

---

## АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІЇ ТА МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН

УДК 94(47+57)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/2524-048X.2021.18.07>

**Yurii Kotliar**

*Dr. Habil (History), Professor*

*Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University, Mykolaiv, Ukraine*

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2222-3857>

### HISTORICAL MEMORY AND HISTORICAL SCIENCE: EUROPEAN AND UKRAINIAN DISCOURSES

**Abstract.** *The current paper is aimed at exploring the level of theoretical understanding of the historical memory concept. The researcher considers the phenomenon of historical memory in the historical-scientific context, including studies of leading European (P. Nora, P. Ricoeur, J. Rüsen, M. Halbwachs) and Ukrainian scientists (P. Verbytska, Ya. Hrytsak, Ya. Dashkevych, L. Zashkilniak, H. Kasianov, A. Kyrydon, L. Nahorna, M. Riabchuk, N. Yakovenko).*

*The problem of historical memory has a wide field of interest in the modern scientific literature. Not only historians and political scientists, but also philosophers, sociologists, culturologists, linguists join the study of such a complex phenomenon. The paper explores the phenomenon of historical memory, its role and place in the system of social values. The culture of historical memory, mechanisms of functioning and interrelation of historical memory and national/regional identity are analyzed by using European experience to understand the connection between the past, present and future.*

*The comprehension of historical memory takes place within different sciences and, depending on it, acquires a characteristic theoretical coloring. In the context of historical research, there is a clear understanding of the order that exists between the past, present and future. Moreover, historical memory not only establishes a causal connection from the past to the future through the present, but also influences the evaluative characteristics of the past and the retrospective vision of our present. Historical memory is «genetically» programmed for evaluation. It is characterized not only by recollection and reproduction, but also by a kind of reflex of perception or non-perception, approval or condemnation. Therefore, every historical fact becomes the object of meticulous analysis.*

*Historical memory is not history, but a form of representation of the past that historians explore.*

**Key words:** *historical memory, history, culture, theory, Europe, Ukraine, discourse.*

**Research Issue and Its Significance.** *The understanding of the «historical memory» phenomenon plays a significant role at the present stage of the historical science development. The essence of historical memory is to preserve in the public consciousness the most substantial information, which is a kind of experience generalization.*

*The problem of historical memory has a wide field of interest in the modern scientific literature. The study of such a complex concept joins not only historians*

and political scientists, but also philosophers, sociologists, cultural studies researchers and linguists. They explore the phenomenon of historical memory, its role and place in the system of social values; analyze the culture of historical memory, mechanisms of its functioning and interconnecting of historical memory and national / regional identity. In this regard, European experience is applied for understanding the connection between the past, modern and future. However, there is no pure consensus on the relation between the concepts of «historical memory» and «historical science» in the scientific world.

***Theoretical Foundations of the Historical Memory Research.*** The problem of comprehension of historical memory in the modern scientific environment has become not merely interdisciplinary: it could be considered as meta-disciplinary, since it specifies the algorithm for coordinating cognitive efforts of researchers in such spheres as history and psychology, philosophical anthropology and religious studies, cultural studies and sociology, ethics and aesthetics. No one branch of socio-human knowledge rests beyond the consideration of historical memory as a spiritual resource of civilization, the pantheon of national identity, the basis of culture and morality. Consequently, historical memory can be attributed to the type of pragmatic knowledge – applied and philosophical-ideological ones. Simultaneously, it exists in the two following planes: diachronic (genetic, temporal), which provides consideration of sequential-linear change of events in time, and synchronous (structural), which creates an opportunity for a synchronous analysis of ties, structures and geopolitical influences [8, p. 8].

Kyiver historian Alla Kyrydon believes that the expansion of the theoretical horizon, methodological and categorical apparatus in the academic environment, actualizes the problem of «memory» study. This phenomenon has become the subject of scientific explorations in various fields of knowledge – history, sociology, culture, philosophy, political science, ethnology and psychology, and also has led to the emergence of the new areas of social and humanitarian knowledge (sociology of memory, mnemonic psychology, phenomenology of memory and mnemonic hermeneutics of culture etc.) [6, p. 151].

In accordance to the Ukrainian historian and ethnopolitical researcher Larysa Nahorna, an interdisciplinary scientific direction, which specially investigates the sphere of memory, has been formed in our time. It joins the general flow of cultural sciences, but retains relative autonomy and has its substantive field. However, the discussed trend remains in a complex and not completely clarified relationship with the system of historical sciences. As far as the research methods are concerned, it is traced the commonality of approaches with those that are fixed in discoursology,

which already has been fighting for the status of sub-discipline in the system of political sciences [8, p. 6].

**Novelty of Research.** The document is one of the most comprehensive domestic studies of historical memory, based not only on the conclusions and visions of Ukrainian scientists, but researchers from Western Europe as well. Moreover, the author reveals his own vision of the historical science structure, which combines different versions of historical memory. For this reason, *the purpose of our research* is the intention to investigate the level of theoretical comprehension of the historical memory notion and to consider the phenomenon of historical memory in the scientific historical context.

**Body of Research.** The genetic link between history and memory is so evident that historical memory is often identified as the process of historical knowledge. At the household level, history as science and historical memory are in the same plane, thus, the question of the possibility of confrontational interaction between them does not even arise. However, everything is not so evident.

Analyzing the relationship between history and memory, the Kyiver historian Heorhii Kasianov believes that they can be reduced to the following positions: 1) history and memory are opposed, even considered as incompatible phenomena; 2) history and memory are equalized; 3) history and memory are treated as forms of understanding, interpreting and representing of the past that are in the process of constant interaction and mutual complement. The first and the third approaches are usually related to research and analytical operations; they are mostly connected with the field of scientific activity. The equalizing of history and memory is an action, which is more typical for socio-political, journalistic, and ideological discourses [5, p. 119].

The problem of historical memory is not new – it was investigated even in the XIX century as a phenomenon of preservation and transfer of information about past events that have been considered valuable in terms of present and future. In the 1930s, the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs defined the social nature of memory and introduced the concept of «collective memory» as a social construct, where the relevant communities and groups create and preserve in order to interpret the past and present events. According to Halbwachs, individuals cannot maintain and activate personal memories, which are not constructed within the social boundaries (of religion, customs, nation and family, etc.), and not supported by the mentioned groups [16, p. 61].

Comparing historical memory and historical science, Halbwachs has argued that historical memory consists of numerous voices of different groups. For this reason, it

is unreliable; it modernizes the aforementioned and could be effective during repetitions only. Whereas, history deals with the unique events, since it is documented and critically distanced from the present; and the historical narrative is monolithic. Halbwachs has noted that history begins when a tradition ends and social memory is dying and decaying [16, p. 53].

According to the historian, the following two core features that differ historical memory from pure history could be highlighted. Firstly, it has no clear divisions (in periods or schemes), which are typical for historical science. Memory is a continuous flow of thoughts. It is stored only in the consciousness of a group that supports it. Secondly, in contrast to history that, as a science, tries to be universal (despite all divisions in national histories there is actually only one united history), several variants of historical memory can coexist simultaneously.

At the end of the XX century, the theme of historical memory received a new impetus for study, when historians were engaged in the study of historical consciousness, segregating the stable structures in it, particularly, historical memory. The German historian Jörn Rüsen studied historical memory in the context of «new cultural-anthropological history», which followers were interested in the dynamics of the interaction of ideas about the past in the collective memory of different groups. He considered new ways of historical thinking and showed the role of history in the life of society. Rüsen distinguished historical culture, memory and consciousness, and determined their impact on the future. The scholar saw a new approach in the ethics of historical thinking as a turning point, where the pursuit of science for rationality could be incorporated into the waymark functions of historical knowledge. Thus, the past would have been no simple material for a further interpretation, but a push and a motive for the appropriate actions, in which the activity and suffering of people in the past would serve the future [10, p. 14]. In the discussed context, we are talking about historical lessons and the possibilities of their application.

Rüsen has expressed an important thought that it is not enough only to deduce the significance of the past as a history for the present and future from the work of the present on the experience of the past. It is substantial to ensure that the past is meaningful. For the past, it should be recognized the so-called «right to identity», which is enjoyed by the present that criticizes the past events and, exalting itself above conventions, moves through the past to the unfolding future [10, p. 14].

The German researcher comprehensively considers history as a science and clearly distinguishes lessons of history. He stresses that the next generation is the purpose of humans' running to the future. Our future must enter into the memory of descendants to inspire them in their future. Drawing knowledge from the historical

memory, we are shaping our future that will reach its completion, when we along with our descendants follow the same path, which is pursued from the past to the future [10, p. 334]. Analyzing the past and suggesting new approaches to historical thinking, Rüsen notes that people modernize, interpret, reinterpret, master it, then – push it away, then – approach it again. Humans adore it, deceive it, materialize or disperse it. Historical thinking could be forgotten, but, in any case, it does not give people any rest [10, p. 299].

Exploring the memory crisis, the French philosopher Jean Paul Ricoeur relates it to the fear of history and the weakening of the intuitive aspect of representation, the irresistible escape of the past and the congestion of the present, the inability to forget and the failure to recall. Therefore, the flexibility of reading and the lessons of elegant dialectics must be learned [9]. Only the hermeneutics that throws the bridge between the phenomenon of history and the phenomenon of memory in the form of semiotics of the past representations can reveal the dialectic of the combination of the corrective function of history with respect to memory and the function of a matrix that memory performs in relation to history. The archived and documented memory has already lost a recollection as its object; and what is called a fact does not always coincide with what actually happened. Thus, a crisis of confidence, which gives rise to the consideration of historical science as a school of suspicion, appears [9].

Searching a point, where the history and memory overlap, Ricoeur concludes that history would like to attribute to memory a status of an object, which exists along with the similar ones in its field of study. At the same time, historical memory emphasizes its considerably wider possibilities of recollection than those that arise under the distant sight of a historian. The controversy on priorities in such conditions seems insoluble. Ontology comprehends this contradiction in the framework of the dialectic of restoring the past and foreseeing the future; it eventually includes the right for a verdict regarding claims of history and memory for hegemony in a closed space of retrospection.

The most radical idea of the history and memory division and contrasting was presented by the French historian Pierre Nora, who stressed that everything speaks for opposing of these concepts, which are far from being synonymous. Memory is a life embodied in the existing communities. It is a constant evolution. Memory is subjected to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, without awareness of the distortions, which eventually impact it. It depends on the various types of appropriation and manipulation, being capable of long sleeping and sudden awakening. In contrast, history is a problematic and incomplete reconstruction of what does no longer exist. Memory is a phenomenon of the present, which binds us to

the ongoing present time. History is a representation of the past. Taking its sensual and logical nature, memory accepts only those facts that gratify it. It grows out of multistage, sometimes – overly common and obscure, sometimes – too private and symbolic details. It is vulnerable to any transfer, display, censorship or design. History, being an intellectual or secular activity, turns to analysis and critical discourse [16, p. 8].

History goes from servicing memory, including the desire (unnecessarily conscious) to describe it in the most completed way, filling gaps and cracks, to critique and analysis. There is a transition from the history-memory to the critical history [16, p. 8–9]. Therefore, history displaces memory from the collective representations of the past and subordinates it. Thus, memory gets a chance to survive in some codified (and historically recognized) tracks and remnants (memory locations), or to be integrated into the historical description.

The problem of historical memory became especially relevant for the Ukrainian humanities, in particular history, after gaining Ukraine's independence [7, p. 212].

The researcher from Lviv Leonid Zashkilniak identifies historical memory as an ability of the human mind to preserve the individual and collective experience of interpersonal relations that give basis to form the conceptualization of history. In fact, it is available information for the social identification of a person and a community. It is clear that historical memory, – both individual and collective, – is a result of the interaction of personality and social environment. There is no historical memory without such interaction. Thus, historical memory is a kind of identification with a certain culture [4, p. 855].

According to the ethnopolitologist Larysa Nahorna, there is always a place for «turns» and «surprises» in the field of history and in the realm of memory. Laying the image of an event in public memory, history can lead to its incomplete reliability or total inadequacy. Similarly, memory, having a reciprocal influence on the historiographical process, can create the problems of an estimated mismatch. The process of studying the past and writing history, at least in its ideal dimensions, exists in the sphere of rational; however, the space of historical memory is mostly a field of imagination. Here, not the past appears as an object of knowledge, but its foggy, blurry image only. Observing the traces of the past, the memory interpreter creates mind-set constructs that are in harmony with the mood and the needs of the present. Such constructs could not be attributed to the category of reflections and they are not embedded organically in the historical context. Rather, there are photos taken from a certain, modernized perspective, visual schemas and orientation models [8, p. 160–161].

An attitude of the historian from Lviv Yaroslav Hrytsak towards the historic memory is specifically-figurative. He stresses that historical memory becomes the most dangerous poison that is produced by the chemistry of our brain. It not only inhibits consciousness, but also paralyzes our readiness for changes. It is impossible to overcome the history that it is, if we do not overpower the history that sits in our heads. It is difficult to make any reforms in a society that is divided by history. Historical memory has a strong emotional coloring; therefore, it could be an ideal means for mobilizing the electorate under the certain political flags [2, p. 105]. According to the scientist, values are historically formed and, for this reason, historical memory serves as a kind of brake for changes.

The Ukrainian educationalist Polina Verbytska highlights that the content of historical memory is not objective information about the events of the past, but it is the presentation of a certain image, its subjective perception and assessment by a separate person [1, p. 251].

The peculiarity of the situation that affects the formation of historical memory in Ukraine could be explained by the following, according to the Kyiver historian Natalia Yakovenko. A community that represents the people of one country is characterized by functioning of several different contents or potentially conflictual canons of historical memory, where three, partially mixed, variants of the past interpretation are combined. Such interpretation variants are borrowed in different proportions from the next sources: 1) the romantic historiography of the first half – the middle of the XIX century, which presents the Kozak-admire vision of the past, that is most intensively cultivated in the center, including the Dnipro (or the Dnieper) and its Left bank; 2) the academic historiography of the populist direction of the late XIX and early XX centuries – perception of the past primarily as a field of struggle of the fraternal Slavic peoples, – Ukrainian and Russian, – for Orthodox faith and social justice (this version of historical memory holds strong positions in the South and the East of Ukraine); 3) the nationalist historiography, mainly diasporas, of the XX century (a version of the past, painted with strong nationalist aspirations influenced by the cult of the OUN-UPA heroes as fighters for the Ukrainian statehood inherent to the West of Ukraine and, partly, to Volhynia) [13, p. 114].

Some researchers explain the problems that surround historical memory and the historical situation in Ukraine by the geopolitical position of Ukrainian lands between the East and the West. In particular, Yakovenko has noted that the space, which today is the territory of Ukraine, has been divided for many centuries by the constantly marginal internal borders: between language and ethnic groups, states, religions, political and cultural systems, and areas of different economic structures. It makes the

discussed space a strong contact zone with a very varied spectrum of socio-cultural phenomena [14, p. 334].

In the same context, the historian Yaroslav Dashkevych also has underlined that there is no doubt that the following significant natural and anthropogenic boundaries have been passing through the territory of Ukraine until now: biological or, as it is now said, ecological – between the Steppe and forest with an intermediate strip of a forest-steppe; hydrographic – the Great European watershed between the basins of the Black and Baltic Seas; socio-economic – between nomadism and settling; ethno-confessional – between the Slavs-Christians and the Turks-Pagans (later – the Muslims), and, as a result, ethnocultural – between the culture of the West and the culture of the East. Considering such saturation of borders, it could be supported an idea that the territory of Ukraine was passed by the Great Border, which was moving depending on political circumstances [3, p. 29–30].

In support of the foregoing, the Volynian publicist Mykola Riabchuk writes about «two Ukraines» with worlds and civilizations, differing in the way of speech and way of thinking of the locals, who focus on completely different cultural models, civilizational and geographical centers; profess other, fundamentally irreconcilable and incompatible historical myths and narratives; see not only the past but also the future of the region in the completely different ways [11, p. 18].

The historian from Kyiv Oleksandr Udod, believes that different regions of Ukraine (conditionally divided into the Center, the East, and the West) are characterized by the various versions of historical memory. For this reason, it is impossible to choose a single version and to put it in the basis of the textbook, as well as to combine all of them. Therefore, according to the scholar's opinion, the strategic decision is the achievement of unity, the full interaction of social memory, historiography, historical education, a certain level of historical consciousness, which provides more or less similar approaches to the interpretation of the historical past. While, a discrepancy between them, or a gap, leads to the conversion of historical memory, social mimicry, double moral standards, monument wars, discrimination of national symbols and heroes [12, p. 11–13].

**Conclusion.** Thus, the relationship between the historical science and historical memory is complex and ambiguous. It is necessary to interpret history and memory as the forms of understanding, interpreting and representing of the past, which coexist in the process of constant interaction and mutual complementation. Historical memory is not a very history, and is not a part of history, but actually a form of the past representation investigated by historians. History is subject to historical memory, which is preserved in some codified (recognized by history) tracks and remnants



(places of memory), or integrated into a historical description. Historical memory is a source of history as a science. Therefore, we are shaping our present and future, extracting knowledge from historical memory.

Ukrainian humanities know the phenomenon of historical memory, which differs in various regions, at least at the level of the West–East. Thus, there is a complexity in creating a universal history that combines different versions of historical memory into a one entity.

***The value of historical memory (HM) and history as a science (H) could be shown by the following formula:  $H = HM1 + HM2 + HM3$ , where historical science is based on the various variants of historical memory.***

#### Sources:

1. Вербицька П.В. Проблеми історичної пам'яті у проекції на завдання сучасної історичної освіти / П.В. Вербицька // Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка». – 2012. – № 724: Держава та армія. – С. 251–256.
2. Грицак Я.Й. 26-й процент, або Як подолати історію / Я.Й. Грицак. – К. : Фонд Порошенка, 2014. – 136 с.
3. Дашкевич Я.Р. Україна на межі між Сходом і Заходом (XIV–XVIII ст.) / Я.Р. Дашкевич // Записки Наукового товариства ім. Шевченка, Львів, 1991. – Т. ССХХІІ: Праці історико-філософської секції. – С. 28–44.
4. Зашкільняк Л.О. Історична пам'ять та історіографія як дослідницьке поле для інтелектуальної історії / Л.О. Зашкільняк // Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність. – 2006–2007. – № 15. – С. 855–862.
5. Касьянов Г.В. Історична пам'ять та історична політика: до питання про термінологію й генеалогію понять / Г.В. Касьянов // Український історичний журнал. – 2016. – № 2. – С. 118–137.
6. Киридон А.М. Студії пам'яті у сучасній гуманітаристиці: історія становлення / А.М. Киридон // Український історичний журнал. – 2017. – № 4. – С. 150–161.
7. Котляр Ю.В. Історична пам'ять: українська інтерпретація / Ю.В. Котляр // Соціально-гуманітарні виміри правової держави: еволюційна парадигма: зб. тез матеріалів Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. – Дніпро: ДДУВС, 2019. – С. 212–215.
8. Нагорна Л.П. Історична пам'ять: теорії, дискурси, рефлексії / Л.П. Нагорна. – К. : ІІЕНД ім. І.Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2012. – 328 с.
9. Рикёр П. Память, история, забвение / П. Рикёр. – М. : Издательство гуманитарной литературы, 2004. – 728 с.
10. Рюзен Й. Нові шляхи історичного мислення / Й. Рюзен. – Львів: Літопис, 2010. – 328 с.
11. Рябчук М.Ю. Дві України: реальні межі, віртуальні війни / М.Ю. Рябчук. – К. : Критика, 2003. – 335 с.
12. Удод О.А. Шкільна історична освіта як репрезентант політики пам'яті / О.А. Удод // Національна та історична пам'ять. Політика пам'яті у культурному просторі: Зб. наук. праць. – К. : УІНТ, 2013. – Вип. 8. – С. 8–13.
13. Яковенко Н.М. «Образ себе» – «образ іншого» у шкільних підручниках з історії / Н.М. Яковенко // Шкільна історія очима істориків-науковців. – К. : Видавництво імені Олени Теліги, 2008. – С. 113–121.
14. Яковенко Н.М. «Україна між Сходом і Заходом»: проекція однієї ідеї / Н.М. Яковенко // Паралельний світ: Дослідження з історії уявлень та ідей в Україні XVI–XVII ст. – К. : Критика, 2002. – С. 333–365.

15. Halbwachs M. The collective memory / M. Halbwachs, F.J. Ditter, V.Ya. Ditter. – New York : Harper & Row, 1980. – 186 p.
16. Nora P. Between memory and history / P. Nora // *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. – New York, 1996. – Vol. 1: Conflicts and Division. – P. 3–25.

### References:

1. Verbytska, P.V. (2012). Problemy istorychnoi pamiaty u proektsii na zavdannia suchasnoi istorychnoi osvity. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho Universytetu «Lvivska Politekhnikha»*, 724, 251–256.
2. Hrytsak, Ya.Y. (2014). *26-i protsent, abo Yak podolaty istoriiu*. Kyiv : Fond Poroshenka.
3. Dashkevych, Ya.R. (1991). Ukraina na mezhi mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom (XIV–XVIII st.). In O. Kupchynskyi (Ed.), *Zapysky tovarystva imeni Shevchenka: Pratsi istoryko-filosofskoi sekti, Vol. CCXXII* (pp. 28–44). Lviv.
4. Zashkilniak, L.O. (2007). Istorychna pamiat ta istoriohrafia yak doslidnytske pole dlia intelektualnoi istorii. *Ukraina: Kulturna Spadshchyna, Natsionalna Svidomist, Derzhavnist*, 15, 855–862.
5. Kasianov, H.V. (2016) Istorychna pamiat ta istorychna polityka: do pytannia pro terminolohiiu y henealohiiu poniat. *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal*, 2, 118–137.
6. Kyrydon, A.M. (2017). Studii pamiaty u suchasni humanitarystytsi: Istoriia stanovlennia. *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal*, 4, 150–161.
7. Kotlyar, Yu.V. (2019). Istorychna pamiat: Ukrainska interpretatsiia. In *Sotsialno-humanitarni vymiry pravovoi derzhavy: Evoliutsiina paradyhma: Zbirnyk tez materialiv Vseukrainskoi naukovy-praktychnoi konferentsii* (pp. 212–215). Dnipro : DDUVS.
8. Nahorna, L.P. (2012). *Istorychna pamiat: Teorii, dyskursy, refleksii*. Kyiv : IPIEND im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy.
9. Ricoeur, J.P. (2004). *Pamyat, istoriya, zabvenie*. Moskva : Izdatelstvo Gumanitarnoi Literatury.
10. Rüsen, J. (2010). *Novi shliakhy istorychnoho myslennia*. Lviv : Litopys.
11. Riabchuk, M.Yu. (2003). *Dvi Ukrainy: Realni mezhi, virtualni viiny*. Kyiv : Krytyka.
12. Udod, O.A. (2013). Shkilna istorychna osvita yak reprezentant polityky pamiaty. In *Natsionalna ta istorychna pamiat. Polityka pamiaty u kulturnomu prostori: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats, Vypusk 8* (pp. 8–13). Kyiv : UINT.
13. Yakovenko, N.M. (2008). «Obraz sebe» – «obraz inshoho» u shkilnykh pidruchnykakh z istorii. In N.M. Yakovenko (Ed.), *Shkilna istoriia ochyma istorykiv-naukovtsiv* (pp. 113–121). Kyiv : Vydavnytstvo Imeni Oleny Telihy.
14. Yakovenko, N.M. (2002). «Ukraina mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom»: proektsiia odniiei idei. In N.M. Yakovenko (Ed.), *Paralelnyi svit: Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlennia ta idei v Ukraini XVI–XVII st.* (pp. 333–365). Kyiv : Krytyka.
15. Halbwachs, M., Ditter, F.J., & Ditter, V.Ya. (1980). *The collective memory*. New York : Harper & Row.
16. Nora, P. (1996). Between memory and history. In P. Nora, *Realms of memory: Rethinking the French past. Vol.1: Conflicts and Division* (pp. 3–25). New York : Columbia University Press.

**Юрій Котляр**

*д-р іст. наук, проф.*

*Чорноморський національний університет імені Петра Могили, Миколаїв, Україна*

## **ІСТОРИЧНА ПАМ'ЯТЬ ТА ІСТОРИЧНА НАУКА: ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ДИСКУРСИ**

**Анотація.** *Метою нашої статті є прагнення дослідити рівень теоретичного осмислення поняття історичної пам'яті; розглянути феномен історичної пам'яті в історико-науковому контексті, включаючи дослідження провідних європейських (П. Нора, П. Рікер, Й. Рюзен, М. Хальбвакс) та українських вчених (П. Вербицька, Я. Грицак, Я. Дашкевич, Л. Запекільняк, Г. Касьянов, А. Киридон, Л. Нагорна, М. Рябчук, Н. Яковенко).*

*Проблема історичної пам'яті має широке поле зацікавленості в сучасній науковій літературі. До вивчення такого складного явища, приєднуються не лише історики та політологи, а й філософи, соціологи, культурологи, мовознавці. Досліджено феномен історичної пам'яті, його роль та місце в системі суспільних цінностей, проаналізовано культуру історичної пам'яті, механізми функціонування і взаємозв'язку історичної пам'яті та національної / регіональної ідентичності, використано європейський досвід в осмисленні зв'язку між минулим, сучасним і майбутнім.*

*Осмислення історичної пам'яті відбувається в межах різних наук і в залежності від цього набуває характерного теоретичного забарвлення. В контексті історичних досліджень існує чітке усвідомлення порядку, який існує між минулим, сучасним і майбутнім. Причому історична пам'ять встановлює не лише причинний зв'язок від минулого до майбутнього через сучасне, але й впливає на оціночні характеристики минувшини, і на ретроспективне бачення нашого сьогодення. Історична пам'ять «генетично» запрограмована на оцінку. Їй притаманні не просто пригадування й відтворення, але й своєрідний рефлекс сприйняття чи несприйняття, схвалення чи осуду. Тому кожний історичний факт стає об'єктом прискіпливого аналізу.*

*Історична пам'ять – це не історія, а форма репрезентації минулого, яку досліджують історики.*

**Ключові слова:** *історична пам'ять, історія, культура, теорія, Європа, Україна, дискурс.*

**Надійшла до редколегії 07.03.2021**