

Mykola BEKH

LOCAL MONOGRAPHIC RESEARCHES OF UKRAINIAN SCIENTISTS IN THE CONTEXT OF WORLD SCIENTIFIC STUDIES IN THE 1920s–1960s

<https://doi.org/10.52603/rec.2022.32.10>

Rezumat

Cercetările monografice locale ale oamenilor de știință ucrainieni în contextul studiilor științifice mondiale din perioada anilor 1920–1960

În condițiile transformărilor sociale profunde din satul ucrainean, cercetările monografice la nivel local (străzi, sate, orașe, raioane) câștigă popularitate. Satul ucrainean de la începutul secolului al XXI-lea trece printr-o perioadă de schimbare, trăsăturile sale sociale și gospodărești și specificul economic nu s-au format încă. Prin urmare, cercetarea locală în această etapă este relevantă și eficientă. Articolul subliniază faptul că în anii 1920 și 1930 au fost efectuate în mod independent diferite studii monografice locale în diferite țări (Statele Unite ale Americii, Rusia, Polonia, Ungaria și România). Etnologii ucraineni s-au confruntat cu problema acută de a studia și înțelege caracteristicile culturale și cotidiene ale diferitelor grupuri locale și de a identifica legăturile complexe între ele la nivel regional și național. Autorul articolului s-a concentrat pe activitățile centrelor etnografice ale Academiei de Științe din Ucraina. Membrii săi au fost cei care au fundamentat și au folosit metodologia cercetării staționare a zonelor locale ca principală în activitatea lor de cercetare. Se analizează metoda staționară a etnografiei de teren ca metodă principală în colectarea și sistematizarea materialului factual pentru studiul monografic. Este prezentată dezvoltarea ulterioară a acestei tehnici în anii 1940–1950.

Cuvinte-cheie: studiu monografic al satului, etnologie, etnografie de teren, metodă staționară, metode, sarcini.

Резюме

Местные монографические исследования украинских ученых в мировом контексте научных исследований 1920–1960-х гг.

В условиях глубоких социальных преобразований в украинском селе все большую популярность приобретают монографические исследования на местном уровне (улицы, села, города, районы). Украинское село в начале XXI в. переживает период перемен, его социально-бытовые черты и экономическая специфика еще не сформировались. Поэтому локальные исследования на данном этапе актуальны и эффективны. В статье указывается, что в 1920-х и 1930-х гг. различные локальные монографические исследования проводились независимо друг от друга в разных странах (США, Россия, Польша, Венгрия и Румыния). Перед украинскими этнологами остро встала проблема изучения и осмысления культурно-бытовых особенностей различных локальных групп и выявления сложных связей между ними на региональном и национальном уровне. Автор статьи остановился на деятельности этнографических центров Академии наук Украины. Именно его члены обосновали и использовали в своей исследовательской деятельности методологию стационарных исследова-

ний местности как основную. Анализируется стационарный метод полевой этнографии как основной при сборе и систематизации фактического материала для монографического исследования. Представлено дальнейшее развитие этой методики в 1940–1950 гг.

Ключевые слова: монографическое исследование села, этнология, полевая этнография, стационарный метод, методы, задачи.

Summary

Local monographic researches of Ukrainian scientists in the context of world scientific studies in the 1920s–1960s

In the conditions of deep social transformations in the Ukrainian village, monographic researches at local level (streets, villages, cities, districts) are gaining popularity. The Ukrainian village of the beginning of the XXI century was going through a period of changes, its social and household features and its economic specifics had not been formed yet. Therefore, local research at this stage is relevant and effective. It is emphasized that during the 1920s and 1930s, various local monographic studies were conducted independently in different countries (the United States, Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Romania). Ukrainian ethnologists were faced with the acute problem of studying and understanding the cultural and everyday features of different local groups and identifying the complex links between them at the regional and national levels. The author focuses on the activities of the ethnographic centers of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. It was its members who substantiated and used the method of stationary research of local areas in their research work. The stationary method of field ethnography, is analyzed as the main one in the collection and systematization of factual material for monographic research. The further development of this technique in the 1940s–1950s is presented.

Key words: monographic study of the village, ethnology, field ethnography, stationary method, methods, tasks.

The events of the political and state affairs of 1917–1920 aroused considerable public interest in national culture and covered the entire field of research in the humanities. The main center of research during this period was established by Hetman Petro Skoropadsky in 1918, the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Within this scientific institution there were a number of ethnographic centers: Ethnographic Commission, Khvedir Vovk Museum-Cabinet of Anthropology and Ethnology, Cabinet of Primitive Culture of the Department of History of Ukraine, Ethnographic Section of the Local His-

tory Commission. These research centers actively conducted various ethnographic studies of the population. Among their developments, a special place was occupied by complex monographic studies of a certain local area – district, city, village or street. It was the ethnologists from the 1920s–1930s who intensified the study of small areas.

The historiographical achievements of Ukrainian modern ethnologists raise the question of the development and the subject of local monographic research in ethnology.

In the works of V. Borysenko (2002) and G. Skrypnyk (1998), the main topics of local research in Ukrainian and the ethnology of the 1920s and 1930s are described. Scientist Glushko M. analyzed the peculiarities of using the technique of stationary ethnography for the collection of field materials (Глушко 2008).

The main task of our article is to highlight the issues of local ethnographic research and the scientific and practical significance of the achievements of both domestic and foreign scholars in the development of this area, the characteristics of methods and the approaches to the study of various ethnocultural processes.

Chronological framework of the research in 1920–1960s. The lower time limit is related to the active implementation of comprehensive local monographs by Ukrainian and foreign scholars. The upper limit is due to the change of scientific approaches and the shift of research priorities from local to areal study of ethnoculture and the life of the population.

A precursor to the emergence of local monographic research in domestic science can be considered a questionnaire-program for the description of Ukraine in 1779, which was created by ethnologist F. Tumansky (Горленко 1964: 100). The main purpose of the developed questionnaire was a detailed and comprehensive study of the Hetmanate (Left Bank of Ukraine) at micro level – village, town or region (Горленко 1964: 101). The priority for the researcher was to establish appropriate contact with respondents to obtain a more complete and comprehensive answer to the question, which is why he pays considerable attention not to asking questions, but to explaining how to answer them (Горленко 2005: 113).

Among the early domestic local monographic studies a special place is occupied by the collection edited by V. Ivanov “Life and work of the peasants of the Kharkiv province” (“Zhyn y tvorchestvo

krestian Kharkovskoi hubernyy”) (Жизнь 1898). Using monographic methods, the author arranged information on folk life and culture of the population of Starobilskoho povitu Kharkivskoi hubernii. It is important to note that in the introduction V. Ivanov included an article “On the modern village”, which is based on field studies of folk life and focuses on the study of the relationship of socio-normative, domestic and economic culture (Иванов 1898).

The program and methodological approaches of domestic scholars of local ethnographic research of the 1920s trace the tradition of Ukrainian studies conducted by Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv. One of the representatives of the society, who studied the history and culture of the “small homeland”, was M. Zubrytsky (1856–1914); he prepared and published 325 scientific articles (Глушко 2008: 57). His works are devoted to the complex study (economy, trade, social institutions, system of government, spiritual and ritual culture) of the village of Mshanets and the neighboring villages of Starosambir povitu. Research activities in the same direction were conducted by A. Onyschuk (1883–1937); he studied the traditional culture and life of the village Zelenitsy Nadvirmianskoho povitu (Арсенич 1989: 10).

The direction of local research was in the general scientific stream of European and world humanities. One of the prominent representatives of the school of monographic research was the Romanian sociologist Dimitrie Gusti (1880–1955), who was the founder of the Romanian School of Sociology (Олтяну 2012: 12). D. Gusti was one of the first in sociology to introduce ethnological (anthropological) methods of study. Under the leadership of D. Gusti, the profile teams of scientists were offered a new comprehensive vision of the Romanian countryside. In particular, in 1936 a group of sociologists and ethnographers D. Gusti, H. Stahl, G. Focsi founded the Museum of the Romanian Village in Bucharest, and the museum still remains one of the leading ethnographic institutions (Олтяну 2012: 12). It should be noted that the combination of monographic research and the method of completing museum collections was one of the main areas of work of Ukrainian ethnologists (Скрипник 1989: 47). At that time, after field surveys and collection of ethnographic material, N. Zaglada summarized: “The ethnographic items collected during the systematic experiments were brought to the Museum and located in a separate de-

partment of Monographic Research of the Village. This department presented a detailed description of the material culture of the village of Starosillya, showing at the same time the methods of stationary experiments on folk life” (Заглада 1930: 10).

In the 1930s, the monographic method was used by English social anthropologists, followers and students of Bronislaw Malinowski, the founder of functionalism. As an example of local research conducted in the tradition of a functional school, we can cite the monograph “Chinese village through the eyes of an ethnographer” (Фэй 1989). Fei Xiaotong’s scientific work is devoted to a third-party study of the Chinese village of Kaixiangong. The book is noteworthy because the researcher used the method of local monograph to study the largest people on Earth, which has a thousand-year history (the main object of study of Western social anthropologists were extremely small “primitive tribes”).

The study of local strata in an urban environment was conducted by American sociologists at Chicago School (Рубр 2012: 47). The first wave of Chicago research, led by R. E. Park and E. V. Burgess, occurred in the 1920s. They conducted research on the Chicago press, the media, crime, and poverty (Рубр 2012: 57). According to the results of the research, a large number of scientific papers were published, which had different subjects of research. At the same time, these books presented materials from one city in Chicago. Urban issues were also in the centre of attention of Ukrainian ethnologists in the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, N. Zaglada prepared a program of survey of the urban population; she outlined the main directions of urban studies of contemporary ethnological science (Онфрійчук 2014: 126).

Local monographs of the village were conducted by Russian local historians. One of the main tasks of such studies was to identify the relationship between micro and macro levels of socio-economic processes and their features (Верняев 2005). One of the ideologues of Russian monographic research M. Ya. Fenomenov had the following considerations: “Study of the inner life and construction of the primary cells that make up the social organism” (Феноменов 1926: 162).

Analyzing the works of foreign ethnographers, we note that local monographic studies of Ukrainian ethnologists in the 1920s and 1930s were in line with the development of world humanities. One of the main tasks of this method of research was a comprehensive study of the spiritual and ma-

terial culture of the population at the micro level (streets, villages, cities), tracing the relationship between local characteristics and national traditions. In particular, one of the ideologues of contemporary ethnographic thought, academician A. Loboda, formed the main criteria for young researchers: “1) to follow the modern fate of ancient forms of folk life and art, but 2) not to miss what was formed and is being formed only in the present time” (Лобода 1925: 7).

According to Ukrainian ethnographers-founders, the study of folk culture, economy and life in the specific historical dynamics is possible due to stationary research, for this there was a need to create research stations in the villages. Researcher A. Onyschuk noted, “Such a method that patiently, systematically exhausts fact by fact through stationary reconnaissance, observes, explores and searches, from the largest and known, to distant and unknown, to the complete study of material” (Онищук 1928: 10). The scientist also emphasized the inseparability of the phenomena of material and spiritual culture of the people (Рубан 2004: 39).

During this period, the most important from a methodological point of view and significant in depth and detail was the study of the village of Starosillya Osterskoho povitu. In 1921, a group of scholars studied the traditional life and spiritual culture: N. Zaglada – the life of a peasant child, L. Shulgina – the physical education of the child and beekeeping; artist Yu. Pavlovich and photographer D. Demutsky prepared illustrations on various topics – clothing, housing. A. Onyschuk headed the research work, he got a job as a teacher at a local school to develop a method of collecting ethnographic materials on the spot to better understand the life of the villagers (Рубан 2004: 40). In a short time a significant amount of valuable materials from the traditional household culture of the rural population was collected: “Living for a long time on the spot, observing the manifestations of village life and recording these phenomena – recording, drawing, photographing, and at the same time collecting for the museum the achievements of material culture” (Заглада 1930: 10). The collected items (337 items) were transported to Khvedir Vovk Museum-Cabinet of Anthropology and Ethnology and located in a separate department of the “Monographic study of the village of Starosillya”. During 1923, a group of employees of the Cabinet-Museum in Myrhorod region studied public housing, pottery and basketry in Slobidka near Kyiv. Scien-

tist N. Zaglada studied children's life, fishing and folk food in the village of Pekari in Kyiv region (Скрипник 1998: 34). In 1924, a new ethnographic research station was opened in the village of Zhukin in the Chernihiv region (Скрипник 1998: 34). The aim of the research was to determine a comprehensive study of one farm (farming, livestock, fishing, hunting, beekeeping, folk food, medicine, family rituals, children's life), the information was supplemented by collected materials from villagers.

During 1926 a group of scientists (A. Onyschuk, N. Zaglada, Yu. Pavlovych) conducted a multifaceted study of the economy, social structure and spiritual culture in the village of Zamyslovychi Olevskoho povitu na Volyni (Скрипник 1998: 34). In the same year, ethnographer L. Shulgina studied pottery in the village of Bubnivka na Podilli (Скрипник 1998: 34).

The results of the above studies have been published in three books "Materials to Ukrainian Ethnology". The first book "Pobut selianskoi dytyny. Materialy do monohrafii s. Starosillia" written by N. Zaglada (Матеріали 1929). The second and third parts are stored in manuscripts in the Archival Scientific Funds of Manuscripts and Phonographs of the Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnology M.T. Rylsky (*abbreviation ASFMP IASFE*). The second part contains articles by N. Zaglada, L. Shulgina, Y. Pavlovich, E. Spaska (ASFMP IASFE, F. 43, c. 174, sh. 31). The third book includes materials by N. Zaglada and L. Shulgina on nutrition and beekeeping in Chernihivshchyni (Борисенко 2002: 12).

V. Petrov's articles contained important methodological significance and critical remarks. The publications are devoted to the analysis of local lore studies, in which the author outlined the main activities of the Ethnographic Commission in the domain of field material collection. In particular, the scientist emphasized the importance of folklore for local lore studies and suggested forms of organizing large-scale local lore work in the collection of folklore and ethnographic material. In this way, the researcher argued with apologists for "latest trends" in science; they advocated the study of production processes at the heart of local lore. According to supporters of the "latest trends", it is important to study "the work of land management, cooperation, the role of the Komsomol", because "it is more important than collecting proverbs and sayings" (Петров 1925).

The scientist V. Petrov did not object to the defi-

nition of the subject of local lore to the representatives of Marxist-Leninist ideology, but argued that folklore cannot be ignored in scientific research. He noted that it is impossible to use only official, archival materials, because in this case only "dead" information with its "office language" will be obtained (Петров 1925: 12). V. Petrov proves the importance of studying not only modern life and folklore, but also "the original everyday foundations of folk festivals", after appealing to the works of authoritative Austrian and German ethnographers, historians and sociologists G. Kunov, J. Lipert, K. Blucher (Петров 1925: 15-16).

V. Petrov initiated the creation of the Cabinet for the Study of the Soviet Village under the Ethnographic Commission in 1929 (ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-2, c. 364, sh. 2). One of the main tasks of this institution was a detailed and comprehensive historical and ethnographic study of the village and obtaining more differentiated ideas about its current state, features of socio-economic processes in different regions of the country. Scientist V. Petrov noted the functioning of the research center as follows: "The Cabinet of the Soviet village – is a cabinet of monographic ethnographic and local lore study of the village, the study of economic, social and domestic processes occurring in the modern village in the historical and genetic aspect" (ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-2, c. 364, sh. 1).

To achieve these goals provided for the creation of one permanent station in each administrative and economic zone with certain natural and economic features (ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-2, c. 364, sh. 3). Between 1929–1930s, a monographic study of five villages was planned: Didkovychi Korosten-skyi okruh; Sartana Mariupolskyi okruh; Tsvitokha Shepetivskyi okruh; Kunashivka Nizhynskyi okruh; Prokhorivka Kyivskyi okruh (ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-2, c. 364, sh. 4).

A thorough study was conducted by N. Dmytruk in the village of Didkovychi on Korostenshchyni (ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-4, c. 219, sh. 1-42). Since 1927, the researcher has collected unique material on the history of the village, customary and ceremonial culture, folk knowledge and life. The results of this research work are covered in his monograph. This book was recommended by the Ethnographic Commission for publication in 1931.

V. Kravchenko made a significant contribution to the organization of stationary ethnographic studies. In his work, the scientist combined the study of ethnoculture and the formation of the funds of

the ethnographic department of the Volyn Museum (Скрипник 1989: 157). He organized clubs and societies, involving teachers, students, priests in research work (Скрипник 2007: 17). In order to ensure the search work, V. Kravchenko developed a number of local lore questionnaires (Кравченко 2009: 7). In particular, the questionnaire program “Local history in nature. Methods of local lore work (1927)”, “General program for the study of the village” (ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-2, c. 68). For the reconstruction of the researcher’s contribution to the development of local monographic research, the No. 15 Fund, which is the nominal fund of V. Kravchenko and was formed on the basis of his personal archive, is important. It is this fund that contains the scientist’s unique field diaries, in which he scrupulously recorded all the events of his life in chronological and sequential order. In addition to ethnographic descriptions and records of folklore, they contain interesting for researchers observations of social and cultural processes witnessed by V. Kravchenko. In the archives of the researcher there are significant descriptions of villages and agricultural associations, in particular “Survey of Korosten and the village Iskorosty by teachers of the Korosten district in 1925” (ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 147, sh. 197), “Survey of the village of Deneshi by teachers of the Zhytomyr district according to the programs and instructions of the head. ethnographic department of the Volyn Research Museum V. G. Kravchenko 1925–1926” (ASFMP IASFE, f. 15-3, c. 148, sh. 68), “Survey of the suburbs of Zhytomyr – Malovanka during the retraining of teachers of national minorities (Germans and Poles) in Volyn. Ethnographic description of 1927” (ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 149, sh. 41), “Pulinsky Ukrainian collective farm named after the 12th anniversary of October” (ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 157, sh. 97), “Zhytomyr Jewish Agricultural Cooperative «Drukar-Collectivist»” (ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 157-b, sh. 27) and other.

Of great interest for studying the peculiarities of the organization and methods of local research are the materials of the fund No. 16 “Volyn Museum of Local Lore”. This fund contains important information about V. Kravchenko as a popularizer of ethnographic science, organizer and leader or consultant of numerous museum institutions, ethnographic and local history groups, initiator of mass ethnographic research, through an extensive network of collectors and contributors in the field. Given the topic of our work, the diaries of the eth-

nographic department, which were personally kept by V. Kravchenko during 1920–1927, present interest as well (ASFMP IASFE, F. 16, c. 4-5, sh. 183).

For a short period (1927–1929), V. Kravchenko created an extensive network of correspondents in Volynskii hubernii. This allowed the researcher to collect and organize a significant amount of ethnographic materials from different settlements of Volyn. The results of the researcher’s work are one of the largest manuscript collections among the archival scientific funds of manuscripts and phonographs in Rylsky Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Скрипник 2007: 25). The most voluminous materials from the ethnographic work of V. Kravchenko are contained in fund No. 15 “Kravchenko V. G.” and No.16 “Volyn Museum of Local Lore”.

During the 1920s and early 1930s, Ukrainian ethnographers managed to collect and systematize a significant amount of material from the traditional household culture of the Ukrainian people. At the level of the state program for the development of local lore studies and in order to study the country’s productive forces, comprehensive historical and ethnographic studies of a number of villages were conducted (Chervonyi Oskil na Kharkivshchyni, Kunashivka ta Zhukyn na Chernihivshchyni, Bekhy ta Zamyslovychi na Zhytomyrshchyni, Sarta-na na Donechchyni and other) (Борисенко 2002: 18).

The progress of science in the direction of monographic study of the village and the development of ethnology in general was interrupted in the 1930s. All leading Ukrainian ethnographers were brutally repressed by Stalin. In particular, in connection with the reorganization of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, ethnographic institutions were virtually liquidated, the ethnographic departments of museums of Ukraine ceased to function (Борисенко 2002: 17).

At the same time, stationary research does not lose its relevance in Western Ukraine. In 1938 V. Pastushchyn conducted a comprehensive historical and ethnographic study of the Ukrainian Polissya village of Drochevo on Beresteishchyni (Пастушин 2014). The scientist made comparisons not only with other regions of Ukraine, but with other nations. He used the scientific works of Ukrainian, Polish and German researchers and analyzed the development and reasons for the transformation of certain customs. Folklore texts in the work of V. Pastushchyna are a supplement to the

description of ethnographic realities. V. Pastushchyna's scientific studies are a clear and relevant example of local monographic research.

In the second half of the 1940s, the staff of the Department of Ethnography of the Institute of Art History, Folklore and Ethnography resumed stationary studies of traditional household culture of individual settlements. According to statistical estimates, during 1944–1964, ethnographers of the institute organized and conducted 170 expeditions (Глушко 2008: 43). The analysis of their reports shows adherence to a stationary methodology of information gathering, scrupulous and comprehensive study of local culture and life. In their work, Ukrainian scientists relied on the academic traditions and scientific foundations laid by the previously repressed generation of researchers.

A striking example of field recording of the above period is the expedition to the Volyn region (lasted from January 27 to February 25, 1955). The expedition was attended by four researchers from the institute, two museum staff, an artist and a cinematographer. The participants of the expedition had the task to study such phenomena of culture and life of the local peasantry: industrial and social life (O. F. Kuvenova); family and family life (O. M. Kravets); fishing and food (L. P. Shevchenko); housing and clothing (manager of the expedition G. Yu. Stelmakh); agriculture (I. V. Bondar). Museum staff (I. V. Bondar and R. P. Naumovich) collected exhibits representing the culture and life of the region to complete the museum collections.

We believe that the participants of this expedition partially realized the traditions of local research: first, they demonstrated an understanding of an integrated approach to the study of culture and life; secondly, aimed to get a more differentiated view of the peculiarities of socio-political processes that took place in different parts of the region; thirdly, they stayed in one settlement for a long time.

Among the works of the 1950s, D. Kosaryk's historical and ethnographic essay is notable. The scientist's work is devoted to the flooded village of Andrusha in Pereyaslav region during the construction of the Kaniv hydroelectric power station (Село 2016). The author lived in the village for a long time, observed the life of the local population, and attended weddings to record the rites (Село 2016: 16).

Beginning in the second half of the 1960s, in connection with the preparation of the fundamental

work "Ukrainians", the stationary method of field ethnography was less used by scientists (Глушко 2008: 45). The issue of areal study of cultures has arisen, and this area of research has also been a priority in many European countries. This nature of the survey became even more relevant with the beginning of the "Regional Historical and Ethnographic Atlas of Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova".

M. Glushko analyzed stationary research methods in detail. The scientist notes the advantages of the above method of research. First, living among the population for a long time, the ethnologist can enter into their trust; secondly, the scientist regularly observes the life of the population, its daily activities, capturing inconspicuous phenomena of traditional culture; third, by recording reliable information about a cultural phenomenon, the ethnologist avoids hasty conclusions (Глушко 2008: 59). The main disadvantage of stationary research, according to S. Glushko, is the relatively low "productivity" during research work (Глушко 2008: 56).

Thus, it should be noted that the methodology of local monographic research, which was used in the nineteenth century by social anthropologists and ethnologists to study "primitive societies", later became especially popular. In the 1920s and 1930s, researchers from different countries (the United States, China, Romania, Russia, Hungary, and Poland) used this technique independently to study modern society. A characteristic feature of such works was a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods (interviews, observation, questionnaires, landscape analysis), versatility (complexity) of the research subject and its spatial limitations (street, village, city). In the direction of the "local monograph" in the 1920s – 1930s, the study of folk culture and life of Ukrainians developed. In a relatively short period of time, Ukrainian ethnologists V. Petrov, A. Onyschuk, N. Zaglada, L. Shulgina, V. Kravchenko, N. Dmytruk and others managed to develop a research methodology, to form the main tasks, which were embodied in numerous questionnaires. Using the method of stationary research, they were able to collect and organize ethnographic material. These recordings are an invaluable source for ethnologists. Attempts were also made to publish a comprehensive study of the village, but these plans were interrupted by the repression in the 1930s. In the postwar years, Ukrainian ethnographers continued to use the method of stationary research, but it has almost never

been used by scientists after the 1960s.

Archival sources

- ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-2, c. 364, sh. 1-4.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 1-4, c. 219, sh. 1-42.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-2, c. 68, sh. 1-24.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 147, sh. 197.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 148, sh. 68.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 149, sh. 41.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 157, sh. 97.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 15-3, c. 157-b, sh. 27.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 16, c. 4, sh. 183.
 ASFMP IASFE, F. 43, c. 174, sh. 31.

References

- Арсенич П. 1989. Етнографічна діяльність Антона Оніщука. In: Народна творчість та етнологія, № 4, с. 22-28. / Arsenych P. 1989. Etnohrafichna diialnist Antona Onishchuka. In: Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, no. 4, s. 22-28.
- Борисенко В. К. 2002. Нарис з історії української етнографії 1920–1930-х років. Київ: Унісерв. / Borysenko V. K. 2002. Narys z istorii ukrainskoi etnohrafii 1920–1930-kh rokiv. Kyiv: Uniserv.
- Верняев И. И. 2005. Локальные монографические исследования деревни 1920–1930-х годов: цели, методики, результаты. In: Историческое регионоведение / Под ред. Ю. В. Кривошеева. Санкт-Петербург, с. 29-64. / Vernyaev I. I. 2005. Lokalnye monograficheskie issledovaniya derevni 1920–1930-h godov: celi, metodiki, rezultaty. In: Istoricheskoe regionovedenie / Pod red. Yu. V. Krivosheeva. Sankt-Peterburg, s. 29-64.
- Глушко М. С. 2008. Методика польового етнографічного дослідження. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка. / Hlushko M. S. 2008. Metodyka pol'ovoho etnohrafichnoho doslidzhennia. Lviv: Vydavnychiy tsentr LNU im. Ivana Franka.
- Горленко В. Ф. 1964. Нарис з історії української етнографії та російсько-українських етнографічних зв'язків. Київ: Наукова думка. / Horlenko V. F. 1964. Narys z istorii ukrainskoi etnohrafii ta rosiisko-ukrainskykh etnohrafichnykh zv'iazkiv. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Горленко В., Кирчів Р. 2005. Історія української етнографії. Київ: Поліграф Консалтинг. / Horlenko V., Kyrchiv R. 2005. Istoriia ukrainskoi etnohrafii. Kyiv: Polihraf Konsaltingh.
- Жизнь 1898: Жизнь и творчество крестьян Харьковской губернии: Очерк по этнографии края / Под ред. В. Иванова. Т. 1. Харьков: Издание Харьковского Губернского Статистического Комитета. / Zhizn 1898: Zhizn i tvorchestvo krestyan Harkovskoj gubernii: Ocherk po etnografii kraja / Pod red. V. Ivanova. T. 1. Harkov, Izdaniye Harkovskogo Gubernskogo Statisticheskogo Komiteta.
- Заглада Н. 1930. Відділ монографічного дослідження села (село Старосілля). Київ: Міськліт. / Zahlada N. 1930. Viddil monohrafichnoho doslidzhennia sela (selo Starosillia). Kyiv: Misklit.
- Иванов В. 1898. Современная деревня Харьковской губернии. In: Жизнь и творчество крестьян Харьковской губернии: Очерк по этнографии края / Под ред. В. Иванова. Т. 1. Харьков: Издание Харьковского Губернского Статистического Комитета, с. I-XXXII. / Ivanov V. 1898. Sovremennaya derevnya Harkovskoj gubernii. In: Zhizn i tvorchestvo krestyan Harkovskoj gubernii: Ocherk po etnografii kraja / Pod red. V. Ivanova. T. 1. Harkov: Izdaniye Harkovskogo Gubernskogo Statisticheskogo Komiteta, s. I-XXXII.
- Кравченко В. 2009. Зібрання творів та матеріали з архівної спадщини / Василь Кравченко; упоряд. О. Рубан. Т. 2. Київ: ІМФЕ. / Kravchenko V. 2009. Zibrannia tvoriv ta materialy z arkhivnoi spadshchyny / Vasyl Kravchenko; uporiad. O. Ruban. T. 2. Kyiv: IMFE.
- Лобода А. 1925. Сучасний стан і чергові завдання української етнографії. In: Етнографічний вісник, кн. 1, с. 1-11. / Loboda A. 1925. Suchasnyi stan i chervovi zavdannia ukrainskoi etnohrafii. In: Etnohrafichnyi visnyk, kn. 1, s. 1-11.
- Матеріали до етнології. 1929. Т. 1: Побут селянської дитини: матеріали до монографії с. Старосілля / Ніна Заглада; ВУАН; Музей антропології та етнології ім. Ф. Вовка. Київ. / Materialy do etnolohii. 1929. T. 1: Pobut selianskoi dytyny: materialy do monohrafii s. Starosillia / Nina Zahlada; VUAN; Muzei antropolohii ta etnolohii im. F. Vovka. Kyiv.
- Олтяну А. 2012. Розвиток румунської етнології: історія та сучасність. In: Народна творчість та етнологія, № 2, с. 8-17. / Oltianu A. 2012. Rozvytok rumunskoi etnolohii: istoryia ta suchasnist. In: Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, no. 2, s. 8-17.

Онищук А. 1928. Розвітки над народнім побутом (методичні зважання). In: Побут, ч. 2–3, с. 3-10. / Onishchuk A. 1928. Rozvitky nad narodnim pobutom (metodychni zvazhannia). In: Pobut, ch. 2–3, s. 3-10.

Онуфрійчук К. 2014. Міська проблематика в етнологічних дослідженнях кінця XVIII – початку XX століття: істориографія питання. In: Народна творчість та етнологія, № 1, с. 123-128. / Onufriichuk K. 2014. Miska problematyka v etnolohichnykh doslidzhenniakh kintsia XVIII–pochatku XX stolittia: istoryohrafiia pytannia. In: Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, no. 1, s. 123-128.

Пастущин В. Ю. 2014. Дрочево Берестейського району на Поліссі (монографія) / [гол. ред. Г. Скрипник; вступ. ст. В. Борисенко]. Київ: ІМФЕ ім. М. Т. Рильського. / Pastushchyn V. Yu. 2014. Drochevo Beresteiskoho raionu na Polissi (monohrafiia) / [hol. red. H. Skrypnyk; vstup. st. V. Borysenko]. Kyiv: IMFE im. M. T. Rylskoho.

Петров В. 1925. Місце фольклору в краєзнавстві. In: Етнографічний вісник, кн. 1, с. 12-21. / Petrov V. 1925. Mistse folkloru v kraieznavstvi. In: Etnohrafichnyi visnyk, kn. 1, s. 12-21.

Рубр Блер 2012. Прагматизм і плюралізм як рушії розвитку великого міста. In: Народна творчість та етнологія, № 5, с. 46-59. / Rubr Bler 2012. Prahmatyzm i pliaralizm yak rushii rozvytku velykoho mista. In: Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, no. 5, s. 46-59.

Рубан О. 2004. Зі спогадів Василя Кравченка (сторінки щоденника). In: Народна творчість та етнологія, № 1–2, с. 39-42. / Ruban O. 2004. Zi spohadiv Vasyliia Kravchenka (storinky shchodennyka). In: Narodna tvorchist ta etnolohiia, no. 1–2, s. 39-42.

Село. 2016: Село Андруші. Історико-етнографічний нарис / [за заг. ред. Г. Скрипник]. Київ: НАН України, ІМФЕ ім. М. Т. Рильського. / Selo. 2016: Selo Andrushi. Istoryko-etnohrafichnyi narys / [za zah. red. H. Skrypnyk]. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy, IMFE im. M. T. Rylskoho.

Скрипник Г. А. 1989. Етнографічні музеї України. Становлення і розвиток. Київ: Наукова думка. / Skrypnyk H. A. 1989. Etnohrafichni muzei Ukrainy. Stanovlennia i rozvytok. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Скрипник Г. А. 2007. Життєпис та наукова біографія Василя Кравченка. In: Кравченко В. Зібрання творів. Т. 1. Етнографічна спадщина

В. Кравченка; заг. ред. Г. Скрипник; Національна академія наук України, Інститут мистецтвознавства, фольклористики та етнології ім. М. Т. Рильського НАН України. Київ: ІМФЕ, с. 9-25. / Skrypnyk H. A. 2007. Zhyttiepys ta naukova biohrafia V. Kravchenka. In: Kravchenko V. Zibrannia tvoriv. T. 1. Etnohrafichna spadshchyna V. Kravchenka; zah. red. H. Skrypnyk; Natsionalna akademiia nauk Ukrainy, Instytut mystetstvoznavstva, folklorystyky ta etnolohii im. M. T. Rylskoho NAN Ukrainy. Kyiv: IMFE. s. 9-25.

Скрипник Г. 1998. Українське етнографічне музеєзнавство 20–90-ті рр. XX ст. Київ. / Skrypnyk H. 1998. Ukrainiske etnohrafichne muzeieznavstvo 20–90-ti rr. XX st. Kyiv.

Феноменов М. Я. 1926. Задачи губернского общества изучения местного края в деле плановой организации краеведной работы (Из опыта работ общества изучения Московской губ.). In: Краеведение, № 2, с. 153-165. / Fenomenov M. Ya. 1926. Zadachi gubernskogo obshchestva izucheniya mestnogo kraia v dele planovoj organizacii kraevednoj raboty (Iz opyta rabot obshchestva izucheniya Moskovskoj губ.). In: Kraevedenie, no. 2, s. 153-165.

Фэй Сяотун 1989. Китайская деревня глазами этнографа: Пер. с кит. В. М. Крюкова. Москва: Наука. Главная редакция восточной литературы. / Fei Syaotun 1989. Kitajskaya derevnya glazami etnografa: Per. s kit. V. M. Kryukova. Moskva: Nauka. Glavnaya redakciya vostochnoj literatury.

Mykola Bekh (Kiev, Ucraina). Doctor în istorie, Centrul Etnologic Ucrainean, Institutul de Folclor și Etnologie „M. T. Rylsky”, Academia Națională de Științe a Ucrainei.

Николай Бех (Киев, Украина). Кандидат исторических наук, Украинский этнологический центр, Институт фольклористики и этнологии им. М. Ф. Рильского, Национальная академия наук Украины.

Mykola Bekh (Kyiv, Ukraine). PhD in History, Ukrainian Ethnological Center Institute of Folklore and Ethnology “M. T. Rylsky”, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.

E-mail: mikolabech@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-4186-1339