

In order to obtain, [more about](#) as the author himself puts it, [sick](#) ?a successful internalisation of the comparative metadiscourse? necessary for ?the survival of comparative literature?, the author refers to constructivism by noticing crucial similarities between the two directions in terms of their historical development and character. The author does not agree with the accusation of the secondary status of comparative research in relation to other fields of science. He points to the fact that the existence of a rich comparative metadiscourse, which implies analogy with constructivism and accounts for the status of comparative studies as an important area of research, is omitted. By means of referring to Niklas Luhman, the author identifies comparative studies with second-order observation, that is, focusing not on the objects of comparative studies (those seem to be as numerous and various as the reality surrounding the human being), but on the nature of the comparative process, in other words on the manner in which the comparison of the above mentioned objects is carried out.

ISSN: 1733-165X