

UDC 304(477)“18”
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.26.275206

Mykhailo MATKOVSKIY

PhD (Philosophy), Associate Professor of the Department of General Pedagogy and Pedagogy of Higher Education, Ivan Franko Lviv National University, 1 Universytetska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (Matkovskiy2017r@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-5846-4719

Volodymyra FEDYNA-DARMOKHVAL

PhD (Education), Associate Professor of the Department of General Pedagogy and Pedagogy of Higher Education, Ivan Franko Lviv National University, 1 Universytetska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79000 (wolodymyra@yahoo.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-8663-0390

Михайло МАТКОВСЬКИЙ

кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри загальної педагогіки та педагогіки вищої школи Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Університетська 1, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (matkovskiy2017r@gmail.com)

Володимира ФЕДИНА-ДАРМОХВАЛ

кандидатка педагогічних наук, доцентка кафедри загальної педагогіки та педагогіки вищої школи Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Університетська 1, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79000 (wolodymyra@yahoo.com)

FEATURES OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL AND NATIONAL CREATIVE PROCESSES OF THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE DURING THE PERIOD OF THE 19th – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURIES (review of the monograph: The Long 19th Century: Resistance to Assimilation. Kyiv: Tempora, 2022, 840 p.)

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СОЦІО-КУЛЬТУРНИХ ТА НАЦІО-ТВОРЧИХ ПРОЦЕСІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО НАРОДУ В ПЕРІОД ХІХ – ПОЧАТКУ ХХ СТОЛІТЬ (рецензія на монографію: Довге ХІХ століття: спротив асиміляції. Київ: Темпора, 2022, 840 с.)

Throughout recent history, the Ukrainian people were subjected to a strong assimilation pressure. It was especially noticeable in the 19th century, when the Ukrainian lands were divided between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires. In spite, the period from the end of the 18th to the beginning of the 20th went down in history of Ukrainian historiography as “The Ukrainian 19th century”. Ivan Lysiak Rudnytskyi, a prominent scholar historian of the Western Ukrainian diaspora, introduced this concept to the scientific circulation of his time (1919 – 1984).

It should be mentioned that significant progress was observed in the study of this difficult period of the Ukrainian history during the years of the Ukrainian independence. The reasons for this are quite natural, since this historical period of time became quite productive in the

context of ideas development and processes of the Ukrainian nation-building, as well as the ideological and organizational preparation for its implementation. If you look at the events, which are happening in Ukraine now, the rethinking of the “The Ukrainian 19th century” is extremely crucial also for the reason that diverse parallels can be drawn in its processes, events and numerous lessons can be found for nowadays.

However, despite great collective scientific achievements of domestic historians modern generation, doing research on “the long 19th century” will continue to remain on the agenda of historiographical discourse.

The monograph “The Long 19th Century: Resistance to Assimilation”, written by Yuriy Tereshchenko is a study that allows a comprehensive look at the main aspects of the historical development of the Ukrainian people at the time. Socio-political system, economy, culture are key aspects of the research. The social and political movements process coverage in Greater Ukraine and Galicia plays an important role in the study. The monograph also substantiates the reasons why the national state tradition did not become dominant in society, but gave way to the populist concepts of national development.

In the “Long Century” Ukrainian historiography outlines three periods of the national revival: noble-gentleman (1780 – the 1840s); narodnytskyi (1840 – the 1880s); modernist (from the 1880s). In his scientific research, Yuriy Tereshchenko analysed these three periods in many aspects. The monograph “The Long 19th Century: Resistance to Assimilation” consists of 6 chapters, each chapter with separate subsections. All of them are logical, consistent and complement each other.

In Chapter “Entering the Empire”, the author analysed the socio-political transformations that took place in the historical Ukrainian lands at the beginning of the 19th century. The scholar considered the influence of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires separately. The main characteristic is that it had both commonalities and discrepancies, in particular in the policy of assimilation.

The Ukrainians faced an extremely important question – will the Ukrainian people survive as a nation at that time. The threat from the Russian Empire was particularly acute. Having annexed the Ukrainian lands, Russia set itself such a task immediately, which was not inherent to any colonial empire in the world. If the French or the British in their colonies built schools, hospitals, communication routes, and developed the economy, the Russian Empire tried to absorb the Ukrainian people, Russify them, destroy the national and cultural identity and erase historical memory, defeat any sprouts of the Ukrainian state-building ideas. At the same time, all possible methods were used, starting from the Ukrainian books ban to mass genocide.

There were many pitfalls, Yuriy Tereshchenko argued that one of them was “deep-rooted contradictions between both peoples, caused by significant differences in their material and spiritual culture, worldview”. Despite the fact that the Russian Empire tried to represent itself as an European state constantly and demonstratively, in its deep sense it was wild Asia. Ukraine strengthened its connection with the Western world step by step. As an example, we cite the founding of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium, which for a long time connected the Ukrainian society with the Western world.

The Russian Empire saw the greatest threat in the implementation of its plans in the aristocratic class, which also included the Cossack elders, the clergy, and the intelligentsia. They were the key outpost of the Ukrainianism and state ideas from the beginning. We agree with the author that the Russian “reformers” sought, at any cost, to sever the ties between

the Ukrainian elite and people at that time. Because it was they, who laid the foundation for the cultural and political revival of the Ukrainian nation.

The Muscovites had fear of the Hetman system in Ukraine the most. Catherine II repeated to her officials the following: “When the Hetmans disappear in Malorossiya, everything must be done to erase them and their era from memory”. Yu. Tereshchenko argued that the liquidation of the Hetmanship was the most important step leading to absorption of the Ukrainian national organism. In the end, they managed to eliminate all manifestations of the Ukrainian self-government, but the Cossack-elderly class did not lose its national identity and continued public and political activity in various forms in the interests of Ukraine.

The Tsarist government resorted to all possible methods, starting from physical destruction of the Ukrainian elite, ending with giving them equal rights with the Russian nobility in order to overcome particularism in the Ukrainian society. They also managed to arrange marriages with the Russian nobility representatives. A vivid example was Hetman Ivan Briukhovetsky, who married the Russian Kniazhna (Princess) Daria Dolgorukova. Unfortunately, to a large extent, it was possible to do this. A significant part of the Ukrainian nobility turned into the Russian nobility, however, it should be noted, it was not massive or irreversible. We agree with Yu. Tereshchenko that the Russian-Ukrainian marriages did not always produce the assimilation effect that the Russian autocracy hoped for. Numerous Ukrainian aristocratic families continued to cherish the national and cultural tradition. It should also be noted that a significant part of the Cossacks did not receive noble status, having formed into a separate estate. They often acted as a detonator of opposition to the Russian imperial system.

The process of spreading ideas about the hostility of the Ukrainian elite to the people was also extremely negative. The division of the Ukrainian nation into pany (lords) and commoners was a well-thought-out step of the imperial propaganda, which was aimed at disuniting the Ukrainian nation and suppressing nation-building processes. Unfortunately, such an idea took root in the circle of many participants of “communities” and many other socio-cultural associations.

An important role in the assimilation process was assigned to the theft of history from the Ukrainians. It is known that starting from the 17th century the Muscovites renamed themselves as Russia. The purpose of such a step was to call themselves the heirs of Kyivan Rus. It became clear to the “reformer” Petro I that in order to “Europeanize” his empire, to represent it in the world as a “great power”, it is vital to have a powerful cultural and historical background connected with the Western world. The lack of their own important cultural and historical achievements led them to theft. Undoubtedly, it is better to call themselves the heirs of Kievan Rus than the heirs of the Golden Horde, who they really were.

In the subsection “The Echoes of European Social and Political Processes in Ukraine at the End of the 18th and the Beginning of the 19th Centuries” Yu. Tereshchenko analysed the impact of the Great French Revolution on social and political consciousness in Ukraine. It was due to the Revolution, the author argued, which gave impetus to the National Liberation Struggles of many peoples of Europe, who did not have their own statehood. Revolutionary France also showed great interest in opposition movements in Ukraine. The French were aware of the danger of “the policy of Russia annexation”. One of the options for overcoming this threat was considered the division of the Russian Empire with the creation of “an eastern barrier”, in which Ukraine would play an important role. Understanding the influence of Russia’s assimilative policy in the annexed Ukrainian lands, the French considered sending their agents there to explain to the population the true essence of the Russian rule. Moissonur

noted that France would deliver the last decisive blow, from which this predatory state would never be able to recover, because the only sore point of the Russian Empire was Ukraine. Unfortunately, Napoleon's plans for Ukraine were not communicated to the Ukrainian society and were not implemented in practice. The Russian government manipulated the mood of the Ukrainian elite skilfully, in particular by making a false promise to them about the possibility of restoring the socio-political status of the Hetmanship as a reward for the Ukrainians for their active participation in hostilities. The Ukrainian opposition was scattered and paralyzed by similar actions on the part of the Russian Empire. We assume that if the Ukrainian elite supported Napoleon militarily, the implementation of this idea would have a chance for success.

In Subsection "The Strengthening of Russian Imperial Pressure in Ukraine. The Beginnings of the National and Cultural Awakening and Shift in the Ukrainian Movement of the 1930s and 1950s" there is described the time that became a turning point in the change of the Ukrainians' worldview. The Ukrainian society, in particular, clearly realized its separateness from the Russian society, and illusions about the Russian Empire were dispelled. As a proof, the author cites the words of the German geographer and traveller Johann Georg Kohl, who wrote the following words after travelling across Ukraine: "the hostility of the people of Malorossiia to Great Russia is so strong that it can simply be called national hatred, and this feeling strengthened rather than weakened during the 17th century, when the country was seized by the Muscovite Empire".

The imperial pressure intensified even more and took on a more organized form during the reign of Tsar Mykola I. The main instrument became "His Imperial Majesty's own chancellery", which received more powers and responsibilities. Its key purpose was to monitor any manifestations of dissent. In spite of this, the sharp and critical reception of the Russian imperialism in Ukraine did not weaken. We agree with Yu. Tereshchenko that the imperial unification press only deepened the alienation between the Ukrainian and the Russian society.

Despite all assimilation efforts, the Ukrainian National Movement persisted and grew stronger. Many factors contributed to this, including the revival of the romantic style in literature. A number of Ukrainian writers embarked on the path of establishing the Ukrainian language, and also in their work turned to the subject of those artistic images, which in their content were close to the broad classes. As Yu. Tereshchenko proved, "The Ukrainian romantic poets prepared the ground on which the poetic creativity of the genius of Ukrainian spirituality, Taras Shevchenko, grew". T. Shevchenko's social and political activities and creativity played an exceptional role in the National Educational Movement of Ukraine. Despite the diverse remarks T. Shevchenko had about the Ukrainian aristocracy, the thinker was aware of its importance and role in the Liberation Struggle. According to Yu. Tereshchenko, later representatives of the populist movement did not understand this unfortunately.

The scholar proved that strong relationship, which existed between the Ukrainian peasantry and the nobility, was based on a distinct socio-cultural background and was historically conditioned. The closeness and kinship of both societies was in everything, language, customs, traditions, everyday life, land ownership.

In Chapter "Under the Habsburgs Scepter" Yu. Tereshchenko analysed the historical period of the western Ukrainian lands under the rule of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Special focus was on transformational processes in society, the so-called transition from "splebeized ethnicity to a modern nation".

The Ukrainian society in Galicia, and in the Russian Empire, waged a difficult struggle against the assimilationist influence. The process of polonization was especially noticeable. The Greek Catholic Church played a decisive role in this resistance. It was in its environment that the national elite was formed, which not only gave an impetus to the national and cultural revival of Galicia, but also became its guide. The tsar (imperial) government did not interfere with this process particularly. A crucial and positive factor was the Greek-Catholic Metropolis establishment in 1808, which helped to elevate the Greek-Catholic Church and spread its authority. It should be noted that in addition to the spiritual pastoral care, the clergy formed a moral obligation to spread among the people secular science, self-organization, the latest economic methods, etc. It strengthened closer ties with all strata of the Ukrainian population. It also contributed to the improvement of the educational and moral and spiritual level of the Ukrainian society, the introduction of European values. The church occupied a certain socio-political niche that was reserved for aristocratic circles previously.

Galician noble families no longer had the influence they had had before, but their role in the processes of preservation and national spiritual revival was significant. As a traditional bearer of conservative tendencies, the nobility preserved family traditions, historical memory, followed the Eastern rite, which prevented the assimilation.

Many representatives of the nobility took the priestly path and formed entire priestly families. These were the Sheptytskys, the Verbytskys, the Bachynskys, and other families. Their presence in the highest circles of society, as well as connection with common people as the clergymen, made it possible to defend and develop the Ukrainian idea at all levels. The Sheptytskys family deserves special attention. Their contribution to the revival and development of the Ukrainian society was colossal and has echoes to this day. Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky and his brother the Blessed Holy Martyr Klymentiy Casymyr Sheptytsky were the moral authorities of that time and remain an example for the present.

In Chapter “Break of Centuries. Bourgeois Ukraine” Yu. Tereshchenko returned us to great Ukraine, which was enslaved by the Russian Empire. The author analysed the social and political movements and processes that took place in the second half of the 19th century in Ukraine, in other words, the maturation of the Ukrainian nation.

The period of the 60s – 70s was marked by complex social transformation processes that covered the entire Russian Empire. Their root causes were the rapid industrial development of Europe and the internal Russian crisis. One of the ways out of the crisis, the tsarist government saw in the strengthening of foreign policy expansion. However, the government suffered a series of military defeats that pushed Russia back in its geopolitical ambitions. As a result, it further exacerbated the internal political problems. Tsar Oleksandr II understood the importance of reforms that were long overdue. Yu. Tereshchenko proved that their key goal became the strengthening of the Russian autocracy, the strengthening of bureaucratic centralism with the aim of keeping the enslaved peoples in subjection and depriving them of any nation-building prospects. However, despite all efforts, the national revival processes were already taking place in the Ukrainian society. Numerous factors contributed to this. The peasant uprising, which went down in history under the name “Kyiv Cossacks” in particular. The tsarist government had a fervent desire to create a military reserve, with the beginning of the Crimean War and issued a manifesto calling on all states to form a military militia, and it happened so. However, it acquired a completely different hue, which was hoped for. The memory of the Cossacks, the desire to break away from the tyranny, oppression, filled this movement with the content that was not expected in Moscow. The main idea was the

resistance to the empire, not its defense. The growth of the uprising was hindered only by the lack of weapons among the Ukrainians, so it was quickly suppressed. There were about three thousand such uprisings throughout Ukraine.

Despite the fact that the “bourgeois reforms” of tsarist Russia were not aimed at defending the rights and freedoms of ordinary people, they launched processes and social transformations that had very positive consequences of a socio-political, cultural, educational and economic nature. If at the beginning the Ukrainian socio-political movement covered relatively few people, mainly the intelligentsia, then later it acquired a mass character, gaining great potential. At the beginning of the 20th century, it resulted in liberation competitions, which unfortunately failed.

The Tsar government saw the Ukrainian movement as a threat to itself, and resorted to various forms of countermeasures, including repression and government bans. The Ukrainian society resisted the assimilation pressure, but for a long time there were many visions of the prospects of the Ukrainian statehood. However, the created national and cultural potential became a good basis for the National Liberation Struggle at the beginning of the 20th century.

We agree with Yu. Tereshenko that the Ukrainian historical aristocracy played an important role. During the 19th century, the aristocratic class went through a complex process of the national awakening on both sides of the Zbruch. It is complicated to imagine the process of national revival at that time without such surnames as Sapiha, Sheptytsky, Skoropadsky, Tarnovsky and many others. The Ukrainian nobility took an active part in the nation-building process and stimulated it. The social relations of “the lordship and the peasantry” were not unambiguous, but without a path to dialogue and reconciliation, without overcoming alienation from each other, there was no “long Ukrainian century”.

In Chapter “The Elements of the Austro-Hungarian Empire”, Yu. Tereshchenko analysed the events and socio-political processes that occurred at the end of the 19th century on the territory of Western Ukraine. This period was marked by the development of numerous Ukrainian socio-political currents that had different ideologies. At the same time, the National Movements of other peoples, particularly the Poles, who sought to restore their statehood, also intensified. Due to the strengthening of the Polish pressure, the movement for rapprochement with Russia also grew.

At the beginning of the 60s of the 19th century, two key currents emerged in the Ukrainian socio-political movement of western Ukraine. These were the Narodovtsi and the Starorusyni (Old Ruthenians), an offshoot of which became the Muscophilism. The development of Ukrainian education was in the centre of the Narodovtsi attention. That is why, the “Prosvita” society was founded in 1868, which played an extremely important role in a social and political life. Yu. Tereshchenko proved that “Prosvita” made a great contribution to the process of relations normalization between the Ukrainian and the Polish social movements and occupied an important place in the state structures of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Also, “Prosvita” became an important factor in the rise of national consciousness among the Ukrainians, the strengthening of statist ideas and the foundations of the Ukrainian movement. It should be added that the funding of “Prosvita” was largely financed by the Ukrainian aristocracy, in particular V. Fedorovych.

At the end of the 19th century, the Galician intelligentsia was established as a leader in the social and political life of the Ukrainians. The clergy continued to play an important role in society, in particular in the formation and direction of the secular world.

The final chapter of the research is “Waiting for a New Age”, in which the author analysed the socio-political evolution of the Ukrainian movement at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries.

At that time, a new generation of participants entered the arena, which was clearly aware of the inadequacy of the previous methods of social activity in the context of the restoration of the Ukrainians’ public rights, as well as the right to choose their future independently. The departure from the priority of social problems to national ones was especially vital. National tasks began to dominate the social and political movement. M. Mikhnovskiy, D. Dontsov, V. Lypynskiy, etc., were a big credit. V. Lypynskiy, in particular, was one of the first to realize the important role of the national elite in the National Liberation Movement. At the same time, he defended the need to preserve their corporate interests.

Over the course of a long century, the Ukrainian nobility passed difficult tests. After all, it was against them, as the main bearers of national state traditions, that the greatest assimilation influence and pressure was applied. Yu. Tereshchenko stated that Lypynskiy’s opinions contributed to the ideological and organizational strengthening and strengthening of the Ukrainian conservatism positions in the National Liberation Movement.

The process of Ukrainian nation-building went a long and difficult way. It was in the Ukrainian 19th century that, in a certain sense, an intellectual turn to rethinking the national ideological foundation, self-identity and social consciousness took place. At that time, the national and cultural revival acquired a nationwide sound. The key problem of this historical period was overcoming difficulties on the way to the maturation of the Ukrainian issue, formulation of tasks and goals of the National Liberation Movement.

World War I involved millions of the Ukrainians in a brutal protracted conflict, with great sacrifices and suffering for the Ukrainian people. But it must be also recognized that it created certain opportunities for statesmanship competitions, which, unfortunately, did not materialize, but significantly served for a deep rethinking and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation and confirmed the need for the National Liberation of the Ukrainian people.

Finally, we should note that the monograph is a complete, relevant, innovative work in its concept. The author possesses the technique of scientific and analytical knowledge at a high level. The presentation style is clear and concise. Its reading opens the curtain and sheds light on many complex issues of the “long Ukrainian century”. We believe that the monograph “The Long 19th Century: Resistance to Assimilation” will be interesting and useful not only for scholars, teachers, students, but also for everyone who is interested in the historical past of Ukraine.

From the point of view of modern history of Ukraine, the considered past era is very crucial, because in the past events, processes and phenomena, human life experience, you can find a lot of lessons for the present. The historical lessons of that era are extremely interesting and should be studied in detail.

*The article was received September 07, 2022.
Article recommended for publishing 22/02/2023.*