of lectures]. Moskva: Youwrite.
- Nedzvetskiy, V. A. (2014). *Shestnadsat' shedevrov russkoi literatury* [Sixteen masterpieces of Russian literature]. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.
- Rybalchenko, T. L. (2007). *Ot redaktora* [Editorial]. In *Russkoyazychnaya literatura v kontekste vostochnoslavianskoi kultury*. (pp. 5-6). Tomsk: TGU.
- Slonim, M. (1990). *Zhivaya literatura i myortvyie kritiki* [Living literature and dead critics]. In *Literatura russkogo zarubezhya*. An anthology in six volumes. Volume 1. Book 2. (pp. 382-386). Moskva: Kniga.
- Smirnova, A. I. (2009). *Russian natural philosophical prose of the second half of the twentieth century*. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka .
- Trebovaniya k rezultatam osvoyeniya osnovnoi obrazovatel'noi programmy [Requirements for the results of mastering the main educational program]. Russian language and literature LLC. (2010). Retrieved from <https://aujc.ru/dokumenty-fgos-uchitelyu-russkogo-yazyka-i-literatury/>
- Fris, T. (1965). *O Tolstom* [About Tolstoy]. In *Literaturnoye nasledstvo. L.N. Tolstoy i zarubezhniy mir*. Volume 75. Book 1. (pp. 224-225). Moskva: Nauka.
- Byram, M. (1998). *Language learning in intercultural perspective: approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. (2020). Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/cultural-studies>
- Guerrero, Laura K., Andersen, Peter A., Afifi, Walid A. (2017). *Close Encounters* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication Inc.
- Hodgetts, E. A. B. (1892). *In the track of the Russian famine: the personal narrative of Journey through the famine districts of Russia*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Romanova, G.I., Smirnova, A.I., Poltavets, E.Yu. (2020). L.N.Tolstoy and the English-speaking Journalists Elaborating on the Crisis of 1891–1892. In *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 95. Conference Proceedings. London. European Publisher (pp. 801 – 808). Retrieved from <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?selid=44352651&id=44352545&>
<https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.11.03.85>