

Dünya İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi

World Journal of Human Sciences

ISSN: 2717-6665

Temmuz 2022

Cilt/Volume: 2022

Sayı/Issue: 2

Scientific Theoretical Fundamentals of Philological Comparative Studies

Filolojik Karşılaştırmalı Çalışmaların Bilimsel Teorik Temelleri

*Gulnoz Iskandarovna Khalliyeva ***Bahor Bakhriddinovna Turaeva ****Dilshod A'zamkulovich Nasriddinov ****

Özet

Karşılaştırmalı edebiyat veya edebi karşılaştırmalı çalışmalar, iki veya daha fazla edebi olgunun karşılaştırılmasına dayanan bir bilim dalıdır. Uluslararası sosyal, kültürel ve edebi ilişkilerin her geçen gün geliştiği günümüzde, karşılaştırmalı edebiyatın geleceği bilimin en büyük yönlerinden biridir.

Herhangi bir karşılaştırmalı çalışma, edebiyatlar arasında genel teorik yasaların ortaya çıkmasına temel teşkil eden edebi fenomenlerin ortak ve özel yönlerini tanımlar.

Bilimin amacı öğrencilere, ustalara ve tüm araştırmacılara karşılaştırmalı çalışmaların metodolojisi, karşılaştırmalı edebiyat hakkında teorik bilgiler vermek, karşılaştırmalı araştırma yöntemlerini açıklamak, bu alandaki bilgilerini geliştirmektir. Ayrıca karşılaştırmalı edebiyatın amacı, edebi olayların (görsel yardımcıları, sanat eserleri (таъсвирий санъат ишларими), yazarların edebi mirası, edebiyat okulları, türler vb.) tarihsel bir fenomen veya belirli bir tarihsel gerçektir ve edebi bir olaya uygulanan iç yasaları göstermektedir.

* **Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding author:** Prof.Dr., Uzbekistan State World Languages University, gulnoz7410@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5013-0792.

** Ph.D., Uzbekistan State World Languages University, bahorturaeva@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4019-7891.

*** Ph.D., Uzbekistan State World Languages University, dilshodnasr@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1432-284X.

Atf/Citation: Khalliyeva, G.I., Turaeva, B.B., Nasriddinov, D.A., (2022). Scientific Theoretical Fundamentals of Philological Comparative Studies. *Dünya İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2022 (2), 120-138.

Bilimin amacı karşılaştırmalı tarihsel yöntem ve kurucuları, temel kavramlardır; makro ve mikro karşılaştırılabilirlik; Doğu-Batı edebi ilişkileri, çeviri eleştirisi, edebi bir metnin karşılaştırmalı analizi için ölçütler hakkında mümkün olduğunca çok teorik bilgi sağlamayı ve araştırmacılarda edebi olayları karşılaştırma ve karşılaştırma yeteneğini geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bu konunun incelenmesi sırasında öğrenciler, yüksek lisanslar ve araştırmacılar: karşılaştırmalı araştırma metodolojisini ve temel kavramlarını açıklayabilme; karşılaştırmalı edebiyat üzerine temel literatür bilgisi ve bunların özeti; çeviri hakkında genel bir fikre sahip olmak, çeviri türleri, çeviri eleştirisi, orijinal ve çevirinin karşılaştırılması konusunda belirli bir bilgiye sahip olmak; edebi olayların genel ve özel yönlerini karşılaştırma yoluyla belirleme, poetika, edebi ilişkiler ve edebi etki konularını analiz etme becerisine sahip olur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karşılaştırmalı Çalışmalar, Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat, Karşılaştırmalı-Tarihsel Yöntem, Nesne, Karşılaştırma Aşamaları,

Abstract

Comparative literature or literary comparative studies is a branch of science based on the comparison of two or more literary phenomena. The future of comparative literature is one of the great directions of science at present when international social, cultural, and literary relations are developing day by day.

Any comparative study identifies common and specific aspects of literary phenomena, which serve as the basis for the emergence of general theoretical laws between literature.

The purpose of the science is to provide students, masters and all researchers with theoretical information about the methodology of comparative studies, comparative literature, to explain the methods of comparative research to improve their knowledge in this area. In addition, the purpose of comparative literature is to determine the typological and genetic nature of literary events (visual aids, works of art (ТАСВИРИЙ САНЪАТ ИШЛАРИМИ), literary heritage of writers, literary schools, genres, etc.), regardless of whether it is a historical phenomenon or a specific historical fact and to demonstrate the internal laws that apply to a literary event.

The object of science is the comparative historical method and its founders, the basic concepts; macro and micro comparability; it aims to provide as much theoretical knowledge as possible about East-West literary relations, translation criticism, criteria for comparative analysis of a literary text, and to develop in researchers the ability to compare and contrast literary events.

- be able to explain the methodology of comparative research and its basic concepts.
- knowledge of the basic literature on comparative literature and their summary.
- have a general idea of the translation, types of translation, translation criticism, a certain knowledge of the comparison of the original and the translation.
- have the skills to identify general and specific aspects of literary events through comparison, to analyze the issues of poetics, literary relations and literary influence.

During the study of this subject, students, masters, and researchers: be able to get the knowledge of the methodology of comparative research and its basic concepts have a general idea of the translation, types of translation, translation criticism, a certain knowledge of the comparison of the original and the translation, have the skills to identify general and specific aspects of literary events through comparison to analyze the issues of poetics, literary relations, and literary influence.

Keywords: comparative studies, comparative literature, comparative-historical method, object, stages of comparison.

Introduction

Comparative studies (lot. comparativus - comparative) is a field of science based on the comparative study of various processes, which includes language and literature along with other areas. The term was first coined in France (“littérature comparée”, 1817), then in England (“Comparative literature” in 1886), in Germany (in the name of the magazine “Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte”, 1887-1910), in Russia (1889 in the research of A.N.Veselovsky.) began to be used.

The direction of comparative research in the field of language and literature is called philological comparative studies. Philological comparative studies consist of two major groups:

1. Linguistic comparative linguistics, i.e., comparative linguistics.
2. Literary comparative studies, i.e., comparative literature.

Linguistic comparative studies aim at the comparative study of languages that are close and not close to each other in different directions. “The study of languages from a comparative point of view, their historical approach, has laid the foundation for the emergence of comparative-historical linguistics, the firm recognition of linguistics as a separate, independent science” (Rasulov, 2010: 291).

1. The Main Peculiarities of Comparative Literature

Features of literary comparative studies. The literary process is the object of literary comparative studies, and all issues related to the study of fiction (*e.g., plot and composition, content and form, the language of the work of art, writer’s style, etc.*) constitute the subject. *Synthesism, mentality, receptive aesthetics, intertext, paratext, metatext, hypertext, architecture, imagology, inheritance, semiotics, typology, and motive* are as the basic concepts of comparative literature.

As noted in the scientific literature, the following literary phenomena can serve as objects for comparative studies: the original and translation of a work; poetics of the work, plot, composition, language of the work, motives, skill of writers, etc. The views of other scientific issues in the literature, the literary reception (the process of acceptance of the literature of other people) are also the object of comparative literature (*For example, “Navoi in the eyes of the Russian reader” or “Pushkin and Uzbek reader”, “The Japanese who dedicated their lives for learning Fitrat”*). And also, there is considered different scientists’ views (for example, the scientific research of Uzbek, Russian, Japanese, and German on “Boburnoma”), international literary relations, issues of interaction, tradition and innovation, the question of the influence of different types of art (*music, painting, sculpture, cinema*) on literature, and etc.



Orientalist N.I. Konrad (1891-1970) focuses on the five aspects that can be the object of comparative literature:

- Comparison of national literature with historical commonalities (e.g., Persian and Tajik).
- Comparison of typological features in the literature of different peoples (e.g., classical realism of the XIX century).
- Comparison of the literature of nations in different places and times (e.g., Russian and Uzbek).
- A comparison of literature with typological features that are not related to each other (e.g., chivalrous novels and Japanese military epics).
- Comparison of international literary relations. At this point, the scholar emphasizes literary influence and literary connections (Konrad, 1978: 32-33).

V.M.Jirmunsky (1891-1971) noted that the comparative study of the writer's work with the national and international literary traditions that influenced him is of methodological importance, helping to determine the writer's creative individuality, and his place in the development of national and world literature (Jirmunskiy, 1960: 183).

In the monograph published in Germany, the science of comparative studies is classified into 4 groups, such as:

1. “Comparative studies of literary theory Dichtungs- / Literaturtheorie)”,
2. “Comparative studies of literary history”
3. “Comparative intermedial research (comparative Intermedialitätsforschung/ Comparative Arts)”
4. “Comparative culture (comparative Kulturwissenschaft)”. At this point, the authors put forward the theory that every phenomenon related to literature can be studied from a comparative point of view (Zymner, 2013: 405).

Furthermore, according to the theory of comparative studies, the literary process can be compared through two different approaches:

1. Historical genetic approach to the literary process (*literature of the same or similar nations in terms of origin*)
2. Comparative typological approach to the literary process (*literature of nations with commonalities, regardless of origin*) for example, internal themes in the literature of different nations, traditional heroes, genres, literary trends.



In terms of comparative study of the literature, comparative study is divided into two major groups.

1. Macrocomparative study – a comparative analysis of literary phenomena within different genetically unrelated nations (*for example, the works of Shakespeare and A.Navoi*).
2. Microcomparative study – a comparative analysis of literary phenomena belonging to one nation or region (*for example, the works of A.Qahhor and O‘Hoshimov, A.Yassavi and Makhtumkuli*).

2. Comparative Literature as A View of World Scholars

A comparative study of the scientific work of literary scholars can also be the object of macro or micro compatibility. E.E.Bertels (1890-1957) and A.N.Malekhova (1938-2009) are Russian scientists who lived and worked in different places at the same time. Their scientific research on the same work, Alisher Navoi’s epic “Lison ut-tayr”, requires a comparative study, showing the evolution and perfection of ideas, as well as the identification of differences and commonalities. This is the object of micro compatibility. Based on a comparative study of the scientific views of both orientalists, the following conclusions can be drawn (Xalliyeva, 2018: 133-134):

1. In the research of E.E. Bertels (1928) and A.N. Malekhova (1978) the balance of hermeneutic doctrine was not disturbed; the essence of the text was not sacrificed for transient ideas and ideological interests. It is difficult to say this about E.E.Bertels’ research in the 1940s because the policy of repression forced the scientist to reckon with the ideology of the time. The plot of the work of both orientalists, Navoi’s connection with mysticism, the reason for choosing the nickname Foni, his views on Eastern Nazism are almost synonymous. For example, on the subject of Navoi and mysticism, E.E. Bertels notes that the poet was deeply acquainted with the teachings of mysticism but was not a Sufi practitioner. A.N. Malekhova also emphasizes that mysticism was not a goal for the poet, but a means.
2. E.E. Bertels approaches the issue from the historical-biographical point of view. A.N. Malekhova from the structural-systematic point of view. The scholar analyzes the essence of the stories in the political, socio-cultural context, down to the smallest elements, and A.N. Malekhova focuses on the study of the internal composition of the work, the identity of the author, and typology of stories.

3. Both studies essentially complement each other. The evolution of views of E.E. Bertels and A.N. Malexova shows that the epic “Lison ut-tayr” can be studied in different aspects and duration.

2.1. Comparative Literature As A Science

The history of science shows that the first theoretical ideas about comparative literature was formed in Europe in the early nineteenth century and in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century due to the need to explain the similarities and differences of literary processes (Akademicheskii shkoli v literaturovedenii, 1975: 211).

Comparative research was initially conducted in the field of linguistics and later had its impact on literature as well. A special contribution to the development of the comparative-historical method was made by European linguists such as Franz Bopp, Rasmus Rusk, Jacob Grimm, who emerged as innovative linguists (Rasulov, 2010: 81).

The first theoretical comparative ideas were formed in Germany. The German scholar I.G. Gerder. The research and works of Gerder (1744-1803) and the great writer I.V. Goethe (1749-1832) were created in a comparative direction. I.G. Gerder focused primarily on the general aspects of the cultural life of Europe. The great writer I.V. Goethe, who continued his ideas, introduced the concept of “world literature” to science. The uniqueness of culture, especially the commonalities of Eastern and Western cultures that make up world literature, is embodied in its West-East desk.

The comparative-historical method in Russian oriental studies is associated with the name of the Russian historian and theorist A.N. Veselovsky (1838-1906). The scientist was the first to use this term in science. “The comparative-historical method is based on the laws of development of socio-historical development in the study of the universal literary process. Because the historical process has its own characteristics within each geographical region, it also has a number of general laws, on the basis of which it is possible to study the literature of different peoples in a comparative aspect” (Qosimov, Hamroqulov, Xo’jayev, 2019: 24). A.N. Veselovsky approached the issue on the principle of historicity. For example, in 1859, a German scholar criticized G. Floto’s article on “Divine Comedy”: “It is difficult to imagine a writer without time; Dante’s creative legacy is not only Dante’s, but also the role of time” (Akademicheskii shkoli v literaturovedenii, 1975: 211). In his view, the history of literature is the history of social thought, culture and science, and the personality of the poet is shaped by certain historical conditions.

A.N. Veselovsky summed up all his ideas and created the work “Historical Poetics” based on a comparative methodology (Veselovskiy, 1989: 405). According to the Russian scholar M.G.

Bogatkina, the methodology of modern comparative studies is based on the traditions of the comparative-historical school created by A.N. Veselovsky and consists of a set of comparative methods of studying the text (Bogatkina, 2004: 75).

In short, the comparative-historical method (Eshonboboev, 2008: 38-46), which is the main method for comparative research, helps to fully understand the dynamics of the literary process, the exchange of inheritance and traditions, artistic values.

Methodological aspects of literary comparatists after A.N. Veselovsky were studied by scientists such as V.M. Jirmunsky, A. Dima, D. Dyurishin, N.I. Konrad, I.G. Neupokoeva, M.B. Khrapchenko, A. Kokorin, M. Bogatkina, V.R. Amineva, Yu.I. Mineralov. The literary research on the field is still being studied today.

Today, the science of comparative literature is gradually developing. Continuing the tradition initiated by American scientists W. Frederick (President of the International American Association of Comparativists) and Rene Wellek, comparative scientific centers and schools are being established in various scientific centers around the world. These include the Moscow School of Comparative Studies and the British and American Comparative Literary Associations (www.bcla.org/index.htm; www.agla.org).

Several scientific journals on comparative literature are currently published in the world. *Imagology and Comparative Studies in Russia*, *Historical Poetics*, and *Revue de literature Compare* in France are among such prestigious journals that publish the best articles on comparative studies (www.bcla.org/index.htm; www.agla.org).

2.2. Scientific Theoretical Fundamentals Of Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis is different from simple analysis. Traditional analysis consists of objects, and they are their constituents. For researchers, it is enough to know this. Comparative analysis, in addition to the aforesaid actions, also focuses on comparing the components of the objects of analysis with each other.

The purpose of comparative analysis is to identify similarities and differences between comparable objects.

From time immemorial, our people say, “the truth is known by comparison”. That is why the methodology of comparison is widespread and used in people’s life activities. Today, the process of comparison is introduced into the mechanism of cognition and event analysis. The methodology of comparison is used in all areas of science and practice.

There is a certain scientific and practical basis for a deeper understanding of the content, essence and functions of the methodology of comparison.



The objects of comparative analysis are divided into natural, social, and spiritual objects. These three relatively independent groups of events are interconnected. They form the environment in which a person lives and are reflected in fictional image.

Despite the relative independence of natural phenomena, they become objects of comparison only after they are involved in human social life. In other words, because people are engaged in a comparative analysis of natural phenomena, they assimilate their social characteristics into it based on their own interests and views. As a result, the comparative analysis of natural phenomena becomes somewhat socialized. Thus, there can be no mechanism for comparing natural phenomena without considering the influence of social factors.

The second group of objects of comparative analysis consists of social phenomena. The method of comparing them has its own characteristics. At the same time, the area of analysis expands the number of comparative analysis indicators increases. The reason is that the laws of social development, all groups of social relations economic, political, spiritual-ideological, legal, scientific-technical, information, military, ecological and many other relations are taken into account here.

Spiritual-ideological issues constitute the third group of objects of comparative analysis. The depth and accuracy of the comparative analysis of the objects of the spiritual-ideological sphere leads to a positive result.

Hence, the natural, social, and spiritual-ideological phenomena that exist in fiction are the objects of comparative analysis. Yet the objects are unique and require consideration of a number of their features.

2.3. Tasks of Comparative Analysis

According to the interpretation in the scientific literature, in the process of comparative analysis such tasks as gnoseological, logical, methodological, methodical, axiological are performed (Mineralov, 2018). In other words, we go through these stages in the process of comparing literary events.

The epistemological function of comparative analysis. Its essence and main purpose are to gain new knowledge and skills about the objects of comparison. We are able to achieve the following results:

First, in the process of comparative analysis, we obtain new information about each object being compared.

Second, we gain new insights into the interaction of comparable literary events.

Third, if the process of comparing objects is sufficiently complete and precise, then we will have information about their past, present, and future. At the same time, we enrich the theory of comparison methodology.

The logical function of comparative analysis. Expression of logical law rules in the process of comparing literary events. In order not to deviate from the requirements of logic in the process of comparative analysis, the following should be observed:

1. It is illogical to compare literary events with different bases. Often different bases are chosen for the comparative analysis of literary events. When this happens - the process of comparison loses its accuracy it is in many respects without subject, and therefore ineffective. There should be clear and unambiguous grounds for comparison. What is right cannot be compared to another. For example, if we take a plot with another plot and the language with another language of a work, it is logically correct to compare it with the language of another work.
2. The expected result cannot be achieved unless certain situations that are not related to the objects are excluded from the analysis.
3. In the process of comparison, one may encounter conflicts and, contradictions. Even in the contradictory characters, there are certain commonalities that do not contradict logic.

The methodological task of comparative analysis. In the comparison process, we use many methods and techniques. This increases not only our knowledge of the object, but also our empirical knowledge i.e., our experience in solving some problems in life, and expands our practical possibilities

The task of worldview in comparative analysis. It is known that every process takes place depending on people's knowledge and worldview. The breadth of a comparative analysis depends on the extent to which a person has a worldview, knowledge, and level. Therefore, worldview plays an important role in this process. The worldview of the subjects serves to enrich the worldview of the public.

The evaluative (axiological) function of comparative analysis is manifested in many forms, in many respects. Whatever we do not compare, of course, in the conclusion we conclude our scientific theoretical views and evaluate this or that literary phenomenon. Therefore, comparative analysis is essentially axiological that is, in its content the value of the events being compared in terms of their similarities and differences is concentrated. This not only enriches the theoretical framework, but also plays a practical role in solving some problems.

The empirical task of comparative analysis is mainly focused on ensuring the solution of practical problems. Every day we face a series of practical issues. Only when comparative analysis serves practice and is important in a person's life, it will be truly productive.

3. The Most Important Stages in The Comparison Process

In order for a comparative analysis to yield the expected result, at what stages should the researcher work?

First of all, the researcher must select the objects of comparison correctly. So, the state of existence of the objects of comparison creates these stages.

First, it is impossible to compare and identify similarities and differences between events without comparing their internal features, internal parameters. The main ones of the latter are the content, essence, qualities of the objects being compared. Therefore, identifying similarities and differences in the content, nature, and qualities of events is the first step in the comparison process.

Second, it is well known that the internal features of events, that is, their content, essence, qualities, are manifested in the environment. It follows that it is necessary to study the similarities and differences in the ways in which the internal properties of the objects of comparison are manifested in the environment. This is the next stage of the comparative analysis.

Third, not only do the objects being compared affect the environment, but the environment also affects them. This involves comparing the characteristics of the impact of external conditions on the objects of analysis. In this way, a third direction is naturally determined at the stage of comparing events. Its essence is to identify similarities and differences in the impact of the environment on the objects of comparative analysis.

Fourth, there will be a reason, a necessity, for the occurrence of any event, including a literary event. Of course, they should be taken into account when comparing. Many needs play a role in the origin, existence, development, and functioning of each event and some of them are of paramount importance. Therefore, before we do a comparative analysis of what we need, we also need to compare the needs and wants that make it happen. This comparison helps us to identify similarities and differences in the reasons for the existence of objects being compared. To do this, we need to perform a comparative analysis in the literature on the algorithm of necessity (motive) - object-essence (result).

Thus, the comparison of needs can be considered as an important link in the mechanism of object analysis that we need. There is nothing happens without need and necessity. If we recall, Alisher Navoi's "*Lison ut tayr*" the first of seven valleys chosen for the original destination was wishes (<http://journals.tsu.ru;www.cairn-int.info/journal-revue-de-litteratur.comparee.html>).

4. Typical Situations That Can Be Compared

Sometimes when we have so much material in our hands, we can not know what to compare or compare with what. It is known that the process of comparative analysis and its results are influenced by many factors. These are the contents of the objects of comparison, methodological tools in the analysis, methods of comparative analysis, etc. With all in mind, the following typical situations can be compared.

The first situation is to compare the events of a literary event that exist in space and time. Such a comparison mechanism has its own characteristics. First, the spatial unity of the objects being compared, the generality of the environment, removes from the agenda the study of how it affects these properties. The general space and time, on the other hand, indicate that the environment of the objects of comparison is the same and that this environment has essentially the same effect on them. This leads to a slight “simplification” of the comparative analysis. Second, the existence of comparable phenomena in one space and one time allows us to speak of their natural-historical unity. For example, a comparative study of the works of Utkir Hoshimov and Tohir Malik reveals the general and specific aspects of writers who lived and worked in the same place and time.

The second situation. It is a space, but a comparison of literary events from different eras. A second situation arises when it is necessary to compare literary events that exist, or may exist in a given environment, in the same space, but at different times. However, comparing events that occur at different times but in very similar situations is a difficult task. Usually, certain problems, difficulties, and puzzles occur in it.

Often, they try to compare events that take place in the same space, for example, in the context of a country, by negating the time factor. This is wrong: for example, poets who lived and worked in the same place but at different times: Muqimiy and Muhammad Yusuf's views on youth will certainly be judged by time. In other words, if the objects being compared exist in the same environment, it is impossible not to take into account that it affects them differently at different stages of their development. Even if the conditions under which the events took place (country, any place) have not changed radically, the objects of comparison themselves may have changed during this time.

The third situation. Comparing objects that existed at the same time but in different places. For example, the Uzbek writer Nasir Zokhid and the American writer Victoria Schwab, who live and work at the same time in the same place, have a novel of the same name “Revenge”. At this point, it is important to take into account the effect of the environment on the objects of

comparison when comparing the motive of revenge in both novels. This process requires special attention from the researcher.

Thus, the simultaneous existence of objects of comparative analysis cannot be a basis for ignoring the characteristics of the environments in which they live and develop. The reason is that if this is done, the comparison will not give the expected result.

The fourth situation. The process of comparing literature of different spaces and times. It compares different environments, different places, and literary events of different times. This situation is considered to be the most complex for the methodology of comparative analysis. For example, in order to study the interpretation of Enlightenment in the works of Shakespeare and Alisher Navoi, or in the works of Abdullah Kahhar and Jack London, it is necessary to take into account the following:

Firstly, it is necessary to understand the nature of the events being compared. Second, it is necessary to examine as deeply as possible the previous conditions and environments in which the objects of comparative analysis exist, revealing their influence on the worldview of Shakespeare and Navoi or Abdullah Kahhar and Jack London. In order to know what unites the works of writers who lived and worked in different times and places, other than popularity, it is necessary to reveal many literary events.

Due to the spatial-temporal parameters of the comparison objects, many difficulties arise in the path of the analyst. However, given the characteristics of the situations that arise during the development of comparable phenomena, they can be solved. The practice has shown that a comparative result is more effective if researchers conducting a comparative analysis understand these difficulties and have methods and methodology for comparing different, conflicting events.

4.1. Methodology of Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis is one of the stages of methodology for knowing and changing the phenomena in existence. The methodology of comparison forms the basis for comparing different processes that exist in a particular space and time. Therefore, there is a need to determine the place of comparative analysis in the methodology.

It is well known that methodology is the doctrine of scientific research methods. In all disciplines, research methods are divided into empirical and theoretical methods. It is on the basis of empirical and theoretical methods that every science, including literature, forms its own research methods. “Without research methods, no science can achieve its goal (strategy), to reveal the essence of the object of research. Because this or that science can determine the phenomena of

nature and society, find their own laws, generate scientific and philosophical ideas about them, of course, through certain methods” (Rasulov, 2010: 291).

The empirical method involves observation and experimentation and consists of steps such as planning, description, and statistics.

Theoretical methods include analysis, synthesis, abstraction, induction, deduction, analog modeling. All theoretical methods go through the following stages: comparison, generalization, classification, evaluation.

Hence, it is clear that comparison is one of the main stages of all theoretical scientific conclusions. Therefore, before performing comparative analysis, it is necessary to thoroughly study the research methods to understand their role in comparison.

In briefly explain the theoretical methods analysis, synthesis - summarization, abstraction, induction - transition from general to specific, deduction - transition from specific to general, analogy - analysis of similar features, modeling (*creation of a prototype: e.g.: artistic model of the universe, textbook electronic model*). Each of these theoretical methods can go through a comparison phase. In comparative analysis, analysis, synthesis, deduction and induction are necessary elements, without which it is impossible to carry out comparative analysis. For example, deduction is the process of dividing events into organizers, and comparative analysis includes the results of this process (Turaeva, 2010).

Hence, comparative analysis shows its influence on all theoretical methods aimed at knowing and changing real-life events. From this, concepts such as comparative synthesis, comparative induction, and comparative deduction are formed. For example, comparative synthesis is the process of identifying similarities and differences between events. It is based on the results of the integration of knowledge in the elements that make them up. In essence, comparative synthesis answers the question, “What is the difference between the objects of comparative analysis?” Comparative induction is the process of identifying similarities and differences between comparable literary phenomena, based on the movement of knowledge from the particular to the general.

4.2. Comparative-Historical and Comparative-Comparative Method

The comparative-historical and comparative (or contrastive-comparative) method is one of the most basic methods in the methodology of comparison. These methods are essentially close to each other but different.

The comparative-historical method is a method of comparing the general and specific aspects of literary events in relation to the process of historical development. The first theoretical

ideas based on the comparative-historical method are described in Aristotle's Poetics. The philosopher compares literature in the process of dividing it into three types, such as epic, lyric, and drama, and explains their essence. There are many theoretical ideas about the comparative-historical method in the scientific literature. In particular, the literary critic B. Karimov notes that using the comparative-historical method, it is possible to conduct research in the following areas:

- Masterpieces of world literature or the beauty of national literature samples are compared with each other.
- Comparative study of literary works according to the period of their creation.
- Study of comparative works of representatives of one national literature.
- Samples of national literature are examined in the context of world literature.
- Different and similar aspects of the literary process or existing literary events in the history of literature are explored.
- Works of writers who are close in terms of topic or scientific problem are examined (Karimov, 2011: 74).
- In the study of literary-aesthetic evolution, the works written by a particular writer are taken as objects.

Such scientists as A.N. Veselovsky, V.M. Zhirmunsky, N.I. Konrad, A. Dima, A. Dyurishin, and V.R. Amineva studied the theoretical foundations of the comparative-historical method (Eshonboboev, 2008: 39).

Contrastive method is a systematic comparison of philological phenomena-based method, mainly to reveal different feature is a focused method. That is why the linguistics called "contrastive" method.

Although theoretical foundations have not been developed, works have been created since ancient times to compare different philological phenomena. Alisher Navoi's work "Muhakamat al-Lughatayn" on the discussion of Persian and Turkic languages is a vivid example of contrastive method. The linguist I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay created the theoretical basis of this method in science in the 19th century. Scientists like E.D. Polivanov, L.V. Shcherba, S.I. Bernstein, A.A. Reformatskiy, Sh. Balli has continued to work in this field (Polivanov, 1933).

According to the linguist R. Rasulov, contrastive method is a method of contract of two or more related or unrelated languages - linguistic phenomena, which differs from the comparative-historical method, which is studied only by comparing and contrasting related languages. In addition, unlike the comparative-historical method, it does not pay attention to the history of the languages being contrasted, their origins - genetic aspects, development, and does not rely on them.

If we apply the above theoretical ideas to the literature, the analysis is carried out within the literature of one nation or one region, focusing on the genetic aspects of literary events, including the comparative-historical method. For example, “comparison of symbols in Uzbek classical literature”, research and analysis of literature based on (e.g., Russian and Uzbek, English and Spanish) we will use the contrastive method if the specific features of this or that literary phenomenon are revealed (Rasulov, 2010: 263).

4.3. Criteria for Evaluating the Results of Comparison

The evaluation of the comparison results depends in many respects on the extent to which the comparative analysis tasks discussed above have been performed. There are historical, epistemological, logical, methodological, spiritual-ideological and other criteria for an objective assessment of the results of comparisons in the scientific literature. To get a clearer picture of them.

A historical criterion is an assessment of how well the results of a comparative analysis correspond to historical facts.

The epistemological criteria are to evaluate the results of this comparative analysis in terms of their conformity to the laws and principles of the theory of knowledge.

The logical criteria are to assess the compliance of the results of the comparative analysis with the requirements of the laws of logic.

The methodological criteria are the evaluation of the results of the comparative analysis in terms of compliance with the choice and order of use of methodological tools.

The spiritual-ideological criteria are to evaluate the results of the comparative analysis, taking into account the extent to which the spirituality of society corresponds to the ideological goals.

In short, the above criteria allow evaluating the results of comparative analysis to determine the scientific and theoretical aspects of comparative research.

Conclusion

In order to achieve fair and objective results in the comparative analysis, it is necessary to pay attention to the following:

First, researchers who want to perform a comparative analysis need to know the theoretical, methodological, and methodological foundations of its implementation. In this regard, they should be able to effectively use the opportunities of theoretical and empirical means of knowledge.



Second, the objects of comparative analysis must take into account the characteristics of the environment in which they exist or may exist. In other words, the researcher must analyze all the circumstances that may affect the process of comparative analysis.

Third, comparison should not be limited to the collection and display of statistical data. The objects of comparison are constantly changing, and researchers need to consider this. The statistical picture of the studied objects must be supplemented with their dynamic features, showing their gradual perfection; otherwise, the comparative truth cannot be complete and objective. Therefore, the statistics should be analyzed and interpreted along with the dynamics.

Fourth, avoid subjectivism in analysis. False comparisons may serve certain interests, but they do not serve the development of science. The fact that some researchers compare philological aspects that do not correspond to each other at all leads to such a false comparison. As a result, the content and results of the comparative analysis are distorted, and misconceptions emerge in people's social consciousness. For example, comparing Otabek's romantic adventures in Abdulla Kadiri's "By gone days" with George Byron's Don Juan's romantic adventures does not give the expected result.

Hence, when the basic rules and requirements of comparative analysis are not met, the process of comparing literary events gives unbiased results.

References

- Akademicheskie shkoli v literaturovedenii. (1975). M. (Academic Schools in Literature Study).
- Akademicheskie shkoli v russkom literaturovedenii. (1975). M.: Nauka, 211. (Academic Schools in Russian literature study).
- Bogatkina, M.G. (2004). O formirovani novoy paradigmi v sovremennoy komparativistike // Mejdunarodnaya nauchnaya konferentsiya. Kazan, 75. (About forming of paradigms in modern comparavistics)// (International scientific conference. Kazan, 75)
- Veselovskiy, A.N. (1989). Istoricheskaya poetika. M.: Visshaya shkola. (Visilovski A.N. (1989) Historical poetics. M.: High School).
- Handbuch Komparatistik: Theorien, Arbeitsfelder, Wissenspraxis / Hrsg. von Zymner R., Hölder A. (2013) Stuttgart: Verlag J.B. Metzler, 405 (Bu kitob nemis tilida. Bu kitobni uzi nomi turaveradi).
- Sotsialnie i gumanitarnie nauki (2016). Otechestvennaya i zarubejnaya literatura. Ser. 7, Literaturovedenie: Referativniy jurnal. M, 7-21. (Social and Humanitarian science (2016) Local and Foreign literature. Ser.7, Literature Study: Abstarct journal. M,7-21)
- Jirmunskiy, V.M. (1960). Problemi sravnitelno-istoricheskogo izuchenie literatur // Izvestiya AN. T.XIX.Vip. 3. M, 183. (Jirmunskiy V.M. (1960) Problems of comparative historical learning literature// Izvestiya AN. T.XIX.Vip. 3. M, 183).
- Eshonboboev, A. (2008). Qiyosiy-tarixiy metod haqida // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti.T., №4. 38-46. (Eshonboboev A. (2008) On comparative historic method// Uzbek language and literature. T., №4. 38-46).
- Karimov, B. (2011). Adabiyotshunoslik metodologiyasi. T. Muharrir, 74. (Karimov B. (2011) Methodology of Literature Study. T. Editor, 74).
- Konrad, N.I. (1978). Izbrannie trudi. Literatura i teatr. M.: Nauka, 32-33. (Konrad N.I. (1978) Collection. Literature and theatre. M.: Science, 32-33.)
- Mineralov, Y.I. (2018). Sravnitelnoe literaturovedenie (Komparativistika). Uchebnik. – M.: Yurayt. (Mineralov Y.I. (2018). Comparative Literature Study (Comparativistics). Text-Book – M. Yurayt).
- Polivanov, Y. D. (1933). Russkaya grammatika v sopostavlenii s uzbekskim yazikom, T. (Polivanov Y. D. (1933) Russian grammar in comparison with Uzbek, T).
- Rasulov, R. (2010). Umumiy tilshunoslik. T, 291. (Rasulov R. (2010) General linguistics. T, 291)
- Reformatskiy, A.A. (1962). O sopostavitelnom metode, "Russkiy yazik v natsionalnoy shkole", № 5. (Reformatskiy A.A. (1962) On comparison method, "Russian language in national school).

- Xaliyeva, G. (2018). XX asr Rossiya sharqshunosligi va o'zbek mumtoz adabiyoti. Monografiya. T. Muharrir, 133-134. (Khaliyeva G. (2018) Russian orientalism of XX century and Uzbek classic literature. Monograph. T. Editor, 133-134).
- Qosimov, A., Hamroqulov A., Xo'jayev S. (2019). Qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik. T. Akademnashr, 24. (Kasimov A., Hamrakulov A., Kxujaev S. (2019) Comparative Literature study. T. Academic edition).
- Turaeva, B. (2021). Theoretical and Poetic Peculiarities of The Chronotope In the Novel "The Place of The Skull" By Ch.Aitmatov// Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology. 18(5), 84-103
www.bcla.org/index.htm; www.agla.org
<http://journals.tsu.ru>; www.cairn-int.info/journal-revue-de-litteratur.comparee.html
<http://kh-davron.uz/kutubxona/alisher-navoiy>