From "One's Own" to Foreign: Categories and Texts of Soviet Folkloristics and Ethnography

Pavlo Artymyshyn
Roman Holyk

The history of socialist folkloristics and ethnography had much in common with the history of the myth and fairy tales that these folkloristics and ethnography explored. Metaphorically speaking, they were born of the "spectre of communism" spoken of by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848). The utopias of the Manifesto have become a worldview tradition for almost seventy years, first for the former territories of the Russian Empire, which became the Soviet Union, and after the Second World War for some of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe united in the Socialist Bloc. With the help of the mythologists of Soviet socialism/communism, its creators sought to form not only the collective image of the new man, homo sovieticus, but also his "picture of the world" and folklore, "elementary structures of everyday life" and semiotics of thinking. New Soviet science, folkloristics, and ethnography, in particular, were part of a new reality. At the same time, the same principles applied here as in the world science of the 20th century: competition of research programs mentioned by Imre Lakatos; the "anarchist" research directed against the method by Paul Feyerabend; change of scientific paradigms, which Thomas Kuhn spoke about; scientific evolution, postulated by Stephen Toulmin (cf. Feyerabend 1975; Kuhn 1962).

Scholars often perceive Soviet folkloristics and ethnography[1] as a self-sufficient system that has separated itself from Western European and American science and was limited by the political doctrines of the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain. In our study, we tried to answer the question: how closed/open to external ideas and concepts was

---

1   Soviet studies of folklore (oral folk art/oral tradition) developed in the context of two main scientific disciplines or research areas. One of them, which corresponded to Friedrich Ratzel's *Völkerkunde*, was called both ethnography and ethnology. These terms (unlike the American and Western European traditions) were used as synonyms for the science of culture and life of national and ethnic communities (peoples), or the science of folk/popular culture. At the same time, in the USSR the term "ethnography" was preferred, meaning not a method of research and a theoretical discipline that studies ethnosocial groups from the subjective point of view of these groups, but a science that Western scholars called the objective study of ethnic groups, nations and civilizations—ethnology or anthropology. Instead, anthropology, which was also known in Western science in the form of cultural and social anthropology (which were partly synonymous with Soviet ethnography), was interpreted in the USSR primarily as biological anthropology, the science of the physical parameters of the development of ethnic groups and nations. At the same time, philosophical anthropology (the study of the phenomenon of man in general) was not associated with ethnography/ethnology in Soviet discourse. Soviet folkloristics also developed alongside dialectology: it was interpreted as a branch of linguistics that studied territorial variants of languages related to regional folk culture and oral tradition.

Soviet ethnology/ethnography and folkloristics? In Soviet ideology, the emphasis was often on the opposition of the Soviet as "one's own" and the non-Soviet as "foreign". This opposition was important for Soviet scholars: they had to trust "their own" ideas first and foremost and separate them from "foreign" as a priori "suspicious". Fundamental to folklore and folk culture itself, the opposition "one's own" and "foreign" partially or completely generated other oppositions (friendly and hostile, allowed and taboo), and influenced the perception of popular and elite culture also in Soviet science of folklore and folk art. This is also its value for our study.

Let us try to trace the genesis of scientific concepts and dichotomies of "one's own" and "foreign", "friendly" and "hostile", "popular" and "elite", "permitted" and "taboo" in pre- and postwar Soviet folkloristics and ethnology. We are interested in how these concepts and ideas looked in the small (Soviet Ukraine) and large (Soviet Union) socialist space, and how they were transmitted and changed with the help or under the pressure of "one's own" and "foreign" texts/books/publications.

From the Mythological Element to the Ideological System: Pre-war Folkloristics and Ethnography

Ukrainian socialist folkloristics and ethnography as well as Soviet in general were the result of the revolution and civil war of 1917–1921. Soviet historical memory and literary imagination (for example, Yuri Yanovsky's *Vershnyky The Horsemen*, 1935, in Ukrainian) folklorized and romanticized these events as an example of an epic "class struggle", where "political elements" converged: from "Makhnovtchina" (which was romanticized by the folklore of the anarchists) to the Bolsheviks with their "Red Army folklore".

During the formation of the Bolshevik regime, the transition from military communism to the NEP, the struggle of ideas continued in folklore and folk culture, and in the sciences that studied them. In Soviet ideology and neo-folklore,[2] this time was depicted as a "heroic period of the great Russian revolution" (statement by Lev Kritzman). The policy of "eliminating illiteracy" (Rus.: *likbez*) and "union of workers and peasants" (Rus.: *smychka*) theoretically provided a link between the "proletarian intelligentsia", urban culture, the peasants, and the rural proletariat (Rus.: *kombedy*). But its downside was aggressive Sovietization, collectivization, and proletarianization. The period of conceptual "scientific anarchism" in Soviet

---

2   The phenomenon that Ukrainian Soviet science called neo- or Soviet folklore was mainly artificial pseudo- or fakelore, created by representatives of literary circles or even by folklorists themselves. Such texts were cited and studied as examples of a new oral tradition. At the same time, a "real" new folklore functioned in parallel, which was a reaction to the Soviet reality within the framework of the oral tradition, but outside the socialist ideology. However, this folklore was not popularized or well known. Part of the chronologically new folklore in the USSR was generally anti-Soviet, so it could be published only in emigration environments.

Ukraine (Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic and then Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic with its capital first in Kharkiv and later in Kyiv) lasted approximately until the beginning—mid-1930s. The policy of indigenization/Ukrainization proclaimed in the 1920s contributed to the ethnicization of the humanities, while the ideology of internationalism, a new Soviet nation, and "communist humanity" denied this.[3] The discourse of the early UkrSSR still allowed a kind of national communism, and at the same time contacts with non-Soviet Western Ukraine. At the same time, the general discourse of the USSR, newly formed in 1922, contrasted the hostile, capitalist/bourgeois world of oppressed nations and nationalities with the "free USSR"—"the space of (inter-)national unity, freedom, and progressive ideas" (as claimed in the Soviet propaganda).

In the early Soviet context, folklorists, ethnographers, and dialectologists became (in socialist lexicon) "workers in socialist construction", subject to new cultural attitudes. Folkloristics, ethnology, and linguistics found themselves between the urban "Proletcult", the Russian-speaking proletarian culture, the workers' "clubs", and the Ukrainian culture of "reading houses", whose task was ambivalent: to preserve the popular peasant culture and displace it by the "culture of the proletariat". The mediator between these spheres was (ideally) a bilingual cultural worker—a communist activist, disseminator of socialist ideas among the masses.[4] The cultural worker had to be a situational folklorist/ethnographer/dialectologist, and record both relics of an ancient oral tradition and new, Soviet folklore. In Soviet popular science culture, "one's own" (communist) was sharply opposed to "foreign" (bourgeois), and "old" (obsolete, archaic) to the new.

However, at the same time there were formed institutions and publications of professional Ukrainian folklorists in the UkrSSR.[5] Here "one's own" and "foreign", "old" and "new" were classified differently. Ukrainian scholars did not try to "completely invent" new Ukrainian folklore, ethnography, dialectology. It was designed on the model of pre-revolutionary Russian publications[6] and works of Ukrainian and Russian folklorists, ethnographers and dialectologists—"collectors of oral tradition until 1917".[7]

3   For the internationalist discourse, "one's own" included everything "communist" and "socialist" in contrast to the "foreign"—"capitalist" and "bourgeois", and the discourse of indigenization contrasted the Ukrainian ("one's own") with the non-Ukrainian ("foreign").

4   It is no coincidence that in 1925 the Kharkiv magazine *Shljah do komunizmu* (*Way to Communism*, in Ukrainian) was divided into the magazines *Seljans'kyj budynok* (*Peasant House*, in Ukrainian) and *Rabochij klub* (*Workers' Club*, in Russian), which later became a bilingual magazine called *Kultrobitnik/Kultrabotnik* (*Cultural Worker*, in Ukrainain-Russian).

5   *Etnografichnyj visnyk* (*Ethnographic Bulleti*n, in Ukrainian) (1925–1932) of the Ethnographic Commission of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (VUAN) edited by Acad. Andriy Loboda and Viktor Petrov and scientific yearbook of the cultural-historical section *Pervisne gromadjanstvo i jogo perezhytky v Ukraini* (*Primitive citizenship and its remnants in Ukraine*, in Ukrainian) (1926–1929) edited by Kateryna Hrushevska.

6   As a four-volume *Etnografija* (*Ethnography*, in Russian) by Nikolai Kharuzin, published in 1901–1905.

7   From Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804–1873), Yakiv Holovatskyi (1814–1888) to Mytrofan Dykarev (1854–1899), Ivan Franko (1856–1916) or Kost' Mykhalchuk (1840–1914).

Ukrainian authors of the early 1920s and first half of the 1930s partially continued the pre-revolutionary (so-called pre-October) traditions.[8] This meant that for some folklorists and ethnologists of this period, the non-Soviet pre-revolutionary paradigm was "their own", and they had to master the "foreign" cultural reality. On the other hand, the culture and science of the Russian Empire were no less actively sought to be replaced by Marxist folkloristics (Howell 1992).

However, the opposition between socialist and non-socialist (in Soviet discourse it was defined as "bourgeois") science was still unstable. In the 1920s, folklorists and ethnographers from the UkrSSR focused on their colleagues from Western Ukraine, which was part of the Republic of Poland (Volodymyr Hnatiuk (1871–1926), Filaret Kolessa (1871–1947), Ilarion Sventsitskyi (1876–1956)) including the publication of the T. Shevchenko Lviv Scientific Society.[9] This distinguished them from other folklorists and ethnographers of other republics of the then USSR. Soviet folklorists still used the Western Ukrainian translation of *The Handbook of Folklore* by George Laurence Gomme (1853–1916) (Gomme 1890), or compared, like Kateryna Hrushevska, the plots of epics with the collection *The English and Scotish Popular Ballads*, compiled by Francis James Child (1825–1896).

At the same time, the concept of Kateryna Hrushevska (1900–1943) was based on the synthesis of sociological and historical-anthropological schools. This was evidenced by her conceptual apparatus: "primitive citizenship", "primitive culture", social history, "folk art in the sociological light". In 1926, Hrushevska and her colleagues believed that research in the UkrSSR could be conducted on the model of North American institutions (in particular Smithsonian Institution).[10] They did not yet feel the line between the Soviet "own" and the Western "foreign" paradigms of science, which Soviet researchers already had to adhere to in the mid-1930s.

The folklore and ethnographic institutions of the UkrSSR of that time acted in this way: the Cultural and Historical Commission (or the Commission for the Study of Primitive Culture

---

8   An example is Mykola Sumtsov from Kharkiv (1854–1922), author of the textbook for teachers *Narodna slovesnist'* (*Folk Literature*, in Ukrainian) (Sumcov 1919), known for his publications on Ukrainian folklore since the 1880s. The same was true of Andriy Loboda (1871–1931), who has been involved in East Slavic folklore since the 1890s. They represented the traditional for the 19th and 20th centuries views of cultural-historical, migratory, mythological or comparative-mythological schools of folkloristics, which in Russian science developed, for example, Alexander Veselovsky (1838–1906). His works were actively published in the USSR in the 1930s.

9   *Etnografichnyj zbirnyk* (*Ethnographic collection*), *Materialy do ukrains'ko-rus'koji etnologii* (*Materials on Ukrainian-Ruthenian ethnology*), *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* (*Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*); all in Ukrainian.

10   On the basis of the magic theory, expressed in *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* by James George Frazer (Frazer 1900), concepts of prelogical thinking by Lucien Lévy-Bruhl from his book *La mentalité primitive* (*Primitive Mentality* (Lévy-Bruhl 1922) and concepts of *L'Année Sociologique* (*The Sociological Yearbook*), published by Émile Durkheim in 1898–1913. The commitment to prelogical thinking, prehistory and primitive culture among this group of researchers was a consequence of reading the classical *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom* by Edward Burnett Tylor (Tylor 1871), a new Soviet Russian translation of which was published in the late 1930s.

and Its Remnants in Ukrainian Life and Folklore), the Commission of Historical Song and the Cabinet of Primitive Culture at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Studies of folk culture, folklore and dialects were partially combined into one paradigm, as in the texts of dialectologist and folklorist Olena Kurylo (1890–1946) with her *Materialy do ukrains'koi dijalektologii i fol'kloristyky* (*Materials on Ukrainian dialectology and folkloristics*, in Ukrainian) (Kurylo 1928).

However, ethnographers and folklorists, such as Victor Petrov (Domonotovich, Ber) (1894–1969) had to defend their discipline against accusations of irrelevance. As a "shield", they used the concept of oral tradition and folk culture as a labor/collective product of the "productive forces of a given district", which had practical significance and which needed to be supported (Petrov 1925). Thus they tried to prove that folkloristics and ethnography are not closed, elitist, "foreign", but open, popular, "one's own" for the new proletarian culture. Accordingly, such studies should be guided by "own" Marxist methodology.

In general, those who tried to interpret folklore and folk culture in a Marxist way tried to rely on three levels of authority in the early Soviet reality: the figures of the world communist movement (from Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels to Karl Liebknecht), ideologues of the USSR (from Vladimir Ulianov (Lenin) to Lev Trotskyi, Nikolai Bukharin or Karl Radek, and later Joseph Stalin), republican party leaders (from Mykola Skrypnyk, Vlas Chubar and Andriy Shumsky to Lazar Kaganovych and Pavlo Postyshev).[11]

At the same time, Soviet folklorists and ethnographers tried to rediscover the works of pre-revolutionary but "their own" and "progressive" scientists, such as folklorist and psycholinguist Oleksandr Potebnja (1831–1891).[12] Theoretically, this made it possible to transfer the "ethnocentric" model to dialectological, folklore, ethnographic research.[13]

[11] Also Marxist essays by Paul Lafargue on the history of culture as well as his *La langue française avant et après la Révolution. Etudes sur les origines de la bourgeoisie moderne* (*The French Language Before and After the Revolution. Studies on the Origins of the Modern Bourgeoisie*), Russian translation of which was made in 1930 (Lafargue 1930) were used to interpret folklore, folk culture, and language in the USSR and Soviet Ukraine in 1920–1930 and works of ethnographer-evolutionist Julius Lippert *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit in ihrem organischen Aufbau* (*Cultural History of the Communities in their Organic Construction*) (Ukrainian translation in 1922) (Lippert 1922). Franz Boas was also an important foreign author for early Soviet folklore and ethnology. His *The Mind of Primitive Man* also was translated in the USSR in 1926 (Boas 1926).

[12] In Odesa, his students wanted to publish a bilingual, Ukrainian-Russian edition of a complete collection of his works, of which only *Dumka j mova* (in Ukrainian)/*Mysl' i yazyk* (in Russian) (*Thought and Language*) was published in 1922. This was no accident. Humboldtian theory of folk symbols and "internal form of the word" in O. Potebnja's works (Fizer 1986) resonated with the ideas of linguistic relativity or complementarity of Edward Sapir, whose one of the main works—*Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech* (1921) was translated into Russian and published in the Soviet Union in 1934 (Sapir 1934).

[13] On the other hand, the interwar concept of children's syncretic thinking by psychologist Lev Vygotsky to some extent resonated with the concepts of primitive, pre-logical thought or complemented it (van der Veer and Valsiner 1994). At the same time, the Marxist critique of Freudianism, which was then presented by Valentyn Voloshinov (Voloshinov 1976) also actually signaled not only criticism, but also the interest in psychoanalytic methods and motives in literature and folklore, folk culture.

There were also signs of "sociologization" of interwar folklore, ethnology, and dialectology.[14] Russian formalism or prestructuralism also emerged, in particular in the form of Vladimir Propp's work *Morfologija skazki* (*Morphology of the Folktale*, in Russian) (Propp 1928). It in a unique way complemented the classification system of Aarne motifs: identified 31 functions of heroes, helpers, and villains (Rus.: *vrediteli*—in the sense of enemy) from the plots of fairy tales, their morphological genera and species. Publication of the A. Aarne's system in the interpretation of Nikolai Andreev (Andreev 1929) as well as works by Petr Bogatyrev on the history of Russian, Czech, Slovak and Ukrainian folk cultures (Popovič, 1970) left field for similar research at the level of the entire Soviet Union.

In 1920–1930, all-Union publishing houses, such as *Academia*, published texts of oral folklore of the peoples of the world, including the union republics.[15] This led to the idea that world folklore as a product of folk (collective) culture is "own" phenomenon for Soviet science and culture, the center of which became the "popular masses" (Rus.: *narodnyie massy*, Ukr.: *narodni masy)* and groups.

Attractive in Soviet folklore and ethnology of 1920–1930 was the "discovery" or "invention" of the life, oral tradition and language of the "culturally backward" (*kulturno otstalyie* from the Rus. *kulturnaia otstalost'* 'cultural backwardness') "Peoples of the (Far) North" (Rus.: *narody (Krainiego) Sievera*) or "Peoples of the Syberia", which were represented in the publications of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (*Kunstkamera*) (Anderson, Arzyutov 2016: 187–200). In this area Vladimir Bogoraz (Natan Bogoraz, N. A. Tan) (1865–1936), who became one of the popularizers of ethnogeography and a researcher of folklore and ethnography of Koryaks, Eskimos, Evenks and Chukchi, was an iconic figure, who partially represented the territory of Ukraine. His work *The Chukchee* in 1934 became "one's own foreign" for Soviet ethnology: the text of the Soviet scientist, who returned from the United States, was translated from English, in which the book was first published in America (Bogoraz 1934). All this created the illusion of "the flowering of the cultures of the peoples of the USSR" against the background of the gradual aggravation of the Stalin's dictatorship.

On the scale of the entire USSR in 1920–1930, it seemed that folkloristics and ethnography were rapidly modernizing in the same way as the whole country was industrializing.

14   Joseph Vendryes' book *Le language : introduction linguistique à l'histoire* (*Language: A Linguistic Introduction to History*), which was translated in Russian in 1937 (Vendryes 1937); sociolinguistics of Rozalia Shor *Jazyk i obshhestvo* (*Language and Society*) (Shor 1926); Valentin Voloshinov's *Marksizm i filosofiya yazyka* (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*) (Voloshinov 1930); *Sociological poetics* of Pavel Sakulin. On the other hand, Antoine Meillet's *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes* (*Introduction to the Comparative Study of Indo-European languages*) translated in Russian in 1938, opened the theoretical possibility of research and folklore sources in the spirit of Indo-European studies (Politics and the theory of language 2010).

15   Russian, Armenian, Ossetian, and Azerbaijani texts, Finnish *Kalevala*, Latvian fairy tales (*Latyshskie skazki*, 1933), Serbian epic, *Legends of Genghis Khan* etc. Instead, the state publishing house of the then Crimean Autonomous Republic published Crimean Tatar *Anekdoty o Hodzhe Nasreddine i Ahmet Ahae* (*Jokes about Khoja Nasreddin and Akhmet Akhay*, in Russian) (*Anekdoty o Hodzhe Nasreddine i Ahmet Ahae* 1937).

However, the opinion of scientists in the Soviet center and the periphery of the union republics was not synchronous. For example, in the Ukrainian literature of the 1920s, modernism/futurism/panfuturism penetrated with expressive experiments on the verbal form and content. However, philologists, folklorists and dialectologists, ethnographers of the UkrSSR in the 1920s and early 1930s used the methods of Russian formalists to a very limited extent, following the traditional for the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries comparative-historical interpretation of plots (with Marxist accents). At the same time, the so-called Red Renaissance in the UkrSSR in 1920s was a time of methodological and conceptual diversity of so called "spontaneous materialism"/Marxism.

Some folklorists and ethnographers emphasized the collective and oral nature of folk art as opposed to individualism and the elitism of professional culture and literature. For example, Oleksander Doroshkevych (1889–1946) argued that "before the invention of writing and the division of the masses into socially hostile classes, oral poetry belonged to the whole people" (Doroshkevych 1924). Instead, Ahapij Shamraj, who was interested in P. Sakulin's method and criticized the formalists, considered the notion of collective creativity undefined, and Ukrainian folklore an "oral tradition of book literature" (Shamraj 1928). Volodymyr Koriak (Volko Blumstein) (1889–1937), who was later called a "vulgar Marxist", tried to combine the theory of economic basis and superstructure with the concepts of the labor nature of folk art, the concepts of animism, fetishism and the evolution of myth and fairy tale in the works by Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt, Edward Tylor, James George Frazer, Kateryna Hrushevska, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, as well as a Marxist and researcher of the history of eroticism Eduard Fuchs (Koriak 1927).

A characteristic segment of interwar folkloristics and ethnography in Soviet Ukraine was the study of Jewish culture and oral tradition, which at that time was partly developed within the framework of Ukrainian "proletarian culture". The drivers of such studies were the collection of works of the Jewish Historical and Archaeological Commission (1928–1929), the activities of the Institute of Jewish Proletarian Culture (1929–1936) and the Cabinet of Jewish Language, Literature and Folklore at the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences (primarily of folklorist and ethnomusicologist Moisei Beregovskyi (Moshe Beregowski) (1892–1961). The result was a large phonoarchive of Jewish folk music and a five-volume work by M. Beregovsky *Evreyskiy muzikalniy folklor* (*Jewish Musical Folklore*, in Russian) from which in 1934 only the first volume was published (Beregovskyi 1934).

At the same time, in the *Etnografichnyj visnyk* (*Ethnographic Bulletin*) of the VUAN as Musiy Beregovskyi, the scientist analyzed the symbiosis of Jewish and Slavic folklore (Beregovskyi Musiy 1930). In fact, at that time the Jewish cultural content was superimposed partly on the Slavic, in particular the Ukrainian language form, and partly on Yiddish.[16]

---

16   Hasidic songs "Katerina-Moloditsa", which was later performed by Nekhama Lifshitz or Ukrainian-Yiddish "Oy, Mikita, Mikita" performed by Mordecai Hershman (1886–1943). Jewish folklore in interwar Ukraine also tried to combine "Soviet and kosher", proletarian and national, elitist and popular (Shternshis 2006).

However, the methodology of interwar Soviet philology in general, dialectology and folkloristics in particular were influenced by Japhetic theory, the concept of staged language of Nikolai Marr. Marrism, in fact, formed a closed in the Soviet space concept of primitive thinking, ethno- and linguogenesis: the theory of labor challenges, the sound evolution of speech and the four elements ("sal", "ber", "yon", "rosh") of the hypothetical proto- language of the mankind. Marr's works were actively translated and distributed in Ukrainian.[17] Dialectological and folklore studies should also take into account the theory of stadial development of the language and culture. Categorical and at the same time ambivalent concepts of Marrism have long separated Soviet folkloristics and dialectology from European (Gerasimov et al. 2016). By 1950, it had become a canon and model of philology and ethnology, presented as an original, "own" Soviet doctrine, contrasting "foreign" (and "imperfect" from the Soviet point of view) Western theories.

This also applied to ethnographic and folklore studies of folk religious culture and folklore. The books of the *Soyuz vojovnychykh bezbozhnykiv* (*League of Militant Atheist*) (1925–1947)[18] served as examples in this context. The categorical imperative was the displacement of religious folklore from everyday life by the texts of *Antireligioznye rasskazy* (*Anti-religious Tales*, in Russian) (1937) and *Antireligioznaja pojezija i proza* (*Anti-religious Poetry and Prose*, in Russian) (1938). In Soviet Ukraine, this line was represented by *Bezvirnyk magazine* of the League of Militant Atheist (Kharkiv, 1924–1935). However, Ukrainian Soviet scholars also referred to the Russian and Ukrainian translation of Heinrich Cunow's (1862–1936) book *Ursprung der Religion und des Gottesglaubens* (*Origin of Religion and the Faith of God*) (Cunow, 1913). It also strengthened the opposition between "one's own" and "foreign" in scientific thinking, stimulated the growth of intolerance and xenophobia in scientific circles.

In general, researchers tried to adhere to atheistic doctrine, and at the same time to record religious folklore and folk culture as a phenomenon. Typical samples was the reaction of scientists to the "apocalyptic folklore of miracles" and the religious (anti-Bolshevik) pilgrimage movement in the Zhytomyr region in the 1920s, against which the Soviet authorities imposed severe sanctions. Instead, in the *Ethnographic Bulletin* of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, folklorists, although calling the peasant respondents "sectarians", distanced themselves from them, but wrote in detail texts about miracles and the Soviet government (Dyakiv 2008). When the Great Famine of 1932–1933 destroyed entire segments of folklore and folk culture, such tendencies in Ukrainian Soviet folkloristics disappeared.

---

17   *Narysy z osnov novoho vchennya pro yazyk* (*Essays on the basics of the new doctrine of language*, in Ukrainian) in 1935, and *Vybrani tvory N. Marra* (*Selected works by N. Marr*, in Ukrainian) in 1936), students were taught by these books.

18   In particular works of botanist and ethnographer of Yakutia Yemelyan Yaroslavsky/Minei Gubelman (*Bibliya dlya viruyuchykh i neviruyuchykh* (*The Bible for Believers and Non-Believers*), *Yak narodzhuyutsya, zhyvut' i vmyrayut' Bohy ta Bohyni* (*How Gods and Goddesses Are Born, Live, and Die*), *Selyans'kyj antyrelihijnyj pidruchnyk* (*Peasant Anti-Religious Textbook*)). All these books were Ukrainian translations from Russian originals.

Collectivization, "the elimination of the kulaks" as a class, led to the curtailment of the policy of Ukrainization. Repression against the so-called villains (Rus.: *vrediteli*, Ukr.: *schkidnyky*), enemies of the people (Rus.: *vragi naroda*, Ukr.: *vorohy narodu*), spies (Rus.: *schpiony*, Ukr.: *schpyguny*), and enemy agents (Rus.: *vrazheskie agenty*, Ukr.: *vorozhi ahenty*) became elements of the Stalin's Great Purge (Werth 2007). As a result, carriers of folklore (for example, kobzars, lyre players (Ukr.: *lirnyky*)) and folklore researchers (for example, Kateryna Hrushevska, Olena Kurylo) were executed or under psychological pressure "converted" to a science full of exclusively Soviet ideology. These authors, their publications, and some scientific topics have turned from "one's own", "allowed", to "foreign", "hostile", "forbidden". As of 1937–1939, a significant part of the folklore and ethnographic institutions of Soviet Ukraine created in the 1920s were also liquidated or radically changed. New scientific journals *Ukrayins'kyj fol'klor* (*Ukrainian Folklore*, 1937–1939, in Ukrainian), *Narodna tvorchist'* (*Folk Art*, 1939–1941, in Ukrainian) were sustained in the spirit of the socialist realist canon, focused on artificial pseudo-folklore (construction/imitation of the folklore discourse, presented as a real oral tradition), which was designed by scientists and writers. Thus, almost the entire issue of *Narodna tvorchist'* in 1940 was devoted to the image of Lenin in folklore, and its authors referred mainly to Russian and Ukrainian party figures and "revolutionary democrats". Only rarely was "non-canonical" folklore mentioned here, in particular the so-called "Cries" or "Howls" (*voyi* in Russian) as laments for Lenin, which were recorded in Russia in the 1920s.

In addition, folklore and ethnographic studies have undergone intense politicization. Author of research on kobzars and paremiological studies Fedor Lavrov (1903–1980) in the *Folklore Guide* (*Poradnyk po folkloru*, 1940, in Ukrainian) taught folklorists how not to turn folklore into literature. At the same time, he emphasized the motives for fighting anti-Soviet movements.[19] This approach was in line with the idea of a "Country of the Soviets" (Rus.: *Strana Sovietov*, Ukr.: *Kraina Rad*) being prepared to be attacked by a hostile outside world. And the beginning of the German-Soviet war of 1941 demonstrated this.

In general, in 1920–1930, the opposition of "one's own"/"foreign", "native"/"hostile" in the discourse of Ukrainian Soviet folkloristics and ethnography underwent significant changes, as well as the dichotomy of "elite"/"popular". Revolutions of 1917–1918, the civil war of the early 1920 changed the idea of these categories. What was "own and native" before 1917, in Soviet times (largely) became "alien and hostile". In the 1920s there was still methodological uncertainty. On the one hand, at this time Soviet science and culture very sharply separated themselves from the pre-revolutionary and "bourgeois"/"capitalist". On the other hand, scholars who had previously been educated further used the works published in the Russian Empire and the concepts of Western European scholars alongside the works of canonical

---

19   However, he relied on the work of Lenin's wife Nadezhda Krupskaya, and noted that (in addition to traditional genres), it is necessary to record stories about the Communist Party, he Red Army and the Navy, the struggle against "the gangs" (in the Soviet parlance—military formations of Symon Petliura or Nestor Makhno) , the battles of Hassan and Khalkhin-Gol, the accession of Western Ukraine and Belarus to the USSR, and "ridicule of hated imperialists and instigators of war" (Lavrov 1940).

Marxists. In the wave of Ukrainization, folklorists and ethnographers from the UkrSSR also used the ideas and materials of their Ukrainian colleagues from outside the USSR (Western Ukraine). The line between "one's own" and "foreign" remained relatively mobile until the mid-1930s. Then Ukrainization was curtailed, some institutions were liquidated, and entire scientific schools of scientists were repressed. In 1939, folkloristics and ethnography were incorporated into the system of the new socialist culture and folklore and separated from Western science, as was the Soviet Union from the Western world.

From Ideological System to Mythological Element: Semiosphere of Folkloristics and Ethnography in the USSR after the Second World War

There were paradoxes in the development of folkloristics and ethnography in the postwar UkrSSR and the USSR. On the one hand, the Ukrainian Soviet humanities, folkloristics and ethnography of the late 1940s through the early 1950s were determined by the socialist canon. The postwar reality further divided the world into two parts: "the prosperous state of developed socialism" or the Soviet socialist state (USSR), its allies (on the one hand) and other countries "suffering under the heel of capital". At the same time, the linguistic discussion of 1950, in which Joseph Stalin himself intervened (*Marksizm i voprosy jazykoznanija* (*Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics*), in Russian), destroyed Marrism and its archaic picture of the world. Thus, Marrism, which was previously completely "own and correct", has now become "alien and erroneous". At the same time, the accession of Western Ukraine to the Ukrainian SSR in 1939 meant both its Sovietization and the diversification of scientific discourse, accompanied by the hidden use of the pre-war non-Soviet experience of Western Ukrainian scientists. Instead, the texts of Western Ukrainian scholars, which until 1939 were non-Soviet, were now Sovietized and "mastered".

The expansion of the socialist space outside the USSR and the emergence of the Socialist Bloc as well as the spread of Soviet influence outside Europe (against the background of competition with the United States), even in the conditions of the Iron Curtain and the Cold War, contributed to the intensification of "political-scientific" interest in the cultures and folklore of the peoples, to which less attention was paid before. This was especially true for Latin America, for the study of which a separate institute (Institute of Latin America in Moscow) was established. This is not surprising: Central and South America was portrayed by Soviet ideology as "almost their" territory, whose peoples sympathize with socialism/communism, but cannot escape from the US protectorate.[20] However, initially interest in Mesoamerica was spurred by external

20 The emergence of socialist Cuba, the activities of communist parties in Chile, Nicaragua and other countries in the region only contributed to the formation of such an image.

impulses—translations of books of Western scholars.[21] Soviet scholars sought to create their own version of Mesoamerican folkloristics and ethnography.

In particular, it concerned a native of Kharkiv region Yuri Knorozov (1922–1999), who in 1950–1970 published as an "ethnographic monument"—a translation of *Relacion de las cosas de Yucatan* (*The Relationship of the Things of the Yucatan*) by Diego de Landa Calderón, in parallel offering his own version of deciphering the Maya script (Knorozov 1955; Knorozov 1963; Knorozov 1975). This theory was immediately retransmitted in Latin America (*La antigua escritura de los pueblos de America Central* (Knorozov 1954)) and presented in Western historiography an alternative to the concepts of American scholars. However, due to the resistance of some Western Mesoamericanists and the incommunicability of Knorozov, his works appeared in English in full only in the 1980s (Knorozov 1982).

At the same time, Knorozov and other Soviet scientists (for example, Rostislav Kinzhalov) published translations of folklore of Quiché Maya, Yucatec Maya (epos *Popol—Vuh*, drama *Rabinal Achí*, books of prophecy Chilam Balam). Other researchers began to study folklore motifs (Yuri Berezkin) and the Folk Theater (Yuri Zubritski) of Ancient Peru, addressing books to Soviet and Latin American readers (Zubritski 1979). It was an attempt to export Soviet scientific paradigms overseas. The theories of Sergei Tokarev's school were actively promoted in the countries of Western Europe.[22] At the same time, in the Soviet texts there was further a division into Soviet ethnography or "Soviet school of ethnography" (in interpretation of Rudolf Its) and "foreign ethnology", which was studied according to the textbook *Istorija zarubezhnoj etnografii* (*The History of Foreign Ethnography*, in Russian) written by the same Tokarev (Tokarev 1978).

In Soviet folkloristics and ethnography, from the late 1950s to the late 1980s, the line between "one's own" and "foreign" became more flexible, and communication between Soviet (socialist) and non-Soviet (capitalist) science increased. More ideas of Western scholars began to be integrated into Soviet literature.[23]

In general, on the one hand, in Soviet folklore they tried to introduce elements of European structuralism and comparative Indo-European studies. This mission was performed by a series *Issledovania po folkloru i mifologii Vostoka* (*Studies in Folklore and Mythology of the East*, in Russian), where were translated many classical works of the semiotic-structuralist

---

21   Such as History of Mexico (1940) by Henry Parkes, (Russian translation appeared in 1949) and Aztecs of Mexico (1941) by George Clapp Vaillant (Russian translation as History of Aztecs was also made in 1949).

22   For example, his *History of Religion* (Tokarev 1989).

23   Beginning from classical work by Giuseppe Cocchiara *Storia del folklore in Europa* (*The History of Folklore in Europe*, Russian translation in 1960) (Cocchiara 1960) to James Frazer *The Golden Bough* (Russian translations in 1980 (Frazer 1980) and 1983 (Frazer 1983)) and *Folklore in the Old Testament* (Russian translation in 1985) (Frazer 1985).

direction.[24] At the same time, translations of the *Cours de linguistique générale* (*Course in General Linguistics*) by Ferdinand de Saussure and *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (*Fundamentals of Phonology*) by Nikolai Trubetzkoy, allowed to look at folklore in the system of oppositions, dichotomies and identities between signs and meanings, to see in folklore semantics, syntactics, pragmatics. These works were considered (and partly rightly so) as a "response" to the work of Soviet scientists.[25] In addition, thanks to the works by Sebastian Shaumyan in the USSR formed its own structural linguistics, which began to influence philology.

The structuralism was the equivalent of the works of Russian formalists of the 1920s and 1930s, in particular the *Morfologija skazki* (*Morphology of a Fairy Tale*, in Russian) by V. Propp, which now fell into Western discourse. For example, Yuri Lotman (1922–1993)—one of the founders of the Tartu-Moscow semiotic school – conducted his structural research with semiotics of culture and *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta* (*The Structure of the Artistic Text*, in Russian). Lotman's works were translated and published in the West in English as early as the 1970s, that again blurred the line between Soviet and non-Soviet (École de Tartu 1976).

This was even more true of the idea of carnival and grassroots culture from the works of Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975), which became known in the West because of *Rabelais and His World* (Bakhtin 1968). Western comparative-historical folkloristics had its equivalent in Soviet works by Viktor Zhirmunsky (1891–1971) on the comparative typology of the epic (Zhirmunsky 1962). Finally, elements of comparative mythology, including the Baltic peoples (Ķencis 2012) were used in the monograph by Tamaz Gamkrelidze (1929–2021) and Viacheslav Ivanov (1929–2017) *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans* (Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995).

On the other hand, in 1960–1980 the activity of the "Soviet mythological school" (school of mythologists) connected with Kharkiv through the figure of Yeleazar Meletinsky (1918–2005)[26]. The mythological paradigm of late Soviet folklore also included older texts of the former Odessa resident Olga Freidenberg (1890–1955) with her works on the myth (Kabanov 2002). The activities of Soviet "mythologists" were summarized in the encyclopedia *Mify narodov mira* (*Myths of the Peoples of the World*, in Russian) edited by Tokarev (Tokarev 1980) and *Mifologicheskij slovar'* (*Mythological Dictionary*, in Russian) edited by Meletinsky (Mifologicheskij slovar' 1991).

---

24   For example, *Anthropologie structural* (*Structural Anthropology*) by Claude Lévi-Strauss (1958, Russian translation in 1983) (Lévi-Strauss, 1983), semiotic works by Algirdas Greimas and Claude Bremond, monograph *Les Dieux souverains des Indo-Européens* (*The Sovereign Gods of the Indo-Europeans*, 1977, Russian translation appeared in 1986) by Georges Dumézil (Dumézil 1986), and Victor Turner's work on symbol theory and ritual (Russian translation was made in 1983) (Turner 1983).

25   On the other hand, such scientists as emigrants Nikolai Trubetskoy (1890–1938) or Roman Jacobson (1895–1982) were more "their own" than "alien" to Soviet science. In this way, "foreign structuralism" became part of "Soviet structuralism".

26   The author of works on the poetics of myth (Meletinsky 1976) and on *Proiskhozhdenie geroicheskogo éposa. Rannie formy i arkhaicheskie pamiatniki* (*The Origins of the Heroic Epic: Early Forms and Archaic Monuments*, in Russian) (Meletinsky 1963).

In general, by the 1980s, Soviet folkloristics and ethnography partly remained within the Soviet discourse, but partly went beyond it. In particular, this applied to folklore and ethnographic oriental studies.[27] This was facilitated by several different factors: the internal development of the modernized Soviet humanities; contacts with Western science (sometimes direct, sometimes through the countries of the Socialist Bloc), the desire of the Soviet government to extend ideological and political influence beyond the socialist society, to Third World countries as well as to Western scientific circles.

However, most Soviet folklore and ethnographic publications were further dominated by the Soviet socialist theory of ethnos and the formation of a supranational community—the Soviet people, which, in particular, was emphasized by the authoritative ethnographic school of Yulian Bromley in the USSR. Its adherents emphasized the so-called "elimination of economic and socio-cultural inequality of the union republics" and the formation of a common cultural heritage.[28]

Ukrainian Soviet folkloristics and ethnology of the 1950s and 1980s developed "in the shadow" of the All-Union and Russian scientific paradigms. This was forced by the doctrine of "Soviet fraternal peoples", the concept of "three East Slavic fraternal peoples" and their "common cradle"—Kyivan Rus'. In the Soviet historical imagination, these peoples had a clear hierarchy: Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians. The Russian model became dominant in both the All-Union and East Slavic areas. In this paradigm, scientific studies of world or even "Union" folklore and culture were the prerogative of the metropolis, not the province, which in the USSR was the Ukrainian SSR. "Union" and world folklore in Soviet Ukraine were often published in children's books series.[29]

Nevertheless, the main axis remained Ukrainian—Russian folkloristics, ethnography, and dialectology. The policy of memory in the USSR and its stereotypes in Soviet folklore formed the image of an "older" and "younger" brother (Russian and Ukrainian people) or an older and younger sister (Russia and Ukraine). These models were transferred to Ukrainian

27 For example, in the series *Skazki i mify narodov Vostoka* (*Fairy tales and myths of the peoples of the East*, in Russian) from 1964 published texts of Bushmen, Somali, Papuan, Eskimo, Abkhazian folklore. On the other hand, folklore texts were published or republished in the series *Literaturniye pamyatniki* (*Literary Monuments*, all in Russian): *Narodnyye russkiye skazki* (*Russian folk tales*) by Alexander Afanasyev; *Lirika russkoy svadby* (*Russian wedding lyrics*); Russian byliny; collection of Kirsha Danilov; Icelandic sagas; English and Scottish ballads; Ossetian *Narty*; Indian Mahabharata; Mayan *Popol—Vuh*; epic of the peoples of East China, etc.

28 Therefore, folklore publications united, for example, *Geroicheskiy epos narodov SSSR* (*The Heroic Epic of the Peoples of the USSR*), forming a set of Ukrainian Dumas, Kyrgyz *Manasu*, Estonian *Kalevipoeg*, Latvian *Lāčplēsis*, etc. In the end, with the help of the presented folklore and ethnological knowledge, the idea of the Soviet Union as an "Empire of nations" was cemented (Hirsch 2005).

29 In particular, *Fairy Tales of the Peoples of the USSR* (Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Uzbek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Georgian, Armenian, Kyrgyz) and *Fairy Tales of the Peoples of the World* (English, French, German, Indian, Portuguese, Romanian, Cuban, Polish, Czech, *Tales of the Peoples of Yugoslavia*, *Tales of the Peoples of Spain*) by "Veselka" publishing house.

folkloristics. By the end of the 1980s, it sharply distinguished itself from the repressed folklorists and ethnographers of Soviet Ukraine of the 1920s–1930s (such as Kateryna Hrushevska), attributing to them the influence of so called "bourgeois-nationalist" concepts, and proclaimed its own "proletarian" genesis with an emphasis on revolutionary populism. This meant a certain change in optics: part of the Ukrainian pre-war folkloristics and ethnography has now become "foreign",[30] while the idea that Russian science and tradition was "their own" for Ukrainian has intensified.

In this spirit, the popular series *Narodna tvorchist'* (*Folk Art*, in Ukrainian) of the publishing house *Dnipro* (1982–1988) was maintained. The series began with the publication of Russian "byliny of the Kyiv cycle" in Russian, but in general texts of Ukrainian folklore of various genres (from dumas to fairy tales) were published here in Ukrainian. This referred to the idea of unity of the Kyivan/Ancient Rus' people,[31] but at the same time made the Russian epics part of the Ukrainian folklore heritage (the system of different genres of Ukrainian folklore, which reflect different historical stages of development of the Ukrainian oral tradition).

Albeit, in fact, despite such loud statements, both Ukrainian folkloristics and ethnology remained within the national paradigm and continued the scientific traditions of the pre-Soviet era. Thus, the *Ukrainska narodna tvorchist'* (*Ukrainian Folk Art,* in Ukrainian) academic series of the M. T. Rylsky Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnography of the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences in Kyiv (edited by Oleksiy Dey, Head of the Folklore Department) (1921–1986) contained a series of collections of Ukrainian songs with notes and comments: from essentially religious carols to recruiting and soldier songs. At the same time, Ukrainian scholars tried to analyze the folklore memory of blind performers of dumas and psalms, kobzars and lyricists of the 19th through thefirst half of the 20th century (Kyrdan, Omel'chenko 1980).[32]

In the end, some of the problems of Ukrainian folklore were sustained entirely in the spirit of the postwar Soviet socialist canon, which was modeled on Russian studies of songs from the Civil War or the folklore of the Great Patriotic War/the Second World War (Gusev

30   The example of ethnologist and folklorist Viktor Petrov (Domontovych, Ber) was paradoxical. Before the Second World War, he was "own" Soviet scientist. He then left the country, joined the Ukrainian emigration (probably as an agent of the Soviet secret services) and became a "foreigner". However, in 1949 Petrov suddenly re-emigrated to the USSR, was awarded by the Soviet authorities, and again became "one's own".

31   Or "old Russian ethnos" (Rus.: *drevnierusskij narod*) from the discourse of Soviet Russian scientists.

32   *Kobzars and lirnyks* (lyre players) represented the environment of the blind performers in Ukrainian folklore. *Kobzars/bandurist* (kobza/bandura players) performed their recitative texts (including dumas, epic historical songs) on *kobzas* and *banduras* (stringed musical instruments of various shapes). *Lirnyks* played on the so-called *wheel lyres* or *relia/rylia*, close to the German *Leier, Drehleier*, Italian *lyra tedesca* and English *hurdy-gurdy*. They traveled and performed both dance and religious songs, chants and psalms, including apocalyptic ones about the Last Judgment. These texts were reproduced through a well-developed memory of performers and through the oral tradition, which was learned among other *kobzars* and *lirnyks*. Kobzars and lyre players had sighted boys-leaders and formed closed hierarchical fraternities with their own rules, as well as a secret language in which they communicated with each other.

1964).[33] In this sense, the publications of the M. T. Rylsky Institute of Art Studies, Folklore and Ethnography of the UkrSSR Academy of Sciences in Kyiv and its then Lviv branch of the Museum of Ethnography were certain equivalents or compensation for those publications published at the all-Union level.[34] For example, *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografiia* (*Folk Art and Ethnography*, in Ukrainian) in Soviet times focused on traditional, even template themes.[35]

Another niche remained paremiology. In the series *Mudrist' narodna* (*Folk Wisdom*, in Ukrainian), which was published by the *Dnipro* publishing house from 1969 to 1991, Soviet (that is, the folklore of the peoples of the USSR) and world folklore were mixed.[36]

Simultaneously, publications of Western structuralists and popularity of systemic or structural-systemic approach in the 1960s and 1970s also influenced Ukrainian scholars. One of the examples of combining traditional and modern paradigms were the works of ethnomusicologist Volodymyr Goshovskyi/Hoshovskyi (1922–1996). In the works of the early 1960s, he tried to combine folklore with cybernetics[37] and semiotics. Initially, the author represented the regional Western Ukrainian oral tradition in the all-Union discourse (Goshovskyi 1968).

V. Goshovskyi's book on sources of Slavic folk music became symbolic for Soviet folk Slavic studies (Goshovskyi 1971), and was quickly translated into Czech (Hošovskyj 1976). This work clearly operated with the categories of sign, meaning, catalog, type, archetype and prototype, model and function, and in general musical language as a semiotic system of signs, which has its own words, sentences, and territorial differences (dialects). He tried to analyze folklore cybernetically and transfer to it the principles of structural linguistics, referring to the work by Sebastian Shaumyan with his structural linguistics and semiotic theory of

33   At this time, "one's own" Ukrainian Soviet folklore was depicted as an alternative to "foreign" Ukrainian emigrant folklore with its research and archives (such as Bohdan Medwidsky Ukrainian Folklore Archives (BMUFA) at the Peter and Doris Kule Centre for Ukrainian and Canadian Folklore of the University of Alberta Museums).

34   In particular, the collection *Russkij fol'klor* (*Russian Folklore*) of the Institute of Russian Literature, works of the Institute of Slavonic Studies and Balkan Studies, collections of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography.

35   Including artistic features of narrative folklore, "songs of the revolution", descriptions of folklore archives of the Institute, the ritual of workers' and Komsomol weddings, folk technology and dialect terminology. As a model for researchers of this time, an example of Donbas folklore with records of miners' folklore or a study of the life of employees of the Lviv Television Plant was cited. At the same time, the topics of Ukrainian folklore monographs were a nationally marked response to all-Union tendencies (Kolessa 1969; Lavrov 1980).

36   Moldavian, Belarusian, Latvian proverbs and adages were published in the same line not only with Polish, Czech or "proverbs of the Peoples of Yugoslavia", but also along with English, French, Spanish, Irish, Portuguese ones.

37   The cybernetics, developed by Mykhailo Glushkov in Soviet Ukraine, Norbert Wiener, and William Ross Ashby in the United States, meant the science of the general principles of control, storage, and transmission of information in complex systems (from machines/mechanisms to the society, and its sign systems).

language. Goshovskyi's works were largely symmetrical to the works of Piotr Bogatyrev, and his work was "Union" in nature: a native of Ukrainian Transcarpathia Goshovskyi published his papers in Moscow and Yerevan, Armenia, as well as worked in Western Ukraine—in Lviv (Dobrjans'ka 2011).

Western structuralist or structural-systemic approaches were used more often in Ukrainian dialectology for example, in Pavlo Hrycenko's monographs on modeling the system of dialectal vocabulary (Hrycenko 1984) and its areal variation (Hrycenko 1990). The ideological boundaries between "one's own" and "foreign" were not so strict here, because it was about poitically neutral topics: phonemes, morphemes, syntagms, and not about motives or concepts.

A new period of "struggle and synthesis of elements" in Soviet, including Ukrainian, folklorstics and ethnography began only after 1985. At this time there were a return from oblivion of banned or undesirable in the postwar period texts of pre-revolutionary and pre-war repressed folklorists and ethnographers (like Kateryna Hrushevska and her associates in Ukraine) and a new interest in the works of Russian OPOJAZ-members and "mythologists"—from Olga Freidenberg to the native of Kyiv Yakiv Golosovker. At the same time, new Western discourses entered Soviet historiography with the works by Gaston Bachelard, Claude Bremond, Roland Barthes, Roman Jakobson and other Western European researchers of the second half of the 20th century.[38] In fact, the end of the 1980s in the USSR and in the UkrSSR in particular was a repetition of that spontaneous construction of Soviet folkloristics and ethnography of the 1920s and 1930s (under the influence of Gorbachev's logic of Perestroika and New Thinking).

After 1991, Ukraine's independence allegedly separated Ukrainian folklore research from the Soviet heritage: Ukrainian oral tradition and material culture began to be interpreted as part of European folkloristics.[39] However, the general trend of post-Soviet Ukrainian folkloristics and ethnography after 1991 differed. It was about escaping from the Soviet model, simultaneously in several directions: positivist description, "going back" (modification of concepts of pre-Soviet folkloristics and ethnography of the 19th–20th centuries) and "moving forward"

38   The have become part of the scientific paradigm of the countries of the late USSR as well as ideas from *The Singer of Tales* by Albert B. Lord (Russian translation in 1994) (Lord 1994) or *Heroic Poetry* by Cecil Maurice Bowra (Russian translation in 2002) (Bowra 2002).

39   On the other hand, the emergence of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) further meant an active study of the Ukrainian (Carpathians) and Ukrainian-Russian-Belarusian ethnocultural territories (for example, Polisia) and their folklore also in Russia, where it was interpreted as part of the common "East Slavic space". Until the early 2010s, Ukrainian folklore and folk culture were further interpreted in the spirit of postcolonial discourse as an element of "CIS folklore". An example was the multi-volume popular series *Folklor i literaturnyye pamyatniki SNG* (*Folklore and Literary Monuments of the CIS*), which traced various dimensions of hybridity: folklore was mixed with literature, and Ukrainian folklore was again among the folklore of Belarus, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan. At the same time, the Slavic dominant of CIS folklore was emphasized: unlike other countries, two books from this series were devoted to Russia and Ukraine.

modernization using poststructuralist, postmodernist methodologies, gender studies etc. However, the theories of Soviet ethnography and folkloristics remain partly the primary impetus for postmodern concepts.

Thus, we can say that the general development of (Ukrainian) Soviet folkloristics and ethnology/ethnography was somewhat different than previously thought. Soviet science, like the entire Soviet Union, sought to distance itself from Western influences. However, science, culture, society, and even the ideology of the USSR and the UkrSSR were constantly changing. "Own"/socialist/Soviet discourse was not only internally modernized at the same time as "alien"/foreign/non-socialist discourse, but also adopted from outside concepts, ideas, schemes. At the same time, Soviet scholars tried to export their ideas to Western discourse in order to form an image of the scientific (and ideological) leadership of the USSR. On the other hand, in the Soviet Union there was also a confrontation between the center (Moscow, Leningrad), in which access to "foreign" was easier and wider, and the periphery (Union Republics), to which this access was more complex and limited.

In general, despite the periods of (self-)isolation of Soviet science in the 1930s and in the postwar period, the boundary between one's own/Soviet/internal and foreign/non-Soviet/external in these disciplines remained variable, flexible. This was due both to the idea of the combination of Soviet science with the "progressive ideas of mankind" and the general trends in the development of science after the Second World War. The "anarchist" searches of early Soviet folkloristics and ethnology of the 1920s, which began to take shape in the system, were later curtailed within the framework of the normal paradigm of Soviet science, limited by ideological clichés. However, these stencils were also not permanent: Soviet folkloristics and ethnography sought to remain a science and modernize. Socialist science (and socialist folkloristics and ethnography) wanted to be a self-sufficient modeling system. However, they tried to expand their influence in the Western capitalist world, which meant adapting to the rules of Western discourse, borrowing Western concepts that penetrated the language of Soviet folkloristics and ethnography and changed them from within. This meant that even the banished from the Soviet discourse Alien, Other/Foreign was in fact almost always a hidden part of the discourse of socialist folkloristics and ethnology, constantly maneuvering between "one's own" to "foreign", from early Soviet to late Soviet political and scientific mythology and until the Soviet Union ceased to exist, and with it the Soviet discourse of science.

Anderson, David, Arzyutov, Dmitry (2016). The Construction of Soviet Ethnography and "The Peoples of Siberia". *History and Anthropology*, No. 27(2), pp. 183–209.

Andreev, Nikolaj (1929). *Ukazatel' skazochnyh sjuzhetov po sisteme Aarne*. Leningrad: Izdanie Gos. russkogo geograficheskogo o-va.

Anekdoty o Hodzhe Nasreddine i Ahmet Ahae (1937). Ed. S. D. Kocjubinskij. Simferopol': Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo Krymskoj ASSR.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1968). *Rabelais and His World*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Beregovskyi, Moisei (1934). *Evrejskij muzykal'nyj fol'klor.* Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor.

Beregovskyi, Musiy (1930). Chuzhomovni j riznomovni pisni Jevreyiv Ukrayiny, Bilorusy ta Polshhi. *Etnografichnyj visnyk,* Kyiv 1930. Knyga 9, pp. 37–51.

Boas, Franc (1926). *Um pervobytnogo cheloveka*. Perev. Alekseja Vodena. Moskva; Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.

Bogoraz, Vladimir (1934). *Chukchi. Chast' pervaja.* Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Instituta narodov Severa CIK SSSR.

Bowra, Cecil Maurice (2002). *Geroicheskaja pojezija*. Perev. Nikolaja Grintsera, Iriny Jershovoj. Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.

Brandist, Craig, Chown, Kathya (eds.) (2010). *Politics and the theory of language in the USSR 1917–1938. The birth of sociological linguistics*. London: Anthem Press.

Cocchiara, Giuseppe (1960). *Istorija fol'kloristiki v Evrope.* Perev. Aleksandr Benediktov. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury.

Cunow, Heinrich (1913). *Ursprung der Religion und des Gottesglaubens.* Berlin: Buchhandlung Vorwärts Paul Singer.

Dobrjans'ka, Lina (2011). Ekspedycijna dijal'nist' Volodimira Goshovs'kogo u L'vivs'kij konservatoriji (1961–1968). *Visnyk L'vivs'kogo universitetu. Serija: Mystectvoznavstvo,* No. 10, pp. 44–63.

Doroshkevych, Oleksandr (1924). *Pidruchnyk istoriyi ukrayins'koyi literatury*. Kharkiv; Kyiv: Knyhospilka.

Dumézil, Georges (1986). *Verhovnye bogi indoevropejcev*. Perev. Tatjany Tsivjan. Moskva: Nauka.

Dyakiv, Volodymyr (2008). *"Fol'klor chudes" u pidradyans'kij Ukrayini 1920-kh rokiv*. L'viv: Institut narodoznavstva NAN Ukraïni.

École de Tartu (1976). *Travaux sur les systèmes de signes.* Textes choisis et présentés par Yuri Lotman et Boris Ouspenski, trans. Anne Zouboff. Bruxelles: Complexe.

Feyerabend, Paul (1975). *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London, New York: Humanities Press.

Fizer, John (1986). *Alexander A. Potebnja's Psycholinguistic Theory of Literature: A Metacritical Inquiry*. Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.

Frazer, James (1980). *Zolotaja vetv'. Issledovanie magii i religii*. Perev. Mikhaila Ryklina. Moskva: Politizdat.

Frazer, James (1983). *Zolotaja vetv'. Issledovanie magii i religii*. Vtoroe izdanie. Perev. Mikhaila Ryklina. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoj literatury.

Frazer, James (1985). *Fol'klor v Vethom Zavete*. Perev. Davida Volpina. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoj literatury.

Frazer, James George (1900). *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Gamkrelidze, Tamaz, Ivanov, Vjacheslav (1995). *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture.* Parts 1–2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gerasimov, Ilya, Glebov, Sergey, Mogilner, Marina (2016). Hybridity: Marrism and the Problems of Language of the Imperial Situation. *Ab Imperio*, No. 1, pp. 27–68.

Gomme, George Laurence (1890). *The Handbook of Folklore*. London: Published for the Folklore Society.

Goshovskyi, Vladimir (1968). *Ukrainskie pesni Zakarpat'ja*. Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor.

Goshovskyi, Vladimir (1971). *U istokov narodnoj muzyki slavjan. Ocherki po muzykal'nomu slavjanovedeniju*. Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor.

Gusev, Viktor (sost.) (1964). *Russkij fol'klor Velikoj Otechestvennoj vojny*. Leningrad: Nauka.

Hirsch, Francine (2005). *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hošovskyj, Volodymyr (1976). *U pramenů lidové hudby Slovanů. Studie z*

hudební slavistiky. Praha: Editio Supraphon.

Howell, Dana Prescott (1992). *The Development of Soviet Folkloristics*. New York: Garland Pub.

Hrycenko, Pavlo (1984). *Modelyuvannya systemy dialektnoyi leksyky*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Hrycenko, Pavlo (1990). *Areal'ne variyuvannya leksyky*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Kabanov, Annette (2002). *Ol'ga Michajlovna Frejdenberg (1890–1955). Eine sowjetische Wissenschaftlerin zwischen Kanon und Freiheit*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Ķencis, Toms (2012). *A Disciplinary History of Latvian Mythology*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Knorozov, Jurij (1954). *La antigua escritura de los pueblos de America Central*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Popular.

Knorozov, Jurij (1982). *Maya Hieroglyphic Codices*. Transl. by S. D. Coe. New York: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, State University of New York at Albany.

Knorozov, Jurij (1955). *Sistema pis'ma drevnih majja: opyt rasshifrovki*. Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR.

Knorozov, Jurij (1963). *Pis'mennost' indejcev*

majja. Moskva–Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR

Knorozov, Jurij (1975). *Ieroglificheskie rukopisi majja*. Leningrad: Nauka.

Kolessa, Filaret (1969). *Melodiyi ukrayins'kykh narodnykh dum*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Koriak, Volodymyr (1927). *Narys istoriyi ukrayins'koyi literatury. I. Literatura peredburzhuazna*. 2-e vyd. Kharkiv. Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrayiny.

Kuhn, Thomas (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kurylo, Olena (1928). *Materialy do ukrains'koi dijalektologii i fol'klorystyky*. Kyiv: Vseukraïns'ka Akademija Nauk.

Kyrdan, Borys, Omel'chenko, Andrij (1980). *Narodni spivci-muzykanty na Ukrayini*. Kyiv: Muzychna Ukraina.

Lafargue, Paul (1930). *Jazyk i revoljucija. Francuzskij jazyk do i posle revoljucii (Ocherki proishozhdenija sovremennoj burzhuazii)*. Perev. Tatjany Falkovich, Elizavety Shyshmariovoj. Moskva: Academia.

Latyshskie skazki (Latvju tautas pasakas). Sbornik

(1933). Moskva–Leningrad: Academia, 1933.

Lavrov, Fedir (1940). *Poradnyk po fol'kloru*. Kyiv.

Lavrov, Fedir (1980). *Kobzari. Narysy z istoriyi kobzarstva Ukrayiny*. Kyiv, Mystectvo.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1983). *Strukturnaja antropologija*. Perev. Vjacheslava Ivanova. Moskva: GRVL.

Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien (1922). *La mentalité primitive*. Paris: Félix Alcan.

Lippert, Julius (1922). *Istorija kul'tury: v 3 narysakh*. Perekl. Petra Djatlova, Khvedora Mojsy. New York, Vienna, Lviv, Kyiv.

Lord, Albert Bates (1994). *Skazytel'*. Perev. Yurija Kleinera, Georgija Levintona. Moskva: Izdatel'skaia firma "Vostochnaya literatura" RAN.

Meletinsky, Yeleazar (1963). *Proiskhozhdenie geroicheskogo éposa. Rannie formy i arkhaicheskie pamiatniki*. Moskva: Izd-vo vostochnoj literatury.

Meletinsky, Yeleazar (1976). *Pojetika mifa*. Moskva: Nauka.

Mifologicheskij slovar' (1991). Meletinsky, Yeleazar (ed.). Moskva: Sovetskaja jenciklopedija.

Petrov, Viktor (1925). Misce fol'kloru v krajeznavstvi. *Etnografichnij visnyk*. T. 1, c. 11–24.

Popovič, Anton. (1970). *Štrukturalizmus v slovenskej vede: 1931–1949; dejiny, texty, bibliografia*. Bratislava: Matica slovenská.

Propp, Vladimir (1928). *Morfologija skazki*. Leningrad: Academia.

Sapir, Edward (1934). *Jazyk. Vvedenie v izuchenie rechi*. Perev. Alekseja Sukhotina. Moskva; Leningrad: Socjekgiz.

Shamraj, Ahapij. (1928). *Ukrayins'ka literatura: styslyj ohlyad*. Kharkiv: Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrayiny.

Shor, Rozalia (1926). *Jazyk i obshhestvo*. Moskva–Leningrad: Rabotnik prosveshhenija.

Shternshis, Anna (2006). *Soviet and Kosher: Jewish Popular Culture in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Sumcov, Mykola (1919). *Narodna slovesnist'*. Kharkiv: Ruh.

Tokarev, Sergej (1978). *Istorija zarubezhnoj etnografii*. Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.

Tokarev, Sergej (1989). *History Of Religion*. Transl. by Paula Garb. Moscow: Progress.

Tokarev, Sergej (sost.) (1980). *Mify narodov mira. Enciklopedija: V 2-h tomah*. Moskva: Sovetskaja enciklopedija.

Turner, Victor (1983). *Simvol i ritual*. Perev. Viktora Beilisa. Moskva: Nauka.

Tylor, Edward Burnett (1871). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*. Vol. 1–2. London: John Murray.

van der Veer, Rene, Valsiner, Jaan (eds.) (1994). *The Vygotsky Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Vendryes, Joseph (1937). *Jazyk: lingvisticheskoe vvedenie v istoriju*. Perev. Rozalii Shor. Moskva: Gos. soc.-jekon. izd-vo.

Voloshinov, Valentyn (1930). *Marksizm i filosofija jazyka*. Leningrad: Priboj.

Voloshinov, Valentyn (1976). *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*. Transl. by I. R. Titunik. New York: Academic Press.

Werth, Nicolas (2007). *La Terreur et le Désarroi: Staline et son système*. Paris: Perrin.

Zhirmunsky, Viktor (1962). *Narodnij geroicheskiy epos*. Moskva, Leningrad: Gos. izd-vo hudozhestv. lit.

Zubritski, Yuri (1979). *Los incas-quechuas*. Moscú: Progreso.

No "savējiem" līdz ārzemēm: padomju folkloristikas un etnogrāfijas kategorijas un teksti

Pavlo Artimišins, Romans Holiks

Rakstā pētītas padomju folkloristikas un etnogrāfijas kategorijas un teksti no 1920. līdz 1991. gadam. Šajā laikā aplūkojamās parādības atšķīrās starp diviem galēji atšķirīgiem zinātniskajiem kontekstiem: padomju jeb sociālistisko un nepadomju jeb kapitālistisko. Autori izseko zinātnisko koncepciju ģenēzi padomju folklorā un etnogrāfijā pirms un pēc Otrā pasaules kara (ieskaitot pretstatus "savs" un "svešs", "draudzīgs" un "naidīgs", "populārs" un "elitārs", "atļauts" un "tabu"). Tiek pētīts, kā šie jēdzieni un idejas izskatījās mazajā (Padomju Ukraina) un lielajā (Padomju Savienība) sociālistiskajā telpā un kā tie tika pārraidīti un mainīti ar "savu" un "svešu" tekstu publikācijām. Neraugoties uz padomju zinātnes (paš)izolācijas periodiem 20. gadsimta 30. gados un pēckara periodā, robeža starp savu jeb padomju, iekšējo svešo jeb citu, nepadomju jeb ārējo šajās disciplīnās palika mainīga un elastīga. Tas bija saistīts gan ar ideju par "padomju zinātnes starptautisku apvienošanu ar cilvēces progresīvajām idejām", gan par vispārējām zinātnes attīstības tendencēm pēc Otrā pasaules kara. 20. gadsimta 20. gadu "anarhiskie" agrīnās padomju folkloras un etnoloģijas meklējumi, kas sāka veidoties sistēmā, vēlāk aprobežojās ar padomju zinātnes "normālo" paradigmu, kuru ierobežoja ideoloģiskās klišejas. Tomēr šie trafareti arī nebija pastāvīgi: padomju folklora un etnogrāfija centās modernizēties. Sociālistiskā zinātne (un sociālistiskā folkloristikas un etnogrāfija) vēlējās būt pašpietiekama modelēšanas sistēma. Tomēr tā mēģināja paplašināt savu ietekmi kapitālistiskajā pasaulē, kas nozīmēja pielāgošanos Rietumu diskursa noteikumiem, aizņemoties Rietumu jēdzienus, kas iekļuva padomju folkloristikas un etnogrāfijas valodā un to mainīja. Tas nozīmēja, ka pat no padomju diskursa izraidītās kategorijas gandrīz vienmēr bija slēpta sociālistiskās folkloras un etnogrāfijas diskursa sastāvdaļas.