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PREFACE

The personality of Pavlo Fylypovych is known in contemporary Ukrainian intellectual circles more as a poet and member of the Kievan Neoclassicists than as a scholar who played a fundamental role in the development of Ukrainian literary criticism of the 1920's and whose primary studies were followed by later literary critics.

The main reason for this situation is that in the 1930's all of Fylypovych's works were prohibited by the Soviet regime not only for general readers and college-level students but even for literary critics. This was excepting, however, some members of the Communist party who in many cases used his studies as a basis for their own writings without indicating the original source. In 1935 Fylypovych was arrested and sent without trial to Siberian concentration camps where he died in exile in 1937. Thus his contribution to the development of Ukrainian literary criticism is rather generally unknown up to the present time.

None of Fylypovych's studies are reflected yet in any annotated bibliographies and thus are not
readily accessible for analysis. An exception in this respect is presented by the list of Fylypovych's works issued in a serial publication of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences which ceased in 1929 and the general bibliographical sketch compiled by Oleksander Fylypovych in 1961. Although these indexes are not complete, they provide a general picture of Fylypovych's activity and may serve students of Ukrainian literary criticism to some extent as reference sources for further research in this field. It should be noted that until the present time even after his formal rehabilitation in the Soviet Union a new edition of Fylypovych's works (except for the reprinting of two essays published abroad) has not yet been issued nor has there been published any full-scale analysis of him as a literary scholar.
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INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of this thesis is to present an analysis of Pavlo Fylypovych as a literary scholar whose critical works, scholarly activities, and personal life represent a comprehensive view of the strivings of Ukrainian literary intellectuals of the 1920's for high levels in critical research and for the demonstration that the development of Ukrainian literature was connected in numerous ways with the main trends of world literature. Along with this analysis, the present work observes the constant pressures from the Communist authorities to minimize and eventually to halt such research work. This was followed by destroying the scholarly heritage of the 1920's and its principal creators as well.

The personality of Fylypovych might be observed in this struggle between objective scholarship and the political system of Communism as an example of the peculiar development,
INTRODUCTION

capability and activities of a Ukrainian scholar of that particular period. After obtaining his education at conservative Russian schools he was on the brink of a promising career as a Russian poet and literary critic. However during the national revolution and the independence of Ukraine he underwent a revival of his national sensibilities and thereafter devoted himself fully to the service of his native culture and in particular its literature. For this he gave all his abilities, knowledge and finally even his life, as it was pointed out by his university colleagues\(^1\) and contemporaries.\(^2\) As one of the


central figures in Ukrainian literary life, Fylypovych functioned as a touchstone of its development and reflected through his activities and writings the path of literary scholarship in Ukraine in that particular time.

In order to deal adequately with the theme it was necessary to present a general survey of the basic studies on the development of Ukrainian literary criticism which aid in determining its main trends and research methods. In this survey concentration is given to those works which provide original contributions especially in regard to the development of Ukrainian literary criticism in the 1920's. Further, it was necessary to consider the principal features of the main critical trends in world literature and to indicate how they were elaborated and utilized by their various representatives in Ukrainian literary criticism which in turn established its own schools and
methods of research. Three main trends are particularly analyzed whose methods dominated in literary research in Ukraine from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1920's: the sociological, the philological and the comparative. On this basis there is also given a general panorama of critical research in Ukraine in the 1920's with emphasis on the implications of these trends for the general literary development.

The basic groundwork of the study is completed by a personal portrait of Fylypovych and a survey of his education, scholarly activity, and also literary surroundings which are considered as a main influencing factor on the formation of his literary production.

To the observation of Fylypovych's literary criticism are devoted three chapters which present a detailed analysis of his principal studies. The criteria for selecting
INTRODUCTION

these works included their originality, the research methods selected, as well as their basic contribution to the subject as reflected by the investigations of others and particularly later studies in the same field.

The analysis of Fylypovych's studies is presented according to the following method:

1) analysis of the individual study or cycle of works devoted to a topic with an indication of previous or contemporary opinions on the same subject,

2) observation of criticism on the research of Fylypovych discussed including stress on the manner of treatment by representatives of Marxist criticism and the official Soviet line,

3) evaluation of his studies and their criticism with the determination of Fylypovych's contribution to the theme researched, and an indication of his research achievements and original conclusions,
characteristic of later critical works on similar topics which followed Fylypovych's lead in their analyses and in their conclusions as well.

The consideration of Fylypovych's studies includes an emphasis on the methodological approaches utilized by the scholar in his research work.

The sixth brief chapter of the thesis has a supplementary character. It contains the characteristic of Fylypovych's additional critical works. A predominant number of the essays and articles considered here play a secondary role in relation to the scholar's main studies or extend some aspects of previous research on a problem. The chapter also includes the observation of the criticism on Fylypovych's literary studies and critical approach by the Marxist critics supported by the Soviet regime in Ukraine and the Communist party in the early 1930's, which subsequently
forced the scholar to reject his scholarly orientation and write on the order of these political authorities.

As a result of the analysis of Fylypovych's critical studies there is also the attempt to determine his place in the development of Ukrainian literary criticism in the 1920's as well as his significance in this area of research for current scholarship.

In order to obtain reliable results it was necessary to examine a great number of sources dealing with this subject and particularly with those primary sources published in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920's. The process of collecting these materials required a considerable amount of effort and time since most of them were not available in the libraries of the free world. In analyzing the pertinent sources, it became necessary to provide in most cases an objective and independent evaluation in order to distinguish
works based on scholarly grounds from those which exhibited a journalistic critical manner and which often contained elements inserted to accommodate the official line of Marxist criticism.

Besides considering all these published materials the author of this thesis was able to obtain unpublished primary sources which aided in providing a portrait as complete as possible of Fylypovych as a person and literary scholar. These include the correspondence of the late scholar and poet, Mykhailo Orest (Zerov), the manuscript of the biography of Fylypovych written by his brother, Oleksander Fylypovych, and personal interviews with him and with such persons as Metropolitan Ilarion and Eugene Radzimovs'kyi who were in close contact with the scholar during his student days at the University of Kiev and also in the 1920's. All these sources were utilized in the present thesis.
I.

GENERAL SURVEY OF LEADING TRENDS IN UKRAINIAN LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE EARLY 1920'S

Literary situation in Ukraine after the national revival of 1917

Ukrainian literary criticism, which achieved remarkable results in the 1920's, has deep roots in the history of Ukrainian literature. The history of theoretical literary studies in Ukraine reaches back to the first half of the 17th century, and especially to the literary lectures at the Kievan Academy. The first theoretical study of poetry was published by this first Ukrainian university in 1637. The work, entitled Liber artis poeticae ac anno Domini 1637, consisted of nine chapters, and included all forms of poetic creation.¹ Since that time Ukrainian literary criticism as well as Ukrainian literature, like the literatures of other nations, has been marked by the various periods of history which have left their particular imprints on its growth and evolution.

¹. This literary monument did not survive. It is known only from the description of M. Bulgakov in his study Istoriia Kievskoi Akademii, S.-Peterburg, 1843, p. 63-68.
GENERAL SURVEY OF LEADING TRENDS IN UKRAINIAN LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE EARLY 1920'S

During the period of the Ukrainian National Revolution in 1917 and the establishment of Ukrain's'ka Narodna Respublika (Ukrainian National Republic) Ukrainian literary criticism, bearing the heritage of the literary schools and studies of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries entered a new stage of development. With the independence of the Ukrainian state came a revival of all aspects of the cultural, economic and political life of the Ukrainian nation. Literature was in the front ranks of this movement, and thus it was especially effected by the revolution of 1917. At various times literature and scholarship were well represented in the Ukrainian government by such personalities as the historian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, the writer Volodymyr Wynnichenko, the literary scholar Serhii Iefremov, the linguist Ivan Ohienko, and the historian Dmytro Doroshenko.² Hence, when literature is discussed in connection with the 1917 revolution and the Ukrainian national revival, the term

² Besides those listed, there were a number of other prominent scholars and literary personalities in the upper levels of the government of Ukrainian National Republic. D. Doroshenko, Istoriiia Ukrainy, 1917-1923, Uzhhorod, 1930-32, v. 1, p. 69-95; v. 2, p. 50-75.
includes not only published material, but also important literary figures. On these individuals the events of 1917 "had a most profound influence". Ukrainian writers and literary scholars emerged from what was often social obscurity into prominent positions of cultural leadership. It was a period in the history of Ukraine when its intellectuals and literary elite felt no compunction in following official trends, dictated by foreign forces of occupation. They became not only highly respected members of the community, but also persons of considerable influence in the cultural life of the state.

Cultural and literary activities continued during the existence of the young independent state in 1917-1919, despite the Ukraine's central position during the course of the war. Moreover, the governments of the Ukrainian National Republic placed special emphasis on cultural policy and tried to advance Ukrainian literature to the best of their


abilities and tastes. It was during the period of Ukrainian independence that the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, the state universities in Kiev and Kamianets-Podilskyi, the National Museum in Kiev, and other cultural and scientific institutions were founded. Book production for 1918 reached 1,084 titles, in comparison with 264 for 1913. Such leading serial and periodical publications as Zapysky (Annals) of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Zapysky (Annals) of the Scientific Society in Kiev, Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk (Literary-Scientific Review), Knyhar (Bibliophile), Shliakh (The Path), and others played an important role in securing the first steps of the revival of Ukrainian culture.


8. L. M. Kovalenko, "Na svitanku ukrains'koi radian-s'koi krytyky, 1917-1920", in Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, Rik 6, 1962, no. 4, p. 49.
A significant contribution to the development of the cultural life of the Ukrainian state was also made by scholars of Western Ukraine which proclaimed its independence in 1918 and then union with the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919. Particularly the activities of the Shevchenko Scientific Society (founded in Lviv in 1873), the Society "Prosvita", and the National Museum in Lviv, with their scholarly and literary publications aided the rebirth of Ukrainian culture after the revolution. It should be emphasized that the close relations between the Ukrainian intelligentsia and literary circles of the eastern and western parts of Ukraine were of paramount importance in the development of Ukrainian culture long before the revolution of 1917. One literary scholar describes the mutual ties between Kiev and Lviv in these words:

9. The history of these reciprocal relations centers on the activities of the Stavropygia Brotherhood and its school in Lviv in the 1580's, the Ostroh Academy in the 1570's-1580's, and the Kievan Academy, founded in 1615. V. Doroshenko, "Naizd halychan na Dniprianshchynu", in Kalendar-Al'manakh na 1943 rik, Krakiv, Ukrain's'ke vyd-vo, 1942, p. 67-71.
Western Ukraine not only offered a haven to some young Ukrainian intellectuals from the east and helped in the publication of Ukrainian literature; in due course it came to be regarded with admiration by Ukrainians as a place where, in spite of the pro-Polish policy of the Austro-Hungarian government, Ukrainian culture was developing much more freely than in Russia. In the early twentieth century these mutual ties were reinforced. Scholars, writers, and politicians from both sides of the border paid prolonged visits to each other's territory. In the field of Ukrainian literature and literary theory this east-west relationship was of the greatest significance. For the east it opened the door to Western Europe, while the Galicians were made aware of the heritage and aims they held in common with other Ukrainians. On the eve of World War I, Ukrainian literary schools and tendencies, by virtue of their Galician contacts with the West (Poland, Germany), had ceased to be dependent on Russian influences.10

Thus, Western Ukraine with its capital Lviv was "rightly regarded as the Piemont of the Ukrainian 'risorgimento'".11

The decline of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919 and its total collapse in 1920 led to the emigration of Ukrainian intellectuals who established cultural centers in Prague, Warsaw, Vienna, Berlin, and Paris.12 Those who

11. Ibid.
remained in Ukraine found themselves in an oppressive atmosphere created by the forces of Communist occupation. This situation, especially in the literary sphere, was viewed with obvious alarm by the academician Serhi Iefremov. In the preface to the fourth edition of his *Istoriia ukrains'koho pys'menstva*, which was published abroad in 1924, Iefremov wrote:

Iefremov's thoughts proved quite realistic in the near future. Taking advantage of the difficult process of

---


12b. Ibid.
establishing control by the Communist party and the apparatus of the Soviet regime in Moscow, Ukrainian intellectuals made every effort to advance the development of Ukrainian culture. Of significant help also in this regard were the struggles inside the new Communist government itself in Ukraine. It is important to mention that many personalities of the Ukrainian Communist movement were in opposition to the policy of the Moscow regime, particularly that which dealt with the self-determination of the Soviet Republics. At the same time, most of these people were very closely connected with the cultural life of the new state. They saw no reason why the development of the culture and literature of Soviet Ukraine could not follow its own course. Under the pressure


14. This position was held by the following leading members of the UKP (Ukrainian Communist Party, the only legal opposition in Soviet Ukraine until 1924): O. Shums'kyi, P. Liubchenko, and V. Blaktytnyi. Later, M. Skrypnyk, a founder of the KP(b)U (Communist Party of Bolsheviks of Ukraine) also shared this view. P. Fedenko, "Mykola Skrupnyk", in Ukrains'kyi zbirnyk, Miunkhenn, kn. 8, 1957, p. 66-67.

15. A statement of the UKP (called also Ukapists) and Borot'biists' cultural policy was contained in "Proekt dekreta o sodeistviu razvitiiu kul'tury ukraiinskogo naroda", prepared by O. Shums'kyi in K razresheniu natsional'nego voprosa, Izd 2, Kiev, Borot'ba, 1920, p. 15-20.
of this struggle, the introduction of the NEP (New Economic Policy) in 1921-1922, was followed by the so-called "Ukrainizatsia" (Ukrainization), 1923-1932, i.e. cultural autonomy, which made possible a sweeping national cultural revival (the so-called National renaissance of the twenties). Operating, however, under the constant pressure of the official Marxist ideology, the great majority of leading representatives of Soviet Ukrainian literature, although without definite declaration against the new socialist style, reflected the heritage of previous periods, and searched at the same time for new paths of literary development. This combination was especially evident in the realm of literary criticism in the 1920's.

Outline of main studies of Ukrainian literary criticism.

Before characterizing the main trends in Ukrainian literary criticism of the early twenties some of the problems facing an investigator should be mentioned. One is that no

comprehensive and scholarly study containing a detailed analysis of the theoretical trends and methodological schools in the history of Ukrainian literary criticism has yet been produced. Hence in order to characterize a literary scholar as a follower of a particular trend or school, especially one who was active during the independence of Ukraine and in the early twenties, one must often study all his works and the critical commentaries on them. Unfortunately, in the present situation many works are not generally available. Although there are a number of serious attempts to give an overall picture of the history of critical research in Ukrainian literature through the various stages of its development, in principle they usually differ from one another and often come to contradictory conclusions in the presentation of identical material. In order to give a general characteristic of the

17. Lack of consistency between these works is notable mainly in their determination of literary trends in modern Ukrainian criticism. For example, Kiev Neoclassicists are characterized by L. Bilets'kyi as proponents of a formal-poetical method, by D. Chyzhevs'kyi, as followers of the formalistic theory, and by K. Koperzhyns'kyi, as representatives of the Historico-comparative trend.
correspondent studies here are mentioned especially those which from different point of view deal with the determination of various critical trends and schools as well as discuss the research methods of their principal representatives.

The most valuable among these studies is the unfinished work of Leonid Bilets'kyi Osnovy literaturno-naukovoi krytyky. The first and only published part of this study covers just half of the author's entire project. Nevertheless it presents scholarly research based on reliable sources as well as on the author's own experience. The work, which in general follows the methodological principles of V. Peretts, provides a detailed analysis of the two main trends of literary criticism (neoclassical and historical), stressing their application to Ukrainian critical works in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Bilets'kyi's study lacks, however, methodological clarity, and this


19. According to Bilets'kyi's statement his work was based mainly on his lectures at the University of Kamianets-Podilskyi (1918-1920) and the Ukrainian Underground University in Lviv (1921-1923). Ibid., p. 5.
produces difficulty in properly determining literary theories and schools and in the analysis of the critical investigations of their followers. It is worthy of note that in the late twenties Bilets'kyi revised his methodological conceptions. He changed his point of view on some literary critics and assigned them to different schools.\(^{20}\)

Another valuable essay on literary trends and their representatives in Ukrainian criticism is a study by Kost' Koperzhyns'kyi "Ukrains'ke naukove literaturoznavstvo za ostanni 10 rokiv".\(^{21}\) This critico-bibliographical investigation provides us with short sketches of leading literary theories in Ukraine after the 1917 revolution. It is based on an extensive bibliography and a concise portrayal of Ukrainian


\(^{21}\) K. Koperzhyns'kyi, "Ukrains'ke naukove literaturoznavstvo za ostannikh 10 rokiv", in Studii z istorii Ukrainy Naukovo-doslidchoi katedry istorii Ukrainy v Kyivi, t. 2, 1929, p. XXI-LII. Here should be mentioned an essay of H. Kostiuk, "Ukrains'ke naukove literaturoznavstvo v pershe borevolutsiine p'iatnadtsiatyliitnia", in ZNTSh, t. 173, 1962, p. 185-216, which was based mainly on Koperzhyns'kyi's study.
literary critics in Ukraine and abroad. The only drawback of Koperzhyns'kyi's study is an insufficient description of reciprocal influences of Ukrainian and foreign literary theoreticians.

The work of Iaroslav Hordyns'kyi, *Literaturna krytyka pidsoviets'koj Ukrainy*, provided with well-organized bibliographical footnotes, presents a valuable survey of journalistic literary criticism in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920's-1930's with an occasional mention of scholarly criticism and its representatives. The study includes also an extensive bibliography on the Literary Discussion of 1925-1928.

Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi in his writings deals with the definition of literary trends in Ukrainian literary criticism according to his particular point of view. In the introduction to his *Istoriia ukrains'koj literatury*, Chyzhevs'kyi's outline presents a brief examination of five main trends (bibliographical, philological, sociological, historical, and formalistic), indicating their application in Ukrainian
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criticism, particularly in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century.\textsuperscript{23}

An historical outline of Ukrainian criticism by Viktor Petrov "Istorychnyi ohliad ukrains'koho literaturoznavstva 19-20 st.",\textsuperscript{24} contains more journalistic elements than scholarly ones. Petrov's survey and Iefremov's historiography of Ukrainian literature\textsuperscript{24a} served as the basis for an article on this subject by Mykola Ohloblyn-Hlobenko "Istoriia i stan doslidzhennia ukrains'koi literature".\textsuperscript{24b} It presents a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{24} V. Petrov, \textit{Istorychnyi ohliad ukrains'koho literaturoznavstva 19-20 st."}. in \textit{Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury}, Miunkhen, IZN pry UVU, 1949, p. 8-26.
  \item \textsuperscript{24a} S. Iefremov, "Dorohoiu syntezu; ohliad istoriokhrafii ukrains'koho pys'menstva", in \textit{ZIFV UAN}, kn. 2-3, 1920-1922, p. 89-109; also "Peredmova", in his \textit{Istoriia ukrains'koho pys'menstva}, 4. vyd., Liaiptsig, Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1924, t. 1, p. 9-66.
\end{itemize}
general historiographical description of literary studies in Ukraine utilizing a chronological approach.

Ievhen Kaharov in his article "Kryza istorii literatury", attempted to define the two theoretical methods in literary research classifying them as follows: the systematic method, i.e., allegorical, philosophical, and aesthetical, and secondly, the genetic method which includes historical, technical or morphological, and psychological methods. The author did not, however, indicate an application of these methods to analysis of literary works.

Among chronological-bibliographical surveys should be mentioned the works of Andrii Kovaliv's'kyi Z istorii ukrains'koi krytyky, and of Pavlo Fylypovych "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo za 10 rokiv revoliutsi".
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There are a number of other essays and articles in the field of literary criticism in Ukraine, but almost all of them deal in a journalistic manner with a discussion on one or another single trend or method. Many of these works were published in Soviet Ukraine during that particular time when the new literary theories and schools were gaining prominence. These critical writings are of paramount importance for a proper understanding of the development of Ukrainian literary criticism, especially during the period following the national revival in 1917. In addition, they reflect the struggle between defenders of scholarly literary research and the representatives of journalistic literary criticism in which Marxist theory, supported by the Communist Party and the regime’s forces, gradually initiated its victorious offensive against Ukrainian literature.

24f. To this category of writings should be assigned:
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In the early twenties eleven different methodological trends in Ukrainian literary criticism arose, each with its own method of analysis. All of these trends were based on three main theories of literary criticism: philological, sociological, and comparative. A schematic list of these trends and their leading representatives may be designated as follows:

I. Philological trend:


II. Sociological trend:


25a. Appendix No. 1.

26. D. Chyzhevs'kyi called this method a formal view of studies. Appendix No. 2.

27. L. Bilets'kyi determined Hrushevs'kyi's method as sociologico-positivistic. Appendix No. 1.
2. Sociological-ideological method: S. Iefremov. 28

3. Sociological-Marxist method: V. Koriak, V. Desniak, A. Muzychka. 29

III. Comparative trend:


2. Comparative-aesthetical method: P. Fylypovych.


Some of the methods mentioned above were often combined by a critic in his literary research. 30 On the other hand, some literary critics alternated from one trend to the other and applied varying methods to their studies. 30a In general, the subject of investigation determined a particular critic's choice of method.

28. L. Bilets'kyi defined this method as part of the Historical trend. Ibid.

29. It should be emphasized that K. Koperzhyns'kyi did not recognize a Marxist method, although his survey was published in Soviet Ukraine in the late twenties. Appendix No. 3.

30. For example M. Hrushevs'kyi in his Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury applied several methods which belong to all three main literary trends.

30a. S. Iefremov was in the front rank of these critics, whose numerous works were written on the basis of the sociologico-ideological, the sociologico-biographical, the sociologico-historical, and even of the philologico-comparative method.
V. Peretts's theory and its followers.

One of the oldest and most basic trends in Ukrainian literary criticism as well as in the criticism of other nations is the philological trend. It has not only an ancient tradition, but also a clearly developed theory of the literary text, principle of criticism, theory of understanding, and criteria of literary judgement. Founded on principles established by Aristotle, the philological system of criticism in the course of its development served as the nucleus of a number of other literary trends which were to play an important role in literary criticism. Thus, in studying critical theories at the present time, one may find elements of the philological trend in each of them.

Despite the creation of new theories of criticism, especially those supported by Romanticism in Germany and England in the second half of eighteenth century, the philological theory played a predominant part in the history of European literatures. A new period of development of philology as a theory of criticism started with the activities of the French philological school under the leadership of Gaston Paris, the historian of medieval literature. It was a time of
elaborating its fundamental principles and determining its methodological canon for application to the new needs of literary analysis. On this basis and with the improvements contributed by German critics, the philological theory presented the following formula:

1. Philology is a science, because it determines a subject of investigation, selects a goal of study, and elaborates its methods.

2. Philology is an empirico-rationalistic discipline which opposes the speculative studies.

31. Here are considered works of such critics as A. Boeckh, Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaft, 1. Aufl. Muenchen, 1886; H. Paul, Literaturgeschichte. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, Strassburg, 1891, and G. Groeber, Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, Strassburg, 1892.


3. At the center of its task the philological trend puts the analysis of a literary work itself.

4. Only a written work may be recognized by the philological theory as a literary creation and one in which all elements of creation are the subject of comparison with its text.

5. For a literary critic literature is a collection of texts, and the history of literature is their sum arranged in chronological order based on biographies of authors and certain historico-cultural facts.

6. The philological trend is a discipline which includes the study of language as well as the study of literary content.

7. Philological study is based on a methodology in which the process of analysis is divided into three phases: a) criticism of the text and criticism of historico-literary elements, b) interpretation, c) individual characteristics.

Elaborating these phases of the philological method, August Boeckh stated:

34. A. Boeckh, Encyklopaedie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaft, I. Aufl., Muenchen, 1886, p. 170
The philological trend in literary research found a number of adherents among Slavic literary critics. Applying its method to their studies, Slavic scholars extended its theoretical basis in order to find correspondence to the demands of research on the literatures of the Slavic nations. Thus, the method was exclusively used in the works of one of the most distinguished scholars in the field of Slavic studies, Vatroslav I. Jagić. The philological trend is particularly evident in his analysis of the Bible and the Apocrypha as well as in his studies of the history of Slavic philology.

During his editorship of Archiv fuer slavische Philologie


V. I. Jagić actually founded a school of philologists and literary scholars who accepted the philological theory in their studies. In Ukrainian literary circles, especially those in Lviv, there was an entire group of scholars who found themselves followers of the philological trend and apologists of Jagić's school. Such persons as Kyrylo Studyn's'kyi, Vasyl' Shchurat, Mykhailo Vozniak, and Iaroslav Hosryns'kyi, followed to some extent the manner of Omelian Ohonovs'kyi in their historical studies of Ukrainian literature (M. Vozniak), and in many of their works reflected Jagić's research method. Similar to Jagić's approach were the critical studies of the prominent Ukrainian scholar, Ivan Franko, on Ukrainian literature, on the Apocrypha, and on early Christian literary writings.

39. Ibid. p. 63-64.
40. K. Dovhan', "Literaturno-krytychni pohliady Ivana Franka", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1926, no. 4, p. 36-38.
41. Here are mentioned just a few of a number of I. Franko's works devoted to these subjects. They are: Etymologia i fonetyka v iuzhnorus'kii literaturi, Kolomyia, 1894, 30 p.; Varlaam i Ioasaf; starokhrystiants'kyi dukhovnyi roman; L'viv, Naukove t-vo im. Shevchenka, 1897, 202 p.; Apokryfy i legendy z ukrains'kykh rukopysiv. Uporiadkuvav i poiasnyv I. Franko, L'viv, Naukove t-vo im. Shevchenka, 1896-1910, 5 v. (vols. 1-4 contain books on Apocrypha, and vol. 5, Legends of Saints).
Continuing the tradition of the seventeenth century, the Lviv group of Ukrainian scholars maintained close relations with literary personalities of Kiev and other cities of the central and eastern parts of Ukraine where at the turn of the century the philological trend was represented by such scholars as Vasyl' Domanys'kyi, Volodymyr Rozov, Ahatanhel Kryms'kyi, Mykhailo Markovs'kyi, and Volodymyr Peretts. Bearing the ideas of Mykhailo Maksymovych and Oleksander Potebnia, Ukrainian scholars corresponded to Russian representatives of the philological trend like Nikolai S. Tikhonravov, Aleksei A. Shakhmatov, Aleksandr M. Pypin (in some of his works), Mikhail N. Speranskii, and others.  

At the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century a new school of the philological trend in Ukrainian literary criticism was created. This was the work of the literary scholar and lecturer at the University of Kiev, Volodymyr Peretts. Among the students of this school were

42. It is worthwhile to emphasize that all of these scholars contributed to the development of research on Ukrainian literature.

43. /A. Kryms'kyi/, "Zhyttiepys akademyka Volodymyra Perettsa", in ZIFV UAN, kn. 12, 1927, p. 253-257.
such young literary critics as V. Adriianova, brothers S. and V. Maslov, S. Halevs'kyi, L. Bilets'kyi, M. Drai-Khmara, M. Hudzii, E. Tymchenko, and others. Although the majority of these scholars also applied other methods to their critical studies, or even accepted entirely different literary trends, it was Peretts's philological school which provided a starting point and indicated the proper method of research for each of these literary critics.

In his earlier literary works V. Peretts followed a pattern devised by West European philological theory, but at the same time shared the general views of his predecessor P. V. Vladimirov. However, in later studies he developed his own research method complementing it with the accepted principles of the philological trend. Thus in his conception of the philological method V. Peretts stated:

Филологический метод изучает факты, возникшие как результат творчества человека в слове, и заключается в тщательном и всестороннем изучении памятников литературы со стороны их языка, способа передачи, происхождения, времени и места возникновения, способа проникновения

44. A complete list of students of Peretts's philological school is presented in Appendix No. 4.

Extending further his method of study, V. Peretts indicated precisely the supplementary disciplines which are imperative for the analysis of a literary work:

According to Peretts's method, the analysis of a literary text includes seven consecutive phases. These phases are:

1) history of the text; 2) correction of the text and determination of its original form; 3) analysis of errors, and their significance; 4) determination of the time, place, and conditions for the creation of the literary work; 5) comparative criticism of the text; 6) analysis and criticism of the


47. Ibid., p. 52.
content, and 7) portrayal of the author, or the determination of an unnamed author. 48

Perhaps the best example of the application of all the elements of the philological method is a study by Peretts Slovo o polku Ihorevimit 49 with its supplement K izucheniiu "Slova a polku Igoreve". 50 As a matter of fact, this study, which some literary critics evaluate as the best among Peretts's literary critical works, 51 also bears traces of the comparative as well as the sociological trends. In this respect it may serve as an example of the utilization of the three main literary trends reciprocally supplementing each other in one research study.


49. ---------, Slovo o polku Ihorevim - pam'iatka feodal'noi Ukrainy-Rusy XII viku; vstup, tekst, komentar, U Kyiv, Ukrains'ka akademii nauk, 1926, ix, 351 p. According to the author, the work was ready for publishing in 1924.
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Among other studies of the early twenties, the publications of the following scholars are recognized as part of the philological trend: M. Vozniak, "Dialog Ioanykiia Volkovycha z 1631 r." ZNTSh, t.129, 1920, p.33-79; F. Sushyts'-kyi, Shchodennyk T. Shevchenka; analiza, Odesa, 1920, 45 p.; Iw. Hordyns'kyi, "Vladimir" Teofana Prokopovycha", ZNTSh, t. 130-132, 1922; P. Rulin, "Ukrains'ka pisnia v starynnomu ukrains'komu spivannyku", ZIFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 148-199; P. Popov, "Zamitky do istorii ukraoms'koho pys'menstva XVII-XVIII v.", ZIFV UAN, kn. 4, 1922, p. 213-233; M. Novyts'kyi, "Do tekstu shevchenkivs'koho 'Kobzaria'," Ukraina, 1924, kn.4, p. 75-83; L. Bilets'kyi, "Moskaleva krynysnia" T. Shevchenka; istoriia tekstu i siuzhetu", Nova Ukraina, 1923, kn. 3, p. 69-94; M. Markovs'kyi, Iak utvoryvsia roman "Khiba revut' voly, iak iasla povni?" Panasa Myrnoho ta Iv. Bilyka; rozvidky ta dodatky za arkhivnym materiialom Poltavs'koho proletars'koho muzeiu, U Kyi, Ukraoms'ka akademiia nauk, 1925, 184 p.52

52. Just a few works are mentioned here to illustrate the variety of subjects approached with the philological method.
During the second half of the 1920's, despite the stifling atmosphere created by the official Communist system, the philological trend was still one of the main factors in the development of modern Ukrainian criticism. Its methods were used effectively by the followers of the Kiev philological school, although its founder had left Kiev.

Tradition of the sociological method of research.

Although the sociological trend in literary criticism belongs to the newer in the study of Ukrainian literature, its method in various forms was perhaps the most popular in Ukrainian critical writings after the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand, this method went through a kind of assimilation on Ukrainian soil and in an altered form was applied to indigenous criticism. A reason for this assimilation was the style of life of the Ukrainian people as well as the sociological views of the leading Ukrainian literary circles both based on particular social-political conditions.

Founded on the basis of Positivism and theoretically elaborated by the French literary and historical philosopher, Hippolyte Taine, the sociological trend recognized literature
as a part of the sociological process and as such is determined by a sum of its causes. Hence in order to understand a literary work it is necessary to know its causes. H. Taine considered a literary work to be a social fact which is determined by a series of causal factors, such as surroundings, historical events, geographical location, and moral circumstances. The study of a creative work is at the same time an explanation and determination of its causes. In this way the research has a genetic character. According to Taine's theory, literary reality with other social facts is ruled by the same sociological laws. Therefore they together are a subject of literary research. Sociological literary research usually interprets its principles as historical principles in which analysis is the only basis for study. Thus, the initial step for a researcher is to look on a literary work in its entirety, and then to analyze the natural connections between its ingredients, as well as to consider facts of the author's


life, and the customs and sensibilities of the period in which the particular literary work was created. Afterwards the investigated work is subjected to study which leads to the determination of the exact conditions of its creation.\textsuperscript{55}

In its later development the sociological trend was influential in historical studies. When the historical trend was initially applied in literary studies, sociology was recognized as one of its main principles. It should be mentioned that according to these principles, the history of literature is treated as a part of history itself, and therefore literary studies are supported by the study of the historical background. A literary work, in historical theory, serves to identify its creator, and through him aids in understanding an epoch and a people in a particular moment of history. For a historian of literature, the literary work itself is a historical fact as well as a document of other facts. It is explained only on the basis of study of

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p. 110-112.
the historical conditions that stimulated its creation.\textsuperscript{56} The similarities in some of their principles brought both the sociological and historical trends into close cooperation. On the other hand, being relatively close to the philological trend which had also some elements of the sociological theory, the sociological trend used the philological method for its analysis and criticism of a literary text. As a result of this reciprocal cooperation these three trends temporarily united, and in such a combination were effectively applied in the studies of such literary scholars as Gustave Lanson in France (the Sorbonne school),\textsuperscript{57} and Wilhelm Scherer and his school of "Drei E" in Germany.\textsuperscript{57a}

In similar form or in union with other literary theories the sociological trend found suitable ground in

\textsuperscript{56} E. Bernheim, \textit{Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie}, Goettingen, Droemer Verlag, 1903, p. 123-128.


\textsuperscript{57} G. Lanson, \textit{Metod v istorii literatury}. Perevod M. Gershenzona, Moskva, Mir, 1911, 76 p.

\textsuperscript{57a} W. Scherer's formula - "Das Ererbte, das Erlebte, das Erlernte" - sums up the genetic method which he introduced. W. Scherer, \textit{Poetik}, Berlin, 1888, p. 7-9.
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Ukrainian literary criticism during the turning point of the last two centuries.

There were two paths along which the sociological trend came to Ukrainian literary criticism: directly from Western Europe (in various critical works of M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, and M. Hrushevskyi) and through Russian criticism (A. M. Pypin, N. K. Mikhailovskii, V. M. Istrin, and others). In the literary studies of the Ukrainian critics and historians of literature this trend united with the historical theory, and with the historico-ideological principles of literary research, which were based on the critical writings of V. Antonovych, and especially on the theoretical works of M. Dashkevych. The sociological-historical trend was applied by the historian and historian of literature, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, who was the most prominent among its followers in Ukrainian criticism. Devoting himself to the history of Ukraine and Ukrainian culture, Hrushevskyi enriched Ukrainian


57c. Ibid., and L. Bilets'kyi, Osnovy ukrains'koi literaturno-naukovoii krytyky, Praha, UHVF, 1925, p. 166-167.
literary criticism with a number of literary essays and reviews, and critical analyses of various writers. He summed up his studies in this area with the chapters on the history of Ukrainian literature in his ten-volume Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy (in volumes 2-4 and 6), and his monumental research work Istoriia ukrains'koi literature, issued in five volumes. In these last two main literary studies of Hrushevskyi several research methods are evident. They have been characterized by D. Chyzhevs'kyi in this way:

В цілому "Історія української літератури" Грушевського с збіркою цінних досліджень, в яких масою добри зразки користування різними науковими методами з цінними вислівами, що в значній мірі залишаються в силі і в наші дні, Володіння різними методами не вичерпують наукової характеристики твору Грушевського. Його основна та важлива риса є також - як що можна так сказати - "її "європейськість"!... Грушевський обізнаний з на той час новішими прикладними історично-літературної науки та вміло вживає їх для освічення явищ історії української літератури.


To this analysis D. Chyzhevs'kyi added:

Коли ми говоримо, що Грушевський користувався різними методами дослідження, то це не має бути законом іому, твердженням, що він з "еклектиком", себто вченим, що не має певної власної наукової фізіономії. Користування різними методами прийшло не на шкоду, а на користь величезному творові Грушевського. Во однорідність якість одного методи він вправляє, користується іншими.

To Chyzhevs'kyi's words it would be appropriate to add that the sociological method served as the basis for Hrushevskyi's literary works. In addition he also applied other methods pertinent to his research on a particular problem. The scholar's manner was also indicated by D. Chyzhevs'kyi when he stated that Hrushevskyi, as a historian, paid notable attention to the historical and social background of literary works, which designates him a worthy example for other historians of literature.

60. Ibid., p. v.

The predominant influence of the sociological trend in his literary research was emphasized by Hrushevskyy himself. Quoting in translation the expression of the German literary scholar, Hermann Hettner: "Istoriiia literatury ne istorii knig, ce istorii idei ta ih naukovih i duhovih form", he stated:

An appraisal of the sociological trend and of the historical principles of literary research, and Hrushevskyy's statement are almost identical. However the scholar's erudition gave him the capacity to operate with other methods as well.

63. Ibid.
The sociological-historical trend with an ideological component was introduced to Ukrainian literary criticism by Mykola Dashkevych, scholar and professor at the University of Kiev. On the basis of the historical theory he elaborated his own conception of literary studies, utilizing also sociological and ideological elements with aspects of the comparative method of analysis as well. According to this conception emphasizing national aspects in literary research is of paramount importance, because it reflects the development of the cultural life of a particular nation and its cultural relationships with other peoples. Thus in his studies on old Ukrainian legends ("bylyny") Dashkevych wrote:

... историческая наука может отнести теперь с больш­шим доверием к былинному эпосу: она найдет в нем не только правду идеальной, но немало также и правды дей­ствительной. Точка отправления нашего эпоса — националь­ная, национально также основное содержание его, а равно в высокой степени националенъ и духъ, его проникающий.

64. N. Dashkevich, "Postepennoe razvitie nauki literatury i sovremernye eia zadachi", in Kievskiiia universitetskiiia izviestiia, 1877, no. 10, p. 723-747.

65. --------, "K voprosu o proishozhdenii russkikh bylin: byliny ob Aleshe Popoviche i o tom, kak perevelis' bogatyri na sviatoi Rusi; chitano v godichnom sobrani Obshchestva Nestora Lietopista, 20 marta 1883 goda", in Universitetskiiia izviestiia (Kiev), 1883, No. 5, p. 247-248.
Although accepting in general the principle of the historical trend as the basis for his own concept, Dashkevych considered literature an independent discipline within the sphere of historical studies, and in this respect he disagreed with sociological and historical theories. From this point of view he criticized M. Petrov's Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stolietiia.66 This review by Dashkevych grew nearly to the size of the reviewed work itself and became an independent study in which its author defended the originality of Ukrainian literature.67

Close to the theoretical principles of Dashkevych was Franko's position, especially in his studies of Ukrainian literature in which he determined the origin of Ukrainian literary movements and the development of Ukrainian literature as well.68 In his survey of Ukrainian literature for a
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Russian encyclopedia, Franko wrote:

"...литература — се збір усіх духовних виплодів чи то якогось одного народу (національна література), чи то більшої групи народів, або й усього людства (всесвітня література), зложені у людський мові... Ось тут являється перший ряд трудностей, які мусить побоювати новоачий історик літератури. При кожній літературній появлі, а особливо при кожній новій течії він мусить розрізняти своєрідно-національне від загально-міжнародного: національний зміст у міжнародній формі, і національну форму, в яку влито міжнародний зміст."

Consequently his periodization of the history of Ukrainian literature corresponded to the political periods of the history of Ukraine itself. There is evidence that I. Franko was close to these principles in his theoretical conception also. Thus in his essay "Teoriia i rozvii istorii literature" which was written as an introduction to his Istoriia ukrains'koj literature, Franko wrote:


70. Ibid., p. 301.

Elements of these theoretical ideas are notable also in some of Franko's comparative studies, particularly those on the creative power and poetry of Taras Shevchenko. 73

The theoretical formula of M. Dashkevych as well as I. Franko's principles (mentioned above) of literary studies were widely used by another prominent critic and literary historian Serhii Iefremov, who in numerous works devoted to Ukrainian literature shared also the views of M. Hrushevs'kyi. 74 S. Iefremov presented his theoretical conception in a preface to his Istoriia ukrains'koho pys'menstva which was published in four editions during the second decade of this century (1911-1924). Here the scholar indicated the three main elements of his critical principles based on the history of Ukrainian literature: 1) "Елемент свободи для людини — невпинна визвольна течія"; 2) "Визвольно-національна ідея"; 3) "Поступова течія народності в змісті і формі, насамперед у літературній мові". 74 Therefore his determination of the


periods in the history of Ukrainian literature was very close to that of I. Franko.75

With a thorough knowledge of literary and historical materials, S. Iefremov fruitfully applied his principles to research not only in historical studies on Ukrainian literature, but also in numerous literary sketches of Ukrainian writers, particularly Ivan Franko,76 and the realistic novelists Panas Myrnyi,77 Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi,78 and Ivan Tobilevych (Karpenko-Karyi).79 In these biographico-literary essays S. Iefremov attempted to characterize the activities and creative works of his subjects as their contribution to

75. Ibid., p. 22-26.
76. --------, Ivan Franko; krytychno-biohrafichnyi narys, Kyiv, Slovo, 1926.
77. --------, Panas Myrnyi, Kyiv, Slovo, 1928.
78. --------, Ivan Levyts'kyi-Nechui, Kyiv, Slovo, 1924.
79. --------, Karpenko-Karyi (Iv. K. Tobilevych), Kyiv, Sorabkop, 1924.
the development of national culture, and, especially to the idea of national liberation. 80

Somewhat akin to Iefremov was Mykhailo Vozniak in his Istoriia ukrains'koi literature, which the author dedicated to: "Славнiй пам'ятi невмiруших борцiв за здiянану, вiльну, самостiйну i незалежну Україну". 81 Following in some details the methods used by I. Franko and M. Hrushevs'kyi, M. Vozniak began his history of Ukrainian literature with a general outline of the history of the Ukrainian nation. 82

Related to the sociological-historical trend of Hrushevs'kyi as well as to the ideological conception of Iefremov were the histories of Ukrainian literature by O. Barvins'kyi, Istoriia ukrains'koi literature, U L'vovi, Nakl.Knyharni NTSh, 1920-21, 2 v., various studies of D. Doroshenko (Mykola

80. Some Soviet Ukrainian critics have considered Iefremov's literary principles a subjective-sociological trend. V. Boiko, "Sub'iektivno-sotsiolohichnyi napriam v ukrains'komu literaturoznavstvi", Krytyka, 1929, no. 8, p. 34-58.


82. Ibid., p. 2-15.
Ivanovych Kostomarov, Llaiptsig, Ukrains'ka nakl., 1924), V. Boiko (Marko Vovchok, Kyiv, Slovo, 1924), M. Plevako (Khrestomiia novoi ukrains'koi literature, Kharkiv, RUKh, 1923), and even some essays by V. Doroshenko, a follower of Taine's theory, who strongly criticized Iefremov's literary point of view. Close to these principles stays B. Lepkyi's Nacherk istorii ukrains'koi literature, although some aesthetic aspects might be observed in this work.

During the early twenties this trend with its popular tradition was very productive, and despite the establishment of other literary trends and bitter attacks by the followers of the newly created Marxist conception, the

83. V. Doroshenko, "Nova istoriia ukrains'koi literature", Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, t. 54, 1911, p. 448-509.

83a. Describing the method of his study, Lepkyi stated: "Я радби написати іст. літ. з естетичної точки погляду, - але пишу з історичної, тому бо цього вимагає життя" (Nacherk istorii ukrains'koi literature, 2. sprav. vyd., Llaiptsig, Ukrains'ka nakladnia, 1922, t. 1, p. 23).
sociological trend in Ukrainian literary criticism stimulated the creation of valuable studies of Ukrainian literature.

Kievan Neoclassicists and their literary research.

Besides the literary theories and various methods which have been discussed, Ukrainian literary criticism also accepted new trends and elaborated its own formulas for other literary theories. This flexibility was stimulated by new times.

One of the most sophisticated of those theories was that of the comparative study of literary works and of literature in general. In the first rank of representatives of the new comparative trend in Ukrainian criticism of the early

84. Z. Chuchmar'ov, "Sotsiolohichnyi metod v istorii ta teorii literatury", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1926, no. 7-8, p. 208-232.

85. Some literary critics designated this trend neopopulistic ("noonuropnyts'kyi"). V. Petrov, Istoriiia ukrain's'koj literatury, Münchhen, IZN pry UVU, 1949, p. 18-22.
1920's was the group of scholars who were recognized as Kievan Neoclassicists by their poetic works. Especially two members of this group, Mykola Zerov and Pavlo Fylypovych, played a leading role in literary criticism in Soviet Ukraine during that period. In applying the comparative method to critical studies, their view was shared by Mykhailo Mohylians’kyi and Viktor Petrov, and followed by other critics who accepted their principles of literary analysis.

Before a general appraisal of the critical works of these scholars is made, it may be appropriate to determine the origin of the comparative trend and to relate its history in Ukrainian literary criticism.

This trend might be considered as one of the newest in literary criticism, although its elements have been used in combination with different literary methods for centuries. Applied to literary studies during the period of Positivism as a historical-comparative aspect of the sociological trend, in the second half of the nineteenth century it was established as a separate theory of research. The source of the new trend was France again, represented by such influential personalities in literary criticism as Paul van
Tieghen, Fernand Baldensperger, Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett, et al. Revue de littérature comparée and its Bibliothèque de littérature comparée served as a forum for comparative literature in which the theory of the comparative trend was elaborated.

Accepting comparison as the principle and sociology as a standard for evaluation, the comparative theory also unified the historical and evolutionary aspects of literary research. Hence, in its methodology it considered a literary creation as a social product which is a result of historical-sociological factors. Furthermore, the comparative trend declined to recognize borders of national literatures and formulated a concept of world literature in which literary studies are based on a comparison of literary works from a sociological point of view. The German literary circles, particularly

87. Ibid., p. 79.
the schools of Theodore Benfey and Hermann Scherer were inclined to consider the comparative trend still as one of the methods of the sociological-historical trend, though Max Koch had established the first German periodical devoted to comparative literature in Berlin. Close to the general German view was the theoretical conception of Mykola Dashkevych who also applied the comparative method to his studies. However it was Mykhailo Drahomanov who introduced the comparative trend to Ukrainian literary criticism. Accepting the French theoretical formula and sharing the views of the German scholars, he went further in elaborating the usage of comparative method in applying it to his research studies on Ukrainian folklore, and especially on the origin and migration of Ukrainian folk songs, tales, and legends. In the preface to one of his essays M. Drahomanov expressed himself on this matter as follows:

M. Drahomanov compared folk songs to the earth's crust, on which the various epochs and numerous influences of neighboring peoples left their traces. Only the determination of the origin and national elements of a particular song could give an adequate reflection of a period and the social condition in which it was created or recreated.  

M. Drahomanov, as historian and sociologist, based his studies on the sociological-comparative method, and criticized at the same time the adherents of the historical-mythological trend (J. Grimm, O. F. Miller, and others) and the mythologico-comparative works of O. Kotliarevs'kyi and

91. M. Drahomanov, "Do vertepm'oi komedii na Ukraini", in his Rozvidky pro ukrains'ku narodnu tvorchist' i pys'menstvo, L'viv, Naukove t-vo im..Shevchenka, 1889-1907, v. 1, p. 144-45.

92. "Slavians'ki pereribky Edipovoi istorii", Ibid., v. 4, p. 143.
F. I. Buslaev. At the same time the Russian scholar, Aleksandr N. Veselovskii, as a historian of literature who in his early studies followed the Buslaev-Kotliarevs'kyi principles, elaborated the historical-comparative theory. In this respect he corresponded to F. Baldensperger's theoretical views as well as to the concepts of the German schools. This elaborated theory looked on literature in general as a sum of literary works; their mutual influences were based on their respective backgrounds, which leads to an understanding of the historical and socio-cultural connections between these components of literature. Thus its attempt was to define literary phenomena on the grounds of cultural and literary trends which in spite of the boundaries of national literatures, modify the character and value of literary works. It


is worthy of note that these principles were also applied by A. N. Veselovskii in his research on Ukrainian folk legends.  

Some aspects of Drahomanov's and Veselovskii's comparative concepts were followed by such historians of Ukrainian literature as M. Petrov in his works on Ukrainian literature, and M. Sumtsov, who also shared the views of M. Dashkevych, in studies of certain periods of Ukrainian literature. Also similar to Drahomanov's formula and Veselovskii's methodological principles was the standpoint of Ivan Franko, especially in his research on Ukrainian folk songs and legends and on some old Christian traditional stories in Ukraine.

94. A. N. Veselovskii, "Iuzhno-russkiia byliny", in SORIS IAN, t. 12, 1881, and t. 34, 1884.

95. M. Petrov, Ocherki ukrainskoi literatury XVIII vieka, Kiev, 1880, and Ocherki iz istorii ukrainskoi literatury XIX stolietiia, Kiev, 1884.

96. M. Sumtsov, "Kul'turnyia perezhivaniia", in Kievskaia starina, 1889, no.1-5, 7-12; 1890, no. 1-2, 4-7, 10.

97. Letters of I. Franko to M. Drahomanov and A.N. Veselovskii help to a great extent to indicate his relationship with these scholars in this respect, especially "No.172, Do M.P. Drahomanova", in I. Franko, Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1956, v. 20, p. 398-402, and "77. Do 0. M. Veselov's'koho", in I. Franko, Literaturna spadshchyna, Kyiv, Vyd-vo Akademii nauk Ukrain's'koi RSR, 1956, v. 1, p. 469.
However, I. Franko, employing original sources and a thorough acquaintance with the literary life of Western Europe, went further in the use of the comparative theory. As a matter of fact, he was one of the first Ukrainian literary scholars who also applied the comparative method to an evaluation of the creative works of Ukrainian poets and writers, although this aspect remained outside the comparative trend's theoretical framework. Franko's essays on the poetry of Taras Shevchenko, particularly such works as "Perednie slovo do 'Perebendi' T. Shevchenka",98 "'Topolia' T. Shevchenka",99 portrayed the poetic relations between T. Shevchenko and other writers like the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz. In "'Naimychka' T. Shevchenka"100 the critic utilized the same comparative method,

98. I. Franko, "Perednie slovo do 'Perebendi' T. Shevchenka", in his Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17, p. 41-61. Franko stated that in this study he applied the methods of Drahomanov, Dashkevych and others. I. Franko, "Vidpovid' krytykov 'Perebendi'". Ibid., p. 62.


100. I. Franko, "Naimychka" in his Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17, p. 100-120.
and indicated the connections of this work to other poems of Shevchenko. Other similar studies of Franko which should be mentioned are "Khutorna poeziia P. Kulisha", "Studii nad St. Rudans'kym", and "Deshcho pro 'Marusiu' L. Borovykovs'koho ta ii osnovu". All of these essays were analyzed with the comparative method, and based on sociological-historical theory. Following this principle, I. Franko expressed his conception in the following words:

Оскільки теорія посторонніх впливів на якогось писателя при поетичнім творенні має своє повне управління, а показ тих впливів відслонює нам важні культурно-історичні течії і взаємини міжнародні, оскільки для характеристики поодинокого поета важна річ показати, як він перетворював у своїй душі ті чухі, нанесені елементи.

Somewhat analogous to I. Franko's research manner was that of another Ukrainian scholar, Oleksander Kolessa, in his study of Taras Shevchenko's poetry where its author applied

101. All these works are included in I. Franko's Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17.

the historical-comparative method of A. N. Veselovskii. In this work the critic analyzed Shevchenko's connections not only with the Polish poet, but also with Ukrainian folk songs as well.

Besides the studies described here, there were also many other attempts to use the comparative method in literary criticism, but some of them often were devoid of the strict logical design necessary for this kind of analysis, and therefore their results were somewhat questionable. In general the comparative trend, after its fruitful start at the end of the nineteenth century, was rather overlooked in Ukrainian literary criticism during the first twenty years, and especially during the second decade, of this century.

103. O. Kolessa, "Shevchenko i Mitskevych", ZNTSh, t. 3, 1894, p. 36-152.

The national revival brought new and fresh air to Ukrainian literature and its criticism. Particularly important was the group of young Kievan Neoclassicists who pursued a modern course in literary affairs. With careful consideration of the traditions of their predecessors they also paid attention to the literary world of Western Europe. Besides possessing knowledge of several foreign languages, and an acquaintance with the ancient literary treasures in their original texts, the Kievan Neoclassicists considered that the development of modern Ukrainian literature and, particularly its criticism, ought to be based on reliable sources both for Ukrainian literature and for world literature as well. From this standpoint Mykola Zerov proclaimed his symbolic - "Ad fontes". Hence, in this regard, at the first public literary discussion, he stated:

Европу повинні ми брати, як школу, що підійме на вершини нашу мистецьку техніку, утворить з нашої творчості могучній культурою слова поток...
Ми повинні - на току критики, з лопатою в руках,
як колись казав Куліш - вибагливо і незалежно від попередніх оцінок переглянути дотеперішнє надбання української літератури. Ми повинні знов і по-новому придивитись до наших уславлених письменників,
інколи тільки з голосу нам відомих, з'ясувати їх...
Besides utilizing the historical-comparative method in their literary research, the Kievan Neoclassicists chose the third branch of comparative theory, i.e., the comparative-aesthetical trend, or, as some literary critics called it - "pure comparatism". According to its theoretical formula, which was outlined by P. van Tieghen, the most important goal for comparative analysis is to indicate the connections of a literary work (influenced or influencing) with another one or series of literary creations, and in this way to determine its value from an aesthetic and formal point of view.

For this purpose, a study of the creator's life, his background, social surroundings, and the historical factors which


106. According to S. Skwarczyńska this term was used by the Polish representative of the comparative theory, Ignacy Matuszewski, in his study Słowacki i nowa sztuka. S. Skwarczyńska, Systematyka głównych kierunków w badaniach literackich, Łódź, Łódzkie T-wo Naukowe, 1948, p. 235.

stimulated the creation of the particular work are of less importance. In other words, research through the analysis of a literary creation should evaluate the aesthetic-artistic capability of its author, rather than determining the value of a literary work through an investigation of the author's life and social-historical circumstances, especially since the particular literary work is held to be independent of social and historical conditions. Thus the comparative-aesthetical theory is as sociological and to some extent ahistorical. An historical aspect might be appropriate only for the history of plot and topic, and the history of genres.

Kievan Neoclassicists modified this theory in order to apply its methods to the study of Ukrainian literary works with an attempt at determining an author's place in the development of a national literature. On the other hand they found the comparative-aesthetical trend, which supplements in many ways the comparative-historical theory, the most adequate for

research on the literary relationship among Ukrainian writers themselves, and on their connections with foreign writers. Representing this view, P. Fylypovych in the preface to his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva stated:

В зібраних тут статтях я вжив переважно порівняльного методу і гадаю, що цей метод, позначенний уже у нас певною традицією (пр. Драгоманова, Франка, Сумцова, О. Колосси та інш.), може дати чимало корисного для сучасного українського літературознавства... Порівняльні студії поширюють також наш обійм, виводячи українське письменство з вузьких національних меж і з'єднуючи його з творчістю інших народів. 108

At the beginning of the twenties, the Kievan Neoclassicists served as lecturers at several universities109 and as active members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences which published their research studies in its annals. Besides such literary periodicals as Knyhar, which in 1919-1920 was under

108. P. Fylypovych, "Peredmova", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva; istorychno-literaturni statti, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 3.

109. M. Zerov and P. Fylypovych were professors of the history of Ukrainian literature at the University of Kiev, and M. Drai-Khmara was professor of Ukrainian philology at the University of Kamianets-Podilskyi (1918-1923) and later professor of the Ukrainian language at the Medical College in Kiev.
the editorship of M. Zerov, Chervonyi shliakh, Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, Nova hromada, and others also generously offered their pages for poetry and critical works by the scholars of this group. Special collective volumes and serial issues, dedicated to a single writer or problem, supplemented these publications.

Anticipating the imminent offensive of the Communist apparatus on Ukrainian national culture, Ukrainian writers and literary critics took advantage of the relative independence of the early 1920's for a broad expansion of their creative activities. Kievan Neoclassicists were among those who pointed the way for this movement. As poets, they presented examples of high quality neoclassical poetry, and as literary critics, they produced sophisticated literary studies through the application of scientific methods to literary analysis. Consequently, during this period a number of literary analyses of Ukrainian writers, reviews of creative

110. V. Petrov, "Ukrains'ki neoklasyky (Ryl's'kyi, Zerov, Fylypovych)", in Nova hromada, 1923, no. 6-7.

The comparative trend, which was renewed and elaborated by the Kievan Neoclassicists, was extensively used in Ukrainian literary criticism during the 1920's. The research
efforts of its leading adherent, Pavlo Fylypovych, will be analyzed in later chapters.
II

PAVLO FYLYPOVYCH

Biographical data and educational background.

There is considerable evidence pointing to Pavlo Fylypovych as an outstanding scholar and poet who played an important role not only among his Kievan Neoclassicist colleagues and in literary circles but also in the development of cultural life in post-revolutionary Ukraine. Moreover, he was one of the most colorful personalities of his generation among the Ukrainian elite. Volodymyr Derzhavyn, an apologist of the Kievan Neoclassicists, stated in his analysis of Fylypovych's poetry that "не можна не добачати певної рівнові- біжності в літературній і науково-академічній діяльності М. Зерова і П. Філиповича, обох цих найпослідовніших ідеологів і духових палядинів київського неокласицизму". To this quotation of Derzhavyn it is necessary to add that Fylypovych's path to the position of respected scholar is somewhat different from that of Zerov and most literary men of his generation; it was one of those interesting phenomena which seem

1. V. Derzhavyn, "Velykyi poet-myslytel'", in P. Fylypovych, Poeziyi, Miunkhen, IL UVU, 1957, p. 16.
PAVLO FYLYPOVYCH

...to occur only against the background of considerable national unrest or national revolution.

A somewhat inadequate biographical sketch of Fylypovych relates that he was born on September 2, 1891 in the small town of Kaitanivka near Kiev where his father was a pastor of the Orthodox Church. Pavlo was the oldest son in the family of seven children. Both his parents, Petro Fylypovych and Marlia Hordievs'ka, derived from old Ukrainian clerical families.

After finishing primary school in Kaitanivka and four grades of secondary school in Zlatopil', Fylypovych received a scholarship in 1906 for admission to one of the best private secondary senior schools of the country, the Pavlo Halahan Collegium in Kiev. The Collegium was organized on the style of Western European aristocratic private schools including a luxurious dormitory and special teachers of foreign languages.

---

2. O. Fylypovych, "P. Fylypovych; biohrafichnyi narys", in P. Fylypovych, Poezii, Miunkhen, IL UVU, 1957, p. 7.

languages. Its teaching staff consisted of select lecturers who usually were well-known scholars. At different times the linguist Pavlo Zhytets'kyi, the literary critic Mykhailo Markovs'kyi, and historian Ivan Balyts'kyi taught at this school. It should be mentioned that among the alumni of the Collegium were such distinguished personalities in Ukrainian religious, cultural, and political life as the botanist Volodymyr Lyps'kyi, who was the president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences from 1922 to 1928, the linguist Ivan Ohienko, who became Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada, the orientalist Ahatanhel Kryms'kyi, who was the general secretary of the Academy from 1920 to 1927, Andrii Levyts'kyi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian National Republic, and the linguists Vsevolod Hants'ov and Mykhailo Kalynovych. With Fylypovych also attended


5. O. Fylypovych, Spomyny pro brata (Manuscript). Also his Zhyttievyi i tvorchiy shliakh Pavla Fylypovycha; do 70-richchia z dnia narodzhennia, Münkhen, Vidbytka z zhurn. "Suchasnist'", ch. 10, 1961, p. 4-5.
this school M. Drai (later Drai-Khmara) and V. Otrokovs'kyi. Although this was during the period following the 1905 revolution which had stimulated the national demands of the Ukrainian people especially in such matters as the introduction of native language teaching in schools in Ukraine, the Collegium stood apart from these events and continued its conservative policy. At that time its outstanding students such as Fylypovych, Drai, and Otrokovs'kyi in addition to their studies continued to collaborate with the Collegium's journal Lukomor'e and under the influence of their teacher of Russian literature, M. Kozhin, who was himself a remarkable orator, began to compose their own poetic works.  

In 1910 Fylypovych completed the Pavlo Halahan Collegium with an outstanding record and a gold medal which gave him the opportunity of receiving a scholarship for college-level studies which he began at St. Vladimir University in Kiev in 1911. The first faculty chosen by Fylypovych was Law, but soon he transferred to the Department of Slavic-
Russian philology of the Historico-Philological Faculty, where he again joined his classmates from the Collegium, Drai and Otrokovs'kyi, and also O. Bahrii, K. Koperzhyns'kyi, and S. Haievs'kyi as well as several older students like the Maslovs, I. Ohienko, and L. Bilets'kyi. The leading lecturers of the Department were T. D. Florinskii, V. Peretts, and A. Loboda. S. Haievs'kyi mentioned that "на філологічному відділі історико-філологічного факультету основними професорами були:... Т. Д. Флорінський, В. М. Перетц і А. Лобода, заляканії, тероризований Флорінським українець".

There was a peculiar phenomenon existing in the educational system in all schools (including universities) in Ukraine under the Russian tsarist rule which continued until the time of the 1917 Revolution. At that time no subject devoted to Ukraine's problems was permitted. The stifling atmosphere was especially evident in secondary schools and

---


colleges. Hence, after the 1905 revolution one was much more likely to hear something about Ukraine, e.g., its language and literature, among the more liberal scholarly circles of the University of St. Petersburg than in Kiev. A prominent Ukrainian scholar and a long-time professor of various colleges in Ukraine, Vasyl' Bidnov, described this situation as follows:

Всі школи на Україні, від вищих до низьких, були часто московськими. Звідси, викладову мову була російська, користуватися рідною мовою не тільки не дозволялося, а навіть заборонялося. Мало того, школа була чужою для нашого народу не тільки мовою, але й самим змістом навчання. В підручниках говорилося виключно про "русский"... народ, про його господарське життя, звичаї, історії, мистецтво, про народ як український, про його минулі та звичаї й господарські відносини ніколи не згадувалося.

Volodymyr Peretts was the first to introduce the study of the history of Ukrainian literature at the University of St. Petersburg.


of Kiev. In 1907 he established the Seminar of Russian Philology and under this official name developed a program investigating old Ukrainian as well as old Russian literary monuments. An outline of his program of study devoted to Ukrainian literary works, especially those of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, was published by Peretts in the first volume of Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva v Kyiv and was introduced at the same time to the curriculum of his Seminar. The official name of the course and the popularity of its lecturer provided the opportunity for its students to visit libraries and archives in Kiev, Nizhyn, Zhytomyr, Poltava, Moscow and St. Petersburg where they conducted research on

11. "Zhyttiepsiys akademyka Volodymyra Perettsa", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 12, 1927, p. 256. It should be emphasized that in 1906 M. Sumtsov introduced his course on the history of Ukrainian literature at the University of Kharkov, but after a few lectures the course was prohibited by the government. "Zhyttiepsiys prof. M. S. Sumtsova", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 2-3, 1923, Chastyna ofitsiial'na, p. 7.


literary manuscripts and first printings. Most of these studies were later published in *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva v Kyivi* and the University's *Izviestiia*.

Although the Seminar was taught in the Russian language, it was devoted first of all to the study of Ukrainian literature, and was conducted according to the principles of the philological theory and the research method of its founder. It should also be stressed that it was this course at the University of Kiev which was devoted to the subject area connected most directly with Ukrainian culture. At the beginning, the Seminar had just a few students, but after

14. --------, "Otchety ob ekskursii seminariia russkoi filologii", in Universitetskiiia Izvestiia, 1910, no. 5; 1911, no. 2, 9-10, 12; 1912, no. 7-8; 1913, no. 1, 11-12; 1914, no. 11.

15. Another subject in the field of Ukrainian culture at the University of Kiev was a minor one on the Ukrainian language and its dialects. It was introduced to the curriculum of the Historico-Philological Faculty during the fall semester, 1913-1914. The first lecturer of this course was the linguist, Volodymyr Rozov, a former member of Peretts's Seminar. P. P. Pliushch, "Pershyi vykladaqa istorii ukrains'koi movy v Kyivs'komu universytetii", in *Visnyk Kyivs'koho universytetu*, 1959, no. 2.; Seriia filohii ta zhurnalistyky, vyp. 2, p. 63-64.
1911 their number gradually grew and during the period between 1911-1914 exceeded 25 persons. 16

Fylypovych and his colleagues were steady participants in Peretts's Seminar which included not only the students of the Department of Slavic-Russian Philology, but also Ukrainian students of historical and other humanistic departments such as M. Zerov, F. Klymenko, and H. Bilotserkivs'kyi. 17 Despite its purely scholarly approach and the general respect accorded its advisor who was closely cooperating with his assistant A. Loboda, the Seminar was under constant pressure and even direct attacks from official Russian circles. Mentioning some aspects of the Seminar's achievements, P. Fylypovych wrote in 1928:

В. П. Перетц, накресливши план студій з старого українського письменства, взявся до певної міри і здійснювати його в семінарі "руської філології" при Київському Університеті, хоч як зазначив сам керівник (у цитованій статті 1908 р.) "праця в Київському Університеті притягала до вивчення української літератури дуже невеликий гурт". Цей гурт пізніше збільшився, низка доповідей членів семінару була надрукована в "Записках Наукового Т-ва", що і викликало доносе відомого чорносотенця-українофоба С. Щеголева. 18

16. A list of the students of the Seminar of Russian Philology is contained in Appendix No. 5.

17. Arkh. Syl'vester (Haievs'kyi), "Mykola Zerov - Student", in Bezsmertni, p. 25.

Fylypovych stressed that

У своїй книзі "Українське двіння, якъ современный этапъ
"юпрусскаго сепаратизма" він писав: "Семинарій, слідова-
тельно, существує при "Імпера. Університет" і даже пооль-
зується поїданої поддержкою, був ізольовічним орга-
ном української партії в Києві і питомником для україниза-
ції русской учащейся молодежі". Свого безглуздого доноса
С. Євгелев закінчував трохи пессимістичною тиркою: "Можно
думати, що тучи, собирався над кафедрой язика і словес-
ності в Київському Університеті, не скоро рассеїся". 18а

The reports of S. Shchegolev and other persons had their
effect: on February 8, 1914 Peretts was chosen an academician
in the Russian Academy of Sciences and transferred from the
position of professor and head of the Philological Department
of the University of Kiev to the position of assistant pro-
fessor ("privat. dotsent") at the University of St. Peters-
burg 19 where under new circumstances he continued to conduct
his Seminar until 1927. 20

Whereas a number of the Seminar's members followed
Peretts's lead and completed their studies as adherents of
his philological principles, Fylypovych was not totally en-
thusiastic about Peretts's approach. First of all in his

18а. P. Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo
za 10 rokiv revoliutsii", in Literatura, zb. 1, 1928, p. 5-6.

19. "Zhyttiepyz akademyka Volodymyra Perettsa", in
Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 12, 1927, p. 257.

20. "Seminarii russkoi filologii" akademika V. M.
Perettsa, Leningrad, Akademia nauk SSSR, 1929, p. 27-49.
studies he inclined to the comparative-historical method, and secondly he was attracted by the literature of the nineteenth century rather than that of previous centuries. Therefore he was not a close follower of Peretts, and consequently the research trips to various cities organized by the Seminar often were made without Fylypovych. Nevertheless, Peretts's guidance introduced him to the realm of theoretical study, to a scholarly understanding of literary works and their evaluation, and finally to the application of the proper methods in literary research.

According to the policy of the University of Kiev, there were two possibilities before each of its students in his college studies: one was to complete the course of study in the normal way which did not, however, provide the best opportunity of obtaining a distinguished position after graduation. The second was to be graduated with a gold medal.

21. Fylypovych participated in only one such trip to Moscow in 1912, where the topic of his research was "Izuchenie 'Vertogrado Mнogotsiatnago' Semeona Pьlotskago (rukopis No. 288)", which he accomplished at "Synodal'naia" Library. The report of his research was published in Peretts's "Otchet ob ekskursii seminariia russkoj filologii v Moskvu 1-12 fevr. 1912 goda", in Universitetskia izvestiia, 1912, no. 1, p. 95-98.
which guaranteed its holder the prerogative of receiving a scholarship for post-graduate research and then to obtain a professorship at a university. The condition for obtaining a gold medal was outstanding research work in the final dissertation. V. Petrov describes this University system with these words:

Пеpед студентом фiлологiчного факультету було лише двi можливостi: одна, напружиши всi свої духовi здiбностi, цiною найбiльших зусиль, забезпечити за собою вихiд в професуру, i друга, пасивне низобiжне самосунення в глуху безвiсть провинцiйного учителявання. Шлях до професури був чiтко накреслений. Вiн починався з написання медальної працi... Домагаючись стати професорськiм стипендиантом, треба було одержати золоту медаль, саме золоту i в жадним разi не срiбну, бо срiбна не гарантувала нiчого... Залишений при Унiверситетi складав магiстерськi iснiпити. Пiсля двох вступних лекцiй вiн здобував звання приват-доцента. Усе це потребувало колосального напруження розумових i фiзичних сил, тодiшньої мобiлiзацiї всiх духовних ресурсiв. Не всi витримували. Часто надмiрнiсть зусиль губила людину. Нишила II.22

To Petrov's words it is necessary to add that for the gold medal candidates of the Historico-Philological Department there was an additional unwritten prerequisite. It was required that the topic of any particular dissertation should

avoid all problems having direct connection with Ukraine as a separate entity. The subjects of the final research effort for those students who obtained a gold medal during Fylypovych's university studies confirm the existence of such a requirement. Among these topics can be mentioned ones like Poviest' o Merkurii Smolenskom by L. Bilets'kyi, Poviest' o kuptsie Basargie by V. Otrokovs'kyi, Russkaia narodnaia skazka; istorii sobiraniia i izuchenia by S. Savchenko, Zapadno-Russkie Tsekhi by F. Klymenko, Tula i Tul'skii uiezd v XVI-XVII viekakh by H. Bilotserkivs'kyi; and the topic of

22a. V. Peretts, "Otzyv o sochinenii na temu 'Poviest' o Merkurii Smolenskom'," in Universitetskiia izviesitiia, 1914, no. 9, p. 31-36 (the dissertation consists of 135,68 p.)

23. -------, "Otzyv o sochinenii na temu 'Poviest' o kuptsie Basargie". Ibid., p. 37-43. V. Petrov (v. Domontovych) in his "Bolotiana liukroza" in Kalendar-Al'manakh na iuvileinyi 1948 rik, Augsburg, 1948, p. 113 stated that Otrokovs'kyi's dissertation "доягла нечуваного ще доти обсягу трьох тисяч сторінок". According to Peretts's review it consisted of 526 pages and 1 table.

24. S. V. Savchenko, "Russkaia narodnaia skazka; istorii sobiraniia i izuchenia", in Universitetskiia izviesitiia, 1913, no. 5-12.


M. Drai-Khmara's dissertation was "Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga" A. Kacica Miosica. Fylypovych, who specialized in literature of the nineteenth century, received his gold medal for the dissertation entitled Zhizn' i tvorchestvo E.A. Boratynskago. It is significant to note that M. Zerov, who studied history and ancient philology, was not among the gold medal winners. He wrote his dissertation on the Ukrainian Cossack chronicle of H. Hrabianka.


29. According to V. Petrov, M. Zerov studied classic philology at the University of Kiev, (V. Domontovych, "Bolotiana liukroza", in Bezsmertni, p. 281.), and S. Haievs'kyi stated that Zerov was a student of history at the same university, (Arkh. Syl'vester (Haievs'kyi), "Mykola Zerov-Student", Ibid., p. 25.

30. V. Petrov mentioned that Zerov's "дипломна робота була студією про Величка, Самовидця, козацьких літописців XVIII стол." At the same time he stated that he did not know Zerov as a student (Ibid., p. 281-282). S. Haievs'kyi emphasized that "Свою дисертацію про козацького літописця Грабянку (не про Перевальську угоду, як говорить В. Петров) М. Зеров написав у приват-доцента В. Данилевича, помітного нашого історика і переконаного українця." (Ibid., p. 26.). It seems that the information of S. Haievs'kyi would be more reliable since he was Zerov's colleague in his college studies.
final thesis was written on Marko Vovchok, also did not belong to that group of students.31

The system of higher education with the special policy of the Russian government toward Ukraine left its mark on Ukrainian university students. On the one hand it stimulated the wide-spread demonstrations demanding the introduction of Ukrainian courses in the college curriculum,31a and on the other hand the system alienated a number of students from their social and national surroundings. To the second category belonged especially the candidates and holders of gold medals from the University of Kiev who became recognized specialists in the subjects chosen for their dissertations. An accurate description of the influence of that system was given by M. Drai-Khmara in his diary in which he wrote the following:


A similar situation might be observed in the careers of other young scholars of Drai-Khmara's generation, and especially in regard to Fylypovych who during his schooling had left his native soil which served to initiate the weakening of his national feelings. From the Pavlo Halahan Collegium through his university years, he inclined toward the study of the period of Romanticism in Russian literature in the nineteenth century, which gave him the opportunity of attaining the status of a specialist on the Russian poet E. A. Boratynskii. After defending his dissertation Fylypovych planned to extend his work on this poet as he stated: "Предмет данной книги - главным образом, биография Е. А. Баратинского. Подробному историко-литературному анализу его творчества будет посвящен особный том". In addition, his


interests included the leading representatives of French
poetry of the nineteenth century whose creative works he
read in the original. At the same time, Fylypovych continued
his poetic writings started back at the Pavlo Halahan Colle-
gium in which he was close to the Russian Symbolists and
Acmeists. As a result, after completing his university stud-
ies in 1915, Fylypovych became a young and promising scholar
of Russian literature and in addition a Russian poet with
the penname "Pavel Zorev". Fylypovych's biographer emphasized
that

... в той час брат дуже захоплювався модерною фран­
цузькою поезією — поетами другої половини XIX столе­
тя (Бодлером, Верленом, Теофілем Готье, Леконт
де Лілем) і російськими символістами та акмеїстами
(Блоком, Бальмонтом, Брюсовим, Ін. Аннєвським, Ан­
ною Ахматовою, Гумельвілем). Його книжкові поліці
були густо заставлені творами улюблених поетів, се­
ред них були в оригіналах томики поезій Верлена і
Леконта де Ліля, "Квіти зла" Бодлера (з яких пізні­
ше він робив переклади на українську мову), "Емалі
і камеї" Т. Готье, "Трофеї" Ередія.34

34. O. Fylypovych, "Zhyttievyi i tvorchyi shliakh
Pavla Fylypovycha; do 70-richchia z dnia narodzhennia", in
Suchasnist', 1961, ch. 10, p. 47. Also his "Spomyny pro
brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 107.
After his graduation Fylypovych continued his studies for the "Magister" examination which he passed in 1916. He also started to publish his articles on Russian and French literature such as his review on V. Briusov's Frantsuzskie liriki XVIII vieka; "Dva neizvestnykh stikhov voreniiia E. A. Baratynskago", in Ocheniiia v Obshchestvie Nestora Lietopistsa, 1914, vyp. 1; "O II-om tome akademicheskago izdaniia sochinenii Baratynskago", in Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnego prosvesheniia, 1916, no. 4; "Ob avtore stikhov 'Kakaieto storona'," in Universitetskiia izvestiiia, 1916, no. 6; "Mopassan kak poet", in Nashi dni, 1918, no. 3. In 1914 he contributed to a new edition of S. P. Vengerov's Kritiko-biograficheskii slovar russkikh pisatelei with his study

35. It is difficult to determine the exact date of Fylypovych's final "Magister" examination. According to his biographer, the second half of 1916 might be the most accurate. O. Fylypovych, "Spominy pro brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 108.

"Kniga o Borodinskom". 37 During the same time Fylypovych published his poetry in such leading Russian liberal journals as Viestnik Evropy, Zaviety, Zhatva, and also in the illustrated Kievan journal Kuranty. 38 About Fylypovych's poetic works published in these journals, his brother mentioned:

The revolution of 1917 found Fylypovych at the University of Kiev where he was about to begin his work as an


38. P. Fylypovych published approximately 16 poems in the journals mentioned above.

assistant professor. This was the time when he and his close friend V. Otrokovs'kyi received the inspiration to create Ukrainian poems although both of them hardly knew the Ukrainian literary language. 40 Afterwards came the moment when Ukraine declared independence and the period of the Ukrainian National Republic began. It was a time of spiritual rebirth for Fylypovych and many others of his generation who found themselves natural recipients of the historical heritage of Ukraine and also citizens of Ukraine as an independent state. The national revival was a turning point not only in their philosophical conceptions and scholarly interests, but also in their life as a whole. In this new era Fylypovych devoted himself to scholarly work in learned institutions and societies and to Ukrainian literature. His close friend, V. Otrokovs'kyi in whom V. Peretts saw a brilliant future scholar, turned to organizing the social and cultural life

40. P. Fylypovych, "V. M. Otrokovs'kyi; z nahody 10-kh rokovyn smerty", in Literatura, zb. 1, 1928, p. 226.
of the young Ukrainian state and died in this activity at 26 years of age.\textsuperscript{40a}

Activities at the University of Kiev and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

It is difficult to determine in which of Kiev's universities or colleges Fylypovych was employed during the independence of Ukraine and especially in 1918-1919. During that time there were two universities in Kiev. One was the St. Vladimir University of Kiev which preserved its old pre-revolutionary traditions including the use of Russian as the language of instruction.\textsuperscript{40b} However, in 1917 it introduced four main courses ("katedry") devoted to Ukrainian subjects.\textsuperscript{41} The second university, the Kievan Ukrainian People's University founded in October 1917, was reorganized in July 1918.

\textsuperscript{40a} P. Fylypovych, "Otrokov's'kyi, Volodymyr Mykhailovych", in \textit{Ukraina}, 1925, kn. 6, p. 183.

\textsuperscript{40b} "Protest Sovieta Universiteta Sv. Vladimira protiv nasil's'tvennoi ukrainizatsii iuzhnoi Rossii priiatyi v zasiedanii Sovieta 24 iiulia 1917 g.", in \textit{Universitets'kii izvestiia}, 1917, no. 12, p. 1-7.

\textsuperscript{41} Istoriia Kyiv's'koho Universytetu, Kyiv, Vyd-vo Kyiv's'koho Universytetu, 1959, p. 316-317.
and renamed the Kiev State Ukrainian University. In addition, there were several colleges which during that period also played notable roles in educational life and policy in the capital of Ukraine.

According to available sources, several of Fylypovych's university colleagues continued their scholarly activities in various universities during Ukraine's independence. For example, F. Sushyts'kyi became Pro-rector and I. Ohienenko was nominated professor of the Ukrainian language at the newly established Kiev State Ukrainian University. L. Bilets'-kyi and M. Drai-Khmara accepted positions as lecturers of Slavic and Ukrainian philology at the newly created Ukrainian State University of Kamianets-Podilskyi. Later they were joined by I. Ohienenko as Rector of this university.


44. Ibid., p. 359.
V. Bidnov, "Pershi dva akademichni roky Ukraїns'koho Derzhavnoho Universytetu v Kam'iantsi Podil's'komu; uryvok iz spohadiv", in Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, 1918, kn. 11, p. 233-240.
M. Zerov, however, after his return to Kiev from Zlatopil' where he taught at a secondary school for several years, was a teacher and secretary of the Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood Gymnasium in Kiev as well as editor of the literary-bibliographical journal Knyhar and a member of the editorial staff of Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk. Fylypovych began his career as a scholar not in a college or university but in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. When the Academy's "Komisiiia dlia vydavannia pam'iatok novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva" (Committee for the Publication of Monuments of Modern Ukrainian Literature) was created on February 1919, he became its first secretary. Fylypovych started his college lectures in 1920. This was after the Communist forces occupied Ukraine completely and began to consolidate their regime which also introduced a new reform into the educational system. According to this reform, both Kievan universities and almost all colleges of Kiev were forced to unite into one state institution.


under the name "Vyshchyi Instytut Narodn'oi Osvity" (Higher Institut of People's Education) which to a great extent became the equivalent of a university.\(^{47}\) Since it was a state institution, its curriculum had to be structured according to Marxist ideology and then gain the approval of the governmental authorities. Among the Kievan colleges was the Archaeological Institut which because of the character of its activities and its particular educational program was left outside the system of "Vyshchyi Instytut Narodn'oi Osvity" (usually called VINO). Instead, the Institut was attached to the Arts Department (Katedra Mystetstva) of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences which during the twenties and especially in the first years of Communist rule functioned as an independent institution. Thus in this new form the Archaeological Institut under the chairmanship of the historian of arts, Fedir Shmit, continued its educational activities up to 1924.

In 1920 Fylypovych was professor of Ukrainian literature at

\(^{47}\) "Zamist' peredmovy", in Zapysky KINO, t.1, 1926, p. 3.

this college. The following are a few words describing this institution at that particular time provided by another of its former lecturers, N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko:

Fylypovych lectured at the Archaeological Institut until 1922 which spans the period of the severe famine in the cities of Ukraine and particularly in Kiev caused by the policies of the occupational forces. The historian, Oleksander Ohloblyn, who was director of the Department of History of VINO, describes those years in Kiev with these words:

The following are a few words describing this institution at that particular time provided by another of its former lecturers, N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko:

Fylypovych lectured at the Archaeological Institut until 1922 which spans the period of the severe famine in the cities of Ukraine and particularly in Kiev caused by the policies of the occupational forces. The historian, Oleksander Ohloblyn, who was director of the Department of History of VINO, describes those years in Kiev with these words:

Колишній університет конав у холоді й голоді... в аудиторіях стояв морозний туман, а нагорі, де бібліотека, була справжня "арктика", і працювати там було справжнім подвигом... Але на цьому не кінчалося. Ще більше, як холоднеча, допікала нам усім думка про хліб.


49. Ibid.

50. O. Ohloblyn, "Spohady pro Mykolu Zerova i Pavla Fylypovycha", in Bezsmertni, p. 216.
N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko in her memoires recollected that

Fylypovych expressed himself on that period of his life in concise poetic form:

\begin{verbatim}
Коли затихнуть двері,
Коли заснуть стільці,
I ялеж без вечері,
I втома на лиці, —

............... ...

I хочь пливе і хоче
Спіймать мої стерно,
Голодне око ночі
Заглянуло в вікно.
\end{verbatim}

In 1922 Fylypovych accepted a position as professor of history of modern Ukrainian literature (from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the 1917 Revolution) at VINO. In 1924 he was joined by M. Zerov who covered the period of

\begin{itemize}
\item 52. P. Fylypovych, Poezii, Miunkhen, IL UVU, 1957, p. 40.
\end{itemize}
the nineteenth century in his course on the history of Ukrainian literature, whereas Fylypovych taught the period covering the first two decades of the twentieth century. In addition, in 1925 they both established and led the Seminar on modern Ukrainian literature (Literaturnyi seminar pidvyshchenoho typu). The Seminar continued until 1929. From 1924 to 1926 Fylypovych was a full-time lecturer and also performed the duties of secretary of the university's administration staff replacing B. Iakubs'kyi who was appointed Pro-rector of VINO.

In 1926 another reform was introduced at the university. At this time it was renamed the "Instytut Narodn'oi Osvity" (Institut of People's Education) which was popularly called KINO (Kyivs'kyi Instytut Narodn'oi Osvity). Also, its structure was reorganized by dividing the entire program of courses as well as its professorial staff into three main


divisions: "Fakul'tet Profesiinoi Osvity" - Profos (Faculty of Professional Education), "Fakul'tet Soysiial'noho Vykhovannia" - Sotsvykh (Faculty of Social Education), and "Robitnichyi Fakul'tet" - Robfakt (Labour Faculty). In general, this reorganization which was accompanied by the introduction of reformed courses lowered the previous standards of the university's educational system. A decline in the quality of lectures was caused also by a struggle between Profos, whose staff defended a scholarly approach to higher education, and the two other faculties, Sotsvykh and Robfakt which were occupied by persons from the Communist party and official circles. From 1926 to 1928 Fylypovych executed the functions of secretary of Profos, the largest among the faculties, which made every effort to preserve the high standards of the university. Besides his duties as a lecturer, Fylypovych elaborated curricula for courses in the history


56. According to a personal interview with O. Fylypovych, Minneapolis, Minn., August 19, 1967.

57. Ibid., and O. Ohloblyn, "Spohady pro Mykolu Zerova i Pavla Fylypovycha", in Bezsmerti, p. 222-223.
of modern Ukrainian literature, prepared reports of the faculty's activities, and finally along with M. Zerov served as advisors for students' organizations and particularly for "Hukus" (Hurtok Kul'tury Ukraïns'koho Slova) which consisted of young writers and literary critics.

Another side of Fylypovych's scholarly activities concerns his work at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences which began in early 1919 as has already been mentioned four months after the founding of this institution. In the minutes of one of the first meetings of the Academy's "Istorychno-Filolohichnyi Viddil" (Historico-Philological Division) of February 27, 1919 the following was recorded:

58. P. Fylypovych, "Prohra na kurstu: Istoryia novoho ukraïns'koho pys'menstva (XIX i XX v.v.) z temamy dlia seminara i korotkoiu bibliohrafieiu", in Biuleten' Metodychnoho konsul'tatsiinoho biura pry Kyivskomu Instytuti Narodn'oi Osvity, 1928, no. 4, p. /14-48/


Regarding the Committee's staff the minutes read:

Певисний склад Постійної Комісії такий: В. С. Бойко, П. І. Зайцев, М. К. Зеров, О. Т. Кисіль, М. А. Іліенко, Ф. П. Филипович, М. М. Марковський, І. Я. Айзенштока, В. А. Ілінов.

This unit of the Academy in which Fylypovych served as secretary from 1919 to 1928 provided the editorial work or otherwise organized the publication with critical commentary of all classics of Ukrainian literature which were then issued in various publishing houses of Kiev and Kharkov. Besides, its members were constant contributors to the Academy's own literary serials and to other periodicals of the time.

In 1923 the Committee initiated a project for the first scholarly edition of Shevchenko's complete works. For this purpose an Editorial Committee was appointed. A special report concerning this reads:


61a. Ibid.
Although the editorial work was completed, the project was not fully accomplished because of Iefremov's arrest. Only two volumes of Shevchenko's works were published: vol. 4 in 1927, and vol. 3 in 1929, in which Fylypovych wrote forty various articles, remarks and explanations.

Fylypovych was one of the founders of the Academy's new literary unit at the beginning of 1920. This was "Istorychno-Literaturne Tovarystvo" (Historical-Literary Society) consisting of forty-nine members in which Fylypovych agreed to serve as secretary. The creation of this society of the Academy which was one of its most popular was accomplished


during the cruel famine in Kiev. Concerning the conditions of the Academy's activities during this period, A. Kryms'kyi, Secretary of the Academy stated in his annual report:

However, instead of absorbing other scientific societies and offering membership opportunities for individual scholars, the Academy was forced to relieve more than the three-fourths of its scholarly staff. In the official report on the Academy's activities for 1922, its Secretary wrote:

64. /A. Kryms'kyi/, Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk; zvidomlenia za 1921 rik, Berlin, Vyd-vo Ukrains'koi molodi, 1923, p. 3-4. The emphasis is the author's own.
Another report indicated that the number of the Academy's staff-members, which during the independence of Ukraine in 1919 was nearly a thousand scholars, was reduced to 82 persons in 1923.⁶⁵⁵ Fylypovych portrayed this situation with artistic skill in his poem:

Тіні людей і камінь —
Важко моїм очам,
Бачу блакитні плями —
Неба дешевий краї.

А серед вулиць купи, —
Всіх заведе одчай,
Хтось обміняє, купить,
Хтось обідніє вирі.

Вийшов і я, бо шуку,
Вийшов та крикнув сам:
Хто проміняє душу!
Душу свою віддаю, —

............... 

... День умира. Убого
Нине небес шатро.
Місто, прокляте Богом!
Кинув тебе і Чорт!⁶⁶

---


Despite such a drastic and painful operation on the Academy's scholarly staff, its vitality declined little. During 1922 its Historico-Philological Division alone gave 176 public lectures and twenty-three of which were organized by the Historico-Literary Society. 67 N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko recollects that

... щось символічне було в тих вечірніх лекціях, коли при світлі кількох наганців, в холоді і сугінках, читалися лекції про вічні цінності культури, про веліки утвори людського генія.68

The Historico-Literary Society was particularly popular not only among members of the Academy but also in cultural circles and especially among graduate students of Kiev. From 1922 to 1927 it performed 167 public lectures (one lecture every two weeks) twenty of which were delivered by Fylypovych. 69 Each of these lectures was devoted to a single problem like the recent discovery of monuments of Ukrainian literature, new views on the relations of Ukrainian writers with foreign literary personalities, the analysis of a


68. N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Kyiv chasiv M. Zerova ta P. Fylypovycha", in Bezsmertni, p. 233.

69. "Spysok pryliudnykh dopovidiv, shcho ikh zachytsly spivrobitnyky I Viddilu", in Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk; zvidomlennia za 1922 rik, Praha, Vyd-vo Ukr. molodi, 1925, p. 93-99, and in Zephysky ITV UAN, kn. 4-5, 1925; kn. 7-8, 1926; kn. 15, 1927. During that period the whole Historico-Philological Division organized 1440 public lectures. Ibid.
literary creation of a single writer, and contemporary developments of modern Ukrainian literature and its criticism. The audience for the lectures varied from fifty to one hundred persons in 1922-1923, and from 200 to 250 persons in 1924-1927. 70

Fylypovych was also known as an editor and co-editor of several scholarly serials and volumes of collected articles. However, all of these publications were discontinued after their first or second issue because of a lack of funds. An innovation of Fylypovych was his plan to publish a whole serial publication dedicated to a single poet. Among these attempts should be noted the first and only volume of Taras Shevchenko edited by Ie. Hryhoruk and Fylypovych in 1921, which was devoted to studies of the life and work of the greatest Ukrainian poet. 71 In 1924 Fylypovych edited a similar volume entitled Shevchenkivs'kyi Zbirnyk which was planned as an annual publication. Contributors to this first issue of the new serial were such literary personalities as S. Iefremov, A. Loboda, B. Iakubs'kyi, and O. Doroshkevych. 72 Then, in

70. P. Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo za 10 rokov revoliutsii", in Literatura, zb. 1, 1928, p. 7.
S. Iefremov, O. Doroshkevych, "Istorychno-Literaturne Tovarystvo", in Zapisy IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1924, p. 209.


1925-1926 he was a co-editor of *Shevchenko i ioho doba* published by the Academy in two volumes\(^7\) which was similar to the Russian serial of that time *Pushkin i ego sovremenniki*. At the same time, Fylypovych was a member of the editorial staff for a volume of collected articles dedicated to another great Ukrainian poet and thinker, Ivan Franko, which was published under the title *Ivan Franko; zbirnyk*.\(^7\) It is appropriate to emphasize that Fylypovych was not only an editor or co-editor of these serial publications but also their major contributor. The last of Fylypovych's attempts to start a scholarly literary serial publication was the first volume of *Literatura* edited by S. Iefremov, M. Zerov and himself in 1928.\(^7\) The destruction of the Ukrainian cultural heritage and its representatives which began in the late twenties curtailed all the Academy's activities including any potential future issues of this journal.

Although some of the Academy's members particularly S. Iefremov and the Kievan Neoclassicists were under constant pressure from the representatives of Marxist ideology especially after the public session of the Literary Discussion of

---

\(^{73}\) *Shevchenko ta ioho doba. Pid redaktsiiieiu S. O. Iefremova, M. M. Noyt's'koho i P. F. Fylypovycha, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1925-26, zb. 1-2.*

\(^{74}\) *Ivan Franko; zbirnyk, Zredahuvaly I. Lakyza, P. Kyianytsia i P. Fylypovych, Kyiv, Knyhopilka, 1926, zb. 1.*

\(^{75}\) *Literatura. Za redaktsiiieiu akad. S. Iefremova, M. Zerova, P. Fylypovycha, Kyiv, 1928, zb. 1.*
1925, the Academy itself was able to extend its activity in a scholarly vein even in spite of its economic straits which were to continue until 1930. Tension between the Academy and official circles began at the end of 1927 when the Moscow regime began to liquidate the opposition and appoint its own people to the top positions in the Communist party (KP(b)U) and the government of Ukraine. Hence, V. Zatons'kyi was appointed as the head of the Kievan Committee of the KP(b)U and P. Liubchenko (ex-Borot'bist, who later became a faithful Bolshevik), as the Secretary of the party's Central Committee.

A little earlier (in the fall of 1926) M. Skrypnyk received the position of the Commissar of Education, replacing O. Shums'kyi who was taken to Moscow and then to the concentration camp of the Solovetski Islands.

A frontal attack on the Academy's humanistic institutions began after the last session of the Literary Discussion in Kharkov of 1928, in which Skrypnyk, Zatons'kyi, and Liubchenko, following the writings of J. Stalin and L. Kaganovich, condemned all non-Marxist approaches in modern Ukrainian


77. Ibid., and N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, Ukrains'ka Akademiiia Nauk: narys istorii, Miunkhen, IVIK SSSR, 1955, v. 1, p. 101-107. In the thirties all of them were attacked by Moscow as "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists". Ibid.
literature and criticism. 78 The attack was directed primarily against the Historico-Philological Division of the Academy. Thus, in 1928 when the first issue of Literatura was published, V. Desniak, a critic of the Communist line wrote in his review:

Методи досліду академістів свідчать про дивовижну обо-гаість а то й цілковиту відсутність пульсування науково-вої літературознавчої думки в наших "академістів", про повну їх безпринципність або принципову мертвенність, свідому чи не свідому нехіт працювати, про принциповий їх консерватизм, і субективна реація випуску такого збірника тільки одна: показати, що "праця" все-таки йде, що певне місце й позиції на літературознавському полі посідається, зберігається, що акція консерватизму не тільки не припиняється, а й росте в бік завуа-лізованого наступу на парості нового літературознавства.79

V. Desniak concluded his review with these words:

З усього цього треба зробити кілька висновків, і перш за все той, що покладати хоч якісь надії на "академічне" літературознавство не можна, що воно цілком зиродніло, не розвинувшись, і перешкоджає настанов-ню нового літературознавства, в процесі "кваліфікації" й "керівництва" псувачи наукову молодь, роблячи з неї безпросвітних ензентиків, бездумних документалістів та консерваторів думки. Це для "академістів" легше ще й тим, що вони посідають і науковий... апарат.79a

Almost at the same time the newly appointed First Secretary of the KP(b)U's Central Committee, S. Kosior, attacked


79a. Ibid.
Павло Филюпович

S Iefremov and the literary scholars of the Academy's Historical-Philological Division on their relations with Ukrainians abroad, stating: "Не випадково закордонна буржуазія фактично використовує деякі елементи з цієї інтелегенції в своїх імперіалістичних інтересах і спробах придушити Радянський Союз". Following Kosior's accusation, the Russian official criticism initiated its direct offensive against the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The article "Idealisty iz ukrainskoi akademii i khudozhestvennye kritiki", published in Na literaturnom postu, belongs with the most typical in this respect. Its author wrote:

Нам думается, что уже пора внести работу Украинской академии наук, украинских музеев, различных научных обществ, существующих при них, за пределы узкого круга специалистов, тем более, что активность их за последнее время сильно возросла... Мы считаем, что пора вскрывать вредность в этой работе и разоблачать этих паломников-искусствоведов, этнографов и критиков, их практику, которая, выступая под заслугой "научной" или художественно-критической работы, составляют в большинстве реакционнейшее крыло на фронте современного украинского искусствоведения. Наши искусствоведческие учреждения не только в центре нашего Союза, но и на местах и в отдельных национальных республиках должны работать под контролем и в окружении советской общественности. (Для последних это особенно важно, поскольку тут мы имеем сложный переплет специфических условий национально-культурного строительства). 81

80. S. Kosior, Pidsumky lystopadovo plenumu TsK WKP(b) i zavdannia kul'turnoho budivnytstva na Ukraini; dopovid' na XIV okruzhnii partiiini konferentsii Kyivshchyny 20 hрудня, 1928, Kharkiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1929, p. 39.

81. E. Kholostenko, "Idealisty iz ukrainskoi akademii i khudozhestvennye kritiki", in Na literaturnom postu, 1929, no. 15, p. 36, 49.
After these and similar writings\textsuperscript{81a} it was evident that a serious crisis for the Academy was imminent. It came in 1930 when two of its three main divisions (Istorychno-Filolohichnyi Viddil, and Socialno-Ekonomichnyi Viddil) were liquidated, and most of their active members relieved.\textsuperscript{82} Forty-five of them including S. Iefremov as their leader were arrested in July 1929 and brought to trial for alleged membership in the underground organization's Union for Liberation of Ukraine (Spilka Vyzvolennia Ukrainy) and the Union of Ukrainian Youth (Spilka Ukrains'koi Molodi).\textsuperscript{83} In 1930 the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was taken over by the Communist party. The statement on this event reads:

\textsuperscript{81a} Here should be included articles of A. Selivakovskii "V bor'be protiv shovinizma", in Na literaturnom postu, 1927, no. 4, p. 43-46, and I. Mykytenko, "Proletars'ka liteatura za doby rekonstruktsii; z dopovidi na II z'izdi VUSPPu", in HART, 1929, no. 9, p. 27-63.

\textsuperscript{82} "Vytiah z protokola No. 8, Zasidannia Prezydii Vse-ukraïns'koi Akademii Nauk, 7 berezenia, 1930 roku", in Visti VUAN, 1930, no. 2, p. 1-3.


\textsuperscript{83} "According to some accounts, the arrests affected up to 5,000 persons, although only 45 were brought to public trial in Kharkiv, from March 9 through April 19, 1930", V. Holubnychy, "The struggle against Ukrainian nationalism", in Ukraine: a concise encyclopaedia, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1963, p. 818.
During that period Fylypovych was appointed for the last time to a committee of the Academy; this time he had to serve with O. Doroshkevych and M. Novyts'kyi under the chairmanship of B. G. Prokof'ev as a member of the ad hoc committee for an inventory of the materials found in S. Iefremov's office.

After this last appointment, Fylypovych was separated from the activities of the Academy. He and his Neoclassicist colleagues were under bitter attack not only by the Marxist literary critics but also by the official statements of the Communist party. Almost all official newspapers and popular journals of that time condemned them as "representatives of bourgeois reactionary forces" and "enemies of the proletariat".

84. "Kolektyv VUAN pro spravu SVU", in Visti VUAN, 1930, no. 6, p. 18.

85. Report of this committee is contained in Appendix No. 6.

There is some evidence that until his arrest in 1935 Fylypovych taught at the KINO which during the second wide-spread famine in Ukraine in 1932-1933 was reorganized and renamed Kiev State University (Kyivs'kyi Derzhavnyi Universytet). 87

Fylypovych enjoyed one happy moment during these trying years when in 1930 he married the talented sculptor Mariia Mykhailiuk. After her husband's arrest she became mentally ill. Despite her illness she was arrested in 1938 and was sent without trial to a concentration camp in Siberia. 88

During his activities at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the University of Kiev from 1919 to 1934, Fylypovych published approximately eighty-six literary and critical monographs, essays, and articles, as well as twenty-eight reviews on the works of Ukrainian and foreign writers. Three of his studies were issued as separate books, and most of the others were published in the following fifteen serials and periodicals: the publications of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: Etnohrafichnyi visnyk, Ukraina, Visti VUAN, Zepysky IFV UAN, Zbirnyk zakhodoznavstva; literary periodicals: Knyhar, Muzahet; periodicals devoted to literature and social-


88. Ibid., p. 9, also his "Spomyny pro brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 127.
cultural life: Chervonyi shliakh, Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, Nova hromada, Zhyttia i revoliutsiia; historico-literary periodical: Nashe mynule; bibliographical periodical: Bibliolohichni visti; popular newspapers: Hlobus, Proletars'ka pravda.

Fylypovych's role as a poet, or "poet-myslytel'" (poet-thinker), as V. Derzhavyn characterized him, represents another side of his creative power, but its analysis belongs to a different sphere of research.

Personality, scholarly portrait, and research approach.

In order to portray Fylypovych's personality as a scholar it is necessary to describe some of his characteristics as an individual. For this purpose there are several helpful sketches concerning certain moments of his life written by his friends and students. In addition, interviews with Metropolitan Ilarion (I. Ohienko), and Ie. Radzimovs'kyi, who at the present time is a professor of Chemistry at the University of Illinois, assist to a certain extent in portraying Fylypovych's personality.

89. Here are not included those literary serial publications which were issued under Fylypovych's editorship.

90. V. Derzhavyn, "Velykyi poet - myslytel'", in P. Fylypovych, Poezii, Miunkhen, IL UVU, 1957, p. 15.
H. Kostiuk, who was a student of Fylypovych and M. Zerov in the second half of the twenties (1926-1929), describes his former lecturer, Fylypovych, with these words: "Він був брізнь із легка витким волоссям, росту вищого, ніж середній. Мав рівний ніс, досить великі риси обличчя, під- стрижени вусики і близькі карі очі, з проникливо-глибоким поглядом". Ie. Radzimovs'kyi, who knew Fylypovych while he was a lecturer in KINO, recollects that he was always very correct and polite in conversation and generally very restrained and reserved. "It seemed", Radzimovs'kyi said, "that he did not know how to jest". 91

O. Ohloblyn, who was Fylypovych's younger university colleague and fellow lecturer at KINO, also recognized these features of his character, but emphasized that at times Fylypovych was quite joyful and direct particularly when he was in the company of good friends. Ohloblyn recollects an episode of such an occasion:

---


An original portrait of Fylypovych's individuality was sketched by V. Petrov who had known him since 1918. In his "Bolotiana liukroza" Petrov stated:

Fylypovych's Weltanschauung and especially his ideologico-political standpoint was far from that of Communism. First of all he was a literary scholar and poet,


93. V. Domontovych, "Bolotiana liukroza", in Ridne slovo, 1946, ch. 9-10, p. 51.
and these fields of activity absorbed him entirely.93a An interesting episode regarding Fylypovych's attitude towards politics can be found in his biography. It reads:

"... в моїй пам'яті зберігається образ надзвичайно скромної людини, що завжди говорила добірною українською мовою. Я думаю, що не помилиюсь, коли скажу, що, крім тих, що на фронті, ніхто й не знає, мабуть, у Карасані, що та скромна людина і е поет Филипович. На так званих вечорах самодіяльності він не виступав ні разу. Не пригадую я також, щоб ми вели з ним розмови на політичні теми, і мені здається, що я в його руках ніколи не бачив ні "Правди", ні "Ізвестий"; зате "Літературну" і "Літературну" він завжди проглядав".94

During the twenties there were approximately 136 lecturers at the University of Kiev or VINO and KINO, as it was called at that time, who were divided into nine faculty ranks.95 Fylypovych and M. Zerov, who taught the history of Ukrainian literature, as well as O. Doroshkevych (methodology

93a. N. Hordiievs'ka, "Choho ia navchylas' vid Pavla Fylypovycha", in Ukraїns'ka literaturna hazeta, 1959, ch. 11, p. 5.

94. N. (a cryptonym of the author of a letter sent from Ukraine to Fylypovych's biographer), O. Fylypovych, "Spomyny pro brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 128.

95. According to the University's official report for 1926, the 136 lecturers were divided into the following nine ranks: "Shtatni profesory 1-i hrupy" - 7 persons; "Shtatni profesory 2-i hrupy" - 20; "Pozashtatni profesory" - 20; "Shtatni vykladachi 1-i hrupy" - 9; "Shtatni vykladachi 2-i hrupy" - 27; "Pozashtatni vykladachi" - 16; "Navchal'ni asystenty" - 6; "Tekhnichni asystenty" - 5; "Vykladachi Bobfaktu" - 25. "Spysok nauchno-pedahohichnoho personalu Kyivs'koho I.N.O. na 1 lypnia 1926 roku", in Zapysky KINO, t. 1, 1926, p. 135-137.
PAVLO FYLYPOVYCH

in literature and the Ukrainian language), S. Savchenko
(history of world literature and the French language),
B. Iakubs'kyi (history of Russian literature and methodology
in literature), O. Ohloblyn (history of Ukraine), and
others, almost all in the humanities, belonged to the
second highest rank which was called "Shtatni profesory 2-1
hrupy". As a lecturer, Fylypovych was known as one of the
most capable in his discipline. His teaching ability is
usually compared with that of his friend M. Zerov who,
besides possessing a thorough knowledge of his subject
matter, was a brilliant orator and a candid advisor to his
students. H. Kostiuk, comparing both his lecturers,
characterizes Fylypovych in these words:

Читав нам Павло Петрович курс нового українського
письменства, з кінця XIX століття починаючи і реvo-
люцією 1917 року кінчаючи... З усіх дослідників
цієї доби він був найавторитетнішим і найглибшим.
Принаймні для нас, сьогодення студентської молоді.
Різнича він від свого друга Зерова значно мень-
шою красомовністю, меншою здібністю до соціоло-
гічних узагальнень, але (принаймні нам так здава-
лось) більшим знанням літературних джерел і фак-
тів.96a

96. "Spysok nauchno-pedahohichnoho personalu Kyivs'-
koho I.N.O. na 1 lypnia 1926 roku", in Zapisoky KINO, t. 1,
1926, p. 135.

96a. H. Kostiuk, "M. Zerov, P. Fylypovych, M. Drai-
Khmara", in Ukrains'ka literaturna hazeta, 1960, no. 2, p. 5.
Kostiuk considered Fylypovych as a scholar with an encyclopedic knowledge in the field of literature and stated that

Від нього можна було довідатися про зовсім забуті джерела, про третьорядні деталі творчої біографії незнаних поетів... Лекції Филиповича не були такими фесрично-ефективними, як лекції Зерова. Але відзначалися вони методичністю, переконливою послідовністю думки, всебічною аналізом мистецького явища і завжди майже вичерпною документацією. Поет, що органічно виріс на багатстві загально-європейської поезії XIX і початків XX століття, він у своїх лекціях був віртуозним аналітиком літературно-мистецьких явищ.97

Kostiuk's reminiscences are close to the thoughts of V. Petrov expressed in his "Boletiana liukroza". Finally it is worthwhile to quote the opinion about Fylypovych as a lecturer of another of his students, the poet T. Os'machka:

Виклади його (Филиповича — Д.Ш.) були ясні, точні й багаті фактами та аргументами. За це студенти його дуже шанували. З усіма був рівний, а в професорській діяльності вимогливий, що нас не обтягувало, а навпаки — підбадьорувало і тримало високо професорський авторитет. А до таких, що почали вже в літературі, він ставився з особливою увагою і завжди ділився з ними своїми вражіннями і від критики, і від критикованих творів.97a


It should be emphasized that Fylypovych and the other Neoclassicists with the exception of M. Zerov and their older colleague and close adherent M. Mohylians'kyi very seldom took part in literary polemics even during the Literary Discussion. This occurred in spite of the fact that the period saw many such polemics and although the Neoclassicists themselves had initiated that phenomenon in the Ukrainian literary criticism of the 1920's. However, it happened to be Fylypovych who actually started the Literary Discussion with his introductory speech at the public meeting organized by the Kievan Neoclassicists on March 15, 1925. In general Fylypovych was

97b. On March 15, 1925 the "Kul'tkomisiiia Mistskому" of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences organized "Vechir orychnoi i perekladnoi literatury" in which Fylypovych delivered an introductory speech and all Neoclassicists including M. Mohylians'kyi were main discussants. This meeting was tentatively reviewed by A. Lisovy in his "P'ijatro z Parnasu" in Bil'shovyk, 1925, no. 57, p. 17, to which Zerov, Fylypovych, and Mohylians'kyi responded with their articles in the same periodical, no. 61-63. All these articles stimulated further interest and response and finally the first of M. Khvyl'ovy's articles "Satana v bochtci" appeared which provided a good opportunity for further public discussion on the improvement of Ukrainian literature of the twenties. That discussion, which was held on May 24, 1925, was initiated again by the same institution in which the Neoclassicists and their colleagues played a leading role. The principal disputants at the meeting were Zerov, Fylypovych, Ryl's'kyi, Mohylians'kyi, the main speaker Iv. Ivaniv-Mezheiko, and O. Doroshkevych who was the chairman of the meeting. To this panel discussion were invited representatives of other literary groups and organizations like B. Kovalenko, V. Desniak, V. Pidmohyl'nyi, S. Shchupak, B. Antonenko-Davydovych, I. Le, M. Ivchenko, V. Nychaiy'ska, and I. Zhyhal'tsa. Shliakhovy rozvytku suchasnoi literatury: dysput 14 travlja 1925, Kyiv, Kul'komisiiia Mistskomu UAN, 1925, 52 p., also Iv. Klen, Spohady pro neoklasykyiv, Münchhen, Nakl. UCVM, 1947, p. 11-17. According to L. Bilets'kyi there were about 800 people at this meeting. L. Bilets'kyi, "Umovy literaturnoi pratsi na Ukraini", in Nova hromada, 1927, vh. 10-11, p. 80.
not a capable polemist, and perhaps this was one of the reasons he avoided all opportunities to defend his and his fellow Neoclassicists' literary position. H. Kostiuk stated in this respect:

Ha протилежність до Зерова Філипович ніколи не встра- вав у літературну полеміку. Він не мав того полеміч- ного бойового запалу, яким позначена була не одна праця Зерова. Звичайно, його поезії і деякі літера- турно-критичні есеї мали в собі елементи полеміки. Але вони були глибоко заховані за образами в пер- шому випадку і за строго науковою аналізовою фактів та документів у другому.97b

Fylypovych's last public appearance as a disputant was during the meeting on May 24, 1925 where his remarks in discussion were not eloquent but contained much that was illustrative of the author's erudition.98 It might be assumed that another reason for Fylypovych's avoidance of further participation in the Literary Discussion was his attempt to obviate pressure from official circles, which did actually begin after these two public appearances of the Neoclassicists. Such response by Fylypovych, created by the predominant atmosphere of general fear of official accusation which usually ended with penal servitude in Siberian concentration camps, was evident during the SVU trial when at the meeting of the Academy's

98. Appendix, No. 7.
membership he had to accuse his former superior S. Iefremov. Fylypovych found himself in a similar critical situation during the second famine in Ukraine in 1933 at which time he was using his pre-revolutionary pen name "P. Zorev". However, all such appearances and articles of Fylypovych commanded by the regime were unable to destroy his previous popularity as scholar and poet.

As a literary scholar Fylypovych belonged to that category of specialists who never attempted to work in another field even relatively close to his own. In the sphere of literature he studied writings in Ukrainian as well as in Russian and the Western European languages where in order to indicate aesthetic and artistic values he largely ignored national borders. However, he clearly designated these boundaries when a question arose concerning a literary work as the product of a particular nation to which its creator belonged. In general Fylypovych employed the inductive method in his literary research which he inherited from the University of Kiev and especially from Peretts's Seminar. In the 1920's


100. P. Zorev, "Okkupatsiia; istoricheskii ocherk (k 15-letiiu osvobozhdения Ukrainy ot nemetskoi okkupatsii", in Krasnaia nov', 1934, no. 1, p. 154-162.
this method was widely applied by his fellow-scholars in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Hence, Fylypovych always attempted to base his research on an analysis of primary sources like manuscripts and first editions. In searching for them he often visited archives and libraries in Petersburg, Nizhyn, Moscow, Kharkov, and Kiev. When searching for needed materials for a subject he often came across other sources concerning Ukrainian culture from which he compiled bibliographical lists in order to serve scholars of that particular field. Fylypovych was especially precise in handling bibliographical data. V. Petrov recollected that

"Павло Филяпович був надзвичайно гордий, коли Ному пощастило з'ясувати ініціалы присвятити в одній з поезій Боратинського" 104 Consequently, the bibliography of his own works was always exactlying prepared for the Academy's publications.


In striving for objectivity in his research, Fylypovych delivered almost all of his main critical works as papers for open discussion at the conferences and meetings of the Historical-Literary Society of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Only after such a process were they sent for publication. As a matter of fact, this custom of presenting research papers for public discussion was followed by the Academy's scholars from 1920 to 1928.

In his reminiscences, Metropolitan Ilarion (I. Ohiienko) stated that Fylypovych was one of the most serious young scholars he had known during the early twenties. According to the Metropolitan, he was one of the best educated literary figures of his generation and one who transmitted his knowledge and learning effectively to the younger generation through his university lectures, and furthermore enriched Ukrainian literary criticism by means of his valuable studies.

Influences on Fylypovych's critical writings.

The following four main centers of influence on Fylypovych's manner of critical research can be identified: 1) Peretts's school; 2) literary scholars of the older generation; 3) foreign literary criticism, and 4) the contemporary, especially Kievan, literary circles.

105. According to a personal interview with Metropolitan Ilarion in Winnipeg, Man., August 12, 1966.
The basic authority among them was Peretts’s Seminar at the University of Kiev on the history of Russian philology in which Fylypovych was a full participant during his university days. However, the future literary scholar belonged among those few students of the Seminar who declined to follow the philological principles of Peretts in their own studies later, although they did complete their Seminar assignments to the order of their teacher. Hence, Fylypovych’s Seminar work, which he prepared on the basis of his research in Moscow’s "Synodal'naia" Library according to the philological method, was published along with the preliminary works in Peretts’s official university report. For Fylypovych, who was impressed with the richness of literary developments in the nineteenth century including the creative works of the French Parnassians, Peretts’s philological school was less engaging since it did not focus on modern literature. This was emphasized by Fylypovych himself in his survey of 1928 on the development of Ukrainian literature during the post-revolutionary period in which he wrote:

106. During the early twenties Peretts did not recognize Fylypovych as his follower. Peretts dedicated his Kratkii ocherk metodolofii istorii russkoj literature to his former students and followers of his philological school. Fylypovych’s name was not among them. Appendix, No. 4.

Consequently, Fylypovych prepared several Seminar papers on literary developments of the nineteenth century for the professor of Russian literature, A. Loboda, who was Peretts's assistant in the Seminar. Later under the advice and guidance of Loboda who actually directed him to the study of the Pushkin Pleiad, Fylypovych expanded one of the most valuable of his papers into the gold medal dissertation on E. A. Boratynskii. The research approach derived from Peretts's methodology gave Fylypovych not only a scholarly introduction to this research system, but also figured in


all his literary studies thereafter. In addition it was the comparative method in Peretts's philological principles of literary analysis which introduced Fylypovych to the sphere of comparative studies which was reinforced later in his main works. Moreover, from Peretts's research methodology he obtained a basis for inductive literary analysis which led him to archival records and primary sources. Finally, the followers of Peretts's philological school were in close contact with Fylypovych as fellow-workers at the University of Kiev and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences during the twenties.

The older generation of Ukrainian scholars with whom Fylypovych collaborated at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences from its founding in 1918 influenced him as an individual and as a literary critic in two aspects: 1) his philosophical conception of the world (Weltanschauung), and 2) his scholarly activities and research. The development of the first aspect was due first of all to his uncle, Mykhailo

111. These aspects are especially evident in such works of Fylypovych as "ob avtore stikhotvoreniiia 'Kakaia esto storona!'", in Universitetskaia izvestia, 1916, no. 10-12; "Do tekstu 'Moskalia Charivnyka'", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1924; "Etneografiichne neporozuminnia z virshem Ia. Shchokhovleva", in Etneografiichni visionky, kn. 8, 1929; "Pereklad Kotliarevs'-koho iz Sapfo", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 13-14, 1927, and "Frymitky do Shevchenkovoho shchodennika", in Povne zbirannia tvoriv T. Shevchenka za red. S. Iefremova, t. 4, Shchodennik, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1927.
Hordiievs'kyi, with whom Fylypovych enjoyed close family relations. He was a prominent scholar and philosopher as well as one of the leaders of the "Ukrainization" of Odessa during his professorship at the University of Odessa in the twenties. The second person in this respect was the academician Serhii Iefremov. The close cooperation between Fylypovych and Iefremov began in 1918 when the latter was also active as one of those prominent in the Ukrainian independence movement. During that period Fylypovych was appointed as secretary of the Academy's Committee for the Publication of Monuments of Modern Ukrainian Literature of which Iefremov was the chairman. In 1920 when the Historico-Literary Society was created, it was led again by Iefremov and Fylypovych. In addition, Fylypovych always participated on the editorial committees for the Academy's chief literary publications which were directed by Iefremov such as Shevchenko ta ioho doba, Povne zibrannia tvoriv T. Shevchenka, and Literatura.

Fylypovych's biographer mentions that Iefremov was especially welcome and respected within the circle of Fylypovych's literary friends. Although Fylypovych remained rather distant from

112. O. Fylypovych emphasized that "свідомий українець ще до революції 1917 року, М. Гордієвський, безперечно, мав вплив на формування фронтової національної соломості". O. Fylypovych, "Spomyny pro brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 112. N. Hordiievs'ka, "Choho ia navchylas' vid Pavla Fylypovycha", Ibid., p. 130-146.

113. O. Fylypovych, "Spomyny pro brata", in Bezsmertni, p. 117.
Iefremov's concept of literary research, he admired his profound knowledge of literary and social problems and his enormous devotion to the development of Ukrainian culture. 114 Thus, when Fylypovych was forced to criticize Iefremov during the SVU trial, his words concerned only the "obsolete" principles of the academician's literary studies and not his ideological views. 115

As a member of the Academy, Fylypovych was free to publish his literary works in publications which were under the control of men of the older generation like such leading figures and high-ranking members of the Academy as Iefremov himself, Fylypovych's former teacher A. Loboda, the historian D. Bahalii, the literary scholar and specialist of Shevchenko M. Novyts'kyi, the historian of arts O. Novyts'kyi, and the historian M. Hrushevs'kyi after he returned from abroad in early 1924. Almost all of these scholars also helped Fylypovych in his own editorship of serial publications by contributing their essays and articles. 116 D. Bahalii even

114. P. Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo za 10 rokiv revoliutsii", in Literatura, zb. 1, 1928, p. 11, 14, 21-23.


co-authored with Fylypovych the criticism of Shevchenko's poem "Iefretyk". Without a doubt the close cooperation with these prominent personalities left a mark on the future work of the young scholar. These traces are particularly evident in his understanding of historico-sociological trends and their role in the development of Ukrainian literature, as well as in the application of the comparative method. In this regard, he greatly admired his predecessors like M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, O. Kolessa, M. Sumtsov, A. Loboda, and M. Hrushev'skyi.

In contrast to these observations which indicate Fylypovych's direct relations with Peretts's school and the Kievian literary circles of the older generation, it is difficult to precisely delineate similar ties to foreign literary criticism. However, there are some traces which point to Fylypovych's literary connections with the Russian formalists and through them with the Prague structuralists.

During the early twenties, the formalistic trend of literary criticism was not only actively discussed among

118. P. Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo za 10 rokiv revoliutsii", in Literatura, zb. 1, 1928, p. 28. --------, "Peredmova", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 4.
Ukrainian critics but also found strong adherents. Its leading representative, Iu. Ivaniv-Mezhenko, using the theoretical concept of O. Potebnia as a basis, elaborated a new formalistic formula in which he stated: "Час переходу до точного знання настиг. Мистецтво слова мусить піти в рівень зі всіма людськими знаннями; для цього є лише один шлях — формалізм". II9 In 1926, after the literary meeting in Kharkov at which B. Eichenbaum, a prominent member of the Russian group, the Society for the Study of Poetic Language, or as it was called Opoiaz (Obshchestvo izuchenia poeticheskogo iazyka), delivered his paper on the theoretical basis of formalism, 120 the discussion began again. As a result, the formalistic trend was condemned by the Marxist critics as a bourgeois and anti-Marxist literary theory. 121 In his survey of the development of post-revolutionary Ukrainian literary criticism, Fylypovych expressed his


120. B. Eikhenbaum, "Teoriia 'formal'noho metodu'", Ibid., 1926, no. 7-8, p. 182-207.

121. Criticism of Eichenbaum's paper and Opoiaz's formalism was published in articles by: A. Shamrai, "Formal'nyi metod u literaturi", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1926, no. 7-8, p. 233-266; Z. Chuchmar'ov, "Sotsiolohichnyi metod v istorii ta teorii literatury", Ibid., p. 208-323; V. Boiko, "Formalizm i Marksyzm", Ibid., no. 11-12, p. 141-164, and others.
thoughts on the formalistic method stating that "захоплення чистим "формалізмом" та ізоляції літератури від соціологічних процесів на Україні не спостерігалось. Наслідників Шкловського не знаходилося". However, at the conclusion of his remarks he emphasized: "Але критикуючи крайності "формалістів" - це зовсім не значить - зріктись формальних досліджень. Навпаки, вони знайшли загальне визнання, бо тільки через них можна зрозуміти специфіку літературних творів, збудувати наукове "літературознавство". In 1929 when the Kievan Neoclassicists as well as the Opoiazists were under attack by the official Marxist criticism, Fylypovych sent a newly published volume of his literary essays to Roman Jakobson with the dedication: "Бп. Р. І. Якобсонові від автора. Київ, І929. ІІ. 8.". Although Jakobson, who at that time was a leading figure of the Prague structuralists, and Fylypovych never met, this gesture of the Kievan Neoclassicist might be seen as symbolic indicating Fylypovych's literary


124. -------, Z novitn'oho ukraïns'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, title page.

125. During conversations with R. Jakobson on May 2, 1961, and on May 4, 1966, he stated that he had never met Fylypovych and did not know him.
connections with the Prague international group of structuralists. Fylypovych not only defended some facets of the literary analysis accepted by the Russian formalists and their followers the structuralists in the survey mentioned above but also joined them to the comparative method and in such a combination utilized them in his literary studies. It is worthy of note that the prominent literary critic of later years, M. Hnatyshak, who in his critical works was close to the principles of the Kievan Neoclassicists and especially to Fylypovych's manner, declared himself an adherent of the Prague Slovo a slovestnost. During the late 1940's V. Derzhavyn, the apologist of the Kievan Neoclassicists also exhibited much in common with D. Chyzhevs'kyi, the Ukrainian representative of structuralism, in their literary discussion. Probably this is one reason

126. Hnatyshak's "Zakliata dochka: S. Rudans'koho", in Pratsi UIFTP, t. 2, 1939, has almost all the features of Fylypovych's comparative studies such as "Tsvit iabluni' M. Kotsiubyns'koho", in Knyhar, 1919, no. 4-6, or "Misiachna Lehenda" L. Ukrainky", in L. Ukrainka, Tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927, v. 3.


why the latter designated Zerov and Fylypovych as representatives of Ukrainian formalism and almost repeated Fylypovych's statement that

... серед українських дослідників майже не було представників крайнього формалізму, які були серед росіян та твердили, що зміст літературного твору взагалі не має ніякого значення або що він цілком залежний від форми. 129

All these traces lead to the conclusion that the connections between Fylypovych and these foreign literary groups did indeed exist as his critical works also attest.

Finally, the fourth factor influential in Fylypovych's scholarly activities and his literary studies was his close relationship with the literary scholars of his generation who may be designated the vanguard searching for new directions in the Ukrainian literary criticism of that time. The first to introduce Fylypovych to this sphere was M. Zerov. He edited and published Fylypovych's first Ukrainian critical articles and essays in Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, and Knyhar, 130 and also was one of the first to review his poetic


130. P. Fylypovych, "Moloda ukrains'ka poeziia", Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk, 1919, no. 4-6.

---

"Tsvit iablu" M. Kotsiubyns'koho", in Knyhar, 1919, no. 21.
as well as his critical works. As a colleague at the University of Kiev and the actual leader of the Kievan Neoclassicists, Zerov was a source of encouragement to Fylypovych in his poetic creations, and provided assistance in many aspects of his work. In his analysis of Fylypovych's poetry, V. Derzhavyn described the relationship with Zerov in these words:

Similar to Derzhavyn's words are the reminiscences of H. Kostiuk in which he mentioned a reciprocal and mutually stimulating relationship between Fylypovych and Zerov.

To the circle of Fylypovych's friends and fellow critics his biographer also assigned three other Neoclassicists, M. Ryl's'kyi, O. Burhardt, and M. Drai-Khmara, and V. Petrov,
A. Nikovs'kyi, K. Holoskevyeh, as well as B. Iakubs'kyi who in the late 1920's was criticizing the literary approach of the Neoclassicists. With this group should also be included A. Lebed' and K. Koperzhyns'kyi who was a frequent reviewer of Fylypovych's literary works. The frequent semi-private discussions of this close circle of literary scholars, usually on literary topics, was an additional influence on Fylypovych's attitude toward his scholarly activity and research work.

His older colleague at the Academy, M. Markovs'kyi, was one of the prominent scholars who criticized Fylypovych's literary studies. As a matter of fact, they both often exchanged critical reviews on each other's research work and these at times bore quite a polemic character. Nevertheless, Markovs'kyi might be described as a check on Fylypovych's objectivity in research.

In general, all the schools, literary groups, and persons discussed above contributed to the formation of Fylypovych's personality as a modern literary scholar and actively stimulated his achievements in this field.

134. O. Fylypovych, "Spomyny pro brata", in Bezamertni, p. 117.
136. P. Fylypovych, "Novi pratsi pro I. Kotliarevs'-koho (z nahody 90-tykh rokovyn smerty Kotliarevs'koho)", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1928, ch. 12, p. 46-64.
III.

LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

When applying the comparative method to his literary studies, Fylypovych was consistent in following its theoretical principles and modified them only when he found it necessary to define the role of a particular poet or writer in the development of a national literature. Hence he chose for his analysis such subjects as single works of Ukrainian writers and their connections, especially in the aesthetic sense, with Ukrainian folklore and with the writings of foreign literary personalities of the same periods. In this analysis he looked for literary traces from the creations of preceding native and foreign authors. This method was applied also in his comparative descriptions of the literary works of two poets regardless of the period of their life and creativity or national origin. Finally, the comparative method was used in his studies on the poetry of single poets in order to define their relations with a particular literary trend.

Following his own formula:

Дослідник завжди повинен мати на увазі можливі запозичення чи наслідування, які іноді можуть зменшити безпосереднє значення того чи іншого твору, або, навпаки, в своєрідності обробки чужого мотиву виразно виявити поетове обличчя.

Fylypovych attempted to present in

1. P. Fylypovych, "Shliakhy Frankovoi poezii", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 6.
in his analysis new light on the problem at hand and to provide a basis for further work on a particular author and his literary period. To this category of Fylypovych's critical works belong his essays on Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko and Lesia Ukrainka.

Research on Romanticism and the poetry of Taras Shevchenko.

In the early 1920's comparative studies on Shevchenko's creative work were initiated by literary scholars in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and particularly by Fylypovych, at almost the same time at which the official line of the Communist camp and the Marxist critics were not only attempting to portray Shevchenko as a "poet of the peasantry", and a "representative of the proletariat", but also concurrently condemning his early poetry as a poor expression of Shevchenko's nationalistic tendencies which were said to be based on a narrow peasant philosophy. Thus, in general the

S. Mikhailovich, "Kobzar' bednoty", in Proletarskaja pravda, 1923, No. 56, p. 2-3.

A. Richyts'kyi, Taras Shevchenko v svitli epokhy, Berlin, Kosmos, 1923, p. 49-50. These works will be taken into close consideration in chapter 4 of this dissertation.
atmosphere created rather hindered scholarly research on Shevchenko and his period. However, most literary scholars including the Kievan Neoclassicists and their adherents who took advantage of the relative liberalism in the Academy began serious and scholarly investigations on the greatest Ukrainian poet.

To the existing works on Shevchenko and his period based on the comparative method, Fylypovych contributed his essays like: "Shevchenko i romantyzm" in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923; "Do istorii rann'oho ukraïns'koho romantyzmu", in Ukraina, 1924, kn. 3, and "Shevchenko i Hrebinka", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2. All these essays supplement each other and compose in this way a unified whole.¹

In the first part of "Shevchenko i romantyzm" which analyzes new studies on Romanticism, Fylypovych emphasized that this literary trend developed differently in different literatures. In the process of its appearance in various literatures, this trend appropriated certain native features and in this manner was represented in the creative works of individual writers. In this respect Fylypovych stated:

¹. Fylypovych used in his studies on Shevchenko both the comparative-aesthetic and the comparative-sociological methods. Those of his works are considered here to which he applied the comparative-aesthetic method.
It is worthy of mention that in 1956 R. Wellek and A. Warren in their definition of Romanticism came to a conclusion identical to Fylypovych's which reads: "We can compare English Romanticism with the different Romantics in France and Germany and can study the parallels or alleged parallels with the Romantic movement in the fine arts. The problems will be different in every time and place: it seems impossible to make general rules".6

Approaching the main part of his study dealing with Shevchenko, Fylypovych pointed out the contributions to this problem made by the critical works of O. Kolessa,7 J. Tretiak,8 and D. Ovsianyko-Kulykovs'kyi.9 However, in Fylypovych's

5. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 4.
7. O. Kolessa, "Shevchenko i Mitskevych", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 3, 1894, p. 36-152.
8. O. Tretiak, Pro vplyv Mitskevycha na poeziiu Shevchenka, Krakiv, Nakl. avtora, 1892, 61 p.
opinion, the characteristic of Shevchenko in this respect is still less satisfactory, and he attempted to add his interpretation on the influence of Romanticism on Shevchenko's poetry. The scholar's aim was not only to analyze the particular literary works of the poet and to indicate their connections with this literary trend, but also to describe the literary atmosphere surrounding Ukrainian writers during the 1820's and 1830's which prevailed after the revival of Ukrainian literature with the appearing of I. Kotliarev's Eneida in 1798. Mentioning the traditional statement that the first step of Romanticism in Ukrainian literature was the appearance in 1827 of P. Hulak-Artemov's ballad "Rybalka", a free translation of J. W. Goethe's "Fischer", Fylypovych added:

10. I. Aizenshtok, "Vstupna stattia", in P. Hulak-Artemov'skyy, Tvory, Kharkiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1927, p. 75. It would be appropriate to mention that in the same year Goethe was nominated as an honorary member of the Senate of the University of Kharkiv where Hulak-Artemov'skyi was a lecturer. "Hete", in Ukrains'ka radians'ka entsyklopediia, Kyiv, 1960, v. 3, p. 223-224.
In Hulak-Artemovs'kyi's version of Goethe's ballad such diminutive expressions popular in Ukrainian folk songs might be found as "рибалка молоденький", "серденько", "козаченько", "солнечко и месяц червоненький" and in addition exclamations like "сміх", "гулък" and "тьох" which Fylypovych considered not as elements of travesty, but as those typical for folk songs and tales, for Kotliarevs'kyi's Eneida, and for the stories of H. Kvitka-Osnovianenko based on the life and customs of the people. Fylypovych considered the sentimental character of Hulak-Artemovs'kyi's ballad a typical Ukrainian feature which distinguished it from the German and Russian manner and brought it nearer to French romantic poetry. 12


12. The connection between folk songs and the sentimental style in French literature was discussed by R. de Souza in his La poesie populaire et le lyrisme sentimental, Paris, 1899, of which Fylypovych took notice.
He emphasized that elements of folk-lore used by Hulak-Artemovs'kyi made his ballad quite different from its German original; it became simpler, livelier, and softer. Thus the first attempt at transplanting Romanticism from Western European into Ukrainian poetry was successful because there was available the rich soil of folk poetry. This "baladnyi" beginning of Hulak-Artemovs'kyi was followed by the ballad "Molodytsia" which was published in Viestnik Evropy, 1828, and signed by a cryptonym "N-". Fylypovych indicated that Ie. Hrebinka considered Hulak-Artemovs'kyi the author of the ballad. In 1829 L. Borovykovs'kyi published his ballad "Marusia" which was a Ukrainian version of Zhukovskii's "Svetlana" (itself a Russian rendition of G. A. Buerger's "Lenore"), and in 1830 he wrote an original, purely romantic ballad "Kozak". In giving critical attention to this poem, Fylypovych emphasized that M. Dashkevych compared it to the

13. In describing the first romantic poems of Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, Fylypovych did not mention his ballad "Tvardovs'kyi", which was a free translation of Mickiewicz's "Pani Twardowska". A reason for this might be the character of travesty in the poem.

14. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i Hrebinka", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 33-34. B. Novyts'kyi stated that Borovykovs'kyi was the author of this ballad. B. Novyts'kyi, "Problema Shevchenkovoi tvorchoi metody", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1932, no. 8-10, p. 113.
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Ukrainian folk song "Za Neman' idu". As a matter of fact, Borovykovs'kyi's ballad "Kozak", which was fully quoted in Fylypovych's study "Do istorii rann'oho ukrains'koho romantyzmu", inspired the poet's later romantic poems and especially his popular "Rozstavannia" which was based on Ukrainian folk songs. The ballad was first published in Ukra"

inskii al'manakh in 1831, edited by I. Sreznevs'kyi and I. Roskovshenko, which Fylypovych considered another significant step towards Romanticism in Ukrainian literature. According to Fylypovych, this collected volume caused an interesting reaction on the part of Ie. Hrebinka. In a letter to I. Kul'zhyns'kyi, his former teacher Hrebinka praised some parts of Ukra"

inskii al'manakh with these words: "... Боровиковский в "Козаке" не подражает; онъ облагородил языка малороссийскй, представленный на судь публики Г.ъ Котляревским в трактирно-бурлакских формахъ. Словом... Украинский Альманахъ мне нравится какъ родной швётокъ, какъ первый звукъ ожившей народной поэзии, какъ доказательство, что украинцы начинаютъ (въ дофий часъ) чувствовать самособйность своей лите-

ратуры". Although in following the Enaid manner

---

15. Dashkevych's statement was corrected by Fylypovych: the poem "Za Neman' idu" was written by S. Pysarevs'kyi and later became a folk song.

16. The letter was found by Fylypovych in the archives of "Pushkinskii Dom" in Peterburg. P. Fylypovych, "Do istorii rann'oho ukrains'koho romantyzmu", in Ukraina, 1924, kn. 3, p. 72.

17. Ibid., p. 73.
the author of the letter still applied elements of travesty to his poetry,\textsuperscript{18} it did not, however, preclude his interest in a new style of poetic creation introduced by Romanticism. This interest was revealed in Hrebinka's romantic poem "Choven" written in 1833. Also in the same position was Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, Kotliarevs'kyi's most direct follower, who was the first to unite the foreign elements of Romanticism with those of native folk songs. Fylypovych mentioned that the works of travesty which were begun by Kotliarevs'kyi, besides their great significance in the development of Ukrainian literature, created an impression that Ukrainian was a rough and rudimentary language which could not be used for serious literary creations. Kul'zhyns'kyi, for example, who played some role in the Ukrainian literary circles of that time, considered that the Ukrainian language contained many coarse and barbaric elements (an influence of the Tatars). At the same time its softness presumably came from the Polish language.\textsuperscript{19} Similar to Kul'zhyns'kyi's thoughts were those of Ol. Markovych, who stated:

\begin{itemize}
\item 18. Hrebinka's translation of Pushkin's "Poltava" was especially rich with elements of travesty. These were analyzed by M. Zerov in his \textit{Nove ukrains'ke pys'menstvo}. Vyp. 1., 2. vyd. Miunkhen, Instytut literatury, 1960, p. 118-125.
\item 19. P. Fylypovych, "Do istorii rann'oho ukrains'koho romantyzmu", in Ukraina, 1924, kn. 3, p. 74.
\end{itemize}
O. Pavlovs'kyi, the author of the first grammar of the Ukrainian language, agreed to some extent with Markovych’s opinion, but he considered that the Ukrainian literary works with which he was acquainted, especially Eneida "кажеться заключать одну шутку, и все они малороссий представл яют народом грубоватым, суеверным и следовательно не заслуживающим почетного места в бытописании".21

All of this served to stimulate the reaction of Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, Borovykovs'kyi, Hrebinka, and other contemporary Ukrainian writers who attempted in their romantic poems to prove that their native language was not only rich in all the elements necessary for the creation of profound poetic works, but even much richer than the other European languages in this respect. They came to this conclusion particularly on the basis of the richness of the Ukrainian folk songs, the first collections of which had been already prepared by M. Tserteliev (1819) and M. Maksymovych (1827). This was the reason why Hrebinka, like his countryman

---

20. P. Fylypovych, "Do istorii rann'oho ukrai ns'koho romantyzmu", in Украина, 1924, kn. 3, p. 74.
21. Ibid., p. 75.
N. V. Gogol, requested his parents to send him materials on Ukrainian ethnography, like folk songs. 22 Fylypovych stated that on this basis also Hrebinka defended the Ukrainian language as he mentioned in his letter to Kul'zhyns'kyi:

Thus, according to Fylypovych, when Shevchenko appeared on the literary stage, he already had some predecessors in one of the areas of romantic endeavor, who had a clearly established view on the abundance of their native language and treasure of the folk creations, especially Ukrainian songs. He could extend the ballad tradition, present pictures of folk poetry, and elaborate plots of folk fantasy which had been partially described by Ukrainian poets before him. For Fylypovych it was worthy of note that concerning interest in literary works in Ukraine Shevchenko expressed himself similarly to Hulak-Artemovs'kyi (in his letter to the


23. P. Fylypovych, "Do istorii rann'oho ukrains'koho romantyzmu", in Ukraina, 1924, kn. 3, p. 73.
editor of Viestnik Evropy). He wrote: "Прочитали собі по складах Енеїду на потинялися коба шинку, та й думаєть, що от коли вже ми розпізнали своїх мужиків. Е, ні, братки! Прочитайте ви думи, писні". It should be emphasized that Shevchenko wrote these words in 1847 while it was in 1838 that he had created the well-known poem "Na vichny pam'iat' Koliarevskomu". However, even at that time, his creative work was distant from Kotliarevsky's. Fylypovych disagreed with previous opinions (including those expressed by Drahomanov, Iefremov, and Doroshkevych) that Shevchenko introduced folk song motifs and formulas into literary usage because he was a peasant by origin and therefore was directly continuing folk "pisnetvorchist'. In order to support his position, Fylypovych pointed out that Shevchenko as a painter in general was not inclined to follow Ukrainian folk art for it was never esteemed very highly by the poet. Fylypovych agreed


O. Doroshkevych, "Taras Shevchenko", in his Pidruchnyk ukrains'koi literatury, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1924, p. 117.
with D. Antonovych in this respect who indicated that Shevchenko as a painter was under the influence of his teacher, K. P. Briullov, who used classical elements predominantly in his pictures. Shevchenko as a poet discovered that folk songs, legends, and "dumy" contained rich material for his creative powers, while Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, and Western European ballads indicated that fantastic and legendary plots could be adapted to poetry. Thus Shevchenko showed in his early poems that the ballad was a type of poetry through which Romanticism could find a well formulated expression in Ukrainian literature. In analyzing the specific features of Shevchenko's ballads, Fylypovych wrote:

Формою своєю вони простіші ніж відомі, улюблені балади того часу - "Денора" Бургера, "Светлана" Жуковського, "Уксука" або "Лілії" Міцкевича. В них не знаходимо звичайної баладної композиції з підходом повторювання, яка збільшує враження, затримує увагу, але має більш-менш штучний "стилізований" характер. Простіші вони і внутрішнім елементом; фантастика в них не прибільшена і далеко також від усякої містички...27

26. Fylypovych based his views on Antonovych's study "Estetychni pohliady Shevchenka", in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1914, kn. 1-3, p. 258-265. It is worthy of note that Antonovych's supplementary work, "Estetychné vykhovannia Shevchenka", published in Dzvin, 1913, v. 6, p. 151-158, supported Fylypovych's approach even more, but it was not part of his research sources.

Fylypovych considered that in Shevchenko's ballads the folk elements mingled with various literary influences. At the same time however, he also agreed with O. Kolessa who stated that Polish and Russian influences (A. Mickiewicz, A. S. Pushkin, I. I. Kozlov, V. A. Zhukovskii, and others) were not notably significant in Shevchenko's early poetic works. To Kolessa's thoughts Fylypovych added: "Варто зазначити, що про окремі елементи балад Шевченкових не можна часто навіть сказати, що вони запозичені у того чи іншого поета. Тоді вони були уже загальній місцем не тільки у європейських і російських поетів, але й в українських". However, whereas Kolessa looked for similarities of Shevchenko's "Prychynna" in Zhukovskii's "Liudmila" and in the poems of Kozlov like "Chernets" and "Son neviesty", Fylypovych pointed out links between this ballad and the poem of A. Metlyns'kyi "Smert' bandurysta" and also the ballad "Molodytsia". The first lines of the latter present the following picture:

---
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Fylypovych stated that "цe питомий Осiянський пейсаж, а Осiяна Шевченко добре знав і, як видно, ще до заслання". 3І

The scholar also compared the ballad "Prychynna" with some scenes in Hrebinka's poem "Bogdan" which was based on the period of hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. Before analyzing the literary ties between Shevchenko and Hrebinka, Fylypovych presented a comprehensive picture of the personal relations between these two poets during the period from 1838 to 1843. In describing some aspects of this relationship during 1839-1840, he also mentioned P. Martos, a Ukrainian landowner who at that time played some role in connection with the publication of the first collected volume of Shevchenko's poetry.

In his memoirs, written in 1862 (after the death of Shevchenko) Martos stated that it was he who in late 1839 acquainted Hrebinka with the first poems of Shevchenko and later

30. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 9. Hrebinka used the first four lines of this poem as the epigraph to the fourth chapter of his story "Tiulepen'".

31. Ibid.
made every effort to publish the poet's first *Kobzar*. Fylypovych considered Martos's recollections more than doubtful, although some of the information from this Ukrainian landowner he considered quite interesting especially his materials concerning the history of Shevchenko's poem "Haidamaky". Fylypovych, however, pointed out that Hrebinka was acquainted with Shevchenko's early poetry as early as 1838 as is evident from his letter to H. Kvitka-Osnovianenko written in November 18, 1838. Thus, in the scholar's opinion Martos's "оповідання скоріше належить до легенд, яких чимало в Шевченковій біографії... Що поміщик Мартос відограв чималу роль в цю добу Шевченкового життя, свідчить присвята "Тарасової ночі" П. І. Мартосові в "Кобзарі" 1840 р. але це не виключає критичного відношення до Мартосового оповідання".

---


33. Fyllypovych referred to confirmation of his view by I. Shpytkovs'kyi in his study "'Haidamaky' Shevchenka, iak pamiatka Koliivshchyny", in Zbirnyk pamiaty Tarasa Shevchenka, Kyiv, 1915, p. 48-82.


35. Ibid.
Fylypovych shared O. Konys'kyi's view that it was Hrebinka who persuaded Martos to assist in the publication of Shevchenko's poetry as a separate volume, and as a result the first Kobzar was published in 1840. In late 1838 Hrebinka was not only familiar with Shevchenko's poems, but admired them as a new and original voice among the Ukrainian poetic creations of that time. Hrebinka expressed his admiration in the letter mentioned above in these words: "А ще тут є у мене один земляк його, що то за завзячий писати вірші, то нехай йому сей та той! Як що напише, тільки цікавий, та вдяр рука-ми об полі! Він міні дав гарних стихів на збірник". Among Shevchenko's poems which Hrebinka selected for the proposed collected volume was the ballad "Prychynna" which, according to Fylypovych, influenced the description of some episodes of Hrebinka's poem "Bogdan" published in 1843. For example, the beginning of "Prychynna" reads:

Реве та стогне Дніпр широкий, Горами хвиля підніма.
Сердитий вітер завива, І блідий місяць на ту пору
До долу верби гне високі, 3-за хмари де-де виглядав...

It has an analogy in Hrebinka's poem, especially in its "Prolog":

Тогда была гроза, въетъ былъ, и тяжело
Вода въ Днѣпрѣ и билась, и стонала...
Нѣско вь небу мѣсяцъ полный,
А вольный вѣтеръ по водѣ гулял. 39

In addition Fylypovych indicated similarities between the two poems in their scenes concerning undines, as well as between their songs and mentioned that this particular part of "Prychynna" was compared with Pushkin's poem "Rusalka" by O. Kolessa in his study "Shevchenko i Mitskevych". Stressing the similar details of these episodes in Shevchenko's and Pushkin's poems, the scholar came to the conclusion that Pushkin's poems might have given Shevchenko some artistic stimulation and minor details, but his scene with the undines was composed independently on the basis of the folk poetry which was precisely reflected in these pictures. Hrebinka, whose picture of undines contains a number of the colors of Pushkin's "Rusalka", also borrowed some motifs from "Prychynna". In their analysis Fylypovych stated:

"Заходившись з осени 1838 року Ще вершениковими поезіями (тобто і "Причинов'ю") Гребінка через Шевченка пробує, хоч і не зовсім вдаючись до народної поезії". Fylypovych also perceived Shevchenko's influence on Hrebinka in the fact that in the 1840's the latter approached more closely to Ukrainian folk poetry and created in his new manner such poems as "Українська мелодія" and "Надпис". In 1843 he took five long epigraphs from Shevchenko's poems "Перебенда", "Думи мої", and "Haidamaky" for his novel "Chaikovskii".

On the basis of all these observations Fylypovych concluded that the ballad in the poetic creations of Shevchenko and in the Ukrainian poetry of this period was a natural phenomenon; it was a Ukrainian variation of this typical genre of Romanticism.

In order to preserve the integrity of his research method, Fylypovych avoided completely the sociological factors which influenced the formation of Shevchenko's Weltanschauung as a poet. The scholar's aim was to indicate the elements of the Ukrainian native folk and historical heritage along with foreign romantic factors which in artistic

41. Ibid., p. 26-27.
union played a major role in the poet's creativity. Consequently, in approaching the analysis of Shevchenko's historical-romantic poems, Fylypovych considered that the poet also had a foundation for this particular kind of poetic work.

The national element, love for the historical heritage and the idealized times of yore were cultivated by all representatives of Romanticism. These factors were especially admired in Ukraine by Shevchenko's immediate predecessors and contemporaries, and were partly preserved in publications of folk and historical monuments (collections of Tserteliev and Maksymovych and the works of M. Markevych). Historical plots were used by M. Kostomarov, A. Metlyns'kyi, M. Markevych, as well as by N. V. Gogol. Fylypovych also emphasized the foreign literary interest toward Ukrainian historical events and personalities (the poetic works of K. F. Ryleev, Pushkin, and of representatives of the Ukrainian school in Polish literature: B. Zaleski, T. Padura, S. Goszczyński, and M. Czajkowski). Besides the preceding materials, Shevchenko found these already elaborated historical motifs of among the historical sources should be mentioned I. Sreznev's'kyi's works, especially his Zaporozheskaia starina, published in 1833-38. It is interesting to add that the author chose such epigraphs for his work as "Głuchy wszędzie, ciemno wszędzie! - Mickiewica" (original reads "Ciemno wszędzie, głuchy wszędzie" - D.S.), and as a contrast to it:

"Так вічній шанти бувало
У нас в Гетьманщині колись. Котляревський".
of Romanticism: "тут були і бандуристи, і могили, які розмовляють з вітром, і запорозькі походи, і гетьмані і т. д. Нарешті думи та пісні особливо цінний матеріял давали поетові". Thus Shevchenko created such poems as "Ivan Pidkova", "Tarasova nich", "Do Osnovianenka", "Hamaliia", "Haidamaky", and others, in which the idealization of past times is compared with dismal contemporary existence, and past liberty is embellished with romantic fantasy as a contrast to present reality. Fylipovych emphasized that in 1845 Shevchenko came to the conclusion:

Раби, підніжки, грязь Москви,
Варшавські сміття ваші пани,
Ясновельможній гетьмані,44
but the scholar also pointed out that in 1849 the poet confessed:

Та іноді старий козак
Верзеться грімному - усатий,
З своєю волєю, мені
На чорнім вороні-коні.45

43. P. Fylipovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 11.
44. T. Shevchenko, "Do mertvykh i zhyvykh i nenarodzhykh zemliakiv moikh v Ukraini i ne Ukraini sushchynkh, moie druzhnieie poslanie", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav, Ukr. wyd-vo, 1921, p. 192.
M. Drahomanov in his study "Shevchenko, ukrainofily i sotsializm" considered that Shevchenko could not critically approach the fantastic pictures of the Cossack period and its events, because in his time historical scholarship on Ukraine was not yet developed, and the poet had only Istoriia Rusov as historical source material. In response to Drahomanov's views, Fylypovych emphasized that Istoriia Rusov was not the only historical source which Shevchenko knew and used. However, in the scholar's opinion, these fantastic pictures were interesting for the poet not only from an historical point of view but also from a poetic and picturesque standpoint. In order to support these thoughts Fylypovych quoted from Shevchenko's letter to his friend Ia. Kukharenko, dated April 22, 1857, in which the poet expressed his interest in the romantic past:

In romantic poems with historical emphasis Shevchenko used typical romantic elements which were seldom applied to his

46. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 11-12.
ballads. Fylypovich noted features like highly dramatic scenes, bloody episodes such as the picture of Gonta and his children in "Haidamaky", or battlefield descriptions in "Tarasova nich". Later Shevchenko also used these and similar motifs in his works based on folk life and customs ("Vid'ma" and "Maryna"). Fylypovich pointed out that another romantic feature of Shevchenko's historical poems is his poetic admiration of strong, brave and heroic individuality. He emphasized that in the poet's later creations "цей культ не минувся, але став глибший. Не фізична, а внутрішня сила почне приваблювати поета... Індивідуальність, своєрідна і незалежна від маси, і в той-же час споріднена з нею, захопленна бажанням визволити масу, народ од всякого ярма, виступає і в постаті поета, що його образ Шевченко малює, наслідує романтиків".47 Fylypovich examined Shevchenko's poem "Perebendia" which he considered a prologue to this sphere of the poet's creations.

47. P. Fylypovich, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapy-sky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 12. These features were thoroughly analyzed by I. Franko in his study "Perednie slovo", in T. H. Shevchenko, Perebendia, L'viv, Literaturno-naukova biblioteka, 1889, p. 3-63 (reprinted in I. Franko, Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17, p. 41-61). In Kolessa's opinion this was "перша, а тим самим найдоблиша проба розбору сей Шевченкової поеми; - і она улегла роботу всякому, що нині бере ся за ту саму тему". 0. Kolessa, "Shev­chenko i Mitskevych", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 3, 1894, p. 87. This work of Franko was not among Fylypovich's research sources.
He agreed to some extent with O. Kolessa who compared "Perebendia" with its prototypes in Mickiewicz's poems "Improwizacja" (in the third part of "Dziady") and especially "Dudarz". However, at the same time the scholar strongly supported a different thought of Kolessa who considered that the clear literary examples of kobzars which played an important role in the works of Metlyns'kyi, and were portrayed by Mickiewicz and the Polish poets of the Ukrainian school, might have reminded Shevchenko of the personalities of real kobzars whom he had seen in his youth, and which gave him inspiration for the creation of "Perebendia". In addition, Fylypovych

---

48. O. Kolessa. "Perebendia", in his "Shevchenko i Mitskevych", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 3, 1894, p. 81-88. In this particular part of his study Kolessa criticized Franko's comparative analysis of "Perebendia" and its connection with Mickiewicz's "Improwizacja". It seems that Franko accepted Kolessa's criticism as an objective one. Some evidence in this respect might be found in Franko's study "'Naimychka' T. Shevchenka", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 5, kn. 2, 1895, p. 2 (reprinted in his Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17, p. 101).

49. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i Hrebinka", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 35-36. In this statement Fylypovych followed the thought of Kolessa expressed in his "Shevchenko i Mitskevych" in Zapysky NTSh, t. 3, 1894, p. 85. It is worthy of note that previous to Kolessa, I. Franko had advanced a very similar opinion on this question. I. Franko, "Perebendia slovo", in T. H. Shevchenko, Perebendia, L'viv, Lit.-nauk. biblioteka, 1889, p. 52.
observed the view of K. Studyns'kyi who looked for direct influence on "Perebendia" by the poem "Banduryst" of M. Markevych to whom Shevchenko dedicated his poetic work "Banduryste, orle syzyi". Fylypovych, however thought that Shevchenko's poem might be similarly compared with a series of other poetic works such as the poem "Ukrainskii bard" by Hrebinka to whom Shevchenko dedicated his "Perebendia". After comparing the similar elements of both poems, the scholar came to the conclusion that "може й Гребінчик твір... разом з іншими творами (і колишніми життєвими враженнями) спричинився до того, що Шевченко написав свого "Барда" і присвятив його Гребінці". Fylypovych also shed some new light on the study of Shevchenko's poem "Velykyi l'okh" which had been compared with Mickiewicz's "Improwizacja" by O. Kolessa. However, V. Doroshenko, in his article on Hrebinka's literary work, mentioned that the composition of Shevchenko's mystery is reminiscent of the "Prolog" of Hrebinka's poem

50. K. Studyns'kyi, "'Perebendia' Shevchenka i 'Banduryst' Markevycha", in Zoria, 1896, no. 24, p. 477-479. Studyns'kyi's thoughts were later supported by M. Markovs'kyi in his article "Shevchenko i Mykola Markevych", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 39-40.

"Bogdan". Doroshenko noted the scenes of the appearing of three souls in "Velykyi l'okh" and similarly the ghosts of Pavliuk, Ostrianytsia, Nalyvaiko, and a girl in "Prolog". Fylypovych stated that this similarity was only outward. The contents of the conversation between Shevchenko's personages is completely different from that of Hrebinka's ghosts. In 1845 when "Velykyi l'okh" was created, Shevchenko was quite distant from Hrebinka in his literary and ideological interests. After comparing the texts of the particular parts of both poems, Fylypovych concluded: "пoдiбнiсть, повторюмо, цiлком зовнiшня - у Шевченка й iншiй змiст промов i зовсiм вiдмiнна iдеологiя: у Гребiнки антипольська, сполучена з вiрнопiдданними почуттями до росiйського царя, в Шевченка - анти-московська, антицарська".

In observing further development of Shevchenko's creative work, Fylypovych emphasized that in the poet's later poems the picture of "Perebendia" was changed to the portrait of a prophet and a leader with dynamic powers of the word. Shevchenko himself approached the conviction that the reforming role of the poet was legitimate. This concept had

52. Fylypovych referred to Doroshenko's article "Ievhen Hrebinka", in Dzvin, 1912, no. 6, p. 36-41.
53. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i Hrebinka", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 34.
been established under the influence of Romanticism which since the period of "Sturm und Drang" had promoted assertive individuality, the creative "Ego" of its prophets and revolutionaries, and finally a cult of poet-leaders. Thus, according to Fylypovych, Shevchenko "був сином своєї доби, коли признавався після виходу 'Гайдамаків', 'хай я буду мужицький поет, аби лиш поет".54 Feeling the impulse of the poet-creator and with the conviction of a lofty destiny, Shevchenko almost ceased his early and especially his ballad writing activities. His themes encompassed a greater range and often proclaimed the slogans of the struggle for political and social liberty. Fylypovych stated that "це ясно помічаємо в тих поемах де... мотиви переходять у загально-людські і революційні - в "Іванові Гусові", в "Кавказі" - в останньому з'являється улюблена романтиками постать Прометея".54a

The same and similar themes were also dominant in the poetic works of the other leading figures of Romanticism among whom Fylypovych named such personalities as Byron, the French poets (especially V. Hugo), Mickiewicz, and some of the

---

54. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 13. This quotation was taken from Shevchenko's letter to H. Tarnavs'kyi dated January 25, 1843.

54a. Ibid., p. 12.
Russian poets like M. Iu. Lermontov. On the basis of Shevchenko's correspondence and the memoirs of the poet's contemporaries, the scholar emphasized that Shevchenko knew the literary creations of these poets well even before his exile.\(^55\) Personal experience and impressions from the life of the people gave Shevchenko material for such poems as "Kateryna", "Naimychka", as well as the Russian "Slepaia" and its Ukrainian versions "Vid'vema" and "Maryna" which portray life under serfdom. Yet, even these realistic pictures, as Fylypovych in line with Franko indicated, contain a number of purely romantic scenes.\(^56\) In dwelling on Shevchenko's poems in the Russian language, Fylypovych distinguished their romantic elements from those of the poet's entire creation in Ukrainian, and opposed at the same time previous observations

---


56. Fylypovych referred to Franko's study "'Naimychka' T. Shevchenka", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 5, kn. 2, p. 12-13, in which the author concentrated his attention on the determination of sociological factors of the poem.
Thus comparing the poem "Slepaia" with its Ukrainian versions "Vid'ma" and "Maryna", he stressed:

Зазначу, що досі порівняння робилися з іншою метою: доводили, що Шевченко погано володів російською мовою і чудово — українською, або впевняли:..."Все те, що ми знаходимо в російській поезії, в українській перетворено в чисте золото". Але якраз не все те, що є в російській поезії, перейшло в українську, і те, що залишилося в "Слепой", особливо повинно зацікавити історика літератури.57

In "Slepaia" Fylypovych observed a pessimistic view and the echoes of the Weltschmerz of Byron, F.-R. Chateaubriand, and Lermontov. These motifs penetrated Shevchenko's second poem in Russian, "Trizna", with even stronger Byronic power. In addition, here they are followed by a sorrowful titanism which was typical for Byron, Pushkin, Lermontov, and Kozlov. In the Ukrainian poems of Shevchenko, all these elements and motifs were replaced by softer, sentimental pictures and expressions which were evident even through the poet's anger.

56a. Fylypovych disagreed with the views of P. Zaitser, expressed in his article "Russkiia poemy T. G. Shevchenka", in Viestnik Kharkovskago Istorichesko-Filologicheskago Oshchestva, 1913, vyp. 3, p. 73-81, and M. Markovs'kyi, "Rosii's'ki i ukrains'ki tvory Shevchenka v ikh porivnianni", in Ukraina, 1918, no. 4-5, p. 71-80.

57. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IPV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 14. The quotation was taken from Markovs'kyi's study "Rosii's'ki i ukrains'ki tvory Shevchenka v ikh porivnianni", in Ukraina, 1918, no. 4-5, p. 78.
and scorn. Sharing the view of Franko, Fylypovych concluded his observation with these words:

В російських творах Шевченко йшло за байронічною традицією, яка панувала тоді в поезії, чука стихія ним володіла і несла в тому напрямкові, який був далекий від сина селянської України... І нічого подібного, ні- якого універсального пессізму і критицизму, ніякої "увістової тури" не вводив Шевченко в українські переробки "Сліпий", в "Марину" і "Вільму" і взагалі в свою українську творчість. Грунт не було.58

The scholar related that Shevchenko expressed himself in this respect in his letter of September 30, 1842, to his friend Ia. Kukharenko in which he gave also his characteristic of the Russian language: "Переписав оце 'Сліпий', тай плачу над ней: який гріх, що оце сповідаєсь кацапам черв'ям кацапським словом".59

Beside these features which contrast Shevchenko's Ukrainian poetry to the Byronic, Fylypovych considered that there were a number of elements which did indeed link his poetic creations with the Byronic tradition of Romanticism.

---

57a. Similar thoughts on the sentimental motifs in Shevchenko's main poems were expressed by Franko in his "'Naimycha' T. Shevchenka", in Zapysky NTSh, t. 5, kn. 2, 1895, p. 12-13.

58. F. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IPV UAN, kn. 4, 1925, p. 15.

59. ------, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapysky IPV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 15.
The lyrical poem of Byron generally is of a novelistic character with psychological content which revolves around one personage and one event in the emotional life. Usually that event is connected with love. There are frequent breaks in the narration of the poem with jumps from one event to another, leaving a whole series of actions occurring between them.

Another main feature of Byron's poems is the concentration of attention on critical situations and scenes heavy with lyrical overtones. Also, an important role in the Byronic creation is played by lyrical monologues and dramatic dialogues which to a great extent supplement the overall composition of the picture. All these features might be found in Shevchenko's Kobzar. They are particularly evident in the poet's ballads, as well as in his poems "Haidamaky", "Maryna", and Vid'ma". Fylypovych added that all these factors, which Drahomanov called "невмілою будівлею іншої поеми і його переходами від речі до речі", should be considered as the Byronic aspect of the romantic composition. The accumulation of questions, exclamations, and repetition of the same or

59a. Here Fylypovych shared the views of V. Zhirmunskii expressed in his preface to D. G. Bairon, Dramy, Moskva, Gos. izd-vo, 1922, p. 5-6.

similar words was typical for the emotional Byronic manner. In Shevchenko's style these features were also predominant not only in his earlier works but also in his later poems. For example:

Горе з вами!
Кого благати ви прийшли?
Кому ви сльози принесли?
Кому ви принесли з сльозами
Свою надію? Горе з вами.
Раби незрнії! Кого,
Кого благаєте, благаії?...59c

Concerning the general characteristic of the romantic style, Fylypovych commented appropriately: "Пластики бракувало романтикам, для їхнього стилю характерна музична стихія". 59d

In the conclusion Fylypovych recapitulated the main aspects of his studies on Shevchenko stating that although many Byronic motifs and romantic forms infused various works of Shevchenko, a number of them were quite alien to the Ukrainian poet. Shevchenko was particularly distant from mysticism and the metaphysical. He also was not interested in the mysterious, the infinite, or the cosmic realm. The Byronic cult of disenchanted, hostile and Titanic individuality
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(typical for Pushkin's "Poet" and "Chern'") was also far from Shevchenko's spiritual sensibilities. Instead, he admired the strong and heroic individual, as well as the personality of a spiritual leader-creator of the flaming word who identifies with the community's needs, struggles against falsehood, and leads his people to liberty. All these romantic elements are very often interwoven with historical motifs, and with the folk poetry and songs which were quite typical for Shevchenko's style. In Fylypovych's opinion, Shevchenko as a poet was and remained a remarkable representative of Romanticism. He considered that this assertion could be confirmed only by a detailed analysis of Shevchenko's works, and especially of those collected in his Kobzar. However, this problem could be solved only after all the elements of romantic poetics had been determined and elaborated.

Fylypovych's studies brought forth various comments and reviews in the contemporary literary criticism. In

60. The contrast between these elements is especially evident in Pushkin's poems and Shevchenko's "Perebendia", which previously was analyzed by I. Franko in his "Perechne slovo", in T. Shevchenko, Perebendia, L'viv, Lit.-nauk. biblioteka, 1889, p. 60. Soviet criticism condemned Franko's analysis of "Poet" and "Chern'" ("Poet i tolpa") in their comparison with "Perebendia", I. Franko, Tvory, Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1955, v. 17, p. 481.

particular his essay "Shevchenko i romantyzm", which was partly based on previous works of a similar character, was actively discussed by the Ukrainian critics of the 1920's. I. Deineko, for example, considered it a serious, scholarly study which showed that Romanticism for Shevchenko was of paramount significance in that it played a larger role in his poetry than previous literary critics had emphasized. In his critico-bibliographical survey of the early 1920's, V. Doroshenko stated that among the studies "над окремими питаннями Шевченкової творчості, або окремими його творами... на першому пляні годиться поставити невеличку, але змістовну статтю П. Филиповича". K. Koperzhyns'kyi emphasized that in his study Fylypovych directed attention to a very important problem, i. e., that of finding new means based on sound research materials of indicating the direct connections

62. These are especially the works mentioned of O. Kolessa and I. Franko.


64. V. Doroshenko, "Shevchenkovznavstvo za ostannie desiatylytstva (1914-1924); korotkyi informatyvnyi ohliad", in Stara Ukraina, 1925, no. 3-4, p. 76.
between Shevchenko's works and Romanticism. In sharp contrast to these laudatory evaluations of Fylypovych's study, stands the review of M. Markovs'kyi who stated that Fylypovych repeated a number of items originally conceived by his predecessors, and that the study in general "нестає нічого нового і цінного в літературу про Шевченка". Defending his viewpoint (criticized by Fylypovych in "Shevchenko i romantyzm") Markovs'kyi remarked that he did not believe that Shevchenko's Russian poetic works were notably different from his Ukrainian poetry, and that the Byronic elements of Romanticism are evident in "Slepaia" just as in the Ukrainian "Maryna". In spite of some polemic features in his review, Markovs'kyi's judgements were given support by his analysis, and as such might be considered as a different view on the particular problem analyzed by Fylypovych. P. Zaitsev, another literary scholar and expert on Shevchenko, did not respond to Fylypovych's criticism of his ideas which were quite similar to


Markovs'kyi's. However, in his new study "Poezii Shevchenka rosiis'koiu movoiu", Zaitsev included several of Fylypovych's studies in the basic bibliography and combined his earlier views expressed in 1913 with Fylypovych's position. 67

Beside the positive elements in Fylypovych's studies which were partly indicated by the critics, there are some failings which should be observed. They might be found particularly in his essay "Shevchenko i romatyzm". Although the scholar's research laboratory was rich with basic materials (43 sources), he overlooked such a basic study on Shevchenko's early poetic works as Franko's "Perednie slovo" analyzing the poem "Perebendia" and "'Topolia' T. Shevchenka" which would have supported not only his research method, but also his views on the connections of Shevchenko's poetry with the poetic works of foreign poets like Pushkin and Lermontov. It also could have directed his attention toward Shevchenko's literary relations with the German representatives of Romanticism. Another important source which should have been taken into consideration is Zaporozhskia starina by Sreznevs'kyi.

This work together with those mentioned by Fylypovych played an important role in Shevchenko's historical poems and especially in his "Chernets'" as was indicated by F. Kolessa. Fylypovych presented just the general contours in his characteristic of Western European Romanticism, especially in relation to Byronic elements and their influence on the poetic creation of Shevchenko. It would have brought greater clarity to the problem if the scholar could have supported his analysis by a comparison of specific works from both sides. He himself stated: "Правда, поетика романтики не зовсім ще розроблена, але характерне вже накреслене. Можна порівняти, наприклад, поетику щевченкову з поетикою "байронічних поем" (Байрона та його наслідуючих)." 69 Fylypovych's study suffers from a lack of this detailed comparison.

Fylypovych's original contributions to the problem might be seen particularly in his research in the sphere of early Ukrainian Romanticism which was analyzed on the basis of documents and materials not discussed by the previous critics of the 1920's describing this trend in Ukrainian literature. His study on Shevchenko's literary relations

---


69. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i romantyzm", in Zapisy IFV UAN, kn. 4, 1923, p. 17.
with Hrebinke might be considered a unique critical work in this respect in Ukrainian criticism.\(^70\) In addition, it should be mentioned that the scholar's criticism of Martos's memoirs was later supported by P. Zaitsev,\(^71\) and fully confirmed by the newly discovered uncensored copy of the edition of Shevchenko's *Kobzar*.\(^72\) In his analysis of Shevchenko's poetic writings (in the study "Shevchenko i romantyzm") Fylypovych brought new insight to comparative studies on the poems "Prychynna" and "Perebendia", and also revised the view of O. Kolessa concerning their connections with Pushkin's works. As one of his original views should be included the unique analysis and determination of the differences between Shevchenko's Russian poems and his Ukrainian poetic creations.

70. This was partially acknowledged by K. Koperzhynskyi in his "Ukrains'ke naukove literaturoznavstvo za ostanniki 10 rokiv", in Studii z istorii Ukrainy NDKIUK, t. 2, 1929, p. xxxi, and by I. O. Luchnyk in his "Istorychna poema Ievhena Hrebinky "Bohdan", in Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, 1968, no. 10, p. 49-50.


72. V. Borodin, "Pisliamova", in T. Shevchenko, *Kobzar; fotokopiia pozatsenzurnoho prymirnyka vydania 1840 roku*, Kyiv, 1962, i-ii. The author of the article indicates that according to documents of the Censorship Bureau, the manuscript of *Kobzar* was submitted for censorship approval by Hrebinke and not by Martos.
Finally, Fylypovych's greatest contribution to Shevchenko studies might be considered his attempt to determine with a scholarly approach the significance of the relations between Shevchenko's works and Romanticism. This problem had been rather neglected by the criticism based on the historical and sociological methods and misinterpreted by Marxist literary critics. These factors resulted in the use of Fylypovych's studies as the basic sources in later research work in this area by other critics. Thus, they occupy one of the first places among the materials used by L. Bilets'kyi in his studies on Shevchenko, and particularly in the composition of the first two volumes of his study on Shevchenko's Kobzar. Fylypovych's works were also fully utilized by F. Kolessa in his Studii nad poetychnoi tvorchistiu T. Shevchenka and by P. Zaitsev in various essays published in


the complete works of Shevchenko which he edited.761. Aizenshtok used them as primary materials for his research work on Hulak-Artemovs'kyi's life and poetry.76a It should be mentioned that under the influence of Fylypovych's studies O. Doroshkevych altered his description of some details in the general survey of Romanticism in the second edition of his Ukrains'ka literatura published in 1927.77 Finally Fylypovych's study "Do istorii rann'oho ukraïns'koho romantyzmu" served D. Chyzhevs'kyi in his characteristic of Ukrainian Romanticism.78

From the 1930's until the 1960's Fylypovych's critical works on Shevchenko were officially excluded from critical attention in the Soviet Union.78a However they were not

---


77. O. Doroshkevych, "Rizni zhanry v ukraïns'kii literaturi XIX st. do Shevchenka", in his Ukrains'ka literatura, Vyd. 2., zmin. i dop., Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927, p. 106.


78a. O. Bilets'kyi, "Zavdannia i perspektyvy vyvchenia Shevchenka", in his Fys'mennyk i epokha, Kyiv, DVKhL, 1953, p. 147-162.
only utilized, but revised for partial reprinting by Communist critics who in their Marxist writings required basic scholarly materials. M. Rusanivs'kyi, for example, in his essay "Shevchenko i ukrains'ka literatura pershoi polovyny XIX storichchia" published in 1939, took various sections from Fylypovych's studies "Shevchenko i Hrebinka" and "Do istorii rann'oho ukrains'koho romantyzmu" and reprinted almost the entire essay "Shevchenko i romantyzm" without mentioning the original source. In order to characterize Shevchenko from the established Communist point of view, Rusanivs'kyi interspersed Fylypovych's studies with generous amounts of Marxist phraseology. Elements of Fylypovych's research works are also evident in all parts of the study by P. Prykhod'ko Shevchenko i ukrains'kyi romantyzm 30-50 rr. XIX st. published in 1963. It should be emphasized that this critic belongs with the first Soviet Ukrainian authors who in the 1960's risked mentioning Fylypovych's name and indicating the significance of his critical works on Shevchenko research. In his survey of previous literary studies on Shevchenko and Romanticism,


Prykhod'ko stated:

До робіт, у яких широко висвітлюється вага романтич- 
ної течії в становленні нової української літератури 
та в формуванні й розвитку творчості Шевченка, нале- 
жити стаття М. Рusanівського... Використовуючи дос- 
лідження П. Філіповича та інших літературознавців 
(хоч і не називаючи їх), М. Рusanівський висловлює 
ряд важливих спостережень, які переконливо показують 
чи мале значення романтичної творчості поетів-попер- 
едників для молодого Шевченка.

In analyzing the critical works of M. Kotsiubyns'ka like "Poe- 
tyka Shevchenka i ukrains'kyi romantyzm" and "Balada Shev- 
chenka", one might point to their close ties to the studies 
of M. Markovs'kyi, K. Studyns'kyi, F. Kolessa, and especially 
of Fylypovych, although like her predecessor, Rusanivs'kyi, 
she neglected to indicate the authors of the original ideas 
which she had followed. The similarity of Kotsiubyns'ka's 
and Fylypovych's analyses is evident in her comparison of 
Shevchenko's ballad "Pryhynna" with Hrebinka's poem "Bogdan" 
in which Kotsiubyns'ka practically repeated Fylypovych's 
statements and employed the same examples for their support. 
Kotsiubyns'ka followed Fylypovych directly in her comparative 
description of Shevchenko's Russian and Ukrainian poems,

81. P. H. Prykhod'ko, Shevchenko i ukrains'kyi 
romantyzm 30-50 rr. XIX st., Kyiv, Vyd-vo Akademii nauk 
URSR, 1963, p. 103.

82. M. Kh. Kotsiubyns'ka, "Balada Shevchenka", in 
Materialy do vyvchennia istorii ukrains'koi literatury, t. 2, 
particularly in regard to "Slepaia", "Vid'ma" and "Maryna", where she attempted to indicate a unification of romantic elements with the realistic approach of Shevchenko's early poems.\textsuperscript{83} Fylypovych's thoughts expressed in his "Shevchenko i romantyzm" were amplified by Z. Henyk-Berezovs'ka.\textsuperscript{84} In her essay "Shevchenko i ievropeis'kyi romantyzm" Henyk-Berezovs'ka closely approaches Fylypovych's determination of those motifs distinguishing Shevchenko's romantic manner from the Byronic.\textsuperscript{85} Finally, the study "Shevchenko i Hrebinka" by Fylypovych served as one of the basic sources for the article "Istorychna poema Ievhena Hrebinky 'Bohdan'" by I. Luchnyk. Following Fylypovych's lead in the comparison of the scenes in Hrebinka's poem with Shevchenko's ballad "Prychynna", the author openly praises his predecessor's research on this subject.\textsuperscript{86}


\textsuperscript{84} Henyk-Berezovs'ka is also the author of the article "Pavlo Fylypovych", in Duklia, 1967, no. 1, p. 21-24.


\textsuperscript{86} I. O. Luchnyk, "Istorychna poema Ievhena Hrebinky 'Bohdan'" in Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, 1968, no. 10, p. 49-50.
Analysis of the poems of Lesia Ukrainka and Ivan Franko.

Whereas for some of his studies on Shevchenko Fylypovych had at his disposal various critical sources already provided by previous critics, in his cycle of comparative works on the poetry of Lesia Ukrainka he was one of the scholars who largely initiated the pioneering research on the poetess's life and literary creation based primarily on unpublished manuscripts and documents. Although the main features of Lesia Ukrainka's works had been observed by literary criticism since the evaluation of her early poetry by I. Franko in 1898, detailed analysis of her single poems began in the 1920's. Thus the first scholarly edition of the complete works of Lesia Ukrainka published under the editorship of B. Iakubs'kyi in 1927-1930, might be considered the beginning of serious research on this leading
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figure of Ukrainian literature. Fylypovych along with other scholars contributed to this edition by providing several essays to which the comparative method was applied. Among these studies should be mentioned especially "Rannia poema Lesi Ukrainky", "'Odno slovo' Lesi Ukrainky", "Heneza dramatychnoi poemy Lesi Ukrainky 'U pushchi'", as well as his article "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", which was published separately.

Analyzing one of Lesia Ukrainka's early poems "Rusalka", Fylypovych pointed out that Franko had reviewed it as "сільський відгомін Шевченкових балад". Franko's opinion was later repeated by M. Zerov and M. Drai-Khmara in their biographico-critical studies on Lesia Ukrainka. Fylypovych agreed with the statements of these scholars in indicating similarities of some episodes in Lesia Ukrainka's poem and Shevchenko's ballads "Prychynnna", "Rusalka", and "Utoplena" which also contains certain motifs of Gogol's "Maiskaia noch', ili utoplenitsa". However in Fylypovych's view, the plot of Lesia Ukrainka's poem is closer rather to Mickiewicz's.

89. I. Franko, "Lesia Ukrainka", in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1898, kn. 7, p. 9.

90. Franko's thoughts were followed also by M. Ievshar in his "Lesia Ukrainka", in Ukrain's'ka khata, 1910, no. 6, p. 37f, and by P. Odarchenko in his preface to the second edition of Lesia Ukrainka's Tvory, New York, Tyszczenko-Bilous, 1953, v. 1, p. xvii.
ballad "Rybka" than to Shevchenko's ballads. In this respect he stated:

Міцкевичова балада — приклад не випадковий... в ній також русалка, селянська дівчина, мститься колишньому коханцеві — панові, що зрадив йому, одружившись з іншою. У Лесі Українки соціальний контраст не накреслено, але де-які риси с:

"Йдуть до сусіда в нову хату
Святуть в нього до чоху багату".91

In his strong criticism of "Rusalka", Franko, however, expressed some favorable observations: "Та є в цій поемці один уступ, де чути якісь нові, нешаблонові, хоч дуже ще не сміли тони; це пісня русалки, котрою вона приваблює до себе козака... Хоч і тут ще нема ніякого особливого майстерства, та все-ж таки в тій пісенно видно перші розмах крил свіого ліричного таланту".92

According to Fylypovych the undine's song in its rhythm and scene differs completely from Shevchenko's pictures which contain elements primarily of folk songs. Shevchenko, who applied folk motifs to his ballads with precision, could not permit his "rusalka" to

91. P. Fylypovych, "Rannia poema Lesi Ukrainky", in L. Ukrainka, Tsvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927-1930, v. 3, p. 7. In order to support Fylypovych's statement, the similarity could be emphasized between the monologues of the girls betrayed in "Rybka" and "Rusalka" before their drowning.

sing such a song as

Все для тебя, дам я, козаче,
Ти палати і віночок...

since undines which enchant with songs of underwater palaces and treasures were not typical for Ukrainian folklore. On the other hand Fylypovych did not consider this part of Lesia Ukrainka's poem an original idea, but indicated that it was a literary extraction typical for Western European Romanticism. Connections might be found with Goethe's ballad "Fischer" and its Ukrainian version by Hulak-Artemovs'kyi, as well as in H. Heine's "Lorelei" and its free Ukrainian translation "Sokil's'ka kniahynia" by Iu. Fed'kovych. In addition Fylypovych presented examples showing scenes similar to those of Lesia Ukrainka's poem in Heine's ballad "Ritter" which was translated by Franko in 1876, and Franko's own original poem "Kermanych" created under the influence of the German poet. According to Fylypovych one might also find the prototypes of some episodes of Lesia Ukrainka's poem in the romantic poetic works of Russian poets like in the ballad

93. The quotation was taken from Lesia Ukrainka "Rusalka", in her Tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927-1930, v. 3, p. 23. P. Fylypovych, "Rannia poema Lesi Ukrainky", Ibid., p. 9. (reprinted in his Z novit'n'ho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 65-69. It should be mentioned that this essay of Fylypovych as well as the studies of other scholars was not reprinted in the second edition of Ukrainka's Tvory which were republished under the editorial supervision of P. Odarchenko in New York, 1953-1954.
"Rusalka" by M. Iu. Lermontov which according to B. Eichenbaum is close to Heine's "Die Nixen". The fifth act of Pushkin's "Rusalka", taken from the opera "Dnieprovskaja rusalka" which was reworked on the basis of G. Hensler's libretto of the opera "Das Donauweibchen", is one which also is close to the "Rusalka" of Lesia Ukrainka. In Fylypovych's opinion, the similarity of the poetess's poem to other earlier works could be observed elsewhere especially in order to emphasize their influence in suggestive and stylistic features. This typical romantic topic was attractive to many young writers, and it belonged among the early literary creations of almost all poets mentioned above. Lesia Ukrainka's poem indicates that she was one of them also. Finally, Fylypovych directed his attention to the poem of Ia. Shchoholiv "Loskotarok", which from a chronological point of view was the closest to "Rusalka" of Lesia Ukrainka. In Shchoholiv's work (published in 1877) the undine bewitched a young man with a song similar to that in "Rusalka". In conclusion Fylypovych indicated two principal elements which dominate in Lesia Ukrainka's poem: the folk-poetical one which as it was developed appeared rather lifeless.

and of little impact, and the literary element based on creations of world literature and the traditions of Romanticism which the poetess did use effectively. This element played a predominant role in Lesia Ukrainka's further poetic and dramatic works and especially in the creation of her neo-romantic "Lisova pisnia".

Fylypovych's introduction to his comparative study on Lesia Ukrainka's poem "Odno slovo" first published with the sub-title "Opovidannia staroho iakuta" in 1906,95 presented the outline of the story of an old Yakut concerning a stranger who lived for a long time among the Yakuts. A sick and lonesome stranger wanted to explain to the Yakuts the reason for his affliction, but his attempts were fruitless because of the lack of particular necessary words in their language. Before his death the stranger said:

... Я від того

Бмираю, що у вас ніяк не зветься
Хоч єсь його без міри в вашім краї.
А те, від чого міг би я охіти,
Не зветься теж ніяк: немає слова!96


The poetess used a political convict as the stranger who lived among the Yakuts, and the magic word which might effect his revival was Freedom. Fylypovych mentioned that shortly after the poem was published, the orientalist A. Kryms'kyi reviewed "Odno slovo" with the conclusion:

На жаль, саме те, що дає найбільшу красу цій поемі, є фактична неправда. Гуртом кажучи, ненавіть в світі та-кої мови, щоб в ній не було слів: "воля", "вільний", "визволити". А зосібна - про якуську мову треба завізяти те саме, бо "воля" і "вільний" буде по-яку-ському: боскі, а "визволити" або "випустити на волю" - це буде по-якуському "босколо".97

In his reply to Kryms'kyi's remarks A. Nikovs'kyi stated Lesia Ukrainka had made a minor error concerning the Yakut language, but not in regard to the image of the stranger. He stressed that the question of the language played a secondary role anyway to the principal idea of national freedom and personal liberty which had gained in strength after the 1905 Revolution and which was portrayed by Lesia Ukrainka in poetic form.98 Also, in Fylypovych's opinion all these remarks are of lesser importance in the evaluation of the poem and its central idea, and in any case they cannot


hinder the positive artistic and aesthetic impression. There are numerous instances of poetic license where writers avoid exact historical, ethnographic, or geographical details.

Finally he made a minor correction in Nikovs'kyi's statement which indicated that the poem "Odno slovo" was not written after the 1905 Revolution but in 1903. This small detail served Fylypovych's further analysis of this poem. Although place and culture are considered secondary factors in "Odno slovo", and the personality of its central figure transcends the boundaries of time and space, in Fylypovych's opinion Lesia Ukrainka might nevertheless have had at hand some useful literary materials or known of actual experiences which served her in the creation of this poem. According to Fylypovych, one such source was the notable figure in Ukrainian literature and also the political prisoner, Pavlo Hrabovs'kyi, who was exiled to Siberia in 1888. While in exile, Hrabovs'kyi still had managed to compose his literary works under the pen name Pavlo Hrab and to send them to Western Ukraine where they were published primarily under the editorship of Franko. These works as well as their author himself, who suffered for the cause of liberty, were popular in all parts of Ukraine. Fylypovych mentioned the fact that during 1898-1901 Hrabovs'kyi's poems and novels were published in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, which was the journal to which Lesia Ukrainka also contributed. Besides his literary work,
Hrabovs'kyi corresponded from exile with Ukrainian intellectuals and literary personalities including the poetess's mother who as a writer was known by her pen name Olena Pchilka. Thus the personality of Hrabovs'kyi was quite familiar to Lesia Ukrainka. Hrabovs'kyi died in Siberia in 1902, and the news of his death spread widely through all the Ukrainian periodical publications of that time. During the next year, i.e., in 1903, Lesia Ukrainka created her poem "Odno slovo". Fylypovych added that Hrabovs'kyi spent a good part of his exile in Yakutsk, and compared this fact with the sub-title of the poem. As support, the scholar also compared the main parts of "Odno slovo" with Hrabovs'kyi's published poetry, letters, and memoirs concerning him in which he indicated identical features. "Чужий вмирає тому", Fylypovych considered, "що не приходить для нього воля - те 'одно слово', якого немає для заслання у Сибіру. Про волю, про повернення на Україну тільки й мріяє Грабовський. 'Тільки й живу надію', писав він С. О. Єфремову, 'побачити хоч не скоро рідний край, віддихнути душою в товаристві тих, що працюють для його щастя та будучини'. Але ця надія не здійснилася ні в житті Грабовського, ні в житті "чужого" з поеми Українки". 99 Fylypovych

did not limit the influences on Lesia Ukrainka to the portrait of this Ukrainian poet who spent most of his life as a political prisoner. He stated that there might be other literary sources also which served the poetess as material for a literary rendition. In this respect he mentioned a similarity in formulating the theme for "Odno slovo" and the story of the exile of the Roman poet, Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso), appearing in Pushkin's poem "Tsygane". In this work an old Gypsy tells about the exiled poet in the following words:

Царем когда - сослан был
Полудня житель к нам в изнанье
(Я прежде знал, но позабыл
Его мудреное прозванье).

Fylypovych indicated a similar episode in Lesia Ukrainka's poem where in his story about the stranger who also was from the South, the old Yakut said:

Вин нам по-своему казав слова,
Як зветься це 1 те, я зная годі.
Тепер забув, - давно було, стариий я.

In both works the same literary approach is found in a story related by an old, naive, and simple hearted man. Finally both stories end with the death of convicts whose personalities are quite similar. For another prototype of the

100. The quotation was taken from: A. S. Pushkin "Tsygane", in his Sochineniiia, Moskva, Gos. izd-vo, 1923, v. 1, p. 261.

stranger in "Odno slovo", Fylypovych looked to the personality of hetman I. Mazepa's nephew, A. Voinaros'kyi, also a Ukrainian political prisoner who was exiled to Yakutsk by the Russian tsar Peter I. Fylypovych related the episode of the meeting of "историк Миллер" and "охотник" (Voinaros'kyi) in the Siberian forest, as described by K. F. Ryleev in his poem "Voinarovskii". Although the portrait of this convict was presented by the Russian poet as a strong and sullen Byronic figure, the fact of the conviction and Voinaros'kyi's death in Siberia provides a similar theme. However, in spite of the fact that in the second edition of the poem (1908) Lesia Ukrainka changed its sub-title (perhaps under the influence of Kryms'kyi's philological remarks) to "Opovidannia tubil'tsia z pivnochi", in Fylypovych's opinion the personality portrayed in "Odno slovo" remained closest to that of the Ukrainian poet Hrabovs'kyi. The story of the old Gypsy in Pushkin's "Tsygane" could be said to serve to some extent as the literary framework for the poem. In conclusion, Fylypovych stated that despite these similarities "Odno slovo" is a completely original work. Regarding the artistic elements in the structure of the poem the scholar shared the view of M. Zerov who indicated that the poem "характеризується зростанням розмовного елементу і належить до творів, що накреслює перехід письменниці до драматичних
In discussing the basic motif of the poem from the aesthetic point of view, Fylypovych repeated his previous thoughts (expressed on this subject in 1920) which read:

Основний мотив поеми — прагнення волі — 1 до того часу і пізніше був основним мотивом Лесі Українки, так само, як і протиставлення вільнолюбної одиниці, борця за волю пригнобленого людини, темній і інертній маси, позбавленій освіти й волі... Образи в'язнів і вигнанців і раніше і пізніше з'являлись у творах Лесі Українки ("В'язень" 1889 р., "Мати невільниця" 1895 р., "Бавилонський полон" 1903 р. та інші).103

The scenes of the North and the arctic night ("spolokh") which occur in "Odno slovo" link this poem with Lesia Ukrainka's fantasy "Poliarna nich" where these pictures are presented in a symbolic manner. In general, according to Fylypovych, the poem "Odno slovo" occupies a significant place among Lesia Ukrainka's creative works.

Fylypovych's most extensive work on Lesia Ukrainka is his study on her dramatic poem "U pushchi", in which the poetess presented pictures of the life of British Puritans in Massachusetts and Rhode Island in the seventeenth century. Using the comparative method here he expanded his research framework to include four main aspects for analysis: 1) a review of previous critical opinions; 2) an indication of the sources which served as the basis for the creation of

the poem; 3) an analysis of the poem’s text against its manuscript and unpublished notes of the poetess, and 4) a determination of the aesthetic connections between the poem and other works of Lesia Ukrainka, as well as the creations of other writers. Since Fylypovych had at his disposal Lesia Ukrainka’s archives and supplementary materials, he attempted to conduct basic research on this topic. In the introduction to his study, he acknowledged that literary critics who previously dwelt with "U pushchi" considered to some extent its sources and principal ideas. However, these notes were rather incidental and were made on the basis of limited information received from the poetess’s family. Fylypovych mentioned among them Zerov’s study in which he noted that "постаті англійських пуритан, ненав 'одлиті з чорної бронзи', 'сурові, тверді, повні сили і моці' – навіяні біографією Мілтона, книгою, яку передав поетці ще Драгоманов десять коло 1895р.

104. Similar thoughts were expressed by M. Drai-Khmara in his

monograph on Lesia Ukrainka. He wrote:

Revising these views, Fylypovych stated that Lesia Ukrainka had worked on a biography of John Milton, but was not able to finish it, and on the other hand this biography was not the only or primary source for the creation of the poem. After discovering some primary materials on which the poem was based, Fylypovych was inclined to link the beginning for the poetess's plans for writing "U pushchi" with her uncle, M. Drahomanov. Among these sources he found Drahomanov's popular study entitled Pro bratstvo khrestyteliv abo baptystiv na Ukraini, which was published in Kolomyia in 1893. The second part of this work dealt with the history of the Baptists in foreign countries including a story about a party of British Baptists who settled in North America and founded the colony of Rhode Island. In his other work Evanhel's'ka vira v Starii Anhlii, published in Geneva in 1893, Drahomanov included the characteristic of the British clergyman and founder of the Rhode Island colony, Roger Williams, and

emphasized his conflict with the Massachusetts colony. The third book which Fylypovych found in the archives was entitled *Footprints of Roger Williams*, a work of an unknown author. In addition, the archives contained Drahomanov's manuscripts connected with Williams and particularly outlines and sketches of this clergyman's works. According to Fylypovych, Drahomanov gave all these materials to his niece when she visited him in Sofia in 1894-1895 (at that time he was still a professor of the University of Sofia), shortly before his death. Returning to "U pushchi" itself, Fylypovych indicated the similarity of its structure with the materials mentioned above. Thus the action presented in the poem is placed in the seventeenth century; its first two acts are in a small colony of Massachusetts, and the third act is in Rhode Island where the central figure of the poem, sculptor Richard Airon, was turned away by the Puritans of the Massachusetts colony. The reason for driving Airon away was his refusal to obey implicitly the authority of the teacher and preacher, Godvinson and his followers. Although the conflict between Airon and the Puritans was based on different views on the arts, the primary aspirations of this sculptor are similar to the strivings of Roger Williams. Fylypovych stated that if the central personage of the poem had been a clergyman its main idea would not be altered. A similar situation is found in the dramatic poem "Brand" by the
Norwegian dramatist H. Ibsen, in which the central figure, Brand, was a clergyman. Concerning the "occupation" of his hero, Ibsen wrote to G. Brandes that Brand was rather incorrectly characterized. The mistake was basically in selecting the priesthood as an occupation for Brand and in selecting religion the main goal for his work. Ibsen affirmed that he might have developed the same idea through the personage of a sculptor or a politician. In Fylypovych's opinion, Lesia Ukrainka, who considered that Brandes had discovered Ibsen for Europe, was familiar with this letter which was published in Brandes's article on Ibsen in 1882. Fylypovych mentioned that the first idea for the title of the poetess's poem was also "Skulptor", although in his opinion this similarity is not so significant, because the history of the Puritan movement itself presents many materials rich with conflicts in which the arts are rejected on the basis of divergent aesthetic principles. Lesia Ukrainka knew this

---

106. P. Fylypovych, "Heneza dramatychnoi poemy Lesi Ukrainky 'U pushchi'", in Lesia Ukrainka, Tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospirka, 1927-1930, v. 9, p. 10. On the basis of the information received from Ukrainka's family, Fylypovych mentioned that "Brand" was one of the poetess's favorite poems among Ibsen's works.

history well through preparing her study on Milton who was one of the most pre-eminent representatives of Puritan philosophy. Thus, being familiar with the colorful biography of this great poet, Lesia Ukrainka united some components of his personality with aspects of William's life in the central figure of her poem, Richard Airon. Another principal source for the dramatic poem "U pushchi" was the Bible. In Lesia Ukrainka's archives Fylypovych found a number of notes and quotations especially from the Old Testament. Many of them were even marked indicating to which of the characters in the poem they pertained. Comparing the text of the poem with these extracts from the Bible, Fylypovych presented a number of instances where the characters apply them in the work. It is worthy of note that for the narrow-minded Puritan colony and particularly for its preacher Godvinson, the poetess selected effective quotations from the Old Testament, while for Airon, a positive and open-minded figure, as well as for his friend Dzhonatan, who appeared as a person of compromise, she chose quotations from the New Testament.

The main thrust of Lesia Ukrainka's philosophical concept was expressed in her portrait of Airon which to some extent reflected her feelings towards her cultural surroundings. Therefore, this question had been discussed by some critics before Fylypovych. In order to revise these observations as well as to approach the most plausible
solution in this central question, he analyzed the published text of the poem as compared with its parts which were not included in the final text but remained in the manuscript. In mentioning previous views, Fylypovych pointed to D. Dontsov who attempted to identify Lesia Ukrainka as a follower of F. Nietzsche:

В этой ненависти к людской тупости, разрушающей высшие культурные ценности (идоли), к самоуверенной и глупой толпе, насилующей всякий свободный порыв личности, слышатся уже чисто аристократические нотки Гейне и особенно Ницше: "Я однажды спросил себя и почти изумился своему вопросу: как? Неужели и толпа нужна для жизни?" ("Also sprach Zarathustra").

S. Cherkasenko perceived in the poem the motif of "самотности на верховинах життя..., що так нагадує знаменитого Ібсенівського 'ворога народів', будівничого Сольвенса". A. Muzychka, however, considered that the motif of individual freedom has in "U pushchi" secondary significance. In his opinion, the principal idea of the poem


was expressed by Lesia Ukrainka in these words:

... в смути боротьби життя минає,  
А мир зостається. Се ж бо й значить:  
Pereat mundus, fiat ars.110

In considering these different views, Fylypovych stressed in his analysis that Lesia Ukrainka contrasted the personality of the leading personage Airon only with a small, hypocrirical group of Puritans and especially with its leader Godvinson. On the other hand, there are a number of instances in the poem which indicate that Airon as a man was not devoid of social feelings. On the contrary, these feelings were much stronger than any in the whole Puritan group. Providing particular examples from the poem, Fylypovych emphasized that Airon "нефільки в практичній буденній діяльності виступає як людина громадської вдачі. Він і мистецьку творчість своєї і заселяє від життя ширшого оточення, навпаки, вона здужується в нього особливо від емоцій суспільного характеру". III

In Fylypovych's view, the figure of Airon reflects completely

110. A. Muzychka, Lesia Ukrainka, ii zhyttia, hromads'ka diial'nist' i poetychna tvorchist', Odesa, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrayiny, 1925, p. 61. It should be added that a similar view was expressed by Dontsov in his "Poetka ukrains'koho resordzhimenta" (Lesia Ukrainka), in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1922, kn. 1, p. 44.

LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

a social human being and this was the tragedy of his character. Fylypovych also did not agree with Cherkasenko but considered that Lesia Ukrainka's dramatic poem is quite distant from Ibsen's drama "En folkefiende" in which the primary conclusion of the work and cultural struggle of its main personage was: "Наїдуччий на світі той, хто найбільше за всіх на самоті". Although there might be some similar features in the activities of Airon and the central figure of Ibsen's dramatic poem "Brand", their characters are completely different. While Ibsen's Brand in following his own slogan "all or nothing" conveys the idea of a rough and strongly consistant leader in his actions, Lesia Ukrainka's Airon is represented as a living, sensitive human being with emotions and endurances. Fylypovych stated that the poetess described the deeds of Airon "з більшою увагою до внутрішніх нюансів... ними." We see, as step by step in his all ideas, every step in possible finding the only support for their struggle, and the same - recognition of his creative work and its recognition for its benefit for life. We see, as these parallel processes of paralleled the creative,


113. Ibid., p. 20.
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act of the poem, especially Airon's dialogues with Dzhonatan and later with Antonio, Fylypovych concluded that Lesia Ukrainka also portrayed here a drama of Airon's individual and intimate life (mentioning here the personages of Dzheni Kembl and Karolina d'Orsi). In this particular episode Fylypovych perceived some similarities between "U pushchi" and Ibsen's "Bygmaster Solness", although the differences between Solness and Airon predominate. Ibsen's symbolic drama portrayed the figure of an architect who from the building of majestic towers transferred his activities to a small provincial town and achieved in that community fame and riches. At the same time he refused to give the younger generation any opportunities in this field. From the beginning to the end he represented the personality of a typical individualist. In contrast to Solness, Airon revealed his interest towards youth and supported young people in their aspirations. Even with his modest funds he assisted them and tried to encourage them to follow in his footsteps. Finally Airon attempted to be an example of courage and spiritual strength for his followers. There is one incident in which Fylypovych perceived a similarity between Airon and Solness: their revival of creative power when reminiscing upon their past years of artist strivings and struggle. However this revival was of no effect since Solness tragically ends his life, and Airon dies spiritually as he waits for his physical end. In his
concluding observation on Airon, Fylypovych connected this figure with other poems of Lesia Ukrainka and mentioned, for example, that in 1896 the poetess had written the poem bearing Shakespeare's expression "To be or not to be". In this work Lesia Ukrainka sketched a scene of the jungle:

Дивись: навколо нас великі перелоги,
і дики пущі, і високі кручі...
... Он з пущі ледве чутно стук сокирї...II4

In the form of questions to her Muse in further verses of the same poem she indicated the problem of choosing one of three paths: everyday cultural work; political-revolutionary struggle, and artistic creation. In response to these questions Airon had chosen the third path and "в нього - не стало сил".II5 The reason for the problem was presented in the dramatic poem "U pushchi", which reflected various motifs of other poetical works by Lesia Ukrainka especially in her dramatic poems "Vavylons'kyi polon" and "Na ruinakh".

In conclusion Fylypovych emphasized that despite the fact that "U pushchi" is directed toward general human problems, Lesia Ukrainka also presented her views on the

114. Lesia Ukrainka, "To be or not to be?", in her Tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927-1930, v. 1, p. 109.

115. Paraphrased by Fylypovych from the same poem, Ibid., p. 110.
connection between art and life as well as her own feelings of isolation. In addition there can be perceived indirectly expressed the poetess's thoughts on her literary surroundings in which she felt rather alone and misunderstood as her great predecessor Shevchenko had before her. Fylypovych mentioned that this was probably the reason for the poetess's response to the critical silence on her works with a characteristic phrase: "Та що ж, поділю свої фатум з Шевченком, в його компанії і се не сором".116

Fylypovych's article "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky" exhibits a different character from his studies previously observed. Here the author analyzed just one motif, the picture of Prometheus, which permeated a number of her poems and played an important role in the ideological strivings of the poetess. In the introduction Fylypovych mentioned that since the first writings on this Titan by the Greek poet Hesiod and the dramatist Aeschylus, a number of writers of different times and countries utilized the myth and added features of their own period, surroundings,

and personality. Fylypovych mentioned a whole series of works of world literature (including English, Spanish, German, Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian) stating that

"З кожним новим тлумаченням міту, з кожною спробою ввести в нього запити й потреби свого часу, свого народу, своєї філософської або політичної школи, первісні обриси його біднули, одходили на другий план... Прометей послідовно став середньовічним християнським-подвійником, діячем просвітньої філософії XVIII віку, народним проводиром XIX сторіччя".117

Unlike his previous studies discussed above Fylypovych began this analysis with an a priori statement which suggests that his critical method in this particular work contained some deductive elements. According to this statement Lesia Ukrainka did not add any new or original features to the interpretation of the ancient myth, i.e., she did not present her own independent extension of this subject as she had with other topics of world literature like Don Juan, Cassandria, Judas Iscariot, Tristan and Isolde, and others. Nevertheless, the theme of Prometheus was repeated by the poetess considerably more than any other and with great inspiration.

In a detailed observation of particular examples, such as:

A в нас вогонь Титана ще не згас... II 8

or

O, не один нашадок Прометей
близьку іскру з неба здобував..., I1у

Fylypovych stated that

Неодмінною умовою сприйняття цих поезій мусить бути попереднє усвідомлення образу Прометей, як "постійного символу" чи навіть постійного атрибуту вільної любовних, революційних прагнень. Лесь Українка обмежується частковим подаванням образу, або лише згадкою про нього. Він не набуває будь-якого самостійного значення, має тільки службове призначення - підсилювати громадську патетику. I19а

Lesia Ukrainka's words addressed to "Нашадків Прометей"

were used for the purpose of enhancing the ideological thrust of her thoughts and to heighten the effect, but this motif actually reduced the flexibility and clarity of that particular part of the work. Fylypovych noted such a programatic character in Prometheus's representation especially in "V katakombakh", and also in "Niobea", and even in "Ifiheniiia

---


119. --------, "Fiat nox", Ibid., p. 125.

119а. P. Fylypovych, "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", in his Z novitn'oho ukraïns'oho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 79.

---
v Tavrydi", although in the latter work this motif was used for the basic characterization of a courageous woman's strong personality:

\[
\text{Ні, це не варт нащадка Прометей.}
\]
\[
\text{Коли хто вмів одважно йти на страту,}
\]
\[
\text{Той мусить все одважно зустрічати,}^{119b}
\]

which brings the conclusion:

\[
\text{Тяжкий твій спадок, батьку Прометей,}^{119c}
\]

Fylypovych perceived that there were also examples in Lesia Ukrainka's poetry where the myth of Prometheus was used in a negative sense. Thus in the presentation of Metsenat in the dramatic poem "Orhiia" the characteristic of the myth is completely devoid of positive elements:

\[
\text{Хто знає, друже, чим була та іскра,}
\]
\[
\text{З якої на землі вогонь з'явився?}
\]
\[
\text{То може був нікчемний перегар,}
\]
\[
\text{А все ж нам шанувати ІІ годиться}
\]
\[
\text{I поважати батька-Прометей,}
\]
\[
\text{Хоч може він й був звичайний злодій.}^{120}
\]

In comparing the motif of Prometheus in Lesia Ukrainka's poetry, Fylypovych emphasized that the poetess had her predecessors in Ukrainian literature who had reflected this

\[119b. \text{Lesia Ukrainka, "Ifiheniia v Tavrydi", in her \textit{Tvory}, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927-1930, v. 2, p. 27.}
\]
\[119c. \text{Ibid., p. 28.}
\]
\[120. \text{---------, "Orhiia", in her \textit{Tvory}, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1917-1930, v. 11, p. 149.}
\]
celebrated myth in their own poetic works. The first was I. Kotliarevs'kyi who in his *Eneida*, which was in the form of travesty, compared the suffering of the Trojans with the torments of Prometheus:

Троянив бідних і Енея
Хто не хотів, той не пуряв, -
Терпіли гірше Прометея,
На ледьку що огнє україв. 121

During the period of Romanticism, Shevchenko was one who in his poem "Kavkaz" gave dynamic expression to his portrait of the suffering Titan. Fylypovych analyzed this motif of Shevchenko's poem in these words:

М. Зеров виразив подібну думку, вивчаючи Прометей, а центральний мотив поезії Шевченка, зписано симболізувати свободу. 123

The poet S. Vorobkevych (Danylo Mlaka), who in


122. P. Fylypovych, "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", in his *Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva*, Kyiv Kul'tura, 1929, p. 82.

a good part of his poetry tried to follow Shevchenko's manner, portrayed the myth of the Titan in sentimental colors. Such a picture of Prometheus might be found in his poem "Dumka" in which he wrote:

... серце боляче все дзьобом той птах
Кровавить що днини, що то Прометей
Так тяжко карав він й загинуть не дав...

and

Ах, Боже мій правий! Знов серце зболіло
Від дзьоба грізного, недоленько зла!124

Fylypovych pointed out that Franko reacted to the plaintive voice of the Bukovynian poet with the following words:

Не в тім, співаче, сила слова твого,
Щоб ти раз-у-раз мок в слюзах, кис у горю,
Ні щоб смілявся, чи є чи не є з чого.
Ти будь керманий наш в бурхливій морю...125

Finally Franko himself used the myth of Prometheus in his poem "Lisova idyliia". Fylypovych mentioned that Franko, "забувши мудрість народного прислів'я "слова - не полов", писав";125a


125a. P. Fylypovych, "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 84.
In Fylypovych's opinion, only Shevchenko gave truly clear expression to the myth as a symbol of political liberty and the virtues of social life. In an analogous manner the motif was used by Lesia Ukrainka who also appropriated for her creation materials from foreign literature. In addition, another influence of the poetess's representation of the Titan came from M. Drahomanov who devoted to the myth of Prometheus his work Zazdri bohy published in 1894. After noting this popular study, Fylypovych emphasized that its description of Prometheus is similar to the motif in the poetry of Lesia Ukrainka who used it as a means for reinforcing the idea of liberty.

In general, Fylypovych's studies on Lesia Ukrainka like almost all the critical investigations included in the poetess's complete works published in 1927-1930 did not find any serious echo in Ukrainian criticism except for condemnation by the Marxist critics. This phenomenon might be explained by the fact that the time from 1927 to 1930 was the

---

period when relations between the Ukrainian cultural elite and official Communist circles had begun to assume a rather tense character. On the other hand, as was mentioned above, these were pioneer research works and as such they were quite new for any substantial critical evaluation. With the few reviewing sketches which did observe some of Fylypovych's works should be included the article by A. Muzychka which from the Marxist ideological point of view refused to fully recognize the comparative method in critical research. However, Fylypovych's study on the poem "Odno slovo" was evaluated by Muzychka affirmately. The review of P. Odarchenko on the first three volumes of Lesia Ukrainka's complete works in which two of Fylypovych's studies were published exhibited a general descriptive character and except for its overall laudatory tone did not appraise the critical works included in that edition. To this kind of response belong also the remarks of K. Koperzhyns'kyi made in his bibliographical survey of literary publications of 1927.

126. A. Muzychka, "Dramatychna tvorchist' Lesi Ukrainky ta ii rozuminnia", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1928, no. 9-10, p. 102.


Fylypovych's studies on Lesia Ukrainka might be considered basic investigations which in general had no predecessors, except for the fact that Frenko had done some initial work on "Rusalka". Actually, Franko was the one who linked this poem not only with Shevchenko's ballads but also with the romantic tradition stating that the poem "не в народному стилі, як сказано в титулі, а в старому романтичному шаблоні зложена". Franko's opinion was taken up by M. Zerov who wrote that "це не так народний стиль, як старий романтичний шаблон". These remarks were very general, but they did indicate that their authors were approaching the point which was later attained by Fylypovych. The study on the poem "Odno slovo" was Fylypovych's pioneer research work and his interpretations stand as the only primary source for comprehending this poem until the present time. In the same category is his critical essay on the dramatic poem "U pushchi" based primarily on Lesia Ukrainka's archives. It should be added that in this study Fylypovych's interpretation of some scenes and the characteristic of the main personages (especially Airon) of "U pushchi" is

130. M. Zerov, Lesia Ukrainka; krytychno-biohrafichni narys, Kharkiv, Knyhospilka, 1924, p. 29.
slightly inclined toward the comparative-sociological method. However, overall the sociological elements remain rather inconsequential. The last work discussed above entitled "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky" might be appraised as the weakest of his studies on Lesia Ukrainka, although the subject chosen for investigation as well as a good part of the study itself are quite original and interesting. In the comparative analysis of the motif of Prometheus, Fylypovych inclined to a polemic manner in his criticism. This polemic tone is especially evident in his description of Vorobkevych's "Dumka" where after quoting from the poem he comes to the conclusion: "Иншого не можна було сподіватись від сантиментальної поезії буковинського пароха, якого Франко навчав...", I31 The analysis itself has another drawback which can be noted in Fylypovych's interpretation of the poetess's motifs connected with the myth of Prometheus in her dramatic poem "Orhiia". In describing them he simply recorded that the characteristic of the Titan "цілком поозбавлена ідейного забарвлення і дає матеріал лише до дотепу", I31A overlooking into whose lips

131. P. Fylypovych, "Obraz Pometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 83.

131a. Ibid., p. 81.
Lesia Ukrainka had put this negative description of Prometheus and his deeds. These cynical words were expressed in the poem by a negative character representing the hostile occupational forces for whom all positive elements, and particularly the virtues of spiritual nobility and ethical conduct were distant and alien. Thus the deprecation of Prometheus' image as a symbol of liberty pronounced by such a figure only strengthened the force of the myth and its principal idea as developed in "Orhiia". There are also other words on Prometheus in the poem which are expressed by its central and positive personage Antei. Fylypovych mentioned them but not in contrast to those pronounced by the negative figure. They read:

Иди служи своему Меценату,
Забудь красоты велики заповіти,
Забудь несмірний образ Прометея,
Борія проти богів, забудь і муки
Лаокоона - страждника за правду...

Finally Fylypovych's statement on the erroneous use of a folk proverb in Franko's poem does not seem to have any real basis because Franko purposely paraphrased the proverb in order to indicate that only "Огонь в одежи слова" has true value and significance especially for a poet (Franko's poem was not only dedicated but also directed to the Ukrainian poet-symbolist, M. Voronyi). It should be emphasized that, on the

131b. Lesia Ukrainka, "Orhiia", in her Tвory, Kyiv, Михолипилка, 1927-1930, v. 139.
other hand, in this study Fylypovych perhaps more vigorously than any other critic denied the attempts of Marxist critical writings to present Lesia Ukrainka as a poet of the proletariat and a follower of Marxist ideology. Mentioning the previous opinions on the "Prometeizm" of the poetess, Fylypovych wrote:

Правда, иногда критики и историки литературы можем утверждать, что "прометейизм", как "революционер" якобы писателем, блестящей творчества Леси Украинки", что "робить тут творчість ріднію, близькою пролетаріатові", але риторичний шаблон таких визначень одногнить штучним патосом і мало-що з'ясовує. 132

Beginning in the 1930's Fylypovych's works on Lesia Ukrainka were condemned by the Soviet regime and thus were unable to openly serve later studies on the subject. Only M. Zerov managed to use some of them (especially "Obraz Prometeizma v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky") in the last revised edition of his study on Lesia Ukrainka. 133 The theme of "Prometeizm" in Lesia Ukrainka's works was later studied by D. Kozii in Nasha kul'tura. Following Fylypovych's lead, the critic extended his analysis to the characteristic of ideological elements of the poetess's writings as the main feature of her Weltanschauung. Kozii concluded his thoughts with these words:

132. Fylypovych referred to S. Cherkasenko's work "Lesia Ukrainka", in Dzvin, 1913, no. 9, p. 189-197.

133. M. Zerov, "Lesia Ukrainka", in his Do dzherel, Krakiv, Ukr. vyd-vo, 1943, p. 181-182. (the essay was revised in 1929).
A close connection of this essay by Fylypovych might be observed also with certain parts of the general survey of Lesia Ukrainka's life and work written by O. Bilets'kyi and published as a preface to the poetess's complete works in 1951. Fylypovych's "Heneza dramatychnoi poemy Lesi Ukrainky 'U pushchi"' served as the basis for the dissertation of O. Stavyts'kyi and his article "'U pushchi' Lesi Ukrainky". Taking full advantage of Fylypovych's research, and works of other literary critics of the 1920's, Stavyts'kyi composed his work according to the concept of the Communist ideological system. It should be emphasized that almost all Fylypovych's

133a. D. Kozii, "Prometei i prometeizm", in his "Kliasychni obrazy i siuzhety v tvorchosti Lesi Ukrainky", in Nasha kul'tura, 1936, kn. 11, p. 743-744.

134. O. S. Stavyts'kyi, "'U pushchi' Lesi Ukrainky", in Hadians'ke literaturoznавstvo, 1959, no. 3, p. 89-103. It is worthy of note that in Stavyts'kyi's opinion Lesia Ukrainka based the image of Airon not only on the biographical data of Milton and Williams but also on the biographical sketch of G. Wither which was included in the book Milton und seine Zeit. Ibid., p. 90.

134a. It was also stressed by O. Bilets'kyi in his "Pro dramatychnu poemu Lesi Ukraїnky 'U pushchi'; vidzyv na kandydata'ku dysertatsiiu O. Stavyts'ko ho 'Dramatychna poema Lesi Ukrainky 'U pushchi"', in his Pys'mennyk i epokha, Kyiv, DVKhL, 1963, p. 493-500.
critical works on Lesia Ukrainka were used by Leonid Bilets'kyi in his general description of the poetess's poetry published in 1951. Analyzing the poem "Rusalka", Bilets'kyi stated that

Як Франко (перший), так і І. Филипович підкреслюють, що "Русалка" Лесі Українки написана в лусі баллад романтичної доби Щевченка, Миккевича, Гайного та інш.135

In his statement Bilets'kyi overlooked the fact that Fylypovych was not only the first but the only one to discover and analyze the connections between "Rusalka" and the ballads of Mickiewicz and Heine. There is also a possibility that Bilets'kyi made his statement on the basis of Franko's remarks that the poem was composed in the old romantic pattern. The influence of Fylypovych's research work is evident in Bilets'kyi's notes to the dramatic poem "U pushchi", although the latter referred to the general work of B. Iakubs'kyi instead of to Fylypovych.136 Finally, Bilets'kyi extensively


136. Ibid., p. 119. It seems that the author referred to Iakubs'kyi's preface to Lesia Ukrainka's complete works published in 1927-1930 (Bilets'kyi did not specify which of Iakubs'kyi's studies he had in mind).
used Fylypovych's study on "Odno slovo" for his general description of this poem, and one can even identify identical expressions. Fylypovych's "Heneza dramatychnoi poemy Lesi Ukrainky 'U pushchi'" was taken into consideration by the scholar, Constantine Bida, in characterizing the poem in his study of Lesia Ukrainka's life and work published in 1968. Bida extended the analysis of "U pushchi" emphasizing its aesthetical-artistic values. In this respect he wrote:

Skillful stage direction, vivacity of dialogue, and an excellent handling of contrast combined with strength and harmony of diction are the chief merits of this drama. Here action predominates to a greater degree than in her earlier plays. Richard's monologues in the third act contain passages of remarkable lyrical beauty.

In contrast to Bida, P. Odarchenko for his study of Lesia Ukrainka (published as the preface to the second (reprinted)


138. C. Bida, "Lesia Ukrainka; life and work", in Lesia Ukrainka. Life and work by Constantine Bida. Selected works translated by Vera Rich, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1968, p. 3-84.

139. Ibid., p. 71.
LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

edition of the poetess's complete works\(^{140}\) ignored Fylypovych's research works as well as almost all the other new studies including those published in Lesia Ukrainka's complete works of 1927-1930 which had revised old views on her poetry.\(^{144}\) It would seem that Odarchenko's study suffers from a lack of consideration of these sources.

In general, Fylypovych's critical works on Lesia Ukrainka's poetry like similar studies of other scholars of the 1920's and especially those produced by the Havan Neo-classicists (M. Zerov, O. Burhardt, and M. Drai-Khmara) were neither revised nor basically supplemented by any additional comparative investigations in this respect. Hence, these studies have remained vital until the present time.

In the cycle of Fylypovych's studies based on the comparative method is also his essay "Heneza Frankovoi lehendy 'Smert' Kaina'", which is among the first detailed


\(^{144}\) In his essay Odarchenko referred also to the biographical-critical works of Zerov, Drai-Khmara, and Iakubs'kyi. However their detailed analyses of Lesia Ukrainka's creative works were not taken into consideration.
LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

comparative analyses of Franko's poems in all of Ukrainian criticism. The study is divided into three parts corresponding to the particular aspects concerned: 1) determination of the relations between Franko's legend "Smert' Kaina" and Byron's mystery "Cain"; 2) indication of the plots and motifs of world literature employed in Franko's legend, and 3) comparison of previous critical views concerning the central idea of the legend. In addition the evolution of Franko's philosophical conception of the world is traced through the entire study.

In the introduction to his study, Fylypovych characterized Franko's critical evaluation of the significance of Byron for the development of world literature as it was presented by Franko in his preface to P. Kulish's translation of Byron's poem "Childe Harold's Pilgrimage". In this scholarly study, Franko analyzed the principal features of the life and work of this leading figure in Romanticism. In spite of the fact that Byron's typical Weltschmerz was quite


distant from Franko's philosophical concept, in appraising Byron's ideas expressed in his poetry he wrote: "Велике, справді, революційне значення Байронового життя і Байронової поезії було власне в тім, що в пору великої реакції та занепаду духа по закінченні наполеонських війн, він із нечіткою, елементарною силою виступає, як речник свободи, як бунтар проти всього усталеного, усвяченого, шаблонового". In 1879 Franko translated Byron's "Cain". Although in this work the pessimistic thoughts of the English poet reached their highest level, at the same time they were united with strong motifs of protest and opposition to authority and also with the search for absolute truth. In Fylypovych's opinion, the latter motifs of the mystery had been the attraction for Franko as the poet expressed in his remarks to his translation. In Cain, the central figure of Byron's mystery, Franko saw the thinking human being of the early nineteenth century as his thought was prevented from freely developing and, as Franko himself stated:

Franko devoted the last part of his remarks to another main personage of the mystery, Cain's sister and wife Ada, a personification of immense love. However, according to Fylypovych, Franko's strong convictions on the victorious successes of positivistic knowledge bringing happiness for humanity did not permit him to give close attention to the analysis of Ada's love as one of the basic motifs of "Cain" and the antithesis of rational knowledge. During the period of the creation of "Kameniari" and "Vichnyi revoliutsioner" such an antithesis did not exist for Franko. Fylypovych concluded his thoughts with the characteristic words: "Промине десять років борні, важких ударів життя й гірких розчарувань і вона всплине в Франковій уяві і він напишe 'Сmёрть Каїна'". 145

144. The quotation was taken from Franko's "Zamitka perekladchyka", in H. Bairon, Kain; misteriia v tr'okh diiakh. Pereklav I. Franko, L'viv, Dribna biblioteka, 1879, p. 70. This quotation was excluded from the reprinted text in Franko's Tvory, Kyiv, DVKhL, 1955, v. 15, p. 583-585.

Fylypovych stated that direct influence on Franko's "Smert' Kaina" created in 1889 can be considered to begin with Byron's mystery. The first words of Franko's legend: "Убивши брата, Каїн многи літ блукав по світі", even read like a continuation of "Cain". The principal personages of the legend, Kain and Ada, in a sense continued the activity begun in Byron's mystery. Also, Franko's characteristic of Ada was close to the portrait of this figure in "Cain". However, the whole philosophical attitude of the Ukrainian poet was completely different. Whereas Byron in his mystery was interested in individualistic problems and their solution through the achievement of the absolute heights of knowledge, Franko's principal idea was the attainment of happiness for humanity where knowledge was only one of the stepping-stones. Fylypovych considered that Franko borrowed the plot of the death of Cain from the apocryphal story of Cain's descendant, old blind Lemekh, who had killed his forefather. As an expert on old Christian legends and apocrypha, Franko knew this story very well several years before his creation of "Smert' Kaina".

Later the story about Lemekh also was included in his collection of apocrypha. From an aesthetic point of view the symbolic pictures of two odd beasts which might be considered close to the mythological figures Sphinx and Chimera, played an important role in the legend. In Fylypovych's opinion, there were various sources which might have served Franko for his elaboration of these symbolic creatures in the paradise scene in "Smert' Kaina". The scholar perceived a picture analogous to Franko's scene in the "Divina Commedia" of Dante Alighieri. In particular the construction of the second part of Dante's poem with its allegorical figures indicated a similarity with the picture of paradise in Franko's legend. Fylypovych mentioned that Dante was one of Franko's favorite poets whose works he translated into Ukrainian as well as having devoted a special study to his life and poetry.

147. I. Franko, "Prychynky do istorii rus'koi literatury XVIII viku. Drohobyts'kyi zbirnyk ruk. apokryfichnykh opovidan'", in Zoria, 1886, no. 9, p. 155-156. The article contains also a description of the story about Lemekh.


149. --------, "Seredni viky i ikh poet", in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1907, kn. 3-12 (also a revised edition entitled Dante Alighieri; kharakterystyka serednikh vikiv, zhyttia poeta i vybir z ioho poezii, Ukr. movoiu zladyv I. Franko, Kyiv, Vyd. T-va prykhyl'nykiv shtuky i lit-ry u L'vovi, 1913, viii, 246 p.
the poem of G. Flaubert, "La tentation de saint Antoine", published in 1872, as an example of the contrast between the pictures of Sphinx and Chimera used for symbolizing two basic internal inclinations of the human being. In the last part of his poem, Flaubert presented the scene of Sphinx and Chimera as symbols of temptation and at the same time as two primordial enemies. In the picture of paradise in Franko's legend, the two beasts (especially that of Chimera's image) also symbolized temptation, but the poet's hero did not accept them, although he recognized their great power over humanity. In Fylypovych's opinion, "La tentation de saint Antoine" drew Franko's special attention as the poet mentioned in his letter to M. Drahomanov where he informed the latter that he planned to publish his translation of "La tentation de saint Antoine" (цими днями я прочитав цю повість за одинвечір). 150

Fylypovych underlined that the principal idea of "Smert' Kaina" is the virtue of love which despite the influence of various works of world literature noticeable in the legend was presented in an original and natural composition. In this respect the scholar agreed with the thoughts

of S. Iefremov and quoted his words: "Любов до життя конкретної людини – це в світогляді Франковім зміст усього життя людського. Один з прикладів – легенда 'Смерть Каїна'... Думаю, що навіть у всьому своєму письменстві не багато можна знайти творів, перейнятіх такою великою і великою ідеєю, з таким грандіозним образом людини".151 Also, Fylypovych shared completely the view of S. Smal'-Stots'kyi who stated that in "Smert' Kaina" Franko "израховувавши чисто філософським способом питання, чи в знання шукати раду, щастя, супонок, доходити до висновку, що знання найперші дари – кров, рані, смерть, що отже не плоди знання, а плоди дерева життя дають людям ту силу, що смерть їм не страшна".152

"Чуття, велика любов – ось джерело життя".152a

151. The quotation is taken from S. Iefremov, Spivets' borot'by i kontrastiv: sproba literaturnoi biografii i kharakterystyky Ivana Franka, U Kyiv, 1913, p. 183.

152. Fylypovych quoted from S. Smal'-Stots'kyi, Kharakterystyka literaturnoi diial'nosti Ivana Franka; iuvileinyi vyklad, L'viv, 1913, p. 11-12.

152a. I. Franko, Smert' Kaina; lehenda, L'viv, Nakladom avtora, 1889, p. 41.
To these opinions Fylypovych added that

The scholar considered that in the second part of the legend Franko inclined toward romantic motifs which are particularly evident in his lyrical expressions after the description of the paradise scenes. In some of the poet's lyrical digressions Fylypovych saw connections with Mickiewicz's ballad "Romantyczność". These parallels are important in the aesthetic development of the poem's motifs, however, they play a secondary role as far as the structure of the central idea of the legend is concerned. On the other hand, Fylypovych pointed out that "Франко зовсім не знєважає знання на зразок де-яких романтиків; він тільки проти того використовування знання, що веде до руйнації життя, до жорстоких війн і т. п."

Franko emphasized the significance of this idea in other poems as well. It was especially clearly presented in the poem "Mamo pryrodo" in which the poet reached the conclusion that "треба 'створити рай в нутрі архитвору-людини':


154. Ibid., p. 17-18.
In the legend "Smert' Kaina" this thought found expression by Franko in a powerful and picturesque style.

Concerning the descriptions of nature which occupy a significant place in the legend, A. Muzychka thought that Franko based them on Milton's pictures and views of the Carpathian Mountains. Acknowledging this conjecture, Fylypovych considered, however, that Milton's influence is less evident in the legend. He also revised Muzychka's view regarding the landscape of the Carpathians in the scenes of paradise presented in "Smert' Kaina". In his opinion, Franko gave the key to the sources of these pictures by himself in his letter to M. Drahomanov in which he wrote:

Цікавий я дуже, що Ви скажете про "Каїна". Він сильні в мозку ще від часу, коли я перекладав байронового Каїна, і тільки тополь я осилив якось свій жиравську легенду, домішавши до неї шматки з легенди про Фавста, який зверху Кавказу оглядає рай.

155. The quotation was taken by Fylypovych from I. Franko, "Mamo pryrodo", in his Iz dniu zhurb, Lviv, Nakl. avtora, 1900, p. 48.

156. A. Muzychka, Shliakhy poetychnoi tvorchosti Ivana Franka, Odesa, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1927, p. 163.

Fylypovych perceived that Franko had in mind first of all the book of J. Spies entitled *Volksbuch* which contained the story of "Doktor Faust". In addition, Fylypovych maintained that in "Smert' Kaina" some traces of Goethe's dramatic poem "Faust" might also be observed, especially in the drama of striving for unlimited knowledge and the contradiction between abstract thought and direct feelings, nature, and the fullness of real life. All these aspects were reflected in Goethe's poem and followed later by other poets and especially by Byron in his "Cain". Through Byron's poem and also directly through Goethe's work these elements influenced Franko's legend to some extent. In Fylypovych's opinion, the unification of all the materials mentioned above brought about the originality of "Smert' Kaina" which might be considered a clear portrait of the evolution of the poet's own Weltanschauung as well as an apotheosis of love. According to Fylypovych's statement,

"Смерть Каїна" — річ складна. В ній ми зустріли різні літературні впливи й образи, і в той же час не можна сказати, що це твір не цільний, штучно з "шматків" зроблений. Він гармоніє з іншими творами поета, в ньому відчувається єдність задуму, уповненість творчої волі.

157a. Spies's *Volksbuch* was first published in 1587 and republished in 1878 and 1884.

LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING
THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

Literary criticism evaluated Fylypovych's study as one of the first serious steps towards the scholarly analysis of Franko's poetic works. Thus, K. Koperzhyns'kyi considered the work as valuable analysis of the legend which in addition to its basic objectivity represents a comparative investigation significant for the scholarly studies of Franko's works. In his review on "Heneza Frankovoi lehendy 'Smert' Kaina" B. Iakubs'kyi stated that the study

Although there were just a few general observations on Franko's legend in Ukrainian criticism preceding Fylypovych's analysis of "Smert' Kaina", he did not make use of


them all. Thus the characteristic of the legend written by A. Krushel'nyts'kyi, and the remarks of D. Dontsov were not taken into consideration. It seems probable that he declined to mention these works purposely since the first one based on socialistic-ideological principles did not provide new ideas or interpretations of "Smert' Kaina", whereas the second, the journalistic article of D. Dontsov, which attempted to portray Franko's literary works in a negative light, did not merit scholarly consideration.

Fylypovych's analysis of Franko's legend did not become one of the popular works on Franko in the Soviet Union. The character of the poem itself and the research work conducted by Fylypovych did not meet the general requirements of the Marxist concept of that time. Nevertheless, the study served as one of the basic sources for

161. In 1928 Fylypovych extended his study on Franko's legend with observations of Muzychka's thoughts concerning "Smert' Kaina", and the newly published correspondence between Franko and Drahomanov. P. Fylypovych, "Henez Frankovoi lehendy 'Smert' Kaina'", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'oho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 51-64.


Iefremov's revision of his biographical-critical work on Franko published in 1926,\(^{164}\) and was considered by Muzychka in his sociological study on the poet.\(^{165}\) After the 1930's, the philosophical poems of Franko as well as any analyses of them were generally avoided by Soviet criticism. Instead, at the order of the Communist authorities all possible efforts were made to portray Franko as an atheist and a direct follower of the Russian revolutionary writers and critics like A. I. Herzen, N. G. Chernyshevskii, as well as V. G. Belinskii.\(^{166}\) Even such leading figures in Ukrainian Soviet literature as M. Ryl's'kyi, and O. Bilets'kyi had to limit themselves to general descriptions of Franko's life and to emphasize only those elements (which in fact play a secondary role in an evaluation of the aesthetic and artistic manner of the poet) which were possible to reconcile with the Marxist system. Thus, in these works an analysis of "Smert' Kaina"

---

\(^{164}\) S. Iefremov, Ivan Franko; krytychno-biohrafichnynarys, Vyd. 2., z dodatkamy, Kyiv, Slovo, 1926, 254 p.

\(^{165}\) A. Muzychka, Shliakhy poetychnoi tvorchosti Ivana Franka, Odesa, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1927, 200 p.

\(^{166}\) O. Bilous, Filosofs'ki i suspil'no-politychni pohliady Ivana Franke, Kyiv, T-vo dla poshyrennia polit. i nauk. znan' URSR, 1949, 131 p.

could find little attention beyond a simple recording of its existence.  

In the second half of the 1950's, Franko's philosophical poems were more closely considered by Soviet criticism. However, almost all such observations were based on Marxist positions and often included the common Communist propagandistic expressions. Among these writings there are some articles and commentaries dealing with "Smert' Kaina" which should be mentioned in connection with Fylypovych's study. Iu. Kobylets'kyi, for example, basing his general description of the legend on Fylypovych's research (without once referring to the original source) criticized some of Fylypovych's views with these words:

Дехто шукав впливу "Божественної комедії" Данте на Франківську поему, дехто твердив про запозичення Франком образів (сфінкс і химера) з Флоберової "Сонячна св. Антонія"... але штучне приз'явування до таких паралелів мало допомогати нам розкрити ідеїний задум Франкової поеми.  

167. An exception might be observed in the essay of O. Moroz, "Do henez i dzherel 'Moho Izmarahdu' Ivana Franka" in Ivan Franko; statti i materiialy, zbiryk 1, 1948, p. 125-152, in which the author attempted to approach closer to the genesis of the cycle of Franko's works which include his "Smert' Kaina".


168. Iu. Kobylets'kyi, Tvorchist' Ivana Franka; do storichchia z dnia narodzhennia, 1856-1956 rr., Kyiv, VDKhL, 1956, p. 248. The author mentioned that the poem of C. Leconte de Lisle, "Cain", which as a matter of fact presents the death of Cain, could also be listed with those which contain some similar features of Franko's legend.
Also, F. Ryvkins took advantage of the data revealed by Fylypovych for his interpretation of "Smert' Kaina". The principal aim of this article was to portray the legend's central personage, Kain, as a representative of a collective body struggling against the religious authorities. A. Iartys' in his essay on the ideological views of Franko went even further in these speculative attempts by finding in the legend a lofty declaration of atheism by which the poet revealed an "антиморальну суть християнської релігії і моралі". Beside these writings, a few serious works were published which despite the stamp of official Marxist ideology dealt with new sources and fresh thoughts concerning "Smert' Kaina". Among these studies, in the first place is the work of M. Derkach and A. Skots', "Nevidoma redaktsiia poemy I. Franka 'Smert' Kaina'", where those parts of the legend which were not included in the final text were disclosed on the basis of the poet's manuscript. Although these


critics gave little attention to a detailed comparison of the published poem and its manuscript form, the data provided presented new opportunity for further research on "Smert' Kaina". A. Skots' also published a separate study dealing with the characteristic of the central figure of Franko's legend, Kain, and indicated its prototypes in world literature. The work, based primarily on Fylypovych's research, was concluded with thoughts similar to Krushel'nyts'kyi's, but colored with stronger expressions typical of Marxist criticism. As one closer to a scholarly criticism of Franko's philosophical poems, the study of A. Kaspruk, Filosofs'ki poemy Ivana Franka might be mentioned in which the description of "Smert' Kaina" occupies a significant place. Following Fylypovych's study directly, Kaspruk extended the scholar's analysis on the legend into a detailed comparison of its published text and the available manuscript. In addition, the critic also perceived the connection between some motifs of "Smert' Kaina" and the poem of V. Hugo, "Cain", as well as Lermontov's "Demon". Furthermore, Kaspruk pointed out that


Satan, the leading figure of Milton's "Paradise Lost", which served as one of the inspirations for the composition of Byron's "Cain", also left its traces on Franko's Kain. Another interesting thought of Kaspruk concerns the landscape pictures in the poem which Fylypovych had connected with the Caucasus on the basis of Franko's letter to Draho­manov. The critic did not deny this fact but added that the landscape of the Carpathians with their high plains and villages also played an important role in those scenes. Finally, Kaspruk emphasized that "Smert' Kaina" might be considered an autobiographical work as well. In order to support this statement, he quoted the small, laconic poem by Franko "Neiasna dlaia vas sia lehenda", which was also written in 1889 as an explanation of "Smert' Kaina". Although Kaspruk's work bore some features which might be described as an impost to the official order, it supplemented Fylypovych's pioneering research with well-organized source materials and amplified it with serious analysis.

174. The first such assumption concerning this question was expressed by D. Shtohrryn in "Do evoliutsii svitohliadu I. Franka ("Smert' Kaina")", in Vyzvol'nyi shliakh, 1961, no. 5, p. 457.

LITERARY RESEARCH OF P. FYLYPOVYCH UTILIZING THE COMPARATIVE METHOD

One of the main reasons that Fylypovych's studies were closely followed by other critics may be considered his effective research manner, based on the methods of scholarly criticism, which was basic in aiding him in achieving his original conclusions.

As it was discussed at the beginning of this chapter and observed in the analysis of Fylypovych's separate works, the scholar applied the comparative method of research. Hence, when comparing the theoretical formula of this method against the methodological basis directly observed in Fylypovych's studies it can be determined that he unified two of its principles. The first was his close following of its theory which leads toward the study of literary works, their mutual connections and influences based on their respective backgrounds, and which provides an understanding of these works on the grounds of cultural and literary trends despite the boundaries of national literatures. In fact, this is the combination of the theoretical formula of A. N. Veselovskii and components of the theoretical concept of M. Drahomanov concerning comparative investigation. The second principle is seen in analysis based on the comparison of literary creations of a single author or in the consideration of corresponding factors within the national cultural process (the works of other writers and folk literature and customs). This concept might be considered
as the research formula generally adopted in Ukrainian literary criticism and extended by its scholars in the 1920's. The combination of both these methodological principles are strongly preserved in all of Fylypovych's studies analyzed above.
IV.

CRITICAL WORKS ABOUT TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Although the comparative method was employed predominantly by Fylypovych in his literary criticism, the scholar did not limit his research to this method exclusively. He also searched for other approaches which in that particular time could provide the necessary scholarly objectivity and lead to productive investigations on the problems studied. Also, many untouched questions in Ukrainian literary criticism required particular research methods suitable to the theme involved. The most fitting method in this respect was the sociological which already enjoyed its own tradition in Ukrainian critical works. However, in Fylypovych's opinion, this method in the Soviet literary criticism of the 1920's was not only overly simplified, but also separated from its original methodological purposes in literary analysis. In regard to this situation he stated:

It is important to mention that Fylypovych wrote this at the time of the attempt in Soviet literary criticism of using the sociological method as a basis for the establishment of a theoretical foundation for the Marxist methodological approach toward literary research. This in turn found firm support from the literary officials of the Communist party and regime.2

Considering such an approach as indeed distant from a scholarly position, the Kievan Neoclassicists, especially Fylypovych and Zerov, declined to apply it in their critical works despite the general attitude of Communist critics.3 Instead they used a methodological formula based on a combination of the sociological and comparative methods. The only difference in applying this combination of methods by these scholars was that while in Zerov's studies one finds

---

2. Iskusstvo i literatura v marksistskom osveshchenii Ch. 1: Obshchee problemy, Moskva, 1924. Also B. Iakubs'kyi, Sotsiolohichniy metod u pys'menstvi, Kyiv, DVU, 1925.

3. To some extent this literary policy forced such scholars as O. Doroshkevych (in his histories of Ukrainian literature) and B. Iakubs'kyi (in his "Do suchasnoho stanu metodolohii literaturoznavstva, in Zapyski KINO, t. 1, 1926), as well as Z. Chuchmar'ov (in his "Sotsiolohichniy metod v istorii ta teorii literatury", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1926, no. 7-8) to alter their methodological approach and adopt a stance leaning toward the Marxist position.
an accent on sociologico-historical aspects, Fylypovych concentrated on comparative elements. 4

Using this particular methodological formula in his research, Fylypovych considered its principal components as a general framework for the study concentrating on comparison between previous views on the problem, the influence of a single sociological factor on various literary works of an author, and finally the works of several writers created under the influence of the same historical or political events. Another aim of this approach was to provide all possible evidence of links between a particular writer and world literature, as well as philosophico-sociological movements in general.

Studies on Shevchenko and his surroundings.

Perhaps one of the best examples of the effective application of the comparative-sociological method by Fylypovych is his research on Shevchenko, which he conducted...

4. In some of their studies these scholars had to pay formal impost to the official literary line which they usually handled by including in the introduction of a work expressions about a "class face of writer and reader" (M. Zerov, Nove ukrains'ke pys'menstvo, p. 9), or remarks on "materialistic characteristic of a poet's creation" (P. Fylypovych, "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby", p. 7). Apparently these inserts were included reluctantly and did not affect the whole content of the particular study. The question of such introductory remarks in the critical works during the 1920's-1930's in Ukraine was considered by H. Kostiuk in his essay "Ukrains'ke naukove literaturznavstvo v pershe povevoliutions'niu piadetsiati-littia", in ZNTSh, t. 173, 1962, p. 211.
at almost the same time his comparative studies on the poet were published. Here should be mentioned especially the essay "Do studiiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby", and the separately published book Shevchenko i dekabrysty. The first study was issued in the initial volume of collected articles under the title Shevchenko ta ioho doba edited by S. Iefremov, M. Novyts'kyi, and Fylypovych. The issue itself which was planned as the beginning of a serial publication devoted to Shevchenko studies, might be described as representative of the sociological method in research on the poet. Although Fylypovych's essay played an introductory role in this volume the scholar stated:

В даному разі нас цікавить не обговорення принципових питань, зв'язаних з соціологічними дослідженнями, а розгляд того, що пророблено в цій галузі над Шевченком. Показати на конкретному матеріалі, якими шляхами йшли дослідження, зафіксувати їх досягнення і помилки, внести певні корективи і доповнення, а на підставі їх, може й деякі узагальнення...

In general the essay presents three different questions in which the comparative-sociological method figured: 1) the discussion of M. Drahomanov's position on Shevchenko's life and work; 2) the criticism of A. Richyts'kyi's study on

6. Ibid., p. 7.
Shevchenko, and 3) the description of Shevchenko's intellectual surroundings, particularly his relationship with Germans and the comparative analysis of the question of Germans as they appear in Shevchenko's poems and diary.

In Fylypovych's opinion, the monograph by Drahomanov, entitled Shevchenko, ukrainofil'yi i sotsializm,7 which as a matter of fact, might be considered the first attempt in Ukrainian literary criticism at disparaging the standing of the poet, belonged with the first serious studies on Shevchenko based on the historico-sociological principles which were set forth by the author as follows: "Кожного чоловіка, кожного писателя, тоді тільки можна оцінити як слід, коли роздивився на нього власне історичним, об'єктивним поглядом, та й ще на грунті тієї громади, з якій він виріс і працював".8 Fylypovych considered that Drahomanov's main contribution to Ukrainian criticism on Shevchenko was particularly in the stimulation it afforded literary critics to initiate scholarly research into the poet's life and cultural-political surroundings. In general, however, the scholar evaluated Drahomanov's


study as obsolete and bearing a number of controversial statements and weakly supported conclusions. Some of these conclusions were considered an anachronism not only by the modern literary scholars but even by Shevchenko's contemporaries. According to Fylypovych, the basic drawback of Drahomanov's work was the extremely limited number of materials dealing with Shevchenko's life at different periods which the author had at his disposal as well as the almost complete lack of primary sources to explain the many important details of the poet's activities. Drahomanov addressed himself several times to this problem, for example:

Thus operating with the poor materials available at that time and with certain questionable assumptions about Shevchenko's education and social relations, Drahomanov adopted conclusions:


which were far from complete, and "в таких випадках",
Fylypovych emphasized, "неповнота стає часто методологічною
помилкою і спричинюється до неправдивого навігання фактів".

Fylypovych challenged Drahomanov's acquaintance with
Shevchenko's personality and his work in three basic areas:
1) the poet's education; 2) the formation of Shevchenko's
philosophical view of world; 3) Shevchenko's role in the
activities of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood, and conse­
quently the interpretation of these three aspects as they
were reflected in the poet's literary production. In order
to support his challenge, Fylypovych pointed out that Shev­
chenko's education and his exceptional intellectual capa-
bility had not only been upheld but essentially proved by a
number of reminiscences and research works, especially those
of P. Kulish,\textsuperscript{12} F. Matushevs'kyi,\textsuperscript{13} S. Iefremov,\textsuperscript{14} A.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{12} P. Kulish, "Perehliad ukrains'kykh knyzhok",
  \item \textsuperscript{13} F. Matushevs'kyi, "Shevchenko v istoricheskoi
obstanovke", in \textit{Ukrainskaia zhizn'}, 1914, No. 2, p. 77-89.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} S. Iefremov, "Shevchenko pro sebe samoho",
in \textit{Shevchenko; zbirka}, Kyiv, 1914, p. 4-18.
\end{itemize}
Nikovs'kyi, I. Aizenshtok, and V. Doroshenko. In distinction to Drahomanov's statement on Shevchenko's Weltanschauung as "muzhytstvo" (peasanthood), Fylypovych emphasized that the poet had consistently underlined his not only peasant but actually serf descent, whereas his philosophical conception of the world was formed under the influence of a number of philosophical and socio-political views and trends. These were particularly the ideas of the German romanticists and French encyclopaedists, the Polish revolutionary circles, the Russian intellectuals and revolutionaries (Decembrists and members of the Petrashevskii group), and above all the Ukrainian scholars and literary personalities with whom Shevchenko not only enjoyed close personal but also at times political relations through participation in the activities of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood. Fylypovych mentioned that this aspect of Shevchenko's personality had also been researched generally by such scholars as V.

17. V. Doroshenko, "Shevchenkova osvita", in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1924, kn. 4, p. 46-60.
CRITICAL WORKS ABOUT TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Shchurat, M. Novyts'kyi, M. Vozniak, O. Doroshkevych, and himself. However the best source for Shevchenko's life, work and views in this respect is the poet himself through his diary, autobiographical novels, and correspondence which were partly reflected in his poems. In these Shevchenko indicated not only the philosophical-social trends predominant at his time, the events and people whose ideas he supported, but expressed his own opinion and criticisms as well. Fylypovych mentioned that Drahomanov's position was to explain somehow the social and revolutionary content of Shevchenko's work which remained even after strong attempts at denying it. For this the author sought source material in the poet's surroundings. Thus, in Drahomanov's opinion, according to the available materials and especially in line

18. V. Shchurat, "Osnovy Shevchenkovykh zviszkiv z poliakamy", in ZNTSh, t. 119-120, 1917, p. 117-118.


22. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko i dekabrysty", Ibid., p. 25-41, and "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka", in Nova hromada (Kyiv), 1924, No. 20-21, p. 4-5.
with his assumptions, there were only "дві компанії: спеціалісти - слов'янишки і так звані світські люди".23

Hence, Shevchenko "так і зостався із напіваною науковою мальяркою про Нептунів, Беатриче Чечі і т. д., наукову, яку виніс із Академії, та з Біблією, яку товк у діка й яку відновили йому приятели Київські, та з історією України найбільше по"Історії Русів". Тільки незвичайна врода (талант) поета, то його мучінство виводили його на просту дорогу з того туману, в якому його держала така наука".24

Drahomanov perceived the poet's peasanthood mainly in the fact that Shevchenko was brought "на обіваних та за-темнених думках селян, на споминах таких темних рухів, як уманська різня 1768 року".25

On the basis of this statement Fylypovych again challenged Drahomanov's knowledge and understanding of the history and significance of this anti-Polish uprising, called "Koliivshchyna", for there was quite little research done on this historical event during Drahomanov's lifetime. New studies on this topic which were begun at the beginning of the twentieth century, and particularly in the 1920's,


24. Ibid.

shed new light on the Haydamaky movement and uncovered primary sources hitherto unknown. These materials revealed the social and political goals of the uprising and, moreover, indicated that the national situation in Ukraine during that time and the movement itself were far more complicated than Drahomanov had imagined.

In reassessing all these questions representing the main aspects of Drahomanov's study, Fylypovych concluded that despite the author's speculative approach to Shevchenko and his work, Drahomanov was the first to see the poet as a social being, and this step stimulated later scholars to conduct further studies in this line.

From the structural point of view, this review on Drahomanov's work played an introductory role in Fylypovych's study. Proving the obsoleteness of Drahomanov's views, the scholar considered that contemporary criticism had every reason to refuse to follow the old patterns which usually led to highly speculative conclusions. In his opinion, modern Ukrainian literary criticism in the 1920's was in the position to conduct sophisticated research especially on those problems supported by documents available in rare-material.

CRITICAL WORKS ABOUT TARAS SHEVCHENKO

libraries and archives. On the other hand, in order to achieve the intended results and to reach objective conclusions such research requires the base of an established critical method. From this standpoint Fylypovych treated A. Richyts'kyi's work, Shevchenko v svitli epokhy, in which its author declared:

Poet-mužyk i krípák viďovťohur všid sebe "teplogo kóhú-
xa"'aj zališaťsja v "sirjakovi". U čymu vláste suspíľ-
no-istórichcje znacíncia geniá Ševčenka. Bín viníc svého
geniá z prihliónených selyankaých máši á tých v neroz-
rivnomu zvyežkózí z ciez mášoo vín miž dousťi nedošk-
noj vósčiní. Mózna z pewnícé sazati, ņo porví Šev-
čenko svój soćiálny zvyežk iz krípíckej mášo, i oód
jogó geniá níchó b ne líšilošo, krim zvícchnýho pisá-
ki, aó vídómó líže vúzłókóm konu kúhóchnika-mályar.

It should be mentioned that Richyts'kyi's book, which was considered by the Communist criticism as the first study on Shevchenko based on the Marxist critical method, was praised by some literary critics not only in Soviet Ukraine, but

27. A. Richyts'kyi, Taras Shevchenko v svitli epokhy, Kharkiv-Berlin, -New York, Kosmos, 1923, 192 p. In 1925 the work was published in its second edition, and in 1931 it was translated into Russian and published in Moscow by Gos. izd-
vo khudozh. lit-ry under the title Taras Shevchenko v svete
epokhi, with additional quotations from Lenin's works and also including Stalin's expressions on literature and the national question.

27a. M. Plevako, "Shevchenko i krytyka", in Chervonyi
shliakh, 1924, no. 4-5, p. 138-140. The article was reprinted in his Statti, rozvidky i bio-bibliografichni materialy, N'Iu-Iork, UVAN, 1961, p. 260-264.
also in Western Ukraine\textsuperscript{27b} and abroad.\textsuperscript{27c} From a similar standpoint also based on a Marxist conception, O. Doroshkevych approached Shevchenko's life and work in his \textit{Pidruchnyk ukrains'koi literatury} which was published in 1924.\textsuperscript{28} In this work when analyzing the poet's creative writings, the author came to the following conclusion:

\begin{quote}
Вся Шевченкова идеологія, як представника певного класу - революційного селянства, виявляється в його поемах, Відбиваючи цей настрій революційного покрівлеченого селянства, Шевченко був виразним та сильним у руїн осередкового соціально-політичного ладу, де панував поміщицький і найбільш поміщицький був цар. Щодо позитивно-будівельних поглядів, то їх у Шевченка ми знайдемо мало.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

which was praised by the Communist critics as the first study on Shevchenko based on the Marxist critical method. As a matter of fact, the works of Richyts'kyi and V. Koriak\textsuperscript{28b} served as accepted examples of the official methodological position in Marxist criticism for studies on the poet and

\begin{quote}
27b. V. Doroshenko, "Shevchenkoznavstvo za ostatnie desiatylittia (1914-1924)", in \textit{Stara Ukraina}, 1925, no. 3-4, p. 76.

27c. O. Hrytsai, "Z novoi literatury pro Shevchenka", in \textit{Nova Hromada}, (\textit{Viden'}), 1924, no. 5-6, p. 51-82.


28a. Ibid., p. 17.

28b. V. Koriak, the various articles on Shevchenko published during 1919-1925, and reprinted in the collected volume entitled \textit{Borot'ba za Shevchenka}, Kharkiv, DVU, 1925, 113 p.
\end{quote}
his time until the early 1930's. Dealing with a determination of the future development of literary criticism in this respect, Ie. Kyryliuk declared that

Despite this situation, Fylypovych decided to criticize Richyts'kyi's study for the sake of scholarly objectivity and with it all similar writings which followed his critical manner. Another reason for Fylypovych's decision was that he perceived a direct link between Richyts'kyi's book and Drahomanov's study, although they were separated by nearly fifty years. Hence, in spite of Richyts'kyi's introductory declaration that "Треба викрити живого Шевченка, виявити його таким, яким він є в усій сукупності суспільно-історичних обставин його місця й часу, в усій його величі й красі, з усіма його забобонами, властивими соціальній вертві Шевченка та духові його часу", Fylypovych considered that the

29. Ie. Kyryliuk, "Do problemy kliasovosty Shevchenka", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1931, kn. 3-4, p. 108. A similar opinion about Richyts'kyi's work was expressed by Doroshkevych in his article "Suchasnyi stan Shevchenkoznavstva", in Shevchenko, rich. 2, 1930, p. 337-360.

30. At the same time O. Hermaize published his review on Richyts'kyi's study in which he strongly criticized it from the historical point of view. ("Novi neporozuminnia z Shevchenkom", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 170-178.

work only simplified and schematized the poet's personality, and presented the whole totality of historical-social circumstances on the basis of general surveys of the pre-Shevchenko period in Ukraine's history. The scholar emphasized that in order to attain the a priori conclusions, Richyts'kyi avoided all research on Shevchenko conducted after the publication of Drahomanov's study and especially those of the last decade which extended and in most cases revised previous conclusions on the poet's education, general environment, and political trends which helped influence the formation of Shevchenko's ideological standpoint. As a result of limiting himself to selected quotations from the poet's diary and novels, Richyts'kyi could accept Drahomanov's views on Shevchenko's low educational level, his uninspiring political and social acquaintance, and consequently his peasant Weltanschauung. In defending his standpoint, Richyts'kyi stated that "як соціальне походження миі Шевченко в пригнобленому панщиному селянстві, так і поетична батьківщина його лежить переважно в народній поезії".\[32\] Without analyzing such a general formula, the critic used the familiar sociological principle as support for his statement:

---

In Fylypovych's opinion this support was needed mainly for the purpose of narrowing the sociological method to those elements which were suitable for the author's preconceptions. For example, dwelling on the social factors influencing Shevchenko's ideology, Richyts'kyi emphasized that "в них він (Шевченко-Д.Щ.) зберігав погляди своєї верстви - селян-кріпаків; завсіди і всіди соціальне походження Тараса зумовляло його поетичну і суспільну чинність." Contradicting such an approach, Fylypovych underlined that in order to present an objective portrait of the personality studied, the critic-sociologist cannot limit himself to just an analysis of social descent but also must pay particular attention to general social factors and political background and surroundings. Otherwise such a critic will deal only in abstractions and often obtain questionable results as is evident in Richyts'kyi's work.

Fylypovych counted the deductive approach as one of the principal drawbacks in Richyts'kyi's study as it played


34. Ibid., p. 93.
a dominant role in the composition of this work so full of generalized statements unsupported by careful analysis. Hence although Richyts'kyi followed Drahomanov's views on Shevchenko which did complement to some extent his Marxist standpoint, methodologically he was not able to follow his predecessor's study even where the sociological method was evident. Richyts'kyi's work, in Fylypovych's opinion, was instead not based on any critical method, and might be considered as a description of selected episodes and features, "що підпирають (іноді досить сумнівно) його основну думку, навіть найвиразніше висловлену в розділі "Мужицька філософія". 35

After this general analysis of Richyts'kyi's work was presented in order to compare it with Drahomanov and also to criticize the basic elements of its critical criteria, Fylypovych dwelt on one of the principal features of several of the critic's statements about Shevchenko's Weltanschauung. According to Richyts'kyi, this feature was Shevchenko's peasantry-national limitation toward all foreigners and especially Germans which in the poet's works tended to germanophobia. The scholar had several reasons to dwell on this limited topic: the first was to refute just such an

35. P. Fylypovych, "Do studiiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby", in Shevchenko ta ioho doba, zb. 1, 1925, p. 22.
opinion which had started to gain popularity among Soviet critics; the second reason was to present an original analysis of this still undeveloped question, and finally he found it excellent material for research utilizing the comparative method which promised the best results in studying this problem. Thus in order to portray Shevchenko's view concerning Germans, the scholar compared corresponding expressions in the poet's poems, novels, and diary with the opinion about Germans current in the circles surrounding Shevchenko at various times. In addition, he analyzed the cultural processes and political events which were utilized by the poet in his works in this respect. In other words, Fylypovych's aim was to prove on the basis of this analysis that all the attempts of the Marxist critics to assign Shevchenko to one or another social class were basically false and could not stand up against scholarly criticism.

As a background for his analysis, Fylypovych presented Richyts'kyi's statements concerning Shevchenko's so-called germanophobia, where after quoting the popular lines from the poem "Poslanie":

CRITICAL WORKS ABOUT TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Як би ви вчилися так, як треба,
То й мудрість би була своя;
А то задизете на небо:
"І ми - не ми, і я - не я!
І все те бачив, все те знаю;
Немає пекла, а-ні раю,
Немає й Бога, тілько я,
Та кучер Німець узловатий,
А більш нічого..." 37

He stated:

Отже за всім, що с од лукавого, завжди стоїть німець.
Не дурно у Гоголя в якомусь з оповідань "Вечера на хуторі близь Диканьки" чорт виявляється схожим на німця.
Некріст-німець у селянській свідомості обов'язково знається з чортом, бо він орудує з різними хитрими машинами,
він економічно й культурно стоїть вище від слов'янського мужика. А для цього останнього все незрозуміле іому - то або-ж од бога, або від чорта. 38

Fylypovych agreed that N. Gogol in his novel "Noch' pered Rozhdestvom" portrayed the devil as a German, but he also emphasized that the writer added to his comic portrait: "Немець називають у нас всякого, хто тольки из чужой земли, будь он француз или цесарец, или швед - все немец". 39

However, according to Fylypovych, who in this case fully

37. T. Shevchenko, "Do mertvykh i zhyvykh i nenarodn-ykh zemliakiv moikh v Ukraini i ne Ukraini sushchych, moie druzhnieie poslanie", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav, Ukrain's'ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 190. In further notes this poem will be called "Poslanie".


agreed with V. Simovych. Shevchenko's words were directed at the Ukrainian aristocracy and particularly at those liberal landowners who were uncritically inspired by German philosophy and especially by the metaphysics of G. W. F. Hegel and J. G. Fichte. The inspiration without the proper understanding of this new philosophical trend bore a rather grotesque character which is thus caricatured in Shevchenko's expression. At the same time the poet had great respect for such German poets as J. W. Goethe and F. Schiller which is evident from Shevchenko's own words in his diary. Quoting another verse from Shevchenko's "Poslanie":

- "Колись будем Тай заговорили
  Як Німець покаже, Так, що й Німець не второпа,
  А до того й історію А не то, щоб прості люди.
  Отоді ми заходимось!

  Добре заходились
  По німецькому показу

Fylypovych stated that these particular words of the poet corresponded to a real contemporary occurrence, i. e., the work of the German writer and scholar Friedrich Bodenstedt entitled Die poetische Ukraine which was published at the end of the year.


Fylypovych indicated that the first to seek a connection between Shevchenko's lines quoted above and Bodenstedt's work was F. Vovk in his essay "T. H. Shevchenko i ioho dumky pro hromads'ke zhyttia", and later V. Shchurat who devoted a special study to Die poetische Ukraine in which he amplified Vovk's thoughts on the subject. Bodenstedt's book, which consists of the first German translation of the Ukrainian historical songs and especially Dumy, was compiled in the Caucasus with the close collaboration of I. Roskovshenko (co-editor with I. Sreznevs'kyi of Ukrainski al'manakh in 1831), O. Afanas'iev-Chuzhbyns'kyi, and T. Zadzabocki, who were also at that time in the Caucasus. In the preface to these translations, Bodenstedt indicated his admiration for Ukrainian folk poetry, and emphasized that the Ukrainian language is fully the equal of the Russian and

44. V. Shchurat, "Die poetische Ukraine von Bodenstedt", in Österreichische Monatschrift für den Orient, 1915, No. 9-12, p. 271, and "Bodenstedtova 'Poeytchna Ukraina'", in Zvit Upravy gymnaziinykh naukovykh kurziv z ukrains'koiu vukladovoi u Vidny za sk. rik 1914/15, Viden', 1915, p. 3-18. On the basis of Bodenstedt's Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben, Berlin, 1888, the author indicated that Die poetische Ukraine was actually published at the end of 1844.
Polish languages. In his introduction the author wrote a short survey of the history of Ukraine expressing the hope that in the future he would expand it into a detailed study. Fylypovych fully agreed with Shchurat that Shevchenko was familiar with this book through Afanas'iev-Chuzhbyns'kyi who provided the poet with information about the Caucasus, and Zad-ZabYocki (the convicted Polish revolutionary) who translated Ukrainian folk songs into French and in his own Polish poems, "здравував знання Щвеченкової поезії". Thus Shevchenko's attitude toward "учитель великий" mentioned in his "Послание" created a year after Bodenstedt's work was published, was a positive one. Fylypovych also opposed Richyts'kyi's statement about Shevchenko's negative approach in utilizing some features of the foreign German civilization in the following words of the same poem:

45. F. Bodenstedt, "Vorwort", in his Die poetische Ukraine, Stuttgart u. Tübingen, Gotta'scher Verlag, 1845, p. ix.

46. V. Shchurat, "Основы Щевченковых связей с поляками", in ZNTSh, t. 119-120, 1917, p. 302.

47. P. Zaitsev considered that these particular words of Shevchenko's poem intended to confront Bodenstedt's high characteristic of Ukraine with contemporary reality. ("Звіт Управи гімназійних наукових курсів з української викладов-ної мови у Відні", in ZIFV UAN, kn. 1, 1929, p. 136-137).
Here Shevchenko's ironic expression was directed rather toward wealthy and liberal Ukrainians, and not toward the "мудрий Німець", i. e., the highly developed German agricultural technology in Ukraine which the poet admired. Examples of Shevchenko's admiration for German accuracy and sobriety can be found in his novel "Blizentsy" especially in the description of the ranch of captain Soroka, or in the novel "Muzykant" from which Fylypovych quoted the following:

Я обожав весь сад и, лучше сказать, парк, и не мог довольно налюбоваться прелестью деревьев, чистотою дорожек и вообще чисто немецкой аккуратностью с какой все это содержится. Например, у кого вы увидите, кроме немца, чтобы между фруктовыми деревьями были посажены арбузы, дыни и даже кукуруза. В Германии это понятно, но у нас это просто непостижимо.

Fylypovych pointed out that especially in the early 1840's in St. Petersburg Shevchenko was frequently surrounded by Germans who were to become his good friends. In his autobiographical novel "Khudozhnik" the poet spoke as follows about

---


his German friends:

На другой день мы (Shevchenko and V. Shternberg, one of the poet's closest friends to whom he dedicated the poems "Ivan Pidkova", 1839, and "Na nezabud'", 1840-D.S.) обедали у Иоахима. Это сын известного каретника Иоахима, веселый, простой и прекрасно образованный немец.51

... Суббота была посвящена Иоахиму, а воскресенье - Шмидту и Фип-туму. Ел заметаете, что все мои знакомые - немцы, но даже прекрасные немцы. Я просто убежден в этом немцах.52

However, there also appeared different thoughts by Shevchenko about Germans in the poem "Velykyi l'okh" through the image of the Third Crow (the evil of Russia) which reads:

"Я таки похила:
С татарами помутила,
С Мучителем покупила,
С Петрухой попила,
Да немцам запродала".53

The image of the First Crow (the evil of Ukraine) answered to this:

"Та ты добре натворила:
Так кацапов закріпила
У німецькі кайдани,-
Хоч ягай та й засни...54

To the same category, in Fylypovych's opinion, might be assigned also the phrase of the poem "Rozryta mohyla":

"Степи мої запродані
Жидові, німоті..."55

52. Ibid., p. 309.
53. -------, "Velykyi l'okh", in his Kobzar, Kate-rynoslav, Ukrains' ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 165.
54. Ibid., p. 166.
Richyts'kyi described all these expressions as a reflection of Shevchenko's peasant nationalism which was one of the main features of the poet's works. The critic stated that from this limited point of view, Shevchenko felt antagonism toward all foreigners. Fylypovych was of a considerably different opinion concerning Germans in Shevchenko's poems. First of all, the poet's initial attitude was expressed against those Germans who possessed high positions in the Russian tsarist government and institutions and in fact directed the state bureaucracy of Russian absolutism. At the same time these high-ranking figures enjoyed special privileges and possessed rich estates throughout the Russian empire and especially in Ukraine and other non-Russian countries. The scholar emphasized that opposition against these Germans of a particularly political character was wide-spread among the Ukrainian intelligentsia and left its mark in Shevchenko's works. Elements of such feelings among Ukrainian intellectuals were clearly marked in Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu, the official program of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood. Germanophobia of this character was also frequent among Russian liberal and even revolutionary circles and was sometimes  

united with Slavophilism. The writings of A. S. Griboedov and the slogans of the Decembrists and the Petrashevskii group may serve as an example of such feelings among this category of the Russian community. According to Fylypovych, Shevchenko as an individual of his time absorbed these ideas as ones which corresponded to his general political and social orientation. Moreover, in the poet's works, Germans were distinguished according to their social status and activities. He strongly criticized high-ranking bureaucrats and landowners who usually were the direct superiors of the Ukrainian serfs. However, at the same time the poet had friendly feelings towards the German intellectuals and professionals and also admired German ingenuity. Overall Shevchenko's approach toward Germans, which was formulated under various influences, was not a complete system and might be altered according to his mood and the particular events described or reflected in his works.

In order to complete the German question in Shevchenko's works, Fylypovych considered the religious problem in this respect and quoted Kozachkovs'kyi's censored memoires


58. As a matter of fact, Shevchenko himself had been a serf of a russified German, P. Engelhardt, who was known as one of the cruel landlords in Ukraine.
on the poet written in 1875 which emphasized that "Шевченко хвалив протестанську віру, і не хвалив у православії його покірливости перед начальством і панством".59

In conclusion, Fylypovych stated that all these features of Shevchenko's life and works indicate that the poet's Weltanschauung was far from limited to the peasantry alone. It was formed under the influence of the Ukrainian circles in Kiev and the cosmopolitan surroundings of Warsaw, St. Petersburg and the period of exile, under various conditions and circumstances which led from the misery of rural serfdom through the luxurious studio of K. P. Briullov, political activities of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood, a professorship of the University of Kiev, the "Petropavlovskaja" prison and ten years of exile, to an academicianship in the Academy of Arts. Shevchenko as the son of his period was enchanted with the idyllic view of a quiet peasant life with a house in the cherry orchard, and at the same time he thought about the new San Francisco as a symbol of progress and wealth60 and dreamed of another George Washington with

59. Fylypovych was not able to find Kozachkovs'kyi's censored memoirs. Quotation was taken from Drahomanov's study: Shevchenko, ukrainofily i sotsialism, Kyiv, Krynytsia, 1914, p. 37.

his new and righteous law. Thus, in Fylypovych's opinion, the complex personality of Shevchenko requires thorough study of each detail of his life. In this light, the scholar considered Richyts'kyi's work as without genuine basis which while perhaps impressing unprepared readers only obstructs scholarly research which requires far deeper knowledge of the problem and considerable serious labor.

Studies on Shevchenko and the Decembrists.

In studying Shevchenko against the background of his period, Fylypovych considered the poet's personality to be a complicated social phenomenon whose complete portrait might be achieved only through extensive research into all possible nuances of his colorful life as well as his contrasting surroundings and circumstances. From this standpoint, the scholar presented his critical study Shevchenko i dekabrysty, giving a comprehensive picture of this hitherto untouched problem which represents one of the important ingredients in Shevchenko's life as a poet. As a matter of fact, Fylypovych's work on this question was a result of over two years research.

into the documents found in various libraries and archives, and it is considered as the largest of his sociologico-comparative studies. The main purpose of this work was to determine not only Shevchenko's direct connections with some of the Decembrists convicted by the tsar Nikolai I, but his interest in the whole liberation movement and its activities resulting in the uprising on December 27 (December 14, according to the Julian calendar), 1825. Although the uprising itself was a political and military fiasco, the echo of this event spread throughout Europe despite the regime's efforts to keep it silenced. After the trial and conviction of the leading participants, a number of their writings were circulated among the liberal intelligentsia. The ideas of liberation which were the principal slogans of the Decembrists were admired particularly by the leading contemporary poets, especially those who marked out not only literary paths but the philosophical-social directions for their nations such as A. S. Pushkin, A. Mickiewicz, and

63. During his research on the connections between Shevchenko and the Decembrists Fylypovych published a cycle of essays and articles devoted to this topic. They are: "Shevchenko i dekabrysty", in Shevchenkivs'kyi zbirnyk, Kyiv, Sorabkop, 1924, t. 1, p. 25-41; "Izuchenie Shevchenka", in Proletarskaya pravda, 1924, No. 59, p. 3-4; "Do richnytsi vystupu dekabrystiv", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1925, kn. 12, p. 75-80, and various articles and comments in T. Shevchenko, Shchodenni zapysky (Zhurnal), Kyiv, DVU, 1927. All these works are taken into consideration in this analysis.
A. S. Griboedov. Although Shevchenko as a poet arrived later on the literary scene, he was not only fully acquainted with the ideas of the liberation movement but was in direct contact with some of the participants of the December event who had survived exile. In addition the Decembrists' principal ideas of liberation were close to those of Shevchenko and the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood. For this the poet and his collaborators in their Ukrainian political organization likewise suffered exile. Thus when Shevchenko returned from exile and met representatives of the Decembrists, he treated them as those who had suffered for the same cause.

Another aspect of Fylypovych's study was to determine Shevchenko's connections with that particular part of this political movement which developed in Ukraine and became the center of the Decembrists' activities. In discussing this question, the scholar initiated the consideration of not only the Decembrists in Ukraine but of the Ukrainian Decembrists and particularly the activities of the secret societies and the liberation mood among the Ukrainian circles. This in some respect influenced one of the leading Decembrists, the poet K. F. Ryleev, in his poetical works on Ukrainian themes. Finally Fylypovych analyzed in detail how the Decembrists' movement was reflected in Shevchenko's works emphasizing those episodes where the poet utilized its ideas as ingredients in expressing his own political conceptions.
The general composition of Fylypovych's study did not present the whole theme according to a chronology of Shevchenko's works analyzed in connection with the Decembrists' movement. It described first the latest period of the poet's life and literary production (mainly post-exile years 1857-1858) and then his early poems seeking in them some traces of the liberation movement in Ukraine connected with the Decembrists. Such a composition might be explained by the work's topic which focused primarily on the direct connections between Shevchenko and the exiled Decembrists which were established after Shevchenko's return from exile. For this period of the poet's life there were writings left by Shevchenko himself as well as those previously undiscovered documents about the Decembrists which served as material for the comparative approach.

The comparative aspect of the first and the largest part of the study was built on the basis of the description of the episodes of Shevchenko's acquaintance with some illegal liberal literature as well as with several Decembrists returned from exile. Also this included the indication of the poet's impressions of these meetings as it was reflected in his diary and poetical works created at that time. Following Shevchenko's diary, Fylypovych analyzed the poet's meetings with five formerly exiled Decembrists during the first months after the end of his own exile. In Nizhnii
Novgorod he met I. A. Annekov and apparently A. N. Murav'ev, in Moscow kn. S. G. Volkonskii, and in St. Petersburg baron V. I. Shteingel and N. N. Orzhitskii. According to Shevchenko's diary, meeting with the Decembrists in Nizhnii Novgorod deeply impressed him. After the first visit with Annekov, a person with high moral values, independent views, and a quiet and refined character, the poet mentioned in his diary: "Благословень перед тобою, один из первозванных наших апостолов!" Annekov was the first and most generous

64. It is rather difficult to determine whether Shevchenko in fact met Murav'ev who at that time was the governor of Nizhnii Novgorod. The poet devoted to this Decembrist a very long note in his diary of February 19, 1858. Fylypovych mentioned that Shevchenko saw Murav'ev in Nizhnii Novgorod (Shevchenko i dekabrysty, Kyiv, DVU, 1926, p. 45).

65. For identification of the Decembrists whom Shevchenko met, Fylypovych used the manuscript of the poet's diary where the name Orzhitskii was written illegibly. The scholar read it as Persidskii and unsuccessful searching in the Decembrists' archives brought him to the conclusion that Shevchenko wrote this name erroneously (Shevchenko i dekabrysty, Kyiv, DVU, 1926, p. 51). In 1927, in the 4th volume of the complete works of Shevchenko (Fylypovych collaborated in its preparation) its editor in-chief, S. Iefremov determined the name of this Decembrist as N. N. Orzhitskii, the grandson of the last hetman of Ukraine, Kyrylo Rozumov's'kyi. Iefremov's determination was accepted later by editors of Shevchenko's diary: S. F. P. Shesternikov, "Primechania", in T. Shevchenko, Dnevnik, Moskva, Academia, 1931, p. 407, and P. Zeitsev, "Prymitky", in T. Shevchenko, Povne vydannia tvoriv, 2. vyd. t. 9, Zhurnal, Chicago, M. Denysiuk, I960, p. 316.


source of information on the Decembrists' sufferings in Siberia as well as on the lives and ideas of those members of the movement who returned from exile. Thus Shevchenko discussed with him another prominent Decembrist who had just returned from abroad, the economist N. I. Turgenev and his work *La Russie et les russes*, in which he demonstrated the necessity of abolishing serfdom and the reform of the state structure in Russia. According to Fylypovych, Shevchenko had been familiar with Turgenev's activities abroad even in the early 1840's through V. A. Zhukovskii who had close relations with this Decembrist. In Nizhnii Novgorod the poet also received interesting information on the Decembrists' families and especially impressive accounts about Annekov's wife. She was the Frenchwoman Poline Helb who as the fiancee of the Decembrist after his trial managed to go to Siberia and become the prisoner's wife. Noting this in his diary, Shevchenko added: "Не знало, скоро ли я удостоюсь счастья вглядеть на эту беспримерную, святую героиню. Думаю, кажется, написал сентиментальный роман на эту богатырскую тему".

---


69. Ibid., p. 212. This event was described by A. Dumas (father) in his novel on the Decembrists entitled *Le maître d'armes*, 1850. A similar story was also written by A. I. Herzen about the Decembrist V. P. Ivashev and his wife (also of French descent) Camille Le Dantau (*Byloe i dumy*, t. 3, 1852.)
Fylypovych emphasized that all this information not only augmented Shevchenko's knowledge on the Decembrists but also developed his great admiration for the ideas for which they suffered, as well as for their own personalities, as people of high morality and character. Hence when the poet learned about a romance of a leading Decembrist, I. I. Pushchin with a Yakut girl and their illegitimate daughter, he reacted to this with the strong accusation:

In addition Fylypovych dwelt on another of Shevchenko's characteristics of the Decembrists as noted in his diary as a direct reaction to Herzen's *Pollarnaia zviezda* (published in 1856) with the portraits of the five executed Decembrists on its cover which the poet saw then for the first time:

All this evidence concerning Shevchenko's meetings with the Decembrists and their families plays an important role in the composition of Fylypovych's study. They create a background for his comparative analysis of Shevchenko's poems written in 1857 in which he reflected his impressions on the convicted Decembrists and his opinion about the deeds of the tsar Nikolai I whom the poet in his diary called: "Не перший русский коронованный палац!" Thus Fylypovych stated that under the influence of these fresh impressions Shevchenko wrote his poem "Iurodyvyi" in Nizhnii Novgorod, which clearly indicates that the poet planned to create a larger poetical work about the Decembrists. In order to compare these lyrical words of protest, the scholar quoted a good part of the poem especially underlining the following verses:

О зоре ясная моя! Ведем мене з тюрям, з неволі, Як раз на смітничок Миколи, І світило гір пронізим Огнем невидимим, святим, Животворящим, а із гною Встаєм стовпом передо мною Його безбожній діла...

Безбожний цар’ї, творче зла, Правді гонителю жестокий! Чого накоїв на землі!...

Та цур ўм, тим царям поганим! Нехай верзується ўм кайдани, А я полюб на Сибір
Аж за Байкал! залюбу в гори, В веретени темні і в нори Без дна глубокії і вас, Споборники святої волі Із тьми, із смрада і з неволі, Царям і людям на показ, На світ вас виведу на-далі Рядами довгими в кайданах...

72. Т. Shevchenko, Dnevnik, Moskva, Academia, 1931, p. 209.

73. -------, "Iurodyvyi", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav, Ukrain's'ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 379.
According to Fylypovych Shevchenko wrote also about the Decembrists in the poem "Neofity" composed in the same year. Although the plot for the poem was supposedly taken from the history of Rome in the period of Nero and the persecution of the first Christians ( "нiби то iз римської історiї", as the poet informed his friend Ia. Kukharenko) it actually dealt with the tsar Nikolai I and the Decembrists. The scholar emphasized that this was quite clear to Shevchenko's contemporaries, especially to P. Kulish who advised against publishing the poem because it might annoy Nikolai's successor Aleksander II upon whom the progressive circles relied at that time. 74 Fylypovych mentioned, that despite the fact that a complete analysis of "Neofity" had still not appeared in Ukrainian criticism, some scholars like O. Doroshkevych and O. Bahrii expressed somewhat similar thoughts on the main concept of the poem. 75 Thus, the Decembrists who in Shevchenko's diary were named as "благовестители свободи" and "первозванне апостоли" who carried "свой крест в пустинной Сибир во имя человеческой свободы" were presented in "Neofity" in these words:

74. P. Fylypovych, Shevchenko i dekabrystv, Kyiv, DVU, 1926, p. 34.

75. O. Doroshkevych, Pidruchnyk istorii ukrains'koi literatury, Kharkiv, Knyhospilka, 1924, p. 114. 
A. V. Bagrii, Shevchenko v literaturnoi obstanovke, Baku, 1925, p. 93.
According to Fylypovych's interpretation these lines corresponded not only to the December uprising, but to the whole liberation movement and particularly to the activity of the "Iuzhnoe obshchestvo" whose influence spread over the whole territory. The scholar considered that the whole fifth chapter of the poem with its remarkable lines: "Ідеш шукат його в Сибір, Чи тес... в Скифію, І ти і чи одна ти?", is devoted to the Decembrists' suffering in prisons, Siberian exile, and military battalions in the Caucasus. Analyzing the sixth and seventh chapters of "Neofity" Fylypovych stated that both also describe the actual events connected with the convicts and their families as well as with Nero - Nikolai I. Comparing the first part of the sixth chapter with Herzen's story about the Decembrist Ivashev, he concluded that the poet was so impressed with the description of this episode, especially after receiving additional information on this drama in Nizhnii Novgorod, that he included


77. Ibid., p. 369-370.
it in his poem. Further verses only proved that this assumption was correct: "А в Римі свято, Велике свято..." begins the description of a celebration in Rome during which the Caesar was proclaimed Jupiter. Actually this picture corresponded to the coronation of Nikolai I which was held after suppressing the uprising on August 22, 1826. On this occasion many wives of the Decembrists requested permission to live with their husbands in exile, and this fact was also reflected in the seventh chapter of the poem. Finally Fylypovych stated that Shevchenko after returning from exile and under the impression of new information expressed his respect for the Decembrists in his poems "Iurodyvyi" and "Neofity" with whose deeds he was familiar even before his imprisonment. In the second part of his study the scholar dwelt on the poet's acquaintance with the Decembrists' activities and their exile and their corresponding traces in his early poetry. He considered that actual evidence in this regard can be found in the poem "Velyki l'okh" written in 1845 and especially in the poem "Son" created in 1844. The second chapter of this poem, particularly its second part, portrayed penal servitude in Siberia. The poet concluded

79. Ibid., p. 371-372.
this picture with the following verse directed to "цар все-
світній":

А між ними, запеклими,
В кайдани убранний,
Цар всесвітній, цар волі, цар
Штемпом увінчаний,
В муці, в каторзі - не просить,
Не плаче, не стогне:
Раз доброму наліте серце -
Б-вік не прохтоне.80

V. Domanyts'kyi commented on this as follows: "Шевченко має
тут на думці борця за волю і правду, письменника-поета, кот-
рого за сміливе слово загнали на каторгу і посадили разом з
81 злодіями та розбійниками." V. Simovych in his remarks gave
more concrete form to Domanyts'kyi's idea:

Це політичний злочинець - борець за правду й волю, цар
волі, цар на цілий світ. У першій половині XIX ст. ка-
рався на Сибірі між іншими Радішев, відомий автор "Пу-
tешествия в Москву" та ще й поваж на сотні декабристів.
А майже рівночасно з Кирило Методіївськими потерпіли кару
й гурток Петрашевського, до якого належав найглибший по-
вістрій цілого світа, моск. письменник М. Достоєвський.82

Mentioning these comments, Fylypovych, however, developed
his interpretation of these rather unclear words in a differ-
ent way. Disagreeing with Simovych but amplifying Domanyts'kyi's

80. T. Shevchenko, "Son", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav
Ukrains'ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 120.

81. V. Domanyts'kyi, "Krytychnyi rozslid nad tekstem
'Kobzaria' Shevchenka", in Kievskia starina, 1906, no. 11-
12, p. 337.

82. V. Simovych, "Prymitky", in T. Shevchenko, Kobzar
Katerynoslav, Ukrains'ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 120.
thoughts and following the historical evidence, the scholar stressed that in 1844-1845 Shevchenko could not yet write about the Petrashevskii group whose activities had occurred mainly during 1845-46. A. M. Radishchev could not be the main subject in this part of the poem, since he was in Siberia not during the first half of the nineteenth century but from 1790 to 1797, and during his exile he did not work as a convict in the Siberian mines but had the opportunity to continue his studies. Fylypovych emphasized that Shevchenko was familiar with the activities of the author of Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu, however he was not mentioned by him in "Son". At the beginning of his own interpretation of this work the scholar mentioned the well-known report of the informer A. Petrov who denounced the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood to the police. The part of this report corresponding to the poem "Son" read:

Содержание я мог запомнить только двух стихотворений, "Сон", "Послание к родичам"; в первом стихотворении Шевченко представляет себя заснувшим и во сне сова переносит его в Сибирь, где он встречается с Рилеевым и другими заговорщиками 1825 года.83

Fylypovych added that apparently Shevchenko knew about the execution of Ryleev, and in his poem he gave a general portrait of a champion of freedom. Thus presenting all Decembrists in the picture of "tsar voli", the poet utilized in this figure the features of one of their leaders, especially of the author of "Dumy" and the poems on Ukrainian themes ("Voinarovskyi", "Nalivaiko", "Gaidamak", "Palei", and "Pesnia storonnikov Mazepy") which had found considerable admiration among Ukrainian literary and intellectual circles. Hence Shevchenko put the direct question to "tsar voli":

А де ж твої думи, рожевії квіти?
Доглядані, сміли, виходані діти?
Кому ж ти їх, друже, кому передав?
Чи може, на вікі в серці поховав?84

Analyzing the poem further, Fylypovych indicated that in "Son" Shevchenko presented the antithesis which later he repeated in his diary when he proposed to mark on one side of a medal the portraits of the executed Decembrists as the first champions of freedom and on the other the image of by no means the first imperial Russian butcher.85 Thus, according to the scholar the poem "Son" indicates that its author not only admired the Decembrists, but the whole movement as radical opposition to the contemporary regime was consonant with his socio-political feelings and as such played

---

84. T. Shevchenko, "Son", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav, Ukrain's'ke vyd-vo, 1921, p. 120.
85. --------, Dnevnik, Moskva, Academia, 1931, p. 209.
an important role in formulating his philosophical conceptions. Some evidence regarding this question might be found in Shevchenko's confession during the inquest in the prison of the "III Otdelenie" which read: "Будучи еще в Петербурге, я слышал везде дерзности и порициания на государя и правительство. Возвратясь в Малороссию, я усилил еще более и хуже..."*

Fylypovych stated that after Shevchenko's transit to Ukraine in 1845 the poet's feelings toward the Decembrists were even stronger. Ukraine, and particularly the region near Kiev was the central arena for the Decembrists' activities and the uprising of the "Chernigovskii polk" in Vasyl'kiv. 87

In this town were located the headquarters of the "Iuzhnoe obshchestvo" whose members were also former activists of the "Obshchestvo soedinennykh slavian" who proclaimed the idea of an all-Slavic state federal system. Also numbered among them were Ukrainian personalities with clear national

---


87. The uprising of this unit was led by S. I. Murav'ev-Apostol, the author of the Decembrists catechism who was executed along with four other leaders of the movement. P. E. Shchegolev, "Katekhizis Sergieia Murav'eva-Apostola", in his Istoricheskie etiudy, S.-Peterburg, Shipovnik, 1913, p. 317-364.
feelings and aspirations. The members of the "Malorossiisko obshchestvo" which bore a distinct Ukrainian character, participated also in the activities of "Iuzhnoe obshchestvo" which as a matter of fact differed from "Severnoe obshchestvo" by its radicalism, democratic structure, and genuine revolutionary approach. The "Katekhizys" of the "Malorossiisko obshchestvo" as a secret society, included a password of these words: "Де сходитъ сонце?" - "В Чигирины".

Considering all these data on the Decembrists' movement in Ukraine, Fylypovych emphasized that many of its members were not only persons of Ukrainian origin but actual

---

88. The Ukrainian question among the Decembrist circles was considered to such an extent that when during the Slavic meeting held near Kiev in 1825, the Polish poet of the Ukrainian school, T. Padura presented his statement on the political rights of Ukraine, it was approved by all participants, and one of the Murav'ev-Apostol brothers gave him an iron ring as a sign of admiration of his statement. Other persons who attended the meeting were: S. I. and I. I. Murav'ev-Apostol, K. F. Ryleev, S. Karwicky, N. Vortsel', M. Tarnovs'kyi, gr. W. Rzewucki, gr. P. Moszyński, and L. Sobanski. V. Hnatiuk, "Padura, Ryleev i dekabryсты", in ZIFV UAN, kn. 18, 1928, p. 118-119, on the basis of (Fr. Obuchowa-Woszczatyńska), Prawdziwy Życiorys T. Padury, Poznań, 1875, p. 34. Also S. Tefremov, "Masonstvo na Ukraini", in Nashe mnule, 1918, ch. 3, p. 13, to which Fylypovych referred.

89. M. N. Pokrovskii in his Ocherki po istorii revoliutsionnogo dvizheniya v Rossi v XIX i XX vv., Moskva, Krasnaia Nov', 1924, p. 139, considered that there were in fact two different December conspiracies, and only that one in Ukraine had a real revolutionary character.

Ukrainians with clear national views which were shared by the contemporary Ukrainian intelligentsia. Shevchenko as the leading representative of Ukrainian literary and political circles was familiar with the activities of the secret organizations in Ukraine and among them "Malorossiiskoe obschestvo" which was reflected in poems like "Chyhyryn" where in correspondence to the password of its catechism he wrote:

```
CnH, povituyu udivo,
Poki sonce vstanet,
Poki ti'j nedoliedky
Psistut - hetyman!92
```

The liberation activities in Ukraine are also reflected in the poem "Velykyi l'okh" in which the image of the First Crow (the evil of Ukraine) said:

```
"Ya oce litala
Akh u Sibir, ta v odnogo
Dekabrista vkrada
Troki juchiv".93
```

Fylypovych stressed that later the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood to some extent was ideologically connected with the

91. Fylypovych referred to M. Slabchenko's work Materialy do ekonomichno-sotsial'noi istorii Ukrainy XIX stolettia, t. 1, Kyiv, DUU, 1925, and collected volume Dekabristy; neizd. materialy i stat'i. Pod red. B. L. Mondzalevskogo i Tu. G. Oksmans, Moskva, Gos. izd-vo, 1925, p. 58, which discusses this question.


93. --------, "Velykyi l'okh", Ibid., p. 163.
Decembrists tradition. Some evidence indicated that particularly its founder and leader, M. Kostomarov was interested in the ideologo-political program of this movement. The clearest evidence of ideological relations between Kostomarov, the Brotherhood and the Decembrists and especially their Slavophile tendencies might be found in certain paragraphs of *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu* which at the same time proclaimed the liberation of Ukraine as the Brotherhood's principal cause. The scholar considered that its members were interested not only in the Decembrists aims but in their strategic and tactical plans. Shevchenko's friend the economist, M. Savych through whom the poet sent to A. Mickiewicz the manuscript of his poem "Kavkaz", stated

94. During the arrest of Kostomarov the police found on his study desk an old newspaper (Fylypovych assumed that it was Russkii invalid) with the official information on the Decembrists case. V. I. Semevskii, "Kirilo-Mefodievskoe Obshchestvo", in Golos minuvshago, 1918, No. 10-11, p. 101-102.


96. P. Fylypovych, *Shevchenko i dekabrysty*, Kyiv, DVU 1926, p. 68. As a matter of fact, Shevchenko read Mickiewicz's "Dziady" while visiting O. Afanas'iev-Chuzhbyns'kyi during his sojourn at the Repnin's at the end of 1843. Fylypovych emphasized that some critics (V. Schurat) considered that the introduction to the third part of this poem had influenced Shevchenko's "Son". Here as Shevchenko had, the greatest Polish poet indicated his respect for the Decembrists whom (especially Ryleev and A. A. Bestuzhev) he knew personally. A. Mickiewicz, "Do przyjaciê Moskali", in "Dziejów części III ustęp", in his *Dzieje; wydanie narodowe, t. 3*, Utwory dramatyczne. Kraków, Czytelnik, 1922, p. 305-306.
that during a discussion with Kostomarov and M. Hulak he "доказывал дурное разпоряджения заговорщиков 1025 года, вследствіе которых они не могли исполнить своих намерений". 97

The house of kniaz' Nikolai Gregorovich Repnin, the Military Governor of Poltava and Chernihiv provinces of Ukraine in 1816-1835, was one of those sources which served Shevchenko with primary information on the Decembrists and also belonged among the factors which influenced the poet in his poetical creations. To the analysis of this question Fylypovych devoted the third part of his study on Shevchenko's ideological connections with the Decembrists and in particular with their secret societies in Ukraine.

In the introduction to this part, the scholar used Repnin's Lihotyn archives as the basis for portraying the governor's family and its relationship with his brother kn. S. G. Volkonskii, who with rank of general and as one of the leading Decembrists was sentenced to twenty years of Siberian exile. Fylypovych stressed also the dramatic event connected with Volkonskii's wife, Mariia Volkonskaiia (Raevskaia), who in 1827 after many difficulties was finally united with her husband in Siberia. A remarkable role in

this woman's efforts was played by Repnin's daughter Varvara with whom Shevchenko later was in close friendship. In Fylypovych's opinion, this drama along with other events learned by the poet in Nizhni Novgorod in 1857 was utilized in his poem "Neofity".

In general the atmosphere in Repnin's family was liberal and opposed the serf system in the country. The scholar characterized Repnin himself as a highly educated person with traits of nobility and humanity. Serving as the ambassador to the principality of Westfalen (1809-1812), and General-Governor of Saxony (1813-1814) he was well acquainted with the Western European social-political trends which later were reflected in his activities as the governor in Ukraine. Fylypovych mentioned that Repnin's well-known speech delivered on the meeting of landlords in Poltava and Chernihiv in 1818 in which he defended the Ukrainian peasantry was a clear reflection of his views in this respect. As a matter of fact, in 1818 the censorship in St. Petersburg stopped publication of the periodical Dukh zhurnalov because it published Repnin's speech. 98 Fylypovych also stressed Repnin's concern for Ukrainian culture and his

98. I. Rybakov, "Iahotyns'kyi arkhiv Riepninykh", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1924, no. 7, p. 221
sympathies toward its history and education. Thus on his order his officer of special services, D. Bantysh-Kamens'kyi, wrote the well-known Istoriia Maloi Rossii. In the first half of the 1820's the supervisor of Repnin's gubernatorial office M. Novikov and the marshal of Poltava province (region of Pereiaslav) V. Lukashevych initiated the organization of "Malorossiiskoe obshchestvo" to which, as some sources indicated, belonged the governor himself, as well as high-ranking persons of his office. Finally, Repnin was a patron of Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi, and initiator of the ransom from serfdom of the great actor, M. Shchepkin, one of Shevchenko's best friends, as well as mecenas of the theater

99. I. Pavlovs'kyi, "Zaboty kn. N. G. Repnina o sostavlenii istorii Malorossii", in TPUAK, vyp. 1, 1896, p. 51. It should be mentioned that in his work Bantysh-Kamens'kyi utilized a considerable number of documents of the archives of the Ukrainian ethnographer and collector of rare sources concerning the history of Ukraine, A. Chep, who on the order of Repnin formulated a declaration on the rights of the Ukrainian nobility. I. Rybakov, "1825-iyi rik na Ukraini", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 6, p. 10.

100. I. Rybakov, "Iahotyns'kyi arkhiv Riepninykh", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1924, no. 7, p. 224. It is worthy of note that in 1818 M. Novikov was a master of the freemason lodge "Liubov k istine" in Poltava in which I. Kotliarevs'kyi occupied a distinguished position. At the same time V. Lukashevych was a master of the Kievian lodge whose official insignia bore the cross with the inscription "Jedność Słowińska". Leading members of this lodge were the future Decembrists S. G. Volkonskii and S. P. Trubeckoii. Both lodges ceased their activities in 1819. S. Iefremov, "Masonstvo na Ukraini", in Nashe mynule, 1918, ch. 3, p. 9.
All these activities apparently did not coincide with the regime's requirements and were the primary reason that Repnin was treated by the governmental circles in St. Petersburg as persona non grata. Fylypovych stressed all these facts about Repnin and his family and emphasized its links with the Decembrists as well as the activities connected with the liberal circles in Ukraine because these persons played a remarkable role in Shevchenko's life. In particular, kn. Varvara was directly involved in supporting the family of the Decembrist S. G. Volkonskii immediately after his exile. During his almost three months stay in the Repnin's house, the poet was treated most sincerely by all the family especially kn. Varvara and between her and the poet there developed feelings which verged upon love. Their most friendly relations did not stop even during Shevchenko's exile. Thus, according to Fylypovych, the poet participated in all family discussions concerning past and contemporary events including activities of secret organizations and the Decembrists' movement.

The Iahotyn period of Shevchenko's life was a direct source for his poem "Trizna" in which was clearly reflected the poet's inmost feelings and which provided a portrait of

his internal Ego. The poem was written in Iahotyn with the special dedication which read: "На пам'ять 9 ноября 1843 года княжне Варваре Николаевне Реппиной. Посвящение". To the analysis of "Trizna" Fylypovych devoted the fourth and last part of his study which he based mostly on the comparative method.

In fact the scholar's aim was not a full analysis of the poem including interpretation of all its details and a concentration on the main idea and poetic form as they were united in the compository formula. Such an analysis would contradict his general approach and stray from the main theme of the study. Thus in order to indicate the influence on "Trizna" of the works of other poets, Fylypovych limited his analysis to the comparison of certain verses of the poem with others containing aesthetic and artistic elements similar to "Trizna". Accepting the previous position of other critics that the poem has an auto-biographical character, he presented the following general description of

102. T. Shevchenko, "Trizna", in his Tvory, Kobzar, t. i.: 1838-1847, L'viv, Ukrains'ko-rus'ka biblioteka, p. 209. Fylypovych mentioned that the poem itself was written earlier than the mentioned above dedication.

103. In this respect Fylypovych considered particularly such studies as: M. Markovs'kyi, "Rosiis'ki i ukrains'ki tvory Shevchenka v ikh porivnanniu", in Ukraina, 1918, kn. 1-2, p. 47; M. Gershenson, "T. G. Shevchenko i kn. V. N. Repnina", in Russkie Propilei, Moskva, t. 2, 1916, p. 181, and O. Bahrii in his Shevchenko v literaturnoi obstanovke, Baku, 1925, p. 41.
Similarly to the thoughts expressed in this respect in his study "Shevchenko i romantyzm" the scholar considered that many verses of "Trizna" bear a Byronic flavor. The most interesting and remarkable influence on the poem was that of the leading Decembrist and poet-romanticist, K. F. Ryleev, especially through his poem "Voinsarovskii". According to Fylypovych, this is evident in the similarity of expression of both poets and in their aesthetic views. For example, Shevchenko gave this portrait of "Trisna's" hero who found himself in a foreign land or in spiritual exile:

Страдал несчастный сирота
Вдали от родины счастливой
И ждал конца нетерпеливо.
Его любимая мечта
Полезным быть родному краю. 105

104. P. Fylypovych, Shevchenko i dekabrysty, Kyiv, DVU, p. 85-86.

105. All quotations of "Trizna" are from T. Shevchenko, "Trizna (Bezstelannyi)", in his Stikhovoreniiia, Leningrad, Sovetskiy pisatel’, 1954, p. 131-136.
Ryleev put a similar expression in the lips of the main personage of "Voinarovskii" in which the last line is identical to that of Shevchenko's:

... вдали страны родной
Могу я всегда быть равнодушен?
Рожденный с чистой душой,
Полезным быть родному краю.106

The principal figure in "Trizna" - "пришелец невслённый, чудесный" (Voinarovskii was also "пришелец" in Siberia) -

Говорил, что себе благо
Должно любовию купить
И с благодарностью отвагой
Стать за добро и зло казнить.
Он говорил, что праздник жизни,
Великий праздник, божий дар
Должно пожертвовать отчизне,
Должно поставить под удар.

In Ryleev's poem Mazepa says to Voinarovskii:

Как должно жному герою,
Любя страну своих отцов,
Женой, дочками и собою
Ты ей пожертвовать готов.

Voinarovskii says about himself:

... друг отчизны, друг народа...

Fylypovych indicated that some lines in Shevchenko's poem are even rhythmically similar to "Voinarovskii". In "Trizna":

И думой мрачной летал
В стране родной, в стране прекрасной.

In "Voinarovskii":

С тех пор на родине прекрасной,
Мне любить не довелось...
В стране глухой, в стране безводной...
... Лери в родимые края,
Там ждут ребя в стране прекрасной.

The act of farewell with the fatherland in "Trizna" is described in such words:

И, как родную, любил,
Рыдая тихо и уныло.
На путь молитву прочитал...
За рубежом родной земли
Считая нины сиротою,

which corresponds to the farewell of Voinarovskii with Ukraine:

Как тяжко взволновалась грудь,
Как сердце, мое зашатло,
Когда рубеж страны родной
Уплотли мы перед собой.
В волненье чувств, тоской томимый,
Я, как ребенок, зарыдал,
И внявши горсть земли родной
К кресту с молитвой присягал.

Finally Fylypovych considered typical Byronic expressions of both poets showing the lexical similarity. Some details of the internal suffering of the hero of Shevchenko's poem read:

... Он трепетал... он цепенел...
... Он хохотал как дикий лютый...
... Рыдал, немел он в иступленны,

which are similar to the expression of Mazepa's feelings in "Voinarovskii":

То трепеща, то цепенея...
...То горько плакал и рыдал...
...Он как безумный хохотал...
As the epigraph to "Voinarovskii", Ryleev used Dante's words:

\[ \text{Nessun maggior dolore} \\
\text{Che ricordarsi del tempo felice} \\
\text{Nella miseria...} \]

Shevchenko recollected this thought of Dante later in exile.

In his letter to O. Bodians'kyi dated November 15, 1852 the poet wrote: "покойный Данте говорит, что в нашей жизни нет горшего горя, как в несчастии вспоминать о прошлом счастье. Правду сказал покойный флорентиец, я это на себе теперь каждый день испытываю".107

Fylypovych stated that these words of the Italian poet were engraved in Shevchenko's memory not without the influence of Ryleev whose "Voinarovskii" he knew almost by heart even before his exile.108

In the scholar's opinion Ryleev's influence on Shevchenko was particularly felt during the poet's transition from his ballad and historical Romanticism to political and social themes as was previously pointed out by P. Zaitsev in his study on Shevchenko's Russian poetry.109 The Decembrist Ryleev who first of all was a poet-citizen ("я не поэт, а гражданин")110 impressed Shevchenko especially with

108. Shevchenko quoted from memory some verses of "Voinarovskii" in his letter to kn. V. N. Repnins written in "Orskaia krepost'" on October 24, 1847. Ibid., p. 352.
110. K. F. Ryleev, "Voinarovskii", in his Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Moskva, Academia, 1934, p. 192.
his poems on Ukrainian themes. In these, despite the atmosphere created by the anathema imposed on Mazepa by Peter I in 1709, Ryleev was the first poet who attempted to portray this hetman as the leader of Ukraine who led his nation toward liberation, as well as to characterize other leading personalities of the Ukrainian hetman state as great patriots who considered the nation's prosperity as their highest ideal.

These poems of Ryleev were not only popular among Ukrainian literary circles but helped to stimulate on Ukrainian soil and especially among the Ukrainian intelligentsia a spiritual revival of national consciousness and self-respect. In 1825, after the first collection of Ryleev's poems was published, M. Markevych to whom Shevchenko dedicated his poem "Banduryste, orle syzyi", wrote to the author of "Voinarovskii":

Позвольте мне Вам написать, как истинный гражданин своего любимого отчества, как добрый малороссийин. Итак, могу ли я холоднокровно читать "Войноровского" и "Наливайку"? Примите мою и всех знакомых мне моих сослуживцев благодарность. Будьте уверены, что благодарность наша искренняя, что мы от души чувствуем цену трудов ваших, которые ваш и предков ваших прославляют. Мы не потеряли еще из виду десяти великих мужей малороссийян, во многих сердцах не уменьшилась еще прежняя сила чувств и преданность к отчине. Вы еще найдете знатных у нас дух Полуботка... Слава тому, кто прославляет величие души человеческой и кому народы целые должны воздаять благодарность.111

Although prohibited by the regime's censorship Ryleev's poems circulated even after the execution of their author. M. Drahomanov recollected that

Thus, Fylypovych considered that Ryleev's ideas expressed in his poems were close to those of Shevchenko who was impressed not only by Ryleev's writings but also by his life and revolutionary activities. Hence, in "Trizna", beside the portions in which clear traces of "Voinarovskii" are evident, the scholar perceived expressions of Shevchenko directed to the Decembrists and especially to Ryleev:


113. Following Drahomanov's statement, Fylypovych mentioned that Shevchenko might have gotten some additional information about Ryleev's personality from kn. Repnin since the latter was acquainted with the Russian poet during his governorship of Saxony. P. Fylypovych, Shevchenko i dekabryaty, Kyiv, 1926, p. 95-96.

114. Fylypovych pointed out that the question about literary connections between Ryleev and Shevchenko was discussed previously by such critics as Drahomanov in his Shevchenko, sotsializm i ukrainofil'y, and O. Bahrii in his Shevchenko v literaturnoi obstanovke. The latter dwelt on the comparison between Ryleev's "Ispoved Nalivaikan" and fragments of Shevchenko's poem "Nikita Gaidai".
The hero of the poem appealed to his friends with such words:

"Хто-ж цей предтеча", asked Fylypovych, "якого оспівує Шевченко, крімчі —

... про подвиг вольний и суворый
На искупление земли.117

"Исповеди Наливайки":119

Известно мне: погибель ждет
Того, кто первый возстает
На утешителей народа,
Судьба меня уже обрекла.
Но где, скажи, когда была
Без жертв искуплена свобода?119

Finally Fylypovych indicated some traces which connect the Ukrainian poet as artist-painter with Ryleev. He pointed out

116. Ibid.
117. Ibid. p.
119. K. F. Ryleev, "Ispoved' Nalivaiki", in his Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Moskva, 1934, p. 250.
Shevchenko's picture of 1858-1859, entitled "Mazepa i Voinarovs'kyi" which was discovered by the historian of arts Oleksii Novyts'kyi. In the archives of Shevchenko's friend and the Ukrainian artist Hryhorii Chestakhivs'kyi Fylypovych found Shevchenko's explanations of this picture which correspond to the poem "Voinarovskii" as it describes the inquest of two Cossacks imprisoned by Mazepa and his nephew Voinarovs'kyi. The episode ends with the following verse:

В ответ, склонив на грудь главу,
Мазепа горько улыбнулся;
Прилеж, безмолвный на траву
И в плещ широкий завернулся.
Мы все в участия ждыем,
За гетмана пылая мечть,
Стояли молча перед ним
Поражены ужасной вестью.

Thus, in Fylypovych's opinion, Shevchenko's previous interest in "Voinarovskii" was renewed after his return from exile.

Although Shevchenko was of a different nation, social surroundings and period than most members of the December uprising, the ideals of their movement, and their activities

120. Fylypovych mentioned that this yet unpublished picture, whose photocopy he received from Novyts'kyi, is located in the Museum of Chernihiv. The picture was not included in Shevchenko's Mystets'ka spadshchyna, published in four volumes by Akademiia nauk URSR, in 1961-63.

121. K. F. Ryleev, "Voinarovskii", in his Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Moskva, 1934, p. 218.
in his homeland were close to his own feelings and thus occupied a significant place among the other ingredients in the formation of the poet's Weltanschauung. Of distinct interest to Shevchenko was the personality and writings of one of the leading members of this movement, Ryleev and particularly his audacious poems on Ukrainian topics which, as a matter of fact, were influenced along with other factors by the same sources as Shevchenko's writings. These were primarily the Ukrainian soil and its historical tradition, the liberation mood among the Ukrainian intellectuals with whom Ryleev had close contacts, and works like *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* and especially *Istoriia Rusov*.

In the conclusion Fylypovych emphasized that Shevchenko and the Decembrists returned at the same time from exile in which all of them, although representatives of different nations, suffered for the same cause. This perhaps was the reason why Shevchenko gave to the Decembrists a significant place in his diary.

Evaluation of Fylypovych's studies.

Both of Fylypovych's studies found certain echos in literary criticism. The discussion on his "Do studiuvannya Shevchenka ta ioho doby" or rather its first part (criticism of Drahomanov's and Richyts'kyi's works) had varying results. While M. Mohylians'kyi and I. Ierofiiv considered it a serious
study which objectively evaluated Drahomanov's work and revealed the drawbacks of Richyts'kyi's book. V. Koriak treated it like he did almost all researches conducted by the literary scholars and members of the Academy, i.e., as a dry, formalistic attempt distant from the characteristic of the poet which the proletariat community expects to find. The critic concluded his opinion with these words: "Нехай наше вчені шевченкознавці порахуються в шпагалах. Нам дорогий наш живий Шевченко, батрацький поет, що його пам'ять такички шанує наше незаможне селянство". O. Doroshkevych took a middle stand. In his opinion, Fylypovych extended some ideas expressed previously by Doroshkevych in his article "Shevchenko v sotsialistychnomu otocchenni", but remained cautious and instead of seeking the traces of the direct


123. V. Koriak, "Borot'ba za Shevchenka", Kharkiv. DVU, 1925, p. 113. Koriak was supported by E. S. Kots who also in general shared the opinion of Richyts'kyi (E. S. Kots, "Krepostnye poety i pisateli. T. G. Shevchenko", in his Krepostnaia intelligentsiia, Leningrad, Seiatel', 1926, p. 199-200).

connections between Shevchenko and socialism limited his conclusions to the following statement: "Звичайно, важко сказати, в якій мірі Шевченко (being in exile-D.S.) був у курсі ідейних прямувань передової інтелегенції того часу". 125

In the literary criticism of Western Ukraine Fylypovych's study "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby" was given some attention and especially by the circle of Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk. It is interesting to note that a positive response came from V. Doroshenko, the one who in 1924 expressed his rather approving thoughts on Richyts'kyi's book. Apparently Fylypovych and similar critical reactions to Richyts'kyi's work convinced Doroshenko of the objectivity and veracity of Fylypovych's position as is stressed in his review on the first volume of Shevchenko ta ioho doba.

Calling Fylypovych's study the best in this symposium, the

125. Doroshkevych quoted Fylypovych's statement from the latter's study "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby", p. 13, in his review on it entitled: "Nove pro Shevchenka", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1925, kn. 3, p. 51. Later he repeated this view in "Shevchenko i petrashevtsi v 40-kh rr.", in Shevchenko ta ioho doba, zb. 2, 1926, p. 24, and in "Suchasbyi stan shevchenkoznavstva", in his Etudy z shevchenkoznavstva: zbirnyk stattei, Kharkiv, DVU, 1930, p. 39. In the last work, however, the author completely shares the views of Richyts'kyi and Koriak and praised their writings as the first Marxist approach on Shevchenko research.
critic emphasized that in his critical analysis of the works of Drahomanov and Richyts'kyi

... автор проляв багато світла на життя й діяльність великого українського поета, виказав цілу кучу невірних, нічим не оправданих поглядів згаданих дослідників, спричинених або недостачає матеріалів (як от у Драгоманова), або крім того односторонність та тенденційність дослідника (мова про Річицького). В результаті постать Шевченка стає перед нами у цілій своїй історичній правді. I26

Finally Richyts'kyi himself gave a reply to Fylypovych's criticism and its supporters. In the preface to the Russian edition of his work, he took advantage of the Union of the Liberation of Ukraine ("Spilka vyzvolennia Ukrainy") trial and condemned all previous researches on Shevchenko conducted by the Academy which were mostly under the leadership of S. Iefremov. In correspondence to Fylypovych's studies and particularly to his "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby" Richyts'kyi wrote: "Попитки буржуазного академізму врятувати поета-борця із його соціальної сфери і представити його в духе "сильної личності", "високого духу" представники інтеллігенції і даже богеми, стоячі вже класових, все більше наглядно виявляють своє неосвітленість..."137

It was a time and circumstances


which did not allow Fylypovych to react to this Marxist statement containing the following declaration:

Все великое общественно-историческое значение поэта-незвольника Тараса Шевченка состоит в том, что он шел по пути, намеченному историей борьбы угнетенного человечества за свое освобождение такими вехами, как Спартак, Манчер, Бабеф, Маркс, Ленин. А этот путь, путь святой, кровавый и правый, ведет к обновленному коммунистическому обществу.128

This kind of declaration, which under the protection of the Communist party129 was quite common in the writings of Soviet Marxist critics in the early 1930's, in fact put a stop to all further study of Shevchenko which had the intention of maintaining a scholarly and objective character.

Fylypovych's study "Do studiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby" which was supplemented by certain articles in this respect like "Shevchenko u zviazku z ioho doboiu",130 and "Ievropeis'ki pys'mennyky v Shevchenkovii lekturi"131 occupies a distinguished place among his critical works on Shevchenko. From the methodological point of view there are really two different topics approached separately: the

129. "Za zhyvu postat' velykoho poeta-kripaka", in Komunist, 1930, No. 69, p. 2.
130. P. Fylypovych, "Shevchenko u zviazku z ioho doboiu", in Nova hromada, (Kyiv) 1925, No. 5-6, p. 2-5.
131. -------, "Ievropeis'ki pys'mennyky v Shevchenkovii lekturi", in Proletars'ka pravda, 1926, No. 56, p. 4.
criticisms of Drahomanov's study and Richyts'kyi as a direct but unsuccessful follower of Drahomanov in this respect, and the analysis of the German question in Shevchenko's ideological framework. Although the second part was connected with the criticism of Richyts'kyi's book, it represents a separate theme by itself. At the same time the study preserved the sociologico-comparative approach, i.e., on the background of social surroundings which were characterized as influential factors in the formation of Shevchenko's views toward the particular problem, Fylypovych illustrated how they were reflected in the poet's writings. Analyzing this question, the scholar attempted to determine the place of these social factors in Shevchenko's philosophical conception of the world. Yet the second part of the study needs some closer observation since it dealt with a problem which led certain critics to different and sometimes even contradictory conclusions. Fylypovych's approach toward this question emphasized his originality. Taking into

132. It should be mentioned that this aspect was rather not acknowledged by the reviewers of his work except by Richyts'kyi who responded negatively to it.

133. Here should be mentioned the previous interpretation of Shevchenko's approach toward the Germans by V. Simovych in his explanations and remarks to Shevchenko's Kobzar: narodnie vydannya, Katerynoslav, Ukrains'ke vyd-vo, 1921, and its criticism by S. Shelukhyn in his "Pro konechnu potrebu novykh poiasnen' "Kobzaria"; pro roziasnennia "Kobzaria" d-rom V. Simovychem", in Dzvony, 1933, ch. 10, p. 457-464; 1934, ch. 2, p. 97-103.
general consideration all materials bearing on the case, he analyzed as if with a magnifying glass all possible details of the historical facts of Shevchenko's life and their literary reflections in his works. The result of utilizing such a research attitude was quite effective, because it considered almost all possible ingredients of the question and explained the main factors connected with the topic. However, in the interpretation of some of Shevchenko's poems as illustrative examples of the theme discussed, e.g., germanophobia, the scholar limited himself only to short excerpts alone without indicating their background in the entire poem which then could be understood differently from the whole poem itself.

For example, illustrating the conversation between the images of the crows (evil of Ukraine and Russia) in the poem "Velykyi l'okh", which corresponded to the German influence on the bureaucratic order in Russia, Fylypovych omitted the characteristic talk between the three lyrists:

"А, може і посадятъ
Москалика, або Німця;
А Мoscалъ та Німецъ
Там найдуть хлібець". 134

134. T. Shevchenko, "Velykyi l'okh", in his Kobzar, Katerynoslav, 1921, p. 169.
which clearly emphasized the poet's concern about the situation in Ukraine created by the occupational force ("Moskal'") and its implementing factor ("Nimets'"). The idea and the composition of the whole poem only proved such a view by Shevchenko, and it gradually reaches the ideological peak in its fourth part, i.e., in the discovery and ruin of Khmel'nyts'kyi's "Malyi l'okh". Shevchenko's view on influential Germans in the apparatus of the Russian empire was different from that of the Russian liberal intellectual and revolutionary circles. While the latter opposed the German influence itself on the state and social order in Russia, Shevchenko first of all condemned the whole foreign system in Ukraine and those forces which served this system to preserve its order including Germans. The poet emphasized his view toward this problem quite clearly, for example:

С т е п и  мо ю за пр о д а н і
Ж и д о в і, Н і м о т і;
Сини мо ю на ч у ж і н і,
На ч у х і й роботі;
Д н і пр о, б р а т м і й в и с и х ає,
М е н е п о к ідає,
A м о г і л і мо ю м і л і
М о с к а л ь р о з р и в а є.

Н е х а й р и с, р о з к о п ує,
Н е св о є ш укає....
A т и м ч а с о м п е р е в е р т н і
Н е х а й п і д р о с т а ю є,
Т а п о м о ж у ть М о с к а л е в і
Г о с п о д а р ю в а т і,
Т а з м а т е р і п о л а т а н у
С о р о ч к у з н і м а т і! 135

It seems that to extend the ideas of separate portions corresponding to Germans against the background of the whole

poem would not have adversely affected the scholar's research method, and might have provided a clearer conclusion.

It is worthwhile to mention that in criticizing the works of Drahomanov and Richyts'kyi, Fylypovych made reference to the works of the main representatives of the sociologico-ideological trend in Ukrainian literary criticism and especially S. Iefremov as one who had made serious strides forward in Shevchenko research. These references were made despite the constant attack on Iefremov by the critics of the Communist front including Richyts'kyi. Quoting Iefremov as support for his own statement, Fylypovych underlined that this scholar was one of those students of Shevchenko who initiated the basic research still during the tsarist days when most of the primary sources concerning the poet's life were not available for close scrutiny.

Thus, Fylypovych's study has a double significance. It explained the basic thrust of Drahomanov's work and proved the inadequacy of its various aspects. In addition it defended scholarly objectivity in Shevchenko studies in the


138. As a matter of fact, Iefremov, in his works of Shevchenko published before the 1920's indicated that the lack of proper documents prevented a detailed description of many important data of the poet's life and his literary relations. S. Iefremov, Istoriia ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Ljaptsig, 1919-1924, t. 2, p. 7.
face of attempts to simplify them by the Marxist critics, especially by their leading representatives in the 1920's like Koriak and Richyts'kyi who attempted to follow Drahomanov's lead. The study also acknowledged the significance of Shevchenko research conducted by the representatives of the sociologico-ideological trend (so-called Neopopulists) and particularly Iefremov who successfully led modern criticism in the 1920's towards its achievements in this field. Finally it should be underlined that despite the difficult circumstances, Fylypovych was the only literary critic who clearly declared himself for a scholarly and objective approach to Shevchenko studies, although this attempt created against him greater antagonism from the Communist camp and official forces.

Every edition of the study Shevchenko i dekabrysty which was considered a new and original contribution called forth the immediate attention of literary scholars and critics. Although generally praising the work, the views were divided into two main groups: the first of them acknowledged Fylypovych's contribution to the problem and evaluated it from the standpoint of historical facts as well.

A. Aizenshtok, "Z novoi literatury pro Shevchenka", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1926, No. 4, p. 240-241.
CRITICAL WORKS ABOUT TARAS SHEVCHENKO

as analyzing the study from the literary standpoint, while others and particularly the Marxist critics generalized their opinions from selected minor aspects in order to prove the almost total influence of the Decembrists, the Petrashevskii group, and especially Herzen on Shevchenko as the main factors in the formation of the poet's philosophical conception of the world. However some questions touched upon in Fylypovych's work like Shevchenko's connections with the Decembrists as they were reflected in his various poems, especially in "Neofity" and "Trizna", stimulated further research which provided sometimes similar and sometimes differing conclusions. Thus, concerning the reflection of the Decembrists' exile in Shevchenko's "Neofity" as indicated by Fylypovych, S. Iefremov stated that

140. M. Novyts'kyi, "Retsenziia na kn. P. Fylypovycha 'Shevchenko i dekabrysty': dopovid' zachytana na zasidennii KDIHTU IFV UAN, 1927. The paper itself was not published. There is only a short note about it in ZIFV UAN, kn. 19, 1928, p. 389.


141. B. Neiman, "Shevchenkovskii sbornik", in Pechat' i revoliutsiia, 1924, No. 4, p. 273.

Ie. Kyryliuk, "Ostanni dosiahennia shevchenkoznavstva", in Proletars'ka pravda, 1929, No. 58, p. 7.


Similar thoughts were expressed by O. Bahrii\(^{143}\) and O. Doroshkevych, but the latter in a discussion of Fylypovych's analysis of this particular question added the following statement:

П. Филипович майже вичерпав це питання, старавно зібравши всі вказівки про декабристів у Шевченкових творах. Зокрема можна зважати за доведене раніше висловлене твердження (не зважаючи на критицизм деяких шевченкознавців), що поема "Неофіти" справді навідна трagiчної історії декабристів, але, маєть важко погодитись з міркуванням про мало не текстуальну близькість поеми до справжніх історичних подій.\(^{144}\)

P. Zaitsev agreed with Fylypovych that in "Neofity" and "Iurodyvyi" there are some reflections of the history of the Decembrists, but he did not comment further.\(^{145}\) In 1930 M. Vozniak published his study "Shevchenkiv Alkyd i ioho maty" in which he came to the conclusion that the poem "Neofity" portrayed the founder and leader of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood, Mykola Kostomarov, and his mother whom Shevchenko had visited during his return from exile, and also reflected

---


the history of the Brotherhood itself. Following Vozniak's lead, Ie. Pelens'kyi strongly declared that the poem was created on the basis of the activities and particularly the exile of the members of the Brotherhood and Fylypovych's conclusions could not be considered in this respect whatsoever. In his comments on "Neofity", L. Bilets'kyi took a middle position stating that both Fylypovych and Vozniak proved the validity of their different conclusions. Following closely Fylypovych's analysis, L. Bilets'kyi concluded his comments as follows:

Декабристи - перші революціонери й повстанці за свободу й ідеї, в перемогу якої вони виріли. Вони перші виступили проти неволі із зброс у руках. Вони - неофіти визвольної ідеї й нової віри. Її в новій поемі Шевченка во́ни творять те головне тло, на якому розвивається особи́ та трагедія сина, одного із тих неофітів, його матері, що стала головною герої́ною поеми.148

146. M. Vozniak, "Shevchenkiv Alkyd i ioho maty", in Shevchenko, rich. 2., 1930, p. 49-69. Here the author extended the thoughts of B. Lepkyi expressed in this respect in his "Pro zhittia i tvory Tarasa Shevchenka", in T. Shevchenko, Povne vydannia tvoriv, Liaiptsiaig, Ukrains'ka nakl., 1919, t. 1., p. 172-186. It should be noted that while Fylypovych concentrated his attention on those parts of the poem where he perceived connections with the Decembrists without considering its main personages, Vozniak, on the other hand, limited his analysis primarily to the principal figures, i.e., Alkyd and his mother and ignored those elements stressed by Fylypovych.


Yet, in interpreting the principal personages of mother and son in the poem, Bilets'kyi added:

... мусимо шукати ближчого відповідника для матері з "Неофітів" у дійсності, з якої черпав образи Шевченка. І таким відповідником для матері і її сина Алкида, на мій погляд, буде мати Мик. Костомарова і сам Мик Костомаров її син. На цю відповідність вказав ще М. Возяк.149

An analogous interpretation can be found in the studies of a Soviet Ukrainian critic, Ie. Nenadkevych, who perceived the Decembrists' history as the background of the poem and considered the suffering of Alkyd's mother as the main theme of the poem.150

Concerning the discussion of "Neofity", it should be emphasized that Bilets'kyi effectively unified the thoughts of Fylypovych and Vozniak, but the background of the poem seems to be still more broad and comprehensive; besides the


Here it should be mentioned that certain works of Ie. Kyryliuk (Taras Shevchenko: zhyt'tia i tvorchist'). 2 vyd. Kyiv, DWKM, 1964; Shevchenko i nash chas; literaturno-krytychnyi narys, Kyiv, Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1968, and "Osnovni etapy radians'koho shevchenkoznavstva", in Zbirnyk Shisnadsatstioi naukovo shevchenkiv'skoj konferentsii, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1969, p. 2-22) also touch on these problems mentioning even several of Fylypovych's studies. However since all of them represent a general survey without new contributions and with numerous elements close to standard Communist propaganda, they are not considered more closely in this work.
history of the Decembrists and the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood it reflects also the events of the Polish uprising of 1830-1831. Shevchenko spent a good part of his exile with the Polish revolutionaries, especially in Orenburg where nearly two thousand members of that insurrection languished. Such Polish prisoners as B. Zaleski, E. Zelikowski, A. Wędzynowski, the Catholic priest M. Zielonka, T. Pszewocki, and Z. Sierakowski became not only adherents of the same general ideas, but also close personal friends of the poet. Shevchenko mentioned a number of these persons with admiration in his correspondence from Orenburg and dedicated various pages in his diary to them. As a matter of fact, some were released from exile at the same time as the poet. Thus, during the creation of "Neofity" these people and their exile were fresh in the poet's memory as were the other events mentioned above. On the other hand Shevchenko's period knew so many political prisoners that it is rather


It is worthy of note that Z. Sierakowski, who was born in Ukraine and spoke Ukrainian fluently, beside his revolutionary views also had some concern for political and social problems of Ukraine. It was he who as an officer of the tsarist army submitted a report in 1862 to the Minister of Army, Miliutin, requiring recognition of national and cultural rights for Ukraine. V. Shchurat, Shevchenko i poliaky, L'viv, NTSh, 1917, p. 107-108.
difficult to single out a single event as primary in this poem, although some parts might be related to one particular episode. These additional remarks can supplement Fylypovych's studies on the problem as well as provide clarification of Shevchenko from the social and ideological point of view in this respect.

The analysis of the poem "Trizna" also found certain echoes in literary criticism especially in those works which dealt with topics close to the poem or analyzed "Trizna" itself. Thus, M. Vozniak in his study of the relations between Shevchenko and kn. Varvara N. Repnina perceived in the poem as did Fylypovych the elements influenced by "Voinarovskii". Another Shevchenko student, P. Zaitsev, in his work on Shevchenko's poetry in the Russian language in general agreed with Fylypovych's opinion concerning the close connections between "Trizna" and Ryleev's poem, but he considered that "Voinarovskii" was not the only poem which contains similar features to Shevchenko's "Trizna". Zaitsev stressed that they might be found in other romantic poems like Goethe's "Faust", some of V. M. Hugo's poems, Lermontov's "Mtsyri", and especially in the poems of E. I. Guber whom

Shevchenko knew. To a different conclusion came L. Bilets'kyi in his analysis of the poem in his study of the relationship between the poet and the Repnins. Bilets'kyi agreed with Fylypovych only in regard to the stylistic connections between "Trizna" and "Voinarovskii", but he strongly stressed that Shevchenko's poem, expressing the complications of the poet's internal feelings, was created under the influence of the surroundings of the Repnin's house and family. In this respect Bilets'kyi stated:

Я намагався показати, що поема "Безсталанний" по вінця насичена тією атмосферою, в якій у Яготині перебував Шевченко, і була відповідною княжою кормою Репніним на цих тяжких обставинах щодо поетової поведінки. Цим самим я заперечую всі інші пояснення поеми.155

In considering Fylypovych's analysis of "Trizna" and the studies of this poem by the other scholars mentioned above and especially Bilets'kyi's, the determination of their two different methodological positions should be pointed out: while Fylypovych sought in "Trizna" aesthetic and literary traces of Ryleev's poetical works, particularly those devoted to Ukraine, L. Bilets'kyi analyzed it from the psychological point of view stressing only those sociological


factors which could fit into the framework of his theme, i.e., Shevchenko's relations with Iahotyn. Hence both studies might be considered as independent approaches which to some extent supplement each other. However, where they discussed the same question, e.g., the connections between "Trizna" and "Voinarovskyi", Fylypovych's analysis based on a direct comparison between the various parts of these two poems does not develop any traces of the speculation as can be observed in Bilets'kyi's interpretation of a portrait of kn. Repnin in "Trizna". 156

Dwelling on Fylypovych's thoughts that some parts of this poem are indirectly directed to Ryleev himself as a personification of liberation ideas close to those of Shevchenko, one may find various critical statements which support the scholar's view. A number of literary critics agree when considering the fact that despite all the historical descriptions existing in the 1820's reflecting the official tsarist standpoint toward hetman Mazepa and his treaty with Charles XII, Ryleev portrayed him as a national leader who directed his policies towards the liberation of Ukraine. In his analysis of "Voinarovskyi", N. Kotliarevskyi stressed that

"Бойнаровский остался верен своему дяде, любя в нем не столь ко человека и родственника, сколько именно борца за свободу родины", 157

To a similar conclusion came also the Soviet critics of Ryleev's poetry. For example, G. Lelevich in comparing "Voinarovskii" with Pushkin's "Poltava", wrote:

"... при оценке мазепинского движения поэт (Ryleev-D. S.) проявил несравненно большую общественную чуткость чем его гениальный современник. Борьба Мазепы с Петром рисуется у него не как борьба честолюбивого авантюриста с законным монархом, а как борьба свободы с самовластием". 158

Even during the period of the socialist realistic radicalism and the general revision of its ideological approaches towards the literary developments of the nineteenth century, Soviet criticism could not find a way of avoiding the acknowledgment of Ryleev's particular emphasis upon Mazepa's portrait in "Voinarovskii". However, the Soviet critics exhibited a rather simplistic attitude in explaining this phenomenon. Usually they neatly avoided analysis of the poem, 159 or stated that the characteristic of Mazepa was simply an


historical and ideological mistake of the author. This official approach is apparent in Soviet criticism up to the present time as can be observed in the following words of I. Zaslavs'kyi:

... немас підстав гадати, що Рілеєв не розумів історичної ролі Мазепи. Однак в поемі Мазепа все ж виявився оточеним якимось авреолом. Його неправе діло надихає Андрія Бойнаровського. Бойнаровський, якому гаряче співчував поет-декабрист, ідеалізує Мазепу. Метафізичність і антиісторизм мислення поета обумовили невірне рішення... 161

Almost all of Ryleev's poems on Ukrainian themes were saturated with the ideas whose influences were notable with the Ukrainian intelligentsia. That was the reason why D. Bahalii called the poet "бардом України з Ю гетьманчи- нов". 162 On the other hand, the Ukrainian liberal circles and especially intellectuals and literary personalities furnished Ryleev, who was "зв'язаний родиною з Слобідською Україною - Вороніничиною", 163 with primary sources and their

---


161. I. Zaslavs'kyi, Rylieiev i rosiis'ko-ukrains'ki literaturni vzaiemyny, Kyiv, DVKhL, 1958, p. 70.

162. D. Bahalii, "Dekabrysty na Ukraini", in Chervony shliakh, 1926, No. 1, p. 100. A similar thought was also expressed by A. Zhyvotko in his "Ukrains'ke pytannia v pohladak predstavnykov rosiis'koj suspil'noj dumky XIX-ho st.", in Nasha kul'tura, 1936, kn. 2, p. 127-133.

163. Ibid.
own ideologico-political aspirations which inspired Ryleev in his creation of these poetical works. One of the distinguished students of Ryleev, Vasyl' Maslov, described these connections between the poet and Ukrainian circles as follows:

Following to some extent Maslov's opinion, the Polish critic B. Galster presented his view in this respect with these words:

Shevchenko was acquainted with all these facts through a very reliable source. This was the family of Ryleev's uncle, kn. Repnin, and it is rather difficult to believe that the young and open-minded poet with his revolutionary feelings ignored


the ideas expressed in Ryleev's poems which had been greatly admired in his Ukrainian surroundings. In addition it should be underlined that "Trizna" was written during the creation of the cycle of Shevchenko's poems called "Try lita", and shortly after "Velykyi l'okh" and "Subotiv". Thus Fylypovych's interpretation as well as his conclusions concerning connections between Shevchenko's poem and Ryleev's "Voinarovskii" possess a serious and convincing background.

When dwelling on the criticism of this work of Fylypovych one notices that the majority of critics overlooked the methodological base and the principal aim of this study. Fylypovych's main idea was neither a literary analysis of Shevchenko's poetry with the consideration of those factors which played an influential role in their creation as it was interpreted by Zaitsev, Bilets'kyi, and especially Pelens'kyi, nor a presentation of a general portrait of the poet and his social-political activities connecting them only with Russian revolutionary circles, as put forth by the Marxist critics (Ie. Kyryliuk, Iu. Iosypchuk, and F. Iastrebov). 166 Fylypovych's study was entitled "Shevchenko i dekabrysty", i. e., he had chosen a very limited theme presenting minor though

166. Iu. Iosypchuk, "Etapy poetychnoi tvorchosti Shevchenka", in Radians'ka literatura, 1937, kn. 3, p. 204-205.
important episodes in the poet's colorful life. This theme he systematically researched in Shevchenko's diary, correspondence, and autobiographical novels, and compared them with historical materials of the liberation movements in Ukraine and Russia culminating in the December uprising. On the basis of these data the scholar observed the various periods of Shevchenko's social activities as well as his ideologico-political views and indicated how these factors were reflected in certain parts of his poetical works. If Fylypovych had not researched this question as he did then a gap would still remain which would seriously detract from the whole portrait of the poet's personality. Without this objective demonstration of the factors connected with the problem, the old opinions might still reign declaring that the poet was not able to comprehend the significance of the liberation movements popular at that time. On the other hand, the Communist camp, which possesses all the relevant documents and the primary sources, would always be ready to handle the question according to the then current line.

In studying Shevchenko's ideological relations with the Decembrists, Fylypovych was the first to emphasize not only the poet's connections with members of the uprising who returned from exile at the same time as Shevchenko, but also presented the whole series of factors connected with the liberation activities of the secret societies which directly
and indirectly played an important role in the formation of the poet's Weltanschauung. In this respect he particularly pointed to the Ukrainian Decembrists who attempted to revive the tradition of the independent Ukrainian hetman state. Later, this subject was elaborated and extended by such scholars as O. Hermaize, I. Zubkivs'kyi, D. Bahalii, and V. Hnatiuk, who affirmed Fylypovych's view on this particular question.

Finally, the methodological manner in the study was carefully preserved from beginning to end. The scholar did not depart from it even in those cases where a small digression might have provided a better understanding (for example in his comparative analysis of "Neofity") of the question for his readers and critics. Instead, following his selected research method, Fylypovych provided successfully a comparison between Shevchenko's poetical works and the poetry of

167. O. Hermaize, "Rukh dekabrystiv i ukrainstvo", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 6, p. 34-38.

168. I. Zubkivs'kyi, "Dekabrysty, narodzhentsi Poltavshchyny", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1925, No. 11-12, p. 116-119.


other poets regardless of their national boundaries or the period of their life and creativity and at the same time he emphasized Shevchenko's social surroundings and the important features of his philosophical conception of the world as the Ukrainian poet.

The question concerning Shevchenko and the Decembrists might still be discussed in the future when later students of this theme discover new and unknown primary sources corresponding to those particular periods of Shevchenko's life. Any such student, however, will be unable to ignore Fylypovych's work which stands as not only the initial research but the most comprehensive up to our day.
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O. Kobylians'ka and her literary surroundings.

A notable place among Fylypovych's research was occupied by his studies on the work of the writer, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka, which were conducted by the scholar during the second half of the 1920's. In his article "Spustoshena idyliia" Fylypovych dealt with the analysis of the social elements in Kobylians'ka's novel "Zemlia" and on this basis attempted to determine the writer's philosophical conception of the world with special emphasis on her spiritual aristocracy and its confrontation with reality as reflected in the novel. On the other hand, his essay "O. Kobylians'ka v literaturnomu otochenni" was devoted to the characteristic of Kobylians'ka's literary surroundings, i.e., the factors which played an influential role in the development of her literary approach as well as of her Weltanschauung. Avoiding sociological aspects, Fylypovych in his study concentrated on the comparison of those elements of Kobylians'ka's

---


3. M. Markovs'kyi objected to this in his "Tvorchist' O. Kobylians'koi v osvitlenni suchasnoi krytyky", in Ukraina, 1928, kn. 3, p. 164.
writings which link her with the philosophers and writers of Western Europe and Ukraine. Since this problem was partly observed previously by various literary critics, Fylypovych extended it with his own interpretations supported by new source material. Thus, discussing the influence of F. W. Nietzsche on Kobylians'ka's views, Fylypovych stated that although the influence of the writings of this German philosopher was remarkable in European literature at the beginning of the twentieth century and Kobylians'ka herself was impressed by his works especially his "Also sprach Zarathustra", still there is little evidence that his influence on the writer was dominant, as it had been stressed by other critics. Aspects of Nietzsche's thought might have aided Kobylians'ka in the development of her personal pride and in the creation of the brave, proud and lordly female personages in her novels. However, Fylypovych emphasized that one might find close connections between Kobylians'ka's novels and the writings of Scandinavian writers. Particularly the

4. The question was partially discussed previously by such persons as: I. Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, S. Iefremov, O. Makovei, M. Ievshan, M. Sriblians'kyi, O. Hrytsai, and L. Lutsiv. All these works were taken into consideration in Fylypovych's study.

5. Fylypovych referred to O. Doroshkevych's "O1'ha Kobylians'ka", in his Pidruchnyk istorii ukrains'koi literatury, Kharkiv, Knyhopispilka, 1924, p. 226, and A. Shamrai's "O1'ha Kobylians'ka", in his Ukrains'ka literatura; styslyi obliad, Vyd. 2., vyprav., Kharkiv, Rukh, 1928, p. 146.
Danish writer J. P. Jacobsen might be considered one of the main sources of influence on the writer which is evident in her novels like "Vin i Vona", and "Tut povynni by rosty rozhi", and also "Pryroda" which might be compared with Jacobsen's novel "Marie Grubbe". Kobylians'ka was also familiar with the literary production of G. Brandes and the dramas of H. Ibsen whose characters in the drama "Gengangere" have features similar to those of the principal figures of Kobylians'ka's works. Also M. Maeterlinck was among Kobylians'ka's favorite writers, and one may observe the connections between his works and her novel "Apostol cherni".

Among the German writers Kobylians'ka was impressed by H. Heine whose poems she planned to translate into Ukrainian. As a matter of fact, Kobylians'ka's first draft of the novel "Tsarivna" had the title "L'oreliai" after Heine's poem "Lorelei". Some episodes in this novel indicate that its author was well acquainted with the works of G. E. Lessing, and one might observe A. Platen's influence in the novel "Za sytuatsiiamy". Finally the later German playwright G. Hauptmann was one of those Western European literary personalities whose works were admired by the Ukrainian writer. For example, his drama "Die versunkene Glocke", which to some extent is close to Lesia Ukrainka's "Lisova pisnia", was mentioned in Kobylians'ka's novel "Cherez kladku". Hauptmann's play in fact was created under the
influence of Nietzsche, and thus also in this way his thoughts were brought indirectly into Ukrainian literature. Among the Ukrainian writers, Fylypovych stressed various personalities who played an important role in Kobylians'ka's literary development particularly Olena Pchilka, Vasyl' Stefanyk, Sofiia Okunevs'ka, Natalia Kobryns'ka, Panas Myrnyi, Marko Vovchok, and Iurii Fed'kovych.

Although listing all these literary figures who were considered influential factors in Kobylians'ka's literary production, Fylypovych emphasized that she did not simply follow their creative manner nor adopt their principal themes but utilized in an original form those elements which supported the main ideas of her own topic. On the other hand, the group of philosophers and writers mentioned above was far from a complete list of those personalities whose works interested Kobylians'ka and who influenced the formation of her Weltanschauung. Fylypovych stated that the source of this influence was quite rich and diverse. It reached the poems of Sophocles, the dramas of W. Shakespeare, works of the French encyclopedists F. M. Voltaire and J. J. Rousseau, representatives of the "Sturm und Drang", J. W. Goethe, F. Schiller, and J. G. Herder, the Positivists, H. Spencer, F. K. Buechner, J. W. Dreper, H. T. Buckle, and Ch. R. Darwin, the Polish poet, A. Mickiewicz (especially his poem "Konrad Walenrod"), the Russian critic, D. I. Pisarev, and finally
the Ukrainian poets and thinkers, T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, and M. Drahomanov. The principal source active in the formation of Kobylians'ka's philosophical conception of the world and her literary orientation was her own native soil with its rich folk traditions which provided her with all necessary themes and the basic inspiration for her literary creations.

Analysis of the novel "V nediliu rano zillia kopala".

The leading place among Fylypovych's critical works of Kobylians'ka's creative production is held by his study "Istoriia odnoho siuzhetu" which was published as an introductory essay to the second edition of the writer's novel "U nediliu rano zillia kopala" issued in 1927. The study containing fourteen chapters can be divided into two main parts dealing with two separate problems. The aim of the first part was to present the history of the novel's plot which was based on the motifs of the old and popular Ukrainian song "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornyi". In the second part of the study Fylypovych analyzed the novel itself, i. e., on the basis of a widely extended comparative approach indicated its connections with the earlier elaborations of the plot and the basic motifs of the song, and
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also emphasized the similarity between the main features of the novel (especially its principal figures) and the literary works of other authors. Finally the scholar analyzed the novel's artistic elements which, in his opinion, played a dominant role in its composition and which achieved here an original and effective formulation.

In the introduction to his study Fylypovych mentioned that the title of Kobylians'ka's novel (first published in 1909) was taken from a line of the song while its whole text served as an epigram to the novel. Dwelling on the history of the song, Fylypovych stated that the theme of "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" could be connected with the motifs of the Western European medieval love story "Tristan and Isolde" which left many models in the works of world literature. The song about the young man, Hryts', who was poisoned by one of two girls with whom he fell in love was one of the most popular in Ukraine for many years. It was first published in Vseobshchii novoizbrannyi pesennik in 1805 and then reprinted seven times before 1827 when the collection of Ukrainian songs of M. Maksymovych was published.

ESSAYS ON THE LITERARY WORK OF OL'HA KOBYLIANS'KA 321.

Fylypovych indicated that in 1823 the historian, D. Zubryts'kyi, published his article on Ukrainian folk songs in the almanach Pielgrzym Lwowski including two examples. The first was the song "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu na vechornytsi". In the same year the song was translated into German and published separately as a score. In 1827 the song was included in M. Maksymovych's Malorossiiskie pesni, and its score was published along with the translation of Zubryts'kyi's article in Viestnik Evropy. Afterwards the song was mentioned by various Ukrainian writers in their works like T. Shevchenko, P. Myrnyi, V. Kulyk, and S. Vorobkevych. Fylypovych noted that the Polish poet J. Słowiacki in his letter written from Paris in 1831 emphasized that "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" in French translation was a favorite among French women.

The motifs of the song were used also by certain other romantic writers. Thus, the leading member of the Ukrainian school in Polish literature, J. B. Zaleski, in his poem "Ukrainie (dumka ukraińska)" presented an infelicitous elaboration of the song which suffered from a distinct...
lack of literary value. Closer to the folk character of the Ukrainian song was the poem of A. Heńkiewicz, "Dumki z mowy wołyńsko-ukraińskiej", published in 1838, which relates how the girl Hańdzia poisoned her boyfriend Jaś.

Beside mentioning these, Fylypovych presented a whole series of literary works based on the song's plot and compared their similar features as well as indicated how the chain of influences was transferred from one creation to another. Using the comparative method with precision, he analyzed the extension of the theme in the different scenes of these works and emphasized their aesthetic value and their response in literary criticism as well.

In observing the early dramatic works which were based on the song's motif including K. Topolia's play "Chary".

---


11. K. Topolia, Chary ili nieskol'ko stsen iz narodnykh bylei i raskazov ukrains'kikh, Moskva, 1837, 97 p.
and I. Lahoda's work with the same title, Fylypovych closely considered A. A. Shakhovskii's story "Marusia, Malorossiiskaia Safo" which presents an event from the period of hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi with the Cossack officer, Hordii Churai's daughter Marusia as the central figure who poisoned her boyfriend the Cossack Hryts' Bobrenko. Marusia herself is characterized as a girl with an extraordinary ability to compose songs which she then sings to accompany various events in the story.

Fylypovych's detailed observation of Shakhovskii's story had two purposes. The first was to define its literary value and indicate the author's acquaintance with historical events of Ukraine as well as with native Ukrainian folklore and customs. The second was to demonstrate how Shakhovskii's work stimulated and influenced later elaborations of the song's plot which were combined with the main motif of his story (works of A. Skliarevs'kyi, H. Borakows'kyi, V. Nadruchchi (Zeno Romano), and V. Samiilenko) and how it also served as one of the basic sources in considering the principal personage of Shakhovskii's story, Marusia Churai, as a real creator of songs particularly "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu,

12. A. A. Shakhovskii, "Marusia, Malorossiiskaia Safo", in Sto russkikh literatorov, Sanktpeterburborg, t. 1, 1839.
na vechornytsi". In the conclusion based on the previous criticism of Shakhovskii's work and on his own investigation, Fylypovych disagreed with the opinions (especially those of O. Ohonovs'kyi\textsuperscript{13} and M. Komarov\textsuperscript{14}) which on the basis of Shakhovskii's story and later on Skliarevs'kyi's "biograficheskii ocherk"\textsuperscript{15} considered Marusia Churai as a genuine historical person.

In order to demonstrate the attempts to elaborate the combination of the motif of "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" with that of Shakhovskii's story in a poetical form, Fylypovych observed such writings as "Hryts'" of T. Onoprienko-Shelkovyi, "Marusia Churai; istoricheskaia byl'" of A. Chiumina (Mikhailov), and "Marusia Churai; buval'shchyna 1652 roku" of K. Ozers'ka-Nel'hovs'ka, and evaluated them as simple rehashes which neither reflect the real drama inherent in the song nor reveal any depth or stylistic prowess.

\textsuperscript{13} O. Ohonovs'kyi, "H. Borakovs'kyi, Zbirnyk dramatychnykh tvoriv, L'viv, 1888, t. 1.", in Zoria, 1889, No. 8, p. 137.

\textsuperscript{14} M. Komarov, Bio-bibliohrafichnyi slovnyk Ukrains'kykh pys'mennykh. Komarov's work was not published, and Fylypovych used its manuscript for his study.

\textsuperscript{15} A. Skliarevs'kyi, Marusia Churai, malorossiiskaia pevun'ia", in Pchela, 1877, No. 45, p. 711-713, and in Istoricheskaia biblioteka, 1879, No. 12, p. 1-12.
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Finally the scholar observed certain plays using the song's plot which served as material for a direct comparison with Kobylians'ka's novel. Among others, he dwelt on the melodrama of V. Aleksandrov which was entitled with the first line of the song: "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi". Fylypovych emphasized that preferring not to follow Shakhovskii's pattern, Aleksandrov avoided all historical elements in his play and transferred the whole action to a Ukrainian village with its rich folk life and traditions. Following Topola's manner, he used a number of folk songs and dances in the drama as well as several scenes with the romantic elements especially those with witches.16

However, despite its new approach and some original motifs Aleksandrov's play was devoid of really effective scenes, and its action appeared rather artificial and without the flexibility necessary for a stage production. In 1890 M. Staryts'kyi, who was attracted by melodrama, reworked Aleksandrov's play and retained the same title. He changed and shortened some scenes, clarified the presentation of the main personages including his destructive one whom

16. V. Aleksandrov, Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi; operetka v I diiakh, Kharkiv, 1873, 61 p.
he named Khoma, and enlivened all the action with humorous elements. Staryts'kyi also added group songs, traditional Christmas carols and other folk customs, and provided excellent stage directions. In its altered form, the melodrama was very successfully performed. D. Antonovych mentioned that

Fylypovych felt that despite its spectacular effects Staryts'kyi's play from the literary point of view still could not be considered a successful elaboration of the central plot of the folk ballad.

Presenting an analysis and literary evaluation of the whole series of elaborations of the folk ballad "Ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornyi" and observing the process of mutual interaction of genres and styles revolving around the central theme, Fylypovych concluded that an outer adornment of the old plot did not create a valuable literary document. The basic reason was that the plot of the folk ballad itself was one typical for Romanticism, and only representatives of this literary trend were able to develop and expand it

17. A. Antonovych, Trysta rokiv ukrains'koho teatru, 1619-1919, Praha, UHVF, 1925, p. 68.
successfully. According to Fylypovych this found confirmation in the novel of O. Kobylians'ka's "V nediliu rano zillia kopala".\(^\text{18}\)

Analysis of Kobylians'ka's novel "V nediliu rano zillia kopala".

In approaching the analysis of Kobylians'ka's novel, Fylypovych stated that for him it was not important whether the writer was familiar with the plot elaborations observed above. This statement might be understood when considering that the scholar's aim was not a direct comparison of Kobylians'ka's novel with the previous works discussed, but in a precise application of the comparative-aesthetical method to analyze the aesthetic and artistic features in its composition and to determine their originality in presenting this version of the song. The very determination of these elements was considered by Fylypovych as a comparison with the other elaborations which would itself designate the novel's place among them. In spite of the fact that Kobylians'ka was familiar with a number of previous works connected with the song "Ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi", in Fylypovych's opinion, they show no noticeable influence.

\(^{18}\) O. Kobylians'ka, "V nediliu rano zillia kopala...", in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1909, kn. 3-7.
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on her novel. Although some typical motifs of the folk ballad are used in the work (the portraits of the widow and her daughter who poisoned her lover before his intended marriage to her rival), the leitmotif of the novel is handled completely differently. Fylypovych emphasized that Kobylians'ka as M. Kotziubyns'kyi and K. Hrynevycha, cultivated in her creations individualistic and psychological factors which often were trimmed with neo-romantic lace. Characterizing this new school in Ukrainian literature, I. Franko stated that

In Fylypovych's opinion, "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" might serve as the best example for these thoughts of Franko's.

In contrast to the previous elaborations of the song's theme, in her novel Kobylians'ka declined to put the accent on the development of the main intrigue, but concentrated instead on the lyrical unification of the various
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psychologically depicted and artfully combined episodes which are presented by means of diverse literary devices. Presenting the outline of the novel, Fylypovych stated that the folk motif of "Oe khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" gave Kobylians'ka only a general orientation (Hryts' fell in love with two girls). In the previous works this motif was based on social elements; there usually appeared a daughter of a wealthy and another of a poor family. Presenting a quite original characteristic of Kobylians'ka's approach toward the interpretation of the novel's principal personages, Fylypovych emphasized that in "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" the predominant role was played by psychological rather than social factors. Here are presented proud Tetiana and meek Nastka. The figure of Hryts' was portrayed as a double-minded person, which helps to explain why he fell in love with two girls of opposite character. Kobylians'ka interpreted Hryts's duplicity as the result of his heredity (a Gypsy mother and white nobleman father) - the sin of his parents for which he must atone. As the main motif of the folk ballad, the poisoning of Hryts' appears as a sentence imposed against him because of previous guilt. In other words the cause was followed by the result. In contrast to this composition, Kobylians'ka presented the idea of a judgement predestined before the existence of his guilt. Explaining Hryts's guilt (he betrayed Tetiana) by the most
individualistic of reasons, the writer showed that he was long ago destined by fate to accomplish this deed, and thus his image was not damaged by the negative features of his character. On the other hand Kobylians'ka's approach did not diminish either the virtues or the poetic features of the central figure, the proud and romantic Tetiana who nevertheless did poison Hryts'. In this respect she was merely an agent of the sentence of fate, and as such she died, although she died in the aura of undefiled beauty destroyed by the cruelties of life. According to Fylypovych this approach of Kobylians'ka is especially evident in the comparison of the novel's opening scene (the drama in the Gypsy camp) with its final scene, when after the funeral of Hryts' the writer presented the following dialogue:

"Ходім, Мавро", обізвався вже по всім старий Андронаті до своєї доньки. "Ходім міх циган. Тепер ми тут знову старці...". "Ходім, тату" - каже Мавра твердо як камінь, і подала старому довгий костур в руки. "Тут вже мій гріх скінчився".

The overture to the story of Hryts' and to the whole novel was presented in psychological and stylistical tones decorated with substantial romantic colors and melodies. The general background of the overture was a traditionally poetized

Gypsy camp and its fires. Instead of a further analysis of the scene illustrated, Fylypovych made a slight digression to present a separate comparative description of Gypsies in Ukrainian and world literature. The scholar needed this comparison to facilitate a determination of Kobylians'ka's Gypsy personages as opposed to those represented by other writers. Hence Fylypovych mentioned that in Ukrainian folk stories, and old interludes, and in Christian drama, especially "vertepna drama" (the puppet-show of the Nativity) Gypsies usually appeared as swindlers and thieves. They were brave, energetic, but always impudent, ready to tell fortunes and steal, and well able to cheat the peasants.

In literary works the image of a Gypsy was usually presented as an entertainment figure and unlikely to evoke true lyrical feelings. Such pictures might be found in P. Bilets'kyi-Nosenko's "Horpynda, chy vkhoplena Prozerpyna", P. Kulish's "Tsyhan", in some poems of S. Rudans'kyi's "Spivomovky", as well as in the comic operetta of S. Pysarevs'kyi "Kupala na Ivana". In the latter the figure of the Gypsy sings a song with these words:

Коро схожу - одурю,
Не м не почервонію...

However, in Pysarevs'kyi's play Gypsies also appear as positive personages who aid people in their problems, as they did in Gogol's "Sorochinskaia iarmarka", and Shevchenko's "Vid'ma (Osyka)". Quite apart stands the only realistic picture which is found in Franko's novel "Tsyhany" where the writer portrayed the wretched life and death of a Gypsy family with warm sympathy.

Fylypovych emphasized that the romantics in world literature were attracted by the Gypsies as exotic, adventurous wanderers, and poetized their life and personalities and especially in regard to Gypsy women. External beauty, love of freedom, a proud character, ardent, unstable and fickle love, mysterious fortune telling, all these elements were used in different combinations where the Gypsy figures, usually women, were presented in their natural beauty and wild gracefulness. Such characters were typical for Esmeralde in V. Hugo's "Notre Dame de Paris", Carmen in P. Mérimée's "Carmen", Zemfira in Pushkin's "Tsygane", Sara in Boratynskii's "Tsyganka", Aza in J. I. Kraszewski's "Chata za wsig", as well as Aza in Staryts'kyi's elaboration "Tsyhanka Aza".

22. Fylypovych agreed with M. Petrov's statement that the source of Pysarevs'kyi's Gypsy was Pushkin's poem "Tsygane". M. I. Petrov, Ocherki iz istorii ukrainskoii literatury, Kiev, 1884, p. 114.
In Bukovyna Gypsies were a common phenomenon. They often appeared in the literary works of Ukrainian writers of that region, especially in the poems of Iu. Fed'kovych. In Kobylians'ka's novels, Gypsies were presented in an impressionistic manner varying from realistic pictures (Rakhira in "Zemlia") to romantic illustrations in "V nediliu rano zillia kopala". In particular the personages of Andronati, Mavra, her mother, and Radu were presented in purely romantic colors. Fylypovych pointed out that similarly to her Gypsy figures Kobylians'ka depicted the other main characters of the novel: the handsome, brave but deceitful Hryts', the image of beauty and pride in Tetiana, and the lovely and dutiful Nastka. Fylypovych considered that Tetiana, who was Kobylians'ka's favorite personage, was an image based on the main feminine figures in the writer's previous novels. Thus, in his opinion, the heroine of the novel was a new variation of Kobylians'ka's princess:

23. O. Kobylians'ka, V nediliu rano zillia kopala, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927, p. 70.
"Valse melancholique", affirmed that "Гордість, це одинока зброя жінки, яка вона справді може вдержатися на поверхні життя". Her central female personage Natalia Verkovychivna in the novel "Tsarivna", characterized herself with similar words: "В мені щось уперте - аристократичне, що має над мною неограничену силу". These virtues were united in Tetiana's personality with "Впертою вдачею дівчини, що не знає сила над собою ніякої власти". Thus, when Tetiana discovered Hryts's love for another girl, she reacted with the extraordinary force of wounded and proud lordliness. Her despair merged with a wish for revenge which did consequently materialize. The figure of Nastka reveals quite a different character. In Fylypovych's opinion, an apt characteristic of her might be found in Kobylians'ka's "Valse melancholique" where in the conversations of its personages the writer portrayed:

24. O. Kobylians'ka, Melianskholiinityi valets'; novelia, Kolomyia, Halyts'ka nakladnia, 1914, p. 47.

25. --------, "Tsarivna", in her Tvory, Kyiv, Rukh, 1927-29, v. 3, p. 239.

26. --------, V nediliu rano zillia kopala, Kyiv, Knyhosplika, 1927, p. 47.
Considering that this motif of direct contrast is well known in literature, Fylypovych again made a digression from the main theme discussed in order to seek its similarities in works of other authors. Thus he pointed out the novel "Pan" of K. Hamsun where its hero Hlan loved the haughty and whimsical Edwarde and the simple Eve. A similar picture was presented in Ibsen's neo-romantic drama "Haermaendene pa Helgeland" with gentle Dagny and the brave and masterly Hjordis. According to Fylypovych, Kobylians'ka presented a new variation of these portraits in which she also used elements of Ukrainian folk poetry as well as elements of the character of the Carpathian aborigines, the Hutsuls.

Here should be indicated an interesting feature of Fylypovych's analysis. Instead of observing the elements concerning the content, i. e., a consecutive description of the development of plot with its principal intrigues and action as they are composed within the structure of the

---

27. O. Kobylians'ka, "Valse melancholique", in LNV, 1898, kn. 1, p. 64 (later editions of this novel were entitled "Meliankholiinyi valets").
novel, the scholar skipped to a detailed concentration on artistic features of "V nediliu rano zillia kopala". Concerning this side of the novel, he mentioned that: "Франко, поставивши на чолі нової білетристики Ольгу Кобилянську, додав таку характеристику:

Нова білетристика — це незвичайно тонка філігранова робота; його змагання — зближитися скільки можна до музички. За для нього вона незвичайно діє про форму, о мелодійність слова, о ритмічність бесіди.28

A similar thought was expressed on Kobylians'ka's writings by Lesia Ukrainka who stated:

Саме реальні картини она постоянно сопровождает лирическими отступлениями, которые напоминают симфония, где впечатления пейзажа и движения души сливаются в одну нераздельную гармонию.29

Fylypovych considered that the best example of such a symphony of colors and melodies is "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" which might be defined not as an epic work but as a lyrico-epic or even to some extent a purely lyrical creation. On the other hand, the scholar stated that it is not "prose" but "poetry", whose rhythmical expressions sound an emotional tone, and whose organization is according to the typical composition for a ballad or lyrical poem.


Concentrating on the analysis of the rhythmical form of Kobylians'ka's novel, the scholar stressed that this poetical feature is particularly noticeable in her landscape descriptions:

"... чорними бровами ніби чудувалася,
а з другої сторони розум відбиравала,
Червоненьким маком ніби ти строїлася,
а з другої сторони до себе манила..." 32


31. Ibid., p. 129. Emphasized by the author.

32. Ibid., p. 164.
Fylypovych also indicated other literary devices used in the novel's composition which contributed supplementary impact to the leitmotif and strengthened the emotional and symphonic colors of the whole work. One of them is the afflicted sound of the trembita (the long bugle). The first time the sound of this traditional Hutsulian instrument was heard was in the mountains at the opening of the story when the old Gypsy left the child (Hryts') at the door of a wealthy Hutsul. Later, when Hryts' informed Andronati about his love for Tetiana during their meeting in the mountains, they both again heard the trembita's sound, and the old Gypsy heard it the third time at the funeral of Hryts'. In Fylypovych's opinion the sound of this traditional musical instrument in the Carpathian region of Ukraine reached the lyrical level of a symbol similar to Fed'kovych's poem "Sonni mary":

Сумно, сумно знов припівдає,
Гей тята любіть, що на сніг спиває.

Another significant symbol in the novel is a hawk which was mentioned several times as it hovered in the air over its booty. Fylypovych considered one of the scenes with this plunderer as important for Kobylians'ka's lyrical digression:

Observing this symbolic sign, Fylypovych added that it was not Mavra who gave warning but Kobylians'ka herself who sadly and anxiously prepared her readers for further events and the tragic death of her heroine. In this respect the writer followed her predecessors who in the epic descriptions used such lyrical digressions. This is especially noticeable in Shevchenko's poems. For example:

Загинеш, сердень, загинеш, Засхнеш, не знатимеш нічого; Мов ряст весною уночі Не знатимеш, як хвалить Бога, Як люди люблять, живучи...

Kobylians'ka also used another device behind which she hid her lyricism. There were two large, red poppies which beside their use as a head decoration for Tetiana, also appeared in a symbolic role. During the first meeting of Tetiana and Hryts' the flower imperceptibly fell down from her head, and at the end of the story Kobylians'ka presented the following picture:

34. O. Kobylians'ka, V nediliu rano zillia kopala, Kyiv, 1927, p. 80.
Tym, de glibina царювала, de камень—вєдеть спокійно означав неповоротну глибину ріки — де на дно вплив носить Тетяни віночок — стояв на поверхні блискучої води, притулювався до каменя, один великий цвіт червоного маку.— Другий, припинив порядок берега ріки, ждав — і як той і собі не рухався. 54

Fylypovych emphasized that Kobylians'ka declined to say simply that Tetiana lost her mind and drowned, but presented the tragic scene in a manner close to Shakespeare's handling of Ophelia and which also is reminiscent of the poem of Lesia Ukrainka:

Хотіла б я уплести за водою,  
Немов Офелія, уквітчана, безумна.  
За мною всіл пили б мої пісні...  
... А потім зник би й відгуки  
А на воді ше б колисалися тільки  
Мої квітки, що не пішли за мною  
На дно ріки... 55

Reassessing these symbols, Fylypovych emphasized that the sound of the trembita was heard at the beginning as a presentiment, later as a warning and finally as a mournful melody. The red poppies first symbolized proud beauty, later impassioned love, and finally blood and death. Kobylians'ka unified these symbols with the approach of the girl's fate forming a leitmotif in the novel's composition.

Although the whole text of "Ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" was taken as the epigraph and also partly used in one of the last scenes of the novel, Kobylians'ka's


approach was quite different from Shakhovskii's and Aleksandrov. Whereas Aleksandrov and Staryts'kyi entitled their plays "oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi", basing them primarily on boisterous meetings of boys and girls, and scenes with songs and dances, Kobylians'ka had chosen for the title of her novel another verse of the song: "V nediliu, rano zillia kopala". She combined its motif with a different song: "Hei na Ivana, hei na Kupala", which together with other symbols supplemented the principal idea and underlined that not handsome Hryts' but proud Tetiana in her struggle with fate is the central figure of the novel. The scenery of the Carpathians with their forests, mountain rivers, and mysterious nooks, which according to Fylypovych played the role of a lyrical refrain to the various scenes, along with the colorful life and custom of the Hutsuls accomplished Kobylians'ka's poetic symphony in prose.

Conducting his analysis of the novel, Fylypovych disagreed with O. Doroshkevych's statement that it represented just an interesting poetic tale. Instead he considered this work as a deeply lyrical confession of the author herself. On the whole the scholar shared the view

38. O. Doroshkevych, "V nediliu rano zillia kopala", in his Pidruchnyk istorii ukrains'koi literatury, Kharkiv, Knyhospilka, 1924, p. 229.
of D. Doroshenko who generally praised the novel, but he noted that in certain places it was unnecessarily extended especially in episodes with Andronati and Mavra. On the other hand, Fylypovych did not agree with S. Iefremov who considered Kobylians'ka's work a weak variation of the song "Ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi". In Fylypovych's opinion, Kobylians'ka did not follow the previous patterns of the old plot, but presented her own ideas in lyrical form based perhaps on her own experiences or feelings. This appears the reason why the writer considered "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" as the best among her creations.

Criticism and evaluation of Fylypovych's study.

Fylypovych's study was treated with some reserve by the literary critics. M. Markovs'kyi acknowledged Fylypovych's analysis of Kobylians'ka's novel and the history of

---

39. D. Doroshenko, "Z ukrains'kykh zhurnaliv; Literaturno-naukovi vistnyk", in Rada, 1909, no. 295, p. 3. M. Sriblians'kyi criticized these thoughts of Doroshenko and considered that the whole novel was composed in a strongly condensed style. M. Sriblians'kyi, "Ol'ha Kobylians'ka", in Ukrains'ka khata, 1910, no.

its theme in literature, but opposed the scholar's short statement of the sociological character of the work which emphasized that

Селянське життя трохи налякало авторку, витончену інтелектуалку: вона побачила в ньому темряву, черствість, забобони, а головне жадобу землі і багатства, що ведуть за собою страхові явища – убивство, дики пристрасті...41

K. Koperzhyns'kyi who dwelt only on the first part criticized the study. More strongly the critic considered that the analytic survey of the history of the novel's plot is

... мало виправданий, оскільки різні обробки розглядаються відрубо в хронологічному порядку, а тим часом для історика літератури важливе не так заповнити дані, як знайти безперервну нитку процесу руху традиції, її пов'язані, а не сторонні кільця.42

Koperzhyns'kyi also stated that

Відкидавчи важь (?) питання, чи знала Кобилянська попередні обробки, автор, на нашу думку, вже саме тому позбавляє грунту своїх міркувань про "заперечення" з боку Кобилянської попередньої традиції (це взагалі правдиво, бо нагоє важко точніше знайти відповідну точку цього, так-би мовить, відштовхування).43

In 1929, when the second edition of Fylypovych's study was published, Koperzhyns'kyi was again among its reviewers.

---

41. M. Markovs'kyi, "Tvorchist' O. Kobylians'koi v osvitlenni suchasnoi krytyky", in Ukraina, 1928, kn. 3, p. 164-165. It is worthy of note that in the second edition of his study published in 1929 Fylypovych excluded this sentence.

42. K. Koperzhyns'kyi, "Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo i krytyka", Ibid., p. 115.

43. Ibid.
Although this edition contained only slight and secondary changes, the critic appraised it highly. Furthermore, Koperzhyns'kyi criticized Markovs'kyi's remarks, stating that he directed his attention only to the consideration of sociological elements, whereas the significance of Fylypovych's analysis lies primarily in the determination of the aesthetic and artistic features of Kobylians'ka's work. The reviewer also revised his previous view concerning the first part of the study emphasizing that its author

старанно проаналізував різні обробки старого сюжету народньої пісні не лише в українських, але й чужих писаннях, вдало знаходячи їхній зв'язок з українською традицією.44

Koperzhyns'kyi's revised review might be considered as a response to the review on Fylypovych's studies by O. Traven' who acknowledged their significant value but opposed Fylypovych's scholarly approach which utilized the comparative-aesthetic method and avoided the consideration of the novel's social elements in the analysis.45

44. K. Koperzhyns'kyi, "P. Fylypovych. Z novit'oho ukrains'oho pys'menstva", in Ukraina, 1929, kn. 3 (34), p. 149-150.
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Similar to Koperzhyns'kyi's view was the review of Ie. Kyryliuk on "Istoriia odnoho siuzhetu" which not only praised its first part as an original comparative research work but also stressed Fylypovych's analysis of the novel itself as the first serious study on this topic:

Приємно вражає скрізь глибока аналіза, широкі порівняння з іншими літературними творами... Цілком задовольняє стилістична аналіза твору, що особливо вражає своїм ритмом, символікою, тісно сполученою із основним мотивом нами... Дослід дає надзвичайно багато для зрозуміння твору й місця самої Кобилянської у укр. літературі.46

In observing various critical voices on "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" it should be stated that they were all rather fragmentary. Almost all critics mentioned by Fylypovych usually focused their attention primarily on such works of Kobylians'ka like "Zemlia" and "Tsarivna" and only occasionally dealt with this novel. Thus, Fylypovych's study might be considered the first one to present a detailed analysis and provide in an original manner the literary history of the principal theme connected with the old folk ballad and popular song, as well as the determination of aesthetical and artistic elements which characterize the literary value of the novel itself. Conducting this study

based on the comparative method required substantial research which is especially noticeable in the first part of the study. The second part is marked by Fylypovych's literary erudition and aesthetic taste united with a critical power of observation. However, despite Fylypovych's bold statement concerning Kobylians'ka's acquaintance with the previous elaborations of the song's plot, it seems that his study would have provided valuable supplementary information if the scholar had taken such questions into closer consideration, since there might well be found more parallels than those indicated by Fylypovych. For example, the scholar

Fylypovych mentioned that in order to obtain the needed materials and conduct the research for his study he visited various libraries and searched through rare collections. As a result he collected a substantial amount of source material and prepared two supplementary studies on the subject which he planned to publish soon. These works were on the history of the literary evolution of the song "Ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi", and the description of its variations in the different parts of Ukraine. The second work planned was an analysis of those literary creations which partly used the song's plot like Shevchenko's ballad "Kolo haiu v chystim poli", the seventh part of Hrebinka's "Chaikovskii", the tale of Bilets'kyi-Nosenko "Chudovaia voda", and others. These works were never published. From Fylypovych's statements, it might be supposed that their manuscripts are located in the archives of the Ethnographical Committee of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. P. Fylypovych, "Istoriia odnoho siuzhetu", in his Z Novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 102, 128.
emphasized that in contrast to Aleksandrov-Staryts'kyi Kobylians'ka declined to create her story around Hryts' as the central figure but replaced him by her heroine Tetiana. However Fylypovych did not mention that this approach was close to those of Shakhovs'kyi, Borakovs'kyi or Samiilenko, where not Hryts' but Marusia Churai play the central role. The description of the outward appearance of Kobylians'ka's heroine is almost identical to that in Shakhsros'kyi's and Shkliarevs'kyi's stories in which some features are especially emphasized ("blidave lytse in chorni, husti brovy"). The personage of Mavra who in the last part of Kobylians'ka's novel showed Tetiana where to obtain the poisonous herbs appeared not as a witch or sorceress, traditional in Ukrainian folk-lore and portrayed in literary works (including the plays of Topolia, Aleksandrov and Staryts'kyi), but as a friend of the girl, although in her hut there did live a black cat and a black raven. A similar description can be found in Shakhovskii's story where a kind of prototype of Mavra, named Iahaivna whose pets were black cats and dogs, appeared as Marusia's neighbor and confidante. Another detail which is part of both works is the scene of the drowning of their heroines after poisoning their lovers, although the method of presentation of these pictures is completely different. Finally an interesting parallel might be indicated between the concluding episodes of Staryts'kyi's
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play and Kobylians'ka's novel. Using the song "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi", Staryts'kyi excluded from it words somewhat rough and rather less natural:

В суботу рано мати доню била:
На що ти, суко, Гриця отруїла?

which did not fit the portrait of Marusia's mother who loved her daughter. In "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" the love of Ivanykha Dybykha for her daughter Tetiana was presented with considerable psychological depth. Thus Kobylians'ka also preferred to avoid the direct use of these verses but instead paraphrased them as in Mavra's expression: "С у-ко!" скричала нараз не своїм голосом, "ти моєго сина отруїла. Ти, ти, ти! Гинь!" і єдиним однісінським пастуком валить дівчину додолу". In 1927 when Fylypovych's study appeared, Kobylians'ka celebrated the 40th anniversary of her creative activities and on this occasion a number of articles and essays devoted to her life and work were published. However, despite the publication of her autobiography in 1927, which presented fresh and


49. -------, "Pro sebe samu; avtobiografiia v lystakh do prof. d-ra Stepana Smal'-Stots'koho", in Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; al'manakh u pamyatku ii soroklitn'oi pysh-mennyts'koi diial'nosti, 1887-1927, Zladyv Lev Kohut, Chernivtsi, Nakl. Ivivileinogo komitetu, 1927, p. 41-65.
original material for critical studies and permitted a closer look at her creative power, almost all of these writings attempted to deal with such problems as the determination of realistic elements in Kobylians'ka's novels (in Soviet literary criticism), and the indication of Nietzsche's influence on her Weltanschauung (in the literary criticism in Western Ukraine and abroad). The question introduced by Fylypovych was somewhat overlooked by other critics and put aside for at least two decades. An exception concerns Olena Verhanovs'ka and Dmytro Kozii. The first critic not only acknowledged Fylypovych's study but followed it closely in various parts of her essay dedicated to Kobylians'ka's anniversary. A similar opinion was later expressed by Kozii who, however, in his general characteristic of "V nediliiu rano zillia kopala" came to a conclusion which contradicts not only Fylypovych's various principal statements but also an understanding of the basic features of a romantic work. The critic stated that in the novel generally

50. For example, the articles of K. Hrynevycheva, L. Lutsiv, and D. Lukiiianovych devoted to Kobylians'ka's life and work published in Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk, 1928, kn. 1, 5 and 6.

51. O. Verhanovs'ka, "Deshcho pro Ol'hu Kobylians'ku", Ibid., kn. 1, p. 49-51.
Moreover, it might be stated that in general after Fylypovych's studies more serious research on Kobylians'ka's creative works was lacking in literary criticism almost until the 1950's. Ie. Kyryliuk was attempting to fill this gap with his general survey of the writer's literary production which was published in 1940. Dwelling on "V nediliu rano zillia kopala", the critic, contradicting his previous laudatory review on Fylypovych's work, stated:

"В неділю рано зілля копала" хочеться назвати поемою. Критика українська ще не дослідила її. Писали про історію одного сюжету, підходили з старими мірками, підходили з ультрамодерністськими "хатяньськими критеріями", а поема лишилася неоціненою. 53

However in his further analysis of the novel the critic followed the second part of Fylypovych's work step by step with the addition of some minor inserts and paraphrasing of various expressions of the original study. 54


53. Ie. Kyryliuk, "Ol'ha Kobylians'ka", in Literaturna krytyka, 1940, No. 11-12, p. 113.

54. Ibid., p. 113-116. The article was reprinted in Ol'ha Kobylians'ka v krytytsi ta spohadakh, Kyiv, DVKhL, 1963, p. 207-210.
ESSAYS ON THE LITERARY WORK OF OL'HA KOBYLIANS'KA

At the beginning of the 1950's interest in Kobylians'ka's works in Ukrainian Soviet criticism was revived. This was led by Oleh Babyshkin who devoted several essays and studies to the writer. Dwelling on "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" the critic, like Kyryliuk before him, concentrated on a general description of the novel itself without an analysis of the historical basis for its plot. However, whereas Kyryliuk completely agreed with Fylypovych's position and reflected it in indicating romantic features and poetical motives, Babyshkin, on the other hand, borrowed from Fylypovych only those observations which he needed in terms of the officially adopted conception. Using the sociological-Marxist method, he apparently was looking for those elements which were less apparent in the novel. Nevertheless, Babyshkin stated, that

Babyshkin based his analysis primarily on Kobylians'ka's reminiscences in which she mentioned:


56. Ibid.
ESSAYS ON THE LITERARY WORK OF OL'HA KOBYLIANS'KA

Referring to the opinion of Fylypovych and Kyryliuk with the words: "Поширана думка, що "В неділю рано зілля копала", як твір насилісь романтичний, нібито далекий від реалістичного принципу зображення життя", the critic in contrast to them stated that the whole plot of the novel, its personages, their activities, and natural surroundings, all these elements are based on a realistic background and are firmly supported by the social conflicts of the period. Hence, the novel includes two parallel suggestive evolutions: the first possessing a social background, begins in the Gypsy camp, and the second one is the confrontation of the two characters (Tetiana and Hryts') based on their inner feelings and their unfortunate love which then led to a tragic end. In the center of the main plot, in Babyshkin's opinion,

...була пісня "Ой не ходи Грицю" - твір українського народного генія, величній і простий, повен сили людських пристрастей, перейнятий спокоєвічним хагучим бажанням заміського щастя.58


In his articles and essays on the same topic published from 1952 to 1956 the critic largely repeated his thoughts of 1950, and they served as official interpretation of the novel and were thus followed by other critics as the accepted opinion of Soviet Ukrainian literary criticism until the end of the 1950's. In the early 1960's the attitude toward the evaluation of Kobylians'ka's works and the determination of her Weltanschauung changed notably as can be ascertained from the critical writings of those years. Thus, while in the collected volume of articles on Kobylians'ka's life and creativity published in 1958 one could not find the slightest mention of romantic elements in her novels, in a similar volume of 1963 these elements in addition to the realistic ones were acknowledged and emphasized. Hence, instead of Babyshkin's opinion concerning the writer's romantic novels especially "V nediliu

59. Especially such his essays as Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; literaturno-krytychnyi narys, Kyiv, 1952, 80 p., and "Tvorchiest' Ol'hy Kobylians'koj; Literaturno-krytychnyi narys", in O. Kobylians'ka, Tvory, Kyiv, 1956, t. 1, p. 5-64.


61. Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; statti i materiialy, Chernivtsi, 1958, (Naukovi zapysky Chernivets'koho universytetu, t. 27), 209 p.
rano zillia kopala", a reprint of Kyryliuk's essay was included which, as was mentioned above, reflected the position of Fylypovych. Close to the Fylypovych-Kyryliuk approach on this novel was that of a young literary critic Mykhailo P. Komyshanchenko who also agreed with Babyshkin regarding the two principal plots united in the novel. However, Komyshanchenko's characteristic of the main personages, especially those of Tetiana, Hryts', and Nastka, as well as his analysis of certain compositional features of the novel (description of landscape, usage of symbols, and rhythmical passages) might be considered as a simplified replica of some chapters of Fylypovych's study, although his name finds no mention in the critic's essay. One may come to a similar conclusion in observing some aspects of the separate chapter devoted to the analysis of "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" in Babyshkin's latest critical work Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; narys pro zhyttia i tvorchist', and especially in those dealing with the description of Tetiana's


character and the discussion of symbolic features. In general, however, Babyshkin reiterated his thoughts of 1950 based on a social-realistic conception.

It is worthy of note that in 1964 voices appeared in Soviet Ukrainian criticism connected with the first part of Fylypovych's study "Istoriia odnoho siuzhetu". This was begun by the art scholar Leonid Kaufman who attempted to prove that the old ballad-song "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" is not of folk origin but the work of Marusia Churai. His first article on this topic entitled "Lehenda pro pisniu" appeared in the journal Vitchyzna in 1964, and later was republished with certain additions in other periodicals and also as a separate issue. The final edition of this work was published in 1967 as an introductory study to the collected volume of Churai's songs. There was included a copy of a document from the Zaporozhs'ka Sich archives which proved the existence of a person with the name Marusia Churai who had lived in the time of the hetmanship of Bohdan Khmel'nyc'skyi, and who had poisoned

65. O. Babyshkin, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; narys pro zhyttia i tvorchist', L'viv, Knyshkovo-zhurnal'ne vyd-vo, 1963, p. 142-153.


ESSAYS ON THE LITERARY WORK OF OL'HA KOBYLIANS'KA

Although the Kaufman essay is historical in nature with the aim of proving that Marusia Churai was a real historical person and the author of a number of songs especially of "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi", it is evident that the essay was based primarily on the first part of Fylypovych's study since it was the first and the only work in this respect in Ukrainian literary criticism. Kaufman's hypothesis was supported by the poet, Stanislav Tel'niuk and by the leading writer Mykhailo Stel'makh who considered that the sources on which this assumption was built proved the existence of the poet-singer Marusia Churai. Tel'niuk in his latest statement came to the following conclusion:

68. L. Kaufman, "Marusia Churai", in Divchyna z lehendy: Marusia Churai, Kyiv, Dnipro, 1967, p. 11+.

69. M. Stel'makh, "Divchyna z lehendy", Ibid., p. 5-6.

The literary scholar Hryhorii Nud'ha declared himself against Kaufman's hypothesis and its supporters by strongly criticizing not only the reliability of its sources but also their presentation in Kaufman's essays. Nud'ha stated that the question concerning the history of the plot of the folk legend "Oi ne khody, Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" had been considered by a number of Ukrainian literary scholars years before. This was especially true of Fylypovych who examined in detail all the available materials in order to present a distinguished scholarly work. Using Fylypovych's study as a basis for his criticism, Nud'ha came to the following conclusion:

Маруся Чурай — літературний образ, як Наталия Поттаква, Тарас Бульба і багато інших, про них ніхто з дослідників літератури не наважиться писати як про реальні історичні особи... Ми нічого не маємо проти фантазії і "поетичних воєнностей" в художній літературі, але ж не можна їх узаконювати і надавати їм права наукової документації.72

The discussion on this vital topic may continue and produce interesting results especially if appropriate new documents can be found. However, all its participants will of necessity have to use Fylypovych's study as a primary source.


72. Ibid., p. 138. To the similar conclusions came Nud'ha in his later article in this respect entitled "Emotsi malo, potribni arhumenty", in Zhovten', 1968, No. 3, p. 137-138.
Ukrainian literary criticism abroad and in Soviet Ukraine in general has not been able to extend Fylypovych's research. However, some critics in their writings directly or indirectly followed the scholar's steps in this respect. First of all it should be mentioned that in order to preserve this work of Fylypovych, it was reprinted in full as an introduction to the new edition of Kobylians'ka's novel in 1953. Almost at the same time the study was used by the literary historian Volodymyr Radzykevych in a general characteristic of Kobylians'ka's life and work in his "Ukrains'ka literatura 20-ho stolittia." In addition, the article by Luka Lutsiv might be considered close to Fylypovych's study. Following the concluding passage of Fylypovych's work, the author entitled his article "Naikrashcha povist' O. Kobylians'koi." Although Lutsiv did not mention Fylypovych in his bibliography, certain paragraphs in the article (passages on the sin and split-personality of Hryts') indicate that the critic knew the scholar's study.


ESSAYS ON THE LITERARY WORK OF OL'HA KOBYLIANS'KA

Finally, the literary scholar Leonid Bilets'kyi fully employed Fylypovych's study for the general essay on Kobylians'ka in his book Try syl'vetky. The article on "V nedil'iu zillia kopala" in this book might be considered as an abridged elaboration of almost all aspects of Fylypovych's study. Bilets'kyi followed his predecessor so closely that he even quoted a number of the same passages of the novel in order to illustrate his particular description of the landscape and symbols as well as the characteristic of the main personages.

It should be stressed that almost all literary critics who evaluated and followed Fylypovych's study "Istoriiia odnoho siuzhetu" considered it as simply an ordinary description of the novel and sought whether he had presented any new aspects of it. Thus one of the most important features, i.e., the critical method of his work was overlooked. Therefore some aspects of the analysis were rather misunderstood and thus criticized.


77. L. Bilets'kyi, "Ol'ha Kobylians'ka", in his Try syl'vetky; Marko Vovchok, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka, Lesia Ukrainka, Winnipeg, Nakl. Soiuzu Ukrainok Kanady, 1951, p. 66-73.
While thematically the study consists of two main parts, from the methodological point of view it might be divided into three parts which indicate their separate features. The first part dealt with the history of the plot based on the comparative method. It presents the literary migration of the theme through the various elaborations which Fylypovych evaluated from the literary point of view. The second part analyzed the characteristic features of the novel's main personages from the aesthetical view with the extension of a comprehensive comparison with similar figures as they appear in the literary works of other (Western European and Ukrainian) authors. Finally in the third part of the study Fylypovych concentrated on the analysis of the form of the novel. He considered it, however, not only as an artistically supplementary factor but as a fundamental element which is equal to the content, or even at times might be considered as the content itself. In this respect he stated:

На тлі попередніх обробок пісні особливо помітно: авторка внесла так багато свого і в той же час характерного і для цілої літературної школи, що її твір може бути прикладом того, як в історії сюжету разом з новим ідейним змістом утворюється з старого - нова форма.78

78. P. Fylypovych, "Istoriiia odnogo siuzhetu", p. XLIII.
Thus, Fylypovych emphasized the artistic element as equivalent to the content in the literary work. In this regard he followed one of the main principles of Formalism which holds that the content of a literary work is determined by its form, or as Iu. Mezhenko stated: "Мистецтво слова мусить піти в рівень зі всіма людськими знаннями; для цього є лише один шлях - формалізм". Fylypovych did not belong to the extreme formalists, but he stated that "критикувати крайності "формалістів" - це зовсім не означать - зрікатись формальних дослідів". Consequently he used this method in his analysis of the artistic elements in Kobylians'ka's novel which, in fact, presented excellent material for this approach. This method was the reason why at the beginning of his analysis the scholar stated that for him it was not important whether Kobylians'ka was familiar with the previous elaboration of the plot, and furthermore declined to include in his study the description of the meeting of the writer with I. Petko Todorov as a direct source of the creation of the novel. It could only


affect adversely the methodological structure of the study. Thus, in general, Fylypovych's "Istoriiia odnoho diuzhetu" has remained until the present time as a fundamental research study and as the primary source in Ukrainian literary criticism for these two subjects: the literary history of the plot of "V nediliu rano zillia kopala", and an original analysis of Kobylians'ka's novel.
VI.

ADDITIONAL WORKS OF FYLYPOVYCH

Supplementary literary studies.

Fylypovych's studies analyzed in the previous chapters might be considered as the core of his research work. However, they do not exhaust the scholar's range of activity. His interests covered a much wider field in Ukrainian literature beginning with Ivan Kotliarevs'kyi¹ and his contemporaries of the early nineteenth century and ending with the Ukrainian writers of the 1920's. Several essays and articles of Fylypovych should be mentioned particularly. There is the study "Ukrains'ka stykhia v tvorchosti Hoholia" in which he pointed out not only the Ukrainian elements in N. V. Gogol's literary production but also indicated the writer's native feelings and inspiration which in his opinion bore similarities to that of the Ukrainian intellectuals and writers of the first half of the nineteenth century. He also dealt with N. V. Gogol's influence on the literary development of Ukrainian writers like Marko Vovchok and

¹ In 1922 Fylypovych had ready for publishing a larger study entitled "Kotliarevshchyna", but for some reason it was never published. ("Postiina komisiia dlia vydavannya pam'atok novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva", in Zvidomlennia VUAN za rik 1922, p. 11). Fylypovych also wrote several articles on Kotliarevs'kyi. Among them was a critical essay "Novi pratsi pro I. Kotliarevs'koho", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1928, kn. 12, p. 108-176, which reviewed the main studies on Kotliarevs'kyi published in the 1920's.
I. Nechui-Levyts'kyi. Basing his study on previous related works (particularly those of P. Kulish, M. Hrushev's'kyi, V. Peretts, V. Rozov, and V. V. Sypovskii) Fylypovych agreed with Hrushev's'kyi that:

"Не тільки з огляду на вплив, який мали Гоголеві повість з українського життя (ляди наших поколінь певно тягнутся, скільки завдали їм в розвою й усвідомленню своїх українських симпатій!), а єз огляду на його українські почуття ми не маємо ніякої причини викидати його з історії українського національного руху, розвою української свідомості.

To the literary creation of M. Kotsiubyn's'kyi Fylypovych also devoted a cycle of essays and articles. Some of them treated new questions or extended previous research on the topic concerned. His study "Kotsiubyn's'kyi i Shevchenko" analyzed the notable impression Shevchenko's liberation ideas and his poetry made upon Kotsiubyn's'kyi. Thus Fylypovych belonged with those who laid the foundation for the preservation of the poet's literary heritage and fame. In extending S. Iefremov's thoughts, Fylypovych again indicated the influence of Shevchenko's poetry on the writings of Kotsiubyn's'kyi as in his poems written in his youth and some novels, especially "Dorohoiu tsinoiu", "Kho" and "Tsipoviaz" where Fylypovych sought traces of "Kobzar" whose lines the writer often used as epigraphs for his

2. P. Fylypovych, "Ukrains'ka stykhia v tvorchosti Hohol'ia", in M. Hohol', Vybrani tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1927, p. v.
novels or for individual chapters. The observations on Kotsiubyns'kyi's novel "Tsvit iabluni" can be considered as central among Fylypovych's works in this area. The novel itself might serve as an example of Kotsiubyns'kyi's writings based on psychological elements and reflecting the feelings of father and writer facing one of the greatest of family tragedies. Fylypovych revised the views of the previous investigators of this question (S. Kozub, A. Lebid', and A. Shamrai), and also rejected a simplified interpretation by V. Koriak. Moreover, he indicated in the novel traces of the sketches of wandering by G. de Maupassant "Sur l'eau", and E. Zola's novel "L'Oeuvre", demonstrating that these works played an influential role in the composition of "Tsvit iabluni". This study served as the basis for Fylypovych's later work entitled "Rozvytok psykholohichnoi noveli Kotsiubyns'koho".

Fylypovych's study on O. Oles's poetry published in 1925 brought new insight to the evaluation of the formation of this poet's creative manner during the three main periods of his literary activity: the period of Oles's early poetry,

---


4. --------, "'Tsvit iabluni' M. Kotsiubyns'koho", Ibid., 1928, kn. 5, p. 90-98.

5. --------, "Rozvytok psykholohichnoi noveli Kotsiubyns'koho", in M. Kotsiubyns'kyi, Tvory, Red. A. Lebid', Kharkiv, Knyhospilka, 1930, t. 4, p. VII-LIII.
the period of national revolution, and the period of the poet's emigration. The study based on the analysis of the aesthetical aspects of the whole of Oles's poetical heritage defined the growth and decline of the poet's artistic approach and even creative power. The scholar's conclusions stimulated several other works on this topic and especially the study of M. Zerov which supplements Fylypovych's views.

Western European writers are partially represented in Fylypovych's works by the general portraits which were provided in his articles like "Bairon", "Gete", "Pisenna spadshchyna Beranzhe", and "Tvorets' sotsiial'no-psykhologichnoho romanu; do 150 richchia z dnia narodzhennia Stendalia". In all these biographical-critical surveys the

6. P. Fylypovych, "Oles'", in 0. Oles*, Vybrani tvory, Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1925, p. VII-XLVII.


8. P. Fylypovych, "Bairon", in G. G. Bairon, Kain, Kyiv, Slovo, 1925, p. IV-X.

9. --------, "Gete", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1932, kn. 6-7, p. 68-72.


11. --------, "Tvorets' sotsiial'no-psykhologichnoho romanu; do 150 richchia z dnia narodzhennia Stendalia", in Hlobus, 1933, no. 9-10, p. 16-17.
scholar sought links between the literary works of these authors with the literary development of Ukraine. The most notable of his studies of this character might be considered the essay "Vidhuky Biurgerovoi 'Lenory' v ukrains'kii literaturi". Here Fylypovych extended the previous research on this problem (especially the studies of I. Franko, M. Petrov, M. Zerov, and A. Shamrai) and demonstrated the way in which one of the most popular romantic poems was introduced into Ukrainian literature directly by its original version (the ballad "Ivha" of P. Bilets'kyi-Nosenko, written between 1822 and 1829) and through its Russian elaborations. Further the scholar analyzed the Ukrainian revisions of the ballad and original poems with this plot from the works of Shevchenko and Kostomarov to the poems of Fed'kovych. 12

The Russian authors of the nineteenth century also occupied a noticeable place in Fylypovych's literary criticism. Among them the study of the life and work of E. A. Boratynskii possesses a central position. The first part of this work, prepared as the author's dissertation at the University of Kiev, was published in 1917 and presents

primarily a detailed description of the poet's life and his social and literary surroundings with the indication of their reflections in his poetry. According to Fylypovych, the second part of the study was planned to deal exclusively with an analysis of Boratynskii's literary production. Perhaps the scholar had it ready for publishing, but it was never issued. Nevertheless, the published portion can be considered as an independent work and as such presents a general portrait of the poet. Besides the observations of Ryleev's poetry on Ukrainian themes, Fylypovych also studied this poet within the framework of Russian literature. This is apparent in his work concerning the literary influence of G. R. Derzhavin, particularly his odes, on Ryleev's "Dumy. Fylypovych's essay on N. S. Leskov presents a comprehensive survey of the relations of this writer with Ukrainian intellectual circles in the second half of the nineteenth century and Ukrainian elements in


some of his writings. The scholar especially dwelt on Leskov's acquaintance with Shevchenko as well as his collaboration on the journal "Kievkaia starina", amplifying the views of previous investigators of this question. Fylypovich's essay on A. S. Pushkin's traces in the literary works of Ukrainian writers of the nineteenth century might be considered as an extension of some aspects of the scholar's studies "Do studiiuvannia Shevchenka ta ioho doby" and "Shevchenko i Hrebinka".

The leading place in Fylypovich's literary research was occupied by his studies devoted to Shevchenko and his period. Beside his principal works in this area which are analyzed in the previous chapters, the scholar published various essays which in many cases bear a supplementary character augmenting the author's main opinions on this particular problem expressed in his primary works on the poet. To this category belongs the article dealing with the characteristic of Shevchenko's interest in European writers and their literary production which presented additional evidence of the connections between the poet and foreign


17. S. Reiser, "Lieskov i ukrains'ka kul'tura", in ZIFV UAN, kn. 15, 1927, p. 200-211.

With the period of Shevchenko's exile are connected Fylypovych's articles "Maikov pro Shevchenka" and "Shevchenko i Pleshcheiev". In the first work Fylypovych described the admiration of the Russian poet for Shevchenko as a poet and as the leading representative of the liberation movement and thus as a result composed the poem "Na bieloi otmeli Kaspiiskago pomoria" dated 1860 in which, according to Fylypovych, A. N. Maikov presented an image of Shevchenko suffering in exile. The second work demonstrated Shevchenko's relations with A. M. Pleshcheev who as a member of the Petrashevskii group was exiled in 1849. Fylypovych emphasized that Pleshcheev like Maikov was impressed with Shevchenko's poetry and his ideological views and this was a basic reason that he became one of the first translators of the poet's literary works into the Russian language.

18. P. Fylypovych, Evropeis'ki pys'mennyky v Shevchenkovi lekturi", in Proletars'ka pravda, 1926, no. 56, p. 3-5. This article was partly based on Fylypovych's study entitled "Barb'is i Beranzhe v lekturi Shevchenka" delivered as a paper at a meeting of the Historicco-Literary Society of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1923 (ZIFV UAN, kn. 1, 1923, p. 350), but the study itself was not published.


ADDITIONAL WORKS OF FYLYPOVYCH poems especially those published in such periodical publications as Sovremennik (1840), Severnaia pchela (1840), Maiak (1840-1842), Biblioteka dla chteniia (1840, 1844), and Moskvitianin (1843), Fylypovych basically revised previous opinions in this respect. He determined that the first reviewer of the poet's literary works was Ie. Hrebinka who expressed his admiration for the use of the Ukrainian language in which they were published and for Shevchenko's artistic manner. Fylypovych also analyzed the evolution of the attitude toward Shevchenko's works of the journals Otechestvennye zapiski and Literaturnaia gazeta and indicated how they altered from a positive (1840) to a negative character after V. G. Belinskii took over the editorship of the literary section of Otechestvennye zapiski (1841-1844). 21

An aesthetical approach is evident in one of Fylypovych's earliest studies on Shevchenko entitled "Poet ohnennoho slova" in which he concentrated primarily on the originality of the composition of Shevchenko's poems as well as on the elements of his direct expression which effectively transform the poet's ideas and produce a strong impression on readers. 22 Another work on Shevchenko "Revoliutsiina lehenda pro

21. P. Fylypovych, "Zabuti retsenzii sorokovykh rokiv na Shevchenkovi tvory", in Ukraina, 1930, kn. 3-4, p. 72-80. Closely following Fylypovych's work is the article of V. Shubravs'kyi, ("Vidzyvy na pershi vydannia tvoriv T. H. Shevchenka", in Pytannya shevchenkoznawstva, no. 3. 1962, p. 48-62) in which the critic without indicating the original source rehashed Fylypovych's observations and concluded that Belinskii belonged with the first critics who thought highly of Shevchenko and positively evaluated his literary production.

ADDITIONAL WORKS OF FYLYPOVYCH

Shevchenka, chy diisnist'" which Fylypovych based primarily on the thoughts of I. Franko bore a somewhat hypothetical character. Following the lead of his predecessor, Fylypovych found support for his assumptions in indicating additional aspects of Shevchenko's relations with the Polish convicts during his exile, and in observing other studies connected with the problem like V. Shchurat's "Shevchenko pro Halychynu v 1846 r." in particular, and V. Simovych's interpretation of Shevchenko's poem "Sychi".

A separate place among the works of Fylypovych was occupied by the study dealing with the social situation in Ukraine in the period from 1830 to 1840 and connected with it was a discussion of the general interest in the literary production among the contemporary reading public in Ukraine and especially its intelligentsia. Here Fylypovych particularly considered the conditions of publication of Shevchenko's works indicating the circumstances under which they were distributed. This was demonstrated as an example of the


24. V. Shchurat, "Shevchenko pro Halychynu v 1846 r.", in his Z zhyytia i tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka, L'viv, 1914, p. 9-14.

demand for literary works in Ukraine during that period. The study which was written in a descriptive manner might be considered as the initial step toward an analysis and evaluation of the cultural standards and general atmosphere in which Ukrainian literature developed at that particular time.  

Besides the studies already mentioned Fylypovych published a number of articles on Shevchenko and reviews on works devoted to his life and poetry which to a certain extent might be considered as independent works. Most of them however play a secondary role among the scholar's studies on this question and as such are handled in the bibliography.

Fylypovych under the attack of Marxist criticism and his writings on order of the Communist party.

The actual end of Fylypovych's scholarly career began at the time of the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (March 9 - April 19, 1930) and the following


27. Here should be mentioned that Fylypovych's analysis of Shevchenko's poem "Mariia" (Shevchenkova 'Mariia'; peredmova"), in T. Shevchenko, Mariia, Kharkiv, Vyd. Instytutu T. Shevchenka, 1927) after an exhaustive search was found to be unavailable outside the Soviet Union. Thus it was not considered in this work.
process of reorganization of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences which in fact halted the activities of the Academy's Historico-Philological Department. At that time the dominant positions in literary criticism were occupied by the followers of the literary policy of the Communist party especially men like V. Koriak, S. Shchupak, A. Richyts'kyi, B. Kovalenko, I. Kulyk, and others. In order to accomplish the regime's orders to establish a firm Marxist-Leninist line in literary affairs and particularly in criticism, special units of critics ("bryhady") were organized at the official literary Communist tribune Za Markso-lenins'ku krytyku, whose primary duty was to uncover traces of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in literary creations and in their criticism as well.


29. In the middle of the 1930's almost all of these persons were identified by the new literary policy of the Soviet regime as vulgar Marxists and as such were attacked (I.e. Kyryliuk, "Shevchenko i velyka zhovtneva sotsialistychna revoliutsiia", in Radians'ke literaturnoznavstvo, 1949, No. 11, p. 60.

30. From 1928 to 1931 the journal was published under the title Krytyka.

31. K. Dovhan', "Iak my vykonuiemo boiovu dyrektyvu partii", in Krytyka, 1931, No. 11, p. 3-12.
The edge of attack was directed primarily against the literary scholars and among them against Fylypovych. As a matter of fact the series of strong accusations against Fylypovych's literary research was initiated by F. Iakubovs'kyi in his review on the scholar's collected volume of articles in 1929. Later it was intensified and as a result at the end of 1931 he was proclaimed a "formalist" and "representative of nationalistic ideas in literary criticism" and as such held to be dangerous for the development of literature in the Soviet Union and particularly in Soviet Ukraine.

In criticizing the critical works of Fylypovych and Zerov, S. Shchupak declared:

Українські буржуазні літературознавці, ставлячи в центр своєї уваги захист націоналістичної ідеології в літературі, ладні були перекидатися від одної до іншої методології, аби вони могли лише бути зброєю для маскування оцього націоналізму... Зеров і Філіпович є яскраві репрезентанти тієї групи буржуазних літературознавців, що використовують формалізм, як побічну метошу, залишаючись в основному на позиціях інших буржуазних методологій.

Shchupak's attacks were supported by Ie. Kyryliuk,


34. S. Shchupak, "Formalizm na služhbi v ukrains'-kykh burzhuaznykh ta dribno-burzhuaznykh eklektykiv", in Krytyka, 1931, No. 10, p. 31-40.

35. Ibid., p. 37-38.

P. Kyianytsia, and especially by Ie. Shabl'ovs'kyi the party's representative for literary-critical activities at the Academy. Under such pressure Fylypovych almost ceased publishing his critical studies. Those few which were published during 1932-34 still struggled to preserve an objective approach and the various lines like "poet bidnoty", "Beranzhe, iakoho vysoko tsnuyav Lenin" or "Shevchenko v borot'bi z ukrains'koiu dvorians'koi pomishchychts'koiu literaturoiu" appear as artificial insertions made later by the author himself or by the editors of the journals in which these studies were published.

---


38. Ie. Shabl'ovs'kyi, "Bil'shovyts'kyi vohon' proty reshtok kontrrevoliutsiinoi iefremivshchyny i hnyloho liberalizmu v shevchenkoznavstvi", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1931, kn. 11-12, p. 117-121.

39. From 1932 to 1934 six articles and reviews were published (two in 1932, one in 1933 and three in 1934).

40. P. Fylypovych, "Beranzhe; do 75-56 richchia z dnia smerty", in Hlobus, 1932, No. 13-14, p. 14. In Fylypovych's study "Pesenna spadshchyna Beranzhe" published in the same year there are fewer such inserts.

41. "Shevchenko v borot'bi z ukrains'koiu dvorians'kopomishchychts'koiu literaturoiu; peredmova do 'Druhoho Kobzaria'", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1934, kn. 4, p. 89-101.
The peak of such mental torture for the scholar occurred in 1934 when he had to write a favorable review on Shabl'ovs'kyi's simplistic survey on Shevchenko which was similar to Richyts'kyi's and Koriak's writings. In this article, which in fact totally contradicts all his previous Shevchenko studies and the essence of his scholarly approach toward literary research, Fylypovych wrote:

Докладно висвітлюючи революційний шлях Шевченка... С. С. Шабльовський ураховує суперечності класової природи Шевченка, висвітлює, хоч і без деталізації, слабкі сторони Шевченкової творчості, до яких треба підходити критично, - характеризує націоналістичну романтику в ранніх творах поета (ст. 88-90, 94-95 та ін.) тощо.43

The review was issued in the official periodical publication of the Academy, although since 1929 the Academy's periodicals had not been available for Fylypovych's studies. A second article which was written by Fylypovych at the same time was completely out of his line of interest. It was published in Russian under the title "Oxkupatsiia; istoricheskii ocherk - K 15-letiiu osvobozhdeniia Ukrainy ot nemetskoi...


In this writing full of the usual elements of Communist propaganda it is almost impossible to recognize Fylypovych's previous manner and style. Hence it is obvious that it was written to order and later re-edited.

These two items can be considered as Fylypovych's last publications before his arrest and exile. They present excellent evidence of how the Soviet political system psychologically destroyed Ukrainian intellectuals and thus prepared the way for their physical liquidation.

P. Zorev, "Okkupatsiia; istoricheskii ocherk - K 15-letiiu osvobozhdenia Ukrainy ot nemetskoi okkupatsii", in Krasnaia nov', 1934, No. 1, p. 154-162.
CONCLUSION

The scholarly activities of Pavlo Fylypovych which began in 1921 and ended essentially in 1930 might be defined as a career of one decade. This is a period which under normal circumstances is necessary for a serious start in the formation of any scholar. During this decade of the 1920's and under the conditions of the forced establishment of Soviet rule in Ukraine and also the struggle between Ukrainian intellectuals and the Communist system in the area of the development of Ukrainian culture, Fylypovych educated a sizeable number of young literary critics at the University of Kiev, served the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences as an active member, and finally contributed significantly with his scholarly critical research to the development of modern Ukrainian literary criticism. In this field he published nearly one hundred sixty works which include books, essays, articles and reviews. Besides these he left four larger studies in manuscript which were never published. A considerable number of these publications are scholarly studies based on selected methods of literary criticism and present original contributions to the research on the subject concerned. Besides these activities he was of course a prominent poet-Neoclassicist.

The span of Fylypovych's scholarly interest was quite wide. It covered the period of Ukrainian literary
development from the early nineteenth century to the 1920's. In studying this particular period as a part of the national literary process within the framework of world literature he might be considered a specialist. Fylypovych's narrower specialty was Shevchenko's life and work against the background of his period with concentration on the determination of the principal factors which connect the poet's literary activities with those of other European writers. In this subject he can be recognized as an expert contributing to it almost one-half of his studies which in many cases served as the basic sources for the research of various other Shevchenko specialists. Fylypovych's research studies particularly present a fundamental lead for those literary critics and students of Ukrainian literature who seek the connections of its development with the leading trends and representatives of world literature.

Finally Fylypovych's life and work present a striking example of a Ukrainian scholar and his tragic struggle in the name of scholarly objectivity and truth against a dictatorial political system.
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An observation on T. Shevchenko's life and circumstances of his creative work.

A comparative study of Shevchenko's creative power in connection with his time.

An indication of new sources of the text of I. Kotliarev'skyi's play "Moskal'-Charivnyk".

--------, "Evropeiski pys'menniki v Shevchenkovii lekturi", Proletars'ka pravda, 1926, ch. 56, p. 9-17.
The essay indicates Taras Shevchenko's interest in the literary works of Central (and Western European) poets and writers.

--------, "Franko - poet", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1926, ch. 5, p. 87-96.
A general discussion on the creative power of Ivan Franko.

The essay deals with a determination of the genesis of Lesia Ukrainka's poem "U pushchi".

A study on the genesis of Ivan Franko's poem "Smert' Kaina".
Fylypovych, P., "Gete", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1932, ch. 6-7, p. 68-77.
A general survey of J. W. Goethe's life and a characteristic of his creative power.

--------, "Istorychno-literaturni materiialy pro Shevchenka, I. Lysty Maksymovycha do Shevchenka", Nashe mynule, 1919, no. 1-2, p. /6-11/.
An analysis of M. Maksymovych's letters to Taras Shevchenko.

A discussion on new poems of Taras Shevchenko.

The study deals with the history of the development of the plot of Ol'ha Kobylians'ka's novel "V nediliu rano zillia kopala" and the analysis of the novel itself.

--------, "Kotsiubyns'kyi i Shevchenko", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1926, ch. 2-3, p. 146-159.
An article dealing with the literary influence of Taras Shevchenko on M. Kotsiubyns'kyi's Weltanschauung and literary activities.

--------, Lesia Ukrainka", Nova hromada; masovyi iliustrovanyi kooperatyvnyi ta literaturnyi dvokhtyzhnevky, r. 1, 1923, ch. 728.
A general outline of Lesia Ukrainka's life and literary work.

A survey of Lesia Ukrainka's life and characteristic of her literary works.

--------, "Liryka Maksyma Ryl's'koho", Knyhar, 1919, no. 22, p. 14-7-54.
An analysis of M. Ryl's'kyi's poetry from the aesthetic point of view.
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A general survey of M. E. Saltykov's life and literary works.

--------, "M. K. Zan'kovets'ka", Mariia K. Zan'kovets'ka; iuvileine vydannia. Kyiv, 1922, p./5-9/.
Some thoughts on Mariia Zan'kovets'ka's significance for the history of the Ukrainian theater.

An analysis of Lesia Ukrainka's poem "Misiachna Lehenda" with a determination of its place among her other literary works of the same time.

--------, "Mohoda ukrains'ka poeziiia", Literaturno-Naukowyi Visnyk, 1919, kn. 4-6, p. /37-50/.
A survey of modern Ukrainian poetry in the 1920's.

An article on a lyric poem of A. Metlyns'kyi, "Dolia", discovered by P. Fylypovych.

A literary description of Ol'ha Kobylians'ka's creative power with an indication of her literary surroundings.

--------, "Obraz Prometeia v tvorakh Lesi Ukrainky", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva; istorychno-literaturni statti. Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 77-95.
A study on the ideal of Prometheus in the poetical works of Lesia Ukrainka.

A comparative analysis of Lesia Ukrainka's poem "Odno slovo".
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Fylypovych, P., "Okkupatsiia; istoricheskii ocherk (K 15-letiui osvobozhdeniia Ukrainy ot nemetskoi okkupatsii)" Krasnaia nov', 1934, no. 1, p. 154-162.
The article is a sharply critical article on political events in Ukraine in 1918-1919 written on order of the Communist authorities in Ukraine.

A literary analysis of the poetical works of O. Oles' from an aesthetic point of view.

The article deals with a new outlook on the translation process of Sappho's poems by I. Kotliarevs'kyi.

A general analysis of the first poetry of Ia. Shchoholiv. The article also includes the poetry itself.

--------, "Pershyi pereklad z Shevchenka rosiis'koiu movoiu", Shevchenko, richnyk 1, Kharkiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1928, p. 201-211.
A characteristic of the first translation of Shevchenko's poetry into the Russian language.

--------, "Pisenna spadshchyna Beranzhe", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1932, ch. 9, p. 155-167.
An essay on the poetical inheritance of P. J. de Beranger and its elements in the literary works of Ukrainian poets in the 19th century.

A literary survey of Ivan Franko's poetry from both sociological and aesthetic points of view.

An analysis of artistic elements of Shevchenko's poetry with the emphasis of its effects on the impression of readers.
Forty essays, articles and remarks to the first scholarly edition of T. Shevchenko's diary.

A literary description of A. S. Pushkin's poetical works and their traces in the literary works of Ukrainian poets of the 19th century as well as a literary evaluation of Pushkin's poetry in Ukrainian literary criticism.

An essay on Shevchenko's relations with Polish revolutionaries during his exile. The study extends I. Franko's work on this subject on which it was primarily based.

--------, "Rusalka" "Lesi Ukrainky", Ukrainka, Lesia, Tvory, Kyiv, 1927, t. 3, p. /2-8/.
A comparative analysis of Lesia Ukrainka's poem "Rusalka". The 2nd edition of this study was published in Fylypovych's Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva; istorychno-literaturni statti, Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 65-69.

A study on literary connections between K. F. Ryleev and G. R. Derzhavin.

Both studies analyze Shevchenko's connections with the Decembrists before and after the poet's exile. Based on extensive research they deal with the investigation of the activities of this liberation movement in Ukraine and indicate how these activities were reflected in Shevchenko's literary works.
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An essay dealing with a characteristic of the literary relations between Taras Shevchenko and Ievhen Hrebinka.

------, "Shevchenko i Platon Symyrenko", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1923, ch. 3, p. 144-149.
A description of T. Shevchenko's connections with P. Symyrenko, a Ukrainian philanthropist.

An article on literary connections between T. Shevchenko and A. N. Pleshcheev.

A study on Taras Shevchenko's poetry on the background of Romantism.

An essay on Taras Shevchenko as a poet on the background of his period and surroundings.

An analysis of Taras Shevchenko's introduction to the second edition of his "Kobzar".

A literary analysis of Shevchenko's poem "Mariia". The article was published as a preface to the poem issued in 1927.

A study of D. Bahalii and P. Fylypovych on T. Shevchenko's poem "Ieretyk".
A study on the development of Ivan Franko's poetical work. It was published as an introductory essay to the collected volume of articles on I. Franko's life and poetry.

--------, "Shliakhy Frankovoi poezii", in his Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva; istorychno-literaturni statti. Kyiv, Kul'tura, 1929, p. 5-50.
The 2nd edition of the same study on Ivan Franko's poetry.

--------, "Sotsial'ne oblychchia ukrains'koho chytacha 30-40 rr. 19 vilku", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1930, ch. 1, p. 21-43; ch. 4, p. 20-42; ch. 6, p. 20-42.
A research study on the social situation of Ukrainian readers in the first half of the 19th century, concerning their circumstances, opportunities and literary interest.

A literary characteristic of Ol'ha Kobylians'ka's novel "Zemlia".

A study on the development of M. Kotsiubyns'kyi's psychological approach in his novels. Author particularly dwelt on observation of the novel "Tsvit iabluni" to which he also devoted a special study.

--------, "Tsvit iabluni M. Kotsiubyns'koho", Knyher, 1919, no. 21, p. /1426-62/.
A comparative analysis of M. Kotsiubyns'kyi's novel "Tsvit iabluni", as a psychological work.

--------, "Tvorets' sotsial'no-psykholohichnoho romanu; do 150-richchia z dnia narodzhennia Stendalia", in Hlobus, 1933, No. 9-10, p. 16-17.
A brief observation of M. Stendhal's literary works demonstrating their main social-psychological features.
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A study on the Ukrainian elements in N. V. Gogol's literary works.

A study on the Ukrainian elements in N. S. Leskov's works and his relations with Ukrainian writers and intellectuals.

--------, "V. M. Otrokovs'kyi; z nahody 10-kh rokovyn smerty", Literatura, Kyiv, 1928, zb. 1, p. 222-228.
A characteristic of the life and literary works of the late V. M. Otrokovs'kyi.

A literary study on the repercussions of G. A. Buerger's ballad "Lenora" in Ukrainian literature.

A critical survey of reviews on T. Shevchenko's poetry published in the main Russian periodicals of the early 1840's.

P. Fylypovych's dissertation on the life and creative power of E. A. Boratynskii.

b) The main reviews.

A review of A. V. Bahrii's work about Taras Shevchenko and his literary surroundings.
A critical review analyzing Navrotskyi's work from an historical point of view.

A review on O. Doroshkevych's handbook of the history of Ukrainian literature.

A critical review with an evaluation of Russian translations of French lyrics of the 18th century.

A review on I. Aizenshtok's editorial work and preface to I. Kotliarevskyi's "Eneida".

A review of a collected volume of Ia. Shcholohiv's poetry and M. Zerov's preface to it.

A review on V. Iaroshenko's collected volume of poetry evaluating its aesthetical and artistic features.

A review on Te. S. Shabl'ovs'kyi's study of Taras Shevchenko's life and creative power. This article, which was in fact written on the order of the ruling Communist authorities, can be considered as one of Fylypovych's last published works.
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Fylypovych, P., "Ivan Franko. 'Boryslav smiJiet'sia.'
A review on 0. Doroshkevych's preface to I. Franko's novel "Boryslav smiJiet'sia".

--------, "M. Savyts'ka. Taras Shevchenko; zhyttieyps i vybir z 'Kobzaria'. U PoltaOvi, Pedahohighne Biuro Poltav's'-koi Huberns'koi Narodn'oi Upravy, 1918. 8° Stof. IX-72-I tabl.-portret. Z druOarni M. Amchyslava'koho. 25000 pr."
Knyhar, 1918, no. 15, p. 919.
A short review on M. Savyts'ka's biography of Taras Shevchenko and her editorial work on the edition of Shevchenko's selected poems.

--------, "Mykola Hobol'. Taras Bul'ba. Povist'.
Pereklav na ukraOins'ku movu Mykola Sadov's'kyi. Vstupna stattia F. Takubov's'koho. V-vo 'Siaivo' (Biblioteka ukraOins'koi povisty) 188 stor., Ts. 80: k." Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1928, ch. 4, p. 86-94.
Critical review on M. Sadov's'kyi's translation of N. V. Gogol's "Taras Bul'ba" and on the preface to it written by F. Takubov's'kyi.

--------, "Nova pratsia pro M. Vovchka", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1933, ch. 1, p. 96-98.
A review of M. Zerov's literary study on the life and creative work of Marko Vovchok.

--------, "Novi pratsi pro I. Kotliarevs'koho (z nahody 90-tykh rokovyn smerty Kotliarevs'koho)" Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1928, ch. 12, p. 46-64.
A critical review on the historical and literary analysis of I. Kotliarevs'kyi's "Eneida", written by M. Markovs'kyi in his "Eneida Ivana Petrovycha Kotliarevs'koho".

A short and general review on a new academic edition of E. A. Boratynski's poetry.

--------, "V. Gippius. Gogol'", Ukraina, 1924, kn. 4, p. 67-70.
A critical review on V. Gippius's work about N. V. Gogol'.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA - SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
Fylypovych, P., "V. Sypov's'kyi, Ukraina v rosii's'komu
pys'menstvi. Ch. 1. (1801-1850)", Literatura. Kyiv, 1928,
zb. 1, p. 216-220.
A review on V. V. Sypovskii's work about Ukraine in
Russian literature.

c) Collected volumes of articles and serial publications
edited by P. Fylypovych.

----------, Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva;
166, 2 p.
Collected volume of P. Fylypovych's literary criti-
cal articles.

Ivan Franko; zbirnyk. Zredahuvaly I. Lakyza, P.
Kyianytsia i P. Fylypovych. Kyiv, Knyhospilka, 1926. /289 p./
Collected volume of articles on Ivan Franko's life
and literary works.

Literatura. Za redaktsiieiu S. Iefremova, M. Zerova,
P. Fylypovycha. Kyiv, zbirnyk 1, 1928, 262, 2 p.
The first volume of a literary serial publication.
No more was published.

Shevchenkiv's'kyi zbirnyk. Za redaktsiieiu Pavla
The first volume of a serial publication devoted to
studies on Taras Shevchenko. No more was published.

Shevchenko ta ioho doba. Pid redaktsiieiu S. O.
Iefremova, M. M. Novyts'koho i P. P. Fylypovycha. Zbirnyk
1-2. Kyiv, Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1925-1926. (Komisiia dla
vydavannya pamiatok novitn'oho pys'menstva. Zbirnyk Isto-
rychno-Filohohichnoho Viddilu VUAN, ch. 28).
The first two and only volumes of a series for
studies on Taras Shevchenko and his period.

Taras Shevchenko; zbirnyk. Za redaktsiieiu Ie.
Hryhoruka i P. Fylypovycha. Kyiv, zb. 1, Derzh. vyd-vo
Ukrainy, 1921. /186 p./
First and only volume of serial publication issued
for study of Taras Shevchenko as a man and poet.
Criticism of P. Fylypovych's literary critical works.

Aizenshtok, Ia., "Z novoi literatury pro Shevchenka", Chervonyi shliakh, 1926, ch. 4, p. 239-242.
A review on Fylypovych's study "Shevchenko i Dekabrysty".

The author belonged to the Marxist critics who were supported by the Communist party in their attacks on the activities of the literary scholars and members of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. This article presents one such attack.

Doroshenko, V., "Shevchenkoznavstvo za ostannie desiatylitlia (1911-192!4)", in Stara Ukraina, 1925, No. 3-4, p. 72-78.
A general survey of critical studies on Shevchenko from 191!4 to 192!4 which considers Fylypovych's comparative studies in this respect as serious scholarly contributions to the field.

Doroshkevych, 0., "Nove pro Shevchenka", Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1925, ch. 3, p. 50-56.
A review of various critical works of Fylypovych on Shevchenko.

Observation of Fylypovych's works on Shevchenko's relations with the Decembrists with the objection that these studies did not meaningfully extend the analysis of the poet's connections with the Petrashevskii group.

A criticism of Fylypovych's collected volume of articles "Z novitn'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva" attacking it as a product of Formalism in literary criticism.

A review on I. Franko's "Smert' Kaina" which praised its preface written by P. Fylypovych.
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The author of this review shared Fylypovich's opinion concerning Drahomanov's thoughts and Richyts'kyi's speculative works and stresses its significance for further study on Shevchenko.


A review on Fylypovich's collected volume of essays which highly evaluated them as a serious scholarly contribution to Ukrainian literary criticism.

Koriak, V., "Borot'ba za Shevchenka", in his Borot'ba za Shevchenka, Kharkiv, Derzhavne vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1925, p. 103-113.

This article condemns Fylypovich's studies on Shevchenko as apart from life and the interests of the people.


The review on "Materialy dlia kul'turnoi i hromads'koi istorii Zakhidn'oi Ukrainy" indicates the importance of Fylypovich's work "Shliakhy Frankovoi poezii" for this problem.


A critical review on T. Shevchenko's "Zhurnal" published under the editorship of S. Iefremov.

Kyryliuk, Ie., "O. Kobylians'ka. U nediliu rano zillia kopala, Vstupna stattia P. Fylypovycha. 'Knyhospilka'. 1927", in Zhyttia i revoliutsiia, 1928, kn. 1, p. 120-122.

A laudatory review on Fylypovich's study "Istoriia odnoho siuzhetu".

--------, "Ol'ha Kobylians'ka", in Literaturna krytyka, 1940, No. 11-12, p. 91-116.

A general survey of Kobylians'ka's life and literary works presented from the Marxist point of view in which the author considered Fylypovich's studies on Kobylians'ka as of limited value.
A review on Fylypovych's critical study "Shevchenko i Dekabrysty".

The article criticizes works on Kotsiubyns'kyi's creative power by S. Iefremov, M. Zerov and P. Fylypovych.

A review on "Shevchenkivs'kyi zbirnyk" which was edited by P. Fylypovych.

A strong criticism of Fylypovych's comparative studies on Shevchenko. The critic disagrees with Fylypovych's opinion concerning Shevchenko's poems in the Russian language and their Ukrainian form, and defends the position in this respect expressed in his study published in 1918.


A review on Fylypovych's studies on the literary works of O. Kobylians'ka. The author objected to some of Fylypovych's conclusions especially those expressed in his work "Spustoshena idyliia".

The author considered the collection as the first serious attempt toward a serial publication devoted to T. Shevchenko. Observing each study separately, he emphasized Fylypovych's work as original research.
A review of Fylypovych's collected volume of literary critical articles "Z novit'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva".

A survey of translations of A. S. Pushkin's poems into Ukrainian. It also includes a criticism of Fylypovych's edition.

Nova hromada, 1921+, no. 26-27, p. 28.

Pechat' i revoliutsiia, 1921+, no. 4, p. 273-274.
Two similar reviews on the first volume of "Shevchenkivs'kyi zbirnyk" which was issued under Fylypovych's editorship.

A review on the study of P. Fylypovych "Shevchenko i dekabrysty".

A review on Fylypovych's "Z novit'oho ukrains'koho pys'menstva".

Richyts'kyi, A., "Predeslovie k russkomu izdaniiu", in his Taras Shevchenko v svete epokhi; kriticheskii ocherk, Moskva, Gos. izd-vo khudozh. liter-ry, 1931, 3-8.
A response to Fylypovych's criticism of Richyts'kyi's writings on Shevchenko.

A review on O. Oles's selected poems edited by P. Fylypovych.
Shchupak, S., "Formalizm na sluzhbi v ukrains'kykh burzhuaznykh ta dribno-burzhuaznykh eklektykiv", Krytyka, 1931, ch. 10, p. 31-49.
A criticism (from a Communist point of view) of the literary critical works of Fylypovych and Zerov.

A review on N. S. Leskov's selected works issued under the editorship of P. Fylypovych.

A review of Fylypovych's collected volume of essays which despite the general ideological line of the journal evaluates them as serious studies on the subject although the reviewer did accuse Fylypovych of "formalism" in his research.

A critical review of Fylypovych's dissertation on E. A. Boratynskii's life and creative power.


Reviews on the first volumes of two serial publications of Shevchenkiana edited by P. Fylypovych.

Themes of P. Fylypovych's studies in the research of other literary scholars and critics; the main works.

Babyshkin, O., Ol'ha Kobylians'ka; narys pro zhyttia i tvorchist', L'viv, Knyzhkovo-zhurnal'ne vyd-vo, 1963, 190 p.
A biographical-critical study on O. Kobylians'ka.
The author observed the writer's works according to the style of criticism of Socialist Realism.
A reliable study on the Decembrist movement in Ukraine based on new materials and documents. The author extended Fylypovych's thoughts about the Ukrainian members of the movement.

Bahrii, O., Shevchenko v literaturnoi obstanovke, Baku, 1925, 327 p.
A reliable study on Shevchenko against the background of his period and literary surroundings. The work was primarily based on the historical-philological methodological principles of literary criticism.

One of the newest research studies on Lesia Ukrainka and her literary activities. While dealing with an observation of the poetess's life in the first part of his work, in the second part of the study the author concentrated on an analysis of Lesia Ukrainka's literary works and their background and evaluated them primarily from the aesthetical point of view.

A general characteristic of Lesia Ukrainka's life and work.

--------, "Ol'ha Kobylians'ka", in his Try syl'vetky; Marko Vovchok, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka, Lesia Ukrainka, Vynypeg, Nakl. Soiuzu ukrainok Kanady, 1951, 23-74.
A general characteristic of Kobylians'ka's life and work partly based on Fylypovych's research in this field.

A study on the genesis of Shevchenko's poem "Neofity" and its critical interpretation. The author considered the poet's relations with the Repnins.
Bibliography

One of the most comprehensive interpretations and analyses of Shevchenko's poems collected in his "Kobzar". Various analyses of Bilets'kyi in the first two volumes were based on Fylypovych's studies.

Bilous, O., Filosofs'ki i suspil'no-politychni pohliady Ivana Franka, Kyiv, T-vo dlia poshyrennia politychnykh i naukovych znan' URSR, 1949, 131 p.
A communist outlook on I. Franko's philosophical conception of the world attempting to characterize Franko as a precursor of Communism.

The essay deals with the investigation of Shevchenko's relations with the Petrashevskii group.

A study on Shevchenko from the social point of view. Although it was the first in Ukrainian literary criticism disparaging the standing of the poet, it might be considered as one of the first serious studies which stimulated further scholarly research in this field.

A critical observation of the early literary production of Lesia Ukrainka which aided Fylypovych to a certain extent in his studies on the poetess.

An analysis of Shevchenko's poem "Naimychka" from the sociological point of view.

-------, "Perednie slovo", in T. Shevchenko, Perebendia, L'viv, Literaturno-naukova biblioteka, 1889, p. 3-63.
A study based on the comparative analysis of Shevchenko's poem "Perebendia".
Franko, I., "Z ostannikh desiatyli't XIX v.", in his Moloda Ukraina. Chast' persha; providni idei i epizody, Vyd. 2., U Vinnipegu, Nakl. Rus'kei knyharni, 1920, p. 5-65. An observation of the development of Ukrainian literature during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in which Franko also expressed his opinion on the new writers including O. Kobylians'ka, M. Kotsiubyns'kyi, V. Stefanyk and others.

Hermaize, O., "Novi neporozuminnia z Shevchenkom", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 1-2, p. 170-178. A criticism of A. Richyts'kyi's study on Shevchenko considering it a work without a serious research base.

---------, "Rukh dekabrystiv i ukrainstvo", in Ukraina, 1925, kn. 6, p. 25-38. The study observed the connections between the Decembrists and the Ukrainian liberal circles of that period.

Hnatiuk, V., "Shevchenko v stosunkakh z poliakamy", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1930, No. 3, p. 148-161. The study considered Shevchenko's relations with the leading Polish revolutionaries during his exile and analyzed their reflections in the poet's works.


Kaspruk, A. A., Filosofs'ki poemy Ivana Franka, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1965, 189 p. A study of the philosophical poems of I. Franko. Although its author analyzes the poems according to the established official line of literary criticism in the Soviet Union he managed to conduct his study on the basis of serious sources and among them on works of P. Fylypovych.

Kaufman, L., "Marusia Churai", in Divchyna z lehendy: Marusia Churai, Kyiv, Daipro, 1967, p. 81-120. The largest among Kaufman's works on the subject which demonstrates the author's hypothesis about Marusia Churai as a real author and singer of a number of Ukrainian songs and especially "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" as a reflection of her love drama.
Kolessa, O., "Shevchenko i Mitskevych", in Zapysky Naukovooho tovarystva im Shevchenka, t. 3, 1894, p. 36-152.
A comparative analysis of Shevchenko and his literary connections with A. Mickiewicz.

Koriak, V., Borot'ba za Shevchenka, Kharkiv, Derzhavne vyd-vo Ukrainy, 1925, 113 p.
A collection of journalistic articles about Shevchenko composed according to the Communist critical line. In various of these articles the author condemned the scholarly approach toward studies on the poet as distant from the attitude of the proletariat.

One of the most comprehensive studies of K. F. Ryleev and his literary works. The work was prepared and defended as a gold medal dissertation at the University of Kiev.

Muzychka, A., "Dramatychna tvorchist' Lesi Ukrainky ta ii rozuminnia", in Chervonyi shliakh, 1928, No. 9-10, p. 84-102.
An observation of Lesia Ukrainka's dramatic works from the Marxist point of view. The author disagreed with Fylypovych's opinion concerning the research approach for the evaluation of the playwright's dramas.

A study on Franko's literary works based on sociological principles with links with the Marxist standpoint.

One of the author's essays on the subject which sharing Fylypovych's view condemned Kaufman's assumptions concerning Marusia Churai.

A study on Shevchenko against the background of Ukrainian Romanticism. The work was written according to the Marxist point of view. On the other hand, it closely followed the previous research of P. Fylypovych, M. Markovs'kyi, and 0. Doroshkevych.
A study on Taras Shevchenko and his period. The work, in which its author attempted unsuccessfully to follow M. Drahomanov's lead, was considered by the Marxist critics as the first study on the poet based on the Marxist approach to literary criticism.

A rehash of Fylypovych's comparative studies on Shevchenko according to the official line of Soviet literary criticism without indicating the original source.

A subjective interpretation of I. Franko's poem "Smert' Kaina" with an attempt to find in it a lofty declaration of atheism. The work might be considered as an example of the studies on Franko in Soviet literary criticism.

Shchurat, V., "Osnovy Shevchenkovykh zviazkiv z poliakamy", in Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka, t. 119-120, 1917, p. 117-147.
A reliable study of the relations between Shevchenko and the Polish revolutionaries and their reflections in the poet's works.

Stavyts'kyi, O. S., "'U pushchi' Lesi Ukrainky", in Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo, 1959, No. 3, p. 89-103.
An analysis of Lesia Ukrainka's drama "U pushchi" which presents an abstract of the author's dissertation based primarily on Fylypovych's study as well as on the thoughts of Zerov, Drai-Khmara, Doroshkevych and Muzychka. The study was conducted within the framework of the Marxist standpoint of literary criticism.

Vozniak, M., Kyrylo-Metodiivs'ke bratstvo, L'viv, 1921, 238 p.
A comprehensive observation of the Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood, its ideas, program, and activities, as well as a characteristic of its members' exile.
A comparative study on Shevchenko's poem "Neofity" in which the author demonstrated the genesis of the poem and considered that M. Kostomarov and his mother are reflected in it as the principal personages.

An observation of Shevchenko's poems in the Russian language which was partly based on Fylypovych's research.

In this analysis of Shevchenko's poem "Perebendia" the author agrees with Fylypovych's standpoint.

A biographical-critical study on Lesia Ukrainka which was based partially on the poetess's archives. The work was considered by Fylypovych in his research on the subject.
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Schools and trends in Ukrainian literary criticism and their representatives as determined by Leonid Bilets'kyi.*

I. Normal-poetical or neoclassical school (based on the theoretical principles of Aristotle, Horace, and J. C. Scaliger).


II. Historical school (based on the theoretical formulas of J. G. Herder and J. G. Fichte).

1. Mythological trend (introduced by G. F. Kreizer and J. Grimm).

   M. Maksymovych, O. Bodians'kyi, I. Sreznevs'kyi, P. Lukashevych, A. Metlyns'kyi.

   Combination of the mythological method with cultural-historical aspects: M. Kostomarov, P. Kulish.

2. Theory of the ideological interpretation of the poetical work.


---


----------, "Holovni napriamy ukrains'koi literaturno-naukovoi krytyky za ostannikh 50 lit", in Zbornik praci I. Sjezdu slovanskich filologu v Praze 1929, V Praze, Orbis, 1932, v. 2, p. 31-36. Schools, trends and persons are listed according to Bilets'kyi's order.

a) Comparative-mythological theory:
   M. Kostomarov, O. Bodians'kyi, O. Kotliarevs'kyi.

b) Comparative-sociological theory:
   M. Drahomanov.

c) Comparative theory:
   A. N. Veselovskii (in his works on Ukrainian themes).

d) Sociological-comparative method based on the Drahomanov-Veselovskii formula:
   1) Sociological-ideological trend (close to the principles of M. Drahomanov and M. Dashkevych):
      M. Sumtsov, V. Hnatiuk, V. Shchurat.
   2) Formal-poetical trend (close to the principles of A. N. Veselovskii):

e) Representatives of the theory of the following in the 1920's:


a) Philosophico-historical trend:
   M. Drahomanov, Kh. Vovk, M. Sumtsov, I. Franko, V. Okhrymovych, V. Hnatiuk, M. Hrushev's'kyi (positivistic approach), V. Doroshenko.

b) Marxist trend:
   B. Iakubs'kyi, O. Bilets'kyi, V. Korisk, A. Richyts'kyi, and others.
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5. Theory of literary dialectics and evolution.
   a) Dialectics in literary interpretation (G. W. F. Hegel, V. G. Belinskii, N. G. Chernishevskii, G. V. Plekhanov, F. Shmit):
      D. Antonovych, O. Bilets'kyi, B. Iakubs'kyi, V. Koriak, A. Richyts'kyi.

   b) Theory of literary evolution:

III. Psychological school.

   2. Theory of the psychological interpretation of the poetical work of S. Smal'-Stots'kyi and its followers:
      V. Simovych, S. Ieliuk, and others.

IV. Philological school (H. Paul and Blass, I. Sreznev's'-kyi, V. Jagic, A. I. Sobolevskii).
   V. Domanyts'kyi, I. Franko, V. Riezanov, V. Rozov, M. Markovs'kyi, V. Peretts.

   1. V. Peretts's school:

   2. Followers of Jagic's theoretical principles.
      K. Studyns'kyi, I. Franko, V. Shchurat, M. Vozniak, I. Bryk, Ia. Hordyns'kyi, M. Tershakovets'.

   3. Followers of the theory of E. Sievers.
      O. Kolessa, and others.

   4. Formal-poetical theory (close to "Opoiaz").
      B. Iakubs'kyi, Iu. Mezhenko, and others.
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Trends and methods in Ukrainian literary criticism and their principal representatives as determined by Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi.*

1. Bibliographical trend.
   M. Petrov, M. Dashkevych.

2. Philological trend.
   I. Sreznevs'kyi, O. Ohonovs'kyi, M. Petrov, M. Dashkevych, I. Franko, V. Peretts and his school, M. Hrushevs'kyi. Also A. M. Pypin, M. S. Tikhonravov, V. Jagic, A. I. Sobolevskii, and V. N. Istrin in their works on the Ukrainian themes.

3. Social-political method.
   M. Drahomanov, S. Iefremov, K. Franko, M. Hrushevs'kyi.

4. Spiritual-historical method ("dukhovno-istorychna metoda").
   M. Hrushevs'kyi, V. Riezanov, and others.

5. Formal method (analysis of literary works from the formal point of view).
   M. Zerov, P. Fulypowych, V. Petrov, O. Doroshkevych, B. Iakubs'kyi, O. Bilets'kyi.

---


--------, "Mykhailo Serhiievych Hrushevs'kyi, iak istoryk literatury", in M. Hrushevs'kyi, Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury, 2. vyd. N'iu York, Knyhospilka, 1959, v. 1., p. iii-v. Trends, methods, and persons are listed according to Chyzhevs'kyi's order.
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Schools and methods in Ukrainian literary criticism and their representatives in the 1920's as determined by Kost' Koperzhyns'kyi.*

1. Philological school.


2. Comparative-historical school.


3. Formal-poetical school.

O. Doroshkevych, S. Iakymovych, R. Maifet, B. Navrots'kyi, V. Otrokovs'kyi (using the combination of philological, comparative-historical and formal-poetical methods), V. Peretts (used the formal-poetical approach within the framework of the philological method), S. Rodzevych, S. Smal'-Stots'kyi.

Formal-poetical method based on the theoretical principles of O. Potebnia and A. N. Veselovskii:
D. Dudar, F. Samonenko.

---

*K. Koperzhyns'kyi, "Ukrains'ke naukove literatururoznavstvo za ostanni 10 rokiv", in Studii z istorii Ukrainy Naukovedoslidchoi katedry istori Ukrainy v Kyiv i, t. 2, 1929, p. xxxii-xxxiii. The names of persons are listed in alphabetical order.
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Formal-poetical method based on "Opoiaz's" theoretical position:
B. Iakubs'kyi, D. Zahul.

4. Formal-psychological and psychological school based on the theoretical principles of O. Potebnia.
   a) Formal-psychological method: S. Balei, D. Dudar, Ia. Hordyns'kyi (following the theoretical standpoint of Ernst Elster), F. Samonenko.
   b) Psychological method: S. Smal'-Stots'kyi (used with elements of the ideological approach).

5. Linguistic analysis.

The linguistic analysis within the framework of the philological method: A. Liashchenko, V. Peretts.

   M. Hrushevs'kyi, B. Iakubs'kyi, M. Mohylians'kyi, P. Fylypovych, O. Popov, R. Zaklyns'kyi.

Sociological approach in the history of Ukrainian literature:
O. Doroshkevych, M. Sulyma.

The Marxist standpoint in literary studies:
S. Iakubs'kyi, V. Koriak, A. Richyts'kyi, M. Slabchenko, A. Shamrai.

Sociologico-historical approach in literary studies:
O. Doroshkevych, O. Hermaize, O. Riabinin-Skliarevs'kyi.

7. Ideological school.
   D. Doroshenko, V. Doroshenko, S. Iefremov, A. Muzychka (with aspects based on the Marxist point of view), M. Plevako, V. Shchopt'iev, P. Stodolia, M. Vozniak.

8. Biographical-critical portraits of writers.
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List of students of Volodymyr Peretts's philological school.*


*According to V. Peretts, Kratkii ocherk metodologii istorii russkoii literatury, Petrograd, Academia, 1922, p. 3.
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List of students of the Seminar of Russian Philology at the University of Kiev led by Volodymyr Peretts and Andrii Loboda in 1911-1914.*
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Report of the Committee on the preliminary inventory of the office of the academician, Serhii Iefremov, on July 18, 1930.

Що знайдено в кабінеті С. Єфремова.

Колишній академік С. Єфремов мав у старому приміщені Академії (Короленко, Но. 54) свій кабінет. З ізоляцією С. Єфремова кабінет було запечатано і тільки 18-го липня 1930 року спеціальна комісія розглянула матеріали, що містяться в ньому.

Комісія виділила президію Першого Відділу Академії в складі т.т. Б. Г. Прокоф'єва (голова, представник маркс-ленинської катедри), О. К. Дорошенкова, П. П. Филіповича (членів від комісії новітнього українського письменства ЄУАН) і М. М. Новицького (секретар). Комісія мала конкретне завдання — розшукати Шевченківі рукописні матеріали і через те не могла детально охарактеризувати ввесь інший матеріал. Для цього потрібно більше часу, ніж його мала комісія.

Комісія констатувала, що речі в кабінеті С. Єфремова складаються з таких частин:

I. Речі, що належать Академії: автографи та копії Шевченкових творів, листування та твори інших українських письменників, прий. П. Кулиша, Я. Щоголева, М. Костомарова, М. Коцюбинського, Б. Гріченка та інших, різні рукописи, архівні матеріали й книги, що вступили до комісії, якими керував С. Єфремов.

II. Речі, що належать безпосередньо С. Єфремову:

1) Рукопис "Про дні минулі", 976 с.с.
2) Друкований на машинні рукопис "Історія нової української літератури XIX-XX в.", написаний 23, VIII, 1926, с. с. 380 (очевидно для перекладу на німецьку мову).
3) Листування приватного характеру з різними письменниками та громадськими діячами.
4) Різні книги, що належали С. Єфремову.
5) Матриці книжок про М. Драгоманова.

III. Речі, що належали іншим особам, а саме: С. Чикаленкові, Д. Дорошенкові, А. Ніковському та М. Гріченкові;

1) Окремка з приватних листувань, рукописами, газетами 1917-1918 р. р., що захова в шафі, та ще деякі

*Із. К(oryliuk), "Shcho znайдено v kabinetii S. Iefremova", in Literaturnyi arkhiv, r. k. 1930, ch. 3-4, p. 378-379.
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речі Чикаленка.
2) Книжки та рукописи (переклади з російської мови) з бібліотеки Д. Дорошенка.
3) Родинні документи М. Грінченкової.

Крім цього знайдено цікавий лексикографічний матеріал: збірка Всеволоді Крижанівського та український словник Сердюкова. Є чимало різних газет, фото, негативів і кіно-стрічки.
Серед паперів Академії є чимало офіційного матеріалу із справ першого відділу.
Але найкінніше серед усіх матеріалів - збірка Шевченкових матеріалів:
1) Книжка Б. - поезії Т. Шевченка за р.р. 1841-1860.
2) Книжка М. - поезії за р.р. 1846-1850.
3) Лист Т. Шевченка з Іб. ХІ-60 р. до Д. Каменецького - автограф.
4) "Бандуріст, орле сизий" - автограф, вірш присвячений Миколі Маркевичеві.
5) Два fotografічні карти Т. Шевченка та маска поета (світлина).
6) Російські повісті Шевченка - автографи: а) "Найминач", б) "Близници", в) "Капітанша", г) "Музикант", д) "Художник", е) "Несчастний", з) "Прогулька" - 2 частини, і) "Барнацок".
7) Копії цих повістей в двох примірниках.
8) "Дело Штаба Отдельного Оренбургского корпуса о рядовом Тарасе Шевченко", І87 аркушів.
9) Вірш Т. Шевченка. "Кобзар" ілюстрований Я. Д. де-Бальменом та М. С. Бачіловим - рукопис "Кобзаря" І840 року та "Гайдамаків" переписаний польськими літерами.

Про ці матеріали знали київські шевченкознавці, але побоювалися за їхню цілість. Тепер їх вилучено з кабінету С. Сфремова й передано на переховування до бібліотеки Першого відділу Академії. Усі матеріали будуть використані для академічного видання "Творів" Шевченка.

Комісія визнала за потрібне з нового академічного року почати опис усіх інших матеріалів, що перековуються в кабінеті. Є. К.
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Stenographic record of Pavlo Fylypovych's speech delivered at the literary dispute in Kiev on May 24, 1925.*

Час у нас обмежений, тому я буду говорити коротко, не обґрунтовуючи, як слід своїх думок. Похіб з того, що тов. Шупак в своєму слові, яке, до речі сказати, присяго прозвучало тут, висловив на мою думку не зовсім вірне положення, коли говорив, що Хвилювий в своїй статті висловлює чужі думки. Я гадаю, що в цій статті й прозвучали ті думки, що вже досить виразно Хвилевий висловив у "Синіх Етюдах". В одному з оповідань він звертається до читачів і говорить ўм: "Я боюся, що ви мою новелу не дочитаєте до кінця. Ви в лабітах просвітницької літератури... Та кожному свій час. Творити то є творити, - переспожувати - не творити, а малювати. І читач творець, не тільки я, я шукаю, і ви шукаєте".

Я думаю, що стаття Хвилевого про "Європу" та "Просвіту" розвиває наведені думки. Тільки я-б сказав, що в цитованому уривку Хвилевий говорив про читача, а в статті, яку він надрукував у "Культурі і Лобуті", він говорить про письменника. Власне, коли-б проблему поставити у всю широчину, то треба було-б говорити і про читача сучасного, і про нашого письменника. Я думаю, що коли йде мова про те, що творити того чи іншого письменника або пілої групи письменників, що входять в певну організацію, задовольняють такі-то верстви, такий-то клас, такий-то шар населення, то в такому тверджені часто багато с такого, що треба розгледіти.

Ми, власне, не знаюмо, чого бажає читач, що його задовольнить, що йому потрібно дати для того, щоб виконати її завдання, які ставилися і ставляться тими, що керують політикою в галузі художній. Коли говорили про те, що треба підвищити рівень мас, коли висловлено було гасло "мистецтво маєм", то хіба, що вкладали в розуміння цього лозунгу? Не тільки утворення нової літератури, а й уміння використовувати те, що є, все те, що треба відбрати і далі використовувати для підвищення рівня мас, щоб вони потім могли сприймати, зрозуміти те мистецтво, що буде творитися новими письменниками. Хіба ми можемо похвалитися, що широкі маси розуміють всі ті досягнення, що у нас є? Хіба широкі маси розуміють

*Shliakhy rozvytku suchasnoi literature; dysput 24 travnia, 1925 r., Kyiv, Kul'komisiia Mistskomu UAN, 1925, p. 50-54.
новий революційний театр "Березіль", хіба Хвильовий зрозумільний, хіба Тичина дійшов до ширшого читача? Хіба мова його для ширшого читача зрозуміла? Я пригадую собі одну розмову з партійною людиною, що вчиться у вищій школі, яка мені казала: "Читаю Олеся і захоплююся, а ось дали мені книжку "Плуг", і я ще не розумію, вона чука, далека для мене".

Я думаю, що тепер перед нами стоїть проблема не "Просвіти", а іменно освіти в самому широкому розумінні цього слова. І може тут нам треба не тільки думати про підвищення рівня цього читача, а й вивчати його. Де-яко може думати, що ті оповідання, що пише Яковенко чи Плужник, дуже потрібні, але треба впевнитися, що вони досягають до ширшої маси. Колись народники думали, що ті, що вони пишуть, читать і розуміють селяни, а коли Гринченко побув на сели, то побачив, що ярак ці твори часто не захоплюють читача. Я думаю, що проблема сучасного письменника, проблема "просвітненської" літератури – перша за все проблема освіти.

Далі про халтуру. Коли була вечірка, присвячена Черемшині, де виступав з вступним словом Зеров, поставивши проблему "культури і халтури", то він не називав халтурою первих ученцівських спроб молодих письменників. Алес в ти не називають їх халтурою, то треба якось інакше підходити, їм робити тепер безглаздю хвалителі перших "спроб пера".

А та ніхто людина два віршки і почуває вже вважати себе великим письменником та сперечатися за всіма. Наприклад, Яковенко, відповідаючи Хвильовому, гордо заявляє: "Я пишу всього 7 місяців і написав дві повісти і до десятка оповідань, при чому одна з повістей вміщено в "Червоному Шляху". Я не пригадую назви оповідання Яковенка, але ясно пригадую, що воно вразило мене тим, що було надзвичайно слабко.

Де-яко перш за все вбачати халтуру? Халтура буде тоді, коли письменник не єде вперед, коли не робить того, про що говорив Хвильовий, коли використовує кліше і не працює над собою, не шукає. Та він в наших умовах часто й не знає, яким шляхом іти. Ми багато говоримо про засвоєння старого письменства, про відібрання здорових елементів та пристосування до сучасних потреб, але конкретно дуже мало увілюєм собі, що це таке. Я наведу конкретний приклад двох різних підходів до класиків. У Москвському Малому театрі рік тому назад був диспут. На цьому диспуті виступав провідник "Лефу" Майковський. Одпозиваючи на закли Дунічарського він сказав:"Вот Анатолій Васильович утримує мене в неуважені к передкам, а я місяць тому надзвід во време работы, когда Брик начал читать "Евгения Онегина", которого я знаю наизусть, не мог оторваться и слушал до конца и два дня ходил под обаянием четверостишия:

Я знаю: хребет мой измерен,
но, чтоб пролилась жизнь моя,
я утром должен быть уверен,
что з вами днем увидишься я.
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Конечно, мы будем стыди раз возвращаться к великим художественным произведением, и даже в тот момент, когда смерть будет накладывать нам петлю на шею, тысячи раз учиться этим максимально добросовестным приемам, которые дают безконечное удовлетворение и верную формулировку взятой, диктуемой, чувствующей мисли. Этого ни в одном произведении современных авторов нет".

Для меня важный самый подход, его можно назвать " эмоционально-синтетический подход. Вин дает возможность проанализировать твир. Би бачьте, что поет диктое спраивает колиши творч, по- чутть, хоч вин иного напрямку іншого світогляду. Беру ін- ший приклад. Яковенко в останньому числі "Культури і Готути" відповідає Хвильовому пише: "Клас переписців, користуючись старим мистецтвом, як гноєс, висомоне з нього потрібні йому соки і утворити потрібні йому пролетарське мистецтво". Не думайте, щоб смотріт гній булі присно, і щоб таким чином можна було-б що-небудь утворити. Візьміть що приклад - з Без- зіменським. Поет, що зараз находиться на найлившому фланзі російської літератури, пише:

Нам у Пушкіна учиться
эпічному полотну...
Ти любиш Пушкіна всього,
но якби спростити про него,
то відомий унікальний розріз.

Так само захоплюється і казаць, і багато інших: "Как хорошо проснуться утром и утро Пушкиным открыть". Поети справжні, культурні, вмиють відчути колишні цінності й використати їх так, як використовує художник художника. Можна зачитуватись письмеником давної доби, не "сучасним", і бути далеким від його світогляду. Коли читаєй такі твори класичних майстрів, то й переживаєш їх. Це не абстрактний підхід, не аналітич- ний, а свого роду синтетичний. Аналіз, гостра критика - дально- ший етап по цьому шляху засвоєння цінностей.

У нас, на Україні, цю проблему засвоєння ще не пост- тавлено. "Культура і Любов" вміщено, наприклад, статтю про "образність окремого слова". Звичайно, цікаво про це говорити спеці, але коли молоді поети пролетарські чи селянські беруть і використовують "образ самого слова", не розуміччя твору в цілому, вихоплюють тільки якіс елементи окремі, то в таких письменників тралляються цікаві ( хоч і штучні, зде- більшого) порівняння, епітети і т. і., але в цілому твір не живий. Я думаю, що коли-б знайдено було шляхи дійсно поглибл- леного широго підходу до того мистецтва, що може іноді чує для нас, але дає багато досвіду і будить емоції, то безпе- речно ми до певної міри знайшли-б і шляхи до розвитку нового письменства.

А йде ми, безперечно, до реалізму, до простоти, ясности. Досить панувала у нас за останні час туманна сим- воліка, інажнізм та футуризм, які панували в багатьох
письменників і до цього часу. І коли підемо цим шляхом, то будемо говорити тоді про Франка, Лесю Українку, як в Росії говорять про Пушкіна.
APPENDIX 8

ABSTRACT OF

Pavlo Fylypovych - a literary scholar.

The thesis "Pavlo Fylypovych - a literary scholar" presents a study portraying P. Fylypovych as an individual and characterizing his scholarly activities. It particularly analyzes and evaluates his critical works which occupy a distinguished place in the development of modern Ukrainian literary criticism.

P. Fylypovych as a poet and literary scholar was one of those Ukrainian intellectuals who participated in the revival of Ukrainian culture during the independence of Ukraine in 1917-1919, and despite the difficult circumstances of the early phase of Communist rule contributed significantly to the impressive growth of Ukrainian literature. Choosing critical approaches bearing a high degree of scholarly objectivity these individuals not only preserved the heritage of their predecessors in Ukrainian literary criticism but on the basis of extensive research and a comprehensive knowledge of literature and criticism extended the scholarship of this field and maintained the fruitful relations

between Ukrainian literature and the dominant trends of world literature.

Fylypovych's scholarly activities played a significant role in this literary process in Ukraine in the 1920's. His studies which were usually solidly based on the research methods of literary criticism brought new insight to the problems at hand and made original contributions to the general literary development and thus were followed thereafter by other Ukrainian critics.

For his firm objectivity and scholarly approach to research Fylypovych suffered the constant attacks of the Marxist critics and Communist party. As a final result of this harassment he was exiled in 1935 along with other Ukrainian intellectuals to concentration camps in Siberia where he died in 1937 at the age of forty-six. At the same time his scholarly heritage was under prohibition by the Soviet regime for readers and literary critics as well. Hence, Fylypovych as a literary scholar is rather unknown up to the present time, although his contribution to the development of Ukrainian literary criticism was followed by a number of literary critics of the 1920's in Soviet Ukraine and abroad.

The analysis of Fylypovych as a literary scholar is based on extensive research of Fylypovych's studies and materials dealing with the principal trends of literary
criticism in general and the development of Ukrainian literary criticism in particular with special concentration on sources published in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920's. It is arranged according to a scheme in which the analysis of Fylypovych's studies is presented within the framework of the traditions in scholarly criticism of Ukrainian literature at the end of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries with particular emphasis on the 1920's.

The first chapter presents a general survey of the leading trends in scholarly criticism in Ukrainian literature in the 1920's with consideration of the political climate of the early phases of Communist rule in Ukraine during which it developed. Special attention is given to the characteristic of three main trends: the sociological, philological and comparative and their principal representatives in world literature with an indication of how they were introduced into Ukrainian literary criticism and elaborated there. Against this background is described the literary research in Ukraine in the 1920's with stress on the role of younger scholars like Fylypovych and his contemporaries.

The second chapter completes the basic groundwork for the study. It deals with the portrait of Fylypovych as a person, his education, and his activities as a lecturer of Ukrainian literature at the University of Kiev and as an active member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The
chapter also includes a characteristic of Fylypovych's literary surroundings which played an important role in the formation of his scholarly orientation.

The following three chapters are devoted to the analysis and evaluation of Fylypovych's main studies which can be considered an original contribution to the critical research of Ukrainian literature. In the first of these chapters his works based on the comparative method are observed. These concern the poetry of Taras Shevchenko against the background of Romanticism, an analysis of the poetry of Ivan Franko and especially the genesis of his poem "Smert' Kaina", and the cycle of studies on Lesia Ukrainka's literary creations. Almost all these works deal with original topics and exhibit new approaches. Besides the critical determination of their own aesthetical features, the author effectively demonstrated on the basis of a comparative analysis the connections between the literary production of the Ukrainian poets mentioned above and foreign writers.

The second of these chapters discusses Fylypovych's works devoted to the characteristic of Taras Shevchenko's social, intellectual and political surroundings and their influence on the formation of the poet's Weltanschauung, as well as an indication of their reflection in Shevchenko's poetry. On the basis of the Sociological-comparative method,
the studies cover four main problems: the evaluation of M. Drahomanov's thoughts on Shevchenko, the criticism of A. Richyts'kyi's work on the poet, the analysis of the question of Germans in Shevchenko's writings, and a comprehensive characteristic of Shevchenko's connections with the Decembrists. Fylypovych achieved substantial results in this research successfully revising Drahomanov's views, and defending Shevchenko's philosophical conception of the world against Richyts'kyi's attempt to simplify the poet's personality in line with Marxist criticism. Further, Fylypovych presented an original formulation of Shevchenko's approach toward Germans as it was reflected in the poet's diary, novels, and poems, by which he demonstrated that the opinions of Marxist critics here are of dubious value. Finally Fylypovych presented a comprehensive picture of the relations between Shevchenko and the Decembrists with a detailed analysis of the reflections of the liberation movement in the poet's diary and poems. On the basis of extensive research Fylypovych also demonstrated not only Shevchenko's literary connections with the poetry of the Decembrist K. F. Ryleev but also specifically with the genesis of the latter's poems on Ukrainian themes and linked it with the liberation movement in Ukraine which played an influential role on both Ryleev and Shevchenko.
The third of these chapters observes Fylypovych's studies on Ol'ha Kobylians'ka's literary production in which he presented such topics as a general critical survey of the writer's novel "Zemlia", the literary surroundings of Kobylians'ka, and especially the analysis of her novel "V nediliu rano zillia kopala". While indicating in the first two studies Kobylians'ka's literary connections with the works of other authors, especially with German and Scandinavian writers and thinkers, in the last work Fylypovych considered two main subjects: the history of the old popular Ukrainian folk song "Oi ne khody Hrytsiu, na vechornytsi" which was taken as the main plot for Kobylians'ka's novel "V nediliu rano zillia kopala", and the analysis of the novel itself. Both parts of the study are marked by original research features and convincing conclusions. From the methodological point of view the work might be considered as an example of the utilization of the comparative-formal method in critical analysis.

In observing these works it was indicated that almost all of these studies by Fylypovych offered original opinions and as such served as a reliable basis for further research and were in fact followed by later investigators of the problems.

Besides these main studies Fylypovych was the author of various other works which shed new light on important questions for the development of Ukrainian literary criticism.
Among them should be mentioned such items as the Ukrainian elements in N. V. Gogol's writings, studies devoted to M. Kotsiubyns'kyi's literary manner, the literary characteristic of O. Oles' (Kandyba), the biographical-critical study on E. A. Borattynskii, literary portraits of G. G. Byron, J. W. Goethe, H. B. Stendhal, P. J. Beranger, and M. S. Leskov, the analysis of the literary traces of G. A. Buerger's ballad "Lenore" in Ukrainian literature, and additional works on T. Shevchenko.

In the early 1930's and particularly after the trial of the Union for Liberation of Ukraine ("Spilka Vyzvolennia Ukrainy") Fylypovych suffered bitter attacks from representatives of the Soviet regime. He was pressured to completely reject his objective and scholarly approach and was ordered to produce writings in accord with the official line. The results of this command are noticeable in his works on the French poet P. J. Beranger, on T. Shevchenko and even on a topic distant from his speciality like the sketch about historical events during the national independence of Ukraine. Almost all of these writings are alien to his usual scholarly objectivity and replete with standard features of the Communist political establishment in Ukraine. Comparing these articles with Fylypovych's previous studies it is evident that the scholar suffered not only from the intense pressure of the political rulers but also was anticipating
his own physical liquidation which was to come in the near future.

In general Fylypovych's scholarly activities might be defined as one decade of literary work spanning the stormy period of the establishment of Communist rule in Ukraine. During that short time the scholar was able to educate a number of young literary critics at the University of Kiev, to contribute significantly to the scholarly activities of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and most importantly to provide his original contribution to the development of Ukrainian literary criticism. In this respect he might be characterized first of all as a specialist of Ukrainian literature of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries and particularly as a Shevchenko expert. Overall, the investigation demonstrates that Fylypovych's studies in this area stand as fundamental and primary sources in Ukrainian literary criticism until the present time.
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