

## COMPARATIVE PARADIGM IN WORKS OF Y. BOYKO-BLOKHYN: APPROACHES “INTERWEAVING AND INTERCROSSING”

*Olga B. Teterina*. Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Ukraine)

e-mail: olgateterina@ukr.net

DOI: 10.32342/2523-4463-2022-2-24-5

**Key words:** *comparative literary studies, national literature, intercultural context, contact and genetic relationship, typological similarities and differences, style, reception, influence, literary translation, traditional plots and characters.*

The article analyzes Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's comparative model as an important integral concept element of Ukrainian emigre scholars comparative literary studies in the 1930s-1980s period (Y. Boyko-Blokhyn, M. Hnatyshak, S. Hordynsky, V. Derzhavyn, I. Kaczurowskyj, D. Chyzhevsky, Y. Sherekh and others). Approaches of the emigre scholar to literature comparative exploration are interpreted in the context of global comparative studies main trends, and placed against the views of the mainland comparative literary studies representatives. We clarified the distinguishing features of Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's model, proved its multidimensional and multivector character, and ascertained comparatist attitudes relevance towards modern comparative literary studies, taking into account their development potential. This goes according to *the purpose* of the work and its tasks. This research applies advances in comparative historical analysis, *methodology* of both historic cultural and receptive aesthetic schools.

Conceptual idea of the scholar shows his attention to contact-genetic relationship as well as typological similarities and differences. The author interprets functionality problem of inter-literary/intercultural communication preeminently as a national literature stylistic development factor. The study reveals the interdisciplinary nature of Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's works (with access to the realm of philosophy, psychology and cultural studies), and demonstrates his integration of contextual, intermedial and other approaches, which fundamentally enriched methodological tools of comparative literary studies. Reflections of Y. Boyko-Blokhyn on the problem of Slavic literatures comparative study, while witnessing the author's inherent interest in national identity problem, emphasized and deepened research of Slavic, specifically East Slavic, literatures as a fundamental component of the European cultural space. They also substantiated the demand for changes in approach to study the East Slavic region, particularly historical and literary processes in Belarusian, Ukrainian, and Russian literatures. Scientist's observations and conclusions, aimed at understanding Ukrainian literature in the European context, broaden drastically the idea of its peculiarity, with an emphasis on the features conditioned by its development (T. Shevchenko – G. Byron, R. Burns, J.W. Goethe, A. Dante, G. Leopardi, A. Mickiewicz, T. Moore, Novalis, S. Petőfi, W. Shakespeare, F. Schiller; I. Franko – G. Byron, E.T.A. Hoffmann, A. Chamisso; Lesya Ukrainka – G. Hauptmann, M. Maeterlinck, O. Wilde and others). The researcher traces occurrences of literary reception by the national literature of other nations artistic and aesthetic experiences at various levels of comparative poetics (themes, motives, style, etc.)

*Conclusion.* We proved an important role of Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's comparative model, who developed impactful traditions of national comparative literary studies of the second half of the 19th century – first third of the 20th century, and at the same time rethought (including through denial) western methodologies, in development not only of Ukrainian, but also of the global literature science as a whole. Insights and ideas of the emigre scholar, many of which were often ahead of his foreign colleagues ideas (A. Balakian, H. Bloom, U. Weisstein, D. Durishin, A. Popovich, H.R. Jaus and others), remain relevant even nowadays. Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's approaches to comparative study of literatures in the world context with a special emphasis on the *problem of national identity* apparently acquired the utmost importance during the era of globalization. Similar logic of thinking is affine to those modern authors who insist to study first differences between national creative writings, which according to their deep conviction enrich and diversify the global cultural universe (A. Balakian, C. Bernheimer, E. Kaspersky, F. Toudoire-Surlapierre and others). In contrast to “cultural unification scenarios”, Y. Boyko-Blokhyn's reflections which draw attention to different literatures/cultures polylogue phenomenon, their mutual understanding and enrichment, are based on the following fundamental thesis: “originality is a runner to commonality” (it is also of fundamental importance for formation of comparative literary history concept). It's emblematic that the Ukrainian scientist back then strongly denied the position of R. Wellek and R. Warren, who absolutized the tendency to universalization of the global literary process. Instead, Y. Boyko-Blokhyn argued for study of *national version* of pan-European style (romanticism, realism, modernism), traditional plots and characters, and he also scaled out radically the influence range idea as a manifestation of literary reception, with an emphasis on its creative character (from influence as a repulsion to influence as an “activity stimulus”, “impulse for self-movement”). In fact, these reflections of Y. Boyko-Blokhyn anticipated approaches of those scholars

who justified later the concept of active perception as opposed to passive influence, actualizing the role of recipient in the process of inter-literary communication (H.R. Jauss), thesis about the decisive role of the recipient literature (D. Durishin), interpretive theory – “fear of influence” (H. Bloom). Y. Boyko-Blokhyn’s conceptual thoughts about understanding the “reverse influences” problem, as well as related matter of contribution of each Slavic, in particular East Slavic, literature to the global cultural heritage, are extremely consonant with arguments that have been in the researchers’ focus even in these recent times (M. Boehmig, O. Pachlovska). In conclusion we can say that Y. Boyko-Blokhyn’s comparative model which is characterized by nation-centric orientation emphasizes fundamentally the prospects for further scientific research in historical, literary and comparative dimensions, first of all in projection of such methodologies inherent to modern comparative literary studies as imagology, theory of intertextuality and cultural transfer.

## References

- Balakian, A. (2009). *Literaturna teoriia ta komparatyvna literatura* [Literary theory and comparative literature]. In D. Nalyvaiko (ed.). *Suchasna literaturna komparatyvistyka: stratehii i metody* [Modern literary comparative studies: strategies and methods]. Kyiv, Kyiv Mohyla Academy Publ., pp. 212-219.
- Bilokin, S., Boiko, Yu. (1992). *Zamist peredmovy* [Instead of a preface]. In S. Bilokin (ed.). *Vybrani tvory* [Selected works]. Kyiv, Medekol Publ., pp. 3-5.
- Blum, H. (2007). *Zakhidnyi kanon: knyhy na tli epokh* [Western Canon: Books Against the Background of Eras]. Kyiv, Fakt Publ., 720 p.
- Boiko, Yu. (1974). *Pereklady Shevchenka na nimetsku movu* [Translations of Shevchenko into German]. *Vybrane* [Selected Works]. Munich, Satz u. Druck Publ., vol. 3, pp. 165-180.
- Boiko, Yu. (1981). *Do problemy porivnialnoho vyvchennia istorii skhidnoslovianskykh literatur* [To the problem of comparative study of the history of East Slavic literatures]. *Vybrane* [Selected Works]. Munich, Satz u. Druck Publ., vol. 3, pp. 229-240.
- Boiko, Yu. (1990). *“Favst” Gete v perekladi Mykoly Lukasha* [Goethe’s “Faust” translated by Mykola Lukash]. *Vybrane* [Selected Works]. Haidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter Publ., vol. 4, pp. 177-187.
- Boiko, Yu. (1992a). *Do problemy rozvytku Frankovoho stylu* [To the problem of the development of the Franko’s style]. In S. Bilokin (ed.). *Vybrani tvory* [Selected Works]. Kyiv, Medekol Publ., pp. 94-109.
- Boiko, Yu. (1992b). *Na porozi vosmoho desiatka* [On the threshold of the eight decade]. In S. Bilokin (ed.). *Vybrani tvory* [Selected works]. Kyiv, Medekol Publ., pp. 6-10.
- Boiko, Yu. (1992c). *Tvorchist Tarasa Shevchenka na tli zakhidnoevropeiskoi literatury* [The work of Taras Shevchenko against the background of Western European literature]. In S. Bilokin (ed.). *Vybrani tvory* [Selected works]. Kyiv, Medekol Publ., pp. 11-73.
- Boyko-Blokhyn, J. (1994). *Lesja Ukrainka und die europäische Literatur* [Lesja Ukrainka and European literature]. Köln, Weimar & Wien, Böhlau Verlag Publ., pp. 249 p.
- Boyko-Blokhyn, J. (1977). *Dante und die Ukraine* [Dante and Ukraine]. In V. Omelchenko (ed.). *Collection in honor of Prof. Olexandr Ogloblin*. New York, Ukrainian Free Academy of Science Publ., pp. 137-152.
- Boyko-Blokhyn, J. (1979) *Gegen den Storm. Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Geschichte der slavischen Literaturen* [Against the storm. Selected contributions to the history of Slavic literatures]. Heidelberg, Carl Winter – Universitätsverlag Publ., 360 p.
- Corbeau-Parsons, C. (2013). *Prometheus in the Nineteenth Century: From Myth to Symbol*. London, Routledge, 200 p.
- Denysova, T. (2005). *Nauka “komparatyvistyka” v suchasnomu potraktuvanni* [The science of “comparative studies” in modern interpretation]. *Literaturna komparatyvistyka* [Literary Comparative Studies], vol. 1, pp. 10-26.
- Espagne, M. (1999). *Les Transferts culturels franco-allemands* [Franco-German cultural transfers]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 31 p. Available at: <https://excerpts.numilog.com/books/9782130500902.pdf> (in French) (Accessed 23 October 2022).
- Fylypovych, P. (1971). *Shevchenko i romantyzm* [Shevchenko and romanticism]. In G. Kostyuk (ed.). *Literatura* [Literature]. New-York, Melborn, Drukarnia B. Ihnatova v Melborni Publ., pp. 53-75.
- Illytskyi, M. (2014). *Znaky doby i hrani talantu* [Signs of the times and facets of talent]. Kyiv, Klio Publ., 432 p.
- Kasperskyi, E. (2006). *Pro teoriu komparatyvistyky* [About the theory of comparativistics]. In D. Ulitska (ed.). *Literatura. Teoriia. Metodolohiia* [Literature. Theory. Methodology]. Kyiv, Kyiv Mohyla Academy Publ., pp. 518-540.
- Khorob, S. (2014). *Literaturoznavchi kontseptsii Yurii Boika-Blokhyna v doslidzhenniakh tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka* [Literary concepts of Yurii Boyko-Blokhyn in studies of Taras Shevchenko’s work]. *Etnos i kultura* [Ethnic Group and Culture], vol. 10/11, pp. 5-17.
- Korpaniuk, M. (2012). *Boiko-Blokhyn (1909–2002) – literaturnyi krytyk* [Boiko-Blokhyn (1909–2002) is a literary critic]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainskoi istorii* [Scientific Notes on Ukrainian history], vol. 30, pp. 92-99.

Melnyk, V. (1991). *Chotyrytomnyk «Vybranoho» Yurii Boika* [The four-volume “Selected” by Yurii Boiko]. *Visnyk Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv* [Bulletin of the International Association of Ukrainianists], 2 pp. 46-51.

Melnyk, V., Astafiev, O. (2004). *Boiko Yurii Havrylovych* [Boiko Yurii Havrylovych]. In I. Dziuba (ed.). *Entsyklopediia suchasnoi Ukrainy* [Encyclopedia of Modern Ukraine]. Kyiv, Institut entsyklopedychnykh Doslidzhen Publ., vol. 3, pp. 197-198.

Nalyvaiko, D. (2006). *Teoriia literatury y komparatyvistyka* [Theory of literature and comparative studies]. Kyiv, Kyiv Mohyla Academy Publ., 347 p.

Nalyvaiko, D. (2007). *Komparatyvistyka y istoriia literatury* [Comparative studies and history of literature]. Kyiv, Akta Publ., 426 p.

Pohrebnaia, Ya. (2016). *Typolohiia interpretatsii obraza Don Zhuana* [Typology of interpretation of the image of Don Juan]. *Voprosy literatury* [The Issues of Literature], vol. 9, issue 63, pp. 41-45.

Scholz, F. *Laudatio für Jurij Bojko-Blokhyn aus Anlaß seines 80. Geburtstages am 25. März 1989* [Laudatory speech for Yurii Boyko-Blokhyn on the occasion of his 80<sup>th</sup> birthday on March 25, 1989]. Heidelberg, Carl – Winter Universitätsverlag Publ., pp. 7-15.

Skoryna, L. (2020). *Teoriia intertekstualnosti: vytoky, zdobutky, problemy* [The theory of intertextuality: origins, achievements, problems]. In T. Sverbilova (ed.). *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky* [Methodologies of Modern Literary Comparativistics]. Kyiv, Literary Institute Publ., pp. 125-159.

Sverbilova, T. (2020). *Mizhdystyplinarnyi aspekt aktualnykh kontseptiv suchasnoi postkolonialnoi teorii v dyskursi Comparative Culture* [Interdisciplinary Aspect of Current Concepts of Modern Postcolonial Theory in the Discourse of Comparative Culture]. In T. Sverbilova (ed.). *Metodolohii suchasnoi literaturnoi komparatyvistyky* [Methodologies of Modern Literary Comparativistics]. Kyiv, Literary Institute Publ., pp. 408–428.

Syvachenko, H. (2019). *Kulturnyi transfer – nova metodolohiia komparatyvistyky* [Cultural transfer is a new methodology of comparativistics]. *Slovo i chas* [Word and Time], vol. 3, pp. 71-81.

Teterina, O. (2019). Ukrainian versions of classic plots and characters: anent the question of the European canon. *Technology transfer: innovative solutions in Social Sciences and Humanities: Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference*, 1, pp. 30-33. DOI: 10.21303/2613-5647.2019.00908.

Teterina, O. (2021a). *Fenomen ukrainskoi emihratsiinoi komparatyvistyky: diapazon rukhu, poshukovi oriientyry, yevropeiskyi kontekst*. Dys. dokt. filol. nauk [The Phenomenon of Ukrainian Emigration Comparative Studies: Range of Movement, Search Orientations, European Context. Dr. philol. sci. diss.]. Kyiv, 462 p.

Teterina, O. (2021b). *Tvorchist Lesi Ukrainky v retseptsii uchenykh-komparatyvistiv ukrainskoho zarubizhzhia 30-80-kh rr. 20 stolittia* [The creativity of Lesia Ukrainka in the reception of comparativist scholars of Ukrainian abroad in the 30s-80s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century]. *Literaturoznavchi studii* [Literary Studies], vol. 61, pp. 165-183. DOI: 10.17721/2520-6346.2(61).165-183.

Teterina, O. (2018). “Magnificent edifice of the history of slavic literatures”: Y. Boyko-Blokhin’s “project”. *Eureka: Social and Humanities*, vol. 6, pp. 49-56. DOI: 10.21303/2504-5571.2018.00775.

Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1999). From Comparative Literature Today Toward Comparative Cultural Studies. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol. 1, issue 3. Available at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=clcweb> (Accessed 23 October 2022).

Touidoire-Surlapierre, F. (2013). *Notre besoin de comparaison* [Our Need for Comparison]. Paris, Ori-zons Publ., 188 p.

Vaishtain, U. (2012). “Retseptsiiia” ta “Diiia” [“Reception” and “Action”]. In L. Grytsyk (ed.). *Zakhid – Skhid: osnovni tendentsii rozvytku suchasnoho porivnialnoho literaturoznavstva* [West – East: the main trends in the development of modern comparative literary studies]. Donetsk, Landon-21 Publ., pp. 21-37.

Одержано 5.09.2022.