

SCI-CONF.COM.UA

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND GLOBAL CHALLENGES



**PROCEEDINGS OF XII INTERNATIONAL
SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE
JULY 23-25, 2026**

**TOKYO
2026**

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Proceedings of XII International Scientific and Practical Conference

Tokyo, Japan

23-25 July 2026

Tokyo, Japan

2026

UDC 001.1

The 12th International scientific and practical conference “Science, technology and global challenges” (July 23-25, 2026) CPN Publishing Group, Tokyo, Japan. 2026. 149 p.

ISBN 978-4-9783419-7-6

The recommended citation for this publication is:

Ivanov I. Analysis of the phaunistic composition of Ukraine // Science, technology and global challenges. Proceedings of the 12th International scientific and practical conference. CPN Publishing Group. Tokyo, Japan. 2026. Pp. 21-27. URL: <https://sci-conf.com.ua/xii-mizhnarodna-naukovo-praktichna-konferentsiya-science-technology-and-global-challenges-23-25-07-2026-tokio-yaponiya-arhiv/>.

Editor

Komarytskyy M.L.

Ph.D. in Economics, Associate Professor

Collection of scientific articles published is the scientific and practical publication, which contains scientific articles of students, graduate students, Candidates and Doctors of Sciences, research workers and practitioners from Europe, Ukraine and from neighbouring countries and beyond. The articles contain the study, reflecting the processes and changes in the structure of modern science. The collection of scientific articles is for students, postgraduate students, doctoral candidates, teachers, researchers, practitioners and people interested in the trends of modern science development.

e-mail: tokyo@sci-conf.com.ua

homepage: <https://sci-conf.com.ua>

©2026 Scientific Publishing Center “Sci-conf.com.ua” ®

©2026 CPN Publishing Group ®

©2026 Authors of the articles

11.	Кадуцькова Л. О. ЛЯЛЬКОТЕРАПІЯ ЯК ІНСТРУМЕНТ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ ДИФЕРЕНЦІЙОВАНОГО ТА ІНКЛЮЗИВНОГО НАВЧАННЯ, ЕМОЦІЙНОЇ СТАБІЛІЗАЦІЇ ТА МОВЛЕННЄВОЇ АКТИВІЗАЦІЇ УЧНІВ НА УРОКАХ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ В УМОВАХ НУШ	86
12.	Кужель В. В., Николук Н. П., Опалко К. С., Кужель Р. В. МОДЕЛЬ ДУАЛЬНОЇ ПІДГОТОВКИ МЕХАНІКІВ СІЛЬСЬКОГО ГОСПОДАРСТВА В СИСТЕМІ ФАХОВОЇ ПЕРЕДВИЩОЇ АГРАРНОЇ ОСВІТИ УКРАЇНИ	93
PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCES		
13.	Мамонтова Ю. Б., Ковчина І. М. АКТУАЛЬНІ ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЩОДО ВИНИКНЕННЯ ПОДРУЖНИХ КОНФЛІКТІВ	105
PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES		
14.	Cheremskа O. MAIN STAGES OF THE FORMATION OF THE KHARKIV PHILOLOGICAL SCHOOL (19th – FIRST THIRD OF THE 20th CENTURY)	111
15.	Ходарєва І. М. ДИСКУРСИВНЕ МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ В СИСТЕМІ ІНТЕНСИВНОГО НАВЧАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ ЯК ІНОЗЕМНОЇ	123
ECONOMIC SCIENCES		
16.	Кривонос Л. ПУБЛІЧНІ ЗАКУПІВЛІ ЯК СТРАТЕГІЧНИЙ ІНСТРУМЕНТ МАКРОЕКОНОМІЧНОГО РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ ТА МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ	134
17.	Леонідов І. Л. ІМПУЛЬС ЗРОСТАННЯ ОБСЯГІВ НАБУТОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОГО ПРОДУКТУ У ПОРІВНЯННЯХ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОГО РОЗВИТКУ КРАЇН ЄС	138
LEGAL SCIENCES		
18.	Koziar R. THE ROLE OF THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION IN ENSURING HUMAN RIGHTS IN UKRAINE DURING MARTIAL LAW	144

PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

UDC 801:930(477.54)"18/193"

MAIN STAGES OF THE FORMATION OF THE KHARKIV PHILOLOGICAL SCHOOL (19th – FIRST THIRD OF THE 20th CENTURY)

Cheremska Olha

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Full Professor
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics
Kharkiv, Ukraine

Abstract. The article presents a retrospective analysis of the activities of the Kharkiv Philological School from the 19th to the first third of the 20th century. Four distinct stages of philological research have been identified: the first stage (syncretic researches) spanning the 1810s–1820s; the second stage (comparative-historical researches) covering the 1830s–1850s; the third stage (psycholinguistic researches or the Potebnian stage) encompassing the 1860s–1890s; and the fourth stage (standardization of the Ukrainian literary language) during the first third of the 20th century.

Key words: linguistic historiography, Kharkiv Philological School, stages of formation, comparative-historical scientific paradigm, systemic-structural paradigm.

The problem of the formation and development of the Kharkiv Philological School (KhPS) in Ukrainian linguistic historiography, the influence of O. O. Potebnia's ideas as the leader and inspiration of this school, and the significance of the scientific legacy of his students and followers in advancing historical-philological, Ukrainian, and linguistic studies in the 19th and 1920s–1930s remain highly relevant today. Scientific studies dedicated to the KPS have identified the dominant traits uniting representatives of the Kharkiv linguistic tradition and their

academic achievements (L. Lysychenko, T. Lysychenko, M. Kocherhan, L. Shevchenko, V. Franchuk). They have also presented the results of analyzing this tradition through the study of its founder, O. Potebnia, and the galaxy of scholars who pursued his research directions to analyze their heritage (M. Zhovtobriukh, S. Vakulenko, S. Yermolenko, O. Muromtseva, I. Muromtsev, V. Nimchuk, Yu. Shevelov, H. Udovychenko). Furthermore, attempts have been made to trace the characteristic features of linguistic thought in Kharkiv (I. Bilodid, F. Batsevych, V. Hlushchenko, T. Lukinova, O. Horbach, Yu. Tymoshenko, B. Kobylanskyi, I. Kovalyk). However, issues concerning the constitution of domestic research schools, the determination of their significance in global linguistics, and the periodization of academic centers remain largely overlooked by Ukrainian linguists.

In the first half of the 19th century, Kharkiv University, founded in 1804, became the center of scientific research and the focal point of Ukrainian cultural life. The university environment brought together cultural forces, uniting all literary and publishing activities. This period marked the beginning of folkloristic studies and drew attention to the Ukrainian language. Replacing the nearly lost bookish Baroque and scholastic culture of the 16th–18th centuries came a new one, "which seeks a foundation in folk culture and language <...>. And its first centers emerged in Left-Bank Ukraine, particularly in Slobozhanshchyna, and gravitated toward the newly opened (1805) Kharkiv University, which <...> became one of the hearths of Ukrainian cultural rebirth" [1, p. 80].

The first generation of Kharkiv philology professors was represented by broadly educated scholars "who stood at the level of European science. Academician Ivan Ryzhsky, professors Ivan Sreznevsky, Ivan Kroneberg, Vasyl Maslovych, Yevhraf Filomafitsky, and Oleksandr Sklabovsky were philologists with deep and versatile knowledge: they knew classical and modern languages, history, philosophy, art theory, rhetoric, and other sciences" [2, p. 480]. University teaching took place within adjacent disciplines, primarily the history of literature (*istoriia slovesnosti*). Due to these factors, historiographical knowledge and the historiographical method became an integral part of university education in the first third of the 19th century.

The romantic movement, which permeated all spheres of culture and science, including philology, became a significant factor in invigorating intellectual activity at Kharkiv University. According to linguists, from the time of O. Pavlovskyi's grammar until the early 20th century, the Ukrainian language developed precisely under the influence of Romanticism: "The Romantic idea of language as a manifestation of the nation's essence, alongside the linguistic and literary concept of Ukrainian national and cultural rebirth, became one of the leading slogans of the entire Ukrainian cultural and political movement" [3, pp. 8–9].

While prior to the emergence of the Romantic school, Kharkiv publications were Russian-language (with only rare Ukrainian fragments in literary works), the activities of Romantic poets (Iz. Sreznevskyi, I. Rozkovshenko, F. and O. Yevetskyi, O. Korsun, O. Shpyhotskyi) led to a series of publications printing artistic works as well as studies in history, ethnography, folkloristics, and Slavic studies in Ukrainian. Notably, the second book of *Utrennyaya Zvezda* (The Morning Star, 1833) was the first Ukrainian-language publication to feature Ukrainian prose (works by H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko).

The Kharkiv School of Romantics, represented by two circles – the first formed in the 1820s around Iz. Sreznevskyi (and joined by L. Borovykovskyi and O. Shpyhotskyi); the second operating in the mid-1830s, also led by Iz. Sreznevskyi, including A. Metlynskyi, M. Kostomarov, O. Korsun, M. Petrenko, S. Pysarevskyi, and others – initiated the publication of ethnographic collections. The collections *Ukrainskyi Almanakh* (Ukrainian Almanac, 1831) and *Zaporozhskaya Starina* (Zaporozhian Antiquity, 1833–1838) became landmark publications for these circles.

Articles and research studies by representatives of the Kharkiv School of Romantics proved the ancient origins of the Ukrainian language and its high artistic potential (Iz. Sreznevskyi, M. Kostomarov, A. Metlynskyi). An important confirmation of this was the release of numerous almanacs in the Ukrainian language, notably *Snip* (The Sheaf / Ukrainian New Year Book), *Lastivka* (The Swallow), *Molodyk* (The Young Moon), and *Yuzhny Russky Sbornik* (Southern Russian Collection). These publications, established on the initiative of Kharkiv University

faculty, gained widespread popularity. Their coverage of sources on Ukrainian history, literary history, and linguistics, alongside the scholars' ethnographic findings, significantly contributed to establishing the theoretical and methodological foundations of Ukrainian philology.

The pages of these publications featured works, free adaptations, and translations by Ukrainian writers: L. Borovykovskyi, M. Kostomarov, P. Korenytskyi, M. Pysarevska, M. Petrenko, H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko, I. Kotlyarevskyi, O. Bodyanskyi, T. Shevchenko, Ya. Shchoholev, V. Zabyla, O. Shakhovskiy and O. Afanasyev-Chuzhbynskyi. The genre diversity of the Romantic era demonstrated "the connections between the language of literature and the language of philosophy or folk songwriting, but by no means with spoken or administrative language. The latter two belonged to low genres until they reached their peak during the era of Realism – when literary language largely absorbed them, using them as a model. Under Romanticism, the literary language deposited entire layers of expressions and imagery into spoken language, while during the period of Realism, it also fulfilled a mediating role in disseminating innovations originating in spoken speech" [4, p. 152].

As publishing activities intensified, the issue of standardizing Ukrainian orthography came to the fore. The efforts and searches of O. Korsun, I. Betskyi, Iz. Sreznevskyi, A. Metlynskyi, and P. Hulak-Artemovskiy contributed to shaping Ukrainian spelling. The innovations established in the publications of the Kharkiv School of Romantics fostered the creation of the Slobozhanshchyna variant of Ukrainian orthography, the fundamental principle of which was the phonetic principle based on representing the pronunciation of sounds using letters of the Russian alphabet.

The active work of I. Sreznevskyi, M. Kostomarov, A. Metlynskyi, O. Korsun, I. Betskyi and H. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko resonated with the views of writers from central Ukraine (M. Maksymovych) and key figures of the Ukrainian revival (O. Bodyanskyi, Ye. Hrebinka). During the first half of the 19th century, the Ukrainian language made significant progress, advancing from the exercises of

"amateurs of the Little Russian word" to full-fledged literary works created in the vernacular and lexicographical studies [5].

The Kharkiv School of Romantics laid a solid foundation for the formation of the KhPS – the first scientific linguistic school in the Russian Empire, which "emerged on the territory of Ukraine, in Kharkiv, in the first half of the 19th century, and is associated with the names of Iz. Sreznevskyi and P. Lavrovskyi, and later with the latter's students – O. Potebnia and M. Kolosov. They studied the affinity of languages, particularly East Slavic ones, approached linguistic phenomena from historical perspectives, studied Slavic languages in their evolution, and analyzed vocabulary comprehensively within a broad cultural and historical context" [6, p. 100].

In the linguistic historiography of the formation and development of the KhPS, we distinguish four stages. The first stage – the 1810s–1820s – marked the inception of studies in classical philology and rhetoric, the establishment of traditions in teaching philological disciplines, and the founding of scientific and journalistic periodicals. The intensification of activities across various fields of science in the first half of the 19th century, driven by an awareness of the need for national self-determination, prompted the examination of historical sources of Ukrainian culture (folklore, ethnographic materials, historical monuments, and dialectological facts), as well as the analysis of questions regarding the origin of the Ukrainian people and their language. This line of research into the Ukrainian dialect stemmed from the dominant direction in linguistics of the first half of the 19th century – comparative-historical Slavic studies. The object of comparative-historical linguistics was related languages, establishing relationships among them and describing their evolution in space and time. The primary approach was the comparative-historical method, widely represented in comparative-historical grammars, which relied on phonetics and etymological dictionaries (lexicon). This period was marked by the works of German linguists F. Bopp (1791–1867), J. Grimm (1785–1863), and W. von Humboldt (1767–1835), as well as the Danish orientalist and comparativist R. Rask (1787–1832), which laid the foundations for the comparative-historical

method of language research.

The second stage – the 1830s–1850s – was characterized by the first dialectological studies, the examination of phonetic, lexical, and grammatical features of Slavic languages, the accumulation of ethnographic material, and the emergence of Ukrainian language studies marked by an ethnographic orientation. On this basis, in the 1840s, regional scientific schools of Slavic studies began to form – at Kharkiv University (Iz. Sreznevskiy) and the folklore and regional studies school at St. Volodymyr University in Kyiv (M. Maksymovych). At that time, these schools existed within the official academic and educational domain and belonged to provincial intellectual centers; however, they subsequently gained recognition among the Eastern European and Western European scholarly communities [7, pp. 15–17].

During this period, historicism became a defining feature of scientific thinking, and the comparative-historical method of research established itself firmly. As V. Hlushchenko emphasizes, it was the studies of the founders of the comparative-historical method that demonstrated "the application of the principle of historicism to linguistic phenomena. The chief achievement of linguistics as a science in the 1820s – 1860s was the understanding of language mutability. The idea of uneven development across linguistic elements of different levels emerged (Iz. Sreznevskiy, F.I. Buslayev)" [8, p. 9]. This period witnessed a transition from a descriptive-static approach to an historical-dynamic study of language. According to T. Lukinova, unlike the previous stage, linguistic facts "appeared in movement, in dynamics, capable of changing across space and time. A shift occurred from a pragmatic description of language – governed mainly by the practical tasks of reading and commenting on texts and school instruction – to an understanding of language as an independent object of scientific inquiry in all the complexity of the laws governing its existence and development" [9, p. 6]. Language ceased to be merely a tool for deciphering texts or a handbook for instruction. It became an independent, profound object of scientific inquiry, while linguistics transformed into a fully-fledged theoretical science that investigates the laws of language functioning and evolution.

The third stage – the 1860s–1890s – was marked by a general rise in theoretical

thinking, which stimulated the active development of linguistics (the formation of East Slavic linguosophy, psycholinguistics, semasiology, and the development of philology in the works of O. Potebnia). The KhPS established itself as an academic school with a distinct linguistic orientation.

The scientific developments of the third stage were driven by the emergence and subsequent interaction of various research schools, as well as the rapid advancement of experimental sciences. The era of German idealism in philosophy came to an end, giving way to positivism and empiricism. The philosophy of Hegel, Schelling, and Fichte as the "science of sciences" was superseded by "the experimental psychology of Theodor Fechner or the even earlier associative psychology of Johann Herbart. The latter became the theoretical framework of the 'Berlin School,' which served as Potebnia's primary theoretical foundation until his death" [10, p. 38].

The originality of the scholar O.O. Potebnia is rooted in a synthetic mode of thought, centered on a harmonious synthesis of philosopher and philologist – linguist, literary historian, researcher of folklore and mythology. Only a scholar with a broad range of linguistic interests (philosophy of language, syntax, morphology, phonetics, semasiology of Slavic languages, dialectology, comparative-historical grammar, the language of literary works, and the aesthetic function of language) could develop a theory of literature (slovesnist) encompassing poetics, literary history, ethnography, and folklore. The ideas of the psychological school articulated in the works of O. Potebnia gained active application, with Potebnianism becoming the guiding force [11]. Attention to the internal, psychological aspects of artistic creation, an approach to the literary work as an expression of the author's subjective experiences, and an interest in reader perception characterized the scholarship of that period. Key works included D. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky's *Theory of Prose and Poetry*; O. Shalyhin's *Theory of Literature and Chrestomathy and Supplementary Course in the Theory of Literature*; B. Lezin's *From O. O. Potebnia's Rough Notes on Myth* (1914), *Psychology of Poetic and Prosaic Thinking: (From the Lectures of O. O. Potebnia)* (1910), and *Artistic Creativity as a Special Form of the Economy of Thought* (1911);

as well as A. Hornfeld's *The Future of Art* (1910) and *Torments of the Word* (1911), among others.

At the beginning of the 20th century, amidst a period of social upheaval, the fourth stage began, lasting into the 1920s and 1930s. These processes provided an impetus for the development of culture, science, art, and consequently language, which serves as a reflection of this development. There arose a need to structure its internal organization and formal description, thereby interpreting language as a functional system. Ideas of structuralism – initiated by F. de Saussure and creatively developed by the linguists of the Prague Linguistic School – became relevant for Ukrainian linguistics. The influence of these ideas can be traced in the works of linguists O. Kurylo, M. Nakonechnyi, K. Nimchynov, O. Synyavskyi, S. Smerechynskyi and B. Tkachenko.

Linguistic structuralism is grounded in the principles of recognizing as true and fundamental reality not individual facts of a language, but language as a system, in which each element exists solely by virtue of its relationship to other elements within the system; the system is not composed of elements, but conversely defines them; the structure of the system is formed by timeless relations; relations within the system dominate over the elements; language is a system of a special type – a sign system that exists, on the one hand, objectively, outside human psychology, in interpersonal human communication, and on the other hand, exists within human psychology as well.

One of the key tasks of linguistics became the codification of the lexico-grammatical and stylistic resources of the language. Historical traditions and innovation in this domain of linguistics are to a large extent associated with the Kharkiv Linguistic School. The scholarly heritage of Kharkiv linguists has been examined in the works of Ukrainian and foreign scholars, including V. Akulenko, I. Bilodid, H. Bieder, S. Bevzenko, S. Vakulenko, V. Hlushchenko, A. Hryshchenko, S. Yermolenko, M. Zhovtobryukh, V. Kalashnyk, B. Kobylanskyi, I. Kovalyk, M. Kocherhan, L. Lysychenko, T. Lukinova, L. Masenko, F. Medvediev, M. Moser, O. Muromtseva, I. Muromtsev, V. Rusanivskyi, O. Taranenko, O. Tkachenko,

V. Franchuk, O. Cheremskaya, Y. Shevelov, Ye. Shyrokorad, H. Shkliarevskyi, O. Yurchenko and others.

The period of the 1920s–1930s was marked by the consolidation of the primary literary norms across all functional styles, taking into account the approaches of the Kharkiv linguistic tradition. Historically, this period was determined by the revival of Ukrainian statehood and the declaration of Ukraine's independence on January 22, 1918, which gave an impetus – in the words of I. Ohienko – to the development of an "integrated all-Ukrainian literary language." In its development, this language was directed "toward something new that did not exist before: toward sophistication and the Europeanization of both content and form" [12, p. 284]. Ukrainian linguists such as O. Kurylo, S. Smerechynskyi, M. Sulyma, K. Nimchynov, M. Hladkyi, O. Synyavskyi, V. Simovych, O. Izyumov, M. Yohansen, I. Ohienko, N. Solodkyi, B. Tkachenko, H. Sabaldyr and A. Krymskyi were called upon to carry out this task; through their scholarly views, they were affiliated with both the Kharkiv and Kyiv linguistic schools [13].

Issues regarding the history of linguistics in the 1920s and 1930s have been examined from various perspectives in the works of Ukrainian linguists (L. Bulakhovskyi, S. Bevzenko, P. Hrytsenko, A. Hryshchenko, M. Zhovtobryukh, O. Muromtseva, V. Nimchuk, P. Plyushch, L. Polyuha, I. Ohienko, O. Skopnenko, Y. Shevelov, O. Horbach, S. Yermolenko, V. Rusanivskyi, O. Taranenko). The main focuses of the KhPS and Ukrainian linguistics during the period from 1917 to the early 1930s were the active investigation of Ukrainian phonetics, grammar, history, and dialectology, a "pronounced practical orientation of linguistic science," and the creation of a literary standard for the Ukrainian language [14, pp. 21–27]. Two underlying concepts – the ethnographic (bringing the literary language closer to the vernacular) and the moderate (incorporating foreign elements) – were to a large extent grounded in the ideas of Ye. Budde and Ch. Bally regarding the distinction between language and speech (*langue* and *parole*), as well as the views of the Prague School of Structuralism.

However, while the period from 1917 to the early 1930s was characterized by

active research into the phonetics, grammar, history, and dialectology of the Ukrainian language, as well as a pronounced practical orientation in linguistics, the subsequent period (1930s–1940s) was marked by an assault on Ukrainization and the repressive policy of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) – CPSU, leading to the curtailment of theoretical studies and the suspension of practical work along these lines [15, p. 648]. Scientific research became politically determined.

Thus, the KPS was one of the central hubs for the development of linguistics in the second half of the 19th and the first third of the 20th centuries, although its foundations were laid much earlier — during the initial years of Kharkiv University's existence, when scholars demonstrated a broad approach to philological questions and fostered the growth of applied linguistics, often with the same individual acting as both a professor-theoretician, a linguist, and a poet. University instructors of poetics and aesthetics such as Iz. Sreznevskyi, Ye. Filomafitskyi, P. Hulak-Artemovskyi, M. Kostomarov, and A. Metlynskyi were simultaneously versifiers, inspiring their listeners toward individual creative endeavor.

In the linguistic historiography of the formation and development of the KhPS, we distinguish four distinct stages: the first stage of syncretic studies (1810s–1820s) marked the initiation of research in classical philology, rhetoric, and literary disciplines (slovesnist); the second stage of comparative-historical studies (1830s–1850s) saw the emergence of the first dialectological investigations, studies into the phonetic, lexical, and grammatical features of Slavic languages (including comparative analyses), and the accumulation of ethnographic materials; the third stage — that of psycholinguistic studies (1860s–1890s) – represented the Potebnian period, distinguished by the introduction and consolidation of the psychological school in linguistics and literary studies; and the fourth stage – the period of the standardization of the Ukrainian literary language (the first third of the 20th century) – was characterized by a systemic-structural approach to the analysis of linguistic data. While the first three periods reflect the evolution of the genetic (comparative-historical) scientific paradigm in 19th-century Ukrainian linguistics, the fourth represents the taxonomic (systemic-structural) paradigm. A defining feature of

the KhPS throughout the 19th and the first third of the 20th centuries was its involvement in the development of linguistics in other Slavic nations, which was shaped by historical circumstances. Comparative studies of Slavic languages contributed to defining the place and role of the Ukrainian language within the broader European context.

REFERENCES

1. Дзюба І. Тарас Шевченко. Життя і творчість. Київ: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2008. 718 с.
2. Назаренко В.Ю. До питання про витoki Харківської філологічної школи. *Вісник Харківського національного університету. Серія Філологія.* № 491. Харків: Видавництво ХНУ ім. В.Н. Каразіна, 2000. С. 489–491.
3. Шевельов Ю. Покоління двадцятих в українському мовознавстві. Портрети українських мовознавців. Київ: Вид. дім «КМ Академія», 2002. 132 с.
4. Шевельов Ю. Олександр Потебня як мовознавець. *Збірник Харківського історико-філологічного товариства.* Харків, 2014. Т. 15. С. 295–304.
5. Черемська О.С. Лексикографія Харківської філологічної школи періоду українського романтизму. *Лінгвістичні дослідження.* Вип. 48. Харків, 2018. С. 316–322.
6. Лукінова Т.Б. З історії порівняльно-історичних студій в Україні (до шістдесятиріччя лінгвістичної дискусії). *Мовознавство.* № 2–3. 2010. С. 98–112.
7. Пасько І. Наукові школи в українському «провінційному» й «столичному» вимірі. Культурологічний аспект. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Сер.: Культурологія.* Вип. 3. 2008. С. 14-24.
8. Глущенко В.А. Принципи порівняльно-історичного дослідження в українському і російському мовознавстві (70-і рр. ХІХ ст. – 20-ті рр. ХХ ст.): автореф. дис... д-ра філол. наук. Київ, 1998. 32 с.
9. Лукінова Т.Б. Нариси з історії славістики в Україні. Київ, 2018. 760 с.
10. Фізер І. Естетична теорія Олександра Потебні: дериват «Берлінської

школи» чи концептуальне переосмислення її основних тверджень? До 100-ліття з дня смерті О. Потебні 1835 – 1891. *Сучасність*. Ч. 12. 1991. С. 37–45.

11. Черемська О.С. Про «потебніанство», «потебніанців» і «неопотебніанців». *Культура слова*. Вип. 89. Київ, 2018. С. 177–188.

12. Огієнко І. (Митрополит Іларіон). Історія української літературної мови / упорядн. М.С. Тимошик. 2-ге вид., випр. Київ, 2004. 436 с.

13. Черемська О. Харківська та Київська лінгвістичні школи 20–30 рр. XX ст.: два підходи до формування літературного стандарту української мови з погляду Юрія Шевельова. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. V (34). Issue: 124. 2017. С. 19–22.

14. Черемська О.С. Харківська філологічна школа в історії українського мовознавства 20–30-х рр. XX ст.: автореф. дис... д-ра філол. наук. Київ, 2021. 39 с.

15. Українська мова: Енциклопедія. Київ: Українська енциклопедія ім. М.П. Бажана, 2000. 752 с.