

УДК 821.161.2.091

Olga Teterina

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8722-8707>

THE MODEL OF COMPARATIVE STUDIES DEVELOPED BY THE UKRAINIAN EMIGRE COMMUNITY IN THE 1930s–1980s: EXPERIENCE AND PROSPECTS

The article analyzes in a holistic way the model of comparative studies developed by the Ukrainian emigre community in the 1930s–1980s. The concepts, views, and methodological approaches implemented in the works of Ukrainian scholars-emigrants (J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hnatyshak, M. Hlobenko, S. Hordynsky, V. Derzhavyn, I. Kaczurovskyj, I. Mirchuk, D. Chizhevsky, Y. Sherekh, and others) are systematized. The author traces the evolution and functions of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre scholars of this period, outlines the vectors of these studies, and characterizes trends and problems of the emigration comparative paradigm. The interdisciplinary nature of the works of the emigre scholars is revealed, with access to the fields of philosophy, ethnopsychology and anthropology, which determines the attention to genetic contactology and typology and the desire to develop intertextual and intermedial studies.

Conclusion about the model of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre community of this period as a holistic phenomenon is substantiated. The author proves that the views of the emigre scholars, who preserved national traditions, ensured continuous development of Ukrainian comparative literature, and enriched its methodological tools — remain relevant until now, outline the field's prospects, and promote new scientific research in the global academic space. The study applies achievements of the methodology of historical and comparative analysis and methodology of cultural-historical and receptive-historical schools.

Keywords: *comparative literature, national literature, intercultural context, contact and genetic relations, typological similarities and differences, style, reception, influence, literary translation, synthesis of the arts.*

DOI 10.34079/2415-3168-2025-18-32-79-105

Problem statement. The conceptual thesis of the unity of Ukrainian literature and the science about it (Y. Barabash, O. Halych, I. Dziuba, M. Ilnitsky, H. Kostiuk, M. Naenko and others) fundamentally deepens the understanding of emigre comparative studies of the 1930s–1980s and the mainland comparative literature of that time, which, despite the “two-pronged” development in the period, together represent a significant component of the science of literature.

I. Dziuba defined the activities of Ukrainian scholars abroad as “alternative forms of Ukrainian cultural and literary life”: their achievements (in the face of the “weakening cultural potential” of the post-Soviet Ukraine) were to become a shared national heritage (Дзюба, 2006a, p. 192).

Contemporary literary scholars share this opinion. They argue that the works of Ukrainian scholars abroad – L. Biletsky, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hnatyshak, S. Hordynsky, H. Hrabovych, V. Derzhavyn, D. Dontsov, I. Kaczurovskyj, O. Kolessa, I. Kostetsky, H. Kostiuk, I. Koshelivets, Y. Lavrinenko, Y. Lypa, E. Malaniuk,

Odarchenko, V. Petrov, L. Rudnytsky, G. Luckyj, D. Chizhevsky, Y. Sherekh, and many others – “are now perceived as unconditional achievements that, with their searching guidelines and interpretive discoveries... have outstripped a number of works of the once communist-oriented Ukrainian literary criticism” (Хороб, 2005, p. 3). M. Ilnitsky emphasizes

that studies of the emigre researchers have become “a recognized asset of our literature studies and played an important role in their methodological reorientation” (Ільницький, 2014, p. 109).

According to J. Lotman, the mechanisms of culture include manifestations of its self-understanding, among which comparative studies play a determining role. Application of the comparative method not only allows for a deeper disclosure of the phenomenon of dialogical cultures (M. Bakhtin, R. Barth, K. Jaspers, W. Jauss) but also contributes to the culture's awareness of itself as an integral part of the world's spiritual and cultural universe. The need for national culture in such a mechanism is especially acute when subjected to colonial pressure. In this context, comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigrants (1930s–1980s) deserve special attention, and a comprehensive study of its achievements is long overdue.

Review of scientific research. The vulgar sociological methodologies that have dominated Ukrainian literary studies since the 1930s are known to have slowed down the development of comparative studies in the mainland Ukraine. Predominance, even absolutization, of interliterary relations, especially the influence of Russian literature on other nations' writings, led to the unification of literature, causing devaluation of comparative studies.

D. Nalyvaiko noted that “in terms of theoretical and methodological aspects, Soviet comparative studies of the time remained largely at the level of the 1920s and 1930s. Fundamental shifts and reorientations unfolded in this area in the last decades of the twentieth century” (Наливайко, 2009, p. 15). According to H. Aleksandrova, “between the second and third stages (1930s–1980s), a certain ‘backlash’ was formed in Ukraine: comparative studies existed in a depressed, truncated form; the study of literary relations was mostly one-sided” (Александрова, 2009, с. 13). At the same time, this is not about complete devaluation of comparative studies in Ukraine at that time. I. Dziuba's appreciation of O. Biletsky's scientific heritage is indicative (Дзюба, 2006b, p. 494–548). Domestic researchers comprehend peculiarities of development of the mainland comparative literature (Брайко, 2009, p. 386–438). Scholars of the Ukrainian emigre community, in particular J. Bojko-Blokhyn (O. Biletsky, G. Verves, N. Kalenychenko, Y. Ivakin, M. Syvachenko, S. Shakhovsky and others), G. Grabowicz (M. Hrytsai, Y. Ivakin, M. Komyschanchenko, L. Makhnovets, H. Syvokin, H. Sydorenko and others), also recognize the importance of specific works by representatives of the Soviet science of literature.

However, joining the discussion of the prospects of Ukrainian comparative literature (which unfolded on the pages of the magazine “Slovo i Chas” in 2002–2003), S. Rosovetskyi emphasized that “Ukrainian comparative studies need not so much renewal as reconstruction” primarily “taking into account national traditions of comparative studies” (Росовецький, 2003, p. 23). The researcher insisted on “re-reading” the scientific heritage of, first of all, I. Franko, M. Drahomanov, M. Hrushevsky, M. Sumtsov and V. Peretz as comparativists whose works in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represent national comparative literature “in the normal pan-European model of that time” (Росовецький, 2003, p. 23).

From this point of view, it is essential to trace the evolution of ideas, views, and concepts (outlined in Ukraine in the previous period) that were realized in the Western world. Sharing the idea of “two fragments of the Ukrainian culture – ‘mainland’ and ‘emigration’ – which can hardly be perceived in isolation” (Дзюба, 2006a, p. 194), it is worth emphasizing, first of all, the critical (including general cultural) role/mission of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre community in the 1930s–1980s.

It is possible to reveal significance of comparative literary studies of the Ukrainian emigre community as a multi-vector and multidimensional phenomenon only if it is studied holistically in the context of general trends in developing world literary comparative studies. The studies devoted to national comparative literature of the second half of the twentieth century provide evidence of this tendency, as they sometimes briefly and incompletely examine only select works of individual emigre scholars (see more: Брайко, 2009, p. 387–388; p. 391–395); such scientific attempts, requiring broader contexts, cannot give a complete picture of the

development of Ukrainian comparative studies in the Western world and its vital role, including nation-building, for national science and culture in general.

The relevance of the work. The factual material under study has already been partially considered in the historical literary aspect (O. Astafiev, N. Bernadska, S. Bilokin, V. Bryukhovetskyi, O. Halych, M. Hnatiuk, L. Hrytsyk, I. Dziuba, M. Zhulynskyi, M. Zymomria, M. Ilnitsky, Y. Kovaliv, B. Kravtsiv, V. Melnyk, O. Myshanych, R. Mnykh, M. Naenko, D. Nalyvaiko, S. Pavlychko, R. Radyshevsky, T. Salyha, H. Syvachenko, M. Slaboshpytsky, L. Stefanovska, B. Tykholoz, S. Khorob, and others), requires a comprehensive understanding from the perspective of comparative studies. It demonstrates how, based on the traditions of national comparative literature of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries, reflecting the works of, first of all, M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, M. Dashkevych, O. Potebnya, M. Hrushevsky, M. Zerov, and P. Filipovych (Александрова, 2009; Гнатюк, 2003), comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre scholars of this period emerge from the positivist phase, getting closer to history and later to literary theory, and applies the methodologies developed by them. Comparative models, primarily those of L. Biletsky, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hnatyshak, S. Hordynsky, V. Derzhavyn, I. Kaczurovskyj, O. Kolessa, G. Luckyj, D. Chizhevsky, Yu. Sherekh and others represented Ukrainian literature in the Western world as an integral part of the European artistic and aesthetic space, emphasizing its national originality and integrating (proving the “inclusion”) of Ukrainian comparative literature into general movement of the world scientific thought. Thanks to powerful development of the Ukrainian comparative literature abroad, traditions of the national science have been largely preserved. At the same time, methodological tools of the discipline have been enriched. The prospects for its further development in the world scientific space have been outlined, and it is now becoming essential in the context of the challenges facing every national culture in the era of globalization in general.

The proposed work is an attempt at a unique comprehensive study of Ukrainian comparative literature in Europe in the 1930s–1980s, which has long been neglected by researchers, unlike other branches of emigre studies of literature. This is the reason for its **relevance**, which consists, first of all, in the “return” of ideas/approaches/concepts of Ukrainian scholars abroad to the national scientific, spiritual and cultural context, and thus in the reproduction/“reconstruction” of the continuous development of Ukrainian comparative literature.

The purpose of the article is to comprehend the model of the Ukrainian emigre comparative literature between the 1930s and the 1980s as a holistic phenomenon.

The objectives of the study are to define the main concepts of comparative literary studies of the Ukrainian emigre community, to trace its evolution, functions, and outline the vectors of comparative studies; to characterize trends and problems of the emigre comparative paradigm; to substantiate the opinion that the ideas, views, and concepts of Ukrainian scholars abroad (which were often ahead of their time) remain relevant, so taking into account their theoretical and methodological experience will help to expand the prospects of the discipline and new scientific research.

Outline of the primary material. Comparative studies are essential among the achievements of Ukrainian literary studies of the 1920s. This was emphasized by the researchers of the time, first of all by L. Biletsky (“Prospects of Scientific Literary Criticism”, 1924), who “saw special prospects in comparative studies” (Грицик, 2010, p. 164). The scientist’s vision was distinguished by an expressive comparative vector, as evidenced by his attention to the theory of imitation (“Fundamentals of Literary and Scientific Criticism (An Attempt at Literary and Scientific Methodology)”, 1925; “The Main Trends of Ukrainian Literary and Scientific Criticism during the Last 50 Years”, 1931, etc.) The importance of Biletsky’s works also lies in the fact that they outlined the trends of further development of Ukrainian comparative studies in the Western world based on the traditions, first of all, of

national science (as emphasized by L. Hrytsyk, M. Ilnitsky, Y. Kovaliv, and S. Khorob).

Deepening achievements of comparative literary studies of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries and rethinking the latest methodologies, the concepts of representatives of Ukrainian comparative studies in the Western world, as shown by the study of works, epistolary and archival materials, are based on the principles of the comparative school of academic literary studies.

Against the background of foreign science (A. Balakian, S. Bassnett, P. Brunel, U. Weisstein, H. Wölfflin, H.-G. Gadamer, A. Dima, D. Diurishyn, R. Etiemble, F. Jost, S.T. de Zepetnek, W. Iser, E. Kaspersky, A. Marino, G. Spivak, F. Tудоire-Surlapierre, K. Jaspers, H.R. Jauss, and others), multidimensional and multi-vector model of emigre comparative studies as a holistic phenomenon is more clearly defined, and its role/mission in ensuring continuous development of national comparative literature is more distinctly outlined. The evolution of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre scholars during this period correlates in its main features with the corresponding stages of world comparative literature development. This makes it possible to “fit” the Ukrainian emigre model into the context of European science. Scholars have noted the reformatting of the paradigm of comparative literature in the mid-twentieth century. In particular, D. Nalyvaiko while distinguishing three periods in development of scientific comparative studies states that the second one (1930s–1950s–1980s) is characterized by the dominance of typology (Наливайко, 2009, p. 12). In the world scientific space, the specificity of comparative literature studies of the Ukrainian emigre community in the 1930s–1980s is fundamentally distinguished: focusing on typology, emigre scholars at the same time attached special importance to the study of genetic and contactological problems. This was a necessary step due to the need to realize a critical task (which was impossible during several decades of the Soviet period under ideological pressure): to assert the identity of Ukrainian literature as an artistic and aesthetic phenomenon, the immanence of its development, which highlighted interliterary connections, and to present national literature as an integral part of the European spiritual and cultural universe.

Combining typological approaches with genetic and contactological ones, using the methodology of interdisciplinary approach, intermedial, contextual, and other methods of analysis, Ukrainian comparative literature, the nature of which was changed in the European scientific space, eventually outlined its material, specified its goals and objectives, and established itself as an independent branch of the science of literature.

The powerful development of the emigre comparative literature on the way to its entry into the context of world science is evidenced by a wide range of problems in the works of Ukrainian scholars (the study of which demonstrates the use of different methodological strategies): from a multilevel study of reception, including literary translation, through the interpretation of epochs, styles and genres, traditional plots and characters as transcultural artistic and aesthetic phenomena embodied in national variants, comprehension of the essence of artistic synthesis – to the problem of the history of national literature and the comparative history of Slavic literatures.

The view of the emigre scholars on comparative studies as a historical discipline is consistent with the interpretation by literary scholars of comparative research as an action that “takes place in time, not outside it” (E. Kaspersky). The fact that this view was also affirmed in Ukrainian science of that time is convincingly evidenced by the history of Ukrainian literature (L. Biletsky, M. Hlobenko, M. Hnatyshak, G. Luckyj, D. Chizhevsky), culture (I. Mirchuk), and D. Chizhevsky’s “Comparative History of Slavic Literatures” (which is still highly regarded by scholars, including foreign ones) published outside Ukraine, including in foreign languages.

A significant contribution of the “founders” of Ukrainian modern literature studies abroad, primarily M. Hnatyshak and D. Chizhevsky, is that the researchers comprehended the national literary process in the stylistic aspect (through the prism of the doctrine of epochs and

styles), widely using methodological tools of comparative studies. This made a “panoramic” literature study possible fundamentally expanded the contextual background. In contrast to the vulgarizing concepts of the history of Ukrainian literature, emigre scholars studying national literature in the interliterary context in terms of *style* focused on its specificity in the diversity of national variants of world literature and culture.

This approach is reflected in the work of M. Hnatyshak, who presents ancient Ukrainian literature as an integral part of the pan-European cultural space (“History of Ukrainian Literature. Book One”, 1941). The attempt at a new periodization of the history of national literature proposed by the scholar in his work is significant for the further development of Ukrainian literature studies in general. It is based on understanding the cultural development process as a change of styles, covering an important level of comparative literature. This approach was pioneered in European science by the Swiss art historian H. Wölfflin (“Renaissance and Baroque: Studies on the Essence and Genesis of the Baroque Style in Italy”, 1888), whose experience proved to be extremely important for literary scholars of the Ukrainian emigre community.

M. Hnatyshak’s use of comparative strategies in “History...” is subordinated to realizing close connection between the national tradition and external influences as powerful factor of literary progress.

Tracing the periods of development of ancient Ukrainian literature, the researcher actively involves “foreign” material in the study of “the own”. It is evident that the methodological tools of comparative studies used by the author performed an auxiliary function in the literature study, but this does not diminish their effectiveness. The comprehension of the stylistic evolution of Ukrainian literature of the period in question, which is in the field of view of the scientist, is combined with the shared contact genetic approaches of that time. The researcher’s attention to intra-literary relations and inter-literary contacts is also noteworthy.

The study of styles allowed M. Hnatyshak to fruitfully develop and fundamentally deepen his view of the close interaction of literature and folklore, which ensures the continuous development of literary traditions (advocated by I. Franko and M. Hrushevsky). M. Hnatyshak’s conceptual conclusion about the important role of intra-literary relations in the development of Ukrainian literature draws special attention to the study of its national originality, in particular, given its importance in the process of creative transformation of the powerful influences of foreign cultures, predominantly Byzantine culture.

The scholar does not limit himself to stating the functionality of interliterary relations in the development of Ukrainian literature of the period. The author’s emphasis on the influences (Byzantine and later Gothic on Ukrainian literature), which the researcher divides into “external” and “internal” (European comparative studies, in particular D. Diurishyn, paid attention to these two types of contacts only in the 1960s), is important. Far from absolutizing the influence, the scholar carefully analyzes Ukrainian literature’s reception of foreign artistic and aesthetic values, outlining its vast range (from translations, alterations, and compilations of religious and secular Byzantine literature to original works on its own substrate). Sharing his predecessors’ opinion about the creative nature of influence, M. Hnatyshak traces contact relations on specific phenomena of Ukrainian literature (Apocrypha, chronicles) and determines the direction of this process - “from the alien to the native”. In particular, the author proves that it is thanks to the folk element that the phenomenon of Ukrainian Byzantineism did not become a manifestation of blind imitation but creatively transformed Byzantine influences into a “peculiar Byzantine-Ukrainian stylistic integrity” (“The Journey of Daniel, Hegumen of the Russian Land”, “The Tale of Igor’s Campaign”). The scholar’s remark on the substantive and formal renewal of Ukrainian folklore in this period is noteworthy, with a distinct emphasis on the style problem. The literary scholar notes the emergence of new genres (Christian legends with an apocryphal element, folk stories with wandering motifs, epics, etc.) At the same time, the observation that Western influences are not very pronounced in specific periods gives the

author grounds for an important conclusion: literature is not always ready for “digesting” foreign artistic experience. Tracing the process of formation of “its transitional style” (Гнатишак, 1941, p. 123-124) at the next stage of the development of Ukrainian literature as a result of the “crossing” of Eastern and Western cultural influences, the researcher stated the Western vector of further national literary development.

It is worth noting that M. Hnatyshak’s interest in the reception problems is associated with the scholar’s distinct emphasis not only on “how” but also on “what” was learned, since this aspect was one of the comparative coordinates in the literature study. This line of comparative studies was less practiced in Ukraine. However, it was tested in the comparative studies of foreign scholars (A. Bruckner, F. Wolman, T. Zielinski, J. Polivka, S. Reiter, P. Riedl, J. Scherr, and others), who established new approaches and research directions in Germany, Poland, and the Czech Republic, where M. Hnatyshak’s comparative model was developed. The emigre scholar’s “History of Ukrainian Literature”, while not yet having a specific system, outlined an approach to the study of comparative poetics, and defined its levels (styles, genres, motifs, traditional plots, and characters). All this gives grounds to assert that the goal and tasks set by M. Hnatyshak as a historian of Ukrainian literature gradually took the researcher out of the sphere of positivism. However, the material and the literary era prompted a careful study of factors of different levels, the contact and genetic nature of which affected the literary field.

The comparative model of D. Chizhevsky, who actually continued Hnatyshak’s work (Чижевський, 1942), is an integral part of the scientist’s large-scale, interdisciplinary scientific work, which defines the ‘unity of meaning’ (N. Nad’yarnykh). The evolution of the views of D. Chizhevsky, a comparativist who was ahead of his time, from early studies that already show distinct attention not only to the problems of contactology but also typology (“Tyutchev and German Romanticism”, 1927; “Schiller and The Brothers Karamazov”, 1929), to the problem of literary reception as a factor of literary development, the specifics of the national variant of the pan-European style, especially Baroque and Romanticism, through the comprehension of general patterns of interliterary progress, the doctrine of epochs and styles (“Cultural and Historical Epochs”, 1948) - to the concepts of the history of national literature and the comparative history of Slavic literatures.

The knowledge of historical and literary material from ancient times, the ability to work with the text (which D. Chizhevsky learned as a participant in V. Peretz’s seminar), the experience of I. Franko, M. Dashkevych, M. Hrushevsky (“M.S. Hrushevsky as a Literary Historian”), M. Zerov, and M. Hnatyshak allowed the scholar to develop his own research model. The methods tested by the Ukrainian author during his emigration were approved under the influence of European comparativists. The formation of D. Chizhevsky’s concept, based on the idea of literary/cultural development as a change of styles (Чижевський, 2005, p. 24-35), was facilitated by the researcher’s assimilation of the views of, first of all, H. Wölfflin, in particular, his ‘theory of cultural waves’, as well as a wide awareness of the latest achievements of foreign philosophy and philology (H.-G. Gadamer, E. Husserl, R. Ingarden, V. Mathesius, J. Mukarzewski, N. Trubetskoy, R. Jakobson, K. Jaspers). The literary critic was one of those researchers who were the first in the world of science to diversify the tools of comparative studies with the methodology of an interdisciplinary approach, which is now gaining exceptional relevance (see more: Нарівська та Пахсар’ян, 2020, p. 48-64; Овчаренко, 2020, p. 472-495; Свєрбілова, 2020, p. 408-428). This was already eloquently signaled in one of D. Chizhevsky’s early works “Tyutchev and German Romanticism” (1927). By applying an interdisciplinary approach to the comparative study of literature (with access to the field of philosophy), D. Chizhevsky actually indicated the prospects for further scientific research in the field of humanities in general.

The comparative principles of D. Chizhevsky’s historical literary works, which demonstrate a wide range of theoretical and methodological thinking of the scholar, gradually changed the idea of the Ukrainian emigre comparative literature and played an important role

in formation of its model as a whole ("Ukrainian Literary Baroque: Essays" (1941-1944), "History of Ukrainian Literature, Vol. 2. Renaissance and Reformation. The Baroque" (1942), "To the Problems of the Baroque" (1946), "Cultural and Historical Epochs" (1948), studies included in the publication "Aus Zwei Welten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der slavisch-westliche literarischen Beziehungen" ("From Two Worlds. Towards a History of Slavic-Western Literary Relations") (1956), "History of Ukrainian Literature (from the Beginnings to the Age of Realism)" (1956), "Comparative History of Slavic Literatures" (1968), and others).

D. Chizhevsky's comparativist concept, adapted to ancient Ukrainian literature, in particular translated literature ("History of Ukrainian Literature, Vol. 2. Renaissance and Reformation. Baroque", "History of Ukrainian Literature: From the Beginnings to the Age of Realism"), had its peculiarities, which were supplemented with new approaches over time, according to the way the material and tasks changed (for example, in the "Comparative History of Slavic Literatures"). Representing Ukrainian literature as a component of European 'integrity' was combined with another task - to justify the 'immanent need for its development'. The phenomenon of Ukrainian literature and various (geopolitical, religious, etc.) factors led to attention to the contact and genetic sphere. This approach implied the need to focus on how alien – antiquity ("Ancient Literature in Old Ukraine"), the Baroque ("Ukrainian Literary Baroque: Essays", "History of Ukrainian Literature. Renaissance and Reformation. Baroque", "Beyond Beauty (On the Aesthetics of Baroque Literature)", romanticism ("Mickiewicz and Ukrainian Literature", etc.) – entered Ukrainian literature and was creatively transformed in it. For D. Chizhevsky, influence is important as an incentive for original creativity, not as imitation or copying.

In the context of Ukrainian and Western European comparative literature, D. Chizhevsky's innovative interpretation of interliterary communication as a 'dispute between two worldviews' ("Schiller and The Brothers Karamazov", 1929) is indicative. Based on a comparative analysis of the works of F. Schiller and F. Dostoevsky, the author broadly outlines the range of manifestations of literary perception (from quotations, reminiscences, motifs, themes, thoughts, and translations to responses to the author's ideas). D. Chizhevsky emphasizes the functionality of influence as repulsion and negation (which did not escape Franko's attention in his time). The author emphasizes the polemical nature of reception (F. Dostoevsky's 'discussion' with F. Schiller around the idea of the 'superman'). D. Chizhevsky's conclusion about literary perception as a 'starting point of thinking' of the writer-recipient, an impulse for further 'unfolding' of his concept, is of fundamental importance (much later, H.R. Jauss addressed these issues).

The researcher's views on influence as one of the most important manifestations of reception were clarified and deepened in his scientific evolution. This is demonstrated by comparing works devoted to romanticism in Slavic literature in the European context ("Tyutchev and German Romanticism", 1927; "Mickiewicz and Ukrainian Literature", 1956). In the later period, D. Chizhevsky demonstrates special attention to the study of interliterary contacts and typological similarities and differences, emphasizing the subordination of the former to the latter. In this projection, the author also considers the problem of influence as a stimulus for original creativity.

The scientist fundamentally deepens the study of the phenomenon of influence as a 'component of the creative process,' comprehending it in the context of stylistic literary development ("Mickiewicz and Ukrainian Literature"). Noteworthy are D. Chizhevsky's observations on the multi-vector reception of the Polish author's work by Ukrainian romantics (L. Borovykovsky, M. Kostomarov, A. Metlynsky, P. Hulak-Artemovsky, T. Shevchenko, P. Kulish).

The material often draws the researcher's attention to internal contacts and, above all, to the main goal of the study – comparative typology. While the previous stage allowed us to focus on the originality of the literary creation (in particular, translated and borrowed literature, the

era of the monumental style), the next stage shows similarities not as an influence or dependence on the West but as a pattern caused by objective reasons – familiar European context. The scholar, who, like M. Hnatyshak, defended the thesis of literary progress as a change of styles, substantiated the view of national literature, especially Slavic one, as an organic part of the European artistic, aesthetic, spiritual and cultural space.

The comparative and typological works of D. Chizhevsky are characterized by a precise sequence of the factors that cause similarities and differences in the study of the literary period. The author pays special attention to the problems of comparative poetics (for him, style is ‘the fundamental category of the literary movement’). This field of research was practiced sporadically in mainland Ukrainian comparative studies (at the time when D. Chizhevsky's “History of Ukrainian Literature” and “Comparative History of Slavic Literatures” were being compiled). Among the comparative and typological problems analyzed by the emigre scholar were those that remain relevant today – problems of contextual analysis, comparative poetics, traditional plots and images, comparative genology (for example, the genres of baroque and romantic literature). In D. Chizhevsky's comparatist concept, an important place belongs to the ‘in-between’ (помежів’я), the study of which determined a separate vector of comparative studies in the twentieth century.

D. Chizhevsky made an exceptionally significant contribution to the development of comparative literature. The scholar's comparative model, based on the awareness of the complementarity of typological, genetic and contact approaches, importance of combining these approaches, as well as the involvement of the interdisciplinary aspect (primarily with access to the field of philosophy), including the comparative history of Slavic literature, influenced the progress of European comparative studies, in particular, indicated the direction of further development of Ukrainian comparative studies (see more: Терпіна, 2018a). Historical literary and cultural studies from the foreign countries evidence this.

The line of comparative studies of this period is continued by the works of Ukrainian emigre scholars who unfold the main trends: first of all, the relationship of Ukrainian literature/culture with Western European and Slavic ones from ancient times to the twentieth century (V. Petrov, D. Chizhevsky, M. Hlobenko. “Ukrainian Literature”. I. Mirchuk. “History of Ukrainian Culture”, 1949). This landmark publication demonstrated the commonality of scholars' views on the sources and prospects of national literature and its understanding as an organic component of the world culture.

V. Petrov's participation in the preparation of the history of Ukrainian literature (a brief description of individual historical epochs, and a historical overview of Ukrainian literary studies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) is also impactful. V. Petrov's multidimensional scientific activity as a ‘systematic scientist’ (V. Bryukhovetskyi) in the field of humanities is determined by a distinct comparative vector. The author's exceptional attention to the issues of methodology, which were of fundamental importance to him, is illustrative, emphasizing their interconnectedness. This is demonstrated by the researcher's works devoted not only to his own culture (folklore, H. Skovoroda, N. Gogol, H. Kvitka-Osnovianenko, T. Shevchenko, M. Kostomarov, P. Kulish, Lesya Ukrainka, I. Franko, Y. Yanovsky and others), but also to the world culture (J.W. Goethe, V. Hugo, V. Van Gogh, P. Gauguin, F. Villon, H. Regnier, R.M. Rilke, A. France and others). However, first of all, we are talking about the reflections of the scientist, who also widely used an interdisciplinary approach, on the general patterns of cultural and historical development based on the change of epochs, which builds his multi-vector scientific concept into an unquestionable integrity. The author's fundamental works published in the 60s and 70s (“Scythians: Language and Ethnicity”, “Entogenesis of the Slavs. Sources, Stages of Development and Problems”) are perhaps the most convincing in this context. The ideas of these studies were important for V. Petrov as a scientist - ‘as an argument of his scientific and ideological system’ - in the process of forming his views, which were moving ‘from universal culture to ethnography’ (Шевельов, 2009,

p. 827). Against a broad spiritual and cultural background, the scholar outlines the place of national literature, clarifies the peculiarities of its stylistic development, and reflects on the prospects of national/world culture, including in the civilizational dimension, and the phenomenon of artistic creativity in general.

V. Petrov, like other representatives of modern national literary studies, highlighted the importance of periodization of the history of Ukrainian literature. In line with the approach substantiated by D. Chizhevsky and earlier by M. Hnatyshak in the introduction to "The History of Ukrainian Literature. Book I" (1941), the scholar defended this new view of the literary "movement," emphasized the 'historical originality' of each epoch, and argued that 'the concept of literature is not extra-historical, but historical, related to the content and structure of the respective historical epochs and periods' (Петров, Чижевський та Глобенко, 1994, р. 12). From this point of view, V. Petrov highly appreciated D. Chizhevsky's "History of Ukrainian Literature" (Prague, 1942) as an attempt to apply 'general historical periodization' to the history of the national literature.

The approach that defines the Ukrainian emigre scholars' model of comparative studies (re-emphasis on the problem of typology in the study of national literature and, at the same time, taking into account functionality of interliterary and national literary contacts) is also developed by M. Hlobenko. One of the most important features of the scientist's methodology is expanding the 'cultural background' (J. Bojko-Blokhyn) in studying national literature as an integral part of the world literature. This is convincingly evidenced by the researcher's works on the legacy of I. Kotliarevsky, T. Shevchenko, P. Kulish, I. Nechuy-Levytsky, I. Franko, Lesya Ukrainka and other authors.

The concept of M. Hlobenko, who developed and deepened the views of one of the founders of national comparative literature - Ivan Franko, is characterized by a similar research vector. The emigre scholar, like his predecessor, attached exceptional importance to fruitful national traditions in literary development (in particular, M. Hlobenko's works "The Circle of Sources of Our Literature" and "The Heritage of Kyivan Rus in the Literature of the Baroque Period" (1958) give researchers grounds to conclude that the literary critic is 'undoubtedly a traditionalist' (Бойко, 1992a, p. 322)). At the same time, M. Hlobenko also paid special attention to the connections between Ukrainian and foreign literature.

M. Hlobenko's model, which advocated the idea of the national literary process as an organic part of the European one (emphasizing the specifics of its stylistic development), emphasizes the phenomenon of interliterary communication. This is most convincingly represented by the scholar's chapters in the above-mentioned history of Ukrainian literature.

Comprehending national literature in the European context, the author emphasized that the development of national literature – as a component of a single spiritual and cultural universe – is generally determined by the patterns of literary progress in Europe. The researcher, who agrees with the opinion of D. Chyizevsky, explains that national literature goes through the same periods of stylistic development as other European literatures. M. Hlobenko substantiated this conceptual thesis by tracing the development of the Ukrainian version of realism and modernism against the background of European literary progress. The author paid special attention to the national specificity of Ukrainian literature. The comparatist scholar understood influence as a stimulus, an essential factor in the literary process (Y. Fedkovych – F. Schiller, L. Uhland; V. Vynnychenko – G. de Maupassant, F. Dostoevsky), contrasted this manifestation of reception with the phenomenon of imitation (Y. Fedkovych's poetry of the late period - Taras Shevchenko's "Kobzar"), and the dependence of writers on foreign models (B. Hrinchenko's "A ray of sunlight" – M. Chernyshevsky's "What is to be done?"). The researcher connected M. Kotsiubynsky's mastery of modern writing techniques (primarily "On the stone", "Intermezzo", "Apple blossom") with the creative transformation of the artistic achievements of representatives of world literature (E. Zola, A. Strindberg, K. Hamsun, A. Schnitzler, M. Maeterlinck and others) on his own background. M. Hlobenko emphasizes

peculiarities of the work of the Ukrainian author, who ‘embarked on his path of synthesis’ of modernist writing techniques with the renewal of ‘populist-realistic’ (“Fata morgana”) and ‘ethnographic-romantic’ (“Shadows of forgotten ancestors”) plots (Петров, Чижевський та Глобенко, 1994, р. 196). The emphasis on the study of the stylistic evolution of individual artists (Marko Vovchok, Yuriy Fedkovych, M. Kotsiubynsky, I. Franko, Lesya Ukrainka, V. Vynnychenko), caused by interliterary dialogue, which distinguishes M. Hlobenko's approach, fundamentally clarifies the idea of the specifics of the stylistic development of Ukrainian literature in the European context.

The attention of emigre scholars to ‘reverse influences’ (D. Chizhevsky, M. Hlobenko) demonstrated an entirely new vector in comparative studies of the time. At the same time, their works are characterized by an active appeal to typology, especially in solving the problem of the national and the universal in the comparative study of literary epochs (primarily Baroque, Romanticism, Realism and Modernism) at the content and formal levels in Western European and Ukrainian literature. The emphasis is on synthesizing the ‘own’ as traditional and the ‘foreign’ as new.

There is a noticeable desire to go beyond literary studies with comparative observations, enriching them with material from philosophy, ethnopsychology and anthropology (which is especially relevant for contemporary humanities in general). These branches of knowledge are actively used in comparative studies performed by Ukrainians abroad. Illustrative in this context is attention of I. Mirchuk as the author of “The History of Ukrainian Culture” to the psychotype of a Ukrainian (Мірчук, 1994, р. 243-274). The logic of the researcher's thinking is close to the interpretation of national worldview dominants by Ukrainian and European scholars (particularly the concept of H. Wolf).

I. Mirchuk focuses on various types of connections, among which the ‘temporal movement of single periods’ of Ukrainian cultural development in comparison with the West is of great interest. The author considers the Western vector of development to be the main one. The researcher also focuses on the complex mechanisms of ‘merging’ and ‘re-facing’ foreign artistic achievements under the influence of the national element (primarily in the Baroque period). In this regard, the scholar extends his observations to architecture (focusing primarily on its folk branch - wooden architecture as a unique phenomenon in the world), Baroque sculpture, painting, and graphics (with a deepening of themes, motifs, images), as well as musical culture, which, in contact with Western European culture, transformed the ‘alien’ in its own creativity. I. Mirchuk reveals the process of transformation of foreign (in particular, German) artistic and aesthetic experience by example of the evolution of M. Lysenko's work. Applying the contextual method fundamentally expands the background against which the works of art are compared. The range of their comparative reading increases significantly as the author also uses the intermedial approach. The work of the emigre scholar is demonstrative, given his attention to the problem of synthesis of arts, of the observation and conclusion about the consonance of M. Lysenko's work with Shevchenko's (the researcher attributes this to a large extent to the high appreciation and development of the achievements of the folk song heritage by both artists) (Мірчук, 1994, р. 352). In general, the problem of synthesis of arts is not new; it has its traditions (see more: Наливайко, 2006; Рязанцева, 2020; Генералюк, 2024), which, in particular, in Ukrainian literature studies is associated primarily with Ivan Franko's treatise “From the Secrets of Poetic Creativity”, although in national comparative studies its final recognition took place in the last decades of the twentieth century (D. Nalyvaiko). The study of this problem in the works of Ukrainian researchers in the West is also due to the broad resonance caused by the researches of O. Walzel, K. Weiss, U. Weisstein and other foreign authors.

Understanding the phenomenon of the interpenetration of ‘own’ and ‘foreign’ as a factor in the development of national literature in the intercultural space is an extremely important vector in the concepts of emigre scholars who developed and deepened the achievements of

Ukrainian researchers of the second half of the nineteenth century – the first decades of the twentieth century, and creatively rethought foreign methodologies.

The comparativist model of Juri Bojko-Blokhyn, which is also defined by the awareness of the interconnectedness of genetic-contactology and typology, with an emphasis on the problem of style (see more: Тетеріна, 2022), deepened the author's understanding of the specifics of national literature, based on which his concept of the history of Ukrainian literature was formed (Бойко, 1992b, p. 8) (“Taras Shevchenko's legacy against the background of Western European literature”, “To the problem of Franko's style development”, “To the problem of Franko's romanticism”, “‘The Stone Master’ by Lesya Ukrainka”, “Aesthetic views of Lesya Ukrainka and her stylistic search”; “Die Stilrecherchen Lesja Ukrainkas auf dem Hintergrund der Weltliteratur” (“Lesja Ukrainka's Style Search Against the Background of World Literature”), “Byrons Einfluss auf die russische, ukrainische und polnische Literatur” (“Byron's Influence on Russian, Ukrainian and Polish Literature”), etc.)

Emigre scholars considered the reception of world classics by national literature as one of the most important research areas in comparative literature, which convincingly demonstrated the consonance of Ukrainian comparative studies with European ones. From this point of view, the studies of Juri Bojko-Blokhyn are emblematic, while he continued the traditions of national comparative literature of the second half of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries (I. Franko “Adam Mickiewicz in Ukrainian Literature”; P. Filipovych “Pushkin in Ukrainian Literature”) and focused on the creative nature of the transformation of foreign artistic experience on the own background “Dante and Ukraine”, “Goethe and Ukrainian Literature”, “Byrons Einfluss auf die russische, ukrainische und polnische Literatur”.

J. Bojko-Blokhyn focuses on the wide range of multilevel functioning of literary perception. The scientist pays special attention to the study of influence as a stimulus of activity, in particular “repulsion” (G. Byron – T. Shevchenko), rather than “disguised violence.” The focus of the comparativist concept of the scientist is influence as creative mastering (see more: Тетеріна, 2018b).

Jurij Bojko-Blokhyn is particularly interested in understanding the functionality of foreign influence in terms of the stylistic development of literature (“Taras Shevchenko's Legacy Against the Background of Western European Literature”, “On the Problem of Franko's Style Development”, “Lesya Ukrainka's Aesthetic Views and Her Search for Style”, “Die Stilrecherchen Lesja Ukrainkas auf dem Hintergrund der Weltliteratur”).

The study of literary perception led to the entry into another field of comparative studies – typology. Noteworthy from this point of view is the comparison of the central female characters in the works of Dante (Beatrice), J. W. Goethe (Gretchen) and Taras Shevchenko (Oksana). J. Bojko-Blokhyn points to the reception of Dante's artistic experience in Taras Shevchenko's work, while between J. W. Goethe and Taras Shevchenko the scholar sees only a parallel.

J. Bojko-Blokhyn's reflections on the problem of comparative study of Slavic literature, showing a special interest in national specificity, emphasize and deepen the study of Slavic, in particular East Slavic, literature as a fundamentally important component of the European cultural space (see more: Teterina, 2018). At the same time, substantiating the idea that “originality is a runner to commonalities”, and it should always be an object of observation, the scholar insisted on changing the approach to the study of the East Slavic zone, in particular, historical and literary processes in Belarusian, Ukrainian and Russian literature.

The comparativist model of Jurij Bojko-Blokhyn demonstrates attention to contact and genetic relations and typological similarities and differences, emphasizing their interconnectedness. The scientist interprets the problem of the functionality of interliterary/intercultural communication as a factor, first of all, in the stylistic development of national literature. The researcher's reflections on Ukrainian literature fundamentally expand the understanding of its specificity in the European context (T. Shevchenko – G. Byron,

R. Burns, J.W. Goethe, Dante, G. Leopardi, A. Mickiewicz, T. Moore, Novalis, S. Petofi, W. Shakespeare, F. Schiller; I. Franko – G. Byron, E.T.A. Hoffmann, A. Chamisso; Lesya Ukrainka – G. Hauptmann, M. Maeterlinck, O. Wilde and others). The author traces the process of creative rethinking of the artistic and aesthetic experience of European writings at different levels of comparative poetics (themes, motifs, style, traditional plots and characters, etc.).

The development of the Ukrainian emigre model of comparative studies shows that consisting of various, sometimes opposing, views, ideas and concepts, it crystallized into a multi-vector and multi-aspect phenomenon in the process of polemics and discussions. One of the most important, which revolved around the problem of “great literature” (O. Hrytsai, V. Derzhavyn, U. Samchuk, Y. Sherekh and others) and the choice of the future direction of literary progress, focused on two approaches (Sherekh's theory of “national-organic style” and V. Derzhavyn's idea of creative mastering of the experience of world artists, in particular through the stylization of their artistic and aesthetic achievements).

The formation of these researchers' views on the problem of synthesizing the national and universal in writing through the prism of the doctrine of epochs and styles (as well as the formation of the concepts of other emigre scholars, in particular, D. Chizhevsky, M. Hlobenko, I. Mirchuk and J. Bojko-Blokhyn) took place on the basis of the widespread use of comparative literature methodology.

The authors' works demonstrate an emphasis on typology, especially style, to which the problems of genetic and contactological studies are subordinated. This is generally characteristic of the development of world comparative literature.

Scholars' different interpretations of literary style as a historical (Y. Sherekh) / supra-historical (V. Derzhavyn) category correlated with the field's multi-vector development worldwide, in particular with its tendencies towards historicism (U. Weisstein, D. Diuryshyn) and universalism (R. Etiemble and his school). This also proved the “inclusion” of Ukrainian emigre comparative studies in the general movement of European science.

Both researchers focused on understanding national literature as an organic component of European space, with an emphasis on its originality. Despite different understandings of the role of tradition in national literature, this was the common thread in the scholars' views that shaped their comparative models and contributed to the development of methodological tools.

The works of V. Derzhavyn on the theory and history of literature (“The Problem of Styles and Pluzhanism Abroad”, “National Literature as Art (Artistic Purpose and Method of National Literature)”, “The Problem of Classicism and Systematics of Literary Styles”, “The Spirit and Source of Kyiv Neoclassicism”, “The Problem of Imitation and Stylization”; “Mykola Zerov's Poetry and Ukrainian Classicism”, “Poet of the Age (Evhen Malaniuk)”, “National Heroine (Olena Teliha)”, “Pathos and the Cult of Perfection (On the Lyrics of Stefan George)”, “Rainer Maria Rilke”, “Poetry of Paul Verlaine”, “William Wordsworth and the so-called Lake Poetry School”, etc.) demonstrate a distinct comparative vector of the scholar's concept. V. Derzhavyn's attention to contact and genetic relations is due to the researcher's view that the development of national literature in the world universe is inseparable from the creative assimilation of the highest artistic and aesthetic achievements on its own soil, and from its “competition” with other literatures (“National Literature as Art (Artistic Purpose and Method of National Literature)”). The author subordinated these connections to the general patterns of the world literary process, emphasizing the interconnectedness of genetic (genealogical), contactological and typological methods (a point also emphasized by Western comparatists).

The scientist, refuting the approach of apologists for the antithesis “Ukraine – Europe”, developed and deepened the views of his predecessors, primarily P. Kulish, I. Franko and Lesya Ukrainka. On a wide range of material, primarily from European, including Slavic, literature (W. Shakespeare, G. Byron, Dante, S. Mallarmé, R.M. Rilke, T. Shevchenko, A. Pushkin, M. Lermontov, I. Krylov), V. Derzhavyn substantiated the conceptual idea of the reception of world artistic and aesthetic achievements as a powerful factor in the development of national

literature. This approach fundamentally distinguished his concept from Sherekhov's concept of the period, gaining particular importance given the fundamental problem of choosing the further development path of Ukrainian literature.

Without absolutizing the phenomenon of influence, V. Derzhavyn emphasized the rethinking of foreign artistic experience on his own soil, which he proved based on the works of domestic authors ("Poetry by Emma Andijevska", "Lyrics by Yevhen Pluzhnyk", "Poet of the Age (Evhen Malaniuk)", "National Heroine (Olena Teliha)", "The Path to Classicism (Olena Teliha: 'Soul on Guard'. A Selection from Poems)", "Mykhailo Orest's Poetry and Neoclassicism", "Olzhych – Poet of National Heroism" and others). This approach not only united the literary critic with the views of Ukrainian emigre scholars, primarily D. Chizhevsky and J. Bojko-Blokhyn, but was also close to the concepts of foreign researchers (A. Dima, D. Diuryshyn, M. Laszlo-Kučiuk, H.R. Jauss). This also applies to V. Derzhavyn's reflections on the range of functioning of literary perception ("The Problem of Imitation and Stylization"). The researcher interpreted translation, imitation, parody and stylization as "formal aspects of the process of influence". The author attached particular importance to stylization, which he distinguished from imitation, unlike D. Diuryshyn ("stylistic imitation"). Based on the works of Kyiv neoclassics ("Mykola Zerov's Poetry and Ukrainian Classicism", "The Knight of the Ideal", "Mykhailo Orest's Poetry and Neoclassicism"), V. Derzhavyn defended the idea of the functionality of the "stylization genesis of literary style" (S.M.R. Leconte de Lisle, J.-M. de Heredia) in the development of national literature. In this context, the researcher finds the poetry of M. Zerov particularly eloquent. The literary critic emphasized the features that distinguish the poetry of the Ukrainian author from the French Parnassians (Державин, 2005, p. 168) (it should be noted that V. Derzhavyn turned to the problem of literary reception much earlier than foreign researchers, in particular D. Diuryshyn, H.R. Jauss and others, back in the 1950s).

V. Derzhavyn's comparative model studies both contacts between national literatures, and intra-literary relations (in D. Diuryshyn's terminology). The emigre scholar used the works of the poets of the "Prague School" ("Poet of the Age (Evhen Malaniuk)", "National Heroine (Olena Teliha)", "The Path to Classicism (Olena Teliha: 'Soul on Guard'. A Selection from Poems)", "Olzhych's Poetic Art"), which creatively reimagined (along with the artistic and aesthetic achievements of world literature) the artistic experience, including that of the Kyiv neoclassics, to substantiate the conclusion that intra-literary relations are important. Such connections make it possible to trace the development of traditions in the progress of national literature, and to comprehend the problem of their continuity (M. Zerov – Yuriy Klen, O. Stefanovych, A. Harasevych; M. Rylsky – L. Mosendz, S. Hordynsky, B. Kravtsiv; P. Fylypovych – O. Olzhych, late E. Malaniuk). The author's observations on the works of N. Gohol and T. Osmachka ("The Fiction Prose of Theodosius Osmachka") are illustrative from this point of view. V. Derzhavyn's emphasis on the problem of influence as a stimulus, an impulse, is important.

The concepts of Y. Sherekh and V. Derzhavyn unite their attention to intra-literary relations, which the apologist for the idea of the "national-organic style" somewhat absolutized. At the same time, dissimilar views of the researchers on the role of interliterary relations contrast their models of the period. The works of Y. Sherekh ("Studies on the National in the Literatures of the Present. Toward a Theory of National-Organic Styles", "Styles of Modern Ukrainian Emigre Literature", "The Legend of Ukrainian Neoclassicism", "Ukrainian Emigre Literature in Europe 1945–1949", "On the Scaffolding of Literary History", "Bells are Ringing Over Ukraine", "Meetings with the West", etc.) reflect the peculiarities of the scholar's use of comparative strategies in the 1940s and 1950s. Unlike his opponent, Y. Sherekh at this stage of his scientific activity considered the assimilation of foreign artistic experience a harmful phenomenon in national literary development (Шерех, 1998a, p. 176).

Y. Sherekh's view on the exceptional functionality of intra-literary relations (including the rethinking of ancient national traditions) represents the scientist's concept of traditionalism

(“Studies on the National in the Literatures of the Present. Toward a Theory of National Organic Styles”). The author developed and deepened the thoughts of the German philologist K. Fossler (“Essential Features of Romance Languages and Poetry”, 1946), who defended “the question of the national in human cultures” as one of the determining factors of their development. Y. Sherekh substantiated his thoughts not only on the example of Ukrainian poetry (folklore, Taras Shevchenko – I. Bahriany, T. Osmachka, V. Barka) and prose (N. Gogol – T. Osmachka), but also on the material of other European literatures, in particular French literature (F. Villon, V. Hugo, Lautreamont, P. Ronsard, P.-J. Beranger, G. Apollinaire, S. Mallarmé – L. Aragon).

Noteworthy in this context is the insightful observations of the researcher, who continued the logic of P. Fylypovych’s thought (“Ukrainian Element in Gogol’s Work”) about the influence of the author of “Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka” on national literature. Y. Sherekh emphasized that T. Osmachka (“today’s Gogol”) primarily mastered the artistic and aesthetic achievements of his predecessor, which determined the specifics of his creative style as a romantic artist, in particular the technique of contrast (“The Elder Boyar” by T. Osmachka). At the same time, the literary critic interpreted the “mythical thinking” of the author of “The Elder Boyar” as a continuation of the ancient Ukrainian folklore tradition through Gogol (Шепех, 1998b, p. 246) (“Bells are ringing over Ukraine”).

The scholar’s approach actualized the study of intra-literary relations in terms of the problem of tradition and innovation. Conceptually important is Sherekh’s idea of revealing in the national organic style not only its literary basis but also the combination of literary tradition with the progress of folk art as a synthesis of traditional and modern (which is partly in line with the reflections of I. Franko and M. Hrushevsky, and later – M. Hnatyshak and D. Chizhevsky on the relationship between literature and folklore). From this point of view, the author considered that the works of W. Shakespeare and T. Shevchenko, as well as of P.-J. Beranger and L. Aragon, are affine.

It is noteworthy that while tracing the synthesis of different lines of development of the national tradition – the tradition of French “high”, “bookish” poetry with the tradition of French chanson in the works of L. Aragon (“Praises of Elsa” «Дитирамб Ельзі»), Y. Sherekh also observed a foreign influence on it (V. Mayakovsky), which does not quite “fit” into his scheme of “national-organic style”. Over time, the emigre scholar rethought his conclusions and gradually moved away, realizing the fallacy of absolutizing one of literary development’s two main, interconnected components – the national and the universal. The phenomenon of interliterary communication between the two artists (L. Aragon – V. Mayakovsky) prompted Y. Sherekh to reflect on the conceptual idea of the determining role of the recipient literature (as emphasized by I. Franko). The researcher stated that L. Aragon embraced only those foreign achievements that were not alien to the French poetic tradition (for example, rhetoric) while ignoring such a structural element as a “oral-speech” verse, which was characteristic of V. Mayakovsky (Шепех, 1993, p. 87).

Sherekhov’s theory of the “national-organic style,” which is a consequence of the “colonial trauma” (in the terminology of postcolonial critics), in the course of the discussion, sharpened the question of choosing the further path of development of Ukrainian literature. This is the significance of the researcher’s theory, the rethinking of which influenced the further formation of his comparative model.

There were fundamental differences between Y. Sherekh and V. Derzhavyn in their views both on the functionality of embracing foreign artists’ aesthetic achievements and the prospects for national literary progress. However, the concepts of the opponents, paradoxically complementing and “balancing” each other in the course of the discussion, not only contributed to the development of the national science of literature in the European context but also convincingly proved the fundamentally important role of the methodology of comparative studies in the study of national literature in the interliterary space. The researchers presented multi-vector models of Ukrainian comparative literature, which, while agreeing in their main

features with the Western ones (primarily a combination of genetic, contactological and typological approaches), were determined by a common dominant feature: an emphasized attention to “one's own”.

The concepts of I. Kaczurovskyj and S. Hordynsky, which are also characterized by attention to the study of genetic-contactology and typology, with an emphasis on the subordination of the connections between authors/works/writings to the general patterns of literary progress, are distinguished by a special emphasis on the problem of literature in the system of arts.

An important place in I. Kaczurovskyj's comparativist model (“Essay on Comparative Metrics”, “Generics and Architectonics”, “On Some of Shevchenko's Resonances in World Literature”, “Submissive to Truth and Beauty (Lesya Ukrainka and Her Legacy)”, “Visnykivstvo and Russian Poetry”, “Ukrainian Parnassism”, “Responses to Goethe's Work in the Poetry of Yuriy Klen” and others) belongs to the study of Ukrainian literature in the world artistic space. The literary critic convincingly substantiates the functionality of typological, contact, genetic and intermedial approaches. Compared to his predecessors, the author's attention to the expansion of the contextual field of study is noteworthy. In particular, the scholar traced typological similarities between Shevchenko's poetry and that of foreign writers (“On Some of Shevchenko's Resonances with World Literature”) at the content (motifs, themes, characters) and formal (styles, genres) levels against a vast literary background – from Western European authors (English, German, Spanish) to poets of the East (Arabic, Chinese). Eastern writings' expansion of the literary context, in line with the views of foreign researchers of the time who condemned Eurocentrism, remains exceptionally relevant for contemporary comparative literature. In order to deepen the study of Shevchenko's romanticism, the scholar, for the first time, compared the works of Ukrainian poet and others and Spanish writers (Duque de Rivas, G.G. de Avellaneda). I. Kaczurovskyj used the intermedial method of analysis, which fundamentally enriched the tools of the model of comparative studies of Ukrainians abroad – this unites the literary critic with other emigre scholars (D. Chizhevsky, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, S. Hordynsky, I. Mirchuk) and Western researchers (U. Weisstein, O. Walzel, H. Wölfflin). Noteworthy: I. Kaczurovskyj examined the poetic works of the author of “Kobzar,” dedicated to the traditional for the world literature theme of death in the context of late medieval and early Renaissance art. Projecting the problem of the synthesis of arts in Shevchenko's work, I. Kaczurovskyj stated the multidimensional comprehension of this theme by him as a poet (“Corsair”, “Plague”) and artist (etching “Soldier and Death”). The work “On Some of Shevchenko's Resonances with World Literature” is a significant contribution to Ukrainian emigration Shevchenko studies, which deepened its comparative aspect (as well as the studies of O. Kolessa, L. Biletsky, D. Chizhevsky, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, S. Hordynsky and others) (see more: Тетеріна, 2020).

I. Kaczurovskyj, like V. Derzhavyn, substantiated the thesis about the unique role of influence as a stimulus, an impulse in the development of national literature, with an emphasis on the problem of traditions and innovation, the synthesis of the national and universal, based on the work of the Kyiv neoclassics, who creatively transformed the aesthetic achievements of world culture “as a whole” (“Ukrainian Parnassism”). The author defended the conceptual idea of the “tradition of Ukrainian Parnassism” established by the Ukrainian neoclassics, which is determining for development of national comparative literature (based on a combination of genetic contactological and typological approaches). Noteworthy is the researcher's attention to interliterary connections and intra-literary relations (continuation of the tradition of “Ukrainian Parnassism” by the poets of the “Prague School”). I. Kaczurovskyj's views show an evolution in understanding the literary perception problem in Ukrainian emigre comparative studies (D. Chizhevsky, V. Derzhavyn, J. Bojko-Blokhyn). The scientist who attached great importance to the reception in the development of Ukrainian literature (beginning with I. Kotliarevsky), emphasizing its stimulating role, significantly expanded the range of functioning

of the paradigm of literary perception, structuring this phenomenon in detail (from dedications, citations, reminiscences, formal borrowings, imitations, creative transformation of motifs, plots, characters, and to re-enactments, translations, manifestations of literary reception). This is convincingly demonstrated by the scheme proposed by the researcher, which the author used when analyzing the perception of Goethe's works by Yuriy Klen (Качуровський, 2008). In particular, the comparison of the *Walpurgis Nights* in the works of J. W. Goethe ("Faust") and Yuriy Klen ("Ashes of Empires") gave the scholar grounds to conclude that the Ukrainian poet embraced the artistic experience of the German classic at the formal level (architectonics, dialogic form) and its creative rethinking at the content level, which manifested itself on Ukrainian soil in the expansion of religious and philosophical issues.

According to the researcher himself, S. Hordynsky's comparativist model is defined by the broadest scientific and historical approach ("Old Art in a New Mirror", 1932). The range of problems outlined in the scholar's works ("Franko's 'Flowers of Evil'", "Verhaeren, Poet and Man", "'The Tale of Igor's Campaign' as a Literary Monument", "'The Tale of Igor's Campaign' and Ukrainian Folk Poetry" and others) shows attention to genetic contactology and typology: from 'purely formal' issues, according to the author, to "the cyclical development of entire styles". S. Hordynsky, using an interdisciplinary approach with access to the field of philosophy, which unites the scholar, first of all, with D. Chizhevsky, was guided by a similar logic of thought. The researcher's work "Franko's 'Flowers of Evil'", in which he emphasized not the influence but the fact that artists "converge in some points of creativity" (I. Franko – S. Baudelaire) with their philosophy, is illustrative. The scholar emphasized the multidimensional typological similarities between the French and the Ukrainian poets. Demonstrating an awareness of the interconnectedness of contactology and typology, S. Hordynsky drew attention to Franko's creative transformation of specific "formulas of worldview" and stated that changing, the Ukrainian author presented a model of subjective poetry in national literature ("on the scale of world poetic problems" (Гординський, 2004, p. 139)). Substantiating the functionality of the comparative method in the study of these artistic phenomena, in particular, S. Hordynsky expanded the literary background for observations: the scholar considered the analogy between Baudelaire's 'Flowers of Evil', Ivan Franko's 'Faded Leaves', and Heine's 'Book of Songs' to be illustrative (all three poets "have their points of similarity").

The scholar's attention to the problems of typology and contactology is demonstrated in his work "Verhaeren, Poet and Man". Explaining, in particular, the commonality of E. Verhaeren and Lesya Ukrainka not by literary influence but by the same 'mental climate', the author also pointed to the phenomenon of literary reception of the Belgian writer's work in the national literary context. In particular, acknowledging the diversity of literary perception, the researcher emphasized the unique functionality of its manifestations in the national literary development (in this, the scientist agrees with J. Bojko-Blokhyn): literary translation (M. Tereshchenko), literary criticism (O. Hrytsai), original literary works (W. Poliszczuk, M. Bazhan, E. Malaniuk).

S. Hordynsky shares a similar logic of thought on the differentiation of influences not only with his predecessors (I. Franko) but also with his contemporaries – Ukrainian emigre scholars (J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hlobenko, I. Mirchuk, D. Chizhevsky) and foreign researchers (H.-G. Gadamer, D. Diuryshyn, W. Iser, H.R. Jauss). Contrasting 'superficial' influences (E. Verhaeren – W. Poliszczuk) with 'deep' ones (E. Verhaeren – M. Bazhan, Y. Malaniuk), which is consistent with the division of literary contacts into external and internal (according to D. Diuryshyn's classification), the scholar substantiated the conclusion about creative influence as a 'driver' of the development of national literature.

Representing the national-centric approach to literature study, the author did not absolutize it, as Y. Sherekh did in a certain period of his activity. S. Hordynsky attached significant importance in the progress of Ukrainian literature to inter-literary relations, which he subordinated to the problem of stylistic literary development and intra-literary relations.

Applying comparative approaches to the study of ancient Ukrainian literature, S. Hordynsky deepened the views of M. Maksymovych, I. Franko, M. Hrushevsky, M. Hnatyshak, and refuted the opinion of V. Peretz and D. Chizhevsky: the author substantiated the conclusion about the close connection between “The Tale of Igor's Campaign” and Ukrainian folk poetry (“‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’ as a Literary Monument”, “‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’ and Ukrainian Folk Poetry”, “With the Lens of a Literary Detective on ‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’”) – both at the formal (“On the Problem of Rhythmicity in ‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’”) and semantic levels (“On One Type of Comparison in Folk Poetry and ‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’”, “Poetic Characters-Formulas in ‘The Tale of Igor's Campaign’ and Folk Poetry”). By expanding the contextual field (“The Tale of Igor's Campaign”, I. Kotliarevsky's “Aeneid”, and Taras Shevchenko's works), the researcher confirmed the conceptual thesis about the common source of the artists' creativity – Ukrainian folk poetry.

S. Hordynsky's model, which is characterized by an emphasis on not only ‘global in the Ukrainian’ but also ‘Ukrainian in the global’, is particularly distinguished by contextual and intermedial approaches. The goal set by the researcher emphasizes bilateral nature of interliterary communication, which is also characteristic of the concepts of foreign comparative scholars. The emphasis on understanding the Ukrainian contribution to the treasury of world culture (in this respect, the literary critic is close to the position of D. Chizhevsky, I. Mirchuk, Y. Sherekh, J. Bojko-Blokhyn and I. Kaczurovskyj) is due to the common task that researchers saw in representing Ukrainian culture as an integral part of European culture. Emigre scholars realized that having developed for a long time under totalitarianism, Ukrainian culture remained a ‘space of myths’ for European cultures (O. Pakhlovska).

That is why the phenomenon of ‘Ukrainian schools’ in other literatures (Polish, Russian and German) seemed exceptionally convincing to the researcher, as D. Chizhevsky also pointed out. S. Hordynsky considered functioning of Mazepa's character as a stimulus in the development of European culture (literature, music, painting), an influence of Ukrainian folk poetry on Western European, preeminently German, music and literature to be illustrative from the point of view of the intermedial approach. The scholar substantiated the idea of a close connection between these art forms, raising the issue of their synthesis.

The reception problem is one of the central ones in the model of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre community of this period, which is connected, as already noted, with a special focus on contact and genetic relations. The views of emigre scholars are close to the concepts of European researchers (U. Weisstein, D. Diuryshyn, H.R. Jauss, H. Bloom, and others), primarily in their emphasis on the *creative* nature of the influence and transformation of foreign artistic experience on their own soil, determined by the needs of the recipient literature. It is important to note that the ideas of Ukrainian scholars in the Western world were often significantly ahead of those of their foreign colleagues, contributing to a rethinking of the phenomenon of literary perception and its functionality in the development of national literature. It is no coincidence that many of them remain important today, as evidenced by modern comparative studies methodologies (primarily the theory of intertextuality and cultural transfer (see more: Скорина, 2020; Сиваченко, 2019; Espagne, 1999)).

In this context, the views of Ukrainian scholars from abroad are particularly noteworthy, as they have fundamentally deepened the nodal problems of the comparative paradigm they broadly outlined, in particular, influence as an ‘impulse of self-movement,’ translation as a factor in national literary development, and traditional plots and characters as a synthesis of ‘own’ and ‘foreign’.

Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research. Summing up the achievements of emigre scholars (J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hnatyshak, S. Hordynsky, V. Derzhavyn, I. Kaczurovskyj, L. Biletsky, D. Chizhevsky, Y. Sherekh, and others), it is worth emphasizing the defining features that distinguish the model of comparative studies of the Ukrainian emigre community and represent it as a holistic phenomenon. The views, ideas, approaches and

concepts implemented in the works of authors who continued the traditions of national comparative literature of the second half of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries and, at the same time, rethought Western methodologies, ensured the continuous development in the field (in its national version), filling in the 'gaps'/'dark places' of the Soviet science of literature. The research of Ukrainian literary scholars in the Western world has confirmed the effectiveness of comparative strategies in the study of national literature and general patterns of literary development in a fundamentally wider range than in the previous stage.

The cardinal reorientation of comparative material is indicative – from the Russian-Ukrainian, widespread in Soviet comparative literature, to the Western European, South and West Slavic, and Eastern (M. Hnatyshak, S. Hordynsky, V. Derzhavyn, I. Kaczurovskyj, D. Chizhevsky, Y. Sherekh and others), an important trend towards regional and zonal scales of understanding the history of Ukrainian literature (which is especially noticeable in the works of L. Biletsky, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, D. Chizhevsky and others).

The model of the emigre comparative studies of this period is determined by the dialogical aspects of studying literature in the researches of scholars, comparative reflections in the discussions of literary critics (V. Derzhavyn – Y. Sherekh), with an emphasis on contactology; a combination of genetic and contactological approaches with typological ones; new research strategies for comparative studies of Ukrainian literature abroad, in particular those based on the use of an interdisciplinary approach and related contextual and intermedial methods. These approaches remain relevant to the world of comparative literature today.

All this convincingly demonstrates the 'inclusion' of Ukrainian comparative studies in the European scientific space. The important role of Western literary schools in this period was that contact with foreign comparative studies (primarily the works of O. Walzel, H. Wölfflin, F. Wolman, and others) contributed to the diversification of tasks and enrichment of the methodological tools of Ukrainian comparative literature. At the same time, emigre scholars who developed the national traditions of the second half of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries did not share the views of some foreign comparatists (R. Wellek, R. Warren), often independently came to conceptual conclusions that are in line with those that were substantiated in European literature studies much later.

In particular, the emphasized attention to the issue of national specificity of literary development is demonstrated by the works of Ukrainian scholars abroad, who emphasized the need to identify the peculiarities of national literature that ensure the diversity of the world literary process. For example, J. Bojko-Blokhyn envisages back in the 1970s that interest in typology would fade into the background, and the issues of national originality of literature would become determining for comparative literature. The problem of the specifics of the development of national literatures/cultures, which was one of the central concepts of Ukrainian emigre scholars in the middle of the last century, now unites the opinions of representatives of various schools of comparative literature (despite specific differences between these schools in general), given the awareness of the threat of cultural unification. Noteworthy are the reflections of the French researcher F. Toudoire-Surlapierre (Toudoire-Surlapierre, 2013), who emphasizes the exceptional importance of studying even the slightest differences between literatures/cultures in the globalization era. According to E. Kaspersky, a synthetic image of literature is formed against this background of 'differences and separateness' (Касперський, 2006, p. 519).

The substantiation by Ukrainian emigre scholars of literary reception as a decisive factor in the development of national literature, with an emphasis on the creative nature of influence as a 'self-movement' when, according to D. Chizhevsky, 'something new was produced' (V. Derzhavyn, J. Bojko-Blokhyn and others also emphasized this), is conceptually significant. A similar logic of thought was followed much later by foreign literary critics, particularly D. Diurysyn, H.R. Jauss and H. Bloom.

The view of influence as a creative stimulus, which researchers of the Ukrainian emigre community once advocated, is now in perfect harmony with the concept of cultural transfer (Espagne, 1999). In particular, this applies to the interpretation of literary translation as a factor of national literary development by emigre scholars (J. Bojko-Blokhyn, S. Hordynsky, I. Kaczurovskyj, I. Kostetsky, D. Chizhevsky and others), with an emphasis on its functionality in the content and formal development of national literature (which remains hugely relevant in the context of contemporary translation studies).

Today, researchers (in particular, O. Pakhlovska, M. Boehmig and others) are actualizing the urgent need to clarify the Slavic (in particular, East Slavic) contribution to the world's cultural heritage. The fundamental importance of this issue was emphasized half a century ago by I. Mirchuk, D. Chizhevsky, Y. Sherekh, J. Bojko-Blokhyn, S. Hordynsky and other Ukrainian emigre scholars. In particular, D. Chizhevsky traced the process of 'irradiation' of Ukrainian culture to the West. The conceptual thoughts of emigre scholars, who established in their works the view of Ukrainian literature/culture as an integral part of the European spiritual and cultural space, with an emphasis on its national specificity, are of exceptional importance, given the contemporary realities of the Russian-Ukrainian war (in which our people not only defend their territory and independence, but also defend their own identity, culture, traditions and spiritual values). Jurij Bojko-Blokhyn's reflections are also important in this context. The researcher emphasized the need to clarify the contribution of *each* of the East Slavic literatures to the European spiritual and cultural treasury, especially given that the achievements of Ukrainian and Belarusian literature are still attributed to Russian literature. The approaches to forming the comparative history of Slavic literatures presented by Ukrainian scholars abroad remain important for world comparative literature (see more: Teterina O., 2018).

The concepts of Ukrainian scholars from abroad, whose ideas were often ahead of their time, raised national comparative literature to a qualitatively new level and ensured the whole progress of the field, not only integrated Ukrainian comparative studies into the general 'movement' of world literary thought (approaches to the study of national specifics of stylistic development, traditional plots and characters, literary translation in the studies of J. Bojko-Blokhyn, M. Hlobenko, S. Hordynsky, I. Kaczurovskyj, I. Mirchuk, D. Chizhevsky Y. Sherekh, and others), but also influenced it to a certain extent (primarily D. Chizhevsky's "Comparative History of Slavic Literatures").

Thanks to the achievements of Ukrainian emigre scholars, the traditions of national comparative studies were preserved, continued and enriched. This gave grounds for reflecting on the peculiarities of its development, purpose, possibilities, evolution, change of vectors, and, as in European science, access to a broader space – the cultural one. Ukrainian comparative studies have established itself as an interdisciplinary science, involving on the material of philosophy, ethnopsychology and anthropology. All of this allows us to justify the conclusion that the model of Ukrainian comparative literature in the foreign world is a holistic cultural phenomenon.

The experience of comparative studies in the Ukrainian emigre community (which not only mirrored the path of European comparative studies from genetic contactology to typology but also established itself as a system of methods closely related to the history and theory of literature, creating a broad contextual background for observations) *changed* the nature of national comparative literature, which in the late twentieth century, following the Western European one, was able to offer an renewed theoretical and methodological model.

Since the 1990s, Ukrainian comparative studies have primarily 'grown out' of the model of comparative literary studies of the Ukrainian emigre community, which, in particular, restored the 'hierarchy of reputations and assessments' (Дзюба, 2013, p. 75). The 'two fragments' (I. Dziuba) of Ukrainian culture/science are gradually being reunited into one whole after gaining independence. This 'connection,' which testifies to the continuity of traditions, including comparative literature, is convincingly demonstrated by the attention of

contemporary Ukrainian comparative scholars to the study of, first of all, national literature in terms of the problem of style in the comparative typological aspect. Among the studies devoted to comprehending the national variant of the stylistic development of Ukrainian literature (Hundorova T. The Manifestation of the word. The discourse of early Ukrainian modernism: postmodern interpretation. Lviv: Litopys, 1997; Bovsunivska T. The phenomenon of Ukrainian Romanticism. Kyiv, 1998. 108 p.; Polishchuk Y. Mythological horizon of Ukrainian modernism: Literary studies. Lviv: Lileia-RV, 1998; Zhulynskyi M. Tradition of national and European cultural development of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and ideological and aesthetic searches of Ukrainian literature of the 1920s. Nation. Kultura. Literature: National and cultural myths, and ideological and aesthetic searches of Ukrainian literature. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 2010; Nayenko M. Romantic epic: the effect of romanticism and Ukrainian literature. Kyiv, 2000. 378 p.; Shumylo N. Under the sign of national identity. Ukrainian fiction and literary criticism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. K., 2003; Golomb L. Innovative trends in Ukrainian literature of the late nineteenth and early decades of the twentieth century. K., 2008. 296 p.; Kaminchuk O. Artistic discourse of Ukrainian poetry of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. K., 2009. 352 p., etc.), the works which examine Ukrainian literature in the context of artistic and aesthetic systems in the world intercultural space, emphasizing its specifics are illustrative (Nalyvaiko D. Was there a Renaissance in Ukrainian literature? Comparative studies and history of literature. K.: AKTA, 2007. 425 p.; Limborsky I. European and Ukrainian Enlightenment: unfinished project? Reinterpretation of the canon and an attempt at comparative analysis of literary paradigms. Cherkasy, 2006. 363 p.; Pupurs I. The East in the mirror of romanticism (the imagological paradigm of romantic orientalism: on the material of Western and Eastern European literatures of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), Sumy, 2017, 407 p.). This also applies to works focused on the problem of synthesis of arts, which is of particular interest to contemporary scholars (Nalyvaiko D. Literature in the system of arts as a branch of comparative studies. Theory of literature and comparative studies. Kyiv. 2006. pp. 9-37; Heneraliuk L. Shevchenko's universalism. Interaction of literature and art. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 2016. 544 p.; Heneraliuk L. Pretexts of intermediality: verbal and visual format. Kyiv: Interservis, 2024. 546 p. Syvachenko H. Intermedial paradigm of Volodymyr Vynnychenko's novel 'Solar Machine'. Slovo i Chas. 2017. No. 2. pp. 3-20; Mocherniuk N. Out of context: Intermedial strategies of literary creativity of Ukrainian writers-artists of the interwar period. Lviv: Lviv Polytechnic Publishing House. 2018. 392 p.), as well as those devoted to the problems of imagology, intertextuality, and many other interdisciplinary studies.

All these multidisciplinary works demonstrate the diversity of methodological approaches to the formation of comparative literary history as one of the main directions of comparative literature. This is a great contribution of the emigre scholars of the 1930s–1980s, whose achievements, while still important for contemporary philology and humanities in general, make a significant contribution to the development of comparative studies as a field with which contemporary scholars associate perhaps the greatest prospects for the interdisciplinary study of literature and culture.

Бібліографічний список

- Александрова, Г., 2009. *Помежів'я (Українське порівняльне літературознавство кінця XIX – першої третини XX століття): монографія*. Київ : Київський університет.
- Бойко, Ю., 1992а. М. М. Глобенко. *Вибрані твори*. Київ : Медекол, с. 319–327.
- Бойко, Ю., 1992b. На порозі восьмого десятка. *Вибрані твори*. Київ : Медекол, с. 6–10.
- Брайко, О., 2009. Українська компаративістика другої половини XX – початку XXI ст. В: *Національні варіанти літературної компаративістики*. Київ : Вид. дім «Стилос», с. 386–438.
- Генералюк, Л., 2024. *Претексти інтермедіальності: вербально-візуальний формат*.

- Київ : Інтерсервіс.
- Гнатишак, М., 1941. *Історія української літератури. Книжка перша*. Прага : Вид-во Юрія Тищенка.
- Гнатюк, М., 2003. До проблеми теорії порівняльно-історичного літературознавства в Україні (друга половина XIX – початок XX ст.: М. Драгоманов, І. Франко, О. Колесса). В: *П'ятий конгрес Міжнародної асоціації україністів : літературознавство*, 1. Чернівці, с. 117–121.
- Гординський, С., 2004. Франкові «Квіти зла». До 100-річчя народження поета. В: *На переломі епох. Літературознавчі статті, огляди, есеї, рецензії, спогади, листи*. Львів : Світ, с. 136–143.
- Грицик, Л., 2010. Пізнавальні механізми порівняльного літературознавства 20-х рр. у працях Л. Білецького. В: *Українська компаративістика: концептуальні проєкції*. Донецьк : Юго-Восток, с. 163–173.
- Державин, В., 2005. Поезія Миколи Зерова і український класицизм. В: *Література і літературознавство : вибрані теоретичні та літературно-критичні праці*. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, с. 153–196.
- Дзюба, І., 2006а. Літературно-мистецьке життя 10-30-х років XX ст. *З криниці літ : у 3 т.*, т. 1. Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», с. 179–243.
- Дзюба, І., 2006б. *З криниці літ : у 3 т.*, т. 2 Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», с. 494–548.
- Дзюба, І., 2013. «Нашого цвіту по всьому світу...». В: *На трьох континентах : у 3 кн.*, кн. 1. Київ : Кліо, с. 8–89.
- Ільницький, М., 2014. «Мале літературне відродження»: Літературна критика періоду МУРу. *Знаки доби і грані таланту*. Київ : Кліо.
- Касперський, Е., 2006. Про теорію компаративістики. В: *Література. Теорія. Методологія*. Д. Уліцька (упоряд. і наук. редагування). Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», с. 518–540.
- Качуровський, І., 2008. Відгуки творчості Гете в поезії Юрія Клена. В: *Променисті силуети: лекції, доповіді, статті, есеї, розвідки*. Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», с. 285–300.
- Мірчук, І., 1994. Історія української культури. В: *Петров В., Чижевський Д., Глобенко М. Історія української літератури*. Мюнхен; Львів, с. 243–274.
- Наливайко, Д., 2006. Література в системі мистецтв як галузь компаративістики. В: *Теорія літератури й компаративістики*. Київ: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», с. 9–37.
- Наливайко, Д., 2009. Інтродукція. В: *Національні варіанти літературної компаративістики*. Київ : Вид. дім «Стилос», с. 5–18.
- Нарівська, В. та Пахсар'ян, Н., 2020. Сучасна французька компаративістика: проблеми й методи. *Слово і час*, 3, с. 48–64.
- Овчаренко, Н., 2020. Інтердисциплінарність як гра пам'яті (Літературна компаративістика в Канаді). *Методології сучасної літературної компаративістики : збірка наукових праць відділу компаративістики Інституту літератури ім. Т.Г. Шевченка НАН України*. Г. Сиваченко (ред.). Київ, с. 472–495. Доступно за: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf.
- Петров, В., Чижевський, Д. та Глобенко, М., 1994. Історія української літератури. В: *Петров В., Чижевський Д., Глобенко М. Історія української літератури*. Мірчук І. *Історія української культури*. Мюнхен ; Львів, с. 6–242.
- Росовецький, С., 2003. Якого оновлення потребує українська компаративістика: нотатки традиціоналіста. *Слово і час*, 5, с. 19–30.
- Рязанцева, Т., 2020. Інтермедіальність як методологія літературної компаративістики.

- Методології сучасної літературної компаративістики : збірка наукових праць відділу компаративістики Інституту літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України.* Г. Сиваченко (ред.). Київ, с. 233–257. Доступно за: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf.
- Свербілова, Т., 2020. Міждисциплінарний аспект актуальних концептів сучасної постколоніальної теорії в дискурсі Comparative Culture. В: *Методології сучасної літературної компаративістики : збірка наукових праць відділу компаративістики Інституту літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України.* Г. Сиваченко (ред.). Київ, с. 408–428. Доступно за: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf.
- Скорина, Л., 2020. Теорія інтертекстуальності: витоки, здобутки, проблеми. *Методології сучасної літературної компаративістики: збірка наукових праць відділу компаративістики Інституту літератури ім. Т. Г. Шевченка НАН України.* Г. Сиваченко (ред.). Київ, с. 125–159. Доступно за: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf.
- Сиваченко, Г., 2019. Культурний трансфер – нова методологія компаративістики. *Слово і час*, 3, с. 71–81.
- Тетеріна, О., 2018а. «Зустрічі слов'янських літератур на їхніх історико-духовних перехрестях»: Д. Чижевський. *ScienceRise*, т. 6. Харків, с. 49–55. Доступно за: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/texc_2018_6_12.
- Тетеріна, О., 2018b. Байрон і українська література: проблема впливу в осмисленні Ю.Бойка-Блохіна. *ScienceRise*, т. 10. Харків, с. 37–42. Доступно за: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/texc_2018_10_10.
- Тетеріна, О., 2020. Компаративістська модель І. Качуровського: між генетико-контактологією і типологією. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, VIII(70), issue: 235, September, pp. 44–48.
- Тетеріна, О., 2022. Компаративістська парадигма у працях Ю.Бойка-Блохіна: «взаємодотикання і схрещення» підходів. *Вісник університету імені Альфреда Нобеля*, 2(34), с. 49–62.
- Хороб, С., 2005. Науковий універсум Володимира Державина. В: *В. Державин. Література і літературознавство (Вибрані теоретичні та літературно-критичні праці)*. Івано-Франківськ : Плай, с. 3–16.
- Шевельов, Ю., 2009. *Вибрані праці : у 2 т. Книга II*. Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія».
- Шерех, Ю., 1993. Етюди про національне в літературах сучасності. До теорії національно-органічних стилів. *Сучасність*, 4 квітня, с. 68–93.
- Шерех, Ю., 1998а. Стилї сучасної української літератури на еміграції. В: *Пороги і запоріжжя. Література. Мистецтво. Ідеології : у 3 т.*, т. 1. Харків : Фоліо, с. 161–195.
- Шерех, Ю., 1998b. Над Україною дзвони гудуть. В: *Пороги і запоріжжя. Література. Мистецтво. Ідеології : у 3 т.*, т. 1. Харків : Фоліо, с. 236–247.
- Чижевський, Д., 1942. *Історія української літератури. Книга 2. Ренесанс та реформація. Бароко*. Прага : Вид-во Юрія Тищенка.
- Чижевський, Д., 2005. Культурно-історичні епохи. В: *Філософські твори у чотирьох томах*. Київ : Смолоскип, с. 24 – 35.
- Espagne, M., 1999. *Les Transferts culturels franco-allemands*. Paris : PUF.
- Teterina, O., 2018. Magnificent edifice of the history of slavic literatures: Y. Boyko-Blokhin's «Project». *EUREKA: Social and Humanities*, no. 6. Tallinn, pp. 49–55.
- Toudoire-Surlapierre, F., 2013. *Notre besoin de comparaison*. Paris : Orizons.

References

- Aleksandrova, H., 2009. *Pomezhivnia (Ukrainske porivnialne literaturoznavstvo kintsia XIX – pershoi tretyny XX stolittia): monohrafiia* [Borderland (Ukrainian Comparative Literary Studies of the Late 19th – First Third of the 20th Century): Monograph] Kyiv : Kyivskyi universytet. (in Ukrainian).
- Boiko, Yu., 1992a. M. M. Hlobenko. *Vybrani tvory* [M. M. Globenko. Selected Works]. Kyiv : Medekol, pp. 319–327. (in Ukrainian).
- Boiko, Yu., 1992b. *Na porozi vosmoho desiatka. Vybrani tvory* [On the Threshold of the Eighties. Selected Works]. Kyiv : Medekol, pp. 6–10. (in Ukrainian).
- Braiko, O., 2009. *Ukrainska komparatyvistyka druhoi polovyny XX – pochatku XXI st.* [Ukrainian Comparative Studies of the Second Half of the 20th – Early 21st Century]. *Natsionalni varianty literaturnoi komparatyvistyky* [National Variants of Literary Comparative Studies]. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Stylos», pp. 386–438. (in Ukrainian).
- Chyzhevskiy, D., 1942. *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury. Knyha 2. Renesans ta reformatsiia. Baroko* [History of Ukrainian Literature. Book 2. Renaissance and Reformation. Baroque]. Praha : Vyd-vo Yurii Tyshchenka. (in Ukrainian).
- Chyzhevskiy, D., 2005. *Kulturno-istorychni epokhy* [Cultural and Historical Epochs]. *Filosofski tvory u chotyrok tomakh* [Philosophical Works in Four Volumes]. Kyiv : Smoloskyp, pp. 24 – 35. (in Ukrainian).
- Derzhavyn, V., 2005. *Poeziia Mykoly Zerova i ukrainskyi klasytsyzm* [Mykola Zerov's poetry and Ukrainian classicism]. *Literatura i literaturoznavstvo : vybrani teoretychni ta literaturno-krytychni pratsi* [Literature and literary studies: selected theoretical and literary-critical works]. Ivano-Frankivsk : Plai, pp. 153–196. (in Ukrainian).
- Dziuba, I., 2006a. *Literaturno-mystetske zhyttia 10-30-kh rokiv XX st.* [Literary and artistic life of the 10s-30s of the 20th century]. *Z krynytsi lit* [From the well of years] : in 3 vol., vol. 1. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», pp. 179–243. (in Ukrainian).
- Dziuba, I., 2006b. *Z krynytsi lit* [From the well of years] : in 3 vol., vol. 2 Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», pp. 494–548. (in Ukrainian).
- Dziuba, I., 2013. «Nashoho tsvitu po vsomu svitu...» ["Our flower all over the world..."]. *Na trokh kontynentakh* [On three continents] : in 3 vol., vol. 1. Kyiv : Klio, pp. 8 – 89. (in Ukrainian).
- Espagne, M., 1999. *Les Transferts culturels franco-allemands*. Paris : PUF. (in French).
- Heneraliuk, L., 2024. *Preteksty intermedialnosti: verbalno-vizualnyi format* [Pretexts of Intermediality: Verbal-Visual Format]. Kyiv : Interservis. (in Ukrainian).
- Hnatiuk, M., 2003. *Do problemy teorii porivnialno-istorychnoho literaturoznavstva v Ukraini (druha polovyna XIX – pochatok XX st.: M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, O. Kolessa)* [To the Problem of the Theory of Comparative-Historical Literary Studies in Ukraine (Second Half of the 19th – Early 20th Century: M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, O. Kolessa)]. *Piatyi konhres Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv : literaturoznavstvo* [Fifth Congress of the International Association of Ukrainian Scholars: Literary Studies], 1. Chernivtsi, pp. 117–121. (in Ukrainian).
- Hnatyshak, M., 1941. *Istoriia ukrainskoi literatury. Knyzhka persha* [History of Ukrainian Literature. Book One]. Praha : Vyd-vo Yurii Tyshchenka. (in Ukrainian).
- Hordynskiy, S., 2004. *Frankovi «Kvity zla». Do 100-richchia narodzhennia poeta* [Franko's "Flowers of Evil". To the 100th anniversary of the poet's birth]. *Na perelomi epokh. Literaturoznavchi statyi, ohliady, esei, retsenzii, spohady, lysty* [At the turn of the eras. Literary articles, reviews, essays, reviews, memoirs, letters]. Lviv : Svit, pp. 136–143. (in Ukrainian).
- Hrytsyk, L., 2010. *Piznavalni mekhanizmy porivnialnoho literaturoznavstva 20-kh rr. u pratsiakh L. Biletskoho* [Cognitive mechanisms of comparative literary studies of the 20s in the works of L. Biletsky]. *Ukrainska komparatyvistyka: kontseptualni proektsii*

- [*Ukrainian comparability: conceptual projections*]. Donetsk : Yuho-Vostok, pp. 163–173. (in Ukrainian).
- Illytskyi, M., 2014. «Male literaturne vidrozhennia»: Literaturna krytyka periodu MURu ["Small literary revival": Literary criticism of the MUR period]. *Znaky doby i hrani talantu* [Signs of the era and the edges of talent]. Kyiv : Klio. (in Ukrainian).
- Kachurovskyi, I., 2008. Vidhuky tvorchosty Gete v poezii Yuriia Klena [Reviews of Goethe's work in the poetry of Yuri Klen]. *Promenyisti sylvety: leksii, dopovidi, staty, esei, rozvidky* [Radiant silhouettes: lectures, reports, articles, essays, investigations]. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», pp. 285–300. (in Ukrainian).
- Kasperskyi, E., 2006. *Pro teoriuu komparatyvistyky. Literatura. Teoriia. Metodolohiia* [On the theory of comparative studies. Literature. Theory. Methodology]. D. Ulitska (uporiad. i nauk. redahuvannia). Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», pp. 518–540. (in Ukrainian).
- Khorob, S., 2005. Naukovyi universum Volodymyra Derzhavyna [The scientific universe of Volodymyr Derzhavin]. V. *Derzhavyn. Literatura i literaturoznavstvo (Vybrani teoretychni ta literaturno-krytychni pratsi)* [V. Derzhavin. Literature and literary studies (Selected theoretical and literary-critical works)]. Ivano-Frankivsk : Plai, pp. 3–16. (in Ukrainian).
- Kostiuk, I., 1983. Na mahistrali istorii. Ukrainska literatura za p'iatdesiat rokiv (1917-1967 rr.) [On the highway of history. Ukrainian literature for fifty years (1917-1967)]. *U sviti idei i obraziv. Vybrane. Krytychni ta istoryko-literaturni rozdumy 1930-1980 rr.* [In the world of ideas and images. Selected. Critical and historical and literary reflections 1930-1980]. Miunkhen : Suchasnist, pp. 491–511. (in Ukrainian).
- Mirchuk, I., 1994. Istoriiia ukrainskoi kultury [History of Ukrainian culture]. Petrov V., Chyzhevskyi D., Hlobenko M. *Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury. Mirchuk I. Istoriiia ukrainskoi kultury* [Petrov V., Chyzhevsky D., Globenko M. History of Ukrainian literature. Mirchuk I. History of Ukrainian culture]. Miunkhen ; Lviv, pp. 243–274. (in Ukrainian).
- Nalyvaiko, D., 2006. Literatura v systemi mystetstv yak haluz komparatyvistyky [Literature in the system of arts as a branch of comparative studies]. *Teoriia literatury y komparatyvistyky* [Theory of literature and comparative studies]. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia», pp. 9–37. (in Ukrainian).
- Nalyvaiko, D., 2009. Introduktsiia [Introduction]. *Natsionalni varianty literaturnoi komparatyvistyky* [National variants of comparative literary studies]. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Stylos», pp. 5–18. (in Ukrainian).
- Narivska, V., Pakhsarian, N., 2020. Suchasna frantsuzka komparatyvistyka: problemy y metody [Modern French comparative studies: problems and methods]. *Slovo i chas*, 3, pp. 48–64. (in Ukrainian).
- Ovcharenko, N., 2020. Interdystsyplinarnist yak hra pamiaty (Literaturna komparatyvistyka v Kanadi) [Interdisciplinarity as a memory game (Comparative literary studies in Canada)]. *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky : zbirka naukovykh prats viddilu komparatyvistyky Instytutu literatury im. T.H. Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy* [Methodologies of modern literary comparative studies: collection of scientific works of the Department of Comparative Studies of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. H. Syvachenko (red.). Kyiv, pp. 472–495. Available at: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V., Chyzhevskyi, D. ta Hlobenko, M., 1994. Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury [History of Ukrainian Literature]. Petrov V., Chyzhevskyi D., Hlobenko M. *Istoriiia ukrainskoi literatury. Mirchuk I. Istoriiia ukrainskoi kultury* [Petrov V., Chyzhevsky D., Globenko

- M. History of Ukrainian Literature. Mirchuk I. History of Ukrainian Culture*]. Miunkhen ; Lviv, pp. 6–242. (in Ukrainian).
- Riazantseva, T., 2020. Intermedialnist yak metodolohiia literaturnoi komparatyvistyky [Intermediality as a Methodology of Literary Comparative Studies]. *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky : zbirka naukovykh prats viddilu komparatyvistyky Instytutu literatury im. T. H. Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy* [Methodologies of modern literary comparative studies: collection of scientific works of the Department of Comparative Studies of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. H. Syvachenko (red.). Kyiv, pp. 233–257. Available at: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf. (in Ukrainian).
- Rosovetskyi, S., 2003. Yakoho onovlennia potrebuie ukrainska komparatyvistyka: notatky tradytsionalista [What Update Does Ukrainian Comparative Literature Need: Notes of a Traditionalist]. *Slovo i chas*, 5, pp. 19–30. (in Ukrainian).
- Sherekh, Yu., 1993. Etiudy pro natsionalne v literaturakh suchasnosti. Do teorii natsionalno-orhanichnykh styliv [Studies on the national in contemporary literatures. Toward the theory of national organic styles]. *Suchasnist*, 4th April, pp. 68–93. (in Ukrainian).
- Sherekh, Yu., 1998a. Styli suchasnoi ukrainskoi literatury na emihratsii [Styles of Modern Ukrainian Literature in Emigration]. *Porohy i zaporizhzhia. Literatura. Mystetstvo. Ideolohii* [Porogi and Zaporizhzhia. Literature. Art. Ideologies] : in 3 vol., vol. 1. Kharkiv : Folio, pp. 161–195. (in Ukrainian).
- Sherekh, Yu., 1998b. Nad Ukrainoiu dzvony hudut [Bells Are Ringing Over Ukraine]. *Porohy i zaporizhzhia. Literatura. Mystetstvo. Ideolohii* [Porogi and Zaporizhzhia. Literature. Art. Ideologies] : in 3 vol., vol. 1. Kharkiv : Folio, pp. 236–247. (in Ukrainian).
- Shevelov, Yu., 2009. *Vybrani pratsi* [Selected works] : in 2 vol. Book II. Kyiv : Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia». (in Ukrainian).
- Skoryna, L., 2020. Teoriia intertekstualnosti: vytoky, zdobutky, problem [Theory of Intertextuality: Origins, Achievements, Problems]. *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky : zbirka naukovykh prats viddilu komparatyvistyky Instytutu literatury im. T. H. Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy* [Methodologies of modern literary comparative studies: collection of scientific works of the Department of Comparative Studies of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. H. Syvachenko (red.). Kyiv, pp. 125–159. Available at: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf. (in Ukrainian).
- Sverbilova, T., 2020. Mizhdystsyplinarnyi aspekt aktualnykh kontseptiv suchasnoi postkolonialnoi teorii v dyskursi Comparative Culture [The Interdisciplinary Aspect of Current Concepts of Modern Postcolonial Theory in the Discourse of Comparative Culture]. *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky : zbirka naukovykh prats viddilu komparatyvistyky Instytutu literatury im. T. H. Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy* [Methodologies of modern literary comparative studies: collection of scientific works of the Department of Comparative Studies of the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. H. Syvachenko (red.). Kyiv, pp. 408–428. Available at: http://www.ilnan.gov.ua/media/k2/attachments/metodologii_17.02.2021.pdf. (in Ukrainian).
- Syvachenko, H., 2019. Kulturnyi transfer — nova metodolohiia komparatyvistyky [Cultural transfer - a new methodology of comparative studies]. *Slovo i chas*, 3, pp. 71–81. (in Ukrainian).
- Teterina, O., 2018a. «Zustrichi slovianskykh literatur na yikhnikh istoryko-dukhovnykh

- perekhrestiaxh»: D. Chyzhevskiy ["Meetings of Slavic literatures at their historical and spiritual crossroads": D. Chyzhevsky]. *ScienceRise*, vol. 6. Kharkiv, pp. 49–55. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/textc_2018_6_12. (in Ukrainian).
- Teterina, O., 2018b. Bairon i ukrainska literatura: problema vplyvu v osmyslenni Yu.Boika-Blokhyna [Byron and Ukrainian literature: the problem of influence in the understanding of Yu. Boyko-Blokhin]. *ScienceRise*, vol. 10. Kharkiv, pp. 37–42. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/textc_2018_10_10. (in Ukrainian).
- Teterina, O., 2018c. Magnificent edifice of the history of slavic literatures: Y. Boyko-Blokhin's «Project». *EUREKA: Social and Humanities*, no. 6. Tallinn, pp. 49–55. (in English).
- Teterina, O., 2020. Komparatyvistska model I. Kachurovskoho: mizh henetyko-kontaktolohiieiu i typolohiieiu [The comparative model of I. Kachurovsky: between genetic-contactology and typology]. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology, VIII(70)*, issue: 235, September, pp. 44–48. (in Ukrainian).
- Teterina, O., 2022. Komparatyvistska paradyhma u pratsiakh Yu.Boika-Blokhyna: «vzaiemodotykannia i skhreshchennia» pidkhodiv [The comparative paradigm in the works of Yu. Boyko-Blokhin: "interaction and intersection" of approaches]. *Visnyk universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia*, 2(34), pp. 49–62. (in Ukrainian).
- Touidoire-Surlapierre, F., 2013. *Notre besoin de comparaison*. Paris : Orizons. (in French).

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.04.2025.

Ольга Тетеріна

МОДЕЛЬ КОМПАРАТИВІСТИКИ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ЗАРУБІЖЖЯ 30-80-х рр. XX СТОЛІТТЯ: ДОСВІД І ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

У статті комплексно розглянуто концепції, погляди, методологічні підходи, реалізовані в працях українських учених-емігрантів 30-80-х рр. XX століття (Ю. Бойко-Блохин, М. Гнатишак, М. Глобенко, С. Гординський, В. Державин, І. Качуровський, І. Мірчук, Д. Чижевський, Ю. Шерех та інші) у проєкції порівняльного літературознавства. Мета роботи полягає в осмисленні моделі українського еміграційної компаративістики означеного періоду як цілісності. Поставлена мета зумовила виконання таких завдань: визначити основні концепції порівняльного літературознавства українського зарубіжжя, простежити його еволюцію, функції, окреслити вектори порівняльних студій; схарактеризувати напрямки та проблеми еміграційної компаративістської парадигми; обґрунтувати думку про те, що погляди українських учених в еміграції (які часто випереджали час) і досі зберігають свою актуальність, тому врахування їхнього теоретико-методологічного досвіду сприятиме розширенню перспектив галузі та новим науковим пошукам. У дослідженні застосовано здобутки методології історико-порівняльного аналізу, методики культурно-історичної та рецептивно-історичної шкіл.

Розкрито міждисциплінарний характер праць учених-емігрантів, із виходом у сфери філософії, етнопсихології, антропології, що визначає не лише увага до генетико-контактології та типології, а й прагнення розвивати інтертекстуальні, інтермедіальні дослідження (які не підтримувалися в радянському літературознавстві). Це піднесло українську компаративістику на якісно новий рівень – культурологічний. З'ясовано специфіку моделі порівняльного літературознавства українського зарубіжжя.

Визначено широкий діапазон проблем генетико-контактології й типології, серед яких виокремлено вузлові, що сформували модель порівняльного літературознавства українського зарубіжжя у певну цілісність: від багаторівневого вивчення літературного сприйняття, зокрема художнього перекладу, насамперед, як явища літератури-реципієнта (це питання в підрадянській Україні на той час дискутувалося) до осмислення

епох, стилів і жанрів, традиційних сюжетів та образів як транскультурних явищ, що втілюються у національних варіантах, зокрема крізь призму феномена синтезу мистецтв.

Сформульовано висновок про українську еміграційну компаративістику, що демонструє поліаспектність та різновекторність, плюралізм теоретико-методологічних підходів, як цілісний культурний феномен. Доведено принципово важливе значення моделі порівняльного літературознавства українського зарубіжжя 30-80-х рр. XX ст. не лише у розвитку тогочасної вітчизняної науки про літературу (збережено вітчизняні традиції, забезпечено *неперервний* поступ національного порівняльного літературознавства та принципово збагачено його теоретико-методологічний інструментарій), а й з погляду її внеску до світового літературознавства загалом: праці дослідників українського зарубіжжя, які творчо переосмислювали зарубіжний теоретико-методологічний досвід та нерідко, при цьому, випереджали час, вплинули на розвиток компаративістики в західному світі (насамперед «Порівняльна історія слов'янських літератур» Д. Чижевського), збагатили її новаторськими ідеями й концепціями, багато з яких залишаються актуальними й досі, окреслюючи перспективи галузі та сприяючи новим науковим пошукам у просторі сучасної гуманітаристики в цілому.

Ключові слова: порівняльне літературознавство, національна література, міжкультурний контекст, контактено-генетичні зв'язки, типологічні подібності та відмінності, стиль, рецепція, вплив, художній переклад, синтез мистецтв.