

Anastasiia Goncharenko

Ph.D. in Art Studies, researcher of the Department of Methodology of Art Criticism, Modern Art Research Institute of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine

tel. / tel: +380977057538 e-mail: artastasy@gmail.com orcid.org/0000-0001-7466-6030

Анастасія Гончаренко

кандидат мистецтвознавства, науковий співробітник Відділу методології мистецької критики Інституту проблем сучасного мистецтва НАМ України

Reception of Ukrainian Historical Memory in the Monumental Forms of the 1990s and 2000s

Рецепція української історичної пам'яті в монументальних проявах 1990-х — 2000-х

Abstract. In the proposed publication the processes of restoring the historical consciousness of the nation in the context of social and cultural changes of the 1990s-2000s study are researched, as well as the reception of Ukrainian historical memory in contemporary monumental creations. It is emphasized that processes of transformation of historical memory and its visualization are not parallel and synchronous, and as historical memory is formed and modified simultaneously with the evolution of plastic art, the monumental sculpture becomes an active participant in the mythologization of the historical past.

Keywords: monumental sculpture, monument, terminology, historical memory, Ukrainian state, national cultural Renaissance, modernity.

Problem statement. Since 1991 an active process of rethinking the issues of local history during the Soviet times has launched in Ukraine. One of the initiators of an objective study of the events of the time was Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance, founded in 2005 as a “special-ly authorized body for the restoration and preservation of the national memory of the Ukrainian people”. The institution does not only raise and solve complex issues of Ukrainian history but also professionally responds to the events taking place in the country. Historical memory is one of the measurements of individual and social memory; it is memory of the historical past, or, more precisely, its symbolic representation. Collective memory record of the events in the form of various cultural stereotypes, symbols, myths act like the interpretive models allows a person to find the way out in specific situations [14, p. 23–24]. However, the thinking of one person is a priori concrete and personal and such perception of events may not always be objective. This context is formed not only by state propaganda (absent in Ukraine during the last twenty-five years) but also through artistic visions, embodied, among others, in monumental sculptures.

The definition of a “monument” (from the word “memory”) refers to the works of monumental sculpture with prevailing memorial function. The memory reflected in the monuments is bound to be connected with the history of the country, reflecting its social, cultural and political realities. The creation of the monuments is usually funded by the state, thus, in a certain way imposing themes and plots,

“necessary” in specific social and cultural conditions. In Ukraine, historical memory of the nation began to emerge since the early 1990s. During the Soviet times the official—distorted—interpretation of the memory of the Ukrainians was formed, legitimizing the “slavic unity” instead of true history of Ukrainian lands.

Analysis of recent research works and publications. Understanding the reception of Ukrainian historical memory in the monumental forms of the 1990s and 2000s is a typical example of the general tendencies that, according to a number of the researchers, generally determine the national art discourse. Analysis of the development of sculptural creativity, except of a few studies, remains fragmentary and not too systematic. Most researchers are interested in studying experiments of a certain artist or, at best, the problems of the regional schools’ and directions’ development. The theoretical basis of work was the extensive research and publications by well-known scholars, who studied Ukrainian history and history of culture: P. Nora [10], J. Rüzen [15], Yu. Shevelev [19], N. Yakovenko [22], G. Pivtorak [12], V. Boiko [2], Y. Hrytsak [4], P. Shtepa [20], etc.

Objectives of this publication are to understand the processes of restoring the historical consciousness of the nation in the context of social and cultural changes of the 1990s and 2000s and to study the reception of Ukrainian historical memory in contemporary monumental forms.

Presentation of the main research material. The development of sovereign Ukraine has inspired re-

thinking of the events of national history through the nation-building. Awareness of historical identity has become an urgent requirement of the time for society. To solve this problem, the national historical science needed new landmarks, sought out in “linguistic forms of historical narration”, “designing’ of meaningful and significant stories from the relics of the past as a kind of cultural propulsion” [15, p. 10]. At the same time, the Soviet interpretation of the history of Ukraine should be understood as an inalienable fact of history itself. According to the German historian and cultural theorist J. Rüzen, “if we take both sides into account and clearly identify their internal interrelations, all the complexity of history, its aesthetic and cognitive nature will be revealed” [15, p. 12].

In 1991, the Canadian historian of Ukrainian origin O. Subtelnyi described the situational aspiration of the Ukrainians for the knowledge of “true” history with the following passage, “The people acutely felt the consequences of Stalinism carried out by the three generations of deformed historical consciousness and wanted to put up with it no more” [17, p. 5]. This was proved by the awakening of the national pride in 1990s, which the linguist Y. Shevelev defined in the middle of the 20th century as “the root and foundation of everything.” In his opinion, “disbelief in their forces means a lack of national pride. Disbelief in the ability of the Ukrainian state is a lack of national pride. The idea that Shevchenko is, of course, a great poet, but Pushkin or Mitskevich are greater, is a lack of national pride” [19, p. 63]. At the end of the 20th century, it was the national pride that prompted Ukrainian nation to build not only its own state, but also to deconstruct the impoverished “imperial thinking” of history. Thus, one of the renewed tasks of modern monumental art is the visualization of national pride that inspired the formation of historical memory.

However, if history finally started giving appropriate assessments to individual pages of Ukrainian history, monumental art could not immediately respond to changes of historical paradigm. Contemporary monumental sculpture should represent Ukrainian history of scientific contemporary paradigms, modern chronological and cultural boundaries. However, an artwork cannot be a “document”, since it is designed not only to cause emotion, but also to become a factor of political process.

Since the 1990s, new tasks have been assigned to the monumental sculpture of Ukraine, the main one being rejection of the figurative-thematic canvasses, structural-compositional schemes, communicative levels of the Soviet period, since “the upbringing of a population capable of contemplating the past only in the concepts of nostalgia and patriotism helps to preserve political humility” [1, p. 245]. According to the British cultural historian P. Berk, “a new history is a story written in conscious confrontation with the traditional (*in our understanding—the Soviet one—Our emphasis—A.G.*) ‘paradigm’ ... we could also call this [new] paradigm as the view of ‘common sense’ on history, not speaking of its high appreciation, and in order to emphasize that it was often—too often—considered as the on-

ly way to construct history and not as one of many possible approaches to the past” [1, p. 15].

The formation of a new paradigm of Ukrainian history is associated with the names of M. Hrushevsky, N. Polonska-Vasylenko, D. Yavornytsky and those who named the Kyiv State as “the first state in Ukraine” [8, p. 9]. The geographical boundaries and the interpretation of historical names (due to the constant interference of various political forces) on the turn of the 19th century were not yet identical; however, their research was a groundbreaking amount of theoretical knowledge, on which the modern knowledge about the Kyiv princely state grew. They devoted a significant place to the chronicle of memory (“as a system of history that is so complete that no other nation can boast such a treasure!” [10]), for which, according to the French historian, the author of the concept of “places of memory” P. Nora—the best story is the return to ancient chroniclers which “naïve evidence” to a certain extent. According to his colleague and compatriot, O. Thierry, names such chronicles of memory “a direct reflection of the past that made us, our habits, customs and civilization” [23; 10, p. 134]. Of course, the testimony of the chroniclers is not a complete source of information, and therefore it does not always reflect the general picture of reality. Nevertheless, chronicles are capable of turning memory into deliberately forgotten and rejected.

In the Russian Empire, Ukrainian history was interpreted as a part of the history of Greater Russia. For persuasiveness, Russian historians of the 19th century invented the term “Kievan Rus”, which sought to refute the Ukrainian historians of the early twentieth century. In particular, M. Hrushevsky, a leading figure in the national, cultural, and state revival of Ukraine at the turn of the 19th century, at the beginning of the 20th century pointed out that “The land (one way over the Black Sea, the other—up to the Caucasus, above the Kuban, in the third over the Pripjat and Bug rivers and the Carpathian Mountains, beyond the Russian border) now we call Ukraine, and the people are the Ukrainians. In ancient times it was called ‘Rus’, and the people—the Rusyns; and still our name is mostly our people in Galicia and in Hungary—Rusyns, Rusnaks. Rus also covered those territories that are around Moscow, those people who are called by us ‘Moscals’, or ‘katsapy’, and ‘Bela Rus’, or Litvyny, as we have their name. Further, for identification, our territories started to be called ‘Little Rus’, or ‘Little Russia’, and the Moscow lands were ‘Great Russia’, and we were ‘Little Russians’, but our people did not accept that name. The Moscals called our people ‘khakhly’ because our people wore bangs on their heads, while the Moscals called that ‘khakhol’, but this was only the nickname, not the name, as other people called Moscovites ‘katsapy’. But now the same name for the whole our country and our entire nation has come to pass—Ukraine, Ukrainians: that is how our people are called in Kyiv, in Kharkiv, Poltava, Odessa or Galicia” [5, p. 3–4]. As Hrushevsky’s “broad thinking” testifies the unity of the Ukrainian lands (the territory of modern Ukraine): from the West, East and South, he also names the state of princely age with a center in Kyiv as Ukraine–Rus

for no reason. A similar opinion is expressed by N. Polonska-Vasylenko, who in her works convincingly uses the term “Kyiv Empire” relevant to that time [13, p. 5].

Contemporary Ukrainian historians (N. Yakovenko, H. Pivtorak, V. Boiko and others) argue that the isotopic pattern of the unification of political unions—states (and national, which borders generally coincide with the boundaries of the respective ethnic territories and empires with different peoples) consists in the fact that “one of them initiates a particular ethnic group, belonging to this state, despite the possibility of expanding its territories in future at the expense of the lands of other ethnic groups” [12, p. 50–51]. The scientists point out that it was Kyiv principality that became the basis of the Slavic state with its center in Kyiv. According to the Ukrainian historian P. Shtepa, “In the 11th century, according to the foreigners, Kyiv was more cultural and rich than Paris and London. In past Ukraine had lively trade and cultural ties with the entire cultural world—Greece, the Middle Asia, India, a thousand years before Christ ... in the 10th century the Ukrainian Prince Svyatoslav the Great conquered the Austro-Hungarians and made their lands (the current lands of Moscow) suburbs (colony) of the Ukrainian state” [20, p. 10–11].

According to N. Yakovenko, “in the Ukrainian historiography ‘princely era’ is the traditional name for the period of Ukrainian history, covering events from the end of the 10th century till the beginning of the 14th century—the times of formation, prosperity and decline of the Kyiv State” [22, p. 32]. A modern researcher V. Krysachenko, in particular, notes that “Galician and Volyn principality have a special place in the history of Ukrainian state, as well as the Galician-Volyn principality after their merge <...> There is reason to believe that the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is a Ukrainian history itself, because it developed on the fundamental principles laid down by Volodymyr the Great, Yaroslav the Wise and other leaders of Ukraine-Russia of the princely era” [9, p. 120].

Today, the terms “princely era”, “princely state” are ambiguous (although more convincing than “Kyiv Rus”), however, they well reflect the fact, decisive for the era, that then statehood was personified in the princes: loyalty to the prince was a testimony to loyalty to the state, changes in the state system and law were made by the princes or on their behalf. The loss of a sovereign prince was perceived as a loss of state status of the territory he owned. “One way or another, the controversy over the legacy of the Kyiv State once again testifies to how the political, ideological and scientific issues are closely intertwined in the historiography of princely era” [17, p. 81].

After the decline of the Principality of Galicia-Volyn in the 14th and 15th centuries, “because of the absence of their own state, local university and academic centers, permanent losses due to numerous military conflicts, fires and the extraction of primary sources from the archives, libraries and museums, other spiritual and cultural values the process of comprehension by the Ukrainians of their historical past and present day lost the necessary dynam-

ics in comparison with a number of European nations” [16, p. 119].

The next stage of the Ukrainian state-building is the period of the Cossack State, which in the national consciousness became the key period of the heroic history of Ukraine. In 1907 or so, M. Hrushevsky points out that when “for the first time, for many years, since the Ukrainian state had fallen (*Kyiv principality—our remark—A. G.*), the Ukrainian people became inspired. They felt their strength, that they could achieve something and defend themselves. Understanding that strength united different Ukrainian communities. And Cossacks were like a shield and a sword, the defense force for the Ukrainian people” [5, p. 53]. I. Krypiakievych, a prominent researcher of the Cossack state, also emphasized the heroic role of the Cossack era, “All Ukrainian people thought that they have already thrown off a foreign yoke and that they would finally be the masters in their land. Everyone wanted their independent state” [8, p. 62]. D. Yavornytsky was the first historian, who at the end of the 19th century studied the Cossacks. In his research works he notes that “the documentary evidence of the existence of the Ukrainian Cossacks was first found in the charter of 1499 by Aleksander, tGrand Duke of Lithuania” [21]. In the imperial science, when the very mention of the Cossacks was a sign of “Mazepynstvo”, to issue scientific works and, moreover, to defend a dissertation on the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks, was a bold step.

At the turn of the 16th century, the social and spiritual life of the lands on the territory of modern Ukraine was undergoing political, domestic and cultural changes. There was a new attitude, relevant to the time. The mentality of the Ukrainians has changed: Ukraine has begun the restoration of its state, language, and education. “Gradually moving into a leading place in the Ukrainian society, the Cossacks began to take an increasingly active part in solving key issues of Ukrainian life, providing the Ukrainian society with the leadership that it lost in the aftermath of the polonization of the Ukrainian nobility for several centuries” [17, p. 136]. Citing *The Chronicle of Samovydyets*, N. Yakovenko points out, “everything that [was] alive rose to the Cossacks” [22, p. 220]. The researchers of the Cossacks are similar in their thoughts on the state-building function of the Cossack State. The statement of O. Boyko is also reasonable, “During the 15th and 16th centuries, a new social stratum—the Cossacks—emerged as an opposition, as a challenge to the existing system, as a new elite, which undoubtedly claimed to be a political leader and power. The ground for the formation of the Cossacks has become the existence of a large areas of free land, accumulated in the previous period of their development, the natural desire of people to self-preservation, self-affirmation and self-realization” [2, p. 132].

Since the end of the 18th century the spiritual culture of Ukrainian people developed under oppression from two empires. The liquidation of the Hetmanate (1764), the destruction of the Zaporizhzhia Sich (1775), the division of land into provinces, the registration of serfdom at the Left Bank and Slobozhanshchyna (1783), the abolition

of the Magdeburg Right (1831) at the Right Bank (1831), and the Lithuanian Statute (1840) abolished the autonomy of Ukraine, which almost turned into imperial colony.

For the Empress Catherine II, the destruction of the Cossacks was not just a suppression of the Cossack state, but the destruction of its very spirit, so that, according to her words, even the Hetman's title disappeared, and not only a person. The Little Russian Collegium was intended to destroy the remnants of Ukrainian autonomy, to carry out careful monitoring of the development of the economy, and so on. For the successful implementation of these directives, a newly appointed governor-general advised to act extremely cautiously in order not to cause hate to the Russians, to turn from "uncomfortable" situations, "having wolf's teeth, and foxtails". The Ukrainian lands in Austria were also colonized [3].

Under such circumstances, at the turn of the 18th century a national and cultural revival begins, aimed at the formation of the national idea and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation. The leading role in these processes was played by the scientific study of the past, including the arts and restoration of various spheres (national, spiritual, cultural, linguistic, etc.). The revival is associated with a significant attention paid to the problems, phenomena and processes that are nationally significant, but in previous times were deliberately or unknowingly slowed or stopped. Activity of the national elite, conscious social forces, which revitalized its activity in all spheres of life, has intensified. [2]

It is evident that the main goal of Ukrainian people during national and cultural revival was the process of nation-building. It is important to emphasize that at the turn of the 18th century, when the Hetmanate was finally liquidated, the formation of the Ukrainian national idea unfolded among the Ukrainian nobility (a former Cossack senior officers). There was a gradual formation of the Ukrainian elite, whose leading representatives created movements and organizations amid the awakening of national consciousness and emergence of the political opposition. According to the contemporaries, the representatives of the Ukrainian elite, "...did what they could. First of all, they began to take more care of their language and writing" [8, p. 80]. For the first time in Ukrainian society, more precisely among the elite, the question arose about ethnicity, "people have always felt great attachment to their homeland, language, customs and traditions. Nevertheless, until recently (*at the beginning of the 19th century, for example, our remark—A. G.*), ethnicity was not considered as the main criterion for determining the group identity. <...> In Ukraine, as in the other countries, the emergence and gradual extension of the idea of national consciousness, based on ethnic identity, becomes one of the main themes of a new and up-to-date history" [17, p. 280].

At the end of the 19th century grows "the politicization of the national movement at the East of Ukraine as well. There are a number of political circles and the first Ukrainian parties. <...> in 1900 in Lviv M. Mikhnovsky published a brochure-proclamation titled *Independent*

Ukraine. This book, for the first time at the Ukrainian East, proclaimed the ideal of 'a single, indivisible, free, independent Ukraine from the Carpathian Mountains up to the Caucasus'" [4]. The result of the Ukrainian national and cultural revival was the Ukrainian People's Republic, which appeared on the European map in 1917. It was a brief period of Ukrainian statehood, recognized by the thirty states of the world. R. V. Koval clearly and precisely outlines the significance of the First World War for the fate of the Ukrainian people, "The First World War, refreshing the feelings of the outbreak of fires, trained millions of the Ukrainians militarily, who became excellent staff officers, prepared for the national revolution, and formed the Ukrainian military elite" [6, p. 4]. "The best organized part of the Ukrainian Army during the liberation war of 1918–1920" was formed [18, p. 105]—Ukrainian Sich Rifleman. For instance, later the Student Battalion of the Sich Rifleman marked in history by a heroic battle at Kruty.

Reception of historical memory in modern monumental forms. The turn of the 20th century became a turning point for the Ukrainian society: the crisis of the 1990s, the millennium expectation, the first Maidan, frustration and new economic, political, and social challenges of the 2000s pushed the Ukrainians to rethink the historical past. "New period of total collision of personal and national sovereignty in feelings, thinking, active will and even civilization doctrines with the ideology of globalism has put on the verge of rethinking and re-assessment even the essence and concept of a high destiny of a human and humanity in future. The idea of personal and national multifacetedness and diversity of self-expression as a phenomenon of self-creation, the mighty power of the Spirit, the unity of feelings, thinking and action, all-powerful in space and time, were covered by the shadow of unification and leveling up. Civilization, culture, art of giants, Prometheus opposes the idea of lumpenization, total mass character, abolition of spiritual aristocracy, and hence real humanism" [7, p. 6–11]. The country needed rethinking and updating, and thus inventing (finding) its own historical memory.

The concept of "historical memory" is used in a broad but precisely defined sense. At the beginning of the 20th century, when the problem of studying the mechanisms of social memory arose, the French sociologist M. Albvax was the first who described it in his work *Social Framework of Memory* (1925). The scientist argued that the categories "space", "time" and "collective memory" are interrelated. He called his concept "social structures of collective memory". Collective memory is rooted in a concrete social experience and, therefore, is closely connected with temporal and spatial representations. One of the first researchers who socially structured the notion of "memory" was Pierre Nora [11, p. 19]. He argued that "the great upheavals and vicissitudes of the last century inspire us to do historical research, to explain what we have seen, to experience what we or our beloved directly participated in. These shocks in some countries are associated with totalitarianism, in others, with the acquisition of independence by colonized countries, and all over

the world, with the accelerated transformation of the living conditions of each of us.” According to the compelling generalization by L. Repina, it is interpreted as “collective memory (to the extent that it fits into the historical consciousness of the group) or as a social memory (to the extent that it fits into the historical consciousness of society), or in general—as a collection of pre-scientific, scientific, quasi-scientific and non-scientific knowledge and mass representations of society about the past” [14, p. 23–24]. Thus, for the formation of historical memory, the Ukrainians first had to transfer collective memory to the state of social memory, applying the whole spectrum of scientific teaching, experience, memories and retellings for this, that in the future formed the backbone of self-identification for every citizen, social group and society as a whole.

Conclusions. Since the 1990s a difficult period of development in Ukrainian art commenced with the general intensification of the cultural and political life of society, with the rethinking and rehabilitation of “problematic” events and facts of the history of Ukraine, etc. In the cities and towns of Ukraine, most of which were under the pressure of monumental propaganda for more than 70 years, the process of renewal launched very fast. The monumental sculpture gradually became a free communicative system with the aim to visualize the national history, as well as to influence public in emotional, aesthetic and didactic way.

The monumental sculpture not only perpetuates the historical memory of the society, but also influences its development. Instability of historical memory (it exists exclusively within the framework of argumentation and persuasion) causes the “variety” of the general picture of the monumental sculpture of the 1990s and 2000s. Since historical memory is formed and modified along with the evolution of plastic art, the monumental sculpture becomes an active participant in the mythologization of the historical past.

The standard themes of the national past merged with the themes of socialist past. Instead of giving up the Soviet “ideal” (heroic one), an appeal to the historical past (“roots”) of the Ukrainian nation and its presentation in monumental sculpture are now under way. According to P. Nora, “... the return of the past, outlined by the colonial oppression (in case of Ukraine, the USSR was such ‘colonist’)—this is the first step in the formation of a national identity,” so, “since recently and, perhaps, for a long time we have a rich memory, free historiography, a history of a prosperous society...” [10]. Therefore, there is a request for “national historical memory” in Ukrainian society.

Today in Ukraine, while creating monuments and memorials that relate to the cultural and historical past of the state, the collective memory dominates, which, according to P. Nora, “is a memorandum or a collection of conscious or unconscious memories of experience, experienced and/or transformed into a myth by a living community, to whose identity the latter sense belongs” [10]. Historical memory is mobilized and actualized in difficult periods of life of society or any social group when new complex tasks arise or there is a real threat to their existence [14].

Thus, in accordance with the tendencies of the installation of monuments devoted to historical events, in Ukraine the following lines are formed:

1) written or oral tradition (chronicles mention of the Prince of the Dove of Kyiv Rus, tales and legends of the Zaporizhzhia Cossacks, etc.),

2) memories of the events faced (such as the memories of the witnesses of the Second World War, local wars, liquidators of the Chernobyl accident, etc.),

3) active memory, which is supported by the institutions, rituals, historiography (sacred images, images of political, cultural figures, etc.),

4) latent memory (for example, Holodomor in 1932–1933, Nazi genocide, Stalin’s terror, return of the default names and the establishment of historical justice) [10, p. 188].

An overview of a large array of monuments allows us to assert that plastic language can transform the traumatic historical experience into heroic one. In other words, the very sculpture is the “environment of comprehension” with the legitimate right to public sentences, convictions, accents, appeals, etc. It compensates infernal phenomena suppressed from historical memory, turning them back to the strategy of “national memory” in homeopathic doses. In modern historiography, the trend of deheroization of war is one of the most interesting tools for clearing historical memory from ideological dirt and debris. The more correct is the history of everyday life and autobiographies, the less of unhealthy pathos arises.

The social and cultural changes of the early 1990s actualized the process of rethinking of national history, creating the need for the formation of a new paradigm. An urgent problem was the discovery of the historical memory of the nation (as a symbolic representation of its past). Since the mid-1990s, monumental sculpture has gradually undergone conceptual and functional changes, becoming a communicative system that simultaneously reflects the present state of historical memory and influences the historical consciousness of the nation.

References

1. Berk P. Novi pidxody` do istoriopy`sannya. Ky`yiv: Nika-Centr, 2013. Vy`p. 5. 368 s.
2. Bojko O. Istoriya Ukrayiny`. Ky`yiv: Akademvy`dav, 2005. 720 s.
3. Gorbach N., Gelej S., Rosijs`ka Z. Teoriya ta istoriya svitovoyi i vitchy`znyanoi kul`tury`. L`viv: Kamenyar, 1992. 166 s.
4. Gry`czak Ya. Nary`s istoriyi Ukrayiny`: formuvannya modernoyi ukrayins`koyi naciyi XIX–XX st. Ky`yiv: Geneza, 1996. 360 s.
5. Grushevs`ky`j M. Yak zhy`v ukrayins`ky`j narod. Korotka istoriya Ukrayiny`. Ky`yiv: ROVO «Ukrvuzpoligraf», RVCz «Orbita», 1991. 112 s.
6. Koval` R. Otamany` Gajdamacz`kogo kraju: 33 biografiy. Ky`yiv: Pravda Yaroslavy`chiv, 1998. 616 s.
7. Kononenko P., Kononenko T. Taras Shevchenko: iz my`nulogo u majbutnye // Ukrayinoznavstvo. 2004. #2(11). S. 6–11.
8. Kry`pyakevy`ch I. Istoriya Ukrayiny`. L`viv: Svit, 1990. 520 s.
9. Kry`sachenko V. Ukrayins`ka derzhavnist` knyazhy`x chasiv: sutnisni vy`miry` // Ukrayinoznavstvo. 2012. #3. S. 114–120.
10. Nora P. Teperishnye, naciya, pam`yat`. Ky`yiv: KLIU, 2014. 272 s.
11. Nora P., Ozuf M., de Pyuimezh Zh., Vinok M. Problematika mest pamyati // Frantsiya-pamyat. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo Sankt-Peterburgskogo un-ta, 1999. S. 17–50.
12. Pivtorak G. Poxodzhennya ukrayinciv, rosiyan, bilorusiv ta yixnix mov: mify` i pravda pro tr`ox brativ slov`yans`ky`x zi «spil`noyi koly`sky`». Ky`yiv: Akademiya, 2001. 152 s.
13. Polons`ka-Vasy`lenko N. Dvi koncepciyi istoriyi Ukrayiny` i Rosiyi. Myunxen: Ukrayins`ky`j vil`ny`j universy`tet, 1964. 52 s.
14. Repina L. Istoriya i pamyat: istoricheskaya kultura Evropyi do nachala novogo vremeni. Moskva: Krug, 2006. 768 s.
15. Ryuzen J. Novi shlyaxy` istory`chnogo my`slennya. L`viv: Litopy`s, 2010. 358 s.
16. Svitlenko S. Svit modernoyi Ukrayiny` kincy XVIII — pochatku XX st.: Zb. nauk. pr. Dnipropetrovs`k: Gerda, 2007. 460 s.
17. Tarasov V. «Bili plyamy`» vitchy`znyanoi istoriyi na storinkax publicy`sty`ky` 1989–1991 rr.: istoriografichny`j ta metodologichny`j aspekty`. Xarkiv: Cursor, 2007. 146 s.
18. Shankovs`ky`j L. Nary`s istoriyi Sichovy`x Stril`civ / red. O. Babij, V. Zary`cz`ky`j, D. Gerchanivs`ky`j. Chikago: Drukarnya M. Deny`syuka, 1969. 663 s.
19. Shevel`ov Yu. Try`pty`x pro pry`znachennya Ukrayiny`. Xarkiv: Savchuk O., 2013. 96 s.
20. Shtepa P. Moskovstvo: jogo poxodzhennya, zmist, formy` j istory`chna tyaglist`. Drogoiby`ch, L`viv: Vidrodzhennya, 2003. 412 s.
21. Yavorny`cz`ky`j D. Istoriya zaporiz`ky`x kozakiv: U 3 t. L`viv: Svit, 1990. T. 1. 319 s.
22. Yakovenko N. Nary`s istoriyi Ukrayiny` z najdavnishy`x chasiv do kincy XVIII st. Ky`yiv: Geneza, 1997. 380 s.
23. Yaciv R. Skul`ptor Emmanuyil My`s`ko: Svitli doli. Ky`yiv, 2009. 224 s.

Література

1. Берк П. Нові підходи до історіописання. Київ: Ніка-Центр, 2013. Вип. 5. 368 с.
2. Бойко О. Історія України. Київ: Академвидав, 2005. 720 с.
3. Горбач Н., Гелей С., Російська З. Теорія та історія світової і втчизняної культури. Львів: Каменярь, 1992. 166 с.
4. Грицак Я. Нарис історії України: формування модерної української нації XIX–XX ст. Київ: Генеза, 1996. 360 с.
5. Грушевський М. Як жив український народ. Коротка історія України. Київ: РОВО «Укрвзполіграф», РВЦ «Орбіта», 1991. 112 с.
6. Коваль Р. Отамани Гайдамацького краю: 33 біографії. Київ: Правда Ярославичів, 1998. 616 с.
7. Кононенко П., Кононенко Т. Тарас Шевченко: із минулого у майбутнє // Українознавство. 2004. №2(11). С. 6–11.
8. Крип'якевич І. Історія України. Львів: Світ, 1990. 520 с.
9. Крисаченко В. Українська державність княжих часів: сутнісні виміри // Українознавство. 2012. №3. С. 114–120.
10. Нора П. Теперішнє, нація, пам'ять. Київ: КЛІО, 2014. 272 с.
11. Нора П., Озуф М., де Пюїмеж Ж., Винок М. Проблематика мест памяти // Франция-память. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во Санкт-Петербургского ун-та, 1999. С. 17–50.
12. Півторак Г. Походження українців, росіян, білорусів та їхніх мов: міфи і правда про трьох братів слов'янських зі «спільної коліски». Київ: Академія, 2001. 152 с.
13. Полонська-Василенко Н. Дві концепції історії України і Росії. Мюнхен: Український вільний університет, 1964. 52 с.
14. Репина Л. История и память: историческая культура Европы до начала нового времени. Москва: Круг, 2006. 768 с.
15. Рюзен Й. Нові шляхи історичного мислення. Львів: Літопис, 2010. 358 с.
16. Світленко С. Світ модерної України кінця XVIII — початку XX ст.: Зб. наук. пр. Дніпропетровськ: Герда, 2007. 460 с.
17. Тарасов В. «Білі плями» вітчизняної історії на сторінках публіцистики 1989–1991 рр.: історіографічний та методологічний аспекти. Харків: Курсор, 2007. 146 с.
18. Шанковський Л. Нарис історії Січових Стрільців / ред. О. Бабій, В. Зарицький, Д. Герчанівський. Чикаго: Друкарня М. Денисюка, 1969. 663 с.
19. Шевельов Ю. Триптих про призначення України. Харків: Савчук О., 2013. 96 с.
20. Штепа П. Московство: його походження, зміст, форми й історична тяглість. Дрогобич, Львів: Відродження, 2003. 412 с.
21. Яворницький Д. Історія запорізьких козаків: У 3 т. Львів: Світ, 1990. Т. 1. 319 с.
22. Яковенко Н. Нарис історії України з найдавніших часів до кінця XVIII ст. Київ: Генеза, 1997. 380 с.
23. Яців Р. Скульптор Еммануїл Мисько: Світлі долі. Київ, 2009. 224 с.

Гончаренко А. О.

Рецепція української історичної пам'яті в монументальних проявах 1990–2000-х

Анотація. У публікації осмислено процеси відновлення історичної свідомості нації у контексті соціокультурних змін 1990–2000-х років, досліджено рецепцію української історичної пам'яті у сучасних монументальних проявах. Наголошено, що процеси трансформації історичної пам'яті та її візуалізації не є паралельними і синхронними. І, оскільки історична пам'ять формується і видозмінюється паралельно з еволюцією пластичних мистецтв, монументальна скульптура стає активним учасником міфологізації історичного минулого.

Відповідно до концепції «місць пам'яті» П. Нора, яка стала теоретичною базою дослідження, виявлено, що відповідно до тенденції встановлення пам'ятників, присвячених історичним подіям, в Україні поширені лінії, сформовані: письмовою або усною традицією (літописні згадки про князівські часи Київської Русі, байки та легенди запорізьких козаків тощо); згадками про безпосередньо пережиті події (спогади очевидців Другої Світової, локальних воєн, ліквідаторів аварії на ЧАЕС і т. д.); активною пам'яттю, яку підтримують інститути, ритуали, історіографія (сакральні образи, образи політичних, культурних діячів та ін.) та латентною пам'яттю (наприклад, Голодомор 1932–1933 років, нацистський геноцид, сталінський терор, повернення замовчених імен і встановлення історичної справедливості). Огляд великого масиву пам'ятників дозволяє стверджувати, що сучасному монументальному мистецтву притаманна трансформація травматичного історичного досвіду в героїку.

Вказано, що соціокультурні зміни на початку 1990-х років актуалізували процес переосмислення вітчизняної історії, зумовили необхідність формування нової її парадигми. Актуальною потребою стало виявлення історичної пам'яті нації (як символічної репрезентації її минулого). Із середини 1990-х монументальна скульптура поступово зазнає концептуальних та функціональних змін, стає комунікативною системою, яка одночасно відображає сучасний стан історичної пам'яті та впливає на історичну свідомість нації.

Ключові слова: монументальна скульптура, пам'ятник, термінологія, історична пам'ять, українська держава, національно-культурне відродження, сучасність.

Гончаренко А. А.

Рецепция украинской исторической памяти в монументальных проявлениях 1990–2000-х

Аннотация. В предлагаемой публикации осмыслены процессы восстановления исторического сознания нации в контексте социокультурных изменений 1990–2000-х годов и исследованы рецепции украинской исторической памяти в современных монументальных проявлениях. Подчеркнуто, что процессы трансформации исторической памяти и ее визуализации не являются параллельными и синхронными и, поскольку историческая память формируется и видоизменяется параллельно с эволюцией пластических искусств, монументальная скульптура становится активным участником мифологизации исторического прошлого. Согласно концепции «мест памяти» П. Нора, которая послужила теоретической базой исследования, определено, что в соответствии с тенденцией установки памятников, посвященных историческим событиям, в Украине распространены линии, сформированные: письменной или устной традицией (летописные упоминания о Княжеском времени Киевской Руси, байки и легенды запорожских казаков и т. д.); воспоминаниями о непосредственно пережитых событиях (воспоминания очевидцев Второй Мировой, локальных войн, ликвидаторов аварии на ЧАЭС и т. д.); активной памятью, которую поддерживают институты, ритуалы, историография (сакральные образы, образы политических, культурных деятелей и др.) и латентной памятью (например голодомор 1932–33, нацистский геноцид, сталинский террор, возвращение замалчиваемых имен и установление исторической справедливости). Обзор большого массива памятников позволил утверждать, что современному монументальному искусству свойственно трансформировать травматический исторический опыт в героику.

Указано, что социокультурные изменения начале 1990-х годов актуализировали процесс переосмысления отечественной истории, обусловили потребность формирования ее новой парадигмы. Насущной проблемой стало обнаружение исторической памяти нации (как символической репрезентации ее прошлого). С середины 1990-х монументальная скульптура постепенно претерпевает концептуальные и функциональные изменения, становится коммуникативной системой, которая одновременно отражает современное состояние исторической памяти и влияет на историческое сознание нации.

Ключевые слова: монументальная скульптура, памятник, терминология, историческая память, украинское государство, национально-культурное возрождение, современность.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 4.09.2018