

Андрій ЗАБЛОВСЬКИЙ  
Київ

## ТРАДИЦІЙНА СИСТЕМА ВИХОВАННЯ УКРАЇНЦІВ ЯК ЕТНОПСИХОЛОГІЧНИЙ КОНЦЕПТ

*Стаття присвячена основним механізмам передачі етнокультурної інформації в українському традиційному суспільстві, особливостям процесів інтеріоризації соціального досвіду, когнітивних та поведінкових кліше в “дитячій культурі”, ролі та значенню народної педагогіки в постулюванні етнопсихологічної моделі українців у цілому.*

*Зокрема, у статті робиться спроба концептуального осмислення проблем, пов’язаних з інкорпорацією в “дитячу культуру” основних етнокультурних регуляторів, соціонормативних установок та стереотипів мислення шляхом прилучення статево-вікової групи дітей до ритуально-звичаєвої системи українського етносу, а також питань, що стосуються процесу моделювання в дитячій свідомості календарно-святкової обрядовості українців як санкціонуючо-впорядковуючої форми селянського соціуму та адаптивного механізму збереження і відтворення традиційних етнічних характеристик.*

Mykola SKYBA

Kyiv

## TRADITIONAL CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY HISTORICAL TRANSFORMATIONS: PROBLEMS IN RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Anthroposphere was and remains mosaic by its nature consisting of different ethnoses. It's becoming more and more obvious that in many aspects artificial escalation of the noosphere processes results in the violation of the social ecology. On the one hand, technical globalization is a dead lock of the world history. French psychologist Serge Moskvichy characterized the transformative jump that has changed the mankind in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a shift from “warm”, traditional value focused societies to “cold”, mass, pragmatically and aggressively adjusted ones. It has resulted in appearing of the crowd as a specific form of human community on arena of history. The environment of the crowd, the core component of which is not a system of values, but primitive and powerful instincts, became the most suitable material for the different psychological manipulations and political gambles. Nevertheless, despite the narrowing of natural areal of traditional culture, it still remains a necessary component of spiritual wealth of modern nations and “ecological niche” for that traditional culture has to be created.

On the other hand leading tendencies of the present period are the spreading of personalism and increasing of the amount of monadic individuals (according to Serhiy Krymskiy). But this individuals need a support of a rich and multiply cultural heritage to maintain their complex integrity.

Analyzing the crucial moments of the Ukrainian history Ivan Dzijuba considers, that “the greatest hopes could be retired on prospects of development of national culture. On the one hand, in Ukraine, as hardly nowhere in Europe, deep sources of authentic national creativity are being kept. This is a saving reserve for professional culture. Nowadays in Europe negative influence of mechanical mastering of the unified consumer standards on spiritual aspects of life and on creating of culture potential of people is more and more realized. It stimulates dramatical revision of the attitude to traditional cultural norms”<sup>1</sup>.

Last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Europe was marked by the reference to a problem of local identity, active reconsideration of experience of traditional cultures, aspiration to define their role in the modern changeable world. Multiculture (as a certain policy) and assistance to understanding of cultural variety have been unanimously

accepted at International Conference of UNESCO on Cultural Policy of Humanitarian Department, which took place in Stockholm in March 1998. The majority of its participants has also connected this discussion with spreading of democratic practice all over the world.

The speaker of UNESCO Noriko Aikawa said: “All cultures nowadays face influence and influence itself other cultures. Each culture is not static and isolated. All cultures are in a condition of constant development, through disclosing of external and internal forces. Globalization in the sphere of culture, as well as in the sphere of economy, can lead to the best understanding of special values and the potential of culture, no less than to cultural expansionism and to gradual disappearance of individual cultures. Preservation of specific originality of cultures are extremely important for the formation of cultural plurality of the world”<sup>2</sup>.

In this context idea of the orientalist and historian Lyudmila Shaposhnikova is interesting: “Two main conditions are necessary for normal spiritual and material development of nations. First, development correspond to the character of this nation, national culture and that originality which has been developed during many centuries of its history. Second, it should not contradict the main tendencies of space evolution in the energy field of which this nation is located, together with the other nations”<sup>3</sup>.

There is one more problem connected to historical transformations of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Under conditions of prompt civilizational progress a gap between generations catastrophically increases. The age gradation in mastering the technologies quite often blocks gradation of attitudes to universal categories of life. “Parents” and “children” seemed to appear not only in different semantic dimensions, but also move in the world with rather different perceptions of time – space, rhythm and movement.

Loss or destruction of tradition serves as a reason of loss of reference points of social progress, causes the general social uncertainty and hopelessness<sup>4</sup>.

On a background of humanitarian crisis, which is peculiar not only to the Ukrainian society, but also to the world community, the interest of many people to the ethnic roots seems not casual. It’s an intuitively experienced way to self-knowledge and spiritual revival. Ethnographic knowledge is collected on the edge of traditional and modern societies, and it is possible that can be considered as the act of self-understanding of society. If we take a psychological, personal side of a problem, a complex of ethnologic knowledge here corresponds to that fund of “cultural memoirs” from which, actually, arises modern monadic individuality. Ethnology as the scientific discipline can give a key for competent use of this heritage. As it is known, during the 19<sup>th</sup> century the hobby for keeping old things in museums and ethnographic researches were the powerful factor of occurrence of the new Ukrainian intelligentsia among which, eventually, appeared leaders of national liberation movement at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. On the basis of ethnologic researches a number of concepts of the Ukrainian nation and algorithms of its development has been formulated. Not all from these concepts have passed the test of history; many perspective ideas were simply ignored.

Professor Valentyna Borysenko rather fairly notices, that in Ukraine: “the Renaissance of ethnic culture is in a poor condition. There are discussions, disputes, even quarrels concerning separate national realities of traditional culture which have got eventually the certain symbolical sign...? tendencies – archaic, futuristic and Bolshevist-nihilistic – display indeed the deep crisis of our society. There is, obviously, another way of harmonious association of traditional agrarian culture – with its entire huge luggage of spirituality, morals, ethics, behavior, and celebratory-ceremonial culture – with achievements of urban environments. This way can pass through deep understanding and knowledge of ethnic and ritual culture, ecological experience of people and development of the western high technologies, conditions of life, and the attitude to preservation of values”<sup>5</sup>. Thus, nowadays, when development of the Ukrainian statehood lasts, the problem of formation of maximum real strategy of historical and spiritual progress/development of the Ukrainian society and its public institutes are extremely important. Without taking into account conclusions of such science as ethnology this strategy will hardly be real and constructive. Nevertheless, ethnology itself should make correlation with the research priorities adjusted to the historical situation determining new configurations of its basic research subject.

So, the world is changing rapidly, methodology of ethnologic researches is focused mainly on the search of stable variants of an investigated culture. But theoretical modeling and reproduction of variants quite often occurs thus as if process of culture formation has finished. Therefore the facts of an ethnic life appear as if taken out of real historical dynamics. The matter is that “the classical science since antique times and up to the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century has been focused on fixing, the analysing and the description of the phenomena, their complete systems or complexes in settled finished or the most often to the observable form”<sup>6</sup>.

Today, in conditions of deep historical transformations, an ethnographer should work not only with exterior forms of this culture (and they have remained only in a fragmentary form), but also he should pay attention to its interior aspects. In particular, on putting the tradition to life through personal approaches and creative interpretation.

But before that it is necessary to reconsider the basic moments of the theory of cultural tradition.

Category of tradition belongs to key concepts of ethnology. The ethymology of concept conducts genesis from

Latin (*traditio* – transfer) where this word was used for definition of the certain legal and property acts. In end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Brockhaus and Efron's dictionary gave such definition to the word “tradition”: “establishing of real dominations over things from the side of their former owner for the benefit of a new one, who buy them in the property or possession”<sup>7</sup>. It's said below that a word “tradition” means the same as to the word “Legend” – “in divinity of the second of two primary sources of Christian belief”<sup>8</sup>.

In fact by the domestic scientific schools the crisis in formation of a basis of theoretical ethnography was defined somewhere in 1960s. One of the culminations of this process started the discussion covered on pages of the magazine “Soviet ethnography” – 1981, №№ 2 – 3, which took place at the methodological seminar of the Institute of Ethnography of the USSR Sciences Academy which has been organized by the Scientific council of the Sciences Academy of the USSR on a history of the world culture, the bureau of the seminar and the editorial board of the magazine. It has been carried out in the form of so-called “round table” that provides beforehand a widespread basic report and a series of short reports of participants. E.Markarjan's article “Key problems of cultural tradition” has been offered for the discussion.

E.Markarjan defines ideological poles of the theory of cultural tradition between such methodological positions. The first one is connected to studying of types of ideology, which is based on principles of Diltey (“philosophy of life”), Veber, and Sorokin. It is the concept of cultural-historical typology. The second one is based on the method of the structurally functional analysis. E.Markarjan is developing his ideas within the second methodological position<sup>9</sup>.

The first approach is illustrated by I.Suhanov's point of view: “Customs and traditions, he states, have two common functions: to be means of stabilization of the attitudes ratified in the given society and to carry out reproduction of these attitudes in the life of new generations. But these functions carry out traditions and customs in different ways. Customs directly stabilize by detailed instructions of action in concrete situations the certain parts of public attitude and recreate them in the life of new generations. Traditions, unlike customs, are directly inverted to an inner world of the man, they carry out the role of means of stabilization and reproduction of the public attitude not directly, but through formation of spiritual qualities which demand these attitudes”.

To oppose it E.Markarjan uses D.Ugrinovich's point of view, who allocating a “traditional” way as one of forms of inheritance of culture, writes: “Its main feature is the mechanism of reproduction of human activity: experience of human activity is gained not by mastering main principles or norms of this activity, but through copying of it, reproduction of its whole pieces, “pieces” in all forms and details”. He considers custom and a ceremony as the basic forms of traditional transfer of culture”<sup>10</sup>.

E.Markarjan defines cultural tradition through the information characteristic of culture, identifying this phenomenon as: “the group experience expressed in socially organized stereotypes which by existential transmission is accumulated and recreated in various human collectives”<sup>11</sup>.

In retorts of those who have taken part in discussion of the article of Markarjan a number of prominent aspects of the object of the research have been outlined:

- “The Tradition can be considered as the social memory”<sup>12</sup>.
- The tradition personifies “the reproductive beginning of culture” and causes “effect of stabilization of a public life”<sup>13</sup>.
- The concept of cultural norm is the central concept expressing regulative function of traditions.
- The tradition is the mechanism of formation of a phenomenon of culture.

The further development of the subject arosed in the above-mentioned discussion, we meet on pages of the monography of S.Arutjunov “Peoples and Cultures”, issued in 1989. Considering ethnos as a set of information connections, the author of the book notices: “the Tradition is the phenomenon which is initially inherent in the person from the moment of his birth, both in phylogenetic, and in ontogenetic sense”<sup>14</sup>. Considering functions of culture – as cultures of life-support – Arutyunov carries action of the mechanism of tradition to “the fourth cycle” realization of the ability to live, that is to a subsystem of the overbiological sociocultural reproduction which is carried out by accumulation and the social organization of socially significant experience, but, besides – “as stereotypes of cultural tradition”<sup>15</sup>.

We find rather interesting development of this problem in Lev Gumilev's works. If Arutyunov develops the information theory of ethnos Gumilev emphasizes the energetical nature of ethnogenesis, suggesting the original concept of passionarity. One more important point for better understanding of the essence of tradition in Gumilev's versions of the theory of ethnos is the concepts of “an ethnic field”. The last is put forward by the scientist for an explanation of a phenomenon of unity of ethnic systems, that coordinate actions of elements, which make ethnos. As the researcher considers, essential argument for the benefit of a hypothesis about an ethnic field is the phenomenon of complementarity (subconscious awareness of ethnic affinity), which is hard to explain from other positions. “The ethnos is the passionar field of one rhythm specific for particular ethnos, – marks Gumilev – the rhythm is not born. It is a property not of a person, and ethnic group. The genotype can determine much:

temperament, speed of reaction, ability to abstraction, imagination, etc., but not the feeling of “my” and “another’s” determining features of ethnos. This feature is transferred to the child by alarm heredity<sup>16</sup>. L.Gumilev considered ethnology as a natural science and considered, that the interdisciplinary approach is necessary for adequate knowledge of ethnic phenomena. In particular he marked: “The transfer of the information through hereditary named by physicists as “tradition”, and in the language of biologists – “an alarm heredity”<sup>17</sup>. E.Markarjan comes to similar conclusions.

Power interchanging processes constantly occur inside the most ethnosocial organism where, “contrary to the genetic information which is transferred through the hereditary way, these information connections exist as communications”<sup>18</sup>. As passionarity is accumulated and transformed by ethnos during ability to live by a version of energy of alive substance (biogeochemical energy)<sup>19</sup>, that is the basis to speak about one more measurement of a power-information exchange.

Thus, the tradition in a context of the concept of a power-information exchange appears as a necessary condition of time – spatial duration of ethnos.

The maintenance of the power-information nature of tradition and ethnic processes will be better clear – in particular of its informational component – if we attach to our analysis the theory of sign systems. Information connections of certain ethnosociors and separate etnofors with concrete space (a landscape – an ecological niche) on which Serhiy Arutjunov makes his accents, it is possible to describe in a quantitative equivalent, what he actually does, but it is possible to look at this interaction from this point of view of the semiotics status of things. “Trying to capture as the greater space as possible, having transformed it from alien Chaos into native Space, the archaic person, on V.N.Toporova’s expression as if throws on the world grid – system of binary and figurative oppositions”<sup>20</sup>. J.Lotman counted sign-symbolical development of the validity as one of determining attributes of culture. One of followers of this direction of A.Bajburin marks, that “as a result of contacts between the person and an environment (which have especially amplified after so-called Neolithic revolutions) and processing of the primary information with the help of sign means there is an original doubling of the world and there is an image of the world which is embodied in the diversified factors of behavior and results of activity”<sup>21</sup>. The researcher sees sense of tradition in “transfer of a picture of the world”<sup>22</sup>.

Thus, within last fifty years ethnographers mainly in stereotyped forms, in universal, general aspects, examined the phenomenon of tradition accordingly – in especially social measurement of a phenomenon of ethnicity. Meanwhile, in a basis of tradition there is a concrete personal experience. Besides the traditional culture of Ukrainians within the 20<sup>th</sup> century survived not only destructive internal influences, but also has gone through the certain evolution on internal algorithm. Therefore, besides generalizations and searches of invariants of cultures, the individual aspect of ethnologic researches becomes more active.

Our Central European colleagues also have interesting conceptual ideas in this direction: “The phenomena of changes and continuity in tradition had crucial importance for cultural anthropology from the beginning of the history of this science.

Among experts the point of view for our time as for typically transitive epoch is enough widespread. All old traditions test erosion, distortions or transformations. Traditions disappear also this ephemeral and rapid phenomenon of transition concerns not only peasant culture of Europe, but is universal. These are changes, which always have been taking place in a developing society.

During continuous development of each culture other mechanism switches on defining the future characteristic of the given culture. Process of a reproduction of prominent features of culture is parallel to form creating (self-development), but opposite to directiveness”, – states the director of the European Center for Traditional Cultures Mihaly Hoppal (Budapest)<sup>23</sup>.

Among the newest works devoted to tradition, the research of Ukrainian ethnopsychologist Volodymyr Kuevda draws attention to developing “psychological mechanisms of an embodiment of traditional character from “ritual” to “ritualized ethics”<sup>24</sup>. That is a certain transformative fracture of societies is taken into consideration.

In this context it is necessary to emphasize on the change of relations between ritual and irritual contents of culture.

It is known, that ritual belongs to modelling sign systems. The last is defined by researchers as “difficultly organized set of interdependent symbolical mental models, patterns, connections which form a complete picture of the world”, organizing “macrocosm and microcosm”<sup>25</sup>. Ritual is allocated with the ability “to consolidate a community around the cultural values during the crisis moments. Display and an exchange of trues, norms, the values determining for the given social group is the function of a ritual”<sup>26</sup>.

At early stages of development of this or that ethnocultural communities its consciousness is characterized by the initial syncretism, that is, concerning small differentiation of the subject and object, macrocosm and microcosm, the archaic person projects acts of the internal life on an environment. Exteriorized spiritual experiences remain in a prevailing measure integrated in a collective field; ritual penetrates all spheres of a life and remains in the

form of a mentality. The text of ritual creation is carried out with the maximal punctuality and full belief at it. It is an epoch of domination of mythological thinking.

In process of accumulation of individual experience the person receives an ability to distinguish more deeply macrocosm and microcosm, to learn them separately, to realize the individuality, and to be more conscious in terms of an influence on it. There comes ability not ritually, and really to feel likeness with group and the place in it. Religious thinking appears as the result of establishing strict hierarchal and institutional relations. This moment does not mean the official acceptance of this or that ethnos of new religion. Besides the religious type of thinking does not supersede mythological – they form original layer with zones of interosculation. Those spheres of life, which “are not blocked” by the religious attitude, remain open for domination of mythological stereotypes of thinking. Near to that the society is also stratified. There are adherents and carriers of one or other type of thinking and culture. Cultures of elite, professional and lower class become separated.

Interior (spiritual) traditions are allocated during the process of activation of religious type world outlook. If traditions are “archaic”, syncretic-spiritual they scoop the primary information from the sources of mythological memory religious – spiritual traditions, as a rule, are located and individualized. A source of the last, in most cases, becomes spiritual experience of the concrete person. This tradition is formed of a chain of concrete spiritual experiences. Its action is directed on support of sensation of individual – spiritual self-identity, and even wider – ethnic identity and ethnocultural originality. For example such element of tradition of Ukrainians of Podillia as custom of reverence of water sources can be rather indicative example of over-placement and the certain synthesis of mythological and religious types of thinking, communal-ceremonial, exteriorized, and personal-subjective, interior, cultures.

So, investigating traditional culture in conditions of historical transformations we face the necessity: first, to pay attention on atypical, not stereotyped, the unique phenomena of an ethnic life, to processes of an individualization in traditional culture. Second, to recognize “subject – heuristic value of all sides of life of ethnonational communities”<sup>27</sup>, bringing a focus to philosophical-culturological paradigm of tradition which provides aksiological attitude to active position of the person in the world on the basis of universal measurements of a human life, as opposed to that intellectual paradigm which asserts quantitative, computing, calculating characteristics of the human attitude to the world around. And, eventually, – from “the most observable forms” to proceed to a noumenal level of the phenomena which are taking place in a field of our supervision. In fact traditional culture being – as by virtue of objective conditions (the general civilizational progress of mankind, a state policy of the separate countries), and conditions subjective: internal mechanisms of self-organizing superseded from daily vital practice, passes from the phenomena of the phenomenal world in noumenal measurement, becomes the internal factor of spiritual – creative, psychological, art processes, in an equal measure as well as the latent spring of expansion of these or those social phenomena. In such situation prevail intrinsic bases of traditional culture, including its aksiological contents. It, finally, can affect the scientific approaches to studying traditional culture. It will enable to find out: what structures have the greatest stability in the process of transformations. And then to create the intellectual background for development of chains of complementarity between representatives of different generations and layers of Ukrainians, and also to provide self-identification of elder generations in new historical circumstances and an identification of the present generation of Ukrainians with the great cultural heritage of the Ukrainian nation.

<sup>1</sup> Дзюба І.М. Україна перед сфінксом майбутнього. – Київ, 2001. – С. – 36.

<sup>2</sup> Multicultural Europe: Illusion or Reality / Series “Bibliotheca Traditionis Europae”. Editor Mihaly Hoppal. – Budapest, 1999. – P. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Шапошникова Л.В. Мудрость веков. – Москва, 1996. – С. 458.

<sup>4</sup> Скрипник Г.А. Екологія національної культури // Матеріали до української етнології. Випуск 1(4). – Київ, 1995. – С. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Борисенко В.К. Традиції і життєдіяльність етносу. – Київ, 2000. – С. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Канак Федір. Перехідний стан буття: поняття й трансформації повсякденності. // Сучасність, 2002. – № 9. – С. 69.

<sup>7</sup> Брокгаузъ и Ефронъ. – СПб., 1901 – Т. 66. – С. 693.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. – Т. 47. – С. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Соколов Е.В. Традиции и культурная преемственность // Советская Этнография. – 1981, № 3. – С. 57 – 58.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. – С. 79.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. – С.80.

<sup>12</sup> Зиков М.Б. Понятие “память” как концептуальная основа для организации междисциплинарного исследования понятия “культурная традиция” // Советская этнография, 1981, № 2, – С.46.

<sup>13</sup> Сарингулян К.С. О регулятивных аспектах культурной традиции // Советская этнография, 1981, № 2. – С.99.

<sup>14</sup> Арутюнов С.А. Народы и культуры. Развитие и взаимодействие. Москва, 1989. – С.160.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. – С.204.

- <sup>16</sup> Гумилев Л.Н. Этносфера. Москва, 1993. – С. 227; Гумилев Л.Н. Этногенез и биосфера Земли. Москва, 1994. – С. 388.
- <sup>17</sup> Гумилев Л.Н. Этногенез и биосфера Земли. – С. 388.
- <sup>18</sup> Арутюнов С.А. Народы и культуры. Развитие и взаимодействие. – С. 19.
- <sup>19</sup> Гумилев Л.Н. Этносфера. – С.553.
- <sup>20</sup> Юдин А.В. Русская духовная культура. – Москва, 1999. – С.32.
- <sup>21</sup> Байбурин А.К. Ритуал в системе знаковых средств культуры. // Этнознаковые средства культуры. Москва, 1991. – С. 23.
- <sup>22</sup> Байбурин А.К. Жилище в обрядах и представлениях восточных славян. – Москва, 1982. – С. 11.
- <sup>23</sup> Horpal M. Multicultural Europe and local Identity // Multicultural Europe: Illusion or Reality / Series “Bibliotheca Traditionis Europaeae”. – 1999. – Pp. 7 – 8.
- <sup>24</sup> Куевда В.Т. Традиційність як спосіб буття людини. – Київ, 1998. – С.32.
- <sup>25</sup> Гаврилюк. Е. Вступне слово // Студії з культурної антропології (SIC). – 1999. – С. 4.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid. – С. 7.
- <sup>27</sup> Степико М.Т. Філософсько-методологічний аналіз становлення та буття етнонаціональних спільнот. Автореф. дис. на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора філософських наук.– Київ, 1999. – С. 6 – 7.

**Микола СКИБА**  
**Київ**

## **ТРАДИЦІЙНА КУЛЬТУРА В ІСТОРИЧНИХ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯХ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ: ПРОБЛЕМА ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКИХ ПРИОРІТЕТІВ**

*Досліджуючи традиційну культуру в умовах історичних трансформацій ми стикаємося з необхідністю: по перше, звернути увагу на нетипові, не стереотипізовані, унікальні явища етнічного життя, на процеси індивідуалізації в традиційній культурі. По друге – зосередитись на ціннісному змісті традиції. А відтак – від “найчастіше спостережуваних форм” перейти до номенального рівня явищ, що перебувають у полі нашого спостереження. Адже, традиційна культура, будучи – як в силу об’єктивних умов (загальний цивілізаційний поступ людства, державна політика окремих країн), так і умов суб’єктивних: внутрішні механізми самоорганізації – витісненою із повсякденної життєвої практики, переходить із явищ феноменального світу в номенальний вимір, стає внутрішнім чинником духовно-творчих, психологічних, мистецьких процесів, рівною мірою як і прихованою пружиною розгортання тих чи інших соціальних феноменів. Така ситуація, зрештою, має позначитись і на пріоритетах наукових підходів до вивчення традиційної культури. Це дасть можливість з’ясувати, які структури мають найбільшу стійкість в процесах трансформацій.*