UDC 168.522
DOI https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2024.2.44

Kopiievska Olha,
Doctor of Cultural Studies,
Professor of the Department of Art Management and Event Technologies,
National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts
orcid.org/0000-0002-4537-4888
okopievska@gmail.com

NEW CULTURAL HISTORY AS AN IMMANENT FEATURE OF CULTURAL PRACTICES

The purpose of the article is to investigate theoretical reflection to comprehend the concept of "New cultural history" to find an immanent sign of the gravity of the theories studied to cultural practices. The methodology of the research includes the general scientific principles of systematization and generalization of the problem under study, which allowed to define and scientifically substantiate theories, conceptual approaches to understanding the contents of the ideas of "New cultural history", "cultural history" as an immanent sign of understanding of the practice. The purpose of the article necessitated the application of an axiological approach, which made it possible to identify interdisciplinary theories, particularly historical, under consideration, to reveal personalized and unanimous scientific positions. The use of the analytical method revealed the conceptual foundations for further scientific perspectives of historical and cultural knowledge. The scientific novelty consists in understanding the semantic range of concepts of "New cultural history", "cultural history", from the point of view of interdisciplinary theoretical approaches and positions; in outlining the historical and cultural context of the formation of the new national direction of cultural studies. The semantic nucleus of a New cultural history are characterized by its interdisciplinary character and productive interaction with various branches of socio-humanitarian knowledge, particularly historical one. Accumulating culture both in its unique sense and in a deep historical meaning, the studying and understanding of historical trends in the development of cultural practices are necessary and promising for the preservation of the national identity. Cultural practices in today's socio-economic and political contexts are gaining ground and need to be developed and effectively utilize appropriate scientific thinking, practical interest, and support for all stakeholders in cultural transformations.

Key words: new cultural history, cultural history, cultural studies, cultural practices, cultural region.

Копієвська Ольга Рафаілівна,
докторка культурології, професорка кафедри арт-менеджменту
та івент-технологій
Національна академія керівних кадрів культури та мистецтв
orcid.org/0000-0002-4537-4888
okopievska@gmail.com

НОВА КУЛЬТУРАЛЬНА ІСТОРІЯ ЯК ІМАНЕНТНА ОЗНАКА КУЛЬТУРНИХ ПРАКТИК

Мета роботи – дослідити теоретичну рефлексію до осмислення поняття «нова культуральна історія», виявити іманентну ознаку тяжіння досліджених теорій до культурних практик. Методологія дослідження включає загальнонаукові принципи систематизації та узагальнення досліджуваної проблеми, які дозволили визначити і науково обґрунтувати наявні теорії, концептуальні підходи до розуміння змісту понять «нова культуральна історія», «культуральна історія», «культурна історія» як іманентної ознаки осмислення змісту культурних практик. Мета та завдання статті зумовили застосування аксіологічного підходу, що дозволило виявити в розглянутих теоріях міждисциплінарний характер і персоналізовані та одностайні наукові позиції. Використання аналітичного методу дозволило виявити концептуальні засади щодо подальших наукових перспектив культурологічного знання. Наукова новизна полягає в осмисленні смислового діапазону понять «нова культуральна історія», «культуральна історія», «культурна історія» з міждисциплінарних теоретичних підходів та позиції; в окресленні культурно-історичного контексту становлення вітчизняного напряму

культуральних досліджень. Смислове ядро нової культурної історії, яка вирізняється міждисциплінарним характером і плідною взаємодією з різними галузями соціально-гуманітарного знання, становить культура як в її повсякденному розумінні, так і у глибинному сенсі, культура як епіцентр людського буття у всіх його вимірах і культурні практики, як взаємодії людини зі світом і її творчого впливу на світ. Ці практики супроводжують людину впродовж усього її життя, і від самої людини залежить їх змістове наповнення, як їх унікальність і неповторність, так і рутинність. Культурні практики в сучасних соціально-економічних, політичних умовах набувають нового змісту й потребують щодо їх розвитку й ефективного використання відповідного наукового осмислення, практичної зацікавленості та підтримки всіх стейкхолдерів культурних трансформацій.

Ключові слова: нова культуральна історія, культуральна історія, культурна історія, культуральні дослідження, культурні практики, культурна регіоніка.

The Problem Statement. In the contemporary domestic cultural idea, there is a practical update to the transformation of the content and forms of cultural practices, their historical origins and meaning. Such active appeal leads to raising the issue of scientific understanding of the transformation of cultural practices, which will enhance the substantiated scientific and practical significance of the studied historical-cultural processes. In this context, the role and importance of scientific and practical partnerships will be enhanced, which will allow more effective implementation of interdisciplinary innovations in the modern cultural development of Ukraine.

For this reason, the cultural scientific community faces several essential tasks, including research related to a particular restructuring of the subject field of socio-humanitarian knowledge in the context of cultural changes. In terms of the own view, increasing interest in cultural practices should be offset by markers of multidisciplinary spaces, which will allow us to consider research sites from different stakeholders. The result of such research will have a broader scope of understanding and appropriate implementation.

Decisive shifts in scientific discourse at the turn of the 1970s–1980s, scientists associate with the spread of methods of cultural anthropology, social psychology, linguistics (especially in the history of mentalities and folk culture), with the formation of a regular interest in the microhistory, the return from analysis of extracurricular structures to the study of the individual, specific life situations (Razdina, 2010).

As a result of such changes, in the 1980s, both in Europe and in the United States, a new direction is emerging – a "New cultural history", within which new ideas are assimilated, new models are developed, a new research space is formed.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications. The scientific thematization of cultural practices raised the question of the need to turn to the theoretical terms of foreign scientists, the object and subject of which is a new cultural history. At the heart of the presented research is the theoretical position of British and American scholars who work in the paradigm of cultural studies or related to it. Within the presented research paradigms, there is not only a general understanding of cultural processes, of culture as a whole but also its changing and situational structure.

Various scientific approaches and techniques have led to the beginning of new research traditions. Different scientific directions, approaches, scientific trends emerge that allows considering cultural practices, processes that take place in culture from different angles of scientific perception.

The conceptualization of cultural practices in our study, in turn, requires a theoretical reflection on the emergence of a proper "New cultural history" an immanent feature of which is the "appeal to cultural practices" (Pallares-Burke, 2002).

In order to understand the scientific object of the research, we need to clarify the conceptual categorical apparatus of research. In Ukrainian science, it is determined by the ambiguity of the translation into Ukrainian of cultural history and cultural studies, and therefore in the first case – cultural history, and in the second one – cultural studies.

The purpose of the article is to investigate theoretical reflection to comprehend the concept of "New cultural history" to identify the immanent sign of the connection between the theories and cultural practices.

The scientific purpose of the article is:

– clarification of the semantic range of concepts of "New cultural history" "cultural history", particularly historical ones;

– analyze the historical and cultural content of the research subject, identify interdisciplinary theoretical approaches and positions;

– understand the logic and cultural-historical context of the formation of a new direction of cultural research;

– research the scientific positions of Ukrainian scientists related to the understanding of domestic cultural practices;

– outline the prospects of the subject under study in the modern scientific and the historical and cultural traditions.

The Statement of the Basic Material. In the United States, "New cultural history" declares itself by the publication of N. Davis's work "Society and Culture in Early Modern France" (1975). The work of R. Darton's "The Great Cat Massacre" (1984), which corresponded to the French history of mentalities in terms of the content, but the author called its genre as a cultural history – "cultural history with an orientation to anthropology". In 1989, US published a collection of articles named "New Cultural History" (ed. L. Hunt et al.), which focused on cultural practices and their representations (Burke, 2008).

In France the term "histoire culturelle" started to be used just for conference 1987 "French history: texts and culture", but the contours of the New cultural history has emerged as well as started with the famous discussion at Saint-Cloud in the 50s of the past century between the representatives of different directions of historical science, which was caused by the crisis in social history, the loss of the macro-historical paradigm of heuristic potential (Burke, 2008).

Against the background of the appeal of historians such as E. Le Roy Ladurie and D. Roche (France), K. Ginzburg (Italy), H. Medic (Germany) to anthropology with a purpose of finding a new relationship among culture, history and society. The scientists tried to analyse "new history" or "New cultural history".

The attraction of the new "cultural history" ("histoire culturelle") in France toward the understanding of mentality, ideas, and feelings of individuals brings it closer to the "school of annals". For us, the appeal to this school is essential in the aspect of her rejection of the "Labrusca matrix" and the turn to historical anthropology, history of everyday life, cultural practices which become one of the leading problems in the study of the New cultural history.

R. Chartier and some of his colleagues began to work in the paradigm of the New cultural history, as evidenced by the work on the practice of reading "Written culture and society" and "The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe Between the 14th and 18th Centuries". Moreover, in terms of the own answers to the question of the journal "New Literary Review", the scientist, who became one of the leaders of the histoire culturelle, states: "the history of mentalities has become a purely historiographical concept and has ceased to be a form of practical research. One area that probably would have taken the history of mentalities now is included in the concept of cultural history that defines the story and its connection with the totality of practices, objects, representations and appropriations" (Chartier, 1988).

As a result of the convergence of the subject field of various scientific disciplines while maintaining continuity, along with the traditional theory and history of culture, formed such a branch of scientific knowledge as the New cultural history, with different narratives, fixation, and codification of research trends in the understanding of culture. Its leading intellectual promoter is the British cultural historian-medievalist P. Burke, who argues that the one represents a new paradigm in modern social and humanitarian knowledge.

The role of cultural history, and cultural practices as one of its essential directions, in the "new paradigm" is significant, since it is "the dominant form of history that is practiced now" (Burke, 2008, p. 82).

A domestic scientist G. Grinchenko notes: "the New cultural history, which is born within, and to some extent in terms of the discussion with the basic requirements of social history, involves the construction of social life through cultural practice <…> New cultural history focuses on the discursive aspect of social experience…" (Grinchenko, 2006, p. 230).

German researcher B. Tsimon notes that "with the advent of the "New cultural history" a pluralism in the methods and statements of questions appeared simultaneously, which led to the rejection of the idea of the existence of a single theoretical paradigm…" (Tsiman, 2006, p. 5).

The logic and historical-cultural context of the formation of a new direction of cultural research, the prospects for the development and the specifics of cultural practices are presented in the works of P. Burke, who in 1997 published

a collection of articles "Varieties of Cultural History", and in 2004 the monograph "What is Cultural History?". The scientist analyzes the relationship between the New cultural history and other disciplines (anthropology, sociology, philology, philosophy), finds out the vectors of influence of specific ideas, identifies areas of interdisciplinary synthesis (Burke, 2008).

P. Burke assigns to practices as one of the directions of the New cultural history, religious, history of language, history of experimentation, history of consumption, history of travel and pilgrimage, history of reading, history of memory, etc (Burke, 2008).

Within the framework of the new cultural history, a wide field of studies of popular culture and its historical potential are being formed, that emphasize its dynamic and productive character. The stiff opposition of popular and elite culture, production and consumption, reproduction, and comprehension of cultural meanings and values is gradually overcome. For example, the Italian historian and culturologist K. Ginsburg has studied the numerous practices of folk culture for decades, including religious, magic, and practicing arrogance. In his research, as in the research of N. Davis, the problem of the relationship between folk and elite cultures is actualized.

The subject of comprehension of the New cultural history is not "objective" structures, over-personal, objective factors that determine the development of society, but the subject, the person in terms of the manifestations of life. In the mentioned context, research interest performs from structure to action, from objective to subjective, from the unconscious to the conscious and from the general to the particular, that is, thus, the conscious, subjective aspects of human activity are emphasized. Also, cultural practices emerge as a means of constructing personal life and social one, based on historical events and traditions.

Given the agenda of the domestic cultural research related to the study of individual cultural phenomena within historical and ethnographic regions of Ukraine, V. Lychkovakh argues that cultural knowledge is allocated a separate sector – "Region Science that is designed to identify the uniqueness and originality of the cultural environment within one or another region and is essential to reconstruct the national culture within the diversity of its regional aspects" (Lychkovakh, 2011).

The mentioned approach, following our opinion, contributes to the consideration of cultural practices, its historical significance at all four levels of cultural space, which are identified by scientists. For our research, the second (national) level, where regional culture appears as a component of the national cultural space, is of particular importance. Moreover, the third, the local level, the basic unit of distribution of cultural space, which allows entering the local culture in the structure of the region culture and its historical uniqueness (Lychkovakh, 2011).

The approach proposed by national scientists entirely corresponds with the research of individual regions as local phenomena by modern European scientists within the paradigm of "new cultural history". Thus, C. Pitian-Adams attempted to identify the "cultural province" of England; he counted fourteen such associations bigger than the county, but less than the traditional geographic regions of Northeast, Central, Southwest England, and others. By exploring the Swabian settlement Laichingen, German scientist H. Medik paid particular attention to the ratio of local and global in terms of preservation of local traditions and attitude to the "invention" of new that emerge under the influence of globalization processes.

The importance of local discourse is based on the historical division of domestic lands into a kind of "cultural province" in terms of the British scientist's terminology. V. Lychkovakh, one of the developers of the Ukrainian cultural regency, for example, the Chernigov-Siversk "cultural province" on this occasion writes, Polissia and Podillia, Slobozhanshchyna, Galicia, Pokuttya and Center, the Crimea and Transcarpathia, the Donbas and Transnistria have long had a distinct cultural history and then "make unique combined Slavic face of Ukraine". However, the scientist emphasizes that "only in the interaction and interinfluence of regional cultures, spiritual portrait of the Ukrainian people appears, which is modeled by a common language, mentality, mythological, moral, artistic, and aesthetic values" (Lychkovakh, 2011, pp. 3–4).

Thematization of cultural practices in scientific discourse, their understanding in the context of regional modification and transformation of traditional components of culture and the emergence of the new dimensions in various spheres of social life need such scientific approaches that would take into account

the main trends of social changes, their different temporality in specific locales, heterogeneity, despite the strong tendency to homogenization. Cultural diversification as the basis of heterogeneity leads to an increase of the significance of the symbolic, not rational-instrumental connotations, actualizes the moral imperative, based on historical traditional values (Kopiievska, 2018, p. 398).

The regional discourse of cultural practices makes it possible to identify and reveal the connection of cultural forms (customs, traditions, rituals, "skills", language norms, behaviors and even features of housing construction) with the local economic system and territorial placement of settlements, since they are all formed at the primary level under the influence of historical regional folk traditions and even if they are immigrants from other regions and countries. Therefore, the cultural practices of local zones (or local cultural practices) fit into the subject field of applied cultural studies and, in the context of the mentioned aspect, appear as a promising research tradition in which their role as well as importance in the functioning and development of regions, districts and other territorial (cultural, historical associations) is researched.

The Conclusions. Thus, the semantic core of the New cultural history, which is characterized by an interdisciplinary nature and productive interaction with various branches of social and humanitarian knowledge, particularly historical one. Accumulating culture both in its unique sense and in a deep historical meaning, the studying and understanding of historical trends in the development of cultural practices are necessary and promising for the preservation of the national identity.

The cultural practices accompany a person throughout life, and their content depends on the historical context and the individual, as their uniqueness, originality, and routine.

Cultural practices, their historical-cultural potential and context in current socio-economic and political conditions acquire a new meaning and need their development and effective use of appropriate scientific understanding, practical interest, and support of all stakeholders of cultural transformations.

Acknowledgments. The authors sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

Bibliography:

1. Грінченко, Г. (2006). Епоха. Культури. Люди (історія будденості та культурна історія Німеччини і Радянського Союзу 1920-1950). *Схід-Захід: Історико-культурологічний збірник.* Харків; Київ : Критика, С. 228–231.

2. Копієвська, О. Р. (2011). Трансформаційні процеси в культурних практиках України: глобальний, глокальний контекст та локальні особливості (кінець XX – початок XXI ст.) : дис. … д-ра культурології : 26.00.06. Київ, 2018. 487 с.

3. Личковах, В. (2011). Чернігово-Сіверська культурологічна регіоніка. Чернігів : Видавець Лозовий В. М., 168 с.

4. Раздина, Е. В. (2010). Трансформація національної держави у світовій системі інститутів влади під впливом процесів глобалізації. *Гуманітарний часопис* : зб. наук. пр. Харків : ХАІ, № 2. С. 121–127.

5. Циман, Б. (2006). Лінгвістичний поворот у культурно-історичному дослідженні. Роздуми на прикладі опису історії сучасного антисемітизму. *Схід-Захід : Історико-культурологічний збірник*. Харків; К. : Критика, Вип. 8: Спеціальне видання: Порубіжжя / за ред. В. Кравченка. С. 5–29.

6. Burke, P. (2008). What is Cultural History?: second edition. Polity, 168 p.

7. Chartier, R. (1988). Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations. Cornell University Press, 209 p.

8. The New History: Confessionsand Conversations / ed. M. L. Pallares-Burke. Cambridge, 2002. 256 p.

References:

1. Grinchenko, G. (2006). Epokha. Kultury. Liudy (istoriia buddenosti ta kulturna istoriia Nimechchyny i Radianskoho Soiuzu 1920-1950) [Epoch. Culture. People (the history of everyday life and the cultural history of Germany and the Soviet Union. 1920-1950)]. Skhid-Zakhid: Istoryko-kulturolohichnyy zbirnyk. Kharkiv–Kyiv: Krytyka [in Ukrainian].

2. Kopiievska, O. (2018). Transformatsiini protsesy v kulturnykh praktykakh Ukrainy: hlobalnyi, hlokalnyi kontekst ta lokalni osoblyvosti (kinets XX – pochatok XXI st.) [Transformational Processes in the Cultural Practices of Ukraine: Global, Glocal Context and the Local Particularities (the end of XX – the beginning of XXI centuries)]. Doctor's thesis. Kyiv: NAKKKiM [in Ukrainian].

3. Lychkovakh, V. (2011). Chernihovo-Siverska kulturolohichna rehionika [Chernigovo-Siverska cultural science regional]. Chernigiv: Lozovyy V.M. [in Ukrainian].

4. Razdina, E. V. (2010). Transformatsiia natsionalnoi derzhavy u svitovii systemi instytutiv vlady pid vplyvom protsesiv hlobalizatsii [Transformation of the national state in the global system of institutions of power under the influence of globalization]. *Humanitarnyy chasopys*: zb. nauk. pr. Kharkiv KhAI, 2, 121–127 [in Ukrainian].

5. Tsyman, B. (2006). Linhvistychnyi povorot u kulturno-istorychnomu doslidzhenni [Linguistic turn at the cultural and historical dlizhenni]. Razdumi on the application I will describe the history of hitherto antisemitism. Skhid-Zakhid: *Istoryko-kulturolohichnyy zbirnyk*. Kharkiv–Kyiv: Krytyka, 8: Porubizhzhya, 5–29 [in Ukrainian].

6. Burke, P. (2008). What is Cultural History?: second edition. Polity, 168 [in English].

7. Chartier, R. (1988). Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations. Cornell University Press, 209 [in English].

8. The New History: Confessionsand Conversations / ed. M. L. Pallares-Burke. Cambridge, 2002. 256 [in English].