

Felicitary meta-plot in the XIX century Russian literature

Guzel M. Ibatullina¹

Galina V. Mishina²

Elza A. Rad³

Julia A. Staritsyna⁴

1. Sterlitamak branch of the federal state budgetary educational establishment of higher education “Bashkir state university”. E-mail: guzel-anna@yandex.ru
2. Sterlitamak branch of the federal state budgetary educational establishment of higher education “Bashkir state university”. E-mail: MishinaGV@yandex.ru
3. Sterlitamak branch of the federal state budgetary educational establishment of higher education “Bashkir state university”. E-mail: Elza_rad@mail.ru
4. Sterlitamak branch of the federal state budgetary educational establishment of higher education “Bashkir state university”. E-mail: zodp24@bk.ru

Abstract: The article deals with felicitary issues of the XIX century Russian literature reflected in the works of A.S. Pushkin, I.A. Goncharov, N.A. Nekrasov, A.P. Chekhov; it contextually touches the ways of embodying the theme of happiness in the works of a wider range of authors (L.N. Tolstoy, N.G. Chernyshevsky etc.). The system study of a felicitary paradigm of the Russian literature has long remained outside the view of researchers, which defines the relevance of this work. The goals and tasks of the study imply describing and analyzing figurative-semantic invariants, which are the most essential for a felicitary paradigm denoted in the artistic worlds of the above-mentioned writers. The study has enabled the authors to identify some key invariant oppositions and identities: rationality – irrationality of happiness; attainability – unattainability of happiness; happiness – rest; happiness – righteousness; happiness – conciliarism. The study leads to a conclusion that dialogic interreflections of these invariants defining various ways of interpreting a felicitary theme in the works of the XIX century Russian writers enable to consider the logic of its development as one of the meta-plots of the literature of that period. General logic of development of the very felicitary meta-plot in the contexts of the XIX century Russian literature defines its main vector as a movement between the poles of moral-psychological and existential-metaphysical explications. **Keywords:** the Russian literature, concept of happiness, felicitary paradigm, meta-plot, opposition, invariant, meaning, text.

1. INTRODUCTION

Happiness as a special artistic-philosophic concept realized in literary texts seems one of the traditional research themes in philology; therefore, at first sight, felicitary issues should be multiply described and somehow solved here. Actually, a figurative-semantic paradigm of happiness in the contexts of the Russian literature remains almost unstudied; however, an indirect analysis of motivic or other related structures is always an actual literary perspective. The literary thesis research of the last years involves the work of Kuang Hong Ni devoted directly to this theme [8], and the work of K. Martowicz devoted to the philosophic worldview of A. Green, the second part of which deals with the concept of happiness in the writer's works [19]. Philosophic, sociological, and psychological research on felicitary issues were started as early as in the second half of the XX century. However, they were rather sporadic than regular and methodologically reflected; thus, discussing psychological contexts of studies, N.V. Vinichuk notices, “The interest of psychologists in studying happiness appeared relatively recently. The first empirical studies of happiness <...> with simple and graphic scales or lists of basic categories emerged only in the 1930es. However, these attempts were rather occasional than regular” [3]. In the last decades, felicitary research becomes more active in both domestic and foreign science and involves different areas of scientific knowledge, see for instance [6], [10], [14], [18], [27], [28]. This research is especially productive in psychology: [22], [23], [24],

[25], [26]; here, positive psychology (one of its modern trends) and some studies of eudemonic orientation actually focus on felicitary issues. However, referring to a felicitary situation in Russia and the Russian science, we can quote a representative remark of I.V. Sidorenko, the author of a thesis *Filosofsko-Antropologicheskoe Issledovanie Kategorii Schastyia* [Philosophic-Anthropological Study of the Category of Happiness]: "...according to international social-psychological studies <...> Russia occupying the worldwide average level by the index of human potential development is at the last but one place by the level of happiness. This fact confirms the relevance of the study topic and raises the issue of elaborating the whole understanding of the category of happiness" [15]. We should note that this situation probably fits the comparative state of studying a felicitary theme in Russian and foreign science. Thus, in the latter one, these processes are more purposeful and axiologically conscious, as shown, for instance, by the website (Global database on happiness //http://www.eur.nl/fsw/research/happiness) (Journal of Happiness Studies //http://www.journalofhappiness.net/page/editorial-board) devoted to similar studies. It is no coincidence that recent literary works though devoted to the Russian literature belong to foreign scientists.

2. METHODS

In latest studies, the issues related to the notion of happiness are often defined by a Latinized term "felicitary". However, the use of new terms instead of traditional ones does not save: happiness as both psychological experience and philosophic category is hardly subjected to any clear-cut definitions since the ancient times. Certainly, fiction never claimed the possibility of exhausting definitions; however, the experience of its spiritual searches in this area aesthetically approved throughout its development enables to reveal some aspects of a felicitary theme significant for both an artist and a scientist as well as for any thinking personality. This experience can become an object of a more thorough study; however, here we will touch only some points that are essential, in our opinion, and perspective for it using the methods of comparative-historic, structural-semiotic, and system-functional analysis of literary texts and basic phenomena of a literary process reflecting the issues declared in the article. Methodological frameworks of this article imply the solution of its tasks within both a literary and a wider historic-cultural context of the issues under discussion.

Earlier, up to the last decades of the XX century, literary criticism studied "happiness" as a "theme" and an "issue"; now it considers happiness a "concept", a "universal", a "gestalt", in other words, a spiritual constant and a category expressed in a "large time-space" (M.M. Bakhtin) of literature as a special felicitary paradigm, which conditions the logic of plot-generation in many literary and artistic texts significant for culture. It becomes more obvious that the attempts to comprehend the essence of human happiness and ways to achieve it (or, vice versa, unhappiness and its reasons) somehow form a main plot of folklore and literature, which we can easily call a meta-plot. Indeed, a felicitary paradigm understood as a meta-plot largely defines the ways of interpreting many literary plots including archetypic plots. Arguably, all the variety of folklore and literary plot collisions exists as a system of invariants of a felicitary paradigm; on the contrary, plots as invariants are the collisions of this meta-plot.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The concept of happiness reflexively actualizes in culture at the stage of folklore consciousness, though in varying degrees and in varying folklore genres; obviously, a theme of happiness becomes central for a fairytale. Since the main task of this article is to study literary contexts, we put aside the felicitary paradigms of a fairytale, which are described in more detail in another work [5].

A tale does not know the issues of individual choice and individual way to happiness, the diversity of a personal ideal and a real state of the world, and internal personal conflicts that prevent from acquiring happiness. However, it is this range of issues that becomes plot-forming for literature as the next stage of the development of artistic-philosophic consciousness. We know that in the ancient Russian literature, an issue of individual private destiny and its dramatic collisions was artistically comprehended only in the XVI-XVII centuries; in this context, *A Story of Woe-Misfortune* is significant for our discourse; apparently, it should be considered one of the first works, which actualized felicitary issues, as also shown in the above-mentioned work [5]. Individualized searching for happiness by a “restless human heart” is depicted here as a source of inevitable dramatism of terrestrial being of a human. We will find a similar narrative situation in *A Story of Savva Grudtsin*. The XVIII century literature went on searching for artistic solutions of felicitary issues and the main vectors of these searches are defined by worldview milestones of the Enlightenment culture. T.E. Abramzon’s work *K Voprosu o Russkom Schastye (Poesiya XVIII Veka)* [Revisiting Russian Happiness (the XVIII century poetry)] represents a thorough analysis of a felicitary paradigm of the literature of the Enlightenment epoch [1]. The author of the article notices, “It is known and commonly acknowledged that happiness is a product of the Enlightenment. Enlighteners succeeded in changing the medieval worldview, where a terrestrial path of a human was treated as preparation for future eternal life, and sufferings were considered its necessary part and a condition of heavenly blessing. They created a new paradigm, which necessarily and unalterably includes terrestrial happiness” [1, P. 116]. However, the XIX century in the Russian culture largely left a worldview rationalized by enlighteners, which undoubtedly found reflection in a more complex dialectics of literary and philosophic discourse about happiness.

A.S. Pushkin’s works became the next significant milestone in the artistic comprehension of the issue of happiness and largely defined the main ways of felicitary reflections in the XIX-XX century Russian literature. Here, the thought of Pushkin as an artist-Proteus is multiple-vector and sometimes ambivalent and contradictive; the dialectics of the theme of happiness, which does not know clear-cut solutions, is reflected in semantic polyphony of Pushkin’s world. Aphoristically-completed author’s reflections: “Instead of happiness, say I, custom’s bestowed us from on high” (*Eugene Onegin*: [13, V. 4, P. 41]); “There is no happiness, but there is peace of heart” (“My friend, it’s time...”, 1834: [13, V. 2, P. 236]) are dialogically aligned with Onegin’s passionate and newly acquired revelation: “freedom and peace, in substitution for happiness, I sought, and ranged unloved, and friendless, and estranged. What folly! And what retribution!” [13, V. 4, P. 153]. S.G. Bocharov notices that these lines were many times compared in critics, “It seems that Onegin’s experience of the last chapter and the poet’s experience of 1834 deny each other (still, the line of 1834 obviously refers to the characteristics of Tatyana in the last chapter). However, both poetic utterances are equally convincing in their own contexts. <...> Both truths are an aspect, a relative truth of complete Pushkin’s world; however, in this or another turn of life, it becomes a whole truth of human life” [2, P. 160].

Pushkin’s works and his novel *Eugene Onegin* can be treated as both an introduction and one of the climaxes of a felicitary meta-plot of the XIX century Russian literature; it is no coincidence that an issue of happiness in Pushkin’s artistic world often was and still is an object of researchers’ attention. Further, the literature of the XIX-XX centuries witnesses a whole range of plot variations somehow resonating with Pushkin’s novel. The plot of life drama of Tatyana and Onegin is reflected in the story of Pechorin and Vera in M.Yu. Lermontov’s *A Hero of Our Time*, Lavretskiy and Liza in I.S. Turgenev’s *A Nest of the Gentry*, Katerina in A.N. Ostrovsky’s *The Storm*, L.N. Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*, in F.M. Dostoevsky’s *Idiot* and *A Gentle Creature*, N.S. Leskov’s *The Toupee Artist* as well as in the stories of many Chekhov’s

heroes and the heroes of other writers up to the XX century – in the works of A.I. Kuprin or B.L. Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago. We do not intend to give an exhausting description of the system of interreflections of these texts in the framework of a felicitary paradigm; therefore, we give only some essential observations and conclusions to delineate general contours of a meta-plot under analysis.

The specified Pushkin's ambivalent dyad "happiness" and "rest" often becomes an object of dialogic reflections in follow-up literature. In this respect, I.A. Goncharov's novel *Oblomov* is one of the representative and significant texts in this regard. It inevitably attracts the attention of researchers for many centuries (see, for instance: [17], [21]); however, it scarcely concerns felicitary issues. In Pushkin's world, a dyad happiness – rest is realized as opposition, while in Goncharov's world focused on the topos of idyll – as an identity; at the first look, happiness is equal to rest here. Actually, the image of rest itself (and, thus, happiness identical to it) in Goncharov's artistic philosophy is not equal to itself anymore and acquires semantic ambiguity and various possibilities of interpretation: there is rest understood as everyday well-being and rest as abundant life achieved through harmonious unity of the "everyday" and the spiritual-metaphysical in human being. Both forms of happiness-rest are played in the novel through a metaphor of a dream. Thus, a dream becomes a kind of metaphor of spiritual-euphoric happiness of the beloved *Oblomov* and *Olga* and then family well-being of *Olga* and *Stoltz*: "How happy I am!" was her frequent reflection... Dream of happiness other than the present used to steal upon her, and wrap her in a haze of inertia" [4, P. 436]; "she was sitting as if she was sleeping – so quiet was the dream of her happiness" [4, P. 436]; she was embarrassed with "this peaceful existence, this halting at various stages of felicity... Yet, for all her efforts to slough these phases of torpor and of spiritual coma... Again, to this mood there would succeed a phase of torture and weariness and apprehension--a phase of dull sorrowfulness..." [ibidem] We gave only a few representative quotes here; however, the analysis of the text generally reveals that in the artistic paradigm of the novel, a dyad happiness – rest exists in two invariant entering the relations of opposition and producing a new semantic invariant-identity: happiness – dream.

Oblomov's dream becomes an apotheosis of dialogic interreflections of these invariants. It is a kind of reminiscence of the "Golden Age" of humanity, when individual happiness was defined rather by sacral-metaphysical than social involvement of each individual in common happiness, when there was no distance between the everyday and the existential. Here, not individual events but the events that contribute to the continuation of a Family in its existential-mythologic understanding (birth, funerals, weddings) acquire dominant meaning for people. Here, even personal happiness of newly married is an opportunity to confirm the eternity of the Gens and to share the happiness of the Gens through an eternal sacral ritual. "...for these peasants live in the fortunate belief that no circumstances could ever be different to their own..." [4, P. 108]. There is a picture of conciliar happiness of the inhabitants of the pastoral world of *Oblomovka* – peaceful settlers dissolved in universal-existential rhythms. On the one hand, it actually looks like a dream, but, at the same time, the *Oblomovka* inhabitants live a creative-bright life deeply plunged into the ritual with a sense of involvement in natural-cosmic and spiritual-sacral cycles (sowing, harvesting, a church year), a life pierced by poetry, music, sense of beauty and harmony of all things.

Felicitary contexts of the novel are extensive and multipolar and, therefore, cannot be exhaustingly described in the framework of this work; however, we will specify some more essential points. Thus, unlike the inhabitants of the "Golden Age" who live in collective felicitary matrixes, each hero of a novel has some felicitary myth and considers happiness as an opportunity to stay within the limits of this myth, as an opportunity to reincarnate it in reality for good, while any demythologisation of individual image of happiness is perceived as its

destruction. Thus, it is characteristic that Stoltz's felicitary consciousness implies the experience of happiness as a state of completeness and final mythological closeness of a destiny, "At last! So many years of the pursuit of feeling, patience, economy of spiritual forces! I have been waiting for so long – and everything is awarded: here it is, the last human happiness!", "Now everything was shielded from him by happiness" [4, P. 435]. We should note that the degree of mythologisation of felicitary consciousness in the personages of the novel is different, and Olga is much less plunged into a myth than Stoltz or Oblomov, therefore she is embarrassed with "this peaceful existence, this halting at various stages of felicity" [4, P. 436]. In the system of the author's consciousness, these myths are not occasionally evaluated through oneiric metaphors: the worlds of individual myths-dreams are the worlds of "reveries" and "illusions". They cannot be adequately embodied into life and cannot intercross in the total reality of a common felicitary myth: for a modern person, it does not exist anymore, since there is no patriarchic consciousness with collective ideals and values that produced this myth. The paradox is that Stoltz, a man without illusions, lives in the illusion of happiness: after the explanation with Olga, he "was going home in thoughtful fumes of happiness not noticing the road and streets..." [4, P. 435] (the text is taken in italics by the authors of the article). Olga who became Stoltz's bride and as if acquired happiness is also caught by an illusion: "A reverie of happiness spread its large wings and was floating slowly, like a cloud in the sky, over her head..." [Ibidem]. Using a wordplay, we can say that for Oblomov, a protagonist of the work, a felicitary myth was realized rather as happiness of illusions-dreams than an illusion of happiness in the final. In spite of the obvious character of this happiness as ordinary comfort-rest, as new Oblomovka reconstructed by Agafia Pshenitsina, it paradoxically acquires rather metaphysic than everyday character, since for Oblomov, it is important to stay in the framework of existentially important myth than to be in a comfort situation itself. Thus, in one of the final chapters, he "was dreaming that <...> he had reached the enchanted country where the rivers run milk and honey <...> and every one walks clad in gold and silver". [4, P. 493]. Thus, oneiric metaphors used by Goncharov acquire special meaning-producing functions in the artistic world of a novel: dreams (and also a "reverie" and an "illusion" as its invariants) are a form of incarnation of an individual-personal myth including a felicitary myth in the reality of modern civilization, where mythologized being of a personality and mythologized happiness becomes almost impossible.

As noted above, when it refers to felicitary myths and a felicitary meta-plot of the Russian literature, another theme special for them and some significant collisions are associated with the opposition "rational – irrational" in the understanding of happiness. The irrationality of "misfortune" was first manifested as early as in *The Story of Grief-Misfortune*, while the irrationality of happiness itself is first consciously declared in the contexts of Pushkin's works. Tatyana's final choice in the *Onegin's* final is morally justified and thus rationally motivated, but a similar final situation in *Dubrovsky* is interfered with an "omnipotent incident": *Dubrovsky* was late quite a bit, but happiness was lost forever.

F.M. Dostoevsky says from the mouth of Versilov in *Adolescent* that there are such painful scenes in literature, which pierce heart once and forever and refers the final of *Eugen Onegin* with its tragic note to such scenes: "Bliss was so near, so altogether attainable!" [13, V. 4, P. 160]. From the viewpoint of imagery-meaning contexts of a felicitary meta-plot, such post-Pushkin texts as *A Storm* or *Anna Karenina* try to model other variants of personages' destinies: the stories of *Katerina* and *Anna* begin where *Tatyana's* story ends. In fact, their plots are a kind of artistically-decorated remarks, which enter a dialogue with Pushkin's felicitary reflections and try to answer the questions somehow emerging in reader's consciousness. Even if these questions seem too narrow-minded and trivial and not corresponding to the organic completeness of Pushkin's text, they are still stimulated by the text itself: would happiness been

possible, if Tatyana had made another choice? Perhaps, she is too severe to herself and Onegin? Indeed, extramarital affairs were common in the epoch of voluntary-compulsory marriages. We admire Tatyana's whole nature, but it never occurs to us to judge Lermontov's Vera for her relations with Pechorin. However, Vera does not acquire happiness either: even in the moment when it seems close and Pechorin understands that Vera is the dearest in his life, there is a reason to make this happiness impossible: Pechorin's horse dies when he tries to catch Vera up in a crazy riding. Certainly, this is an illusional-rational motivation. We can be sure: if a personage in the novel rides a horse as rapidly to catch some abrek, Kazbich or Azamat, nothing will happen with his horse, at a pinch, an abrek's horse will be faster and he will fling off a pursuer. However, if we see a personage trying to catch his escaping happiness with his only beloved, an unpredictable incident will inevitably occur. Such rationally unexplainable "occasional non-randomness" is defined by a popular saying "Not on the cards". Even if a horse did not die, there would apparently be another reason, equally unpredictable: indeed, even Lavretsky's ex-wife, allegedly dead, suddenly occurs to be alive and returns. Happiness is close and impossible for Tatyana, Vera, and Liza; just the same, it is impossible, for other reasons, for Katerina and Anna, for A. Kuprin's personages or for the characters of I.A. Bunin's Clean Monday, B.L. Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago... It seems that there is something fatal in the very world order, which makes so close and real happiness almost irrational and unreal – wherever it refers to a perfect love or perfect human beings.

A.P. Chekhov's *Black Monk* becomes a kind of climax and at the same time a final accord in the development of a theme of irrational unattainability of happiness. We will find dialogic interreflections of many literary texts, genres, images, styles in the story, but "Onegin's myth" (V.A. Koshelev: [7]) also occupies a special place here. A whole range of imagery and narrative-semantic situations of the story reveals Chekhov's conscious orientation on Pushkin's text; moreover, the story has direct references to Pushkin's novel: "Onyegin, I won't conceal it; I madly love Tatiana", humorously sings Kovrin in one of the scenes of the work [16, V. 7, P. 292]. Unlike his predecessors, Chekhov does not transform Onegin's final situation but makes up his mind to make a more wide-scale experiment, if we might say so. Terrestrial happiness was unattainable for Pushkin's personages, while the destinies of Chekhov's personages are first favorable, even idyllically favorable. The personages are young, meant for each other, and are in love. Happy beloved got married, and absolutely nothing could disturb perfect harmony. However, happiness is also just a possibility for them: the appearance of a Black Monk in Kovrin's life becomes the beginning of a future disaster. (Certainly, artistic dialectics of the story is much more complicated, and here we consciously reduce it up to some final narrative-semantic vectors; thus, we put aside the issue of the essence of Kovrin's euphoric felicitary states during his meetings with a Black monk.) Chekhov's models another variant of a hero's story; however, the inversion of the plot does not change the result: the final meaning of their destinies happens to be unexpectedly and dramatically similar. Parallels with Pushkin's plot reveal some mysterious, "fatal" impossibility of happiness in its everyday favorable understanding in Chekhov's world. The very figure of a Black Monk becomes a sign of the irrational, fatal dramatism, which lays wait not only for "ideal" or "idyllic" love, but also for everything that strives to connect the ideal with life well-being. (Let us remember that the image of a strange black cat whose appearance destroys the idyllic being of heroes plays the same significant role in N.V. Gogol's *The Old World Landowners*.)

However, it is not for nothing that Chekhov is called Pushkin in prose. Tragic breakdowns of being are open for them as for no one else; it paradoxically does not destroy the feeling of beauty and harmony of human life but sharpens it. For both Pushkin and Chekhov, life is also beautiful in its very dramatism. This is what opens to Kovrin in his final catastrophe and simultaneous cathartic enlightenment; however, he cognized the beauty and meaning of

terrestrial existence in all their completeness only at the borderline between life and death, “He called Tanya, called to the great garden with the gorgeous flowers sprinkled with dew, called to the park, the pines with their shaggy roots, the rye-field, his marvelous learning, his youth, courage, joy--called to life, which was so lovely.” [16, V. 7, P. 321]. The paradox is that here, Kovrin does not just remember about his bygone happiness, it is nearly the first time that he consciously experiences it during these several moments before his death that bring him the feeling of complete being. In Chekhov’s understanding, happiness is existential experience emerging in the states where human soul and consciousness overcome existential borders between life and death, spirit and body, individual-personal and universal-whole, rational and irrational. Such metaphysical experience of happiness does not depend from an eventful pattern of destiny and can open to any human consciousness. However, the drama is that we can cognize this revelation only in a special, “transgradient” state of being: by acquiring the ability to sense of the world, which is neither restraint from “fabulous” flow of life nor swallowed by it.

Thus, metaphysical, existential, and irrational “ends” and “beginnings” of a felicitary meta-plot are parabolically projected in Pushkin’s and Chekhov’s works. Parabolically, not linearly, since the logic of its development in the XIX century literature is defined, in our opinion, not by linearly-forward movement – from Pushkin to Chekhov – not syntagmatically, but paradigmatically: it functions as a meta-level narrative-semantic paradigm realizing in a form of some invariants (oppositions and identities) in various artistic worlds. Delineating basic coordinates of a felicitary conflict and ways to solve it, the Russian literature “between Pushkin and Chekhov” lives in a constant artistic-reflexive dialogue, in contrapuntal interlocks and mutual disputes. Thus, post-Pushkin literature contexts equally actualize rational and irrational moments of a felicitary plot. This opposition acquires plot-producing meaning conscious by the author in L.N. Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*, where Levin’s “rational” happiness lives in a counterpoint with ultimately “irrational” impossibility of happiness for Anna. Apparently, a felicitary topic is most clearly rationalized in N.A. Nekrasov’s works. In the poem *Silence* (1856-1857), personal happiness is excluded from life values – not because it is “impossible” or “unattainable”, but because it should consciously give place to other eudemonic ideals, “Strengthen yourself by his example, / you who are broken under the yoke of grief. / Do not strive for your personal happiness / and yield to God without arguing” [12, V. 4, P. 57]. Moreover, happiness in the form acceptable for a peasant seems doubtedly-ambivalent in *Silence*: “He clings onto his sadness. – / He is vivacious, he is ploughing. / He lives without enjoyment, / He dies without regrets” [Ibidem]. To die without regrets does not mean to die happy, not to speak of that happiness without enjoying life is nonsense. Here, happiness is replaced by spiritual rest achieved through religiousness, confession, and acquiring reasonable-rational balance of an imperfect human and imperfect world with God.

Later, largely final though uncompleted Nekrasov’s poem *Who is Happy in Russia?* does not annul but actualizes a felicitary theme and deals with the searches for the “happy”, which turn to the searches for the essence of the very happiness as the plot develops: finally, an eudemonic ideal joins here to a felicitary ideal, which again rationalizes both of them. As we know, by the end of the poem the issue of attainability of happiness is replaced by the issue of true understanding of happiness, which seems convincing when it refers to Grisha Dobrosklonov: to live righteously means to be happy. However, in the context of a common literary felicitary paradigm, we will certainly remember Tatyana Larina who made a righteous choice and honestly confessed that she was “unhappy”: happiness was still only possible for her. Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* would not become happier if she made more righteous and reasonably-proper choice after Tatyana. The N.G. Chernyshevsky’ heroes succeeded in uniting righteousness and personal happiness, but here the artistic logic of the very novel *What Is to Be*

Done? honestly admits that it is rather a sermon, a parable and a utopia than a direct reflection of existing reality.

N.A. Nekrasov is clearly close to L.N. Tolstoy not only in the attempts to comprehend rationally the essence of happiness as righteousness, but also in the pursuit of understanding rationally and explaining the ways to achieve it. However, unlike Tolstoy, whose hero from common people understands both things inherently, these reflections are natural for both an enlightened hero and a peasant in Nekrasov's works. For both artists, happiness of righteousness is conciliar and is acquired through the unity with people's life. However, Nekrasov's intellectual hero cannot merge with the organic idyll of peasant world, like Levin, since Nekrasov's world does not know this idyll. Even after the abolition of serfdom, the poet asks himself "The people are free, but are they happy?" [12, V. 3, P. 151]. The rationally decorated Nekrasov's position is also original because felicitary issues in his artistic world (except for the poem Jabber Frost that requires a special discussion) are integrated with social issues. Therefore, happiness-righteousness for Nekrasov's intelligent is not only salutary involvement in popular life (like in Tolstoy's works) but, at the same time, performing a mission of a savior towards a peasant life and soul.

The integration of religious-mythological, spiritual-moral and social aspects in understanding happiness, which define the originality of Nekrasov's felicitary paradigm, is defined in the Russian popular worldview and culture. Thus, Yu.M. Lebedev [9, P. 154] assumes that Nekrasov's epic *Who Is Happy in Russia?* is based on a popular legend about Belovodye. In Russian tales, this is a land of freedom, a land of righteous and happy people identified with Iriy (Vyriy) – a paradise of ancient Slavs. In the folklore of the XVII – XIX centuries Russian peasants, Belovodye is a wonderful country with abundant lands and nature, free from oppression, where holy righteous men live far from the world and piety and justice rule. Only pious people could enter this country. It was called "The Country of Justice and Well-Being", "Forbidden Country", "The Land of White Rivers and High Mountains", "The Land of Fair Spirits", "The Land of Live Fire" (See about it: [11, P. 46]).

Belovodye as a felicitary locus of popular worldview is mentioned in other, later works of the Russian literature; for example, in M. Gorky's drama *The Lower Depths*, Luka tells about a "righteous land". We should note that the position of the author of the piece on this utopia is ambiguous. Not without reason, Luka is opposed here by Satin who declares futurological concept of happiness and speaks of the future as the epoch of realizing the happiness of an "overman". The happiness of this "special person" is also the happiness of truth and righteousness, but the path to it is not a mystic-utopian voyage to Belovodye. The path to it lies through the sacrifices of the previous generations. Further, in the XX century literature, the searches for a country of peasant happiness will become plot-significant in S.A. Esenin's poem *Inonia*, A.T. Tvardovsky's *The Country of Muravia* and some other works clearly focused on both common popular-peasant understanding of eudemonic values and a particular Nekrasov's tradition.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Thus, delineating general logic of development of the very felicitary meta-plot in the contexts of the XIX century Russian literature, we can define its main vector as a movement between the poles of moral-psychological and existential-metaphysical explications. Here, we put aside some names undoubtedly significant in our context – for example, A.A. Fet, F.I. Tyutchev, F.M. Dostoevsky, V.G. Korolenko; however, it is certainly impossible to describe a felicitary text of the XIX century Russian literature in detail in the framework of a small article. Phenomenology of happiness realized in artistic worlds of each of the authors requires a separate thorough discussion. We have tried to delineate logically the semantic contours of a

felicitary paradigm of the literature of this period through the analysis of interreflections of some key, in our opinion, invariant opposition and identities: rationality – irrationality of happiness; attainability of happiness – unattainability of happiness; happiness – rest; happiness – dream; happiness – well-being (everyday) and happiness – abundant life (existential) happiness – righteousness; happiness – communalism.

Indeed, similar logic of mutual reflections of moral-psychological and spiritual-metaphysical explications largely defines felicitary issues of the XX century literature and, apparently, achieves a kind of limit in M.A. Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*, where a felicitary conflict acquires purely metaphysical solution in both plot and fabulous level. Certainly, the diversity and semantic multipolarity of the XX century literature implies other possible ways to solve this conflict and other possible interpretations of felicitary invariants with plot-producing meaning, which are classic for literature. It is impossible to give an exhausting description of the issues under study and to analyze all the works that actualize it in the framework of one work. Therefore, further we are going to study in more detail the specifics of the realization of imagery-semantic paradigm of the issue of happiness in the works of the XIX-XX centuries Russian literature.

The results obtained at this stage have both theoretical and practical value, since they open the possibility of a new, original interpretation of many quotable texts of the XIX century Russian literature. Materials and conclusions of the article can be of interest not only for literary critics, but also for researchers in the field of cultural studies, philosophy, linguistics, psychology, and sociology.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is supported by the grant No 16-20 of the Sterlitamak branch of the State Educational Institution of Higher Education “Bashkir State University”.

REFERENCES

1. Abramzon T.E. K Voprosu o Russkom Schastye (Poeziya XVIII Veka) [Revisiting Russian Happiness (the XVIII century poetry)]. *Libri Magistri. A scientific reviewed collection. Issue 1. Literary process: Historical and Modern Dimensions. Magnitogorsk. Magnitogorsk State Technical University named after G.I. Nosov. 2015. P. 116-134.*
2. Bocharov S.G. Svoboda i Schastye v Poezii Pushkina [Freedom and Happiness in Pushkin's Poetry]. *Issues of Poetics and History of Literature. (A collection of articles). Saransk. Publishing house of the Mordovian State University named after N.P. Ogarev, 1973. P. 147-163.*
3. Vinichuk N.V. Psichosemanticheskiy Analiz Predstavleniy o Schastye Kitaiskih i Rossiyskih Studentov [Psychosemantic Analysis of the Representations of Happiness of Chinese and Russian Students]. An abstract of a Ph.D. (Psychology) thesis. Khabarovsk. Far-Eastern State Railway University, 2008. 22 p.
4. Goncharov I.A. *Collected Works in 8 volumes. V.4. Moscow. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1953. 518 p.*
5. Ibatillina G.M. “A Schastye Bylo Tak Vozmozhno...”: Felitsitarnaya Tema i Ee Interpretatsii v Russkoy Literature [“Bliss was so near”: Felicitary Topic and Its Interpretation in Russian Literature]. *Kormanov's readings: Articles and materials. Edited and compiled by D.I. Cherashnyaya. Editorial board: T.V. Zvereva, N.G. Medvedeva, E.A. Podshivalova. Issue 13. Izhevsk. The Udmurt University, 2014. 477 p. P. 69-75.*

6. Idelbakova [Migranova] L.Sh. Schastye Kak Geshtalt Felitsitarnoi Otsenki v Romane Anna Karenina L.N. Tolstogo [Happiness as a Gestalt of a Felicitary Evaluation in L.N. Tolstoy's novel Anna Karenina]. The Russian language and Methods of Teaching. Traditions and modern life: Materials of the All-Russia Applied Research Conference of March 29-30, 2006. P.1. Tyumen. The publishing house of the Tyumen State University. 2007. Pp. 150-153
7. Koshelev V.A. Onegin'skiy Mif v Proze Chekhova [Onegin's Myth in Chekhov's Proze]. Chekhoviana: Chekhov and Pushkin. Editorial board: V.B. Kataev (executive editor) et al. Moscow. Nauka, 1998. 332 p.
8. Kuang Hong Ni. Problema Schastya/Neschastya v Proizvedeniyah Lyudmily Petrushevskoi i Chi Li [Issue of happiness/unhappiness in the Works of Lyudmila Petrushevskaya i Chi Li. A Ph.D. (Philosophy) thesis. Moscow. Moscow State Teachers Training University, 2008. 399 p.
9. Lebedev Yu.V. Na Puti k N.A. Nekrasovy [On the Way to N.A. Nekrasov]. Spiritual sources of the Russian classics. The XIX century poetry / Historian-literary sketches. Moscow. Classic Style, 2005. Pp.93-160.
10. Levit L.Z. Chastye ot Uma [The happiness of being clever]. The second edition, amended and supplemented. Minsk. Publishing house A.N. Varaksin, 2009. 320 p.
11. Mythological Dictionary. Edited by A.P. Semenov. Moscow. Aist, 2004. 539 p.
12. Nekrasov N.A. Complete collection of works and letters in 15 volumes. Edited by V.G. Bazanov, A.I. Gruzdeva, N.V. Osmakova et al. Leningrad. Nauka – Leningrad department, 1982.
13. Pushkin A.S. Eugene Onegin. Pushkin A.S. Collection of works in 10 volumes. Moscow. Pravda, 1981.
14. Rudakova S.V. Filosofiya Schastya v Lirike E.A. Boratynskogo [Philosophy of Happiness in E.A. Boratynsky's Lyrics] Series 2. Humanitarian Sciences. Yekaterinburg, 2012 No 4 (108). Pp. 103-114.
15. Sidorenko I.V. Filosofsko-Antropologicheskoe Issledovanie Kategorii Schastya [Philosophic-Anthropological Study of the Category of Happiness]. An abstract of a Doct.Sc. (Philosophy) thesis. Moscow. M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2006. 44 p.
16. Chekhov A.P. Collection of works in 12 volumes. Under general editorship of V.V. Ermilov, K.D. Muratova, Z.S. Paperniy, A.I. Revyakin. Moscow. State publishing house of fiction, 1960-1964.
17. Goncharov's "Oblomov": A Critical Companion. Ed. By G. Diment. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1998. 200 p. (Northwestern / AATSEL Critical Companions to Russian Literature; Vol. 8).
18. Hagerty M.R. Wealth and Happiness Revisited. Growing Wealth of Nations Does go with Greater Happiness. Social Indicators Research. 2003. Vol. 64, pp.1-27.
19. Martowicz K. The Work of Aleksandr Grin (1880-1932): A Study of Grin's Philosophical Outlook. A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of St. Andrews. 2011. – 220 p. // <http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>; <http://hdl.handle.net/10023/2467>;
21. Molnár A. Goncsarov Hármaskönyve. Budapest: Argumentum, 2012. – 342 s.

22. Myers D., Diener E. The Pursuit of Happiness. *Scientific American*. Vol. 274. No 5 (1996/5/1), pp. 70-72.
23. Pavot W., Diener E. Happiness Experienced: The Science of Subjective Well-Being. In S. David, I. Boniwell, & A.C. Ayers (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of happiness*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013. P. 134-151.
24. Ryan R.M., Deci E.L. On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2001. Vol. 52, pp.141-166.
25. Seligman M.E.P. *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being*. New York: Free Press, 2011. 349 p.
26. Style C. *Brilliant Positive Psychology: What Makes Us Happy, Optimistic and Motivated*. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall, 2011. 284 p.
27. Tatarkiewicz W. Happiness and Time. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Vol. 27. No.1. (Sep., 1966), pp. 1-10. Access mode: www.istor.com
28. Waterman A. S., Schwartz S. J., Conti R. The Implications of Two Conceptions of Happiness [Hedonic Enjoyment and Eudaimonia] for the Understanding of Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 2008. V 9, pp.41-79.