

## Abstract

This study examines the specific aspects of the reception of Russian formalism and the development of the Formal method in Soviet Ukrainian culture in the 1920s – the beginning of 1930s. Russian formalism in the process of reception becomes an important tool for the “modernization” of national culture and, as a result, an instrument for a new phase in the construction of national cultural identity.

On that basis, the cultural-historical and ideological context of the development of Ukrainian literary criticism, criticism and (partially) literature of the late 19th – first decades of the 20th century is consistently reconstructed in eight chapters of the work.

The first chapter highlights theoretical aspects of the study, reviews critical literature, reconstructs the history of reception of Russian formalism in Russian and Western criticism and the history of literature. The second chapter addresses the historical and theoretical premises of the reception of Formal theory in Ukrainian culture. The next chapter discusses historical and political context of the development of literature and literary criticism in 1917–1920 using the example of multinational post-revolutionary Kiev; a brief review of the theoretical and historical works of the 1920s also appears here. A special focus is put on the theoretical perspectives of B. Yakubsky and M. Yohansen. The fourth chapter is devoted to the analysis of discussions around the Formal method that unfolded throughout the 1920s on the pages of Ukrainian periodicals. The fifth chapter examines M. Semenko’s pan-futuristic theory of art in its connection to the ideas of constructivism, Dada, and a Formal school. The next chapter outlines the ideological framework of the so-called “Literary Discussion” and examines M. Khvylovy’s concept of the “Asian Renaissance” as an example of “cultural transfer.” A special emphasis is put on the “formalist” discourse of VAPLITE magazine. Next chapter reconstructs the course of public self-criticism of the apologist of the Formal method A. Shamray in the context of changing cultural policies in the late 1920s – early 1930s. The eighth chapter offers a comparative analysis of the two articles by B. Eichenbaum and D. Chyzhevsky, dedicated to the “Overcoat” of N. Gogol. The final part considers the specific aspects of the development of “Ukrainian formalism.”