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Abstract

The study discusses and systematizes various features and methods of word generalization in the fictional philosophical prose of Russian writers. The research methodology for the phenomenon of philosophical prose in Russian literature was developed throughout several decades, including the scholarship of Omsk scientists. The identity of the philosophical word is an acute problem, which is generally due to the actively continuing development of philosophical prose in contemporary literature. The study of philosophical prose is based on all the key methods of literary text analysis developed in Russian literary studies: holistic analysis, comparative historical method, genetic analysis, mythopoetic analysis, etc. At the same time, the analysis of philosophical prose needs to meet the case of logical and figurative principle correlation within the artistic thinking of the author. The genre and style analyses are necessary for understanding the synthesis of artistic traditions in philosophical prose. The analysis of rhetorical techniques in conjunction with the analysis of metaphors, allegories, and symbols contributes to the understanding of the specifics of generalization in philosophical prose.

Understanding the genesis and evolution of philosophical prose allows the authors to trace how the concept of life-building, which is very characteristic of the national literary tradition, is transformed into an auto concept of philosophical prose of such authors as A. S. Pushkin, V. F. Odoevsky, A. I. Herzen, F. M Dostoevsky, and others. The study demonstrates that philosophical prose responds to the most important spiritual, generally cultural phenomena; its literary tradition establishes human life experience as the object of its image. The subject of reflection simultaneously becomes an object. A reflecting consciousness is not only depicted but studied as well in this paper. This also applies to the forms of thinking, including those experiencing a spiritual crisis. Philosophical prose is often implemented in marginal literary genres and forms that are genetically related to the didactic allegorical tradition: anecdote, parable, diatribe, maxim, sermon, etc. The works of distinguished authors usually take the form of philosophical prose such as “Russian Nights” by V. F. Odoevsky, “My Past and Thoughts” by A. I. Herzen, “A Writer’s Diary” by F. M. Dostoevsky. This paper demonstrates numerous approaches to the analysis of these literary works.

Keywords: Philosophical prose, oxymoron, etymologization, paradoxicality, aphoristic nature, meaningful repetition, didactic allegorical genre.

¹ Omsk Humanitarian Academy, 644105, 2A 4th Chelyuskintsev str., Omsk, Russia. E-mail: nou_ogu@mail.ru
² Omsk Regional Research Center for the Study of the Creativity of F. M. Dostoevsky (Omsk State University named after F. M. Dostoevsky), 644077, 55, building 2 Mira pr., Omsk, Russia. E-mail: fmdostocentr@yandex.ru
³ Omsk State Pedagogical University, 644099, 4A Partizanskaya str., Omsk, Russia. E-mail: eleonora_kopteva@mail.ru
⁴ Omsk Humanitarian Academy, 644105, 2A 4th Chelyuskintsev str., Omsk, Russia. E-mail: gen777kos@mail.ru
Introduction

The entire history of Russian prose development is connected with various forms of existence of the philosophical principle acting as a fruitful synthesis of various cultural trends. These trends implement a unique artistic experiment. The philosophy of prose grew simultaneously with the formation of artistic quality. The philosophy of prose started deviating from the depiction of outward to the depiction of inward and intrinsic. The term “philosophical prose” covers the interaction of various trends in cross-cultural synthesis, which changed depending on the era. Philosophicality was constantly actualized in transitional, critical epochs with dramatic changes to the entire cultural paradigm. These epochs were quite frequent throughout Russian history. Each time the impulse to change the nature of a writer’s philosophical word was caused by a leading dominant trend based on either the influence of European literature or the internal tasks of mature Russian prose following the internal needs of its self-development.

Philosophical prose, in contrast to the fictional one, serves as a means of generating thought, searching for truth, visualizing the essence of existence, tracing a personal path to truth, and reflecting on the word of philosophical text. Russian prose accumulated artistic means of “birth-of-self-in-thought, when the writer actualized themselves” (M. K. Mamardashvili). Philosophical prose, placing the author in the extreme semantic space of the search for truth for the sake of salvation, contributes to his “second” spiritual birth. With the help of text, the artist creates an integral existential consciousness.

The study of philosophical prose began in the last decades of the twentieth century. The publication of scientific works of Y. V. Mann (1969) on the Russian philosophical aesthetics and E. A. Maimin (1976) on philosophical poetry gave rise to the concept of actualization of philosophical forms in relation to Russian prose (Shtern, 1987; Eremeyev, 1989; Eremeyev & Kireyevsky, 1996; Akelkina, 1998). A prominent number of works in Russian literature of the XVIII-XIX centuries is based on the traditions of ancient didactic allegorical forms (anecdote, parable, diatribe, maxim, sermon, etc.). These include “Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow” by A. N. Radishchev, “Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends” by N. V. Gogol, “Russian Nights” by V. F. Odoevsky, “My Past and Thoughts” by A. I. Herzen, “Poems in Prose” by I. S. Turgenev, “A Writer’s Diary” by F. M. Dostoevsky, “A Confession” by L. N. Tolstoy, etc. The integrity of the human personality acts as the key idea within these works created based on the synthesis of logical and imaginative principles. They present an understanding of its life path concerning universal values; in other words, the ethical and aesthetic content of human life.

The relevance and novelty of this research are based on the interest of literary critics, cultural scientists, and philosophers in the analysis of the so-called borderline and marginal genres of literature, as well as non-fiction literature (see, for example: Epstein, 1988; Uvarov, 1998; Nikanorova, 2001; Goncharova, 2004; Prikazchikova, 2006; Mestergazi, 2007; Kalugin, 2008; Koshechko, 2011; Eremeyev, 1989; Eremeyev & Kireyevsky, 1996; Akelkina, 2012; 2015; Kopteva, 2012; Kosyakov, 2007; 2011). As expressed by A. E. Eremeyev et al.,

The complexity of the content of the art forms that started to form around the period of Russian classics ... leads to cognition of those artistic processes that researchers indicate as a unique qualitative transformation of the internal structure of the modern period works including the fictionalization of philosophical ideas, the intellectualization of statement forms, the impact of rhetorical and didactic allegorical genres, creation of new mythology, the symbolism of images and artistic structure, the essayization of style, genre synthesis, and the birth of hybrid forms of literature (2019, p. 5).

This paper assesses the evolution of prose forms in the national literary tradition of the XVIII-XIX centuries.
Materials and Methods

The question of specific meaning in philosophical criticism, philosophical poetry, and philosophical prose in Russian literature of the XIX century is one of the most relevant topics of Russian literary studies. This issue was interpreted by such scientists as L. Y. Ginzburg (1971; 1987), Y. V. Mann (1969), E. A. Maimin (1976), S. I. Mashinsky (Mashinsky & Aksakov, 1961), V. V. Kozhinov (1964), M. N. Epstein (1988), and others. Thus, reflecting on essayism as a specific mode of representation characteristic of modern literature, Epstein notes the “synthetic ability” of this style:

...not only to demythologize artistic imagery, reducing it to an extra-artistic reality but also to universalize this imagery, raising it to super-artistic generalizations. However, the image is not “thrown aside,” becoming a subject to a reflective game. It grows and learns the external factual and abstract-logical functions, taking on a higher ontological status as an extremely generalized, but vital and reliable conceptual reality (Epstein, 1988, p. 365).

We can observe the philosophical, critical, and historical foundation in the biographism-based works of the didactic-philosophical prose of the XVIII century. The paradox lies in the fact that the work becomes everything at once. The cultural versatility formed in the prose of this period, allowed the author to deduce various spheres of knowledge from his personal experience into the world of observed and re-experienced reality.

The philosophical prose of the XVIII-XIX centuries is created based on the emerging thinking ability, which originates from the scientific, oratorical, and public spheres. The paper attempts to identify the direction of the prose evolution within this period. The analysis allows us to enrich and largely revise the existing notion of the secondary character of such prose, establish continuity between the genre-narrative tradition of the XVIII century and the Russian classical literature of the XIX century, and significantly change the existing idea of style, narrative, and compositional organization of the works of the studied period.

Due to its close relation to the social and everyday context of the epoch, philosophical prose has a pathetic effect: it convinces, inspires, and drives the knowledge of everyday and socio-historical experience developed since antiquity. The all-embracing situation of existence in such prose is presented within the framework of everyday topical experience, prompting the reader to reflect on both the essence and the phenomenon of the event.

The study of philosophical prose is based on all the key methods of literary text analysis developed in Russian literary studies (holistic analysis, comparative historical method, genetic analysis, mythopoetic analysis, etc.). At the same time, the analysis of philosophical prose needs to meet the case of logical and figurative principle correlation within the artistic thinking of the author. Genre and style analyses are necessary for understanding the synthesis of artistic traditions in philosophical prose. The analysis of rhetorical techniques in conjunction with the analysis of metaphors, allegories, and symbols contributes to understanding the specifics of generalization in philosophical prose.

Understanding of genesis and evolution of philosophical prose allowed the authors of this study to trace how the concept of life-building, characteristic of the national literary tradition, is transformed into an auto conception of philosophical prose authors such as A. S. Pushkin, V. F. Odoyevsky, A. I. Herzen, F. M Dostoevsky, and others. Philosophical prose responds to the most important spiritual, generally cultural phenomena since its literary tradition establishes human life experience as the object of its image. The subject of reflection simultaneously becomes an object. A reflecting consciousness is not only depicted but studied. This also applies to the forms of thinking, including those experiencing a spiritual crisis.

Discussion
Formation of the Russian narrative tradition at the end of the XVIII century: the origins of philosophical prose

For almost three centuries, Russian prose, gradually collecting artistic and philosophical experience, moved to the discovery of a complete and existentially “fulfilling” consciousness, where the universe and the thought of it coincide. The formation of philosophical prose at the end of the XVIII century can be observed in the creative work of D. I. Fonvizin, N. M., Karamzin, A. S., Pushkin, V. F. Odoevsky, A. I. Herzen, F. M. Dostoevsky.

The development of narrative prose in the second half of the XVIII century is closely connected with the birth of the “inner man,” who seeks to express himself in various forms of relationships with the world. The genesis of personal consciousness, the awakening of introspection, and the need to reveal one’s spiritual experience stimulate the transition of literary creativity to a qualitatively different stage of development. In Russian culture, this “awakening” was most clearly manifested during the last third of the XVIII century, when secular literature, having experienced the fascination with “rules” and “canons,” sought to find patterns of the inner life of the individual, its conflicts and insights.

The need to create autobiographical notes, memoirs, and letters became more than just a personal necessity of the famous. The end of the XVIII-XIX centuries in Russian culture marks the epoch of writing or, in the words of M. N. Epstein, “the self-foundation of individuality” (1988, p. 335). Biographical forms, as well as travel, fictional, and real correspondence, served as a “meeting” with yourself, created a sense of a complete “I,” acting and comprehending life, observing and describing both for the author and reader of the XVIII century.

Experiments with biographical forms accompanied the birth of journalism, epistolography, satirical parody, travelogues, and other forms of prose in Russian literature of the last decades of the XVIII century. During this historical, literary period, the narrative prose was not yet divided into philosophical, historical, fiction, magazine, etc. This was the time of “fermentation,” genre syncretism, and simultaneous experiment of the author. Before the emergence of a large epic form, it was necessary to pass a period of apprenticeship and imitation, master, and rework the experience of small and medium-sized narrative genres. We can observe a similar trend in the works of Catherine the Great (Rudnitskaya, 1990), A. N. Radishchev (1988), M. D. Chulkov (1987), and many others.

Ancient genres (including didactic and allegorical) are intensively assimilated in the Russian secular literature of the XVIII century. The most popular include an anecdote, parable, fairy tale, dialogue, parabola, apologue, character sketch, and ancient biographical forms. Since a unified system of prose narrative genres did not exist during this period, the cultural interests and author’s “intuition” played a significant role in the author’s practice. The first Russian writers, specifically D. I. Fonvizin (1981), M. D. Chulkov (1987), G. R. Derzhavin (2000), A. N. Radischev (1988), and N. M. Karamzin (1984) possessed the aforementioned “intuition.”

For example, one of the biographical forms is presented in Fonvizin’s “Callisthenes” built in the tradition of the encomium (Fonvizin, 1981). The Russian author creates an ideal person, a philosopher. The image of Callisthenes is devoid of introspection, but it resembles the heroes of high classical genres like epics and tragedies, whose life’s work is to prove their loyalty to themselves and their idea. This type of the main character marks all high genres of classicism, and also appears in the philosophical novels and short stories.

Fonvizin’s “short story” is based on the principle of a parabola colliding various historical situations and revealing the universal, timeless meaning of current developments. This constructive principle will prove most fruitful during the genesis of Russian philosophical prose in the early XIX century (lyubomudry, V. F. Odoevsky, prose “excerpts” of A. S. Pushkin) (Kireyevsky, 1979; Odoevsky, 1981; Pushkin, 1978).
In his autobiographical notes, “An Open-Hearted Confession about My Deeds and Thoughts,” Fonvizin refers to other ancient traditions such as consolacio and soliloquia (Fonvizin, 1981, pp. 274-295). Here the author needs not only to express the events that demonstrate a strictly intimate side of life, but events permeated with personal introspection. This work preceded similar instances of this expression in literature such as “My Confession” by N. M. Karamzin (1802) (Karamzin, 1964, pp. 729-739), “An Author’s confession” (Gogol, 1952, pp. 432-467) and “Selected Passages...” (Gogol, 1952, pp. 213-418) by N. V. Gogol. Reliance on the “Confessions” of J-J. Rousseau and Augustine of Hippo allowed to bring together and re-imagine the facts of personal biography as natural manifestations of the inner life of a person. This gradually establishes the features of the confessional genre, such as the scenario of illness and trial, the existential boundary, fixation on the authority of the Holy Scripture and Tradition (a system of quotations and allusions), the combination of personal and universal spiritual experience.

Cultural familiarization with the literary tradition and the “memory of the genre” becomes the path to immortality and the restoration of the “I” – Integrity in its fusion with the world. Fonvizin was one of the first Russian authors to master the spiritual dimensions of literary creativity in secular prose: “<...> there is hardly any time left for me to repent, and for this purpose let there be no other feat in my confessions than Christian repentance: I will frankly reveal the secrets of my heart, and I will declare my iniquities. My intention is neither to justify myself nor to cover my corruption with evil words: Lord! Do not turn my heart away from the words of deceit and keep in me the love of the truth that you have instilled in my soul” (Fonvizin, 1981, p. 274). It is interesting that Fonvizin, as well as Karamzin (later in “A Knight of Our Time”) (Karamzin, 1964, pp. 755-782), do not depict human maturity, consciousness acknowledging certain laws of life comprehension. This formation of “I,” according to Bakhtin, depicts the "incompleteness" of the human person (Bakhtin, 1975, p. 472). It will find expression in the style of notes with the fragmentary, discrete image of a person depicted in facts, thoughts, feelings, actions which form the necessary material of confessional literature, in which this “fragmentary” human growth is supplemented and formed by introspection.

“Notes” of G. R. Derzhavin, where the author creates detailed remarks to his own memoirs, form a complete autobiography (Derzhavin, 2000). The author combines different perspectives of life depiction, including historically reliable (essay element), integral objectified (epic element), and personally experienced (autobiographical element). Didactic and allegorical forms (aphorisms, thoughts, portraits, anecdotes, etc.) serve as a kind of “construction” material for thought, which connects the temporary and the eternal throughout the work.

Derzhavin’s prose begins to depict the multi-aspect image of the world and man, making a hero less static and one-dimensional and more dynamic, which does not always reflect the process of gradual improvement. The author creates a hero who is capable of abrupt changes in a short time, while the movement of his inner life is more “abrupt” than consistent. The desire to constantly expand the boundaries of their consciousness, including self-awareness, in order to correlate their opinions with the views of other people, recognizing the incompleteness of both, self-affirmation in the hero’s contradictory desire to find the practically necessary truth, as well as the emphasis on “practical ethics” (V. Zenkovsky) of the deed – all this speaks on the formation of a philosophical and artistic sense, manifested in the image of “I” “seeking true knowledge” in Russian prose (Bakhtin, 2000, p. 58). The freedom of the human self is already liberated. Derzhavin anticipated Dostoevsky’s search in “A Writer’s Diary” (Dostoevsky, 1980a; 1980b; 1980c; 1980d; 1981e; 1981f; 1984), where the philosophical narrative contributes to the reader’s creation of consciousness that cannot be obtained by assimilating the ideas of other people. This is a state of motivation for independent, unselfish, and, in many ways, paradoxical thinking.
Anecdote, parable, fairy tale, novelization of epic forms, “physiognomic” portrait, characters, etc. genres become the basis not only for journalism but also for such literary “spheres” as private correspondence, epistolary texts that expose their literary conventions, collections of short stories, travelogues, biographies acting as Menippean satire of the modern age. Such literature is a reaction to everything official and hierarchically divided, so-called “high” and “decent.” It does not shy away from any forbidden topics, off-hand images, or farcical scenes. An informal domestic conversation is played out before the reader in which any hypocrisy and falseness immediately become noticeable.

Genre models, mastered over several decades of the 17th century, are “fragmented,” reduced, or, on the contrary, “expanded,” filled with “genre content” in the narrative literature (Pospelov, 1972, pp. 152-153). Thus, forms of sleep, visions, conversations in the realm of the dead, “night vigils,” Socratic dialogue, Lucian dialogue, etc. These elements "pull together" their centuries-old potential, becoming both satirical and philosophically allegorical, prefiguring the birth of philosophical prose in Russian literature. The origins of Russian prose of the XVIII century rely on the traditions of the Age of Enlightenment, where the dreams created by Fonvizin and visions from the works of Dostoevsky “come to life.”

Despite the fact that a clear system of narrative genres did not exist at this time, prose reached a new frontier in its development. Gradually, the very sense of the literary convention, the figure of a conventional narrator, the principles of philosophical detachment, the inductive and deductive unfolding of thought, the desire to move away from monological rhetoric to the awareness of numerous points of view on an event, phenomenon, person. All these qualities are essential to the dynamics of the narrative tradition.

Development of philosophical prose in A. I. Herzen’s book “My Past and Thoughts”

There are a number of fruitful attempts to justify the boundaries of philosophical prose, to understand its poetics, and to study the author’s position in Russian literary studies (Averintsev, 1979; Batkin, 1985; Bakhtin, 1979a; 1979b; Bocharov, 1982; Gulyga, 1978). The organizing principle of philosophical prose is a self-aware and self-cognitive hero of a conditionally biographical (or autobiographical) type or openly personal embodiment (as in journalism).

The form of expression and the measure of individualization of the “I” are different, but its presence is a prerequisite for philosophical prose. The meaning of life, defined by philosophical prose, is based “not on analytical self-evidence and not on systematic argumentation, but on a complete spiritual experience, the truth of which can only be experienced, but not proven” (Epshtein, 1978).

The author’s philosophical word reflects the individual path of the narrator’s conditional “I.” Still, in the process of this cognition, an impersonal, generally significant, historical scale of the image is born—for example, the choice made by the subject of the story in the A. I. Herzen’s “My Past and Thoughts” gave huge opportunities (Herzen, 1956a; 1956b; 1956c; 1957). In contrast to memoir literature, the narrator is not a person who remembers or a person who is aware of the “past,” but acts like someone who is obsessed with obtaining the vivific truth. Herzen chooses a hero whose biography is based on significant events that take place within the social whole of which he is a member. A historical date invading the history of personal life acts as a starting point within the structure of the work. Thus, history acts as the material for a biography, while the personality in the course of its development acts as a subject form in which this material is reflected. The experience of indifference to a historical event is the new form in which the relation between history and personality is cast. Becoming the subject of experience, historical fact receives biographical understanding in Herzen’s work. This process was reflected in the unfolding story of “My Past and Thoughts.” It created an atmosphere of actively tense thought processes, determined the fluctuations of the author’s tone. The story follows the inner rhythm of the author’s consciousness.
The creative will of the author’s consciousness is manifested in the fact that the narrative appears to the reader not in the form of randomly scattered memories, (despite the external fragmentary composition) but reveals a connection with the historical meaning of development. The deliberate emphasis on the conventions of the story, the clear division of the chapters into separate parts, the author’s sententiously aphoristic comments. All these features seemingly suit a rationalistic manner of narration based on a purely mental, intellectual connection.

However, the author’s thought (and, hence, the principle of organization of the artistic image) takes an entirely different approach. Someone else’s story, someone else's opinion or experience, is handled by the author and is transmitted as a fact of artistic reality, accounting for the realities of their own spiritual experience. This is followed by the direct narration of the author, maxim, aphorism, and it ends with a generalization that consolidates the meaning in the form of either historical or everyday anecdote, pun, mot, quote, or a symbol.

The moment of direct existence and the moment of its awareness merge at every stage of the artistic image creation. In addition, this stage sequence (the fact – its assimilation and inclusion in your spiritual experience through understanding – the concentration of the historical meaning of the phenomenon in the artistic generalization) is a living synthesis of philosophical, conceptual, and artistic ways of life cognition.

The author does not present the reader with finished ideas, but sets a special rhythm for the spiritual intensity of mastering life, directs his thought in the right direction, and encourages him to accept the way of dialectical life awareness. M. M. Prishvin described this way of artistic thinking in the following fashion: “The true knowledge of an object can only be achieved through a bilateral approach, seeing from both the outside and the inside; this means to see the object as it exists by itself, without a person, to see it with all the “naivety” of science. And to understand your experience in inner contact with this object in a way that is no less real than its comprehension is art” (Prishvina, 1981, p. 77).

**Philosophical prose in “A Writer’s Diary” by F. M. Dostoevsky**

At the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, philosophical prose with educational and extrapersonal intentions was replaced by the prose of experimental personal search for truth, that uses text as a vessel for the energy of the soul’s inner structure. F. M. Dostoevsky was one of the first to create philosophizing in prose on the basis of “personal experience and free creative fiction,” in the words of M. M. Bakhtin (2000, p. 230). Such works determined the direction of art development in the XX and XXI centuries. This determines the relevance of philosophical prose research currently commencing in literary studies. After all, the directions for the future cultural development of the XXI century depend on understanding the specifics of such literature.

The word of philosophical prose is aimed at the dynamics of comprehension of the existential essence unseen by the eye or, in other words, aimed at the actualization of contemplation. This word lives within the conditions of a constant experiment. With this aim in view, authors use a variety of stylistic techniques: paradoxes, contradictions, oxymorons, etymology, a revival of the internal form of the word, potentiation, puns, tautologies, wordplay, various figures of speech, reflection on narrative language, distancing, fantastic assumption. In a philosophical narrative, the word is extremely conditional following the inner rhythm of the author’s consciousness. Charged language tissue of this prose aims to activate the reader’s consciousness. At the border of artistic image and idea, there is strenuous coupling energy that overcomes the cliches of the philistine majority. The word of philosophical prose, according to S. S. Averintsev, is currently in the process of “becoming terminological” (Averintsev, 2004, p. 116), it aims to become a peculiar figurative term. Thus, the formulas of F. M. Dostoevsky such as “a random family,” “an idea that got on the street,” “a lull of order,” “a simple but complicated matter” are located in the zone of mobile meaning that is born
before the eyes of the reader. Dostoevsky, like other Russian authors, creatively mastered the poetics of the Bible with its rhetorical questions and appeals, with aphorisms and semantic repetitions, using archaic genres of legends, parables, biographies, panegyrics, and myths. The synthesis of artistic, logical, journalistic, and didactic principles is often observed within the word of philosophical prose, prompting the reader to his own insight and the birth of integral consciousness. The flexible and dynamic position of the philosophizing author takes on various generalized roles of “wanderer,” “sage,” “simple-minded,” “child,” critic, writer, experimenting fantasist, memoirist, didact, pragmatist. The controversy and inconsistency of these positions permeate the word, dynamizing the story of the search for truth.

Dostoevsky constantly uses provocative titles of parts in his book of philosophical prose “A Writer’s Diary,” for example, “I. In Place of a Foreword. On the Great and Small Bears, on Great Goethe’s Prayer, and, Generally, on Bad Habits” (Dostoevsky, 1981e, p. 5). Bringing together the concepts of different tiers, semantic plans (astronomical, creative, and everyday), the philosophizing writer imperceptibly introduces the thought and feeling of the interconnection of all the principles in the universe into the reader’s mind. The author takes an empirical fact of the mass suicides among the young demographic of the late 1870-ies in Russia and correlates it with the fabricated but plausible “Great Goethe Prayer.” He plays with semantic scales and evaluates the act of the twenty-three-year-old suicide victim using feelings of Goethe’s Werther, saying goodbye to the constellations of the Big and Little Dipper. This way, the author expands on the value of a factual newspaper statement and reduces it by calling these suicides a “bad habit.” Dostoevsky gives this fact an expansive meaning, placing it in unexpected contexts, establishing the connection of a senseless act with the crisis of morality of the epoch. So the fact becomes a mental universal: the image is expanded by others (sometimes strangers), and thus it reveals its generalizing properties and generates a personal experience of the acquired meaning from the point of view of eternity, worldliness in the reader.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, the word of philosophical prose always has increased intertextuality. Philosophizing actualizes the “forever truths” allowing them to come to life, while also helping to express quotations, the arguing voices of other people, aphorisms, and symbols. All this helps the reader learn to think independently. For example, Dostoevsky in “A Writer’s Diary” often breaks off the story at the climax, which gives impetus and space for the thought process of the reader.

Philosophical prose does not draw a sharp line between the meaning and the living phenomenon of reality. On the contrary, putting the universal situation of being in the framework of everyday experience it encourages reflection on the essence of the phenomenon. Philosophical prose became a form of time and an artistic laboratory for social and philosophical searches within the Russian national literary tradition.

Of course, not every prose work creates a philosophical angle of the image. “The unifying feature for all types of philosophical prose is the reflexive nature of the author’s consciousness or the consciousness of the narrator. Such consciousness is characterized by close attention not only to the object of recreation but also to the very process of its reflection” (Eremeyev, et al., 2019, p. 186). Philosophical prose does not aim to create a self-sufficient image. It requires sharp transitions from logical to metaphorical and vice versa, as well as the observation of thinking and awareness, the process of personal growth, the inclusion of any life experience in the context of universal searches, especially on the borders of the known / unknowable, expressed / inexpressible, everyday / existential, etc. Philosophical prose does not experiment in the field of plot or figurative system. It connects the free thought with feeling, description, observation of historical-social, and generally cultural forms of life. This synthesis creates an “open” type of mental image construction (Epstein, 1988, p. 361), which marks the modern forms of literature.
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