



## Retrospective analysis of an intercultural paradigmatic shift in the philosophical and educational thought in Ukraine in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century

**Abstract:** The article reveals the peculiarities of intercultural paradigmatic shifts in the philosophical and pedagogical thought of Ukraine in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It has been proven that Ukrainian philosophical and educational thought (despite the fact that it objectively bordered with the Russian one and actively fits into the pan-European philosophical and pedagogical algorithm) had a number of specific national concrete-cultural features and colours. Its image was closely related to the formation of the “soul of the Ukrainian people”, which was formed by a combination of mental, cultural and moral characteristics. The matrix of paradigmatic shifts in philosophical and pedagogical thought of this period was focused on the semantic, ontological dimensions of human spirituality, pedagogical factors of personality development, the formation of the national discourse of educational science as a certain theoretical integrity. It has been confirmed that the philosophical and pedagogical thought, which unfolded within the framework of socio-political development of scientific and educational institutions and which performed a human-creating function in culture, was characterized by a tendency to create an intercultural “philosophy of teaching and education”, which became the background for pedagogical constructions of our (that?) time. On this basis, the most important constants in the development of education of this period are determined, which have heuristic significance and are in many respects compliant with modern educational transformations, which require comprehensive understanding, primarily from the standpoint of pedagogical anthropology.

**Keywords:** Ukrainian philosophical and pedagogical thought, ethnic self-identification, mentality, national idea, intercultural shifts, philosophy of teaching and education, pedagogical anthropology, syncretism of education and teaching

## Introduction

The topics of national self-identification and the conscious choice of the future destiny of the Ukrainian people are gaining special significance today. They became even more acute when the Russian Federation tries to erase the steadfastness of the historical memory of Ukrainians not only through large-scale falsification of history, but also by means of particular crimes in the course of the current military aggression. Russian attempts to inscribe the Ukrainian culture to and dissolve it in the far-fetched theory of Eurasianism, which substantiates the insurmountable gap between Ukraine and Europe (with its norms and values) does not stand up to criticism and is contrary to common sense.

What can be considered the evidence of this is the peculiar image of the Ukrainian philosophical and pedagogical thought of the late 19<sup>th</sup>–early 20<sup>th</sup> century, which had a number of distinctive national features and peculiarities, despite the fact that it objectively bordered with the Russian one and that it actively fits into the pan-European philosophical and educational space. The integral image of such thought was closely related to the formation of the “soul of the Ukrainian people”, which was a combination of mental, cultural and moral characteristics of Ukrainians (Kremen and Ilyin, 2020, p. 108). The matrix of philosophical and pedagogical shifts of this period was built on the semantic, ontological dimensions of human spirituality, intercultural factors of personality development and the formation of the national model of educational science as a certain theoretical integrity. In addition, it had a number of features associated with a moderate attitude towards abstract-rational system constructions; it had a positive attitude towards religion and the veneration of spiritual values; it showed an inclination to moral guidelines and life guidance, laying the foundations for the algorithm of the “philosophy of teaching and education”. Finally, this mental matrix was quite strongly integrated into literature, socio-political movements and cultural, historical and educational projects.

In view of the above, it is appropriate to remark that, despite the significance of the period (the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup>–beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) in the history of philosophical and pedagogical thought and for modern educational transformations, and despite the heuristic ideas of its representatives, it has not become a subject of systematic analysis until now.

**The analysis of some studies and publications** proved that, on the one hand, Ukrainian scholars substantiated the role and significance of the philosophical thought of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the historiosophical understanding of the mental peculiarities and the identity of the character traits of Ukrainians, as well as of the semantic, ontological dimensions of human spirituality (P. Kralyuk, V. Kremen, V. Krysachenko, O. Kulchytskyi, N. Radionova, M. Tkachuk and others), which are highlighted in numerous publications, textbooks and anthologies. On the other hand, the peculiarities of *the philosophical and educational thought* of this period in the creative heritage of many representatives of enlightened communities and societies and their influence on the formation of national education were investigated (L. Berezivska, O. Kvas, V. Petrusenko, M. Pryshchak and others).

What seems quite promising are the results of the scientific research on *philosophical and educational thought*, which was conducted within the framework of scientific and educational institutions, performing a human-creative function in culture and was directly related to the formation of the matrix of the philosophy of intercultural education (Gerasimenko, 2020; Kuzmina, 2013; Mnozhinskaya, 2015; Radionova, 2010 and others).

However, in most studies, there is an avoidance of consistency in the analysis of the image of philosophical and educational thought, the selection of its individual representatives, retelling and relishing their ideas and reflections on the problems of education. Such retransmission of educational imperatives of philosophical and pedagogical thought simplifies the significance of their creative assets in the field of education and educational science.

**The purpose of this research** is a retrospective analysis of the philosophical and educational thought of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the context of cultural, educational and ethnically determined events of this period. This is the base on which the system of its intercultural paradigmatic shifts is revealed and the most important educational constants are determined, which has heuristic significance for modern educational science.

**Presenting the main material.** The existential and categorical identification of national culture was especially significant in the discussed period. It became an important stage in the transformation of views on the problems

of human existence, the spiritual development of an individual, as well as the pedagogical matrix of national education. In the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Russian Empire, which included most of the Ukrainian territories, faced the need to carry out large-scale reforms in various spheres of life. Yet, these reforms could not give a positive result without radical changes in the field of education in the times when the period of abolition of serfdom and some cardinal changes in the political, economic, judicial, military spheres started. That is why in the early 60s a series of reforms in the educational sphere began.

During this period, Sunday schools became widespread – in free educational institutions for illiterate adults and children who did not have the opportunity to attend regular school due to lack of funds. Teaching in most of them was conducted in Ukrainian, textbooks and primers were published, including “Southern Russian Primer” by Taras Shevchenko. Substantial support for school education began to be provided by organs of rural self-government called *zemstva*. School committees of *zemstva*, the core of which consisted of people with progressive views, covered about 85% of the school budget the construction of new schools, improved teaching methods, introduced the teaching of such subjects as mathematics, geography, history, etc. A new charter for gymnasiums (secondary schools) was developed and approved, introducing the principle of formal equality in secondary education for all classes and religions. In classical gymnasiums, the emphasis was on teaching ancient languages (Greek and Latin) and logic, while in another type of schools called real schools, the emphasis was on the study of European languages, mathematics and natural science. All graduates of classical gymnasiums received the right to enter the university without exams, and graduates of real schools – to higher technical educational institutions. There were also changes in women’s education, which involved the opening of gymnasiums for women. In general, already at the end of the 70s, every provincial town and even many county towns had their own gymnasiums. There were about 130 of them throughout Ukraine.

Radical changes were taking place in higher education during this period. In particular, in the 70s, higher school was replenished with the opening of the Nizhyn Historical and Philological Institute, Kharkiv Technological and Kyiv Polytechnic Institutes. Institutions of higher education were granted wide autonomy by the “University Statute” (1863), including the right to independent solving scientific, educational, administrative and financial issues. Certain developments in the field of higher education were also achieved

in Western Ukraine, where the University of Chernivtsi, the Lviv Polytechnic Institute and the Academy of Veterinary Medicine were opened. A new phenomenon was the emergence of various scientific organizations. For example, at the Kyiv University of St. Volodymyr, scientific societies (philological, mathematical, physico-medical, historical ones, the Society of Nature Researchers) were created, and in Western Ukraine – Taras Shevchenko Literary Scientific Society, which was headed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky from 1897 to 1913.

The reforms in education led to the large-scale democratization of the educational process, the influence of European philosophical and pedagogical thought, and the strengthening of the struggle against the formal and dogmatic essence and content of education. This, in turn, resulted in the transformation of views on the reality of people's lives, their mentality, understanding, behaviour. It was not accidental that the growth of the national and educational movement periodically caused dissatisfaction with the tsarist authorities, which resorted to harsh political repressions regarding the revitalization of Ukrainian culture. An apt example of these persecutions was the famous Valuev circular of 1863, which forbade the printing of "textbooks and books for the people." In the "Regulations on primary public schools", it was stated that teaching in higher schools should be conducted exclusively in Russian. Throughout this period, the government policy regarding national schools and national languages was extremely reactionary. It was forbidden to conduct theatrical performances in the Ukrainian language, to print books (except for historical documents and works of "red literature") and even lyrics for musical works.

However, it was no longer possible to stop the processes of national awakening. Against the background of intensive economic development and the transformation of consciousness, the demand for educated people was constantly growing and was a serious deterrent to the anti-democratic actions of the authorities. National ideas, having become an element of the consciousness of cultural figures, representatives of academic philosophy and education, were welcomed by wide sections of the Ukrainian society, and despite the oppression of the tsarist government, the Ukrainian national movement was gaining strength.

**Firstly**, a significant role in the formation of the national paradigm of philosophical and pedagogical thought of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was played by educational societies, whose active members were V. Antonovych, B. Grinchenko, M. Hrushevskyi, M. Ye-

fremov, M. Kostomarov, P. Kulish, S. Rusova, M. Starytskyi, K. Ushinskyi and others whose main task was the popularization of knowledge, spread of education, development of culture and morality. Their conclusions regarding the definition of the main principles of the Ukrainian national school (teaching in the Ukrainian language, subjects of Ukrainian studies, textbooks in the native language, special training of teachers, national education system, popularization of the national idea) were extremely valuable (Berezivska, 1999; Pobirchenko, 2002). An important contribution to developing the philosophy of the Ukrainian national idea, the national Ukrainian identity, the relationship between thinking and language, language and history, was the activity of M. Drahomanov, O. Potebny and other figures of culture and science. Under their influence, the formation of the Ukrainian literary language, the beginning of which was laid by I. Kotlyarevsky, took place, the theatre acquired the features of national character, thanks to the activities of such artists as I. Karpenko-Karyi, G. Gulak-Artemovsky, M. Kropyvnytsky and others.

The process of Ukrainian national revival was significantly influenced by academic philosophy, which became the “trigger” of philosophical and educational thought and actively produced the national worldview and the perception of the world. Along with pure philosophical theory associated with the German philosophical theory (in particular Schellingism), diverse religious philosophies (J. Schad, A. Novitsky, S. Gogotsky, I. Mikhnevich, P. Yurkevich) and ideas of natural and scientific orientation (M. Lyubovskiy, P. Lodi, M. Kozlov, D. Kavunnyk, M. Maksymovych), the substantiation of the national identity of the Ukrainian people was revealed in the teachings and works of professors of Kharkiv and Kyiv Universities as well as the Kyiv Theological Academy. This unfolded in the context of understanding the critical cultural-historical memory (Saukh, 2017) and became an important socio-ideological topic of a wide range of thinkers of this period. At the same time, the philosophical self-awareness of the nation was derived from the interpretation of this idea as an imperative of the nation, meanwhile the ethnic unity was defined as a spiritual unity. The initial thesis of the philosophical understanding of the Ukrainian idea was the idea of the identity of the Ukrainian people, which was determined by its natural spiritual features.

The research guidelines of many representatives of academic philosophy were determined by the need for a new “true human”, philosophical and pedagogical discussions about the essence of human being, the spiritual world and freedom. Without denying the semantic determination of a human being by God’s spirit and of the very idea of God, scholars shifted the emphasis



in the search for the very idea of God to the topics of human spirituality. However, despite this religious and anthropological discourse, their activities were permeated with purely secular tasks of educating both children and adults. This means that although the religious paradigm was the basis of the pedagogical views of university philosophers, its essence was not reduced by them to simple definitions of Christian truths. In this context, the opinion of P. Yurkevich, who warned against excessive exaltation and dogmatism in studies, can serve as an example (Yurkevich, 1865). Alongside the drawing of attention to the semantic aspects of human existence and, on this basis, to the problems of moral education, the studies conducted by representatives of philosophical and pedagogical thought emphasize the axiological aspects of human spirituality. In the works of P. Yurkevich, S. Hogotsky, V. Zenkovsky and H. Chelpanov spirituality is discussed as a harmonious combination of truth, goodness, and beauty, and the task of pedagogy is declared to be the development of mind, will, feelings and empathy.

**Secondly**, the representatives of philosophical and educational thought in this period not only explored the semantic, ontological dimensions of human spirituality, but also analyzed the factors of personality development, in particular the pedagogical ones. They tried to find the “mechanisms” for the actualization of the semantic aspects of human existence, primarily at the personal level, which would contribute to the formation of the national discourse of educational science as a certain theoretical integrity. Academic philosophy of this period was closely connected with pedagogy, it was even believed that the latter is an integral part of philosophy. Philosophical studies in higher educational institutions often ended with the reading of individual pedagogical disciplines. Philosophy, which existed within the framework of scientific and educational institutions and performed a human-creative function in culture, was characterized by a tendency to create a “philosophy of education”, which rightfully became the framework of the pedagogical constructions of our times. In this context, the studies of the Kyiv Academic School deserve special attention, in particular, the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy (M. Grot, S. Gogotsky, I. Mikhnevich, A. Novitsky, P. Yurkevich, etc.) and the Kiev University of St. Vladimir (O. Gilyarov, V. Zenkovsky, O. Kozlov, G. Chelpanov, G. Shpet and others). At some point in their careers, all of them dealt with teaching of pedagogy or with educational research. A. Novitsky, a former professor at the Kyiv Theological Academy, together with the Department of Philosophy at the Kiev University of St. Vladimir was in charge of the Department of pedagogy. S. Gogotsky and P.

Yurkevich not only taught pedagogy, but also published their textbooks and research on pedagogical science and education (Kuzmina, 2013). On the basis of the fundamental research in the field of human sciences, this allowed them to formulate an important theoretical standpoint on the comprehensive study of the child as a complex developing system. In the context of developing the ideas of child-centrism, the child was considered not only as an object of influence of the social environment, but as a person who is able to actively perceive the phenomena of the surrounding world and process them, on the basis of internal motivation and individual characteristics. This understanding of the child contributed to the justification of new effective methods of teaching and educating, which are based on cooperation and solidarity between a teacher and student.

**Thirdly**, all this became the basis for determining important pedagogical constants in the development of education, which have heuristic significance and are in many respects compliant with modern educational transformations from the standpoint of pedagogical anthropology. In particular, they comprise:

- the principles of respect and a respectful attitude towards the child's personality, the theoretical and methodological significance of which was to define the child as the initial coordinate system and at the same time the main goal of the educational process. This should be aimed at preserving and developing individuality, creating the necessary conditions for self-development, the disclosure of all the valuable things that have been instilled in the child since birth. The child's right to its own path of development was substantiated, and the "emphasis on the child's individuality is considered the most important principle of pedagogy" (Zenkovsky, 1924);
- syncretism of learning and education, according to which pedagogy is called "the science of educational education" (Hogotskyi, 1879). The relationship between education and training should become a problem of systemic pedagogical activity. After all, what is discussed here is the development of two main dimensions of the whole spiritual world of a person – the ability to learn the world by mastering the earlier acquired knowledge and the ability to evaluate everything that exists (including oneself) with the help of a certain hierarchical system of values developed in the person's consciousness. It is proven that personality is connected with all spheres of life and cannot be imagined outside the physical, mental or social boundaries – everything must be nurtured,



but this should be done under the auspices of spiritual life, which is the “basic principle of personality”. The soul is considered the main object of pedagogical influence. Along with emphasizing the need to educate the “whole personality”, it was emphasized that its formula is determined not only by the harmonious development of nature, but also by an internal hierarchy, and that “education of the empirical component of life activity” is just as necessary as the spiritual one, “since the latter is mediated by it” (Zenkovsky, 1924);

- the principle of an increasing role of the teacher in society. A teacher can have a variety of skills, yet above all, must be a person. Only then they can consolidate the children around them. The teachers’ mission is to teach children to be flexible in change, and their main feature is love for children, who learn from and listen to the one they love. It is confirmed that the professionalism of a teacher depends not only on perfect knowledge of a particular subject, the teaching methods, but first of all on love for children, the belief in the possibilities and uniqueness of each child. Without this, there cannot be any “pedagogical initiative, and hence, there cannot be any pedagogical skill”;
- a critical attitude towards the role and importance of school in society, which is “detached from the needs of social life” and requires a comprehensive understanding, mostly from the standpoint of pedagogical anthropology. The school must perform a double task: on the one hand, it must instill in a person the desire for perfection, bring them closer to the Creator, and thus form a personality; and on the other hand, it must help a person justify their own presence in this world by overcoming evil. The school should both teach a person to self-improve throughout life and be the most important and most necessary institution in human life;
- the transformation of worldview orientations and political preferences of the population, which at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century reduced the influence of the religious factor on the spiritual sphere of a person and determined the processes of secularization of education. The development of natural sciences, positivism and materialism during those times expanded the understanding of human spiritual life, giving rise to and consolidating secular culture and secular spirituality. Along with the theoretical substantiation of the methodological and organizational aspects of the creation of the national school, the cultivation of national education, the role and importance of social education was observed. The point is that education should not only give knowledge and instill

the habit of intellectual work, it should also prepare the child for social activities. Therefore, school must take on the task of social education, which consists in the development of social activity, in the education of solidarity, the ability to rise above personal egoistic intentions. Social education is considered to be “a basic factor in the spirituality of the individual, the main form of pedagogical action that ensures the effectiveness of other forms of education” (Zenkovsky, 1920). On this basis, the pedagogical ideal is formed as the system-creating basis of an intercultural life strategy of the national educational space.

Thus, the leading features in the constitution of the educational space in this period were:

- affirmation of universal human values as a priority for education (love and respect for children, faith in them and the good movements of their soul, assertion of the existential nature of freedom);
- democratization of education (creation of conditions for free activity and the child’s life self-determination);
- individualization of the educational process with an emphasis on education which involved taking into account the natural abilities and inclinations, character traits and personal needs of each child;
- actualization of the role of the teacher as a mentor, able to create a viable, friendly atmosphere, organize the educational process on the basis of common interests with students, spiritual closeness, trusting relationships and dialogue;
- public nature of intercultural education, which provided for a close connection between school and life, participation in public associations and organizations, wide publicity at work, multicultural education and social responsibility.

## Conclusion

The second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was a turning point in the development of domestic philosophical and pedagogical thought. Despite its objective connections with the Russian one, it declared itself as a system of a new worldview and understanding of the world and it accumulated the best achievements of world culture while maintaining the national identity. Its philosophical and anthropological concept of education has become an independent and distinctive phenomenon of the contemporary culture and education.

An appeal to the origins and historical and cultural heritage of the representatives of the philosophical and educational thought of this period is of great importance for understanding the domestic environment of the modern educational space. This is also marked by our desire to understand our own internal logic and conceptual foundations, which will serve as a framework for further pedagogical searching. Moreover, these assets are surprisingly compliant with the main imperative of the UNESCO International Commission on the Future of Education, declared in the report of its chairman Her Excellency President Sahle-Work Zewde at The Transforming Education Summit on September 19, 2022 at the United Nations in New York (Report of the International Commission, 2022).

## References

- Berezivska, L. 1999. *Educational activities of Kyiv educational societies (second half of the 19<sup>th</sup>–early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries)*. Kyiv: Molod.
- Gerasimenko, A. 2020. *Theoretical foundations of Ukrainian pedagogy of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> – the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century*. Kyiv: Philosophical School.
- Gogotsky, S. 1879. *A Brief review of pedagogy or the science of educational education*. Moscow: INSTRAO.
- Kralyuk, P. 2013. *History of Ukrainian philosophy: a study guide*. Ostrog: Publishing House of the National University “Ostroh Academy”.
- Kremen, V. and Ilyin, V. 2020. *Man in the challenges of civilization: from the past to the future: Man. Education*. Kyiv: Diploma.
- Kulchytskyi, O. 1995. *Basics of philosophy and philosophical sciences*. Munich – Lviv: Ukrainian Free University.
- Kuzmina, S. 2013. Pedagogical heritage of Kyiv academic philosophy of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries: Capital is dead or alive? *Problems of Pedagogical Secondary and Higher School*. **26** (65), pp. 24–43.
- Linytskyi, P. 2002. About education. *Philosophical Thought*. **2**, pp. 106–116.
- Pobirchenko, N. 2008. *The issue of national education and upbringing in the activities of Ukrainian Communities (second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century)*. Kyiv: Science World.
- Report from the international commission on the futures of education. 2022. *Reimagining our futures together – a new social contract for education foreword*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707> (7.09.2023).

- Saukh, P. 2003. *Philosophy: study guide*. Kyiv: Center of Educational Literature.
- Saukh, P. 2022. *Peculiarities of Ukrainian philosophical thought of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century*. In: *Modern directions of scientific research development. Proceedings of the 15<sup>th</sup> International scientific and practical conference*. Chicago: BoScience Publisher, pp. 359–364.
- Yurkevich, P. 1865. *Readings about education*. Moscow: Chepalevsky Publishing House.
- Zenkovsky, V. 1920. *About social education*. Kyiv: Allukraininan Printing House.
- Zenkovsky, V. 1924. *Psychology of childhood*. Leipzig: Sotrudnik Publishing House.