

УДК [94:930.1](477)

<https://doi.org/10.17721/2524-048X.2021.19.5>**Yuriy Kotlyar,***Dr. habil. (History), Professor,**Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University, Mykolaiv, Ukraine**ORCID: 0000-0003-2222-3857***SYNERGETIC METHOD IN THE RESEARCH OF UKRAINIAN STATE FORMATION: EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE**

**Abstract.** *The article considers the problem of Ukrainian state formation that is studied by applying a synergetic method. One of the founders of synergetics, the Belgian chemist and philosopher Ilya Prigogine, has pointed out that history is a sequence of bifurcations.*

*The situation in Ukraine requires an objective comprehension of national statehood not only in terms of content and structure, but also in terms of time. For this reason, the use of the synergetic method can ensure the choice of its most advanced models for the future.*

*The research article is purposed at determining the different levels of «bifurcation points» in the history of Ukrainian state formation. The author sets the following tasks: to disclose the European context of essence of the synergetic method; to highlight the features of the four stages of Ukrainian state formation; to calculate a number of key dates that have become a kind of symbol of Ukrainian state forming; and to show the impact of «bifurcation points» on the statehood processes.*

*The study uses such scientific methods as analytical, comparative-historical, chronological and synergetic (for the analysis of numerical models of historical dates).*

*In the current research, the author proceeds from the fact that «bifurcation points» have taken place in the history of Ukrainian state forming. Moreover, their exploration, which is based on the synergetic method, has scientific nature. A number of key dates, which became symbolic for the Ukrainian state formation, has been identified.*

*«Bifurcation points» of the first level that concern the Ukrainian state forming include the following dates: 1199, 1648, 1919 and 1991, which contain the numbers «1» and «9» in different variations (explicitly or implicitly). Their presence led to the existence of four stages of Ukrainian state formation: princely, Cossack, national-democratic and modern ones.*

*«Bifurcation points» of the second level include the dates that contain the numbers «7» (1169, 1349 and 1709) as an internal component and symbolize the negative processes in the history of Ukrainian statehood. However, changes with the numerical code 7 are not critical, and the elements of statehood have existed for decades in the form of autonomy.*

*The third level of «bifurcation points» should include dates with the interweaving of the numbers «5» and «6»: 1569, 1596 and 1659. The events that took place at those points were inevitably negative.*

**Key words:** *Ukraine, statehood, state formation, «bifurcation points», chronology, synergetic, numbers.*

**Research Issue and Its Significance.** *The current situation in Ukraine requires a deep and impartial comprehension of national statehood not only in the contextual-structural, but also in chronological-temporal dimension that can ensure the choice of its most advanced models for the future. Such approach is relevant, since the process of state forming should be carried out accordingly to a certain theoretical model, based on a comprehensive analysis of the past and present circumstances as well as*

the future perspectives. This is significant for Ukraine, which is experiencing the transition from a part of the empire to the independent nation and state. In our opinion, it is interesting to try applying the synergetic method, which is widely used by European scholars, to study the history of Ukrainian state formation.

*Analysis of the Latest Research and Publications.* Ukrainian historiography, highlighting the national traditions of state formation, serves to form a state worldview, promotes a better understanding of national interests and satisfies the desire for historical truth. Despite the fact that the topic of Ukrainian statehood is broadly discussed in the monographic literature [12; 22], textbooks [2; 5; 6; 7; 15; 24], reference books [13] and separate articles [8; 20], a number of its aspects require additional research. Thus, for understanding the state forming processes on the territory of Ukraine, it is necessary to study their prehistory in numerical terms and determine certain mathematical patterns.

The problem of the synergetic method is only partially covered by historical science. Moldovan anthropologist, Doctor of History Leonid Mosionzhnik notes that synergetics is a young but promising science, which has reached the peak popularity of scientific fashion, especially in the humanities. It should be argued that the synergetics of humanities knowledge differs from traditional quantitative methods in humanities research not so much by mathematical apparatus as by philosophical approach to the material under study [14, p. 6–7]. Ukrainian historian and a theorist of cliometric research, Doctor of Historical Sciences Yurii Sviatets believes that a phase portrait of system changes in «bifurcation points» during the transition through critical modes that causes an abrupt transition of the system to a new qualitatively different steady state. It means, when the parameters reach critical values in the process of changings, the state of the system becomes unstable. Under such circumstances, a further small change in the parameters causes a directed abrupt transition of the system to a new steady state, after which the cycle repeats again [18, p. 311].

The *purpose* of the study is an attempt to determine the different levels of «bifurcation points» in the history of Ukrainian statehood. The *tasks* are the following: to show the European context of essence of the synergetic method; to highlight the features of the four stages of Ukrainian state formation; to calculate a number of key dates that have become a kind of symbols of Ukrainian state formation; and to show the impact of certain «bifurcation points» on the processes of state forming.

*Methodological Foundations of the Research.* The principles of historicism and objectivity became the basis for the study. The principle of historicism helps to

---

realize the aspirations of the researcher through awareness of the essence of the explored period and highlighting the processes from the point of view of contemporaries. The principle of objectivity requires the reproduction of the past impartially, without opportunistic distortions and «corrections» of past events to prove particular scientific positions. In the process of studying the issue, such methods of scientific cognition as analytical, comparative-historical, chronological and synergetic were used. The comparative-historical method makes it possible to compare historical events that correspond to different stages of state forming on the territory of Ukraine; the analytical method helps to single out individual dates and to determine their significance in state-building processes; the chronological method is used to show the events and phenomena of the historical process in chronological order. Finally, the synergetic method is applied to analyse numerical models of historical dates.

*Novelty of Research* is determined by the formulation and development of the topical scientific problem: the determination of levels of «bifurcation points» in the Ukrainian state formation, based on the usage of synergetic method, which to date has not received comprehensive and objective coverage in historical science.

*Body of Research.*

*Synergetics in European science.* The term «synergetics» comes from the Greek «synergos» that means one, who works together. In this case, it means the joint efforts of scientists from different fields of knowledge to find new paradigms for studying natural phenomena and society and to create a scientific picture of the world that meets modern requirements [10, p. 157]. The subject of the synergetics study is reality, but a reality that has another mode of existence – the reality of relationships.

The founder of synergetics, the German theoretical physicist Hermann Haken, drew attention to the similarity of processes occurring in both complex natural systems and social ones. One of the properties of complex natural systems, according to the scientist, is their nonlinearity, which greatly complicates the study of such systems due to the lack of a common methodological basis of research. Their behaviour is unstable, irrational, random and multi-alternative. However, Haken believes that one can hope that synergetics will contribute to the understanding and further development of sciences that seem completely different [23, p. 381].

The key concept for synergetics is «bifurcation». The French physicist, mathematician and philosopher Henri Poincaré has introduced this term for the first time, describing a physical process that at some point begins to move in different trajectories. Bifurcation occurs when different systems lose stability in the environment. As a result, unexpected and nonlinear (chaotic) processes are caused,

forcing the system to develop along an increasingly complex trajectory, or destroying it. Most often, the term «bifurcation» means the concept of «fork» (furcation or division into two parts), although it should be told not about «bifurcation», but about «polyfurcation», meaning that the way out of chaos in complex systems is not realized by bifurcating of paths, but by the detection of much greater, in fact, indefinite or infinite number of them [19]. The archetypal image of the world tree can be considered as a peculiar bifurcation model.

«Bifurcation points» are unique and appear spontaneously in any unbalanced systems, including social ones. The content of the moment is determined by the fact that the system state loses stability and can develop in any direction. In our study, we proceed from the fact that there were «bifurcation points» of different levels in the Ukrainian statehood history. Moreover, their study, which is based on the synergetic method, is scientific in nature and excludes mystical-literary interpretations of the historical process.

The point of view of the Nobel laureate, Belgian chemist and philosopher Ilya Prigogine is extremely important for our study. Being one of the founders of synergetics, he pointed out that history is a sequence of bifurcations [9, p. 15]. It could be argued by the transition from the Mesolithic to the Neolithic (the so-called Neolithic Revolution), which took place almost at the same time around the globe. We rely on considerations of Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers that the final event depends on a prehistory of a system [17, p. 217–218].

By discoveries in physics and chemistry, Professor Prigogine has shown that the image of history as a clew unwinding into an endless thread has been destroyed. It has turned into an independently developing organism, the important element of which is a human person, who makes the own choice. In «Order out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature», Prigogine writes that a deterministic description becomes unusable, when an evolving system reaches a bifurcation point. Fluctuation forces the system to choose a branch along which the further evolution of the system will take place. The transition through bifurcation is the same random process as tossing a coin [17, p. 236–237]. The system can go through one of two possible ways of development, which is unpredictable. At such moments, a person starts influencing the historical process, and a chance here acts in a certain version of conscious choice.

Thus, synergetics radically changes the vector of scientific research. The view of scientists that previously has focused on stability and regularity turns to chance. For historical science, an important consequence of the general turn of scientific thinking is the fact that a historian starts being interested in events that have taken place not independently, but in the context of unrealized possibilities. At the same time,

synergetics makes it possible to calculate those «bifurcation points» in the history of Ukraine that have led to the creation of statehood, as well as become critical to its existence.

*Stages of the Ukrainian State Formation.* The forming of Ukrainian statehood has a long history. There are different considerations regarding the number of its development stages. We are supporters of the classic version of the Ukrainian statehood history, which consists of the following four stages:

1. The Princely Era [Kniazha Doba]. It can be divided into a number of periods, some of which are debatable:

- Legendary Period (Kingdom of Ants, Kuyavia) – the 1st–9th centuries AD,
- Kyivan Rus (the Old Rus state) – 882–1240,
- Galicia-Volhynia state – 1199–1349.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Mykhailo Braichevsky begin the traditions of state formation with the Ants, who were famous by the clearly fixed political structures of a powerful inter-tribal union that dominated almost the entire territory of modern Ukraine.

Accordingly to modern Ukrainian historians, the Old Rus state or Kyivan Rus was an unstable state formation, where the processes of ethnogenesis of Ukrainians (in the Kyiv, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, Volhynia and Galicia lands), Russians (the lands of Vladimir-Suzdal, Novgorod, Pskov, Smolensk and Ryazan) and Belarusians (the Polotsk, Minsk and Turov lands) were occurring simultaneously.

In our opinion, the key to the formation of Ukrainian statehood was the existence of the Galicia-Volhynia state, although Hrushevsky believed that the Galicia-Volhynia principality was the heir to the political and cultural traditions of Kyiv [8, p. 9].

2. The Cossack Era. The Hetmanate:

- National Liberation War headed by Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the formation of the Ukrainian Cossack statehood – 1648–1657,
- Ruin – 1657–1687,
- Struggle for autonomy of Ukrainian lands. Liquidation of the Hetmanate – 1687–1764 (1775, 1783).

According to the domestic historians Olena Apanovych, Oleksandr Hurzhii, Valerii Smolii, Valerii Stepankov and Raisa Ivanchenko, the Ukrainian Cossack statehood with pronounced ethnic features has already existed in its completed form in the middle of the seventeenth century [8, p. 10]. The Cossack Hetmanate functioned as a democratic entity, recognized the right to vote and showed signs of powers separation.

3. The period of the Ukrainian National Revolution:

- Central Rada (i.e. the Central Council) – 4 March 1917 – 18 April 1918,
- Hetmanate or «the Ukrainian State» of Pavlo Skoropadsky – 24 April – 14 December 1918,
- Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic (UNR) – 14 November 1918 – 10 November 1920,
- Western Ukrainian People's Republic (ZUNR) – 1918–1923.

The twentieth century covered the third and fourth stages of the struggle for state independence of Ukraine. There were supporters of the republican system among the Ukrainian independents: the Central Rada, the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and the monarchists – the Hetmanate. Attempts to revive statehood in Ukraine failed during the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921. However, it reminded of certain national-political archetypes that testified to the existence of a national idea in Ukrainian society, which was able to form a statehood under favourable conditions.

4. Modern Ukrainian independent state since 24 August 1991.

The fourth stage of state formation began, when an extraordinary session of the Verkhovna Rada proclaimed the historic the Act of Declaration of the Independence of Ukraine, which claimed that the creation of an independent state of Ukraine would continue the millennial tradition of the state formation. The resolution of the Verkhovna Rada stated the following: «Ukraine shall be declared an independent democratic state on August 24, 1991. Upon declaration of its independence, only its Constitution, laws, orders of the Government, and other legislative acts of the republic are valid on the territory of Ukraine» [16]. The state independence of Ukraine was proclaimed on the basis of the right to self-determination of peoples, provided for by the UN Charter and other international legal documents.

Unfortunately, mathematical calculations give grounds to claim that Ukraine was more in the conditions of stateless or semi-state existence, than in the process of state forming that creates a significant difficulty in perceiving these stages as the moments of existence of a single Ukrainian statehood. At the same time, we have a unique experience in world history of the revival of Ukrainian statehood, even after centuries of foreign oppression. The long absence of its own state necessitated finding and defending a separate position in other state and civilizational structures; first – in Rzeczpospolita (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Rus and Zhemantia, then – in the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and later – in the Soviet Union. One of the consequences of this situation was the formation of a specific Ukrainian political culture, which is described by

some modern researchers as the culture of adaptation and survival, closely related to the general social ambivalence of society [11, p. 51].

«*Bifurcation points*» of *Ukrainian history of the Second Millennium*. A number of key dates that have become a kind of symbol of Ukrainian statehood are important for our study. They are a specific numerical code for understanding historical processes and phenomena. Considering the numerical series related to the history of Ukrainian statehood, we have identified the following dates:

- 1199 – creation of the Galicia-Volhynia state; the conquest of Kyiv; the reign of Roman Mstyslavovych,
- 1648 – beginning of the National Liberation War headed by Bohdan Khmelnytsky; the formation of the Ukrainian Cossack state,
- 1918 – proclamation of the Ukrainian Central Rada; the creation of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic,
- 1919 – Unification Act of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic in Kyiv, reunification of the eastern and western Ukrainian lands,
- 1990 – adoption by the Verkhovna Rada of the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine,
- 1991 – adoption on 24 August 1991 of the Act of Declaration of the Independence of Ukraine by the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). The name «Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic» was replaced by the original name of the state –«Ukraine» by a law of 17 September 1991. On «1» December 1991, referendum and elections of the President of Ukraine were held (90,3% of citizens, who participated in the referendum, confirmed the Act of the Independence of Ukraine).

These dates are the starting points of different stages of Ukrainian statehood – princely (1199), Cossack (1648), national-democratic (1918) and the modern Ukrainian independent state (1991). We consider the beginning of Princely Era of Ukrainian state formation in 1199, supporting the Ukrainian historian and diplomat Stepan Tomashivsky, who named the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia the first form of the Ukrainian national state, describing it as «the Galicia-Volhynia state» [3, p. 32]. In addition, the territorial framework of the Galicia-Volhynia state, the Hetmanate and the Ukrainian People's Republic best corresponds to the modern borders of Ukraine. A key year in state formation is 1919, as it symbolizes the unification of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Western Ukrainian People's Republic, proving the idea of unity and indivisibility of the Ukrainian lands.

Adoption of the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine in 1990 can be considered the year of the beginning of modern state formation [11, p. 52].

Three of the mentioned six dates immediately attract attention. They are 1199, 1919 and 1991, which consist of two numerals «1» and «9» by their doubling. Consider the following dates: 1648, 1918 and 1990. Consecutively adding the numerals from the dates, we get such interesting results:

$$1+6+4+8=19$$

$$1+9+1+8=19$$

$$1+9+9+0=19$$

Again, we get numerals «1» and «9», which are significant for the Ukrainian state forming.

Thus, basing on the dates, the dominance of two numerals «1» and «9» (the Hindu-Arabic decimal number system) can be clearly traced through the history of Ukraine's state formation.

All numbers have quantitative and qualitative characteristics. We are used to dealing with their quantitative side. However, numbers also have a qualitative side as symbols of creation. They were perceived as such by the mathematician Pythagoras, who, according to legend, studied with the Egyptian priests, and then brought the ready-made numerical matrices to Europe. In an adapted version, they have survived and are known as the «Pythagorean Square». In this system, the numeral «1» (beginning of the square) represents momentum, unity, activity and creativity, and the numeral «9» (ending of the square) expresses the highest form of symbiosis. Perhaps it explains why the combination of such components gives a numerical impetus to the symbiosis of Ukrainian state forming.

According to Pythagoras, mathematics was the most appropriate science for establishing general harmony as an abstract and universally applicable part of scientific knowledge. From mathematical cognition, Pythagoras put arithmetic in the first place, because numerical characteristics formed the basis of all mathematical and scientific knowledge. That idea led Pythagoras to an intensive studying of mathematics and its basis – the arithmetic of natural row of numerals, separating of arithmetic from geometry, and studying them as independent disciplines that have their own subjects, methods, and objects of study. Using these mathematical disciplines, Pythagoras sought to establish the relationship between numerals and geometric objects and to establish, by their help, harmonious relationships between objects of the universe [21, p. 48–49]. This principle should be used, while performing mathematical operations with dates and determining certain patterns of the historical process.



---

Other mathematical operations with three basic dates are also interesting.

1991–1919=72; «72» is  $7+2=9$

1919–1199=720; «720» is  $7+2+0=9$

Subtraction with additionally applied dates also gives a similar result: 1990–1648=342; «342» is  $3+4+2=9$

1918–1648=270; «270» is  $2+7+0=9$

In the result of various mathematical operations with the specified dates, we get «9» – the basic number of the Ukrainian state formation.

Thus, the dates of Ukrainian history, which contain the numbers «1» and «9» are closely related to Ukrainian statehood and make a kind of basis for the formation of «bifurcation points», given the synergetic method.

– However, do the numbers «1» and «9» always symbolize the state-building process in Ukraine? It turns out that no. There is a number of dates that contain these numbers, but threaten the existence of statehood in Ukraine.

– 1169 – destruction of Kyiv by the Prince of Suzdal Andriy Bogolyubsky; the beginning of the Old Rus state's decline.

– 1349 – Galicia was conquered by neighbouring Poland, and Volhynia – by Lithuania. The Galicia-Volhynia principality ceased to exist as a single political unit.

– 1709 – Battle of Poltava. Defeat of the Swedish army and its ally Ivan Mazepa. For Ukraine, the consequence of the Poltava catastrophe became the Moscow military occupation and a significant restriction of the autonomous rights of the Hetmanate.

What is the peculiarity of these dates? The following calculations could be done:

$1+1+6+9=17$

$1+3+4+9=17$

$1+7+0+9=17$

On the other hand, after discarding the initial «1» and the final «9» of these three dates, we get the numeral «7» in a result of every calculation.

1169 ( $1+6=7$ ); 1349 ( $3+4=7$ ); 1709 ( $7+0=7$ )

Thus, the numeral «7», which is sacred in many religions, particularly, in the Bible it occurs more than 160 times [4, p. 35], seems destructive for the Ukrainian state formation.

In addition, the bizarre intertwining of numerals in the following dates of Ukrainian history looks quite mystical:

– 1569 – Union of Lublin. Creation of Rzeczpospolita. Polish conquest of the Podlasie [Podlasiu], Kyiv, Bratslav and Volhynia regions,

– 1596 – Church Union of Berestia. It increased division among Ukrainian believers,

– 1659 – Pereyaslav Articles (or Pereyaslav Agreement). Contractual terms between the Moscow tsarist government and Hetman Yurii Khmelnytsky, which significantly narrowed the power of the hetman and the autonomy of Ukraine.

In addition to the already known «1» and «9», the simultaneous presence of the numerals «5» and «6» is negative for state forming events in Ukraine.

Vedic numerology provides a certain explanation for the calculated facts, according to which the numbers are in harmonious, passive (neutral) and divergent (negative) states. Thus, in particular, the numbers «1» and «9» have a harmonious interdependence with each other. The numbers «1» and «9» are divergent to «7». Moreover, «1» divergent to «6» and the number «6» is divergent to «5» [1, p. 288].

Based on the analysed dates of Ukrainian history, it can be assumed that the numbers «1» and «9» are the numerical code that corresponds to the Ukrainian state. Doubling this code actually gives a 100% chance to the Ukrainian state for existing, as the numbers are in harmony with each other. The presence in the date of the internal number «7» indicates a potential threat to the state, since there is a discrepancy between the numbers. The intertwining of the numbers «1», «5» and «6» starts the liquidation of state forming processes in Ukraine, as there is a double discrepancy between them [11, p. 53].

*Conclusions.* The synergetic method made it possible to calculate different levels of «bifurcation points» in the history of Ukraine. The following dates should be considered as peculiar «bifurcation points» of the Ukrainian state formation of the first level: 1199, 1648, 1919 and 1991, which contain the numerals «1» and «9» in different variations (explicitly or implicitly). Their presence led to the real existence of the following four stages of the Ukrainian state formation: princely, Cossack, national-democratic and modern ones.

«Bifurcation points» of the second level include the dates, which contain the numeral «7» (1169, 1349 and 1709) as an internal component and symbolize the negative processes in the history of Ukrainian state formation. However, changes with the numerical code «7» are not critical, and elements of statehood have existed for decades in the form of autonomy.

The third level of «bifurcation points» should include the following dates with the interweaving of «5» and «6»: 1569, 1596 and 1659. The events that took place at the mentioned points were inevitably negative for the Ukrainian state formation.

These levels of «bifurcation points» in relation to historical events in Ukraine have operated within the second millennium AD. Time will tell what changes the third millennium will bring us.

#### Sources:

1. Ананда В. Ведическая нумерология / В. Ананда, Р. Кумар. – Бангалор-Лондон-Москва: ООО «ИПК» «БИОНТ», 2006. – 368 с.
2. Бойко О. Д. Історія України / О. Д. Бойко. – К. Видавничий центр «Академія», 2002. – 656 с.
3. Зубрицький І. Степан Томашівський – дослідник державницького напрямку в українському історіописанні / І. Зубрицький // Історія України. – 2012. – № 3. – С. 32–36.
4. Иванов С. Магическая семерка / С. Иванов / Наука и религия. – 1990. – № 2. – С. 34–37.
5. Історія України / під ред. В. А. Смоля. – К. Альтернативи, 1997. – 416 с.
6. Історія України та її державності / Л. Є. Дещинський, С. В. Терський, І. Я. Хома та ін. – Львів: Видавництво Національного університету «Львівська політехніка», 2009. – 476 с.
7. Історія України: Документи. Матеріали / укл. В. Ю. Король. – К.: Видавничий центр «Академія», 2002. – 448 с.
8. Киридон А. М. Етапи українського державотворення: крос-історичне дослідження / А. М. Киридон // Наукові праці: Науково-методичний журнал. Історичні науки. Миколаїв: МДГУ ім. Петра Могили. – 2007. – Т. 74., Вип. 61. – С. 7–11.
9. Князева Е. Н. Синергетика как новое мировидение: диалог с И. Пригожиным / Е. Н. Князева, С. П. Курдюмов // Вопросы философии. – 1992. – № 12. – С. 3–20.
10. Котельников Г. А. Теоретическая и прикладная синергетика / Г. А. Котельников. – Белгород: БелГТАСМ; Крестьянское дело, 2000. – 162 с.
11. Котляр Ю. В. Числові коди української державності / Ю. В. Котляр // Історичний архів. Наукові студії: Збірник наукових праць, Миколаїв: Вид-во ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили. – 2016. – Вип. 16. – С. 49–55.
12. Кралюк П. М. Історія України «без брому». Розвиток державності на українських землях / П. М. Кралюк. – Харків: Фоліо, 2020. – 424 с.
13. Крушинський В. Ю. Історія України. Події. Факти. Дати / В. Ю. Крушинський, Ю. А. Левенець. – К.: Зодіак-ЕКО, 1993. – 176 с.
14. Мосионжик Л. А. Синергетика в науках о человеке (прагматические аспекты) = Synergetics in Anthropological Studies: pragmatic aspects / Л. А. Мосионжик. – Кишинев: StratumPlus, 2016. – 381 с.
15. Петровський В. В. Історія України: Неупереджений погляд: Факти. Міфи. Коментарі / В. В. Петровський, Л. О. Радченко, В. І. Семененко. – Харків: ВД «ШКОЛА», 2007. – 592 с.
16. Постанова Верховної Ради УРСР «Про проголошення незалежності України» // Відомості Верховної Ради. – 1991. – № 38. – Ст. 502.
17. Пригожин И. Порядок из хаоса: Новый диалог человека с природой / И. Пригожин, И. Стенгерс. – М.: Прогресс, 1986. – 432 с.
18. Святець Ю. А. Злами в історії як точки біфуркації / Ю. А. Святець // Ейдос. Альманах теорії та історії історичної науки. – К.: Ін-т історії України, 2008. – Вип. 3, Ч. 1. – С. 297–318.
19. Спиця Н. Проблема біфуркації як об'єкт соціально-філософської рефлексії [Електронний ресурс] / Н. Спиця. – Режим доступу: <http://www.alba-training.com/?p=476> (Дата звернення: 04.01.2016). – Назва з екрану.
20. Тригуб П. М. Етапи української державності: авторський погляд на проблему / П. М. Тригуб // Наукові праці: Науково-методичний журнал. Політичні науки. Правознавство. Миколаїв: МДГУ ім. Петра Могили. – 2007. – Т. 69, Вип. 56. – С. 123–127.

21. Узбек К. М. Фрагменти побудови античної науки, філософії і культури / К. М. Узбек. – Донецьк: Східний видавничий дім, 2010. – 232 с.
22. Україна крізь віки: У 15-и т. – К. Альтернативи, 1997–2000. – Т. 1–15.
23. Хакен Г. Синергетика / Г. Хакен. – М.: Мир, 1980. – 404 с.
24. Шевчук В. П. Історія української державності / В. П. Шевчук, М. Г. Тараненко. – К.: Либідь, 1999. – 480 с.

### References:

1. Ananda, V. (2006). *Vedycheskaia numerolohyia*. Bangalore-London- Moskva: ООО YPK BYONT.
2. Boiko, O. D. (2002). *Istoriia Ukrainy*. Kyiv: Vydavnychi Tsentr Akademiia.
3. Zubrytskyi, I. (2012). StepanTomashivskyi – doslidnyk derzhavnytskoho napriamu v ukrainskomu istoriopysanni. *IstoriiaUkrainy*, 3, 32-36.
4. Ivanov, S. (1990). *Magicheskaiasemerka: Naukaireligii*, 2, 34-37.
5. Smolii, V. A. (Red.). (1997). *Istoriia Ukrainy*. Kyiv: Alternatyvy.
6. Deshchynskyi L. Ye., Terskyi S. V., Khoma, I. Ya. (Red.). (2009). *Istoriia Ukrainy ta yii derzhavnosti*. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Natsionalnoho Universytetu Lvivska Politehnika.
7. Korol, V. Yu. (Ed.). (2002). *Istoriia Ukrainy: Dokumenty. Materialy*. Kyiv: Vydavnychi Tsentr Akademiia.
8. Kyrydon, A. M. (2007). Etapyu krainskoho derzhavotvorennia: Kros-istorychne doslidzhennia. *NaukoviPratsi: Naukovo-MetodychnyiZhurnal. IstorychniNauky. Mykolaiv*, 74(61), 7-11.
9. Kniazeva, E. N. (1992). Sinergetika kak novoemiro videnie: Dialog s I. Prigozhinym. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 12, 3-20.
10. Kotelnikov, G. A. (2000). *Teoreticheskaiia i prikladnaia sinergetika*. Belgorod: BelGTASM, Krestianskoe Delo.
11. Kotlyar, Yu. V. (2016). Chyslovi kody ukrainskoi derzhavnosti. *Istorychnyi Arkhiv. Naukovi Studii: Zbirnyk Naukovykh Prats, Mykolaiv*, 16, 49-55.
12. Kraliuk, P. M. (2020). *Istoriia Ukrainy“bez bromu”*. Rozvytok derzhavnosti na ukrainskykh zemliakh. Kharkiv: Folio.
13. Krushynskyi, V. Yu. (1993). *Istoriia Ukrainy. Podii. Fakty. Daty*. Kyiv: Zodiak-EKO.
14. Mosionzhnik, L. A. (2016). *Sinergetika v naukakh o cheloveke (pragmaticheskie aspekty) = Synergetics in Anthropological Studies: pragmatic aspects*. Kishinev: Stratum Plus.
15. Petrovskyi, V. V. (2007). *Istoriia Ukrainy: Neuperedzhenyi pohliad: Fakty. Mify. Kommentari*. Kharkiv: VD ShKOLA.
16. Postanova Verkhovnoi Rady URSS Pro Proholoshennia Nezalezhnosti Ukrainy of 1991, 38 Art. 502. (1991).
17. Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1986). *Poriadok i zkhaosa: Novyi dialog cheloveka s prirodoi*. Moskva: Progress.
18. Sviatets, Yu. A. (2008). Zlamy v istorii yak tochky bifurkatsii. Eidos. *Almanakh Teorii ta Istorii Istorychnoi Nauky, Kyiv*, 3(1), 297-318.
19. Sptysia, N. (n.d.). Problema bifurkatsii yak obiektsotsialno-filosofskoi refleksii. Retrieved from: <http://www.alba-training.com/?p=476>
20. Tryhub, P. M. (2007). Etapy ukrainskoi derzhavnosti: avtorskyi pohliad na problemu. *Naukovi pratsi: Naukovo-metodychnyi zhurnal. Politychni nauky. Pravoznavstvo. Mykolaiv*, 69 (56), 123-127.
21. Uzbek, K. M. (2010). *Frahmenty pobudovy antychnoi nauky, filosofiii kultury*. Donetsk: SkhidnyiVydavnychi Dim.
22. *Ukrainakrizviki: U 15-y tt.* (1997-2000). Kyiv: Alternatyvy.
23. Haken, H. (1980). *Synerhetyka*. Moskva: Myr.
24. Shevchuk, V. P. (1999). *Istoriia ukrainskoi derzhavnosti*. Kyiv: Lybid.

**Юрій Котляр,**

*д-р іст. наук, проф.*

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

## **СИНЕРГЕТИЧНИЙ МЕТОД У ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДЕРЖАВОТВОРЕННЯ: ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИЙ ДОСВІД**

***Анотація.** В статті розглядається проблема українського державотворення, для вивчення якої використано синергетичний метод. Один із засновників синергетики бельгійський хімік і філософ І. Пригожін вказував, що історія є послідовністю біфуркацій.*

*Становище в Україні вимагає об'єктивного осмислення національної державності не лише в змістовно-структурному, а й в часовому вимірі, тому використання синергетичного методу може забезпечити вибір найбільш досконалих його моделей на майбутнє.*

*Метою статті є спроба визначити різні рівні «точок біфуркації» в історії українського державотворення. При цьому автором ставляться наступні завдання: показати європейський контекст сутності синергетичного методу; виділити особливості чотирьох етапів українського державотворення; вирахувати ряд ключових дат, які стали своєрідним символом українського державотворення та показати вплив «точок біфуркації» на процеси існування державності.*

*В дослідженні використані такі методи наукового пізнання, як аналітичний, порівняльно-історичний, хронологічний, а для аналізу числових моделей історичних дат – синергетичний.*

*В нашому дослідженні ми виходимо з того, що в історії українського державотворення «точки біфуркації» мали місце. Причому їх вивчення, яке базується на синергетичному методі, носить науковий характер. Виділено ряд ключових дат, які стали своєрідним символом українського державотворення.*

*«Точками біфуркації» українського державотворення першого рівня слід вважати наступні дати: 1199, 1648, 1919, 1991, які в різних варіаціях (явно або приховано) містять числа «1» і «9». Їх наявність призвела до існування чотирьох етапів українського державотворення: княжого, козацького, національно-демократичного та сучасного.*

*«Точками біфуркації» другого рівня ми визначаємо ті дати, що містять як внутрішню складову число «7» (1169, 1349, 1709) і символізують негативні процеси в історії українського державотворення. Разом з тим, зміни з числовим кодом «7» не носять критичного характеру і елементи державності у вигляді автономії існують ще не один десяток років.*

*До третього рівня «точок біфуркації» слід віднести дати з переплетенням чисел «5» і «6»: 1569, 1596, 1659. Події, що відбувалися в цих точках носять невідворотно-негативний характер.*

***Ключові слова:** Україна, державність, державотворення, «точки біфуркації», хронологія, синергетика, числа.*

**Надійшла до редколегії 07.05.2021**