MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index

MODERN APPROACHES TO TEACHING LITERARY TERMS IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Zoya Sarsenbaeva
Doctor of Science (DSc), act.associate professor
Head of the department of Pedagogy and Languages,
Institute of Social and Political sciences, Uzbekistan
E-mail: zoe.sarsenbaeva@list.ru
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Abstract: The article deals with contemporary pedagogical approaches to teaching literary terms within comparative literature, focusing on how conceptual understanding, cross-cultural interpretation, and transferable analytical skills can be strengthened through evidence-based instructional design. The research conceptualizes literary terms (e.g., genre, motif, intertextuality, focalization, symbolism) as disciplinary concepts that require both definitional clarity and contextual flexibility across languages, traditions, and media. Methodologically, the project integrates concept-based instruction, inquiry-driven learning, and contrastive textual analysis with digital humanities practices to support term acquisition as a process of modeling, application, and interpretive justification. A technology-enhanced framework is proposed that combines corpus-informed examples, annotation platforms to develop students' metalinguistic awareness and comparative reading strategies while maintaining academic integrity and transparency in tool use.

Introduction

The urgency of studying modern approaches to teaching literary terms in comparative literature is driven by profound transformations in contemporary humanities education, characterized by increasing cultural diversity, digital mediation of texts, and the growing influence of artificial intelligence in academic learning environments. Traditional pedagogical models, which emphasize the memorization of fixed definitions, are no longer sufficient for preparing students to engage critically with literary concepts that are historically contingent, culturally embedded, and theoretically contested across national and linguistic traditions. Without systematic research into innovative instructional models, there is a risk that literary terminology will be taught in a reductive manner, limiting students' comparative competence and weakening their ability to conduct nuanced cross-cultural analysis. Moreover, comparative literature increasingly operates within multilingual and transnational academic spaces, where literary terms circulate through translation and disciplinary discourse with partial equivalence and semantic shift. The lack of empirically grounded pedagogical frameworks for addressing this conceptual instability creates a gap between theoretical advances in comparative literary studies and classroom practice.

Modern approaches to teaching literary terms in comparative literature treat terminology not as a list of definitions to be memorized, but as a living analytical language that students gradually learn to use, question, and adapt across cultures and traditions. Instead of presenting terms as universal and fixed, contemporary pedagogy emphasizes their historical variability and theoretical plurality, encouraging students to explore how concepts such as genre, narration, symbolism, or myth function differently in diverse literary systems. Through inquiry-based learning, dialogic discussion, and comparative problem-solving, students are guided to justify their terminological choices with textual and theoretical evidence, developing a deeper form of disciplinary literacy. This approach helps learners understand that mastering literary terms means acquiring the ability to think comparatively, negotiate meaning, and engage critically with multiple interpretive perspectives rather than simply reproducing established definitions.

At the same time, modern teaching increasingly integrates digital tools and new technologies as meaningful supports for conceptual learning. Digital annotation platforms, corpus-based analysis, and AI-assisted exploratory tasks allow students to observe how literary terms operate in real scholarly discourse and across media, while collaborative activities promote reflection and peer learning. When used critically and transparently, these technologies support intercultural awareness, conceptual transfer, and independent analytical

thinking. Importantly, contemporary approaches also foreground inclusivity and decolonial perspectives, drawing attention to whose conceptual frameworks are privileged and how alternative literary traditions articulate meaning. In this way, teaching literary terms in comparative literature becomes a reflective, research-informed process that prepares students for responsible participation in global literary scholarship.

Literature review

A literary work may be understood as an integrated artistic whole, an ideologically and aesthetically coherent system characterized by structural completeness. Central to this understanding is the relationship between content and form within the artwork, conceived as a dynamic dialectical unity that is realized in the structure of the image. While content and form are inseparable, artistic form possesses a degree of relative autonomy that allows it to function as an independent aesthetic factor. Scholarly inquiry into literature therefore relies on objective and theoretically grounded conceptions of the elements constituting artistic structure, including such notions as aesthetic idea, poetic idea, artistic system, and artistic model, as well as categories such as text, meaning, discourse, artistic world, world of the work, the poet's artistic universe, informational sequence, context, intertext, and cultural signs. Modern literary theory increasingly treats the literary work as a multilayered phenomenon composed of multiple, hierarchically organized levels. Each of these levels retains a certain degree of autonomy, despite being determined by the overall structure of the work. This interaction produces an effect of integrity in which seemingly incompatible elements coexist within a unified artistic whole. Structural models of literary works emphasize the functional interdependence of all components of the artistic system. Within this framework, the creative activity of the author is characterized by a centrifugal movement during the process of artistic production, whereas the act of reading or interpretation by the recipient demonstrates a centripetal movement aimed at reconstructing unity and meaning.

The category of the author occupies a central position in poetics and functions as a key concept in literary studies. The author is examined not only as a historical or biographical figure but also as a theoretical construct representing authorial consciousness and modes of thinking. Scholarly attention is directed toward the ways in which authorial consciousness is expressed, including the author's position, point of view, and the image of the author embedded in the text. Similarly, the reader is regarded as a significant category within literary theory. The dialogic relationships among author and narrator, narrator and character, character and reader, and reader and author together constitute an informational structure that organizes subjectivity within the literary work.

In the context of global integration and cultural globalization, one of the essential requirements for the contemporary literary scholar—regardless of national affiliation—is the ability to competently interpret and employ not only newly emerging concepts but also those terms that appear long established. Addressing the issue of terminology in literary studies reveals a phenomenon comparable to an iceberg: even an examination of its visible surface exposes scholars to unexpected difficulties and, at times, conceptual chaos. These challenges arise from several factors. First, modern researchers operate within multiple terminological systems shaped by diverse scholarly schools. Second, literary studies as a discipline has expanded its object of inquiry to such an extent that, as noted by Russian scholar V. Kurilov, it can no longer fully encompass its own field of investigation. Third, the rapid development of interdisciplinary connections has introduced new conceptual frameworks into literary research, including semiotic, phenomenological, philosophical, reception-oriented, hermeneutic, narratological, cultural, and sociological paradigms.

Methodology

The coexistence of numerous scholarly concepts and the pluralism of theoretical perspectives—within individual schools, methods, and Western and Eastern aesthetic traditions—frequently leads to divergent interpretations of key terms and contributes to terminological ambiguity. As a result, even well-established and widely used notions such as literary term, system of literary terminology, literary history, poetics, and artistic image remain highly debated within contemporary literary thought. Terminological and conceptual globalization in literary studies thus reflects both professional differentiation and a degree of disciplinary fragmentation.

In the pursuit of the latest terminology, contemporary scholarship often neglects the reflections of classical scholars on the mission of science and the trajectories of its development. The inherently discursive nature of fundamental principles and methodological approaches in both Western and Eastern scholarship significantly complicates the achievement of stable and unambiguous interpretations of literary-theoretical positions. Consequently, discrepancies in defining the scope of terminological reception generate difficulties across all forms of literary analysis, including the interpretation of artistic texts, and may lead to misunderstandings within the scholarly community.

In the modern academic landscape, many theoretical disagreements stem not only from the application of different analytical approaches or an inability to engage with alternative perspectives, but primarily from divergent interpretations of literary facts themselves. These differences often relate to entire historical periods and artistic paradigms shaped by the

mentality of a given epoch. The absence of scholarly consensus thus results from inconsistencies in defining the boundaries and content of foundational theoretical and historical-literary concepts. In her study, I.E.Frolova [7], taking into account the principle of instructional and methodological relevance as well as the realities of pedagogical practice in the training of future philologists, argues that already at the early stages of education it is necessary to delineate a core set of terminological vocabulary intended for active use in students' academic speech. She proposes a gradual and parallel introduction of this vocabulary, structured into five terminological groups.

The first group comprises terms denoting philosophical and aesthetic categories, including ideal, ideological content of art, national character of art, content, form, the comic, the tragic, irony, image, and symbol.

The second group includes terms essential for the analysis of literary works and modes of artistic representation (such as types of imagery and stylistic devices), among them grotesque, detail, idea, composition, motif, rhythm, type, the typical, typification, satire, stylization, theme, and conventionality.

The third group consists of terms that designate historical stages and frameworks in the development of literature, such as genre, style, canon, method, myth, school, and movement.

The fourth group encompasses terms referring to artistic methods, styles, movements, and trends, including avant-gardism, Baroque, the Renaissance, decadence, impressionism, classicism, the Enlightenment, realism, romanticism, symbolism, and expressionism.

The fifth terminological group is made up of terms directly related to the structure and components of an individual literary work, such as interior, landscape, portrait, conflict, plot, and character [8].

As can be observed, this classification does not include certain fundamental concepts of literary studies that are indispensable for future specialists, most notably the term poetics. From our perspective, poetics constitutes a central categorical concept within literary scholarship and therefore merits particular scholarly and pedagogical attention.

Paratext may function as a significant analytical key for scholars, as it reveals the complex dynamics of interaction among national cultures. For instance, A.Koldiron [5] of Florida State University examines English translations of French books produced during the Tudor period and observes that the majority of their paratextual elements bear clear traces of resistance to, and modification of, French source materials within English culture. These paratexts often articulate the translator's ambivalent or conflicted positioning between the two cultural spheres. Similarly, Peter Burke explicitly argues that paratexts—particularly prefaces

and addresses to the reader served as a deliberate means of reshaping translations so that they would reinforce ideas or prejudices already present in the target culture. In this sense, paratext becomes an instrument of ideological alignment rather than a neutral supplement to the translated text.

It is noteworthy that paratext also gained increasing importance within original French publications and French translations from the early sixteenth century onward, especially in mediating relationships between authors and publishers. Cynthia Brown illustrates this development through her analysis of the Paris edition of Boccaccio's Nobles et cleres dames, demonstrating how the bookseller Antoine Vérard strategically manipulated paratextual elements to dismantle traditional author–patron relationships and, in effect, restructure the organization of the publishing industry. This case highlights the capacity of paratext to redistribute cultural authority within literary production. According to Hesse, the determination of a text's meaning and status shifted away from the author toward its representation and reception by editors and readers. The revolution thus inaugurated a new cultural regime that prioritized paratextual variation—differences among editions and readings—over epistemological debates concerning the origin of ideas [1].

In the context of eighteenth-century English theatre, Gillian Russell emphasizes the critical importance of paratextual forms such as prologues and epilogues, which functioned as essential communicative tools between performers and audiences. These elements did not merely frame theatrical works but actively shaped their interpretation, exposing the constructed nature of genres, drawing attention to audience performativity, and ultimately revealing the theatricality of English society itself. Far from being marginal, such paratexts constituted a defining feature of Georgian theatrical culture. From Franz Potter's perspective, framing narratives in Gothic fiction can likewise be interpreted as a form of paratext [6]. These narrative frames not only sustain suspense but also enable the text to be read simultaneously as historical documentation and imaginative fiction. Potter argues that Gothic framing devices often undermine historical accuracy through the deliberate ambiguity of legendary or folkloric materials, resulting in narratives that oscillate between historical realism and the supernatural. Gothic fiction thus exists in a precarious equilibrium between historical and fantastical modes [4].

Paratextuality may also extend beyond written discourse to encompass geographical locations understood as clusters of culturally significant narratives. Lisa Hopkins, for example, interprets the French city of Lourdes as a paratext for Bram Stoker's Dracula, suggesting that events associated with Lourdes between 1858 and the jubilee year of 1897 provide a

meaningful interpretive framework—not merely through their content, but through the manner in which they shape narrative resonance.

In addition, paratext can function as a mechanism for legitimizing texts and granting them cultural authority. Jonathan Flatley argues that this role was especially evident in publications by African American authors, particularly prior to the abolition of slavery in the United States. In such works, paratext served as an indispensable "additional layer" aimed at white readerships, often including endorsements by prominent white figures who attested to the author's existence and authorship. These validating paratexts were crucial in securing credibility within racially stratified literary markets.

Paratexts—especially epitexts existing outside the primary text—may also shape public perception of an author's entire body of work. In Virginia Woolf: An Icon, Brenda Silver observes that following the 1962 premiere of Edward Albee's play Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?, Woolf herself attained iconic cultural status independent of her literary reputation or scholarly reception, effectively becoming a household name through paratextual circulation.

Autobiographical writing likewise relies heavily on paratextual framing. Oliver Davis notes that in the third volume of Simone de Beauvoir's autobiography, paratext assumes a legitimizing function by justifying both the memoir project and the author's reflection on aging. Notably, the volume of paratext in this installment far exceeds that of the preceding and subsequent volumes, underscoring its strategic importance.

Bran Nicol suggests [3] that Gérard Genette's theory of paratext offers valuable insights into the postmodern structure of Vladimir Nabokov's Pale Fire. The paratexts authored by Charles Kinbote explicitly perform a function that most paratexts only imply: the attempt to control and direct reader interpretation. At the same time, their overt unreliability produces the novel's postmodern effect, exposing the instability of all narrative authority and casting doubt on the credibility of the text as a whole. Despite its complexity, paratextuality remains an essential feature of postmodern historical fiction, such as John Fowles's The French Lieutenant's Woman. Here, deliberate paratextual strategies integrate historical intertexts into an explicitly fictional framework while preserving their documentary value. Paratext thus draws attention to the interpretive processes through which the past is understood and reconstructed in textual form.

Nevertheless, the concept of paratext has also been subject to critique within contemporary literary studies. Robert Ray argues that postmodern cultural ecosystems require a more up-to-date vocabulary, proposing the biological metaphor of "recycling" to describe environments in which the distinction between text and paratext—such as blurbs, dust jackets,

and criticism—has become increasingly indistinct. Jerome McGann similarly contends that Genette's model privileges linguistic elements and neglects material aspects such as typography, binding, pricing, and page format. For McGann, these material features should be fully incorporated into paratextual analysis. An illustrative example of this expanded approach is Laurie Osborne's study of published screenplays of Shakespearean films, which she interprets as paratexts mediating Shakespeare's works for contemporary audiences. It should be noted, however, that McGann's critique of Genette as "exclusively linguistic" may be overstated. Genette does address typographic choices as components of publisher peritext, citing the first edition of William Thackeray's The History of Henry Esmond, Esq., whose historically stylized typeface significantly shaped its reception as a pastiche.

Finally, Martin Puchner [2] successfully applies paratext theory to modernist drama, particularly to authorial stage directions overlooked by Genette. Puchner argues that theatrical performance depends on the distinction between spoken dialogue and a secondary text— paratext—including stage directions, dramatis personae, and act divisions. Although never spoken aloud, this secondary text governs staging, lighting, and performance, functioning as a form of descriptive or prescriptive diegesis. According to Puchner, a defining feature of modernist drama lies in the transformation of stage directions from straightforward authorial instructions into autonomous textual components that complicate theatrical representation.

Results and discussion

Teaching literary terms within comparative literature is no longer limited to transmitting fixed definitions; it increasingly operates as a practice of conceptual negotiation across languages, traditions, media, and interpretive communities. In comparative contexts, terms such as genre, narrator, intertextuality, myth, symbol, modernism, or tragedy are not merely technical labels but historically contingent concepts whose meanings shift as they travel between cultures and critical paradigms. This makes "terminological competence" a central learning outcome: students must not only recognize terms but also understand their semantic range, theoretical genealogy, and culturally embedded assumptions. Accordingly, contemporary research frames the learning of literary terminology as a form of disciplinary literacy, where conceptual knowledge is developed through inquiry, argumentation, and evidence-based interpretation rather than memorization.

A key issue raised in recent scholarship concerns the tension between standardization and contextualization. While curricula often require stable definitions for assessment, comparative literature demands that terms remain open to reinterpretation when applied to different textual ecosystems (e.g., applying realism across European, Latin American, and

postcolonial traditions). Modern pedagogy therefore tends to adopt concept-oriented instruction that treats terms as "working tools" tested against texts, genres, and historical moments. This approach aligns with constructivist learning theory and threshold concept frameworks: certain literary terms function as threshold concepts because once understood (e.g., focalization, defamiliarization, heteroglossia), they reorganize how students read, compare, and argue, but they can also produce persistent misconceptions if taught as rigid formulas.

From a methodological perspective, modern teaching increasingly integrates comparative conceptual mapping. Here, students build explicit networks among terms (e.g., linking narrative voice to focalization, reliability, and metalepsis) and then examine how these networks behave across cultural traditions and translation contexts. Concept mapping and knowledge-graph pedagogy support this process by externalizing students' conceptual structures and enabling instructors to diagnose gaps, overgeneralizations, or culturally narrow interpretations. When implemented as iterative tasks—pre-map, guided revision, post-map—these tools generate learning analytics that can be used to trace conceptual change over time, providing empirical evidence for the effectiveness of instruction.

Another prominent direction is corpus-informed pedagogy, which treats literary terms as elements of disciplinary discourse that can be studied through usage patterns. Using digital corpora of criticism, reviews, and scholarly articles, students can investigate how terms such as modernism or allegory collocate with particular evaluative adjectives, authors, or cultural references in different languages and periods. Such activities shift terminology instruction toward data-driven learning and critical discourse analysis, helping learners see that terms are not neutral but shaped by institutional traditions, canons, and ideological formations. In comparative literature courses, multilingual corpora further enable students to examine semantic drift and partial equivalence in translation (e.g., how romanticism or symbolism is framed differently across national literatures), strengthening both conceptual precision and intercultural interpretive awareness.

Pedagogical research also emphasizes dialogic and inquiry-based instruction, particularly through problem-based comparative cases. Instead of presenting satire or tragedy as settled categories, instructors can pose comparative problems—such as whether a given text qualifies as tragedy under different traditions, or how satire changes in authoritarian versus liberal public spheres—and require students to justify terminological choices with textual evidence and theoretical sources. This approach supports epistemic cognition by positioning literary terms as analytic decisions that must be warranted, contested, and refined. Classroom

discourse in such designs often uses structured academic controversy, Socratic seminars, or argument-driven inquiry, which have been shown to increase conceptual depth when learners must reconcile competing definitions and apply them to non-identical textual objects.

In addition, digital annotation environments support close reading and terminological application at scale. Shared annotation platforms enable students to tag passages with literary terms (e.g., irony, free indirect discourse, metaphor, motif), attach micro-justifications, and respond to peers' categorizations. The resulting annotation data can be analyzed through learning analytics to detect where students systematically misapply terms or where interpretive disagreement signals productive ambiguity. Such evidence can inform targeted mini-lessons and adaptive feedback. Importantly, in comparative literature, annotation can be designed to include culture-specific tags and translation notes, encouraging students to articulate how a term's application depends on historical and linguistic context.

Immersive and multimodal approaches further extend terminology learning beyond print-centric paradigms. Because comparative literature often engages with adaptation, film, digital narratives, and transmedia storytelling, teaching terms through multimodal corpora clarifies how concepts like narration, metaphor, or intertextuality operate across media. Digital storytelling assignments—where students create short comparative adaptations—can function as design-based learning tasks that require operationalizing literary terms in production, not only interpretation. In research terms, this aligns with multiliteracies pedagogy and semiotic domain theory: students learn the term by using it to make meaning within a semiotic system, then reflecting on how that system differs across cultural and medial contexts.

A persistent challenge in terminology instruction is assessment validity: measuring whether students have learned a term as conceptual competence rather than as definitional recall. Contemporary research increasingly advocates for performance-based assessment—comparative commentaries, concept application essays, and analytic portfolios—supported by analytic rubrics that operationalize criteria such as definitional accuracy, contextual sensitivity, textual evidence, cross-cultural transfer, and theoretical justification. Pre-/post-test designs can be complemented with artifact analysis and discourse analysis of student writing to examine how terms function within students' argument structures. In mixed-methods research, quantitative gains in rubric scores can be triangulated with qualitative coding of reflective journals to capture how students' understanding of conceptual ambiguity evolves.

Equity and inclusivity are also central to modern approaches, particularly because comparative literature classrooms often include linguistically diverse students and texts from marginalized traditions. A critical pedagogical stance argues that teaching literary terms should

include explicit attention to the politics of canon formation and conceptual authority: whose definitions dominate, which traditions are treated as "standard," and how terminological frameworks may obscure indigenous, regional, or oral literatures. Decolonial and postcolonial methodologies thus recommend creating "conceptual bilingualism," where students learn to work with both global critical vocabulary and local interpretive categories, acknowledging partial translatability and resisting forced equivalence. This not only enriches comparative analysis but also prevents epistemic injustice in the classroom.

Conclusion

Thus, the study indicates that effective teaching of literary terms in comparative literature depends on integrating conceptual, cultural, and methodological dimensions. Modern approaches prioritize active meaning-making through inquiry, discourse, data, and design; they employ digital tools and AI as structured scaffolds for exploration and verification; and they assess learning through authentic comparative performances rather than memorization. Finally, from an equity and inclusivity perspective, urgent research is needed to ensure that the teaching of literary terms does not perpetuate canon-centric or Eurocentric conceptual frameworks. Comparative literature, by definition, engages with marginalized, non-Western, and minoritized traditions whose interpretive categories are often underrepresented in standard terminologies. Developing and validating pedagogical models that integrate multilingual, and culturally responsive approaches to literary terminology is crucial for fostering epistemic justice and preparing students for responsible participation in global literary scholarship.

<div align="center">**References:**</div>

1.   Hesse, Carla. Publishing and Cultural Politics in Revolutionary Paris, 1789–1810. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

2.   Puchner, Martin. Stage fright: modernism, anti-theatricality, and drama. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

3.   Nicol, Bran. The Cambridge Introduction to Postmodern Fiction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

4.   Колотов А. А. Паратекстуальный подход в современном литературоведении //Филология и лингвистика: современные тренды и перспективы исследования: материалы междунар. конф. – 2011. – Т. 30.

5.   Coldiron, A. E. B. French Presences in Tudor England//A companion to Tudor literature. Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. Pp. 246–260.

6.   Potter, Franz J. The history of Gothic publishing, 1800–1835: exhuming the trade. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

7.   Frolova O.E. O sootnoshenii literaturovedcheskoj i iskusstvovedcheskoj terminologii pri rabote s hudozhestvennym tekstom v auditorii inostrannyh studentov-filologov // Russkij yazyk i literatura v obshchenii narodov mira: problemy funkcionirovaniya i prepodavaniya. Doklady sovetskoj delegacii. M., 1990.

8.   Хатамова Д. А., Соломонова А. А. Проблемы идентификации литературоведческой терминологии //Русский язык за рубежом. – 2020. – №. 1. – С. 120-123.

9.   Сарсенбаева З. Analysis of images and symbols in english non-realistic works //Ренессанс в парадигме новаций образования и технологий в XXI веке. – 2023. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 229-232.

10.   Qizi S. Z. J. The development of intercultural competence as an essential element in learning EFL //Национальная ассоциация ученых. – 2021. – №. 64-1. – С. 21-24.

11.   Сарсенбаева З. Модернизм в узбекской литературе и интерпретация образов //Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 1. – С. 193-199.

12.   Sarsenbaeva Z., Sarsenbaeva R. English Language Proficiency In Translation //Interpretation and researches-2024.

13.   Zoya S. LITERARY ANALYSIS OF DAVID MITCHELL'S WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE //Talqin va tadqiqotlar ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 41. – С. 11-19.

14.   Zoya S. LITERARY ANALYSIS OF ULUGBEK HAMDAMOV'S WORKS IN UZBEK LITERATURE //Talqin va tadqiqotlar ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali. – 2024. – Т. 2. – №. 41. – С. 20-25.

15.

https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=HYdBv8cAAAAJ&cstart=20&pagesize=80&citation_for_view=HYdBv8cAAAAJ:NhqRSupF_l8C