

---

DOI: 10.31866/2410-1915.23.2022.260966

UDC 001.891:008(477)"2019/2021"

## PROBLEM SPACE OF UKRAINIAN CULTURAL STUDIES: 2019–2021 EXPERIENCE

Yuliia Sabadash

*DSc in Cultural Studies, Professor,*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-5068-7486, juliasabadash2005@gmail.com,*

*Mariupol State University,*

*129-a, Budivelnykiv Ave., Mariupol, 87500, Ukraine*

---

### **For citations:**

Sabadash, Yu. (2022). Problem Space of Ukrainian Cultural Studies: 2019–2021 Experience. *Culture and Arts in the Modern World*, 23, 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1915.23.2022.260966>.

---

The purpose of the article is to analyse a number of collections of scientific works that have actualised culturally oriented issues. The research methodology is based on general scientific principles, namely terminological and systemic, and has determined the use of such research methods as analysis, synthesis, and generalisation. Emphasis is placed on the potential of a personalised approach, which outlines the theoretical and practical interests of domestic scientists, and allows adjusting the research space of Ukrainian humanities. Scientific novelty. The process of developing arguments on the special features of the interaction of different humanities in the field of culturology and the gradual development of the principles of culturological analysis is reproduced on the example of regular scientific publications. Conclusions. The subject of collections of scientific articles of 2019–2021 showed a noticeable interest in the following theoretical issues, namely: further improvement of the conceptual and categorical “support” of cultural research, reconstruction of the process of formation of the phenomenon of “turn” with an in-depth analysis of “anthropological”, “linguistic”, “cultural” turns and identification of “pros” and “cons” of such a theoretical construction. A prominent place is occupied by issues that reveal the “intersection zone” of cultural studies with other humanities: philosophy, history, psychology, and art studies. Significant publications are those that focus on the history of culture as the basis for the formation of cultural studies. A significant segment in modern cultural studies belongs to the issue of the specific character of art, which organically combines the history and theory of culture, having a clear significance for outlining the ways of further development of Ukrainian art studies.

*Keywords:* cultural studies; scientific and theoretical, scientific and practical issues; systematisation; the communicative function of collections of scientific works

### **Introduction**

The problem space of Ukrainian culturology, as is known, is wide enough, which requires constant attention to the theoretical positions that are matters of interest to

its researchers. Deliberately emphasising the current scientific and theoretical issues, the author of the article believes that due to “current” can be traced “bias”, and this makes it possible, on the one hand, to show what remains unnoticed by scientists, and on the other, to direct the work of PhD students or doctoral students in the right direction: this is a real way to avoid repetitions and lack of progress for the development of specific scientific schools.

Recent research and publications analysis. Since the content of this article is based on publications in periodicals that attract attention both by their relevance and the author’s approach to understanding the stated topic, the relevant publications will be analysed in the process of presenting the works of 2019–2021.

The article does not cover all collections of scientific articles in the Ukrainian space, but only that part of them that has a consistent cultural direction.

### **Purpose of the article**

The purpose of the article is to analyse a number of collections of scientific papers that purposefully actualised culturologically oriented issues during 2019–2021, outline the “problem field” and systematise those areas in the research process that are perceived theoretically promising.

### **Main research material**

The concept of “problem field” used in the title of the article does not provide for the analysis of all articles presented in collections of scientific papers, but only those whose authors have either already identified a theoretically promising issue, or the issues raised by them allow “seeing” it and encourage other scientists to develop the outlined direction. This idea is detailed using a specific example. It is known that since the beginning of the active entry of cultural studies into the context of Ukrainian humanities, the attention of scholars has been focused on identifying those humanities with which culturology actively cooperates. This theoretical aspect is clearly embodied in the article by M. Brovko (2007) “Culturology in the system of humanitarian knowledge”, in which he showed the prospects of both “the process of detailing, deepening the study of culture — that is, its differentiation, and the process of integrating knowledge about culture” (p. 97). M. Brovko operates with the formal and logical structure of “subject parameters of cultural studies”, thanks to which the synthesis of knowledge from various sciences in the “problem field” of cultural studies is perceived as quite an appropriate idea.

The article writing requirements limit our ability to expand various points of view related to M. Brovko’s theses. However, we consider it necessary to refer to the article by M. Chikarkova (2019) “The term “modern culture”: semantic content and the chronological problem”, which showed the relevance of the study of the conceptual and categorical apparatus of cultural studies and confirmed a rather symptomatic fact: despite the fact that 12 years of intense research have passed between the articles by M. Brovko (2007) and M. Chikarkova (2019), the scientific space of culturology has many “white spots”, the filling of which keeps scientists in constant tension.

In the same year, 2019, an article by N. Otrushko (2019) “Transculturality as a modern theoretic concept in an interdisciplinary academic space” was published in the collection of scientific works *The Culturology ideas* issued by the Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine. The article was dedicated to the re-animation and actualisation of the concept of “transculturalism”, which, using the root structure of “culture”, attempts, so to speak, to adapt to modern positive and negative examples of cultural creation. Summing up his scientific research, N. Otrushko (2019) defines three positions of argumentation of the concept of “transculturalism”:

- first, the expediency of using the concept of “transculturalism”, which “will help solve the main question of modern cultural studies: how is it possible to study cultures that are constantly transforming and changing, flowing into each other”;
- secondly, it is necessary to take into account the existence of deep ideological contradictions between neoliberals and postcolonialists, which complicates the situation, since separate centres for studying modern culture are being formed;
- and thirdly, the study of the phenomenon of “transculturalism” is not only theoretical, but also purely practical, since it helps to solve the issues of transcultural communications (p. 95).

Based on the article by M. Brovko (2007), which was published in 2007, it is shown, how the outlines of his position were transformed and formed into promising ideas that expanded the potential of cultural studies. However, the presented block of issues is one of the directions that is clearly “visible” in the subject of collections. In addition, it is necessary to demonstrate another block that has both theoretical and practical aspects.

Thus, during the round table “Aesthetics in Ukraine: present and future”, which was organised by the *Philosophical thought* journal on 25 September 2009, the need to focus on culturology’s interdisciplinary contacts with aesthetics and art studies, which “maintain” the entire specific structure of arts, was clearly outlined. Gradually, the issues related to the identification of the interaction between “cultural studies — art studies” began to appear in the “problem field” of Ukrainian humanities. That applies particularly to taking into account the experience of the history of culture, which was accumulated during the centuries-old civilisational stages, thanks to which culturology was able to bring, so to speak, new motives in the space of art studies and aesthetics.

In this context, it is worth mentioning the publications of V. Lychkovakh, O. Malanchuk-Rybak, M. Ternova, S. Stoian, S. Kholodynska, which during 2019–2021 — this is the chronology of this article — showed ways to reconstruct a number of issues related to the interaction of cultural studies with other humanities.

In our opinion, M. Ternova’s article (2019) “Culture studies and art studies in structure of modern Ukrainian humanities” deserves special attention, in which the author offers her vision of ways to implement a number of important research tasks:

- first, M. Ternova (2019), analysing specific publications, shows a rather high level of study by Ukrainian scientists of the essence of culturology, in general, emphasising their consistent interest in the facts of the interaction of this science with the aesthetic and art studies sphere, in particular;
- secondly, carrying out a comparative analysis of “culturology-art studies”, M. Ternova (2019) reconstructs the historical and cultural stages when, on the one hand, the humanities tended to synthesise their capabilities, and on the other, cultural creation tried to rely on the principles of theoretical and practical parity, due to which

a particular person acted as both a theorist and an art practitioner. If to the list of names used by M. Ternova (2019) — T. Gautier, S. Baudelaire, E. Zola — add V. Kandinsky, S. Mallarme, K. Malevich, T. Mann, A. Matisse, M. Proust, M. Semenko, and I. Franko, the concept of “theoretical and practical parity”, the meaning of which is emphasised by L. Levchuk, O. Onishchenko, S. Kholodynska, really turns out to be a powerful basic principle in the context of “problem field”.

– third, an important aspect of the article under consideration is the appeal of its author to the legacy of the famous English esthetician, art theorist and historian of science R. G. Collingwood, whose monograph *Principles of art* (1938) at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries received pan-European publicity.

It should be noted that M. Ternova (2019), on the one hand, convincingly argues the powerful cultural subtext of Collingwood’s monograph — being a historian of science, he was guided by a retrospective approach in the consideration of the issues, — and on the other hand, his attitude to the potential of “inter-science”, outlining the plane of interaction between history, aesthetics, psychology and various structural components of art studies (pp. 131–132).

It should be emphasised that during 2019–2021, scientists were interested not so much in art studies as a holistic phenomenon, but in its manifestation and role in specific types of art. During this period, a number of theatre studies articles, first of all, of *the Scientific Bulletin* of the Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi Theatre, Cinema and Television University, provided analysis of the important stages in the history of the theatre based on the principles of a personalised approach. The authors of these articles — T. Batytska, V. Bubnova, M. Mishchenko, L. Ovchiieva, in our opinion, reasonably “fit” the creative search of the specific directors or leaders of successful theatre groups into a particular historical and cultural stage, reproducing the aesthetic and artistic atmosphere of that time. In the space of such a theatrical task, L. Ovchiieva’s scientific research (2020) “Liubov Linytska is a performer in plays by Jewish playwrights (the Sadovsky’s theatre is the first Ukrainian stationary theatre in Kyiv (1909–1915))” deserves support and positive evaluation.

Among the articles in the field of film studies, we will focus on the scientific research of T. Kokhan (2020) “Culturological guidelines of modern Ukrainian film studies”, which was published in the collection of scientific works *Ukrainian cultural studies*. In recent years, this is one of the few articles that outlines a number of important cultural aspects in the field of film studies:

– first, systematising the research space that was formed during 2005–2020, T. Kokhan (2020) justifies the “interaction zone” between cultural studies and film studies, emphasising the fact of “supporting the interest of artists in the issues of other humanities — cultural studies, philosophy, aesthetics, psychology, sociology”, since such a “collective stimulus” as “film — humanities”, which takes into account the potential of humanities knowledge, will have a significant aesthetic and emotional, and educational potential (p. 20);

– secondly, it is expedient to support the following thesis of T. Kokhan (2020), according to which “an analysis of a number of works by Ukrainian film critics gives grounds to assert that they are characterised by both the relevance of the issue and the integrity of its “grasp”. At the same time, film studies do not bypass the potential of the principles of culturological approach” (p. 22);

– third, in our opinion, the “principles of cultural approach” that are – to some extent – stated in the article by T. Kokhan (2020) are also likely, namely: inter-scientific, dialogic, continuity of historical and cultural stages, the significance of the “authorship” in cinema. In this context, the creative and search load of personalisation, a structural element of the biographical method, is emphasised.

A fundamentally important emphasis in the space of Ukrainian humanities in 2019-2021 was made regarding “turns” – an idea that began to take shape in the first half of the twentieth century. Since the phenomenon of “turn” is used quite actively and in various aspects in the field of Ukrainian humanities, we will focus on the collection *Ukrainian Cultural Studies*, which is a basic publication on the issues of cultural studies of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Several of its issues have shown that the organisers of the publication try to expand the author’s space, performing the communicative function of the collection, and to go beyond the discussion of only theoretical issues: *Ukrainian Cultural Studies* presents a section “Practical cultural studies”, which allows the specialists to join the controversial issues of the aesthetic and artistic orientation of television, the possibilities of media technologies, the experience of cultural expertise.

O. Shynkarenko’s article “Ethical explications of “visual turn” in contemporary culture” (2020) published in the *Ukrainian Cultural Studies* continues the analysis of the issues raised by the author in the article “Cultural turns as a request for culturology” (Shynkarenko, 2018). It should be noted that this collection publishes articles on one topic by the same author in several issues, so to speak, “with a continuation”. Regarding the issue of “cultural turn”, the presence of two articles allows us to holistically present the issue that is clearly relevant in the space of not only Ukrainian, but also European humanities.

O. Shynkarenko (2018) emphasises that the “metaphor of “turn” in the 50s of the last century “was used in philosophical discourse by M. Heidegger, gradually stimulating scholars to transform “metaphor” into “concept”, and the construction of “turn” was supposed to confirm the fact of transition to the need to master a new sphere of reality. Today, “ontological”, “linguistic”, “iconic”, “cultural”, and “visual” turns function in the field of cultural studies. The actualisation of the problem of “turn” is also confirmed by the fact that some European culturologists (S. Van Tuinen), who since the early 90s argued for the end of “postmodernism” and the transition of “post+post-modernism” to “metamodernism” – a new stage in the development of this model of culture. This “transition” is proposed to be considered as a “craft turn”.

The key word in O. Shynkarenko’s article “Ethical explications of “visual turn” in contemporary culture” (2020) is “ethical”, because this is almost the first attempt to emphasise the complex of issues that turns out to be the most significant in the context of “visualisation” of cultural creation. O. Shynkarenko (2020) is right in saying that in the process of discussing “the originality and changes in the nature of the modern cultural practice, the issue of the relationship between ethos and aesthetics in human perception and experience of the world is increasingly raised” (p. 47).

It is necessary to support and positively evaluate the attempt of O. Shynkarenko (2020) to actively use, considering the “adjustment of compliance of visual practices” with the principle of “kalokagathia” – the inseparability of ethos and aesthetics”. In our opinion, the conclusion that sums up arguments on the pros and cons of cultural visual-

isation is important, namely: “The introduction of these concepts into today’s discourse implies their more expanded understanding than a reference to morality, ethics or aesthetics. Moreover, with regard to the latter, to date, the arbitrariness in their interpretation and use does not contribute to productive coverage of existing problems” (pp. 47–48). In our opinion, there is no doubt that both the issue of “turns”, in general, and the influence of “visual turns” on the theoretical and practical space of modern culture will not end there, but will continue to be present in the “problem field”.

As both European and Ukrainian humanities are increasingly involved in the analysis of a wide range of issues related to the analysis of changes in the dynamics of the cultural orientation of modernism — postmodernism — post + postmodernism — metamodernism, during 2019–2021, interest in the avant-garde — the most expressive historical and cultural stage of modernism — has noticeably increased.

It should be recognised that during 2019–2021, a number of publications appeared, the authors of which are known for their scientific research in the field of historical and theoretical trends of the avant-garde movement. It is not only about deepening the material on the period between 1905 — the publication of the foundations of “fauvist” aesthetics — and the dynamics of the development of surrealism of the 1920s and 1930s, but also about the influence of the avant-garde on postmodernism and metamodernism. Obviously, it is no coincidence that D. Quayola, a well-known English metamodernist of Italian origin, has constant, so to speak, contacts with the heritage of representatives of the Russian avant-garde, in particular, with the work of K. Malevich.

Making a brief review of the articles devoted to deepening ideas about the space of avant-garde art, it should be emphasised that the thorough scientific research of O. Onishchenko (2019) “Dadaism in the dynamics of the development of European avant-garde”, which focuses not so much on the artistic practice of Dadaists, but on the theoretical ideas of those art studies scholars who, first of all, in the wake of the establishment of certain means of Dadaist aesthetics, tried to understand the essence of those “claims” which were put forward by its supporters regarding the models of artistic development of certain types of art on the eve of the appearance of Dadaism.

O. Onishchenko (2019) notes: “Reconstructing both the history of Dadaism and the features of its development at the initial stage, it is worth stating that the complexity and inconsistency of the European avant-garde movement make its further study expedient, revealing new aspects of this complex phenomenon, which will never lose its relevance” (p. 61).

Accepting the approaches proposed by O. Onishchenko to the analysis of avant-garde according to the method of “projection of time”, S. Kholodynska, (2021) in the article “From avant-garde to realism without borders: modification of philosophical support of French cultural formation” quite convincingly reproduces the reasons for putting forward in the context of the avant-garde “the idea of “realism without borders” — a concept that aggravated the situation among supporters of realistic methodology in art” (p. 109).

In our opinion, S. Kholodynska (2021) fairly states that a wide range of issues related to realistic methodology in art remained on the margins of Ukrainian humanities, and this prevented the objective recreation of the logic or illogicality of the process of European cultural creation right up to 1974 — the year of the official proclamation of the principles of postmodernism. There is every reason to evaluate “realism without

borders” as a kind of “flexible bridge” between avant-garde and postmodernism. A positive aspect of S. Kholodynska’s (2021) research is that elements of the heritage of Roger Garaudy (1913–2012), an outstanding French theorist and author of such studies as “Grammar of Freedom” (1953), “The answer to Jean-Paul Sartre” (1962), and “Realism without borders” (1966), have been introduced into the space of Ukrainian humanities. Thus, the development of the avant-garde movement in its dynamics from the beginning of the last century to the 70s is a significant direction in current scientific output.

Obviously, attention to avant-garde and its modifications prompted Ukrainian scholars to realise the need to fully reproduce the process of cultural creation over the past century and explain the extremely contradictory phenomena that characterise artistic culture at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. This direction is implemented in I. Petrova’s article (2020) “Identification of Metamodernism as a Cultural Practice”, the purpose of which is to “describe the essence and analyse the structure of metamodernism as a modern trend in the context of cultural practices” (p. 68).

For this purpose, I. Petrova (2020) makes a brief review of the positions of European scholars regarding the expediency of highlighting “metamodernism” as an independent stage of cultural creation, focusing attention, at the same time, on “cultural practices”: performances by Hollywood actor S. LaBeouf, “Technoimages” by Danish-Icelandic artist O. Eliasson, the creation of “closed heavenly space” by J. Turrell and others.

According to I. Petrova (2020), “the internet is also a metamodern cultural phenomenon, the main feature of which is the ability of an individual to move intensively along independently chosen cultural paths, believing in the vivid illusion of individual control, management, and direct involvement in the cultural world” (p. 72). Using the term “illusion”, I. Petrova (2020), unfortunately, does not add it to the “keywords” of her article. At the same time, she, quite reasonably, actualises the essence of metamodern practices, which — in some places — create only the “illusion of culture”.

In the publications of the period, which we have singled out to present the directions of development of Ukrainian culturology, theoretically significant is the article by O. Onishchenko (2021) “From post to metamodernism: the process of cultural research”, which continues the analysis of the essence of metamodernism and the reasons for the transformation “postmodernism-post+postmodernism- metamodernism”. For several years, this “transformation” encouraged discussions about the future of European culture, and also forced scholars from different countries to adapt to the models of the new conceptual and categorical apparatus. O. Onishchenko (2021) focuses on a number of concepts, due to which “a fundamentally new aesthetic and artistic stimulus is formed: “history + plastic + personalised interpretation = historioplasticity” (p. 62). The articles of O. Onishchenko (2021) and I. Petrova (2020) showed the need for further study of those processes that most clearly reveal the essential features of metamodernism.

## Conclusions

Proceeding from the purpose of the article, which is to analyse a number of collections of scientific papers that purposefully actualised culturologically oriented issues during 2019–2021, outline the “problem field” and systematise those areas in the re-

search process that are perceived theoretically promising, the process of developing arguments (from 2007) on the special features of the interaction of different humanities in the field of culturology and the gradual development of the principles of culturological analysis is reproduced on the example of five regular scientific publications. This issue is still present in the “problem field” of today’s Ukrainian humanities, shaping an important theoretical direction.

The article demonstrates that in addition to general theoretical issues, an independent sector of the “problem field” is the correlation of culturology with related humanities, primarily with art studies and such part of it as film studies. Among other components of art studies, this aspect is most clearly presented in the publications of 2019–2021.

Emphasis is placed on those articles whose authors, focusing on the historical and theoretical problems of avant-garde, reveal its stimulating role — on the example of the concept of “realism without border” — in clarifying the place of realistic methodology. The examples of scientific research devoted to metamodernism — a new stage in the development of postmodern artistic practice — are reproduced.

## References

---

- Brovko, M. M. (2007). Kulturolohiiia v systemi humanitarnoho znanntia [Culturology in the System of Humanitarian Knowledge]. *Aktualni filozofski ta kulturolohichni problemy suchasnosti*, 19, 96–102 [in Ukrainian].
- Chikarkova, M. Yu. (2019). Termin "suchasna kultura": semantychne napovnenntia ta problema khronolohizatsii [The Term "Modern Culture": Semantic Content and the Chronological Problem]. *Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: Philosophy, Culture Studies, Sociology*, 17, 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2849-2019-9-17-67-73> [in Ukrainian].
- Kholodynska, S. M. (2021). Vid avanhardyizmu do "realizmu bez berehiv": modyfikatsii filozofskoho "zabezpechennntia" frantsuzkoho kulturotvorennntia [From Avant-Garde to Realism Without Borders: Modification of Philosophical Support of French Cultural Formation]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, 29, 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.29.2021.248793> [in Ukrainian].
- Kokhan, T. H. (2020). Kulturolohichni oriiientyry suchasnoho ukrainskoho kinoznavstva [Culturological Guidelines of Modern Ukrainian Film Studies]. *Ukrainian Cultural Studies*, 1(6), 18–22. [https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2020.1\(6\).04](https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2020.1(6).04) [in Ukrainian].
- Onishchenko, O. I. (2019). Dadaizm u dynamitsi rozvytku yevropeiskoho avanhardyizmu [Dadaism in the Dynamics of the Development of European Avant-Garde]. *The Culturology Ideas*, 16, 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.37627/2311-9489-16-2019-2.54-62> [in Ukrainian].
- Onishchenko, O. I. (2021). Vid "post" do "meta" modernizmu: protses kulturo tvorchykh poshukiv [From Post — to Metamodernism: the Process of Cultural Research]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, 29, 60–66. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.29.2021.248740> [in Ukrainian].
- Otreshko, N. B. (2019). Transkulturnist yak suchasnyi naukovyi kontsept u mizhdystsyplinarnomu naukovomu prostori [Transculturality as a Modern Theoretic Concept in an Interdisciplinary Academic Space]. *The Culturology Ideas*, 16, 91–97. <https://doi.org/10.37627/2311-9489-16-2019-2.91-97> [in Ukrainian].

- Ovchiieva, L. (2020). Liubov Linytska — vykonavytsia roli u piesakh yevreiskykh dramaturhiv (pershyi ukrainskyi statsionarnyi teatr M. Sadovskoho u Kyievi (1909–1915 rr.)) [Liubov Linytska is a Performer of Roles in Plays by Jewish Playwrights (the Sadovsky's theatre is the first Ukrainian stationary theatre in Kyiv (1909–1915))]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, 26, 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.26.2020.202573> [in Ukrainian].
- Petrova, I. V. (2020). Identyfikatsiia metamodernizmu yak kulturnoi praktyky [Identification of Metamodernism as a Cultural Practice]. *Bulletin of Mariupol State University. Series: Philosophy, Culture Studies, Sociology*, 20, 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.34079/2226-2830-2020-10-20-67-77> [in Ukrainian].
- Shynkarenko, O. V. (2018). "Kulturnyi povorot" yak zapyt do kulturolohii ["Cultural Turns" as a Request For Culturology]. *Ukrainian Cultural Studies*, 1(2), 55–58. [https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2018.1\(2\).13](https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2018.1(2).13) [in Ukrainian].
- Shynkarenko, O. V. (2020). Etychni eksplikatsii "vizualnoho povorotu" u suchasni kulturi [Ethical Explications of "Visual Turn" in Contemporary Culture]. *Ukrainian Cultural Studies*, 1(6), 45–49. [https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2020.1\(6\).10](https://doi.org/10.17721/UCS.2020.1(6).10) [in Ukrainian].
- Ternova, M. V. (2019). Kulturolohiia ta mystetstvoznavstvo v strukturi suchasnoi ukrainskoi humanistyky [Culture Studies and Art Studies in Structure of Modern Ukrainian Humanities]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, 25, 128–133. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.25.2019.188340> [in Ukrainian].

## ПРОБЛЕМНИЙ ПРОСТІР УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЇ: ДОСВІД 2019–2021 РОКІВ

Сабадаш Юлія Сергіївна

Доктор культурології, професор,  
ORCID: 0000-0001-5068-7486, [juliasabadash2005@gmail.com](mailto:juliasabadash2005@gmail.com),  
Маріупольський державний університет,  
Маріуполь, Україна

Мета статті — проаналізувати низку збірників наукових праць, які актуалізували культурологічно зорієнтовану проблематику. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на загальнонаукових принципах — термінологічному та системному, й обумовила застосування таких методів дослідження, як аналіз, синтез, узагальнення. Наголошено на потенціалі персоналізованого підходу, завдяки якому окреслюються теоретико-практичні інтереси вітчизняних науковців, що дозволяє корегувати дослідницький простір української гуманістики. Наукова новизна. На прикладі регулярних наукових видань відтворено процес розгортання аргументів щодо специфіки взаємодії різних гуманітарних наук на теренах культурології й поступове відпрацювання засад культурологічного аналізу. Висновки. Тематика збірників наукових статей 2019–2021 років виявила помітний інтерес до наступних теоретичних питань, а саме: подальше удосконалення понятійно-категоріального «забезпечення» культурологічних досліджень, реконструкція процесу становлення феномену «поворот» з поглибленим аналізом «антропологічного»,

«лінгвістичного», «культурного» поворотів та виявлення «за» і «проти» такої теоретичної конструкції. Помітне місце посідає проблематика, що розкриває «зону перехрестя» культурології з іншими гуманітарними науками: філософією, історією, психологією, мистецтвознавством. Значущими є публікації, в яких акцентовано на історії культури як підґрунті становлення культурології. Помітний сегмент у сучасній культурології належить проблемі видової специфіки мистецтва, яка органічно поєднує історію та теорію культури, маючи виразне значення для окреслення шляхів подальшого розвитку українського мистецтвознавства.

*Ключові слова:* культурологія; науково-теоретична та науково-практична проблематика; систематизація; комунікативна функція збірників наукових праць

