

DOI 10.26886/2414-634X.5(24)2018.6

UDC: 27–79(477)

HISTORICAL WAYS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE MULTIETHNIC CULTURE OF UKRAINE

O. V. Andriyenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor

Donetsk National University, Ukraine, Kramatorsk

In the article the historical ways of forming of the multiethnic culture of Ukraine have been analyzed. The main scientific approaches to the Ukrainian ethnogenesis have been distinguished. Among them are the theory of “Primordialism”, the autochthonous theory of Mikhail Grushevsky, the theory of “one cradle”, and the theory of the “Independent Development of East Slavic Peoples”. It has been emphasized that the main element of any ethnos is a language. The main elements of the Ukrainian ethnos have been named: 1) Basic ethnic massive of the Ukrainian people; 2) Ethnic Ukrainian groups abroad in short-distance and long-distance – Diaspora; 3) Subethnic groups – communities among Ukrainians, differing by specific culture traits (gutsuls, lemks, boyks, polischuks, etc.).

Key words: Ukrainian history, Ukrainian culture, Ethnos, Nature and geographic conditions, Primordialism.

Each culture, people or nation existing in the world is unique, and each is an integral element of the treasury of the world history and culture. The process of development of ethnic culture is influenced by wide range of factors such as history of the nation, isolation or interference of other nations, social, economic, ecological conditions, cultural policy of the country, etc. Thus, national culture should be considered as a complete system that includes folklore-ethnographic layers and input to it by various levels of population throughout a long historical way, influence of culture

another nations, and achievements of the natives of the country, living abroad.

The purpose of this article is the systematic investigation of the main historical ways of development of the Ukrainian culture.

Ethnos (from Greek root means “*people*”) is the complex historical concept. This term often has the following sense: Ethnos is a historically developed on a certain territory community of people possessing the stable features of language, culture and mental condition and also consciousness of their entity and differences from the others. The last one is usually fixed in an ethnonim (the self-name) of the ethnos [1, p. 68].

Generated ethnos is like a social organism that self-reproduces mainly by ethnically homogeneous marriage and by transferring language to new generations, traditions, etc. For its more steady existence ethnos aspires for creation of its own socially-territorial organization (the state) and ethnic groups – their own independent associations, securing their rights in the legislation.

For the internal entity of ethnos, culture is of the major value. It gives people understanding of their community. Culture, as a necessary component and one of the inherent to ethnical features, provides its high-grade functioning.

There is also a process of convergence (*rapprochement*) of ethnic cultures owing to historical development and interaction of ethnic cultures exists. Therefore, culture of every ethnos today is characterized by a set of national-specific and common to all mankind elements.

Formation of an ethnic culture is connected with forming of ethnos itself. Considering Ukrainian culture it is impossible not to mention ethnogenesis problems of the Ukrainians.

The basic points of view about the problems of the Ukrainian ethnogenesis are the following:

1) The theory of “Primordialism”: Ukrainians have existed as long as a modern type of a man, that is 30–40 thousands to 2–3 million years old.

2) The autochthonous theory (formulated by Mikhail Grushevsky) according to which ethnic basis of the Ukrainians was created by the population of the late Paleolithic and Russians and Byelorussians have their own ethnic basis and residing territory.

3) The theory of “one cradle” that was standard in USSR in 1930–1980s. It says that the origin and development of the three Slavic nationalities came from one old Russian nationality;

4) Lately spread theory of the “Independent Development of East Slavic Peoples”, that is Ukrainians, Russians and Byelorussians.

Lately it has been also emphasized that Kyiv Rus’ was multiethnic state in which no one old Russian nationalities was dominating.

In modern historical literature however it is considered that national genesis began in period of Kiev Rus’ though it was not completed at this time. Then, because of adverse historical circumstances it was interrupted and renewed at the full capacity in 17th–18th centuries.

This is an important specific feature of the ethnogenesis of the Ukrainians. Ukrainian ethnos was finally formed on boundary of 16th–17th centuries, and catalysts of this process was threat of physical destruction from Steppe (the Crimean Khanate was formed as a vassal of the Ottoman empire) among with the national oppression by the Polish Shlyakhta, internal change of elite – aristocracy were transited to Catholicism and signing of the Church union.

On a wave of the national struggle national consciousness was growing. The last one was displayed at the ordinary level in consciousness of the belonging to “Rus’ people” but on high ideological level – in struggle for national rights for Orthodoxy, for creation of national governmental institutes and attributes.

Difficulty of the ethnic history of the Ukrainians was reflected in variety of self-names (ethnonims), names from the other ethnical communities and also names of the country and state.

From the moment of birth of the Ukrainian ethos, “Rus’” was a key concept.

Through different periods different varieties of it were dominating: in the 6th–11th centuries – Rus’; from the 13th – Malaya (Small) Rus’; in 17th–18th centuries – Malorussia; in the 19th– beginning of 20th centuries – “Ukraine”. The name “Ukraine” (that was first mentioned in 1187) was recognized in the 17th century, but it existed simultaneously with another name – “Malorussia” that became wide-spread after inclusion of Ukrainian territories under protectorate of the Moscow state [1, p. 102].

Only at the beginning of the 20th century ethnonim “Ukraine” became common term.

It is necessary to emphasize that at the beginning central region (Kyiv) was called Rus’, but later from this place the name was used for all East Slavs, like “Ukraine” for all the Ukrainian territory.

So the name “Rus’” was formed like common Slavic term that is why Moscow state used this name for the approval of concept the Third Rome [2, p. 56].

As for the name “Ukraine” there is a few meanings of its origin – from “krai” (the border), or from “kraiyna” (the country), etc.

Self-name “Ukrainian” was unpopular in many respects it is possible to explain it by difficulties of ethnical and social development.

As synonyms such terms as “cossack”, “Cossack people” were used, along with old self-names like “Russians” and “Rusins”.

Only in condition of national renaissance in second part of 19th century a self-name “Ukrainian” was definitively affirmed.

So, in ethnic Ukrainian history three key ethnical self-names can be defined: 1) Slavic (Slovens); 2) Ruses (Rosses , Russki , Rusiches); 3) Ukrainians.

Today Ukrainians form the most of the Ukrainian population. It is one of the biggest European nations and second by numbers in the Slavic world.

According to 1989 population census Ukrainians comprised almost the 2/3 of the population (72,7%) of the country. 84,4% of Ukrainians that lived in the USSR at that time (37,4 million) lived here [3, p. 24].

Ukrainians are in regular intervals distributed in all the territory of Ukraine excluding Crimea and southeast. In the countryside they're forming to 90% of population, in the cities – to 70%.

Ukrainians are in the Slavic group of Indo-European ethno-lingual family.

Ukrainian ethnos consists of 1) Basic ethnic massive of the Ukrainian people, that in most of the cases coincides with territories of its forming and state borders of Ukraine; 2) Ethnic Ukrainian groups abroad in short-distance and long-distance – Diaspora; 3) Subethnic groups – communities among Ukrainians, differing by specific culture traits (gutsuls, lemks, boyks, polischuks, etc.).

Today, as a result of national-politic delimitation, hundreds of thousands Ukrainians appeared beyond the Ukrainian borders in adjacent with it regions like Kuban, Asov Sea coast and Central-Chernosem region.

Considerable number of the Ukrainians moved to Siberia and the Far East (East diaspora).

In the former soviet republics there are the following number of Ukrainians: Russian federation (Kuban, Asov Sea coast, Central-Chernozemniy region) – 4,4 million, Kazakhstan – approximately 2 million, Moldova – 561 thousands, Byelorussia – 291 thousands. On American continent mainly emigration of Ukrainians from Ukrainian territories which

were a part Austro-Hungary took place. Only at the end of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries it was more than 700 thousands of ethnical Ukrainians.

Modern emigrating processes have activated after the collapse of the USSR. Most of Ukrainians living in foreign countries live in the USA – 1 million of people, in Canada – more than half-million, in Argentina and Brazil – 200 thousand each, in Poland – approximately 300 thousands of people [3, p. 17].

It is important that considerable ethnical mass of Ukrainians on Polish territory was terminated after operation “Visla” in 1947 when they were moved to western territories.

In the middle of 1989 there was 46,2 million of Ukrainians in the world. Despite of emigration population of Ukraine has been growing. In 1897 it was 28,4 million, and in 1913 – 35,2 million. At the same time at the beginning with 19th century, mainly because of industrial development of South and East of Ukraine that lead to resettlement of big mass of people from other regions of the Russian state, relative density of Ukrainians decreased.

In 18th century Ukrainians constituted 85% of population in borders of the modern Ukraine, in 19th century – 74%.

In the last decade countryside population sharply decreased and city population has increased to 65%.

The most dangerous phenomena was birth rate decrease (in 1990 this was worst in all the USSR) and death rate increase as a result depopulation has been observed since 1980s that increased in 1992 and complex military situation in Donbass.

From the historical-ethnographic point of view we can distinguish the following regions: 1) Middle Priidneprovye ; 2) Podillya; 3) Slobozhanschina

and Poltavschina; 4) Polissya; 5) Prikarpatye (Galichina); 6) Volin; 7) Zakarpatye; 8) Bukovina; 9) South region [4, p. 206].

The South region was occupied by a few migration waves and its population was finally formed in the 18th–19th centuries. This is the youngest region of Ukraine from the ethnographic point of view.

South region may be divided into such sub-regions: Prichernomie (Black Sea coast), Tavria, Donschina (Podonia, Donetchina). It should be mentioned that this division is mostly symbolical. More right division into districts – is possible with thorough studying of historical-ethnographic phenomena. Moreover all these regions change as well as the criteria defining them.

There are some ethnographic groups that still have differences in culture and language. Most important are Ukrainian highlanders (hutsuls, lemks, boyks) in Prikarpatye and Polishuks and Litvins in Polissya.

There were more such groups among Ukrainians before, but with capitalism development and then Soviet Union times some of archaic, conservative traditions acquired new elements in material and spiritual life of villagers, that was majority of Ukrainians.

There became wide spread elements of city clothes, new types of living houses, instruments.

That is social-economic factors were leading in forming of modern Ukrainian nation, influenced on population and geographical place of other ethnic groups and character of ethnic processes in all Ukrainian territory.

Main element of ethnos is a language. Most of Ukrainians speak the Ukrainian language, that was formed on the basis of territorial elements of the old Russian language (but there is also some other theories).

As many scientists consider, approximately in the second half of the 12th century the process of separation of Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples began.

Process of forming of colloquial version of the Ukrainian language continued up to 17th century. On the early stages of the Ukrainian nation development, this language preserved traditions of Kyiv Rus' literary language. In fact, there were two languages: colloquial language, formed on basis of local territory dialects and literary language that was resembling nowadays south Slavic (Macedonian) language.

From the 18th century in Ukrainian literary language has been appeared. It included some elements of spoken language. But at the same time language preserved internal separation on dialects (Middle-Dnieper, Polissya, Podillya and Zakarpattya) [1, p. 225].

The basis of modern Ukrainian language on borders of 18th – 19th centuris was Middle-Dnieper dialect. It was due to the fact that western Ukrainian territories were under power of the Austro-Hungarian Empire literary language in these regions was different from the one variant in western part (mostly understandable by western Ukrainians).

Therefore, that is the basic features of Ukrainian ethnic development is a very difficult process, many problems of which are still disputable. Traditions and life of Ukrainian people, having many national lines, preserves many territorial features nowadays. They are caused by the following factors: 1) The character of historical development of separate Ukrainian regions; 2) Natural and geographical conditions; 3) Interrelations with other ethnic communities.

References:

1. *Popovich M. V. Narysy z istoriyi kulturi Ukrayiny / M. V. Popovich. – K.: ArtEk. – 728 s.*
2. *Boiko O. D. Istoriya Ukrayiny / O. D. Boiko. – K.: Akademiya, 2001. – 656 s.*

3. *Grushevskiy M. S. Illusrtirovannaya istoriya Ukrayiny / M.S. Grushevsky. – K.: Naukova dumka, 1992. – 302 s.*
4. *Veriga V. Ocherky po istoriyi Ukrayiny (konets 18 – nachalo 19 vv.) / V. Veriga. – M.: Mir, 1996. – 448 s.*