

Extended summary of monograph of Konta R. M. on the topic:
“The ethnological researches in Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv
(1892–1940): historiography”

The monograph studied and summarized historiography of ethnological research in the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv (1892–1940). Main trends of accumulation and development of historical knowledge of ethnological research in NTSh by the representatives of different historiographical schools are reviewed. The thesis examined methodological aspects of ethnological research in the Society and features of investigation of formation and further fate of the museum's ethnographic collection of NTSh. The author investigates the structure of the Society and analyzes the state of study in the historiography of the contribution of some of its units in the field of ethnological research. The work provides the analysis of historiographical materials on the pages of publications, notably «Chronicle of NTSh», «Notes of NTSh» and «Literary-science herald» relating to the organization of ethnological research in the Society.

Part of the monograph is dedicated to the research of the scientific activity of the administrative board of the Ethnographic commission of the NTSh, including I. Franko, M. Hrushevsky, F. Vovk, V. Hnatiuk, F. Kolessa etc. The author emphasizes that modern historiography has the stereotypical view on the role of personality in the history of Ukrainian science that needs some clarification and correction. Thus, even in the evaluation of activity of such prominent figures as M. Hrushevsky and I. Franko their scientific and organizational contributions to the establishment and development of ethnology in NTSh were not mentioned or considered in the last place of the list of their achievements as scientists. Although the organizational, methodological and scientific activities of the mentioned members of the Society decisively influenced on the formation and development of ethnology and had resulted in the formation of a powerful source base for modern ethnology, together with the formation of a “golden fund” of Ukrainian ethnology.

Ethnological scientific achievements of I. Franko remained largely unnoticed by scientists until nowadays. Even after M. Wozniak founded a separate scientific branch of knowledge called "frankoznavstvo" in the mid-1920s, above-mentioned problems remained minor and not so important in the evaluation of the creative legacy of Ivan Franko in comparison with his achievements as a writer, poet, essayist, translator, public and political figure. Soviet scientists discovered a new stage in the case study analysis of the scientific heritage of I. Franko. Overall publications of Soviet scientists about I. Franko were prejudicial. This situation is explained by domination of the Marxist-Leninist methodology. Emphasis was placed on political views of I. Franko, which were submitted in the context of fighting with Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists". After Ukraine became independent former Soviet researchers were able to freely express their views, which led to a fundamental changes in the evaluation of the scientific heritage of I. Franko especially in the field of his ethnological academic achievements. That's why the author thoroughly examines the scientific and organizational contributions of I. Franko to the development of Ukrainian ethnology, because these problems are usually not studied by researchers. In addition, importance of editorial activities of I. Franko, which contributed to the formation of ethnological science in Ukraine and its integration into the European Research Area are also studied in the monograph.

Despite the large scale of the figure of M. Hrushevsky, whose scientific achievements form the cornerstone on which the modern Ukrainian historical science was built, a number of important issues related to his scientific activity is not enough studied and interpreted in historiography. This is particularly true about scientific research of M. Hrushevsky as an ethnologist, because his heritage is rarely studied from this perspective. Specificity of ethnological component of scientist's works is that he was more talented theorist and developer of methodologies of ethnological sciences, but not a classical ethnographer in the narrow sense of the word. M. Hrushevsky was not the field researcher, he didn't personally collect ethnographic material. As a result, in his writings we do not

notice many new folk-ethnographic materials, but this is compensated by the latest integrated approaches in analysis of the existing source base.

The author has identified five periods in the development of historiography of the problem. The first period (1892–1917) was characterized by the appearance of printed materials prepared mostly by members of NTSh which were published mainly in its editions. These materials were mostly short and presented in the forms of articles, notes, reviews, annotations on ethnological studies of the NTSh members.

The second period covers the 1920s, when ideological control over science was weak. At that time there were scientific contacts between members of the NTSh and Soviet scientists. In addition, scientific cooperation was permitted in some research projects.

The third period covers 1930 – the first half of 1950s and is characterized by fundamental changes in the approaches to the assessment of the problem. At this time, information about ethnological research in the Society was mostly ignored or changed according to party dogma and Marxist-Leninist methodology.

The fourth period (second half of the 1950s – 1991) is characterized by some changes in historiographical estimates of Soviet scientists of the contribution of members of Ethnographic commission in the development of Ukrainian ethnology. New approaches to assessment of the problem of ethnological research in NTSh were initiated, which brought their results in the period of Ukrainian independence.

Only from time, when Ukraine gained independence appropriate conditions for comprehensive study of the problem were established. This is the fifth historiographical period of the study of organization of ethnological research in NTSh.

Separately singled historiographical trends and schools that have emerged in the study of problems of ethnological studies in the Society. The author distinguishes literature written in Western Ukraine during Polish occupation in 1921–1939. During this period, summarizing studies on the previous ethnological

achievements of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in general and its individual members were published.

Particular attention is paid to studies of diaspora scholars which preserved the traditions of Ukrainian national science founded in Shevchenko Scientific Society. These works were written in an atmosphere of lack of ideological pressure on the scientists. This allowed them to examine the establishment of ethnological research in the Society impartially.

The foreign historiography of this problem has mostly referenced and encyclopedic character and does not reveal the fundamental problems associated with the organization of the research in the field of ethnology in the Society in 1892–1940.

Thus, the historiographical analysis involved the main publications of the issue, including works of scientists of the pre-Soviet period, Soviet, diaspora and foreign scientists. The dominant place belongs to the historiographical analysis of scientific works of modern Ukrainian researchers, published after Ukraine gained independence. The ranges of issues that require further study, rethinking and scientific interpretation are highlighted.

**Review of monograph of Konta R.M. on the topic:
“The ethnological researches in Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv (1892-
1940): historiography”**

The period of the activity of Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv (hereinafter - NTSh) in Ukrainian lands is an important component of the current stage of the development of Ukrainian ethnology. The scientific heritage of this organization is assessed differently in historiography. Among the main scientific directions of the Society were ethnological studies, which scientists actively conducted since the beginning of 1892, when the reformation of the Society started till the establishment of the Soviet regime in Western Ukraine in 1939. This period was the most productive in the history of the Society. It includes a number of scientific, expeditionary and publishing activities that became iconic in the development of Ukrainian ethnology.

In this context, special attention is given to the problem of coverage in the historiography of ethnological studies in the NTSh during this period. This study allows to identify the available literature on the subject. It also allows to trace step by step how the accumulation of knowledge on the subject was carried out and how the representatives of different historiographical schools research these problems. Systematic analysis of the historiography of ethnological research in NTSh allows to identify bottlenecks and not investigated questions of this problem. It also allows to outline prospects for further research that could potentially contribute the organization of ethnological studies in modern Ukraine.

A number of ethnographic and anthropological-ethnographic expeditions, which were organized and carried out by members of NTSh, facilitated the ethnological scientific work in the society. Their results form the part of the “golden fund” of Ukrainian ethnology and are have scientific value. They were collected before the revolution, civil war, between two world wars. Establishment of the Soviet regime on the Ukrainian territory led to the destruction of a major stratum of traditional Ukrainian culture and life of Ukrainians up to the physical physical extermination of

Ukrainian population.

According to content of monograph, it includes study, systematization and analysis of the literature of the problem, which chronologically covers the period more than 120 years. This allowed the author to highlight a number of historiographical periods in the study of ethnological studies in the Society and describe each of them. The author took into account the main components of objective-subjective nature that affected the coverage of this issue in the literature. The list of sources and literature, which consists of more than 1,000 items, shows the large scale and in-depth analysis by the author of historiographical research base.

The scientist explained the importance of ethnological studies in the NTSh, along with the coverage of the results of this work in the literature as an important component of the formation of Ukrainian national identity. The issue of ethnographic study of Ukrainian lands perceived by occupational authorities of foreign countries mostly in a negative context until the revival of Ukrainian statehood. The author emphasizes the excessive politicization of the problem, which was a natural result of ethnological knowledge of Ukrainians, who had been deprived of their statehood and belonged to neighboring countries (Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires, and later Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR). In particular, as noted by Rostyslav Konta, Russian scientists of prerevolutionary period considered ethnological research in NTSh as a political project of “fabrication” of the Ukrainian language, culture etc. The purpose of this “fabrication” was justification of the existence of actually non-existent nation to getting rid of the influence of the empire on Ukrainian lands. Organization of ethnological studies in NTSh during abovementioned period automatically raised the problem of the existence of a separate Ukrainian cultural nation with all its attributes: language, territory, mentality, customary law, material and spiritual culture, the history of the statehood, etc.

In several examples Rostyslav Konta proves the thesis that the coverage of ethnological research in the Society during the Soviet period often bore the ideological character. This affected on research achievements of leading ethnologists

of NTSh, which according to the tenets of dialectical materialism, were divided into “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists” and representatives of the revolutionary-democratic wing.

Specific feature of the ethnological analysis of the scientific and organizational achievements of members of the Society is that it covers “frankoznavstvo” and “hrushevskoznavstvo” as separate fields of studies. According to the author, characteristic feature of modern scientific knowledge of ethnological scientific and organizational achievements of NTSh is that despite their multi-scientific research and scientific achievements in many areas in recent years there was a steady trend to cover their ethnological scientific achievements. In addition, a series of papers dealing with ethnology achievements of such scholars as I. Franko and M. Hrushevsky in the context of the development of local history, regional historical studies were published recently.

R. Konta found the issue of coverage in the historiography of the problem of intrigues and controversy in the Society and how this affected the study of ethnological research in the NTSh. On the example of coverage in the historiography of the conflict between M. Hrushevsky and I. Franko the impact of various factors that led to the formation of a number of works, where information was presented in a distorted form was analyzed. The causes of conflicts and differences of opinions of many Ukrainian scientists in historiography is treated differently. But it is important to note the common points of view of M. Hrushevsky and I. Franko that influenced on the organization of ethnological studies during their cooperation in NTSh. Common to them was the idea of scientific evidence of ethnic and cultural independence of Ukrainians as the initial phase of their revival, which had to be completed by acquisition of statehood.

That's why ethnological researches in the Society were particularly important, namely the collection, analysis and publication of scientific ethnological materials, which had to prove the identity of Ukrainians. The ethnologists of NTSh proved the existence of Ukrainians as a European nation with their own history of statehood,

language, culture and peculiarities of everyday life, customary law, folklore, social organizations etc.

The author singled out a number of important and controversial issues that require further study. By showing "white spots" in the history of Ukrainian ethnology, the author encourages the scientific community to study important problems of the Ukrainian ethnology. The researcher also highlights the problem of separation of theoretical disciplines such as ethnology, social and cultural anthropology. This issue is particularly relevant in the modern Ukrainian academic discourse because it can coordinate ethnology research in Ukraine with relevant scientific research in Western Europe and the USA.

Research of Rostyslav Konta meets the needs of the time and is an important step towards the formation of a new vision of the history of modern ethnology in Ukraine. The author generalized, analyzed and structured large array of historiographical sources on the problem of ethnological research in NTSh, has shown the characteristics and features of formation of scientific knowledge of the problem. This eliminated all assertions of ideological and personal nature in the issue of coverage of ethnological research in the Society. Rostyslav Konta managed to submit ethnological research in the NTSh in the context of Western European ethnology studies, that allows to make positive forecasts for the further development of ethnological knowledge in Ukraine.