

UDC: 821.161.2.091

SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF PAVLO FYLYPOVYCH: THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Galina Alexandrova

Doctor of Philology, Senior Research Fellow,
Institute of Philology,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (UKRAINE),
01601, Kyiv, 14, blvd. Shevchenko,
e-mail: galekss@ukr.net

ABSTRACT

Aim. The article deals with comparative studies of Pavlo Fylypovych – one of the most prominent Ukrainian literary scientist in 10-20-s of the 20 century. The purpose of this article is to characterize neoclassic's literary heritage, which methodological conceptualizes aspects of comparative studies of the first decades of the 20th century. *Methods.* In the article we applied a systematic approach by using comparative-historical and cultural-historical methods. On the basis of literary heritage of P. Fylypovych we investigated basic provisions, theoretical principles and practical aspects of his comparative studies. *Results.* The article discusses the works of Pavlo Fylypovych in which it he served by comparative method to analyze literary phenomena. The evolution of literary views, his appeal to the traditional subjects of history, challenges and impact of borrowing has been done. The context of theoretical and methodological problems of comparative literature in first decades of the 20th century is widely involved. It was shown that comparative method for P. Fylypovych – purposive research strategy that covers all kinds of literary connections, demonstrating continuity of traditions in Ukrainian comparative literature. *Scientific novelty.* Various scientific heritage of P. Fylypovych leads to many theoretical and methodological considerations and historical and literary plan that is not covered exhaustively. For the first time we analyzed the responses to his work, a scientist's role in the contemporary literary discussions that express position of the author, inscribed in its scientific context of the era. *The practical significance.* The article can be used in the study of comparative history, relations with foreign Ukrainian literature, in clarifying history of Ukrainian literature and literary criticism.

Key words: literary criticism, comparative and historical method, ties, influences, borrowing, analogies, parallels, reader.

НАУКОВА СПАДЩИНА ПАВЛА ФИЛИПОВИЧА: ТЕОРІЯ І ПРАКТИКА КОМПАРАТИВІСТИЧНИХ СТУДІЙ

Галина Александрова

Доктор філологічних наук, старший науковий співробітник,
Інститут філології,
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (УКРАЇНА),
01601, м. Київ, бульв. Тараса Шевченка, 14,
e-mail: galekss@ukr.net

РЕФЕРАТ

Мета. Статтю присвячено дослідженню компаративних студій Павла Филиповича – одного із найвидатніших українських літературознавців 10–20-х років 20 ст. Мета цієї статті – схарактеризувати літературознавчий доробок неокласика, у якому методологічно концептуалізуються аспекти порівняльних досліджень перших десятиліть 20 ст. *Дослідницька методика.* Для дослідження використаний системний підхід із застосуванням порівняльно-історичного та культурно-історичного методів. На основі вивчення літературознавчої спадщини П. Филиповича було досліджено основні положення, теоретичні

засади і практичні аспекти його порівняльних студій. **Результати.** У статті розглядаються праці Павла Филиповича, у яких він послуговується порівняльним методом для аналізу літературних явищ. Простежено еволюцію поглядів літературознавця, його звернення до історії традиційних сюжетів, проблем впливу та запозичень. Широко залучається контекст теоретико-методологічних проблем порівняльного літературознавства перших десятиліть 20 ст. З'ясовано, порівняльний метод для П. Филиповича – цілеспрямована наукова стратегія, яка поширюється на всі види літературних зв'язків, демонструючи спадкоємність і неперервність традицій в українському порівняльному літературознавстві. **Наукова новизна.** Різноманітна наукова спадщина П. Филиповича спонукає до багатьох розмірковувань теоретико-методологічного й історико-літературного плану, які ще вичерпно не висвітлені. Вперше проаналізовано відгуки на його праці, участь ученого в тогочасних літературознавчих дискусіях, які увиразнюють позицію автора, вписують її у науковий контекст доби. **Практична цінність.** Стаття може бути використана у вивченні історії компаративістики, зв'язків української літератури із зарубіжними, у висвітленні курсу історії української літератури та літературної критики.

Ключові слова: літературознавство, порівняльно-історичний метод, зв'язки, впливи, запозичення, аналогії, паралелі, читач.

«Fylypovych researcher much more interesting than Fylypovych poet» [21, p. 4], – it has already indicated his contemporaries. Now the literary heritage of the scientist observed a particular interest, because he owns many works that have not lost their significance to this day. High professionalism and brilliant erudition, good knowledge of literary context, intellectual dynamism and richness of its studies give reason to believe P. Fylypovych one of the leading figures of the national cultural process of the 1920s and most authoritative researcher deepest night, which made a significant contribution to the formation and foundations determine the main lines of comparative literature (both note that scientists applied and other research methodology and emphasized: you can only do those conclusions «on them ... empower the facts. When the facts do not fit into the framework of a theory, we must reject the theory, and in no way ignore the facts» [4, p. 49].

L. Beletsky counted P. Fylypovych to historical and comparative trend in literary criticism, including the formal poetical group (with A. Kolessa, J. Hordynsky, T. Sushytsky, V. Boyko) [2, p. 363]. In the «comparative-historical school» saw improvements P. Fylypovych and K. Koperzhynskyi, while noting that it is «widely uses sociological methods» [17, p. 13]. «Scientific caution and lack of broadcasting, and with cliched stencils» [24, p. 32], correct methodological approach to the problems of the sociological and historical-comparative, psychological, etc. – these features of Fylypovych that «there is a skillful literary analysis model» [23, p. 36], – stressed M. Mohyliansky. «P. Fylypovych has made a name respected researchers on our literature» [14, p. 303], – wrote about it yet B. Yakubsky in 1924. His articles «awaken scientific interest in literary studies and give a lot to understanding the new phenomena of Ukrainian literature and literary techniques» [16, p. 150], is «a real example of comparative studies of modern Ukrainian literature» [25, p. 150]. About Fylypovych-teacher warmly recalled his former student T. Osmachka: «All articles of the scientist only objective and reasonable» [29, p. 498], they «...were seen as works of great intelligence, meaning with erudition and conscientious attitude to the issues raised» [29, p. 498]. V. Derzhavin wrote that the scientific work of P. Fylypovych, «beyond its high scientific objectivity and erudition are defined the same basic feature as literary works Zerov – interpretation of Ukrainian literature as full European literature» [3, p. 16]. Scientist, observations G. Kostiuk, stood out

«thorough analysis of texts and comparing them» [20, p. 561]. «Comparative studies of P. Fylypovych remarkably clear, faceted, compositionally balanced and therefore – convincing» [28, p. 4], – said M. Nayenko, considering his followers and M. Zerov, V. Peretz in the principles of philological school of literary studies [27, p. 81]. Enrollment academic and comparative, and philological school do not contradict one another, as remarked K. Koperzhynsky comparative principle is the basis of any research, particularly it is the basis of the study of the text Philological School. The comparison may be limited to textual study of the history of the work (and amended versions); You can compare different works of one writer, constituting a literary series; work can be compared with the works of other authors to reveal his source or the amount of influence on these works. So Philological School is both a school of comparative historical, putting a broad historical and literary problem and is not limited to literature of one nation or country [17, p. 10]. «The method of philological analysis as a comparative» [19, p. 42], – so well characterizes N. Kostenko concept of P. Fylypovych. Comparative exploration scientist are analyzed in the works of A. Vashkiv, L. Vashkiv, S. Hrechanyuk, V. Doroshenko, M. Zubrycka, N. Kotenko, G. Kostiuk, S. Melnyk, M. Nayenko, Y. Polishchuk, M. Raybedyuk, A. Tomchuk and others. But most have done to study scientific heritage neoclassic Vladimir Polishchuk, compiled editions P. Fylypovych «Studio of Shevchenko studies» (2002), «Literary Studio. Comparative» (2008), the author of numerous articles on his scientific collections brought together in the book «My Fylypovych» (2015), which deals with the reception of the works of P. Hulak-Artemovskij, M. Maksymovych, T. Shevchenko, M. Gogol, E. Grebinka, I. Franko, Lesia Ukrainka: it is built around these figures the basis of comparative studies of P. Fylypovych. Active and effective use of comparative method, said Vladimir Polishchuk, made P. Fylypovych «one of the founders of the Ukrainian literary comparative studies of twentieth century» [32, p. 54].

Various scientific heritage of P. Fylypovych leads to many theoretical and methodological considerations and historical and literary plan that is not covered exhaustively. Need attention and numerous reviews of his work, a scientist involved in the contemporary literary discussions that distinguish, detailing the position of the author, inscribed in its scientific context days.

Ukrainian science of 1920s was moving, according to L. Bieleckiy, «...the path of comparative studies, absorbing other principles and theories areas: psychological or historical and philological» [2, p. 307]. Especially elevated intellectual level of national literature, enriching the aesthetic Ukrainian scientific opinion neoclassical work, which, according to M. Nayenko, represented the first post-revolutionary years younger «growth» among academic scientists such as [26, p. 169]. But the specifics of literary studies of P. Fylypovych, in his opinion, more applied than theoretical – this contributed to his teaching work – after studying at the University of St. Volodymyr he was working here as a scholar (his work on the life and work of the Russian poet Yevgeny Baratynskiy was awarded gold medal and published in 1917 a separate edition), assistant professor and later as a professor until his arrest in 1935. «I think pleasant duty to express deep gratitude to A. Loboda, who directed me to the study of Pushkin galaxy» [8, p. 1], – said P. Fylypovych in his first monograph.

(Andrew Loboda - assistant professor, then professor at the University of St. Vladimir, a prominent Ukrainian folklore, later the founder and chairman of the Ethnographic Commission at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences – G. A.). At the same time pointed out: «Many methodological skills I owe to V. M. Peretz» [8, p. 1]. After the seminar the head of Russian Philology at the University Professor V. Peretz offered characterization methodologies to students in the science of literature from ancient times to the verge of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries («From lectures on the methodology of Russian literature. History studies. Methods. Sources», 1914). The work of «seminarians» he concentrated primarily in the form of artistic expression, and therefore scientific methodology called formal or formalist. But, according to S. Hrechanyuk, P. Fylypovych «was not dogmatic follower of his teacher» [12, p. 7] and, according to Y. Polishchuk, persistently sought «his own scientific model of knowledge» [33, p. 67]. D. Shtogrin recalls that Mr Peretz, adept of philological methods, did not consider his pupil P. Fylypovych, mainly because he did not use his methodology in their experiments [35, p. 355]. Remember: V. Peretz has doubts about the possibility of scientific studies on the history of literature of the nineteenth century. («References to the nineteenth century are very close to us and try to study of the literary material for years, this period inevitably miss due to excessive farness, subjectivity, and because they are, in fact, is the product of „journalistic pen”, they are too far from the modest ideal of science» [30, p. 22] and P. Fylypovych was convinced that literary historian can study and contemporary literary process [4, p. 243], following to I. Ayzenshtok, who remarked: «Chronological time to study literature plays a minor role, and at the forefront are questions of material and methods» [1, p. 142]. No wonder J. Hordynskyi believed that M. Zerov and P. Fylypovych brought up under the influence of various schools: historical and comparative A. Veselovsky (P. Fylypovych) and philological Vladimir Peretz (Zerov) [11, p. 14]. A. Veselovsky influenced by evolutionary natural science theories attempted to overcome subjective aesthetic method and literary studies and turn on objective science, genetic professed views, acknowledged causal effect of previous events the next. He introduced comparative historical method by which a connection between common objects and builds only a number of these objects. In his opinion, the content of the works varies, but the forms of transition from one generation to another, only in a new combining with new content. P. Fylypovych always reffers to work of A. Veselovsky, so it is rightly considered the successor of the Ukrainian scientist in comparative literature.

In the center of the study of P. Fylypovych face fundamental problems of literary science. «Ukrainian literature in the development of its non isolated with other literatures, especially neighbors, suffered from their effects, in turn, affect them» [4, p. 259], – stressed he is treating Ukrainian literature as «equal» with the European. P. Fylypovych repeatedly summarized the implications of contemporary literary studies that used «primarily sociological analysis and formal (partly historical-comparative and psychological» [10, p. 4]. Just the two most expedient ways to go – said the scientist. The survey «Ukrainian Literary 10 years of revolution» (1928), inter alia, paid tribute to the works of such diverse authors as S. Jefremov, D. Bahaliy, M. Hrushevsky, A. Beletskiy, I. Ayzenshtok M. Zerov,

O. Doroshkevych, B. Yakubskyy, V. Koryak., occasionally laying out their attitude to the methods by which these used and other researchers. Comparative-historical school of P. Fylypovych counted to major Ukrainian literary achievements of this decade, because in 1920 the Institute worked Shevchenko office comparative study of literature (director Alexander Beletsky, M. Lehavko secretary, M. Zhinkin staff, I. Ayzenshtok, M. Camarin, S. Efimova, M. Gabel, S. Utevskyy, A. Leites), whose work is focused around three major topics: Russian-Ukrainian literary relationship; translations of classics of world literature in the Ukrainian language in connection with the question of their impact on Ukrainian literature; study the literature of the modern West [ref. 13, p. 374].

Through literature review of scientific achievements of the first post-revolutionary decade, P. Fylypovych raised prospects of the comparative method, noting that due to the proliferation of literary interest «grow with us and comparative studies» [4, p. 260]. This contributed to some Ukrainian literary tradition: this direction works, he notes, characteristic M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, M. Sumtsov, O. Kolessa who «did much to popularize the comparative method, moreover, brings our writing from narrow national boundaries» [4, p. 260]. Commenting on his own research strategy in the preface to a single lifetime collection of his articles, he adds, comparative studies «...extend our horizon... linking him (Ukrainian literature – G. A.) with the work of other people» [4, p. 3]. So the researcher delineated tasks K. Koperzhynskyy stressed, «deserves recognition and support of the entire» [10, p. 148]. P. Fylypovych stressed that comparative method «...can provide a lot of useful for the modern Ukrainian literature, submitting material for sociological generalizations» [5, p. 3]. Despite the «pull» method of comparative sociology to problems characteristic of the literature of the 1920s, calls for interaction and comparative sociological approaches, P. Fylypovych observed: researcher should always keep in mind the possible borrowing or imitation that can sometimes reduce the immediate value of a other work, or vice versa, «the identity of the processing someone else's motive distinctly reveal the poet's face» [5, p. 6]. At the same time, he limited the value of functional capabilities of comparative studies, recognized only a supporting role Comparative Studies: «In theory, literature searching, including the study of the poet belonging to this or that school, and observation of individual loans, inheritance, and so on, have not independent significance as material for deeper submit findings and to understand the poet's place among his contemporaries and predecessors, its unique features» [5, p. 8]. So he warned supporters comparative studies of simplicity and schematics from such failures as «Kotsyubynsky and Maupassant» S. Kozub («Red Road», 1927, N 3), or «literary parallels» M. Mochulsky («Ukraine», 1924, № 3). These researchers P. Fylypovych revealed two types of mistakes that led to the discrediting of the comparative method: First, exaggeration of the role and impact of borrowing that often cramp the specific national literature to a simple imitation and ignoring the national traditions; Second, the mechanical accumulation of facts, small details that led to the loss of critical in explaining the genesis of literary analogies and was unable to find out the internal laws of such processes.

In particular the mistake of B. Navrotsky's view on «„Gaydamak” Shevchenko. Source. Style. Composition» (1928) P. Fylypovych called that the author did not make a clear boundary between «influence» and simple «borrowing». Needless reviewer seemed some comparisons. In particular, referring to the theme of the historical basis of «introduction», B. Nawrockiy drew attention to the work of authoritative experts at the time of day researchers – Frenchmen Rullierre and Ferrand and because he was convinced that the ukrainian poet could study French source. Thus, based on unproven facts (possession of a poet in French), Shevchenko appeared genuine scientific investigator. P. Fylypovych was against such comparisons [7, p. 100]. It seemed inconclusive and finding similarities and relationships between the works, the similarity between them was only external, and borrowing – unproven. Even these were studies of M. Mochulsky and A. Bahriy who wanted to hold literary parallels between Shevchenko poem «Dream» and Turgenev's «Ghost». Such attempts P. Fylypovych called «late tribute to the treasury of the funny things that they left a lot of researchers of 'impacts' during their special heyday in 1910's» [9, p. 98].

In the analysis of the work, according to P. Fylypovych, the best way is literary evolution, which is the main factor «struggle» personal creativity with the literary tradition. In this he – follower N. Kareev, who believed in the tradition of literature “that the writer does not create himself, and is already ready, invented other... most original writer creates all alone: some facets of his work on some original ideas and forms, and other inherited the tradition» [15, p. 7]. These views was supported V. Peretz [31, p. 187–197]. Not every work of P. Fylypovych comparison is subject to the broader task, first it helps to reveal the originality or, conversely, especially the imitation of a certain writer. Displays literature in a new way, those who combines inspiration and work and achievements learns foreign authors – says the researcher. Exploring the similarities addiction, he always stressed: «But I need to remember and cancellation» [7, p. 411], as literary role models talented poet «only helped to express that shaped and inspired life» [7, p. 411]. Fixing the works «life» and «literary» [7, p. 526], scientist therefore distinguished by modern terminology, genetic-contact typological study. For important literary convinced P. Fylypovych, figure out the essence of the writer's «outline motifs and forms of his works, to determine the characteristics of talent that distinguish it from other contemporaries» [6, p. 220], identified in the work «element is borrowed, opposed it is more important and unique element most creative» [8, p. 393].

The comparison or contrast – an integral part of his scientific thinking for P. Fylypovych, not only an important component of its historical and literary works, but also comments and reviews. Covering era and art of the writer, he figured his role in the global and national writing, and making comparisons within the national literature, and between different literatures. He has never reduced any investigation to the analysis of the text out of its context. Even in the reviews of collections of contemporary researcher wanted to «stretch yarn» [7, p. 301] the authors predecessor and notice «comments earlier works» [7, p. 302]. Comparative studies are needed, he said, «not for the bare statement of influences and borrowings (often our comparison with nature only analogies, parallels the general background), and for a better

understanding the writer's poems» [7, p. 220]. So often unfolded some even cursory observation of their predecessors (I. Franko, S. Yefremov, L. Starytska-Cherniakhivska etc.) in-depth study, because «no conclusions about the effects – the materials are not given sufficient reasons for this and just stayed parallels» [7, p. 191], and every literary task – «to deepen and extend the findings of previous researchers» [7, p. 397].

Scholar's heritage demonstrates the continuity of traditions in Ukrainian Comparative Literature. P. Fylypovych makes a full comparative studies not the detailed guidance of his predecessors. In particular, it develops more topics «interesting labeling» [7, p. 571], which began Franko, in the article «Something about „Marusya” of L. Borovikovskiy and its basis» compared a ballad of L. Borovikovskiy and «Svetlana» of V. Zhukovsky and briefly characterized the story «Lenore» of W. Bürger and the history of its development, but neither he nor I. Sozonovych didn't highlight the Bürger's ballads impact on Ukrainian literature. P. Fylypovych greatly expanded comparative material, covering and works directly related to Bürger's «Lenore» (translation and remakes of the groom-dead man), and those who had links with «Lenore» by other processing. He checks also general guidelines of A. Krymskiy, according to which, ballad «Hopeless» of S. Rudanskiy, which is subtitled «For Bürger» is a verse that «strongly reminiscent of the locations in „Lenore” and „Svetlana”» [7, p. 586]. Analyzing ballad, P. Fylypovych concluded that S. Rudanskiy made free translation of Burhers ballads, making it Ukrainian in folk-song spirit. All translations and processing, examined by researcher, filed «an interesting page in the history of Western influences on Ukrainian poetry» [7, p. 594].

Sometimes P. Fylypovych also only provides material for comparison, citing textual coincidence, outlining the contours of work for future researchers. As Franko, «he outlined pebbles collected or for later use» [7, p. 151]. In particular, Mr. Filipovic sometimes only brings together two works (for example, selects a parallel to the first printed in 1840 poem of J. Schoholev, «Reflexion» with song of V. Zhukovsky in 1820), leaving successors space comparative analysis. Therefore, the reader «would like to see ourselves increasingly detailed laboratory-investigation» [16, p. 150], and this article P. Fylypovych not always give – the author is often limited to cursory notes, offers only a «few new encounters and labeled» [16, p. 149]. In particular, the article «The image of Prometheus in the works of Lesya Ukrainka» the researcher said only, in which works of the poet is the image of Prometheus and of the other writers of this image can be found. Sometimes the desire to define literature works and put it in an evolutionary «number» typological phenomena in Ukrainian literature aroused opposition criticism and misunderstanding. In particular, the claim that the story Kobylanska «Earth», «...there is something from idyll and ethnography of Kotlyarevskiy, Mark Vovchok echoes populist realism of Nechuj-Levitsky, described in family life, though there are also strict paints of Franko and Stefanik» [5, p. 98–99]. Against such a finding similarities M. Markowski was, in his opinion, love Michael and Anna a lot of passion, while «in relations of those couples who called P. Fylypovych, quiet, peaceable, gentle, and love does not like Hanna (Anna of O. Kobylanska – G. A.) and heroes in works of Kotlyarevskiy and Kwitka» [22, p. 166]. V. Vasilenko ironically: «For P. Fylypovych turns out that the „Earth”, all

built on a „tradition” that there are all, starting from Kotlyarevskiy and finishing on Stefanyk that can be completely free to allow such serious statements „mixing of concepts and time”. In short, P. Fylypovych „by the grace of their” psychic gave it to others, leaving almost nothing very Kobylianska» [38, p.122], while for P. Fylypovych main task is to show the background against which the writer conveyed innovation. It should be noted that this quest parallels, analogies without giving influence to produce a context in which vision of the work was conveyed, and was not, in our opinion, negative or simplistic aspect of research, but rather its initial stage. These principles are often kept P. Fylypovych, in particular, he defined literary factors, which can bind «Apple blossom» of Kotsyubinsky (works of Goncourt, G. de Maupassant, E. Zola), stressing that they have value only art parallels, not literary influences [7, p. 191].

In the center of comparative research of P. Fylypovych and many literary scientists in 1920th (I. Ayzenshtok, M. Zerov, M. Markowski) appeared Kotlyarevskiy work because his legacy was marked by the influence of «foreign» pulses. Literary did not write some articles about the initiator of the new Ukrainian literature, but closely followed by the study of its heritage, expanded scientific space of this topic by new facts and phenomena. According to P. Fylypovych not sufficiently recognize the close links of «Eneida» of Kotlyarevskiy of the Russian literary tradition, and not enough text comparisons to bring relationships and influences Mapping and close connection of some excerpts and quotations not brought closer to solving major problems. Studying samples of Russian literature that prompted Kotlyarevskiy to create Ukrainian similar examples, according to the P. Fylypovych should carefully choose the material for comparisons and to consider not just assimilated but as absorbed [7, p. 45]. Few methodological credibility he found in textual comparisons M. Markowski, so ironically remarked: so pretty to see «at least some similarity in the content or in terms of some of Kotlyarevskiy with Blyumauer or Skarron and ready conclusion: Kotlyarevskiy uses foreign source» [7, p. 55]. It is not only illegal assumptions flames and lack of proper criticism, can not be based on narrow textual comparisons, often mechanical nature, find genesis of the work. P. Fylypovych was about profound stylistic analysis and comparison of whole works as a single body, not just the individual words and expressions. For the main scientist in comparative studies – not proof that Kotlyarevskiy wrote the «Eneida» regardless of Osipov, since this effect does not detract Ukrainian author: «...did not he had to have some samples?» [7, p. 62]. What language written these models, German or Russian – a secondary question, important for researchers – to find out to what extent they learned creatively, not mechanically.

P. Fylypovych draws attention to the seemingly quite minor detail – Tatiana song in the play «Moskal the Wonder»: it is valuable primarily «to characterize the Russian element» [7, p. 33] in the writers art. According to the hypothesis literary, it's not folk song and folk song in the spirit, which is «composed, possible thing he Kotlyarevskiy for the finished samples of Sumarokov and other Russian poets of the eighteenth» [7, p. 33]. Researcher also pays attention on Kotlyarevskiy's translation of Sappho in the context of translations of Derzhavin, Zhukovsky, Crimskiy, Franko, Shpyhotskiy et al.) and concludes that the interest in the poet was a very significant

for Kotlyarevskyi in Russian writing, and «Ukrainian poet has gone for tradition» [7, 41]. P. Fylypovych notes that «high» Russian poetry wasn't alien for Kotlyarevskyi and stylistically reflected in his works written in Russian. It was not only a literary influence, but true imitation of literary tradition, because the Ukrainian language was then produced for «high», the classical tradition. It was therefore not simply dependent on Ukrainian literature from Russia, and the more – the Russian-Ukrainian relations as a complex literary, cultural and historical problem. In keeping with the theory of counter currents A. Veselovskiy scholar observed: «...slowly and gently Ukrainian authors assimilate new trends in European literature, take only that, what was your soil at that day» [9, p. 63].

Contemporary studio are important for P. Fylypovych is, which covers not only the main stages of the writer's literary movement because of his age and previous tradition, but «special» issues on specific subjects, effects and more. In particular, the positive features of the preface M. Zerov about work of J. Schoholev P. Fylypovych called «bigger picture poetic preferences of Schoholev, literary influences on him» [7, p. 117]. However, observes: should be clearer and more resting on the genesis of his poetry, especially to find out «what he took in Shevchenko» [7, p. 117], advised to take note of fleeting remarks V. Gorlenko correlation of ballads with works by J. Schoholev this genre in Tolstoy or Y. Polonsky and «see whether there was something in common with these Schoholev and some other poets, which could be useful to him in the way Shevchenko's departure from the lyrical ballad» [7, p. 117]. Researcher focuses on the fact that Tolstoy, and Y. Polonsky numbered among the favorite authors of J. Schoholev and therefore inevitably influenced him.

Another important point which emphasizes P. Fylypovych – a problem the reader that he, along with I. Ayzenshtok, A. Beletsky, K. Dovgan and others. introduced into scientific discourse of 1920s and lecture examined the role of the writer. P. Fylypovych emphasized, that read product sometimes becoming an important incentive that predetermined writer or creative inspiration strengthened it, because a lot of style and facilities author draws on literature from previous tradition of artistic vision predecessors. Treatment of P. Fylypovych writer as reader to some extent was interesting material to explain the facts of literary imitation. In particular, literary critic remarked: studyind the lecture of Kotlyarevskiy, one should pay attention not only to translated novels that he read, and «resting and interest of Kotlyarevskiy to the works on the history of Ukraine and analyze its view of the romantic and ethnographic movement» [7, p. 45].

P. Fylypovych turned not just to the works of Shevchenko, Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, Olga Kobylanska who stood in his studio as attentive readers. An important research material were Shevchenko diary and correspondence, which in 1920th were on the margins of literature and because of ignorance findings of his work were incomplete or even distorted. In contrast of Drahomanov, who estimated Shevchenko's low education, P. Fylypovych tried to establish the true extent of understanding the phenomena of world literature poet. They are marked with the names of Homer, Virgil, Phaedra, Plutarch, Herodotus, Horace, Titus Libya, Caesar, Dante, Tasso, Ariosto, Boccaccio, Shakespeare, Swift, Holdsmi, Richardson, Young, Osiana, Scott, Byron, Dickens, Burns, Gibbon, Goethe, Schiller, Herner, Voltaire,

Chateaubriand, Dumas, Sue, Balzac, George Sand, de Kok, Barbier, Beranger, Washington Irving, Barthelemy, Heine, Hugo and others. Great interest in Western literature combined with interest to European painting, architecture, music, science, political thought. P. Fylypovych not simply «recorded» Shevchenko interest – particularly noting the interest poet W. Scott, a researcher showed the functioning of his motives in literary and painting creativity of Shevchenko [ref.: 9, p. 88].

Considering the legacy of Ivan Franko, P. Fylypovych celebrated its relationship with the creative achievements of mankind – «beyond time and nation» [5, p. 49]. On the development of realism of Franko Fylypovych said different effects: tips of Drahomanov, critiques of Pisarev and M. Chernyshevsky, E. Zola creativity and contemporary Russian writers, in a realistic way in his verses were determined except Western authors (Lenau, Dranmor, Leythold, Karduchi, Hugo), poetry Nekrasov. But along with bookishness and borrowing material from various foreign sources, mostly romantic, P. Fylypovych notes and objections folk-song tradition, canonized in Shevchenko and continued by his followers, and «unfeeling of historical romance, especially love to cossacs» [5, p. 19]. Introductory article P. Fylypovych «Genesis Franko legend „Death of Cain”» helped to navigate the complex structure of legends and literary motifs and images. In it, in particular: the poem «Cain» of Byron was only somewhat source for Franco, who took the English poet only certain «starting points». This article, as noted by critics, meet stringent methodological requirements: «She finds Franko's relation at all to Byronism, describes the features of Byronism that influenced on Franko, briefly introduces the topic of Cain in the apocryphal literature, decides detail source of Franko's „Death of Cain” in the old apocryphal literature and new west one, introduces the relation to „Death of Cain” critics finally finds the idea of work, analyzing it in the era of Franco and accurately indicating its place among Franko's creativity» [40, p. 303]. K. Kopererzhynskyy pointed article «Ways Franko poetry», especially sections «convincing comparisons (Slovazkiy, Heine, Vorobkevych etc.). Franko put on the soil of European literary tradition» [18, p. 154]. Introductory article P. Fylypovych fully met its objectives: «...it is not only supplement, explained the poem, she even revived her» [21, p. 4].

An important reference point for researcher are the names of the writers whose works are read heroes of Kobylanska: Draper, Buckle, Spencer, Bihnera, Darwin. They characterize the lecture of the writer, not once she quotes or mentions Sophocles, Goethe, Heine, Hauptmann, Lessing, Koehler, Marlit, Werner, Bar, Rickert, Plyatena, Herder, Shpilhahen, Strindberg, Ibsen, Hamsun, Hayershtrama, Mickiewicz Flamarion Rousseau, Hekkle, Pestalozzi, Tolstoy, Garshin. The researcher concludes: creative person of Kobylanska formed «literary factors, together with the experiences of life» [4, p. 137], lecture had its value significantly greater than for other writers. He adds remarks and observations literature that focused simplistic influence on the work Kobylanska only Nietzsche's philosophy, believing that sustained it for ideological and other artists and thinkers, especially those affected by the German philosopher, says common grounds with creativity and Yakobzen that «affect the senses and imagination of the writer, and as the author of "tune" is not distributed as intensified her work» [5, p. 157].

Equally important was the literary element for early Ukrainian Lesya poem «Rusalka», which Franko noticed only a faint echo of Shevchenko's ballads. M. Zerov agreed with this later, M. Dray-Khmara viewed it as work delays imitation «causal», «mermaid», «drowned», which were literary adaptations of folk tales and legends. P. Fylypovych maintained: literary element in the poem of Lesya Ukrainka stronger than the folk and Shevchenko's influence (works of Goethe, Heine, Mickiewicz, Pushkin, Lermontov, Koltsov). Even by this early work differs from traditions of Ukrainian poetry. The author does not extend «comparative material that could give and give» [7, p. 226], because it is a purely romantic theme that gives young poets processed material, and can be easily combined – in this case we can talk about typological, not contact and genetic research.

One of the key interest of P. Fylypovych – the «world» stories – universal literary heritage, which writers are using for centuries, even forgetting that it is essentially borrowing. Not every story can always use – different times as different literary schools have their favorite, the most important subjects, – stressed scientist. Specifically, the material for the writers of the Romantic movement was not just folk ballad about poisoned Hryts, the plot is most skillful applied Kobylanska in the story «On Sunday morning dug potion» for researchers, convinced P. Fylypovych, has great weight, did O. Kobylanska pretreatment that seemingly exhausted all possible with this story. In general, they hardly influenced the writer, almost gave the material to follow, rather prysluzhylysya a tradition that is objectionable and seeking new ways. Against the background of previous treatments songs (B. Zaleski, A. Hyenkevych, K. Topolya, A. Shakhovsky, A. Borakovsky V. Samoilenko, V. Alexandrov, M. Starytsky, A. Groza, T. Onoprienko-Shelkovyi, A. Chyumina, K. Ozerska-Nelhovska etc.) scientist traces by A. Veselovsky, the evolution of consciousness and its poetic forms, and reaches the conclusion that the author has not approached this «hackneyed plot» [4, p. 195] mechanically. Formally Kobylanska made «so much his own and at the same time typical for an entire literary school that her work is an example of how the history of the plot with new ideological movement formed from the old – a new form» [5, p. 183]. These thoughts resonate with famous words of O. Veselovsky, who wrote that the comparative method reveals the history of literature «entirely new challenge – to see how the new meaning of life... this element of freedom permeates the old images, these forms of necessity» [39, p. 41]. This gave grounds for Gordynskyi say: «Fylypovych primarily interested in the history of the plot and comparing the poetic work of others, putting weight on their style and change» [11, p. 16]. It was obvious to researchers that borrowing from folk elements or previous literary tradition was not a great sin, because the writers «keep using the achievements of the past» [4, p. 215] – it proves the continuity of the literary process, spiritual continuity. The work appeared in historical terms, genetic and typological plane, studied in the context of the world from the perspective of national identity. The basic task of the researcher – to show the evolution and transformation, borrowed by writer.

Considering sketch of O. Oles «On the way to a story», P. Fylypovych interested not only by symbolic treatment of this «eternal» story (as did A. Nikovsky – G. A.). It is more important for him to see how Oles dramatic sketch is related to his

lyrics, and many places in it «repeated almost identically various poetry» [4, p. 207] by the same author. When Russia seek parallels and influences, you should not avoid a certain similarity in some Oles motives and Balmont, Fet, Polonsky, Nadson, Fofanov, Cherniavsky, Maeterlinck, Gorky and others. P. Fylypovych says he gives certain parallels first in order to see the poet's literary circle, not to «making sure conclusions about the effects» [4, p. 217]. Immediately emphasizes different: a talented poet, he suffered various influences, has echoes in his writing, including reviews of Oles «harps» «clearly heard in the early poetry of Tychna» [4, p. 218].

In the article of M. Rylskiy P. Fylypovych notes as he «close» [4, p. 220] to F. Tyutchev, K. Balmont, observes effect of Blok and only «external influence» of Pushkin and Lermontov, A. Krymskiy, M. Kuzmin, V. Bryusov, N. Gumilev, J. Rodenbah, but most importantly for literary – all these influences show that the poet «took a good school and didn't lost identity» [4, p. 223]. This M. Rylskiy modernized Ukrainian literature tried to extend the scope of its themes and moods of the Ukrainian poetry for «the best achievements of Russian and Western poets» [4, p. 224].

Already in 1929 began to write not only about the importance of adapting to the needs of the comparative method in Marxist literary history [31, p. 5] – the method of responding contemptuously as a «classic example» of comparative chatter «wicked and the weak» [37, p. 203]. P. Fylypovych started calling overdue loans imitators theory, it criticized by a large number of names, titles, sources, comparisons, influences, borrowing or «inspired», seeing it as helplessness and powerlessness investigator; He was allegedly «sinking» in a variety of random facts, unable to figure out because the impact of the phenomenon, as borrowed and original every writer began to consider derivatives and minor factors that need first of all sociological explanation. «In practice, P. Fylypovych this „method” is directed out to invent a maximum of literature, to bring up comparisons to finally break the continuous work of a writer on „borrowing” („imitation”, „suggestion”) and his own creative inventions, these borrowing or, in general, literary influences are considered seriously by factors that cause the appearance of the work» [37, p. 200]. The «surface-formalist» works of P. Fylypovych the evasion sociological consideration was seen. Working on only partial, not coming to the general, to the core, he «...remains a prisoner of sterile formalism mixed with eclectic also other methodological influences» [14, p. 19]. His methodology called destructive because it instilled, according to Marxist critics, political indifference, nonclass understanding of art, formalist aesthetic attitude to literature, images and forms that are just traveling, going from writer to writer, considered «beyond time and space, without any connection with the era, public relations, psychology class and the author. Such as Fylypovych, correct old comparative method of Veselovsky by more modern principles» [34, p. 47].

Researcher was especially abused for the article «History of a plot» (the story O. Kobylanska «On Sunday morning dug potion»). Consideration of international story versions considered unjustified, «because different treatment considered in chronological order, and yet for the historian of literature is not important so fill in the dates to find the continuous thread of the movement traditions, its related and not

outsiders ring» [40, p. 28], and it proves that all those who took up this story, «something was bound together that there is indeed consistent evolution» [40, p. 17], critics seemed too sharp P. Fylypovych's statement: «we don't have much weight – did Kobylanska know previous treatment?» [4, p. 181]. «If so, is it appropriate to submit a detailed history of the story?» [16, p. 150], – asked K. Koperzhynskiyi, showing this commitment only to contact-genetic studies, as opposed to typological researches of P. Fylypovych. Meanwhile, clarification typological unity of different genres works which demonstrated researcher, showed that this community is not static but dynamic, all in the product depends on the position of the author, his role in the realization of artistic intent.

In 1930 comparative method, particularly legacy of P. Fylypovych has already called idealistic, outdated, and ultimately reactionary, because it is «contrary to the single-scientific method – the Marxist one» [36, p. 335]. Supporters of comparative-historical method were persecuted in those days everywhere (because the very fact of comparison with other Ukrainian literature had a political connotation) This reflected steady process of socialization social consciousness, shift it to the imposed «only correct teaching». P. Fylypovych, in particular in the article «Shevchenko in the fight against aristocratic literature» (1934) gave him tribute when he wrote that «in Shevchenko's early works affected alien class influences that instilled nationalism» [9, p. 148], – then it began dramatic changes across political and cultural paradigm that led to vulgarization of provisions in comparative literature, physical destruction of many experts in this area, including P. Fylypovych. However, despite some ideological forced to adapt to query important thing in science were his scientific thought, combined with the flair and imagination of the poet and the desire for individual self-utterance. He always correlate features of Ukrainian literature, specifically «our» problems with trends of world art development, the literary atmosphere of the day. Focusing on the comparative method applied P. Fylypovych convincingly argued, we can reveal national heritage in a new way, avoid provincialism, join the universal artistic context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Айзеншток И. Изучение новой украинской литературы / И. Айзеншток // Путь просвещения. – 1922. – № 6. – С. 135–162.
2. Білецький Л. Т. Основи української літературно-наукової критики / Леонід Білецький / [упоряд., автор передм. і приміток М. М. Ільницький]. – Київ : Либідь, 1999. – 405 с.
3. Державин В. Великий поет-мыслитель / Володимир Державин // Поезії / П. Филипович. – Мюнхен : Ін-т літературознавства при Українському Вільному Університеті, 1957. – С. 15–27.
4. Филипович П. Літературно-критичні статті / Павло Филипович. – Київ : Дніпро, 1991. – 270 с.
5. Филипович П. З новітнього українського письменства : історично-літературні статті / Павло Филипович. – Київ : Культура, 1929. – 168 с.
6. Филипович П. П. Жизнь и творчество Е. А. Баратынского / П. П. Филипович. – Киев, 1917. – 220 с.
7. Филипович П. П. Літературознавчі студії. Компаративістика / Павло Филипович / [упоряд., авт передмови і приміток В. Поліщук]. – Черкаси : Брама-Україна, 2008. – 644 с.
8. Филипович П. В. И. Маслов. Начальный период байронизма в России. Критико-библиографический очерк. Киев 1915 г. / П. Филипович // Вестник Европы. – 1915. – Сентябрь. – С. 392–394.

9. Филипович П. Шевченкознавчі студії / Павло Филипович. – Черкаси : Брама, 2002. – 219 с.
10. Филипович П. До студювання Шевченка / Павло Филипович // Нова громада. – 1924. – № 20–21. – С 4–5.
11. Гординський Я. Літературна критика підсоветської України / Ярослав Гординський. – Львів, 1938. – 125 с.
12. Гречанюк С. Щоб давнє слово на чатах стало / Сергій Гречанюк // Літературно-критичні статті / Павло Филипович. – Київ : Дніпро, 1991. – С. 3–16.
13. В Інституті Т. Шевченка. Робота кабінетів // Літературний архів. – 1930. – Кн. III–VI. – С. 371–377.
14. Якубовський Ф. «Небезпека формалізму» / Ф. Якубовський // Критика. – 1929. – № 9. – С. 8–28.
15. Кареев Н. И. Литературная эволюция на Западе / Н. И. Кареев. – Воронеж, 1886. – 343 с.
16. Копержинський К. П. Филипович. З новітнього українського письменства. Історично-літературні статті. Видавництво «Культура», «Київ-Друк», 1929 / К. Копержинський // Україна. – 1929. – Травень–червень. – С. 148–150.
17. Копержинський К. Українське наукове літературознавство за останнє десятиліття, 1917–1927 / К. Копержинський. – Київ, 1929. – 34 с.
18. Копержинський К. Українське літературознавство. Науково-дослідчий і науково-видавничий рух Радянської України в 1926 році / К. Копержинський // Україна. – 1926. – № 3. – С. 152–159.
19. Костенко Н. В. «Врятує вроду і себе людина» / Наталя Костенко // Поезії // Павло Филипович. – Київ : Рад. письм., 1989. – С. 5–45.
20. Костюк Г. Українське наукове літературознавство в перше повоєнне п'ятнадцятиліття / Григорій Костюк // Збірник на пошану українських учених, знищених большевицькою Москвою. Записки Наукового товариства імені Шевченка. – 1962. – Т. CLXXIII. – С. 185–216.
21. М. Т. Ів. Франко. Смерть Каїна. Вступна стаття П. Филиповича. «Слово», Київ, 1924 / М. Т. // Більшовик. – 1925. – № 259. – С. 4.
22. Марковський М. Творчість О. Кобилянської в освітленні сучасної критики / М. Марковський // Україна. – 1928. – Кн. 3. – С. 163–167.
23. Могилянський М. Смерть Каїна. Вид-во «Слово», Київ 1924 р. / М. Могилянський // Нова громада. – 1925. – № 7. – С. 36.
24. Могилянський М. Шевченко та його доба. Збірник перший, за редакцією С. О. Єфремова, М. М. Новицького і П. П. Филиповича. Державне видавництво України. Київ 1925 / М. Могилянський // Нова громада. – 1925. – № 8. – С. 32.
25. Миронець І. Проф. П. Филипович. «З новітнього українського письменства», історично-літературні статті. Вид. «Культура», 1929 / І. Миронець / Пролетарська правда. – 1929. – 7 квітня. – № 80. – С. 5.
26. Наєнко М. К. Історія українського літературознавства / М. К. Наєнко. – Київ : Академія, 2001. – 312 с.
27. Наєнко М. Наука про літературу в Київському університеті : історико-літературний аспект / Михайло Наєнко // Слово і Час. – 1998. – № 1. – С. 72–83.
28. Наєнко М. К. Науковий метод і «практичне» літературознавство Павла Филиповича / М. К. Наєнко // Павло Филипович і неокласики в історії української літератури 20-30-х років. Зб. тез доповідей і повідомлень міжвуз. конференції, присвяч. 100-річчю з дня народження письменника. – Черкаси, 1991. – С. 3–4.
29. Осьмачка Т. Павло Филипович / Тодось Осьмачка // Хроніка-2000. – Київ, 2001. – Вип. 45–46. – С. 498–508.
30. Перетц В. М. Найближчі завдання вивчення історії української літератури / В. М. Перетц // Записки Українського наукового товариства у Києві. – 1908. – Кн. 1. – С. 16–24.
31. Перетц В. Из лекций по методологии истории русской литературы. История изучения. Методы. Источники / В. Н. Перетц. – Киев, 1914. – 496 с.
32. Поліщук В. Мій Филипович / Володимир Поліщук. – Черкаси : Видавець Ю. Чабаненко, 2015. – 170 с.

33. Поліщук Я. Школа Володимира Перетца / Ярослав Поліщук // Література як геокультурний проект. – Київ : Академвидав, 2008. – С. 62–65.
34. Щупак С. Формалізм на службі в українських буржуазних та дрібнобуржуазних еkleктиків / С. Щупак // Критика. – 1931. – № 10. – С. 31–49.
35. Штогрин Д. Володимир Перетц / Дмитро Штогрин // 125 років київської української академічної традиції 1861–1986 / За ред. М. Антоновича. – Нью-Йорк, 1993. – С. 341–359.
36. Літературознавча робота в Києві // Літературний архів. – 1930. – Кн. I–II. – С. 335.
37. Травень О. Проф. П. Филипович. З новітнього українського письменства. Історично-літературні статті. В-во «Культура» Держтресту «Київ-Друк». 1929 / О. Травень // Критика. – 1929. – № 7–8. – С. 200–203.
38. Василенко В. О. Кобилянська «Земля». Повість зі вступною статтю П. Филиповича. «Книгоспілка», 1926 р. / В. Василенко // Життя й революція. – 1926. – № 9. – С. 121–123.
39. Веселовский А. Н. Историческая поэтика / Александр Веселовский. – Москва : Высш. шк., 1989. – 404 с.
40. Якубський Б. І. Франко. Смерть Каїна, Вступна стаття П. Филиповича. Вид. «Слово» К. 1924 / Б. Якубський // Червоний шлях. – 1924. – № 11–12. – С. 302–304.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzenshtok, I. (1922), “Study of new Ukrainian literature”, [Izuchenie novoj ukrainskoj literatury], *Put' prosveshcheniya*, No. 6, pp. 135-162. (in Russian).
2. Beletsky, L.T. (1999), in Ilnytskyu, M. (Ed.), *Essentials of Ukrainian literary and scientific criticism [Osnovy ukrainskoj literaturno-naukovoi krytyky]*, Lybid, Kyiv, 405 p. (in Ukrainian).
3. Derzhavin, V. (1957), “Great poet-thinker”, *Fylypovych, P., Poetry*, [“Velykyi poet-myslytel”, *Fylypovych P. Poezii*], Institute of Literature at the Ukrainian Free University, Munich, pp. 15-27. (in Ukrainian).
4. Fylypovych, P. (1991), *Articles from literary critiques [Literaturno-krytychni statti]*, Dnipro, Kyiv, 270 p. (in Ukrainian).
5. Fylypovych, P. (1929), *From the modern Ukrainian literature, historical and literary articles [Z novitnoho ukrayinskoho pysmenstva: istorychno-literaturni statti]*, Culture, Kyiv, 168 p. (in Ukrainian).
6. Fylypovych, P. (1917), *Life and Works of E.A. Baratynsky [Zhyzn i tvorchestvo E.A. Baratynskoho]*, Kiev, 220 p. (in Russian).
7. Fylypovych, P. (2008), in Polishchuk, V. (Ed.) *Literary Studies. Comparative [Literaturoznavchi studii. Komparatyvistyka]*, Brama-Ukrayina, Cherkasy, 644 p. (in Ukrainian).
8. Fylypovych, P. (1915), “V.I. Maslov. The initial period Byronism in Russia. Critical-bibliographical essay. Kiev 1915” [V.I. Maslov. Nachalnyi period bajronizma v Rossii. Kritiko-bibliograficheskij ocherk. Kiev 1915 h.], *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 9, pp. 392-394. (in Russian).
9. Fylypovych, P. (2002), *Shevchenkoznavchi studio [Shevchenkoznavchi studii]*, Brama, Cherkasy, 219 p. (in Ukrainian).
10. Fylypovych, P. (1924), “To the study of Shevchenko” [“Do studiyuvannia Shevchenka”], *Nova hromada*, No. 20-21, pp. 4-5. (in Ukrainian).
11. Hordynsky, J. (1938), *Literary criticism of Soviet Ukraine [Literaturna krytyka pidsovietskoyi Ukrainy]*, Lviv, 125 p. (in Ukrainian).
12. Hrechaniuk, S. (1991), “The ancient word was on guard”, *Fylypovych, P., Literary critiques* [“Shchob davnie slovo na chatakh stalo”, *Fylypovych, P., Literaturno-krytychni statti*], Dnipro, Kyiv, pp. 3-16. (in Ukrainian).
13. (1930), “In the Institute of Taras Shevchenko. Work of cabinets” [“V Instytuti T. Shevchenka. Robota kabinetiv”], *Literaturnyi arkhiv*, No. III-VI, pp. 371-377. (in Ukrainian).

14. Jakubowski, F. (1929), “The danger of formalism” [“Nebezpeka formalizmu”], *Krytyka*, No. 9 pp. 8-28. (in Ukrainian).
15. Kareev, N. I. (1886), *Literary evolution in the West* [*Literaturnaya evolyutsiya na Zapade*], Voronezh, 343 p. (In Russian).
16. Koperzhynskyy, K. (1929), “P. Fylypovych. With modern Ukrainian literature. Historical and literary articles. Publisher ‘Culture’, ‘Kyiv-Print’ 1929” [“P. Fylypovych. Z novitnoho ukrainskoho pysmenstva. Istorychno-literaturni statti. Vydavnytstvo ‘Kultura’, ‘Kyiv-Druk’, *Ukraina*, No. 5-6, pp. 148-150. (in Ukrainian).
17. Koperzhynskyy, K. (1929), *Ukrainian literary science in the last decade, 1917-1927* [*Ukrainske naukove literaturoznavstvo za ostannie desiatylittia, 1917-1927*], Kyiv, 34 p. (in Ukrainian).
18. Koperzhynskyy, K. (1926), “Ukrainian literary studies. Scientific investigation and scientific publishing movement in Soviet Ukraine 1926” [“Ukrayinske literaturoznavstvo. Naukovodoslidchy i naukovo-vydavnychi rukh Radyanskoï Ukrainy v 1926 rotsi], *Ukrayina*, No. 3, pp. 152-159. (in Ukrainian).
19. Kostenko, N.V. (1989), “Saves themselves the beauty and man”, *Fylypovych, P., Poetry* [“Vryatuye vrodu i sebe lyudyna”, *Fylypovych, P., Poezii*], Rad. pysmennyk, Kyiv, pp. 5-45. (in Ukrainian).
20. Kostiuk, G. (1962), “Ukrainian scientific literary criticism in the early postwar 15 years”, [“Ukrainske naukove literaturoznavstvo v pershe povoyenne piatnadsiatylittia”], *Zbirnyk na poshanu ukrainskykh uchenykh, znyshchenykh bolshevytskoiu Moskvoiu, Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, T. CLXXIII, pp. 185-216. (in Ukrainian).
21. M. T. (1925), “Iv. Franko. Death of Cain. Introductory article P. Fylypovych. ‘Word’, Kyiv, 1924” [“Iv. Franko. Smert Kaina. Vstupna stattia P. Fylypovycha. ‘Slovo’, Kyiv, 1924”], *Bilshovyk*, No. 259, p. 4. (in Ukrainian).
22. Markowski, M. (1928), “Creativity of Kobylanska in the light of modern criticism” [“Tvorchist O. Kobylanskoï v osvittenni suchasnoï krytyky”], *Ukrayina*, No. 3, pp. 163-167. (in Ukrainian).
23. Mohylyanskiy, M. (1925), “Cain’s death. Publishing House ‘Word’, Kyiv 1924” [“Smert Kayina. Vyd-vo ‘Slovo’, Kyiv 1924 r.”], *Nova hromada*, No. 7, p. 36. (in Ukrainian).
24. Mohylyanskiy, M. (1925), “Shevchenko and his era. First Collection, edited by S. Efremov, Mikhail Novitsky and P. Fylypovych. State Publishing House Ukraine. Kyiv 1925” [“Shevchenko ta yoho doba. Zbirnyk pershyi, za redaktsiieyu S. O. Yefremova, M. M. Novytskoho i P. P. Fylypovycha”], *Nova hromada*, No. 8, p. 32. (in Ukrainian).
25. Myronets, I. (1929), “Prof. Pavlo Fylypovych. ‘With modern Ukrainian literature’, historical and literary articles. Kind. ‘Culture’, 1929” [“Z novitnioho ukrayinskoho pysmenstva», istorychno-literaturni statti. Vyd. ‘Kultura’, 1929”], *Proletarska pravda*, 7 April, No. 80, p. 5 (in Ukrainian).
26. Nayenko, M. (2001), *History of Ukrainian literary criticism* [*Istoriya ukrainskoho literaturoznavstva*], Akademia, Kyiv, 312 p. (in Ukrainian).
27. Nayenko, M. (1998), “Science of literature at the University of Kiev: historical and literary aspect” [“Nauka pro literaturu v Kyivskomu universyteti: istoryko-literaturnyi aspekt”], *Slovo i Chas*, No. 1, pp. 72-83. (in Ukrainian).
28. Nayenko, M. (1991), “Scientific method and ‘practical’ literary study of Pavlo Fylypovych”, Pavlo Fylypovych and neo-classical in the history of Ukrainian literature 20-30’s. Coll. abstracts and reports interuniv. Conference devoted to 100th anniversary of the writer [“Naukovyi metod i ‘praktychne’ literaturoznavstvo Pavla Fylypovycha”, Pavlo Fylypovych i neoklasyky v istorii ukrayinskoï literatury 20-30-kh rokiv. Zb. tez dopovidei i povidomlen mizhvuz. konferentsii,

- prysviach. 100-richchu z dnia narodzhennia pysmennyka], Cherkasy, pp. 3-4. (in Ukrainian).
29. Osmachka, T. (2001), "Pavlo Fylypovych" ["Pavlo Fylypovych"], *Khronika-2000*, No. 45-46, pp. 498-508. (in Ukrainian).
30. Peretz, V. (1908), "Immediate task of studying the history of Ukrainian literature", ["Naiblyzhchi zavdannia vyvchennia istorii ukrayinskoj literatury"], *Zapysky Ukrayinskoho naukovooho tovarystva u Kyevi*, No. 1, pp. 16-24. (in Ukrainian).
31. Peretz, V. (1914), *From lectures on the methodology of history Russian literature. History studies. Methods. Sources* [Iz leksij po metodologii istorii russoj literatury. Istoriya izucheniya. Metody. Istochniki], Kiev, 496 p. (in Russian).
32. Polischuk, V. (2015), *My Fylypovych* [Miy Fylypovych], Vydavets Yu. Chabanenko, Cherkasy, 170 p. (in Ukrainian).
33. Polishchuk, Y. (2008), "School of Volodymyr Peretz", *Literature as geo-cultural project* ["Shkola Volodymyra Perettsa", Literatura yak heokulturnyi proekt], Akademvydav, Kyiv, pp. 62-65. (in Ukrainian).
34. Shchupak, S. (1931), "Formalism in the service of Ukrainian bourgeois and petty-bourgeois eclecticism" ["Formalizm na sluzhbi v ukrainskykh burzhuaznykh ta dribnoburzhuaznykh eklektykiv"], *Krytyka*, No. 10, p. 31-49. (in Ukrainian).
35. Shtogrin, D. (1993), "Volodymyr Peretz", *125 years of Kiev Ukrainian academic tradition 1861-1986*, M. Antonovich (Ed.), ["Volodymyr Peretts", 125 rokiv kyivskoi ukrainskoi akademichnoi tradytsii 1861-1986, za red. M. Antonovycha], New York, pp. 341-359. (in Ukrainian).
36. (1930), "The literary work in Kiev" [Literaturoznavcha robota v Kyevi], *Literaturnyi arkhiv*, No. II, p. 335. (in Ukrainian).
37. Traven, O. (1929), "Prof P. Fylypovych. With modern Ukrainian literature. Historical and literary articles. Publishing house 'Culture', 'Kyiv-Print'. 1929" ["Prof. P. Fylypovych. Z novitnoho ukrainskoho pysmenstva. Istorychno-literaturni statti. V-vo 'Kul'tura' Derzhtrestu 'Kyiv-Druk'. 1929"], *Krytyka*, No. 7-8, p. 200-203. (in Ukrainian).
38. Vasylenko, V. (1926), "O. Kobylanska 'Earth'. The story with an introduction by P. Fylypovych. 'Knyhospilka', 1926" ["O. Kobylanska 'Zemlya'. Povist zi vstupnoiu statteiu P. Fylypovycha. 'Knyhospilka', 1926 r.], *Zhyttia y revoliutsiia*, No. 9, pp. 121-123. (in Ukrainian).
39. Veselovsky, A. N. (1989), *Historical poetics* [Istoricheskaya poetika], Vysshaya shkola, Moscow, 404 p. (in Russian).
40. Yakubskiy, B. (1924), "I. Franco. Death of Cain, P. Fylypovych introductory article. Kind. 'The word' Kyiv, 1924" ["Franko. Smert Kaina, Vstupna stattia P. Fylypovycha. Vyd. 'Slovo', Kyiv, 1924"], *Chervonyi shliakh*, No. 11-12, p. 302-304. (in Ukrainian).

