

UDC 930(477):304(477)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292927

Oleksandr BONDARENKO

PhD hab. (History), Professor of Department of History, Archeology, Informational and Archival Affairs, Central Ukrainian National Technical University, 8 Prospekt Universytetskyi, Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine, postal code 25006 (o.v.bondarenko.un@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0001-8582-513X
Researcher ID: ABD-2888-2020

Anatoliy KOTSUR

PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Department of Ethnology and Local History, faculty of History of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 60 Volodymyrska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01033 (kotsurap@meta.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0002-7015-8052
Researcher ID: B-8484-2019

Олександр БОНДАРЕНКО

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри історії, археології, інформаційної та архівної справи Центральноукраїнського національного технічного університету, пр. Університетський, 8, м. Кропивницький, Україна, індекс 25006 (o.v.bondarenko.un@gmail.com)

Анатолій КОЦУР

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри етнології та краєзнавства історичного факультету Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, вул. Володимирська, 60, м. Київ, Україна, індекс 01033 (kotsurap@meta.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Bondarenko, O. & Kotsur, A. (2023). Theoretical and Methodological Principles of Studying Everyday History: Contemporary Ukrainian Historiographic Discourse. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 29, 235–247. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.29.292927

**THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES
OF STUDYING EVERYDAY HISTORY: CONTEMPORARY
UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHIC DISCOURSE**

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to analyse the state of development of the main theoretical and methodological foundations of the history study of an everyday life in modern Ukrainian historiography, to determine their problems and further prospects for analysis. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, systematicity, objectivity along with the use of general scientific methods – analysis, synthesis, abstraction and generalization; historiographical – specifically historiographical analysis and synthesis; historical – comparative and historical, chronological and typological. The scientific novelty consists in the fact that the article is the first attempt at historiographical reflection on the theoretical and methodological foundations of the history study of an everyday life in modern Ukrainian historical science. The Conclusion. Over the past decades, in modern Ukrainian historiography, there has been a significant increase in research interest*

in the history of an everyday life and everyday life as a theoretical and methodological concept, which has been formed into a stable scientific direction. This process is evidenced by the scientific work on the history of an everyday life at both factual, theoretical, methodological, and conceptual levels. A whole series of thorough concrete historical, theoretical and methodological studies and source researches have been done. Their characteristic feature is a significant predominance of concrete and historical research papers (both in number and subject matter) over theoretical and methodological (conceptual) studies. Another characteristic feature of research papers is a certain conceptual and categorical, conceptual uncertainty of an everyday history, the vagueness of its boundaries and relationships with other directions of anthropologically oriented history. An important feature of modern historiography on the problem raised is, in addition, national peculiarities regarding the clarification of the subject and methodology of an everyday history, which are determined by the level and state of the general development of national historiography, the presence of scientific traditions and schools, and the degree of general development of society. Despite a considerable number of scientific publications, still not all theoretical and methodological foundations of an everyday history have been solved. In particular, this concerns the definition of the very concept of “everyday”, its object and subject. Even nowadays, these issues are at the stage of formation, having not found their solution either in Western or in modern Ukrainian historiography. In general, the outlined issue is quite complex and requires further research, first of all, it is important to develop tools, systematize approaches, principles and methods of determining one’s own subject field of an everyday life.

Key words: everyday history, theoretical and methodological principles of research, the concept of “everyday”, Ukrainian historical science, modern historiographical discourse.

ТЕОРЕТИКО-МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ІСТОРІЇ ПОВСЯКДЕННЯ: СУЧАСНИЙ ВІТЧИЗНЯНИЙ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНИЙ ДИСКУРС

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* полягає в аналізі стану розроблення основних теоретико-методологічних засад дослідження історії повсякдення у сучасній українській історіографії, визначенні їхньої проблематики та подальших перспектив вивчення. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, об’єктивності поряд із використанням загальнонаукових – аналізу, синтезу, абстрагування та узагальнення; історіографічних – конкретно-історіографічного аналізу та синтезу; історичних – порівняльно-історичного, хронологічного та типологічного. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що стаття є першою спробою історіографічної рефлексії щодо теоретико-методологічних засад дослідження історії повсякдення у сучасній вітчизняній історичній науці. **Висновки.** З’ясовано, що за останні десятиліття в сучасній вітчизняній історіографії відбулося суттєве зростання дослідницького зацікавлення до історії повсякдення і до повсякденності як теоретико-методологічного концепту, яке переросло у сталий науковий напрям. Про це свідчить науковий доробок з історії повсякдення як фактографічного, так і теоретико-методологічного і концептуального рівнів. Підготовлено цілу низку ґрунтовних конкретно-історичних і теоретико-методологічних досліджень й джерелознавчих праць. Встановлено, що їхньою характерною рисою є суттєве переважання конкретно-історичних праць (і за кількістю, і тематикою) над теоретико-методологічними (концептуальними). Ще однією характерною рисою наукових праць є певна понятійно-категоріальна та концептуальна невизначеність історії повсякдення, нечіткість її меж і взаємозв’язків з іншими напрямками антропологічно спрямованої історії. Важливою рисою сучасної історіографії з порушеної проблеми є, крім того, національні особливості щодо з’ясування предмета та методології історії повсякдення, що визначаються рівнем і станом загального розвитку національної історіографії, наявністю наукових традицій та шкіл, ступенем загального розвитку суспільства. Зазначено, що, попри чималу кількість наукових публікацій, ще й досі далеко не всі теоретико-методологічні засади історії повсякдення знайшли розв’язання. Зокрема, це стосується визначення самого поняття “повсякдення”, його об’єкта та предмета. Ці питання й сьогодні перебувають на стадії становлення, не знайшовши свого розв’язання ні в західній, ні в сучасній вітчизняній історіографії. Загалом порушена проблема достатньо складна та потребує дальшого дослідження, насамперед актуальним

є напрацювання інструментарію, систематизації підходів, принципів і методів визначення власного предметного поля повсякденності.

Ключові слова: *історія повсякдення, теоретико-методологічні засади дослідження, поняття “повсякдення”, вітчизняна історична наука, сучасний історіографічний дискурс.*

The Problem Statement. A significant feature of modern Ukrainian historical science is a significant expansion and enrichment of a problematic circle of historical research. After all, the concepts and approaches that prevailed in the Soviet historiography did not and could not provide answers to many key questions in the history of a social development. Primarily, the absence of answers was caused by the historiographical tradition, which was oriented to the priority of the state in the historical process and did not imply a chief focus on ordinary people. The issue of an average person was elucidated fragmentarily, as it was recognized as insignificant and trivial, therefore it was considered as an appendix to a real story.

In modern Ukrainian historiography, there is a process of a constant search for the newest directions of research, one of which is the history of an everyday life. Scholars have come to understand the need to reflect not only events, processes, phenomena as such and to study the biographies of outstanding figures, but also to study an average person: his/her life style, needs, worries, interests, thoughts, feelings. The study of an everyday life of people contributes to the rethinking of stereotypes, trivial, banal schemes of the history of society, as a result of which a new assessment of what is already known appears. As the famous German historian A. Liudtke claimed, everyday history is “an attempt to understand history as a multi-layered process that is reproduced and primarily transformed by those who are both the objects of history and its subjects” (Liudtke, 1999, p. 99).

Unlike the scholars of previous periods, modern scholars consider the history of an everyday life not in isolation from important events, political, economic, and social factors, but primarily as a sphere that not only reflects the main historical processes, but also directly affects the course of history. The appearance of an everyday history is primarily caused by a new understanding of it, the course of which is determined not only by economic laws, political events, prominent personalities, but also by the unremarkable course of an everyday life of ordinary people.

The Analysis of Recent Research Papers and Publications. The issue of an everyday life found a certain reflection in the studies of the imperial period. However, the authors of that time did research on the issue of a daily life, the way of life of the population in a fragmented way, focusing mainly on the description of the privileged classes life.

In the Soviet historiography there are researches on socio-economic processes and issues of a class struggle, that is why, an everyday history did not arouse the interest of scholars.

With the restoration of Ukraine’s independence, there is an increase in scientific interest in the history of an everyday life, in particular, in the theoretical and methodological foundations.

Nowadays, this issue occupies a proper place in the research papers, becoming the study subject of many Ukrainian scholars. In particular, the history of an everyday life as a methodological problem and the historiographical and source-scientific issues of its research were analysed by O. Udod, a well-known Ukrainian scholar (Udod, 2002, 2004, 2010a, 2010b). Theoretical and methodological issues of an everyday life, the meaning of the concepts “everyday life”, “history of an everyday life” were analysed by O. Koliastruk, one of the first female researchers of the history of an everyday life in modern domestic historiography

(Koliastruk, 2008, 2009, 2012). The views of scholars on the history of an everyday life and the theoretical foundations of the history of an everyday life were elucidated by V. Holovko (Holovko, 2007, 2009). M. Zinchuk did research on the history of an everyday life as a new direction in the domestic humanities studies (Zinchuk, 2010). Methodological issues of the history of an everyday life and everyday life as a conceptual category of historical research were highlighted by T. Nahaiko (Nahaiko, 2010, 2012). In modern historiography the definition of the concept of “everyday” was analysed by P. Lesnycha (Lesnycha, 2015). The problem of the definition and subject of the concept of “everyday” was analysed by V. Alkov at the local level (Alkov, 2014).

The research papers of the Ukrainian scholars: V. Alkov (Alkov, 2012), O. Bondarenko (Bondarenko, 2021a, 2021b, 2022), O. Vilshanska (Vilshanska, 2011), V. Ilnytskyi (Ilnytskyi, 2015), V. Ilnytskyi and M. Haliv (Ilnytskyi & Haliv, 2019), V. Ilnytskyi and N. Kantor (Ilnytskyi & Kantor, 2018, 2019), M. Haliv and L. Homych (Haliv & Homych, 2017), O. Koliastruk (Koliastruk, 2010), P. Lesnycha (Lesnycha, 2019), S. Orlyk and V. Orlyk (Orlyk & Orlyk 2019), S. Orlyk and A. Mekheda (Orlyk & Mekheda, 2020), S. Orlyk and V. Pavlenko (Orlyk & Pavlenko, 2023), S. Orlyk, H. Palchevich and M. Orlyk (Orlyk, Palchevich & Orlyk, 2021), O. Shportun and V. Orlyk (Shportun & Orlyk, 2021) focus on the study of an everyday life of the Ukrainian society different strata in certain chronological and regional locations.

The Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine launched a series of monographs under a general title “From the History of an Everyday Life in Ukraine”. In the first of them – “Essays of an Everyday Life in Soviet Ukraine during the NEP period (1921 – 1928)” there is summarized the history of an everyday life of the Ukrainian society during the period of a new economic policy (*Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia*, 2009; 2010). More than a dozen monographs of this series were published over twelve years. Such essays are extremely necessary to expand the palette of generalizing researches of a synthetic nature.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the development of the main theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of the history of an everyday life in modern Ukrainian historiography, to determine their problems and further prospects for study.

The Results of the Research. An everyday history as a new direction of research into the past is one of the components of a historical and anthropological turn in Western humanitarianism that took place in the 1960s as a result of the collapse of great ideas and the destruction of all old explanatory concepts of the historical process.

A steady scientific interest of Ukrainian scholars in the history of an everyday life can be traced back to 2000. Using the achievements of European and world historiography, domestic scholars outline their own approaches to the general theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of an everyday history.

An everyday history is a complex and multifaceted problem. The level of development of this or that scientific problem, the degree of its solution and the determination of prospects for further scientific research depend on the depth and fundamentality of theoretical, methodological, conceptual foundations and a conceptual categorical apparatus. Because of that, the study of the problem we have declared involves, first of all, the definition of the content and essence of its basic categories.

O. Udod, O. Koliastruk, V. Holovko, T. Zabolotna, T. Nahaiko and the others analysed the general state of research into the theoretical and methodological aspects of an everyday history and its problems.

O. Udod was one of the first to address these issues, noting that in modern Ukrainian historiography, the study of theoretical and methodological problems of an everyday history becomes more and more common and is characterized by the growth of methodological, factographic and source studies levels (Udod, 2010a, pp. 6–7). The relevance of an everyday history, in his opinion, consists in the need to solve two methodological scientific “super objectives”: firstly, to overcome a significant lag behind Ukrainian historical science from foreign ones, and, secondly, to use available experience of our own historiography, in particular, the beginning of the 19th century 20th century in relation to the humanities issue, which nowadays resonates with the methodology of an everyday history (Udod, 2010b, p. 18).

A similar general analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of an everyday history is contained in the publications of O. Koliastruk, who singled out the most significant features of its current state. According to the scholar, an everyday history, first of all, became a separate object of a scientific study, overcoming at the same time the complex of inferiority. Secondly, the author considers the history of an everyday life not only as an empirical, but also as theoretical problem, which has its own methodological approaches and appropriate scientific tools for research, which contributes not only to reconstruction, but also to the construction of certain conceptual models within which an everyday life is filled with specific things, situations and events. Thirdly, an everyday history, according to O. Koliastruk, involves “multidisciplinary borrowings in its methodology and tools, putting an end to the “enclave” of a highly specialized history, promoting integration processes in historical science as a whole. In this way, the history of an everyday life provided a chance to overcome the habit of historians to broad theoretical generalizations, in which asynchrony, social contradictions, and heterogeneity of the world picture were eliminated (Koliastruk, 2009, pp. 21–22).

T. Zabolotna formulated the most significant problems faced by modern domestic humanitarianism on the way to the study of the history of an everyday life: the lack of a clear and unambiguous definition of the concept of “an everyday life”, the vagueness of the subject of research, the limitation of methodological tools; skepticism of the older generation of scholars regarding social history; a frequent confusion about the elementary descriptiveness of individual authors, sometimes due to the lack of a suitable source base or due to the insufficient theoretical training of young scholars, etc. (Zabolotna, 2010, pp. 38–39). However, according to the scholar, these difficulties are temporary in nature, since understanding and clear awareness of their causes helps to overcome these difficulties and to use the opportunities of an everyday history to study a multifaceted human existence in different historical eras (Zabolotna, 2010, p. 42).

O. Udod also emphasizes the problems in the study of an everyday history, rightly noting that despite the recognition of an everyday history in Ukraine, the reduction of skepticism about its self-sufficiency and institutional independence, there are still ongoing discussions about the objectivity or non-objectivity and relativism of this new direction of historical research. The controversy continues regarding the sources of the history of an everyday life and its scientific and documentary support. The author explains this situation with a number of reasons: “methodological crisis; lagging behind the development of European scientific and methodological culture; prejudiced attitude towards non-traditional sources (personal origin, oral sources, visual, literary, etc.)” (Udod, 2010a, p. 8).

I. Piatnytskova analyzed scientific publications focused, in her words, on “one of the most promising and relevant directions of modern Ukrainian historical science”, which enables a

comprehensive study of the Ukrainian society at various stages of development, updating such important aspects as the peculiarities of an everyday life and everyday practices, a collective and personal identity, worldview, deviant behaviour and social anomalies. The author came to the correct conclusion that the history of an everyday life, its theoretical and methodological foundations are one of the important directions of scientific research in modern Ukrainian historiography (Piatnytskova, 2017, pp. 78–80).

An important aspect of the theoretical and methodological foundations of an everyday history is the definition of the object and subject of research. Nowadays, the problem of an everyday history is becoming not only popular, but also gaining scientific independence, as it strives for a comprehensive reproduction of history. Historians of an everyday life, like historians in their pure form, outline a human history as the object of their scientific study, although for the latter, event history is key – state, political, diplomatic, class, military, etc., on the other hand, its everyday, secondary details and personal factors are beyond the focus. An everyday history has a distinctly integrative character, which is why its interest includes an everyday life, and the impact of various events on people's everyday life, and private life, and stereotypes, and mentalities, and case studies. O. Udod, for example, claims that the object of an everyday history “is a person himself in his relations with the surrounding world” (Udod, 2004, p. 287). Since various aspects of a human existence are studied, in addition, by other social sciences, an everyday history uses their work and methods, therefore it is a “complex, integral science” that covers the entire multiplicity of people's social relations: economic, political, public, ethnic, cultural, family, legal, etc. (Udod, 2004, p. 287).

O. Koliastruk formulated her vision of the history of an everyday life as an object of a scientific study, pointing out, in particular, the reasons for its problematic nature. Firstly, according to the scholar, the research period of this phenomenon is quite short. Secondly, an everyday life is difficult to formalize, since it does not have permanent institutions and mechanisms of expression. After all, the everyday is a wide range of connections, objects and phenomena, which are extremely difficult to single out and define accordingly. Thirdly, an everyday life does not have stable temporal and spatial characteristics. Fourthly, an everyday life is among the interests of other scientific disciplines, each of which sets different tasks in the study of an everyday life. Fifthly, an analytical process complicates the commonness of an everyday life, the obviousness of its rules and norms for all members of society (Koliastruk, 2010, pp. 10–11).

When considering the issue of the subject of an everyday history, O. Udod emphasized that the constant connections of an everyday sphere of life with the others make it impossible to characterize clear boundaries of the subject of study. In addition, the scholar noted that it is not advisable to strive for certain limits in the field of an everyday research. In his opinion, the subject of an everyday history is “first of all, the process of humanizing an everyday life, the psychologization of an everyday life, the attitude of a person to everyday problems, to the government, the state and society as a whole through the prism of a personal reception of living conditions” (Udod, 2010b, p. 20). The history of an everyday life, emphasizes O. Udod, is quite multifaceted, its subject should not be regulated or limited, as it needs various sources. The scholar warns that scientific works should not be a “collective salt shaker” or a factual collection, it is necessary “to adhere to the classical principles of objectivity, comprehensiveness and historicism in the processing of sources from the history of an everyday life, which will make it possible to achieve the maximum reliability of scientific results and the reliability and validity of conclusions” (Udod, 2010b, p. 34).

A similar position is followed by V. Holovko, claiming that an everyday history does not have clear boundaries and methodological principles. The scholar is convinced that in domestic historiography “an everyday life has not yet emerged as a certain methodological direction of research ... in fact, talk of greater ambitions, complex generalizations, etc., is just beginning” (Holovko, 2007, p. 98).

Analyzing the scientific literature on the history of an everyday life, V. Holovko emphasized that “not only do researchers have great problems with defining the subject of this direction, it is quite difficult for them to outline its boundaries. There is the situation in this case – as many researchers, as many judgments – in the worst understanding of this thesis” (Holovko, 2009, p. 59). Reflecting on historiographic analysis of the history of an everyday life, the scholar singled out the views of researchers regarding the subject and limits of an everyday life, noting that some historians try to expand the limits of an everyday history as much as possible and present it as an alternative to history as such. Some scholars reduce it to microhistory, as a description of unique aspects of the past. The others – only to a certain extent see the unity between everyday history and micro-history. In addition, according to V. Holovko, the problem of the relationship between the history of an everyday life and the history of a private life, the history of an everyday life, the history of the bottom and the history of the lower social classes is unsolved. This inconsistency is further strengthened when the supporters of the mentioned areas try “to form their research identity based on the history of an everyday life” (Holovko, 2009, p. 59).

The subject of an everyday history, according to V. Alkov, “is the life of a person and his self-understanding in a certain chronotope” (Alkov, 2014, p. 100). The researcher notes that in the case of the history of an everyday life, it is not advisable to use the dichotomy “right-wrong”, but it is only necessary to state the variety of approaches to its definition, since in the majority of cases historiography is not even about the definition, but “about its image, which cannot be defined unambiguously and comprehensive” (Alkov, 2014, pp. 100).

An important component of a scientific research is the definition of key concepts, because the conceptual and categorical apparatus of any science must be clear, precise, understandable and devoid of ambiguity, different interpretations, etc. This is especially relevant for the study of socio-historical phenomena and processes. It is because of this that, in the context of the study of the discussed topic, the theoretical and conceptual clarification, definition and understanding of such a basic concept as “an everyday life” is of a prominent importance. Many Ukrainian researchers did research on this problem. After all, the need for a scientific definition of the concept of “an everyday life” caused a wide debate among researchers.

O. Udod, for example, noted that in modern historical science, the process of institutionalization of everyday history in the methodology of history has not yet been completed, therefore “the boundaries of the subject of research continue to be blurred, there is no clarity regarding the delineation of the circle of those sciences that can have interdisciplinary connections with the history of an everyday life” (Udod, 2010b, p. 23). Despite this, the scholar is convinced that the use of such a relevant approach in modern methodology, which is everyday history, will contribute to the faster withdrawal of historical science from the state of a prolonged methodological crisis, will make it possible to “turn history into an interesting, truly humanistic discipline” (Udod, 2004, pp. 289–290).

The absence of a clear definition of the concept of “everyday”, the vagueness of the subject of research, the lack of development of methodological tools, etc. is also pointed out by O. Koliastruk. The scholar claims that there is still no clear definition of an everyday life, as

its subject seems self-evident. That is why, the majority of authors who study the history of an everyday life, without explaining the subject of their research, equate it with “ordinary everyday life, a way / way of life, with what people usually do, with everyday life, with private life, neophilic / non-public sphere of being, etc., i.e. it is about different aspects of a person’s “life world” (Koliastruk, 2009, pp. 8–9). Because of that, O. Koliastruk emphasizes that “one of the problems in the “scientific territory” of everyday life is the definition itself”. An everyday life, the scholar notes, is “life as a whole, all the realities of life, this everyday, natural environment, the actual “now” and “here” existence of a person, which includes the entire spectrum of his personal choices”. It is a man, with his diverse needs and interests, that is the key point in understanding the history and culture of an everyday life (Koliastruk, 2009, p. 8).

The analysis of publications on clarification, definition and understanding of the concept of “an everyday life” allowed T. Nahaiko to come to a fully justified, in our opinion, conclusion that “to find a single concrete definition that would absorb the entire essence of this concept is a too difficult task, if at all possible” (Nahaiko, 2012, p. 9). In addition, in the opinion of the author, an attempt to define the everyday as an exclusively historical, philosophical, sociological or cultural category will certainly face rejection by some representatives of the humanitarian trade. At the same time, the scholar emphasizes, during the study of everyday history, it is important to take into account the whole set of evaluations about it – from abstract to concretely applied, which have a certain methodological validity in various disciplines. For T. Nahaiko, it is obvious that an everyday life as a field of scientific research is seen in different ways. In reality, the subject of everyday history is so limitless that “even the considerable number of attempts at theoretical understanding and presentation of one’s own research visions, which is available today in historiography, appears to be only a positive trend in the understanding of this, by all dimensions global, topic” (Nahaiko, 2012, p. 9). In the end, the author claims that the theoretical postulates and his reasoning are outlined, which are related to an attempt to understand an everyday life as an applied field of historical research, “do not exhaust the stated topic, rather on the contrary, they only call on scholars to try their hand at the training ground of existing interpretations” (Nahaiko, 2012, p. 9).

In general, the same position is followed by V. Alkov, who believes that the most adequate definition of the concept of “an everyday life” at the local level is “a continuous interaction between the subject-spatial environment and the local population, aimed at satisfying material and spiritual needs, reality in the interpretation of direct participants” (Alkov, 2014, p. 100). He disagreed with the opinion of V. Holovko regarding the fact that “in Ukraine, unlike the West, there is still no dialogue about the framework of an everyday life and its definition”, explaining this by the author’s desire to give more significance to his works. In reality, says V. Alkov, “the discussion exists and is a relatively large-scale” (Alkov, 2014, p. 98). In our opinion, there is no controversy in this case, because during the period between the publications of the articles by V. Holovko (2007) and V. Alkov (2014), a substantial layer of publications appeared, in which the authors focused on the definition of the concept of an “everyday” and defining its subject.

T. Zabolotna emphasizes that scholars from different countries and scientific schools have been trying for several decades to clarify the essence and definition of the concept of “an everyday life” and to determine the subject of its research for several decades. These searches, in her opinion, were long-term and controversial, as some scholars restricted an everyday life to the concept of “mode of life” (Zabolotna, 2010, p. 39). However, the researcher emphasizes that, in contrast to an everyday life – a defining category in ethnology, the everyday historian

strives to establish the impact of random events on a private, everyday life and reproduce the diversity of individual reactions to the course of certain political events, analyzing the changing life of a person with his everyday everyday worries, and not isolated elements of material or spiritual culture that were created by this person. Modern domestic researchers of everyday history often equate it with anthropology, social history, new cultural history, microhistory, etc. Therefore, T. Zabolotna quite rightly claims that these modern directions of historical research, although they have certain dissimilarities, are united by their analysis of the microcosm of an average person with all its nuances. What they have in common, according to the scholar, “is the focus on local objects with their reorientation to the social practice of people, the application of interpretive analysis to the phenomena of the past” (Zabolotna, 2010, p. 39).

The issue of history are everyday, according to O. Vilshanska, one of the first domestic researchers of an urban everyday life in Ukraine at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, contains a whole range of objects, phenomena and connections, which are sometimes difficult to differentiate according to their significance and classify because “the very concept of “an everyday life” is multifaceted and multi-layered, it covers various aspects and different levels of a human life” (Vilshanska, 2010, p. 87).

In modern historiography P. Lesnycha analysed the problem of defining an everyday life, according to whom it is obvious that there is still no unified approach to the definition of this concept. She is convinced that this is exactly what motivates researcher of an everyday life to a creative search and enrichment of domestic and world historiography with qualitatively new studies not only on the methodology of history, but also on historical research in general. The author notes that “the history of an everyday life as a direction of historical science has already firmly established itself in the circle of scientific interests of modern scholars, and in Ukraine a significant number of leading scholars are engaged in the theoretical and methodological development of the specified issue” (Lesnycha, 2015, pp. 155–156). According to P. Lesnycha, there is no universally accepted definition of the concept of “an everyday life” as a subject of a historical study, which is why scholars who do research on the content of this concept “try to generalize the whole set of questions that would reflect the essence of an everyday life of an average person as fully as possible. Common to the majority of theoretical developments is consideration of a mode of life as the basis of an everyday life” (Lesnycha, 2015, p. 155). The researcher conventionally divided all definitions of everydayness into three groups: the everyday as the opposite of festivity; an everyday life as an organic unity of a mode of life and mental attributes; the definition of the everyday through psychological and mental characteristics of a person (Lesnycha, 2015, p. 155).

O. Koliastruk drew attention to the important moment of the conceptual foundations formation of everyday history, emphasizing that the methodological foundations of the everyday studies school in domestic historical science were formed owing to the evolutionary progress of Ukrainian historiography and as a result of scientific contacts with advanced European historical and sociological thought. Therefore, the emergence of this direction should not be interpreted as the result of exporting or, in this process, the catch-up trend of modern Ukrainian historical science (Koliastruk, 2012, p. 6). The researcher connects the growth of scientific interest in history of everyday with a specific feature of the general democratization of Ukrainian society, which “requires the objectification of the subjects of history, the recognition of their active participation not only in the creation of history, but also in its understanding and awareness” (Koliastruk, 2012, p. 8). Since history of everyday, according to the scholar, is intended to demonstrate that the course of history depends not

only on the decisions of politicians, economic laws and the will of those in power, but also on the actions of ordinary people, on their understanding of economic laws, their reactions to political processes, etc. (Koliastruk, 2012, p. 8).

The Conclusion. Thus, in Western European historiography the anthropological turn in historical research of the second half of the 20th century caused the emergence of the so-called “new history” – a number of new directions in historical science, the focus centre of which is a person, his life and his inner world. One of these directions, in particular, is everyday history. The issues of everyday history contain a whole range of objects, phenomena, connections, which are sometimes difficult to divide according to their significance and tie into a certain coherent system. After all, the very concept of “an everyday life” is multi-layered and multi-faceted, covering various levels of a human life.

The analysis of the development state of the main theoretical and methodological issues of the history of an everyday life gives grounds for asserting that in recent decades there has been a significant increase in research interest in the history of an everyday life and in an everyday life as a theoretical and methodological concept, which has grown into a stable scientific direction. This growth is evidenced by the scientific papers on the history of an everyday life at both factual, theoretical and methodological, and conceptual levels. A whole series of thorough concrete historical, and theoretical and methodological studies and source studies have been written. The greatest contribution to the theoretical and methodological issues development of the study of the history of an everyday life, the clarification of its conceptual foundations, and the search of a clear definition of the very concept of “an everyday life”, without any doubt, were made by the works of well-known researchers O. Udod and O. Koliastruk. These issues were analysed by V. Holovko, T. Zabolotna, T. Nahaiko, V. Alkov, P. Lesnycha and the others.

It should be noted, that among scientific papers on the history of an everyday life, concrete historical researches (in terms of number and subject matter) significantly predominate over theoretical and methodological (conceptual) researches. Another characteristic feature of scientific papers is a certain conceptual and categorical, and conceptual uncertainty of everyday history, the vagueness of its boundaries and links with other directions of anthropology-oriented history. An important feature of modern historiography of everyday history is, in addition, national peculiarities regarding the clarification of the subject and methodology of everyday history, which are determined by the level and state of the general development of national historiography, the presence of scientific traditions and schools, and the degree of the general development.

However, despite the considerable number of scientific publications in which everyday history is studied during certain historical periods, not all theoretical and methodological foundations of everyday history have been resolved. It concerns, in particular, the definition of the very concept of “everyday”, its object and subject. Therefore, we can say that these issues questions are still at the formative stage, having not found their solution either in Western or in modern Ukrainian historiography.

In general, the issue under discussion is quite complex and requires further research, first of all, the development of scientific tools, systematization of approaches, principles and methods of forming the subject field of an everyday life is urgent.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial support for the research, authorship and / or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alkov, V. A. (2012). *Kharkiv naprykintsi XIX – pochatku XX stolittia: dozvillia miskykh meshkantsiv v umovakh modernizatsii* [Kharkiv at the end of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th century: leisure time of city residents under the conditions of modernization]. (*Candidate's thesis*). Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]

Alkov, V. A. (2014). Povsiakdennea: problema definitsii ta predmetu na lokalnomu rivni [Everyday life: the problem of definition and subject at the local level]. *Hurzhiivski istorychni chytannia – Gurzhiev's historical readings*, (7), 98–101. [in Ukrainian]

Bondarenko, O. (2022). Povsiakdenne zhyttia miskoho naselennia Naddnyprianskoi Ukrainy 1785 – 1917 rr. u suchasnomu istoriohrafichnomu dyskursi [Everyday life of the urban population of Dnieper Ukraine in 1785 – 1917 in modern historiographical discourse]. *Naukovyi visnyk Izmailskoho derzhavnogo humanitarnoho universytetu. Serii: Istorychni nauky – Scientific Bulletin of the Izmail State Humanitarian University. Series: Historical sciences*, (59), 9–19. doi 10.31909/26168774.2022-(59)-1. [in Ukrainian]

Bondarenko, O. V. (2021a). *Mista Naddnyprianskoi Ukrainy za imperskoi doby (1785 – 1917 rr.): istoriohrafichnyi dyskurs* [The cities of Dnieper Ukraine during the imperial era (1785 – 1917): historiographical discourse]. Kropyvnytskyi: Vydavets Lysenko V.F. [in Ukrainian]

Bondarenko, O. V. (2021b). *Sotsialno-ekonomichni ta sotsiokulturni protsesy v mistakh Naddnyprianskoi Ukrainy v 1785 – 1917 rr.: istoriohrafia* [Socio-economic and socio-cultural processes in the cities of Trans-Dnieper Ukraine in 1785 – 1917: historiography]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Pereiaslav. [in Ukrainian]

Haliv, M. & Homych, L. (2017). Etnorelihiyni konflikt u shkolakh Boryslava 1909 – 1910 rr.: vytoky i naslidky [Ethno-religious conflict in the schools of Boryslav in 1909 – 1910: origins and consequences]. *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East Europe Historical Bulletin*, 7, 46–55. doi 10.24919/2519-058x.5.117188 [in Ukrainian]

Holovko, V. (2007). “Ryba ta m'iaso” istorii povsiakdennosti: teoretychni zasady napriamku [“Fish and meat” of the history of an everyday life: theoretical foundations of the direction]. *Problemy istorii Ukrainy: fakty, sudzhennia, poshuky – Problems of the history of Ukraine: facts, judgments, searches*, (17), 87–101. [in Ukrainian]

Holovko, V. (2009). Istorii povsiakdennosti: istoriohrafia i mizhdystyplinarni zv'iazky [The history of an everyday life: historiography and interdisciplinary connections]. *Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia radianskoi Ukrainy v dobu nepu (1921 – 1928 rr.): Kolektyvna monohrafia*, (in 2 books, Book 1, pp. 47–66). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Ilnytskyi, V. & Haliv, M. (2019). The Industrial School for Jewish Girls, Sambir (1925 – 1939): A Local Institutional Description. *Annales Universitatis apulensis. Series Historica*, 1(23), 119–132. [in English]

Ilnytskyi, V. & Kantor, N. (2018). Reprisals of the Soviet administration against families of insurgents in Karpatskyi krai of the OUN (1945 – 1954). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East Europe Historical Bulletin*, 7, 173–180. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.7.131213. [in English]

Ilnytskyi, V. & Kantor, N. (2019). Establishment of the soviet administration in the Carpathian region through the use of the open forms of punishment (1944 – 1954). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 10, 181–192. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159174. [in English]

Ilnytskyi, V. (2015). Osoblyvosti oblashtuvannia pobutu v umovakh pidpillia Karpatskoho kraiu OUN (1945 – 1954) (za materialamy Haluzevoho derzhavnogo arkhivu Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy) [Peculiarities of living conditions in the underground conditions of the Carpathian OUN region (1945 – 1954) (based on the materials of the Branch State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine)]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii kerivnykh kadrov kultury i mystetstv*, 3, 34–39. [in Ukrainian]

Koliastruk, O. (2008). *Istorii povsiakdennosti yak ob'iekt istorychnoho doslidzhennia: istoriohrafichnyi i metodolohichni aspekty* [The history of an everyday life as an object of historical research: historiographical and methodological aspects]. Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian]

Koliastruk, O. A. (2009). Teoretyko-metodolohichni aspekty vyvchennia povsiakdennoho zhyttia [Theoretical and methodological aspects of studying everyday life]. *Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia*

radianskoi Ukrainy v dobu nepu (1921 – 1928 rr.): Kolektyvna monohrafiia, (in 2 books, Book 1, pp. 5–46). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Koliastruk, O. A. (2010). *Povsiakdenne zhyttia intelihentsii USRR u 1920-ti.: suchasnyi teoretyko-metodolohichni ta istoriohrafichno-dzhereloznavchyi dyskurs* [Everyday life of the intelligentsia of the USSR in the 1920s: a modern theoretical and methodological, historiographical source discourse]. (*Doctor's thesis*). Kyiv [in Ukrainian]

Koliastruk, O. A. (2012). *Istoriia povsiakdennosti v suchasni Ukrainii istoriohrafii* [The history of an everyday life in modern Ukrainian historiography]. *Ukraina XX st.: kultura, ideolohiia, polityka – Ukraine of the 20th century: culture, ideology, politics*, (17), 5–9. [in Ukrainian]

Lesnycha, P. (2015). Poniattia “povsiakdennist” u postradianskii istoriohrafii [The concept of “everyday” in post-Soviet historiography]. *Naukovyi visnyk Skhidnoevropeiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Istorychni nauky – Scientific Bulletin of Lesya Ukrainka East European National University. Historical sciences*, 5 (306), Lutsk, 5 (306). 152–157. [in Ukrainian]

Lesnycha, P. S. (2019). *Povsiakdenne zhyttia miskykh poselen Volynskoi hubernii druhoi polovyny XIX – pochatku XX st.* [Everyday life of the urban settlements of Volyn province in the second half of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries]. (*Candidate's thesis*). Lutsk. [in Ukrainian]

Liudtke, A. (1998/1999). *Chto takoe istoriia povsednevnosti? Ee dostyzheniia i perspektivy v Hermanii* [What is the history of an everyday life? Its achievements and prospects in Germany]. *Sotsyalnaia ystoriia: Ezhehodnyk*, 77–100. [in Russian].

Nahaiko, T. (2010). *Istoriia povsiakdennosti: pohliad na problemu* [The history of an everyday life: a view on problem]. *Istoriia povsiakdennosti: teoriia ta praktyka – The history of an everyday life*, 43–48. [in Ukrainian]

Nahaiko, T. Yu. (2012). *Povsiakdennist yak poniatiina katehoriia istorychnoho doslidzhennia: osiahnennia interpretatsii* [Everydayness as a conceptual category of historical research: understanding interpretations]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainskoi istorii – Scientific notes on Ukrainian history*, (29), 4–12. [in Ukrainian]

Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia. (2009). *Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia radianskoi Ukrainy v dobu nepu (1921 – 1928 rr.)* [Essays of a daily life in Soviet Ukraine during the NEP era (1921 – 1928)]. *Kolektyvna monohrafiia*, (in 2 books, Book 1). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia. (2010). *Narysy povsiakdennoho zhyttia radianskoi Ukrainy v dobu nepu (1921 – 1928 rr.)* [Essays of a daily life in Soviet Ukraine during the NEP era (1921 – 1928)]. *Kolektyvna monohrafiia*, (in 2 books, Book 2). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Orlyk, S. & Mekheda, A. (2020). Natural duties of the population of Eastern Galicia and Northern Bukovyna under conditions of the Russian occupation (1914 – 1917). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 16, 153–162. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.16.210900>. [in English]

Orlyk, S. & Orlyk, V. (2019). Control of the Russian occupation authority over the activities of salt factories in Halychyna and Bukovyna in the period of the First World War. *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East Europe Historical Bulletin*, 10, 85–93. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.10.159178>. [in English]

Orlyk, S. & Pavlenko, V. (2023). Money Issue in the Life of the Population of Kyiv Province (1797 – 1917). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 27, 39–52. doi: [10.24919/2519-058x.27.281543](https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058x.27.281543). [in English]

Orlyk, S., Palchevich, G. & Orlyk, M. (2021). Mutual credit societies of Naddnieper Ukraine in the credit system of the Russian empire (second half of 19th – early 20th century). *Financial and credit activity-problems of theory and practice*, 4(39), 415–428. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18371/fcaptop.v4i39.241407>. [in English]

Piatnytskova, I. V. (2017). *Vyvchennia istorii povsiakdennosti v suchasni Ukrainii istoriohrafii* [Studying the history of an everyday life in modern Ukrainian historiography]. *Materialy naukovi konferentsii profesorsko-vykladatskoho skladu – Materials of the scientific conference of the professorial*

staff. (in 2 vol., vol. 1, pp. 78–80). Vinnytsia: Donetskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stusa. [in Ukrainian]

Shportun, O. & Orlyk, V. (2021). Informatsiynyy potentsial dokumentiv Derzhavnogo arkhivu Kyivs'koyi oblasti shchodo vyvchennya istoriyi povsyakdennya sluzhbovtiv kazennykh palat u Naddnipryans'kii Ukraini (kinets' XVIII – pochatok XX st.) [Information potential of documents from State Archives of Kyiv region concerning study of history of everyday life of state chamber's officials in Naddniprianska Ukraine (the end of the 18th – the beginning of the 20th centuries)]. *Rukopysna ta knyzhkova spadshchyna Ukrainy – Manuscript & Book Heritage of Ukraine*, 27, 21–34. doi: <https://doi.org/10.15407/rksu.27.021>. [in Ukrainian]

Udod, O. (2002). Istoriia povsiakdennosti yak metodolohichna problema [The history of an everyday life as a methodological issue]. *Doba – Age*, (3), 6–18. [in Ukrainian]

Udod, O. (2004). Istoriia povsiakdennosti: pytannia metodolohii, istoriohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva [The history of an everyday life: issues of methodology, historiography and source studies]. *Aktualni problemy vitchyznianoï istorii XX st. – Actual problems of national history of the 20th century*, (2), 286–313. [in Ukrainian]

Udod, O. (2010a). Istoriia povsiakdennosti yak providnyi napriam ukrainskoi istoriohrafii [The history of an everyday life as a leading direction of Ukrainian historiography]. *Kraieznavstvo – Local history*, (3), 6–9. [in Ukrainian]

Udod, O. (2010b). Istoriia povsiakdennosti: pytannia metodolohii ta istoriohrafii [History of an everyday life: issues of methodology and historiography]. *Povoienna Ukraina: narysy sotsialnoi istorii (druha polovyna 1940-kh – seredyna 1950-kh rr.) – Postwar Ukraine: essays on social history (second half of the 1940s – mid-1950s)*, (Book 1, vols. 1–2, pp. 17–39). Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian]

Vilshanska, O. (2010). Dzherela do vyvchennia povsiakdennoho zhyttia mist Ukrainy [Sources for studying an everyday life of Ukrainian cities]. *Istoriia povsiakdennosti: teoriia ta praktyka – History of everyday life: theory and practice*, (pp. 87–89). Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi. [in Ukrainian]

Zabolotna, T. (2010). Istoriia povsiakdennosti – “panatseia vid khvorob” chy pastka dlia istoryka? [The history of an everyday life – a “panacea for diseases” or a trap for the historian?]. *Istoriia povsiakdennosti: teoriia ta praktyka – History of everyday life: theory and practice*, (pp. 38–43). Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi. [in Ukrainian]

Zinchuk, M. (2010). Istoriia povsiakdennosti yak novyi napriamok humanitarnykh doslidzen [The history of an everyday life as a new direction of humanitarian research]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho – Scientific Notes of Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University*, (18), 391–394. [in Ukrainian]

The article was received January 22, 2023.

Article recommended for publishing 14/11/2023.