



Journal
of Danubian
Studies
and Research

Imagological Discourse in Modern Anthropological Reflection

Nataliia Yantsos¹

Abstract: The article presents the main stages in the development of imagology as a young science, and the dynamics of its evolution by Jean-Marie Carré and Marius François Guillard, who are considered pioneers in this direction. The review includes studies by contemporary Ukrainian scholars Dmytro Nalyvayko and Mykola Ilnytsky. The categorical apparatus of imagology as a branch of comparative literature, the subject of which are images of other countries and foreigners, reproduced in a particular national literature, the following concepts are noted: non-national and ino-cultural, ethno-cultural identity, self-determination, mutual perception, ethno-national stereotype, autostereotype, idea of the image of “one’s own” and “other” cultural space, etc.

Keywords: imagology; image of “other”; stereotype; comparative literature; mentality

Introduction

The dynamic life of the modern world, technological progress, a clear course to globalization and other events of the 20th – 21st century set the pace of the development of everything around us. This is especially true for science, because science is the reason for accelerating the development of society. New discoveries and achievements in science make irrelevant what has been discovered before, but this doesn’t mean that what is acquired is not important, because you cannot imagine one without other - new achievements without what has already been discovered. The same can be said about, it seemed, a completely new and young science, imagology. It appeared as a science in the middle of the twentieth century, but certain ideas were also originate in previous centuries.

¹ Izmail State University of Humanities, Ukraine, Address: Repina St, 12, Izmail, Odessa Region, 68601, Ukraine, Tel.: +38 (04841)51388, Corresponding author: yantsosnataly@gmail.com.

Imagology (imagology or image studies in English, imagologie in French and German) is an extensive system of related disciplines that studies the historical, cultural, sociological, psychological and political aspects of the images through which participants represent themselves and their partners (*Ilnitsky*, 2007, p. 244). That is, imagology is a scientific discipline about the laws of creation, functioning and interpretation of images of “others”, “strangers” and which are not unique to a particular group of people. The term was first used by G. Dizerinko in the work “Comparative Studies. Introduction” (1982).

Due to the fact that to this day in the imagological discourse the question remains open to which branch of science belongs imagology, what it specifically studies and what it leads to, the main purpose of this article is to reveal in chronological order how the perception of the main subject of the study of imagology in foreign and domestic scholars has changed. Having analyzed recent research and publications related to the topic of imagology, we came to the conclusion that researchers in their work only partially address the topic of the dynamics of the development of imagological thought. For example, in his publication “Imagology” A.R. Oschepkov writes about how imagological thought is considered by such foreign researchers as Jean-Marie Carré, Marius François Guillaume and Hugo Dizernik. L.P. Ivanov in his work “Imagology” relies more on the achievements in the field of imagology on Vladimir Orekhov. O.A. Polyakova in her article “The Origins of Domestic Imagology” speaks more about the appearance of imagology in the Soviet Union. And Natalia Kior in the publication “Literary Imagology: the study of images of other ethnic cultures in national literature” mentions D. Nalyvayko only in a few sentences. Therefore, the main task of the article is to show chronologically how the subject of imagology has changed in foreign and domestic researchers.

Also, this article has the following objectives:

to show the subject, object, main tasks and goals of imagology as a science;

to highlight in chronological order the dynamics of the development of imagological thought of foreign and domestic scientists;

to explain the terminological apparatus of imagology.

The relevance of this article is to show how imagological thought has changed from the time when it was just born as a science to the present. The central question of imagology, as a science, varied and depended on the researchers who dealt with it. Thus, this article answers the question: “What was the main subject of the study of imagology in the process of its formation and development?”

Object, Subject and Tasks of Imagology as a Science

This science has an interdisciplinary character, and therefore we can say that the ideas of imagology are found in other sciences. Imagology is considered mostly in the context of linguistics and literary criticism. Here it is given the status not of an independent science, but is considered as a branch of literary comparative studies. Imagology, in the context of comparative literature, studies the possibilities of transmitting literary images when translating from one language to another. One of the practical tasks of imagology is the creation of methods for practicing teachers, which would allow to form in the teaching of a foreign language, adequate ideas about the realities that are absent in the culture of the one who learns a language.

Imagology in the aesthetic and psychological direction is also present. In this area, imagological ideas found embodiment in the works of A. Meneghetti (founder of the ontopsychological method). His works and the works of his followers are aimed at studying the imagination of the creative person about himself and the “other”, bringing unconscious images to a conscious level (Meneghetti, 2005).

Imagological ideas and methods are also used in history, so we speak about historical imagology, which studies images that existed in the past and stereotypes of perception of the world around us. Here imagology acts as a direction of historical anthropology. It also appears as a direction of historical anthropology. Imagological issues were widely covered at the interdisciplinary scientific seminar “Russia and the World: Problems of Mutual Perception”, where imagological issues were the subject of work. This seminar was conducted by the Center for the Study of National Culture of the Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Andreicheva, 2016).

Imagology as a branch of political science studies political technologies, patterns of development and formation of leadership skills. In the field of political imagology are considered the fundamental ideas of the nature of political leadership and political governance, as well as political psychology, political ethics, political literature, etc. Imagology also deals with the circulation of political elites, power resources, and so on (*National Encyclopedia*).

Thus, we see imagology as a scientific discipline whose ideas are used in other scientific fields. But in our study, imagology as a science will be considered in the context of literary disciplines. What does imagology investigate?

The objects of imagology can be as much as the perception and evaluation of a nation or country, as much as the image in the evaluation of another nation, for example, not England in the British, but “Englishness”, not France in the French, but “Frenchness”, “Americanness”, “Germanness” and so on.

The subjects of imagology are linguistic means that represent the national point of view of the people or country, including myths, symbols and stereotypes.

The main task of imagology, according to N.P. Michalska, is “to study the figurative perception and embodiment of ideas about another country, its people and the peculiarities of national character” (*Mikhalskaya*, 2012, p. 4).

It is expedient to consider the following problems in the imagological aspect:

perception of a country, people, locality by representatives of other people in synchrony or diachrony;

one country or people in the mirror of other countries or people;

first impressions of a country and people as a result of geographical discoveries.

If you fill this list with specific countries and peoples (for example, a comparative analysis of the diaries of the secretaries of the first diplomatic missions of Russia, Britain and France to Japan), there will be many topics. The material for the analysis can be folklore, literary texts, epistolary, memoirs, journalism, new reports in the media.

Principles of literary imagological analysis is determined by the specifics of its subject - the work of art, its world and text. The idea of a foreign country and a foreign national character and mentality consists in a literary work of various artistic elements, among which the first (but not the only) place is occupied by foreign characters, as bearers of “foreign” culture, as well as direct descriptions and characteristics from the the narrator’s or characters’ points of view.

Imagological thought from its Inception to the Present

The origins of imagology can be traced to the French comparative-historical literary criticism of the 1950s, which sought to relate its thematic register and research tools. But it should be noted that an extraordinary **surge of interest in the Other** and other worlds in the history of European culture marked the sixteenth - seventeenth centuries, the time of great geographical discoveries, which gave rise to a large and

diverse ethnographic literature about not “their own” countries and peoples, which passed into the contemporary art, in particular epic poetry (it is worth remembering “Lusiada” by L. Camoens, as well as “Roxolania” by S. Klonovich). This wave did not subside in the eighteenth century, although interest in the Other and other worlds takes a different direction. According to **D. Nalyvayko**, we have reason to talk about attempts at their socio-philosophical understanding (*Nalivayko*, 2006, p. 92). According to **T. Todorov**, at that time began to form an imagological scientific discourse.

There are two concepts in imagology: “artistic imagology” and “literary”. A special role in the **development of artistic imagology** was played by the Enlightenment, which popularized the literary genre of travel (in Russia, for example, supporters of this genre were E.R. Dashkova, D.I. Fonvizin, N.M. Karamzin, N.I. Grech, M .P. Hours and others). Romanticism, as we know, showed a deep interest in the national identity of the people, its language and folklore, the mentality and character of another nation, the “exotic” (“uncivilized” peoples, savages) . Following the “color local” chronotope, creating images of characters from other nations (the theme of the Caucasus, Crimea, Roma and Moldovans in Pushkin, the Russians in Pushkin and Gogol, the Caucasus in Lermontov and Tolstoy, etc.), the literature of romanticism embodied ethnostereotypes that had already developed in the minds of the people from which the writers came. The work of the Romantics was influenced by the interest in the national, such as the Hegelian-Schellingian understanding of the nation as an individual and the bearer of a certain historical mission. This interest persisted in post-romanticism, especially in connection with the problem of Russia’s historical path, for example, and its attitude to the West (*Zenkovsky*, 1926).

Artistic imagology means the reflection of ethnostereotypes of national consciousness in the figurative world of literature, and **literary imagology** - a scientific analysis of these images and their interpretation by the researcher. Literary imagology is “an actual direction of modern comparative studies, which systematically studies the ideas of one nation about another” (Chevrel, 2006),”section of literary comparative studies” (Schwarze, 2003), which considers “dialogue of cultures embodied in literary texts” (Khorev, 2005).

The question of literary imagology in foreign literary criticism was addressed by J.-M. Carre and M.F. Guyar, who are considered pioneers in this direction. **J.M. Carré** studied the formation and evolution of the image of Germany in the nineteenth-century French literature in his 1947 monographs “French Writers and the German Mirage: 1800-1940”. In the preface to the book, Carre emphasized that he did not

intend to study the influence of German literature on French, but saw his goal as “recalling the optical errors made by French writers” in his ideas about Germany (Carré, 1947).

Guyard's book became a kind of theoretical manifesto, which declared the need to address new (imagological) issues in comparative studies. M.F. Guyard entered into a controversy with the American comparativists, who, in his view, paid too much attention to literary contacts and influence. Guyard believed that “the study of influences is often misleading and disappointing” (Guyard, 1951). But even when it comes to a particular writer, studying which of the foreign authors attracted his attention, was read by him and influenced him, can be fruitful, since the circle of his literary preferences of a writer is described, it means to describe himself. Guyard said: “We will no longer trace and study the illusory effects of one literature on another. It is better to try to understand how great myths about other peoples and nations are formed and exist in the individual or collective consciousness ... – this is the key to the restoration of comparative studies, a new direction of this research “(Guyard, 1951). Thus, Guyard proposed to shift the attention of researchers from the problem of literary influences to the problem of reception of the “other”. Guillaume was heard, and in the 1950s and 1960s, studies of the image of the “strange” appeared in France.

The other important figure in the history of imagology was Hugo Dizerink. The Belgian scholar made a turn in literary studies not only to a new issue, but also to a new methodology. In 1966 he published the article “On the problem of” images “and” mirages “and their research in the framework of comparative literature”, which became a theoretical manifesto and the main “Aachen program of imagology”. He argued that national images and stereotypes should not be external to the inner fabric of the text, but permeates its whole being. With his Aachen program, Dizerink went even further and advanced the concept of comparative literature (Joep Lirsén, *Imagology: history and method.*).

Hugo Dizerink considered imagology as a direction in comparative studies, the task of which is to study in the literature the image of another country, people, culture. He also virtualized the concept of “nation”. In his opinion, a nation is not a really existing community, but only a mental construction, a “temporary mental construction”. Thus Dizerink questioned the objective existence of the nation, and hence the national identity (*Oshchepkov*, *Imagology*). This process of virtualization of the nation was started by **Karl Popper**, who declared that “a nation is a certain number of people united by a common mistake about their history.” The concept of

social constructivism was to be significantly influenced by Lukman and Berger's concept of social constructivism, who argued in their 1966 book "Constructing Social Reality", that society is a continuous construction of meanings and symbols that determine human activity and social practice (*Oshchepkov*, Imagology).

D. A. Page has an original program of research of the main aspect of imagology. He taught in his papers "Prospects for Research in Comparative Literature: Cultural Iconography" (1981) (*Pageaux*, 1981), and "Cultural Iconography: From Comparative Literary Studies to Cultural Anthropology" (*Pageaux*, 1983). Thus, it must be said that imagology developed especially intensively in France and Germany during the 1950s and 1980s.

In our country, imagology, as a scientific discipline, developed step by step. It all started with the need to study national images, reception and representation of the image of "others", and the formation of the conceptual apparatus, which had not yet been established, to extended research on a large specific topic with rich theoretical material (*this is primarily in the works of V.A. Khorev, V.B. Zemkov, N.P. Mikhalskaya*) (*Polyakova*, 2016, p. 1).

During the Soviet period, a whole trend was formed in literary studies. L.P. Egorova believes that this trend, in retrospect, can be called "imagological". This imagological current in Soviet times was influenced by the ideological charge due to the cliché "Friendship of Peoples - Friendship of Literatures". Therefore, the work of scientists of that time reveals the process of perception of Russian writers mentality and way of life of other nationalities. Literature is considered an important fact of intercultural communication, and talked about the polyethnic and multi-religious unity of a huge country (*Egorova*, 2009, p. 296)

For the first time in Ukrainian literary studies, **D. Nalyvayko** turned his attention to this discipline, defining the subject and strategies of literary imagology. From the pen of this scientist came a thorough study of the foreign reception of Ukraine, its history and culture ("Eyes of the West: The reception of Ukraine in Western Europe XI - XVIII centuries", 1998), and he published the first in Ukrainian comparative studies theoretical research in this field of research - "Literary Imagology: Subject and Strategies" (2005) (*Kior*, 2011). M. Ilnytsky devoted an entire section in his textbook to this field and defined imagology as an interdisciplinary specialization of literary comparative studies.

Scientists and imagologists have adopted the main provisions, which were developed by **M.M. Bakhtin**. He spoke of the "dialogue of cultures", that another's culture

only in the eyes of another culture reveals itself more deeply and fully: “We asked foreign culture new questions that it did not ask itself. We look for answers to our questions in it, and another’s culture answers us, opening before us its new sides, new depths of meaning “.

In his introductory article, V.B. Zemskov talks about the theoretical foundations of imagological reception. He begins this article with the definition of imagology, and clarifies its place in the system of sciences. The scientist emphasizes that imagology is a field of knowledge and an interdisciplinary, integrative discipline that studies the reception of one’s own world and the world of others / strangers. In this interpretation, imagology is understood primarily as a scientific field. If we resort to understanding the concept in historical retrospect and see the foundations of imagology in antiquity, it should be considered as “a kind of cultural and social consciousness, a specific and basic type of cultural creativity.” In this sense, “imagology has come a long way as the history of mankind itself,” and its main features remain universality and constant “mirror” appeal to reality and culture. “ V.B. Zemskov briefly describes the prehistory of imagology, and says that this “field of knowledge and consciousness” has ancient roots in life, as well as in mythology, folklore, philosophy, and its scientific basis was adopted in the XVIII-XIX centuries, when all sorts of theories to explain national differences .

Despite the fact that there are many works on various aspects of imagology, it should be noted that today this science is insufficiently studied. This is due to the fact that researchers have not come to a single conclusion about what imagology studies. Some researchers consider imagology as a theoretical or historical and literary discipline in the field of literary criticism, as a “doctrine of images” (Yatsenko, 1999) or the study of stable images (images) of others, (by ethnic, cultural and linguistic affiliation), object in literary texts, others - as a branch of historical science that explores those ideas about another people or country, which are formed in the public consciousness of a country at a certain historical stage (Mezin, 2002, p. 150), the third - as a branch of culturology or sociology, which explores the ideas of participants in cultural dialogue about each other, the fourth - as a technology of image creation (Pocheptsov, 2000).

The current state of imagology is commented on B.V. Zemskov. He believes that a new trend has now emerged, which he calls “deconstructivist-relativistic”, when imagology becomes a simulacrum of ideology. “Imagology destroyed the clear picture of the world and became the foundation of manipulation” - B.V. Zemskov quotes M. Kundera, and also quotes the German philosopher J. Habermas that

imagology has come to mean “systematic distortion that occurs in the process of communication, because of the focus not on reality, but on distorted images of the media, on pseudo-reality “(Polyakova, 2016).

Terminological Apparatus of Imagology

The purpose of modern imagology is to “reproduce the holistic image of the existence of individual historical subjects, and as a result - the image of the whole being in its entirety.” To achieve this, it is necessary to define the “tools”, “mechanisms” of reception and representation, or “special types of imagological tools.” This important aspect is commented in detail by V.B. Zemskov as follows: “Each culture of any level of development in its own way perceives, reproduces and fixes in memory the images of others / strangers, which characterize either individual aspects, features and properties of these “others”, or in general their “essence”, their identity, against the background of their own ideas about norms and values.” Such complex communicative processes are carried out using such traditional mechanisms and forms as ethnostereotype, stereotype, image and so on (in the narrow sense of these words) (Polyakova, 2016).

One of the key concepts of imagology is an **ethnostereotype**, that is a worldview meaningful and fixed idea of one nation about other one. Ethnic stereotype is a simplified schematic, emotionally colored and extremely stable image of any ethnic group, which is spread to all its members” (Sadokhin, 2000, p.149),” the picture in people’s minds about their own or other national groups” (Klenberg, 1950).

Important for imagology is the term that Yu.S. Stepanov defines it as “opposition, which, in various forms, permeates the entire culture and is one of the main concepts of any collective, mass, national, national worldview” (Stepanov, 1997, p. 472). The distinction between “one’s own and another’s” has existed for a long time not only as a spatial-territorial boundary, but also as a difference in the system of beliefs and cultures. The attitude to another in each historically specific society was connected with its own picture of the world, so the opposition of “another” had a different content in each era.

Imagology has such a concept as “**mentality**”, which means a way of thinking, a set of mental skills and spiritual attitudes inherent in an individual or social group, nation (New encyclopedic dictionary, 2001, p. 713). The mentality is opposed to

rational mental activity and ideology, serves in the imagology of distinguishing between “one’s own” and “another’s”.

The concept of *national mentality* is very close to the concept of national character. These two terms denote the historically formed community of mental composition of the nation, culture, methods of behavior, collective consciousness. National self-consciousness is formed “mainly through reflections” (Khalizev, 2002) - when a person refers to a particular nationality, and its ideas about its people. All these ideas are emotionally colored.

For artistic imagology, along with the picture of the world, the linguistic picture of the world is of great importance, as the linguistic picture is a structure “inextricably linked with the national historical and mental composition of the people” (Lotman, 1997), its mentality. Nominations of foreigners that have become entrenched in the language (Italian - “pasta”, German - “sausage maker”, etc.) indicate that peoples have strong ideas about the permanent features of other nations: *the British are famous almost everywhere for being dry and mannered, the Germans for being thorough and practical, the French for being loving and frivolous, the Spaniards for being passionate and unruly, and so on*. The homogeneity of these characteristics in members of the ethnic group is motivated by the commonality of their national mentality and character, values, linguistic picture of the world. It is the stereotypical idea of one nation about the character, behavior, mentality of another nation is the central subject of imagology.

Much attention in imagology is paid to the term *ethno-image*. In general, this term is the subject of study of literary ethno-imagology, which studies the image of other peoples and countries (Illytsky, 2007, p. 247). By literary *ethno-image* we mean such a literary image that constructs not only individual features but also ethnic (national) identity of depicted characters, landscapes or historical past, presenting some of their features as “typical” for the country, “characteristic” of the whole nation (Illytsky, 2007, p. 247).

According to its structures, the literary *ethno-image* is a detail that is used to represent (depict) the whole nation. According to this preferential relation (that is the connection of individual features of the depicted with a certain national identity) distinguish the image of one’s own ethno-cultural I - self-image (or auto-image) and the image of the Other - hetero-image (or hetero-image) are distinguished. The range of mediating genres that spread ethno-cultural images, not only capturing but also shaping the history of intercultural communication and mutual knowledge, is

extremely wide: travel notes, customary (ethological) story, historical, ideological, adventure novel, as well as translation, critical reception, journalistic essayist, etc. (Kior, 2011)

It is necessary to mention that there are several types of literary ethnic images by researchers. One of the images is called J.-M. Carre mirage (Ilnytsky, 2007, p. 261). Such mirage images existed in the national literatures of the Romantic era: the enthusiastic perception of France, the French and French culture in Russian literature, the German mirage in French literature, the great interest in Scandinavia in England, the poeticization of Italy in Goethe's work, the dreamy image of Ukraine in Polish literature (Kior, 2011).

Another type of literary ethno-image is a collective image, which emerges as a symbol of the nation, which embodies in certain, proportions both its positive features and certain defects mirage (Ilnytsky, 2007, p. 262).

The opposition of a narrow, superficial portrait of a stranger to an idealized self-image is characteristic of all nations in the process of experiencing dramatic historical events or solving political problems mirage (Ilnytsky, 2007, p. 265). On the other hand, every nation sees its country through the eyes of its poets and presents this self-image to the world: *Shevchenko's Ukraine, Mickiewicz's Poland, Hugo's France*. However, the self-image in the national literature can be ambivalent, and sometimes even satirical. The unadorned image of the native country is presented in the following works of "Germany" by G. Heine, Shevchenko's "Both Dead and Alive", Malaniuk's "Cursed Land, Hellado Steppe", etc. (Kior, 2011)

Today it is important to study the peculiarities of the national worldview of different cultures. Researchers have pointed out that at the level of everyday thinking, the individual and collective psyche have the ability to create stereotypes - the usual stable ideas about various spheres of life, including interethnic relations. Although **stereotypes** are simplistic images, they are inevitable. After all, as J. Lirsen noted, we as individuals know mostly foreign cultures (and our own) not directly, but from their reputation, established public opinion about them, their publicity (Leerssen, National identity and national stereotype).

National stereotype is a mediator between other cultures and us, a kind of distinguishing mark, which has a very conditional connection with the national character. "At the stage of its initial formation, it can consolidate some results of cognition, but then, absolutizing these relative results, becomes an obstacle to cognition and can distort human consciousness and human relations" - says I. Dziuba

(Ilnytsky, 2007, p. 253). When studying national stereotypes, imagology is not interested in the question “is this reputation true?”, but in the question “how does it become recognized?”(Kior, 2011)

According to J. Lirsén, stereotypes can be positive or negative depending on the political circumstances and position of the author. That is, with the change of political circumstances, the image of one country in the imagination of another may change. The image changes not because the character attributed to a certain nation changes, *but because the attitude to the country changes*. This means, according to G. Diserenko, that hetero- and auto-images are interconnected: each “image of another country” has a basis in the image of its own country, regardless of whether it is declared openly or exists latently (Dyserinck, *Imagology and the Problem of Ethnic Identity*).

Conclusions

Thus, drawing conclusions, it should be noted that imagology is a young science that emerged as an independent discipline in the middle of the twentieth century and developed intensively during that period in Germany and France. Some researchers consider imagology as a theoretical or historical-literary discipline in the field of literary studies, as a “doctrine of images” or the study of stable images (images) of others (ethnic, cultural and linguistic affiliation), object in literary texts, others as a section of historical science that explores those ideas about another people or country, which are formed in the public consciousness of a country at a certain historical stage, third as a branch of culturology or sociology, which explores the ideas of participants in cultural dialogue about each other, fourth as a technology of image creation. Among the important figures who are also considered pioneers in this direction, we can find the following names: Professor of the Sorbonne Jean-Marie Carré, who published in 1947 the monograph “French writers and the German mirage: 1800-1940”, Marius François Guillard, who authored *Comparative Literature* in 1951), and Hugo Dizernik, who in 1966 published an article entitled “On the Problem of Images and Mirages and Their Research in Comparative Literary Studies”, which became a theoretical manifesto and basis for Aachen Imagology Program. This list is also continued by J. Leerssen, J.M. Moore, D.A. Page, P. van Tiegem, R. Welleck, A. Dima, J. Leerssen, I. Chevrell, M. Fischer, V.A. Khorev, V.B. Zemkov, N.P. Mikhalsky, M.M. Bakhtin, Y.S. Stepanov and others. For the first time in Ukrainian literary studies, D. Nalyvayko turned his attention to this

discipline, defining the subject and strategies of literary imagology. M. Ilnytsky devoted an entire section in his textbook to this field and defined imagology as an interdisciplinary specialization of literary comparative studies.

The main task of imagology, according to N.P. Michalska, there is an imagology “study of figurative perception and embodiment of ideas about another country, its people and the peculiarities of national character.” The image of a nation or country in the minds of another nation is formed under the influence of three main factors: 1. objective factors (historical, political, social); 2. subjective factors (personal author’s impressions, experiences); 3. traditional ideas, stereotypes. The most successful way to study the status of one nation in the eyes of another, in literary works, because there they are recorded symbolically, i.e. in words. Representations of other peoples and countries are reflected in works of art, memoirs, journalism, travel descriptions, at the household level - in anecdotes. We all know from childhood: “A German, a Frenchman and a Russian met ...”. As a result, the German is meticulous, the French are frivolous and ambitious, the Russian is able to shoe the flea, however, after that it stops jumping. This is what imagology as a science studies - how the image of “another”, “no one’s own” is perceived in the interpretation of a certain country or nation.

As a science, imagology has its own terminological apparatus. Among the most commonly used terms are: *ethnoimage*, *ethnostereotype*, *concept “one’s own - another’s”*, *“mentality”*, *national mentality*, *linguistic picture of the world*, *mirage image*, *collective image*, *stereotype*, *national stereotype and others*. It should be noted here that in their origin and social function, ethnic images are specifically associated with national myths, stereotypes, prejudices, public opinion, political sentiments, and so on. The specific connection implies that in literature, if we consider imagology as a discipline of comparative literature, national stereotypes are used to build an ethnic image, which, however, is mostly not a stereotype, because, unlike current statements, it is perceived by the reader as an artistic invention that does not claim to be true and therefore gives complete freedom of imagination to the reader. It depends on the receiver how to use the image: in what context to put it, what content to put in it, how to interpret it.

References

Andreicheva, M. Yu. (2016). Religious imagology: the subject and tasks of a new historical and imagological direction / Религиозная имагология: предмет и задачи нового историко-имагологического направления // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. *Вопросы теории и практики/ Theory and practice questions*. № 11-2 (73), pp. 37-40.

Carré, J.M. (1947). *French writers and the German mirage: 1800–1940*.

Chevrel, I. (2006). *La littérature compare*. Paris.

Dyserinck, H. (2003). Imagology and the Problem of Ethnic Identity. *Intercultural Studies*, no.1.

Egorova, L.P. (2009). Literary imagology / Литературоведческая имагология // Выпускные квалификационные работы по русской литературе. – М.: Высш. Шк/ Graduation qualification works in Russian literature. - М: Higher. Shk, p. 296.

Guyard M. F. (1951). *Comparative literature*.

Plnitsky M. (2007). Comparative literature: a textbook / Порівняльне літературознавство : навчальний посібник : у 2 ч. / М.М. Ільницький, В.В. Будний. – Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка. – Ч. 1 : Лекційний курс/ *Lecture course*, p. 280.

Imagology. (2005). Имиджелогия // Казахстан. *Национальная энциклопедия*. Алматы: Казак энциклопедиясы. Т. II/ *Imagology // Kazakhstan. National Encyclopedia*. Almaty: Kazakh encyclopedias. Т. II.

Ivanov L.P. *Imagology / Имагологія*.

Lirsen J. *Imagology: history and method*.

Khalizev, V.E. (2002). *Consciousness and self-awareness of the character. Psychologism / Сознание и самосознание персонажа. Психологизм*. Теория литературы. М.: Высшая школа, p. 215.

Khorev, V.A. (2005). *Imagological aspect of the study of literary connections / Имагологический аспект изучения литературных связей*. Межрегиональная конференция славистов. Российское славяноведение в начале XXI в.: задачи и перспективы развития. М, p. 202.

Klenberg, O. (1950). *Tensions Affecting International Understanding*, p. 93.

*** Leerssen, J. National identity and national stereotype.

Lotman, Yu.M. (1997). *Semiotics of culture and the concept of text / Семиотика культуры и понятие текста // Русская словесность. Антология*. М.: Academia, p. 208.

Meneghetti A. (2005). *Image and the unconscious - St. Petersburg: "Ontopsychology"*.

Mezin S.A. (2002). *Stereotypes of Russia in the European public thought of the XVIII century / Стереотипы России в европейской общественной мысли XVIII века // Вопросы истории*. No 10, pp. 148–157.

Schwarze M. (2003). *Imagologie, komparatistische /Imagology, comparative*. Concepts of cultural studies. Theoretical foundations - approaches - perspectives. edited by Ansgar Nuenning and Vera Nuenning. 2nd revised and expanded edition. Stuttgart; Weimar, pp. 274-276.

Mikhalskaya N.P. (2012). *Russia and England: problems of imagology / Россия и Англия: проблемы имагологии*. М.; Самара: Порто-Принт, С.4.М.

Nalivayko D.S. (2006). Literary imagology: subject and strategy / Теорія літературознавства і компаративістики: розвідувальні статті. – К.: Видавництво «Києво-Могилянська академія». – С. 91-103.

Kior N. (2011). Literary imagology: the study of images of other ethnocultures in national culture / Літературна имагологія: вивчення образів інших етнокультур у національній культурі // На рубежі: образ Росії минулого і сьогодення в культурі, літературі Європи та Америки (кінець ХХ – початок ХХІ ст.). – М.: Новий хронограф. - 696 с.

New encyclopedic dictionary. (2001). М.: *Great Russian Encyclopedia*; Ripol Classic, p. 713.

Oshchepkov. A. R. *Imagology / Имагология*.

Pageaux D.H. (1981). A perspective of studies in comparative literature: cultural imagery. *Synthesis*. No. 8, pp. 169–185.

Pageaux D. H. (1983). Cultural imagery: from comparative literature and cultural anthropology. *Synthesis*, No10, pp. 79–88.

Pochepstov G.G. (2000). *Imagology*. М.

Polyakova O.A. (2016). *Origins of domestic imagology/Истоки отечественной имагологии*. Научно-методический электронный журнал «Концепт». №7 (июль).

Sadokhin, A.P. & Grushevitskaya T.G. (2000). *Ethnology / Этнология*. М.: Изд. центр «Академия»; Высшая школа, p. 149.

Stepanov, Y. S. (1997). Constants / Константы. Словарь русской культуры. М.: Языки русской культуры. С.472.

Yatsenko, N. E. (1999). *Explanatory dictionary of social science terms / Толковый словарь обществоведческих терминов*. М.

Zenkovsky, V.V. (1926). *Russian thinkers and Europe. Criticism of European culture among Russian thinkers/Русские мыслители и Европа. Критика европейской культуры среди русских мыслителей*. Париж.