

UDC 930(477)“19/20”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253738

Oksana FRAIT

PhD hab. (Art History), Associate Professor of Musicology and Piano Department, Institute of Musikal Art of Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franro Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (oksana_frajt@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6903-7096

Natalia SYNKEVYCH

PhD (Art History), Associate Professor of the Department of Methodology of Music Education and Conducting, Institute of Musik Art of Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, postal code 82100 Ukraine (synkewych@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9576-2387

Оксана ФРАЙТ

доктор мистецтвознавства, доцент кафедри музикознавства та фортепіано Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (oksana_frajt@ukr.net)

Наталія СИНКЕВИЧ

кандидат мистецтвознавства, доцент кафедри методики музичного виховання і диригування Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (synkewych@ukr.net)

**STAGES OF UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN CULTURAL
AND SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXTS
OF THE XXth – THE BEGINNING OF THE XXIst CENTURY
(review of the monograph “Cultural Space of Ukrainian Historiography
in the Light of Sovietization and Socio-Cultural Transformations
of the XXth – the Beginning of the XXIst century”. O. Udod and O. Yas)**

**ЕТАПИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ У КУЛЬТУРНОМУ
ТА СУСПІЛЬНО-ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ КОНТЕКСТАХ ХХ – ПОЧАТКУ ХХІ ст.
(рецензія на монографію “Культурний простір української історіографії
у світлі радянзації та соціокультурних трансформацій ХХ – початку ХХІ ст.”
О. Удода та О. Яся)**

The formation stages of historical science (historiography) are currently developing on the basic principles formed with the acquisition of the state status of Ukraine in 1991. A vast source base and an objective approach are the leading aspects. The Ukrainian history of the twentieth century also provides rich comparative methodological opportunities to elucidate historiographical priorities not only in the brief outbreak of the state building and

various occupations, power structures, but also in regional and territorial coordinates and chronological comparisons with diaspora science.

The monograph of Oleksandr Udod and Oleksiy Yas consists of two chapters, each of which is supplemented by documents and materials, general names, subject and geographical indexes. In the Preface there is formulated the general idea of the book “On the Transformations of the Cultural Space of Ukrainian Historiography in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Era” (p. 7). There is given the definition of the concept of “a cultural space of historiography” as a peculiar, dynamic and relative combination of internalist and externalist factors, components, circumstances and preconditions that developed in a certain temporal perspective or during a specific period in the history of historiography” (p. 9). The activists-heroes of the cultural space, who created, mastered and at the same time adapted to it, are mentioned (pp. 8–9). However, it should be noted that there were many activists (at least M. Lysenko and I. Franko) who created the cultural space contrary to the prevailing doctrines, went beyond existing boundaries, paving new paths in culture and science. Due to historical and political reasons, the division of the Ukrainian territories between empires contributed to the differentiation of regional cultural features, which continued to be noted and taken into account in a socio-humanitarian discourse, including historiography.

O. Yas is the author of Chapter I “The Ukrainian Soviet Historiography: Cultural Territories, Spatial and Regional Configuration”. In Subchapter 1.1 “The Ukrainian Historiography on the Cultural Landscape of the Habsburg and Romanov Empires” there are analyzed the pre-Soviet achievements of the Ukrainian researchers – both Austrian and Russian subjects. Nevertheless, more attention is paid to the historians of the Romanov empire, in particular, the author of Chapter I elucidated the functioning of the following two basic organizational forms: 1) associations of researchers for historical studies of local environments; 2) creation of institutions of an archeographic and archival direction (societies at universities, other higher schools, archival commissions, etc.). On the examples of M. Hrushevsky’s employment at Lviv University, where he held the position of a head of “The Second Ordinary Department of World History” and failures at St. Volodymyr University in Kyiv it was concluded that the situation was radically different for the Ukrainian historians and other scholars in the two empires (on the other hand, I. Franko, as it is well known, failed at becoming a professor at Lviv University). Many scholars, without indication as the Ukrainians, took an active part in the development of Russian “imperial science”, because, according to statistics, there were 71 societies by 1917. In 1906, in Kyiv the Ukrainian Scientific Society (USC) was founded with various departments (leading positions were occupied by History, including the study of “History of Art”, History of Literature, History of Law, etc.) (p. 23). There was also emphasized the leading role of M. Hrushevsky in the reorganization of the Lviv NTSh.

But especially fruitful and encouraging sprouts of a national scientific growth gave the next period, when there was “formation of the national cultural space in the light of the revolutionary transformations of 1917–1921 and the metamorphosis of the post-revolutionary decade” (Subchapter 1.2.). From the excerpts of explanatory notes of well-known Ukrainian figures and scholars to the draft laws on the establishment of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, later, due to the integration tendency of All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, there is support for the national consciousness of people, raising the level of its culture and education. An institutional network was developed “to study the history of Ukraine from the perspective of different socio-cultural dimensions, territorial and spatial segments and state and political scale” (p. 26). However, the unstable socio-political reality slowed down widespread plans

to establish the National Library, National Archives, commissions, departments and other institutions to ensure “a full development of the Ukrainian past” (ibid.), district studies and publications.

Subchapter 1.3 “Total Sovietization as a Socio-Cultural Basis and Traumatic Component of the Ukrainian Cultural Field Formation of the 1930s – the Beginning of the 1950s” begins with a shocking quote-marking of prominent Ukrainian historians as hostile elements, “fascists” and “national democrats”. Careful analysis of documents and materials illustrates the Soviet scientific realities truly, which were based on manipulations of the mass consciousness, distortions of obvious facts and repressive mechanisms, and were dictated by the party apparatus. The Ukrainian national past disappeared as such, and scholars had to focus on the history of factories, coal-minings, and enterprises against the background of “great socialist transformations” (p. 46). This meant that academic science, according to O. Yas, “mastered ideological schemes and algorithms for the production and development of “new knowledge”, in particular, the basis of the institutional network became “Histparty” – the centers of historical and party science” (p. 48).

From 1939, at the beginning of World War II, the discourse of “reunification of the Ukrainian lands in a single Soviet state” was born and developed, in fact, as the author noted, it was nothing more than the annexation of the western Ukrainian lands of the USSR (p. 52), which inspired the transformation of the entire cultural landscape. There are mentioned the ways of involving Galician historians into the course of ideological reorientation of the scientific sphere, reorganization of departments and institutional study of the common history of the USSR for all nations. Meanwhile, during the years of the German occupation of Galicia, there was probably a change (though short-lived) in the outlined vectors of the Soviet historiography in the regional environment (as happened at that time, for example, in Musicology, Art History, Literary Studies, and etc., however, it is not mentioned in this Chapter as well as about the same period (though shorter) in central Ukraine. On Page 54 there is V. Petrov’s description of the psychological state of the Ukrainian artists, writers and scholars evacuated or exiled to Ufa, but the range of activities of this extraordinary personality is narrowed: a famous scholar (writer, archaeologist, ethnographer, folklorist), a teacher and the Soviet spy, he was also a prominent figure in the OUN.

Subchapter 1.4 “Liberalization of the End of the 1950s – the 1960s and its Collapse in the Cultural Sphere of the Ukrainian Soviet Historiography” focuses on the period of the party and ideological pressure weakening on culture and science and its gradual intensification. The author convincingly presented the notable results of “the Khrushchev thaw” or “the Shelest era”. The greatest achievements were recorded in the publishing industry – including “The Ukrainian Historical Journal” and professional scientific collections to multi-volume publications. Although their scientific value was not homogeneous, they became good reasons for further historiographical research.

In Subchapter 1.5 “The Era of Cultural Stagnation in Terms of Institutional Life of the 1970s – the 1980s” there is elucidated the impossibility of the development of the Ukrainian historical science, as well as historiography under the conditions of “stagnation” of the Brezhnev’s period. This is explained by various factors, including self-restraint inspired by censorship and repression: “a centralized and vertical model of knowledge policy prevailed, which imposed a passive and inertial algorithm of thinking, aimed at the “eternal” expectation of instructions and guidelines of the party leadership” (p. 77). It is rightly noted that the fall of “the Chinese wall” in the cultural sphere before the collapse of the Soviet Union, during

the years of “perestroika”, and the “parade of sovereignties” caused by it, as we know, made a powerful wave of free creativity in art, literature and science.

In Chapter II “The Ukrainian Historiography of the Post-Soviet Era: Spatial and Regional Dimensions and Environments” its author, Olexander Udod, analyzed the principles of functioning of this scientific field in terms of the state sovereignty and its entry into a new level of world standards. First of all, there is stated the reorientation of historical research to the cultural space – history as a factor of culture, due to which the term “socio-cultural history” was introduced (p. 171), and, taking into consideration the content of the book, the term “socio-cultural space” should be used in its very title. On the other hand, culture is also a factor of history. This can be seen in the example of “Excerpt from the Explanatory Note of D. I. BaHaliy, A. Yu. Krymsky ... to the Commission for the Draft Law on the Organization of the Historical and Philosophical Department of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences [August 10, 1918]”, in which it is written that the history of the Ukrainian people “now covers not only its actual events, but also all pages of its historical life and, in general, the archeology of the region, and historical geography with ethnography, and the history of culture, church, art” (p. 84).

O. Udod called the strengthening of the role of regional research the innovation of modern historiography, singling out regionalism as one of the important subdisciplines. All these aspects were also planned and developed by M. Hrushevsky, it is mentioned about it in Chapter I – hence, the current process is rather a restoration and enrichment of the ideas of M. Hrushevsky and other prominent Ukrainian historians of the past.

In five Subchapters, O. Udod raised other numerous issues and problems, including changes in the object, functions, methodology of modern historical science and the very vision of national history, internal and external factors of its progress. Some of these issues and questions are answered in detail, while the others are challenges that need to be solved. It is fair and natural for the current stage that “the history of a country (nation) is no longer imagined outside the world context, without comparison with other types of historical development, without determining the place of one’s own country in world history” (p. 174). We can agree to the thesis about the difficulty of being a researcher in the near future (and hence, the need for a vision from the point of a longer retrospective), and with observations about the competition between science and mythmaking, about the emergence of “historical culture”, about the danger of instrumentalization of history for political purposes, etc. There are important considerations about the ambiguity of interpretive discourses of history, when one should avoid both the presentation of the Ukrainian martyrology itself and the omission of little-known important victories. In addition to cultivating pride of military victories, one should “show achievements in the intellectual and cultural sphere” (p. 172).

At the same time, the author showed his commitment to controversial interpretations of some “painful points” of the Ukrainian historical existence. This concerns, for example, such narratives as the Pereyaslavskaya Rada, which allowed Russia “to incorporate” Ukraine (there is no unanimity in the qualification of this event among scholars, because the agreement was not observed by the Russians) and make, according to O. Subtelny, “a giant step forward on the path to becoming a great power” (Subtelny, 1992, p. 125), while for centuries Ukraine remained in Russia’s shadow to the world (A. Kappeler); “victimization” of the historical memory of the Ukrainians about the Holodomor (every ordinary and normal nation that survived this horror would honor the victims and demand compensation, especially after its recognition as genocide); participation of the Ukrainians in the Holocaust (the fact of hiding and saving the Jews by the Ukrainians is omitted in the monograph), and this can be contrasted with the

participation of the Jews in repressive Soviet bodies. As for the cultural factor of history, it is necessary to emphasize the need for public memory of “the Shot Renaissance” of the 1930s, as a result of which the Ukrainian literature suffered numerous irreparable losses, suffered severe moral and psychological consequences. A tragic fate befell a large number of composers: in particular, B. Kudryk was deported to Siberia on completely unfounded charges (he died there), V. Barvinsky, who was innocently convicted of allegedly giving information on L. Munzer, a Jew, during the German occupation. V. Barvinsky was the director of M. Lysenko Lviv State Conservatory and had previously employed L. Munzer, J. Kofler, S. Barbag, and under pressure signed a “sentence for his work: “I allow the destruction of my manuscripts”” (Pavlyshyn, 1998, p. 8) and spent 10 years in the camps of Mordovia. Both the knowledge of these and other national cultural and historical tragedies and the analysis of their causes do not contradict the truth of the belief of O. Udod, that “the Ukrainian historical science confidently assimilates the best methodological examples of European historiography, in which a critical approach to history, evaluation of historical themes and plots from the point of view of universal principles of humanism has long been asserted” (p. 188).

If in Chapter I there is written about the contribution of diaspora historians to national historiography, their importance in debunking the Soviet myths (p. 80) and other merits (as evidenced by the article by O. Dombrovsky), in Chapter II it is rightly noted about the artificial division into diaspora and mainland science among modern historians. This division follows from the understanding of the spatial environment of the Ukrainian historiography as a cultural space of the whole segment of historical science (pp. 173–174). After all, we must strive for the unity of this environment and the humanities in general in Ukraine and the diaspora, having common goals and objectives, especially taking into consideration new occupation threats from Russia.

On Page 186 we come across a technical inaccuracy in referring to V. Lyzanchuk’s textbook, namely the discrepancy in the title of the text (“Genocide, Ethnocide, Linguicide of the Ukrainian Science: Chronicle”) and in the footnote (“Genocide, Ethnocide, Linguistic of the Ukrainian Nation: Chronicle”), while in the list of literature this position is absent.

In the Afterword to the book there are summarized the stages in the development of the Ukrainian historiography and there are outlined the prospects for research practices and strategies dictated by globalization, digitalization and virtualization of our time. The monograph is of value not only from the scientific and professional point of view, but also from the point of view of educational and editorial processes. Its multifacetedness organically fits into the colorful dynamics of the epistemological and ontological picture of the world of the XXIst century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pavlyshyn, S. (1998). *Vasyl Barvinskyi ta ukrainskamuzychnakultura* [Vasyl Barvinskyi and Ukrainian Music Culture]. *Vasyl Barvinskyi ta ukrainska muzychna kultura: statyi ta materialy* (O. Smoliak, Comp.). (pp. 5–9). Ternopil’. [in Ukrainian]

Subtelnyi, O. (1992). *Ukraina. Istoriia*. [Ukraine. History]. (Yu. Shevchuk, Trans.). (2nd ed.). Kyiv: Lybid’, 512 p. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received November 06, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 23/02/2022.*