

## Методологія, історіографія та джерелознавство аграрної історії

### Methodology, historiography and source studies of agrarian history

УДК 94:338.43(477): [140.8:631.11](045)

DOI: 10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Kornovenko-Morozov

**Serhii Kornovenko**

*Doctor of History, Professor, Director of the Research Institute of Peasantry and Agrarian History Studies, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Cherkasy, Ukraine*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6268-2321>

e-mail: [s-kornovenko@ukr.net](mailto:s-kornovenko@ukr.net)

**Anatolii Morozov**

*Doctor of History, Professor, head of the Department of Archival Studies and Special Branches of Historical Science, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Cherkasy, Ukraine*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5486-235X>

e-mail: [anacid2012@ukr.net](mailto:anacid2012@ukr.net)

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Kornovenko, S. & Morozov, A. (2023). The latest study methodology of agrarian history of Ukraine: rural studies. *Ukrainskyi Selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 30, 57-70. (In English). doi: 10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Kornovenko-Morozov

#### THE LATEST STUDY METHODOLOGY OF AGRARIAN HISTORY OF UKRAINE: RURAL STUDIES

**Abstract. The purpose of the article.** *The authors of the article aim to gain knowledge about the latest methodology of historical and agrarian research in Ukraine, in particular, about such a methodological paradigm as rural studies.*

**The scientific novelty** of the publication lies in the fact that the authors have analysed the use of rural studies in modern studies of agrarian history. In particular, it was established that, **firstly**, rural studies is a relatively new methodology that was formed during the 1960s – 1980s as a reflection on the processes of globalization, it was the result of returning «face to the peasants». It represents a new understanding of the non-linear multifaceted interaction of rural and urban subsystems of society; **secondly**, rural studies unite all scientific directions that study certain components of the rural territorial subsystem of society; **thirdly**, the conceptual apparatus of rural studies includes «rurality», «rural development», «ruralization», «ruralism», «rural history»; **fourthly**, rural history, according to ruralists, despite the debatable theoretical development of the concept, is a component of rural studies, an independent branch of historical science in the context of rural studies, which is both theoretical and empirical history, the subject field of which is rural space and rural territories; **fifthly**, the heuristic value of rural studies in general and ruralism in particular is that the latter is designed to form a systematic view of the prospects and ways of rural development in a post-industrial society. The heuristic potential of rural studies is fully revealed in the studies related to the agrarian history of Ukraine in the 2000s. The authors of the article did not find works written on the basis of rural studies, which relate to the earlier periods of the agrarian history of Ukraine, so we cannot talk about the heuristic potential of the rural studies in relation to earlier periods of agrarian history Ukraine does not have to; **sixthly**, the ruralists' thesis that rural history is broader than agrarian history or the history of the peasantry needs additional theoretical refinement. In particular, the ruralists' proposed understanding of the essence of rural history, its scientific toolkit, requires additional argumentation. Considering the results of the analysis of the considerations proposed by them regarding the essence of rural history, according to the authors of the article, they only strengthen the understanding of the latter as a synonym of agrarian history; **seventhly**, the ruralists have not provided a coherent system of convincing evidence in favor of their thesis that «agrarianism» and «ruralism» are not the same thing». On the contrary, the considerations proposed by the ruralists give sufficient grounds to speak of ruralism as agrarianism of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century; **eighthly**, there are no fundamental differences between agrarianism and rural studies, they complement each other as methodological paradigms. For example, if agrarianism is a heuristic scientific tool for studying the pre-industrial, industrial peasantry, then ruralism is a post-industrial one. In this way, synergy or complementarity is achieved – enlargement of chronological boundaries, object and subject fields of research, panoramic and thoroughness of new scientific knowledge obtained, etc.

**Key words:** rural studies, methodology, rurality, rural development, ruralization, ruralism, rural history, agrarian history, agrarianism.

**Сергій Корновенко**

доктор історичних наук, професор, директор Науково-дослідного інституту селянства та вивчення аграрної історії, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, м. Черкаси, Україна  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6268-2321>  
e-mail: [s-kornovenko@ukr.net](mailto:s-kornovenko@ukr.net)

**Анатолій Морозов**

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри архівознавства та спеціальних галузей історичної науки, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, м. Черкаси, Україна  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5486-235X>  
e-mail: [anacid2012@ukr.net](mailto:anacid2012@ukr.net)

**Бібліографічний опис статті:** Корновенко С., Морозов А. Новітня методологія вивчення аграрної історії України: руралістика. *Український селянин*. 2023. Вип. 30. С. 57-70. doi:10.31651/2413-8142-2023-30-Kornovenko-Morozov

## НОВІТНЯ МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ВИВЧЕННЯ АГРАРНОЇ ІСТОРІЇ УКРАЇНИ: РУРАЛІСТИКА

**Анотація. Мета статті.** Автори статті ставлять за мету отримати знання щодо новітньої методології історико-аграрних досліджень в Україні, зокрема, стосовно такої методологічної парадигми, як руралістика.

**Наукова новизна** публікації полягає у тому, що авторами проаналізовано застосування руралістики в сучасних дослідженнях із аграрної історії. Зокрема, встановлено, що, **по-перше**, руралістика є відносно новою методологією, що сформувалася упродовж 1960-х – 1980-х рр. як рефлексія на процеси глобалізації, стала результатом повернення «обличчям до селян» Вона представляє нове розуміння нелінійної багатогранної взаємодії сільської та міської підсистем суспільства; **по-друге**, руралістика об'єднує всі наукові напрями, що вивчають ті чи інші складники сільської територіальної підсистеми соціуму; **по-третє**, до поняттєвого апарату руралістики належать «руральність», «руральний розвиток», «руралізація», «руралізм», «сільська історія»; **по-четверте**, сільська історія, на думку руралістів, попри дискусійність теоретичної розробки поняття, – складник руралістики, самостійна галузь історичної науки у контексті руралістики, що водночас є теоретичною й емпіричною історією, предметним полем якої є сільський простір та сільські території; **по-п'яте**, евристична цінність руралістики загалом і руралізму зокрема полягає у тому, що останній покликаний сформувати системне уявлення про перспективи і шляхи сільського розвитку в постіндустріальному суспільстві. Повною мірою евристичний потенціал руралістики розкрито у дослідженнях, що стосуються аграрної історії України 2000-х рр. Праць, написаних на засадах руралістики, що стосуються ранніших періодів аграрної історії України, авторами статті не віднайдено, тому говорити про евристичний потенціал руралістики стосовно попередніх періодів аграрної історії України не доводиться; **по-шосте**, додаткового теоретичного доопрацювання потребує теза руралістів стосовно того, що сільська історія є ширшою за аграрну історію чи історію селянства. Додаткової аргументації, зокрема, вимагає запропоноване руралістами розуміння сутності сільської історії, власне її наукового інструментарію. З огляду на результати аналізу запропонованих ними міркувань стосовно сутності сільської історії, вони на думку авторів статті, лише посилюють розуміння останньої як синоніму аграрної історії; **по-сьоме**, руралістами не наведено стрункої системи переконливих доказів на користь їхньої тези стосовно того, що «аграризм» і «руралізм» не одне і теж». Навпаки, запропоновані руралістами міркування дають достатньо підстав говорити про руралізм як аграризм другої половини ХХ – початку ХХІ ст.; **по-восьме**, між аграризмом і руралістикою відсутні принципові розбіжності, вони як методологічні парадигми доповнюють одна одну. Наприклад, якщо аграризм є евристичним науковим інструментом для вивчення доіндустріального, індустріального селянства, то руралізм – постіндустріального. У такий спосіб досягається синергія чи комплементарність – розширення хронологічних меж, об'єктного і предметного полів дослідження, панорамність і ґрунтовність отриманих нових наукових знань тощо.

**Ключові слова:** руралістика, методологія, руральність, руральний розвиток, руралізація, руралізм, сільська історія, аграрна історія, аграризм.

**Problem statement.** Traditionally, research on the agrarian history of Ukraine has been a priority in Ukrainian historiography. The dramatic transformations of socio-economic, socio-political, cultural and spiritual life that began in the second half of the 1980s and early 1990s also affected the development of historical and agricultural research in Ukraine. There have been qualitative changes in this area. According to the authors of the article, the main ones were as fol-

lows: first, the restoration and re-establishment of such a fundamental component of national historical science as agrarian history; second, the formation of scientific schools of agricultural historians; third, the functioning of specialized scientific professional publications on agrarian history, such as “Ukrainian Peasant”, “Bulletin of Agrarian History”, etc.

In view of this, the analysis of the latest methodological paradigms in the study of agrar-

ian history is of scientific, practical, and social importance. This determines the relevance of the proposed study.

**Research analysis.** The issues raised in our publication are among those that are in the focus of constant attention of researchers, participants of scientific and practical conferences, round tables, and seminars. The professional works are those of H. Vasylichuk<sup>1</sup>, V. Bondar<sup>2,3</sup>, V. Hotsuliak<sup>4</sup>, V. Honcharevskyi<sup>5</sup>, Y. Prysiazhniuk<sup>6</sup>, I. Farenii<sup>7</sup>, S. Liakh<sup>8</sup>, Y. Kalakura<sup>9</sup> and other authors.

**The purpose of the article** At the same time, according to the authors, it is promising to clarify the methodological tools of the latest historical and agricultural research in Ukraine. In view of this, the authors of **the article aim** to gain knowledge of the latest methodology of historical and agricultural research in Ukraine, in particular, with regard to such a methodological paradigm as ruralism.

**The statement of the basic material.** At the beginning of the twenty-first century, such a methodological approach as ruralism was formed in the scientific discourse of Ukraine. It is represented by the works of H. Prytula<sup>10</sup>, O. Pavlov<sup>11</sup> and other scholars. It came into the field of our research attention because:

1) its supporters argue that the subject field, a component of rural studies, is 'rural history';

2) its theorists consider it possible and appropriate to study 'rural history' in the system of historical sciences;

3) the intellectual sources of rural studies are the works of F. Brodel, P. Sorokin, and K.

Zimmerman on the rural-urban continuum as a convergence of town and village.

Rural studies is a relatively new methodological construct that evolved during the 1960s and 1980s, transforming into a separate scientific tool in the early twenty-first century. The chronological period in the global history of science, in particular historical science, which developed in the postwar period, is marked by nonlinear transformations that reflected the priority planetary trends. The scientific and technological revolution and scientific and technological progress of the 1960s-1980s were the intellectual basis for globalization processes and the industrialization of the leading countries of that time. Excessive enthusiasm for the latter had ambiguous consequences for both individual countries and the world as a whole. This was primarily due to the aggravation of contradictions in the world, transformations of social structures of individual societies, etc.

At the same time, new existential challenges have emerged, such as human existence in the industrial and post-industrial eras. Previous intellectual constructs proved to be partially or completely incapable of "explaining the world and becoming the basis for its transformation." Historical science as a component of global knowledge and reflections on reality has also undergone changes under the influence of the above priority trends. The focus of historians' attention has shifted from structures and processes to culture, lifestyles, inner experience of both individuals and communities, etc. (for details refer<sup>12</sup>).

1 Васильчук Г. Проблемно-теоретичні пріоритети сучасних дисертаційних досліджень з історії України 20 – 30-хрр. XX ст.: історіографічний дискурс. *Вісник Житомирського державного університету ім. І. Франка*. 2006. Вип. 30. С. 22 – 28.

2 Бондар В. Сучасна історіографія аграрної історії України другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. на сторінках «Українського історичного журналу» *Український історичний журнал*. 2008, Вип. 11. 2008 С. 337 – 351.

3 Бондар В. Вітчизняні селянсько-інституційні їх роль у вивченні історії українського селянства пореформеної доби. *Історіографічні дослідження в Україні*. 2008. 19. С. 178 – 210.

4 Гоцуляк В. Актуальні питання методології та інституціоналізації історії селянства в дзеркалі історіографії. *Вісник Черкаського університету . Серія Історичні науки*. 2010. Вип. 182. С. 16-20.

5 Гончаревський В. Цивілізаційний підхід до історії: сучасний український досвід (1991-2009). Київ: Логос, 2011. 219 с.

6 Присяжнюк Ю. Українське селянство в контексті сучасних дослідницьких завдань. *Український селянин*. 2018. Вип. 20. С. 74 – 79.

7 Фареній І. Концепція національної аграрної буржуазної революції початку XX ст. академіка М.І. Яворського. *Український селянин*. 2019. Вип. 21. С. 130 – 136.

8 Лях С. Методологія історії: класика і практика. Запоріжжя: Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2021. 130 с.

9 Калакура Я. Українська історіографія на переломі: від методологічного монізму до європейських орієнтирів. К.: «ВПЦ Київський університет», 2022. 464 с.

10 Прутула Х. Соціально-економічний розвиток сільських територій: регіональний вимір. Львів: ДУ «Інститут регіональних досліджень імені М.І. Долишнього НАН України», 2015. 356 с.

11 Павлов А. Руральний контекст глобального економічного розвитку України. *Modern Science – Moderni Veda. Praha*. 2015. № 5. С. 15 – 22; Павлов А. Ідентифікація і класифікація сільських територій: теорія, методологія, практика. Одеса: Астропринт, 2015. 344 с.; Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69 – 86; Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 30 – 37; Павлов О. Руралізм як світогляд та ідейна течія: історичний вимір. *Регіональна історія України*. 2018. Вип. 12. С. 157 – 186; Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні направлення. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. 408 с.

12 Павлов О., Павлова І. Руралістичні засади брендингу сільських територій Південного регіону України. Одеса: Астропринт, 2019. 288 с.; Стельмах С. Парадигми історичної думки у XX столітті. *Політична думка*. 1997. № 4. С. 153 – 169; Стельмах С. Історична наука // *Енциклопедія історії України*: Т. 3: Е–Й / Редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. НАН України. Інститут історії України. К.: В-во «Наукова думка», 2005. С. 562 – 566.

Our judgments are in line with the correct observations of T. Portnova. The scientist defines the period we have outlined as the time of the “Golden age” of the history and anthropology of the peasantry. The researcher justifiably emphasizes that the development of historical science was significantly influenced by the “practices of ‘social history’ in the study of ‘dumb’ subordinate social groups”<sup>13</sup>. First of all, we are talking about the peasantry.

Given these general trends in historical science, a peasant-centered approach to the study of social problems of rural-peasant development is emerging in Ukrainian academic discourse. It was represented in the work of agricultural economist V. Yurchyshyn and his team of like-minded people: L. Shepotko, P. Sabluk, O. Onyshchenko, O. Pavlov, and others. In particular, V. Yurchyshyn substantiated and made public the idea that “until the peasant-centered principle becomes a priority in Ukrainian society, there is a real threat of losing the peasantry as a social class”. He called for raising the peasant issue to the level of a national idea and proposed a specific algorithm for its implementation. He also raised the problem of peasant asociality as a result of reforming the agricultural sector of the economy without taking into account possible social risks and negative consequences. It is possible to eliminate such peasant antisociality by developing and implementing a peasant-centered state strategy<sup>14</sup>.

The reasons for the emergence of ruralism, according to O. Pavlov, one of the theorists of this methodology, are as follows: first, “the current state of globalization, characterized by the development of two opposing trends - integration and localization of all spheres of public life”; second, a new understanding of “the issue of interaction between urban and rural territorial subsystems of society”; third, the fallacy of the approach that ignores the specifics of cities and villages; fourth, the inexpediency of artificially limiting rural development to the agricultural food function<sup>15</sup>; fifth, the deepening specialization of scientific research and integration of urban and rural areas; sixth, the emergence of new interdisciplinary scientific fields that accumulate

the potential of modern science and its innovative research methods<sup>16</sup>.

In our opinion, the picture of the reasons for the formation of ruralism will be more complete if we take into account both the reasons given above by O. Pavlov and the global trends of the 1960s-1980s, intellectual reflection on existential challenges in a highly organized industrial civilization, the emergence of new tools of historical science, such as “new social history,” and the intellectual contribution of the scientific school of V. Yurchyshyn. All of these phenomena and processes, in our opinion, can be figuratively called, to paraphrase a famous work by J. Melin of 1914<sup>17</sup>, “facing the peasants.” This, in our opinion, is the generalized formula-cause of the emergence of ruralism. O. Pavlov also agrees with this, noting that rural studies “arose as a result of a systematic study of such a complex natural and socio-spatial formation as rural areas in terms of its structure and functions. It (rural studies - the authors of the article) unites all scientific areas that study certain components of the rural territorial subsystem of society”<sup>18</sup>.

It is interesting that similar trends in the socio-economic, socio-political, and intellectual development of European countries in the 1830s gave rise to the phenomenon of agrarianism, a peasant-centered phenomenon of that time<sup>19</sup>.

Developing a judgment about rural studies as a scientific field, O. Pavlov distinguishes three levels of its research field:

- 1) global;
- 2) national;
- 3) rural.

The first level includes issues related to the foundations of the natural, spiritual, and economic existence of rural society, the place and prospects of the rural direction of development in the modern globalized world, and the role of agricultural labor in solving global problems, etc. The second includes issues related to the entire set of interconnections and relationships between the rural territorial subsystem of society and the corresponding urban subsystem. The third is the range of issues that reveal the specifics of rural life in all its manifestations: from the rational foundations of the natural and socio-cultural space of rural areas to their mental im-

13 Калакура Я. Українська історіографія на переломі: від методологічного монізму до європейських орієнтирів. К.: «ВПЦ Київський університет», 2022. 464 с.

14 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні направлення. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 8.

15 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*, 2016. № 5. С. 30.

16 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69.

17 Мелін Ж. Назад к земле. Москва : Труд, 1914. 190 с.

18 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69.

19 Корновенко, С., Тельвак В. Аграризм як селяноцентричний феномен країн Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи другої половини ХІХ – першої третини ХХ ст. *Український селянин*. 2020. Вип. 24. С. 10 – 16.

age. Priority issues include land ownership and land use, effective use of the integral potential of rural areas, development of the rural economy, creation of appropriate conditions for rural life, so that life in rural areas becomes a joy for those who are born and live there<sup>20</sup>.

The concept of rural studies includes the following: “rurality”, “rural development”, “ruralization”, “ruralism”, “rural history”. Their meaning, according to Pavlov, defines the system of knowledge about rural studies as an interdisciplinary scientific field<sup>21</sup>. Thus, rural studies, as interpreted by the developers of this scientific concept, is an interdisciplinary scientific field that unites all scientific areas that study certain components of the rural territorial subsystem of society. In this understanding of the essence of this methodological construct, we see an attempt by its authors to combine the general and the specific, the global and the local, eliminating contradictions between them, and to approach the study of rural history as a component of rural studies in a systematic and comprehensive manner. At the same time, the use of the concepts of “rural territorial subsystem of society” and “rural history” requires, in our opinion, convincing arguments and explanations of how their use differs for the better from the well-known concepts of “peasantry”, “agrarian history”, etc.

The primary importance in the conceptual apparatus of rural studies belongs to “rarity”. It is defined as a certain state of being that is dynamically developing. This understanding of it correlates with the philosophical interpretation of life as a holistic unity of anthropic, material, social and spiritual forms of life. In this sense, “rurality” is a real state of both natural and artificial nature, society and consciousness (mentality). It is an objective and subjective reality that manifests itself in the objects of the material and ideal world, in the social and individual consciousness. It is the world of things and ideas created by nature and man as its creator<sup>22</sup>. Rationality-being is in constant spatial and temporal development. It is the essence and state of the object of study. It is translated from Latin as rurality<sup>23</sup>.

In general, “rurality” is understood broadly by ruralists. In addition to the above, it is interpreted in the following ways. First, as a rural

identity that is associated with a certain object of rurality, its specific activity, as well as with the space and place of activity. Its attributes, expressors of rural identity, are the peasant, agriculture, and the village. Ruralists, sharing the position of the civilizational approach in the interpretation of the peasantry, believe that the last three categories position a certain stage of civilizational development of mankind - an agrarian society in which the dominant and identifying components were the peasantry as a social group, agricultural labor as the main type of economic activity and way of life, and the village as a type of settlement and space of life. Further, using the terminology of the civilization approach, they interpret “rurality” as “an attribute of pre-industrial social development or as a historical anachronism, manifested in the dominance of natural-patriarchal and agrarian-small-scale economic systems”<sup>24</sup>. Secondly, “rurality” is both a social phenomenon and a social process that is understood outside of the formative context. It is a way of perceiving the world and living of Ukrainian citizens living in rural areas<sup>25</sup>. Third, “rurality” is a concept that has undergone semantic changes. Initially, “rurality” was associated with the village as an arable settlement, whose inhabitants were mainly engaged in agriculture. In view of this, the term “rural” had a sectoral rather than settlement origin. Over time, it came to mean everything that was associated with a settlement formed around arable land. The expansion of the economic functions of the village did not lead to a change in semantics. The village continued to be understood as a place of production. This gave scholars grounds to consider the concepts of “agrarian” and “rural” to be identical. Semantic changes in “rurality” occurred in the early twenty-first century with the introduction of the concept of “rural areas” into scientific circulation. Since then, “rurality” has been understood from the perspective of the territorial approach<sup>26</sup>.

The typical signs, features and properties of “rurality” are:

- 1) agricultural use of the territory;
- 2) economic mono-functionality;
- 3) fine-dispersed type of settlement;
- 4) low-rise and estate development of the territory;

20 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 70.

21 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 31.

22 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні напрями. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 24.

23 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69.

24 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 31 – 32.

25 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69 – 70.

26 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 32.

- 5) combination of agricultural landscapes with natural & recreational landscapes;
- 6) socially homogeneous composition of the population;
- 7) low population density;
- 8) basic infrastructure;
- 9) simplified communication system;
- 10) direct nature of interpersonal relations<sup>27</sup>.

This definition of “rurality,” as its analysis shows, combines several methodological approaches. In our opinion, these are: “history of mentality”, civilizational, social history, etc. Ruralists confirm the correctness of our reasoning and note that rural studies as a scientific field is based on the following important theoretical and methodological foundations “the fundamental provisions of civilizational and world-system theories, physical economy, socioeconomics, the concept of sustainable development, modern achievements of economic, historical, geographical, legal, sociological, philosophical sciences, ethnology, cultural studies, public administration theory and their methodological arsenal”<sup>28</sup>.

Generally, without objecting to this attempt to concentrate in one scientific field the scientific tools of other branches of knowledge, we would like to draw attention to some contradictions that arise as a result of the use by ruralists of certain concepts that they use to define the essence of “ruralism”. In particular, the first thesis stated above: “the attributes and expressions of rural identity are the peasant, agriculture, and the village”. The second is “rural identity, which is associated with a certain object of rurality, its type of activity, as well as with the space and place of activity.” The third is the “rural-centered approach” declared by the scientific school of V. Yurchyshyn. Comparison of these theses makes it obvious that the interpretation of “ruralism” overlooks its subject, its carrier, and “rural identity,” in our opinion, is a category-identifier of only space, not a way of production activity, and it does not have a subjective character. In addition, “rural identity” cannot be a phenomenon of the civilizational approach used by ruralists to define “ruralism.” Such a civilizational phenomenon is known to be the peasantry. O. Pavlov himself writes about this in his monograph, noting that the peasant (social

group)<sup>29</sup> is the expressor of rationality. In view of this, the term “peasant identity” seems to be more correct, as “rural identity” is undoubtedly a component of it.

In our opinion, the ruralists’ judgment of agrarian society “as a historical anachronism, manifested in the dominance of natural-patriarchal and agrarian-small-scale economic systems” requires additional arguments. It contradicts the interpretation of the peasantry by representatives of the civilizational approach, whose scientific tools are used by ruralists to define “rurality.” In particular, O. Spengler, as V. Afanasiev has rightly proved, substantiated that “the peasant class serves the great life not only by giving it food obtained from the land, but also by its own blood, which for centuries has been flowing from villages to higher classes, taking their form there and supporting their life”<sup>30</sup>. O. Pavlov himself, in his 2015 publication, emphasizes that “rurality” is “not positioned as a natural-patriarchal or agrarian-small-scale system”<sup>31</sup>.

According to the above understanding of “rurality”, the object of scientific attention of ruralists is rural areas. The latter are interpreted as an agro-ecosystem, economic space, social environment and mental image<sup>32</sup>. In our opinion, this proposed definition of the concept is abstract. It contains categories, such as “mental space,” which are debatable and subject to interpretation. Our reservations are recognized by O. Pavlov. He points out that there are a number of difficulties with this term:

- 1) the implicit nature of the concept;
- 2) pluralism in understanding due to different approaches to its interpretation by representatives of different fields of knowledge;
- 3) the concept is not enshrined in Ukrainian legislation;
- 4) non-recognition of rural areas as an independent object of sociological research;
- 5) uncertainty of the criteria for identifying rural areas<sup>33</sup>.

At the same time, despite the above reservations, ruralists consider it appropriate to speak of rural history as a component of rural studies; as an independent branch of historical science in the context of rural studies, the research field of

27 Ibid. С. 33.

28 Павло О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69 – 86. С. 70.

29 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні напрями. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. 408 с. С. 25.

30 Афанасьев В. Историческая социология Данилевского, Шпенглера и Сорокина. *Социологические исследования*. 2005. № 5. С. 129 – 137. С. 133.

31 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69.

32 Павлов А. Идентификация и классификация сельских территорий: теория, методология, практика. Одеса: Астропринт, 2015. С. 72 – 153.

33 Ibid. С. 72.

which is rural space and rural territories (objects of rural progress)<sup>34</sup>. They substantiate the expediency of this position by referring to the latest historical developments, in particular, those of J. Vermenich, as well as foreign historiography, such as the work of J. Levy. In their understanding, what is common to both domestic and foreign historiography in defining the research field of rural history is the historical reconstruction and interpretation of a certain local space, the boundaries of which are determined by the type of settlement. Ruralists are convinced that rural space is multiscale, not limited to the village, rural areas occupying a certain area of rural space, thus embodying it and endowing it with natural and social characteristics, it is the object of historical research as a component of rural studies. According to this logic, the temporal, spatial and essential<sup>35</sup> dimensions of rural territory as a multilevel system are the direct subject of study of rural history<sup>36</sup>.

In this context, it is important to answer the question: “What is rural history, which has as its subject matter a multi-scale rural space embodied by rural areas and endowed with their natural and social characteristics?” Ruralists interpret rural history as both theoretical and empirical history. By the first component, they mean historical knowledge about the national level of rural areas, and by the second - a cross-section of historical knowledge at other levels of territories, primarily the basic one. Accordingly, rural history directly corresponds to the hierarchical structure of rural areas. It consists of the history of the territories of the basic level (history of the territorial community), the territories of the district level (rural local history), the territories of the regional level (history of the rural component of the region), the territories of the national level (history of the rural territorial subsystem of society)<sup>37</sup>.

In our opinion, this answer is not exhaustive, as it leaves unanswered the question: “How is rural history different from agrarian history?” There is a reasonable understanding that “rural history” is a derivative of “urban” or “urban history” or its opposite, because ruralism, as its developers note, was formed as the antithesis of urbanism. As is well known, agrarian history is a science that produces historical knowledge at

both the macro and micro levels, a fundamental component of Ukrainian history. In this context, the agrarian history of Ukraine is indeed “the history of the peasantry, the foundation of the nation,” the history of “the presence of the peasantry in the national history of Ukraine”<sup>38</sup>.

Ruralists’ attempts to show agrarian history as a discipline that, along with historical geography, social geography of agriculture, regional studies, historical landscape studies, etc., resulted from the “junction” or intersection of directions and points of contact of common research problems, are also insufficiently motivated<sup>39</sup>. According to the authors of the article, the “disciplines” listed by O. Pavlov are self-sufficient branches of humanities that were formed in the context of the global development of scientific knowledge with a clear object and subject field of study. The ambition for interdisciplinarity of rural studies, and thus of rural history, is not a sufficient reason to downplay the importance of historical geography, agrarian history, etc. Such an approach is questionable in an attempt to define the essence of rural history by denying the self-sufficiency of other branches of the humanities and claiming their research field.

Based on the above logic of O. Pavlov’s presentation, the opposite judgment seems reasonable: rural studies, and thus rural history, were the result of the “junction” or intersection of such independent branches of humanities as agrarian history, historical geography, etc. that had already been formed in previous years and centuries. The basis for this judgment is the lack of a ruralist, and thus “rural history” scientific toolkit.

Borrowing/using the scientific tools of other branches of the humanities, rural studies, and thus rural history, should have its own, so to speak, autochthonous scientific tools. Instead, the analysis of the methods of rural history proposed by O. Pavlov shows only their borrowing. In particular, the researcher considers the “arsenal of research methods of historical science” to be a scientific toolkit of rural history. These include: source study, retrospective, event analysis, etc<sup>40</sup>. Based on the analysis of the above, it is obvious that these methods are methods of historical science and do not reflect the difference

34 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 69.

35 Ibid. С. 76.

36 Ibid. С. 72 – 73, 75.

37 Ibid. С. 82.

38 Смолій В. Передмова // *Історія українського селянства*. Нариси в 2-х томах т. 1. С. 5.

39 Павлов О. Предметне поле сільської історії як складової руралістики. *Регіональна історія України*. 2015. Вип. 9. С. 78.

40 Ibid. С. 78.

between research on rural history and research on agrarian history.

We can also observe contradictions in the judgments of ruralist theorists regarding the essence of rural history. In one paragraph, they write about the fallacy of identifying rural space “with the history of the peasantry, the village, or agrarian history.” In the next paragraph, they argue the opposite, that “rural history in the context of its levels corresponds to one or another local level of historical science. Local history and microhistory are comparable to the history of a territorial community, local history to a certain extent to rural local history, and regional history to a certain extent to the history of the rural component of a region. The history of the rural territorial subsystem of society is a direct component of national history”<sup>41</sup>.

According to the authors of the article, in view of the above, the ruralists’ thesis that rural history is broader than agrarian history or the history of the peasantry requires a more thorough explanation and proof. Their arguments strengthen the understanding of rural history as synonymous with agrarian history. Their thesis about separating the rural component<sup>42</sup> of historical science from its historical component is essentially a reiteration of the understanding of agrarian history as a fundamental component of Ukrainian history, as we wrote above and as stated in the preface to the two-volume essays in *The History of the Ukrainian Peasantry*. At the same time, if rural history = agrarian history, then O. Pavlov’s opinion that its separation from historical science is a development of the general scientific trend toward specialization of knowledge is reasonable. Such a separation contributes to solving socially significant problems, enriches its heuristic potential by attracting interdisciplinary methodological techniques in response to the challenge of our time - substantiating the ways of reviving rural areas and their access to a qualitatively better standard of living<sup>43</sup>.

According to ruralists, “rural development” is a form of manifestation of rurality. In this sense, its task is to preserve and maintain the rural state of being and its characteristic activi-

ties, which are directly related to the origins of human life and society<sup>44</sup>.

On the one hand, “rural development” is an objective, multidimensional process characterized by self-organization and self-development due to the multifunctionality of rural areas. On the other hand, “rural development” is the purposeful development of rural areas in accordance with their social purpose and tasks. At the same time, rural development is influenced by external factors. Globalization sets a certain algorithm for it<sup>45</sup>.

Despite the number of approaches to the interpretation of this concept, ruralists reduce them to two main ones: sectoral and territorial. In this sense, “rural development” reflects the evolutionary development of an object, the transition from one state to another. The dynamics of development can be traced in the course of the object’s performance of specific functions determined by the nature of the object. Since the object of rational development is simultaneously associated with the relevant space and type of economic activity, there are different ways of identifying<sup>46</sup> it in the research discourse and management practice. According to O. Pavlov, “rural development” can be defined as a purposeful process that takes place mainly within the rural spatial segment, which plays an important role in the life of the whole society<sup>47</sup>.

“Ruralization is understood by ruralists as a social process. There are “narrow” and “broad” interpretations of this term. In the first case, it means measures to introduce ecological and aesthetic elements of the rural landscape into the urban landscape. The second is the process of quantitative growth of rural settlements and the number of rural population, i.e. intensification of the process of rural development of the territory, spreading and preservation of the rural way of life in certain territorial elements of agglomeration settlement<sup>48</sup>.

It is more realistic and natural to understand “rurality” as a conscious choice of rural areas by urban residents as a more attractive place of permanent residence than the city. As a social phenomenon, rurality has its own classification. For example, O. Pavlov proposed the following:

1) imaginary (false);

41 Ibid. С. 85.

42 Ibid. С. 86.

43 Ibid.

44 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні напрoвлення. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 47 – 48.

45 Ibid. С. 60.

46 Ibid. С. 48 – 62.

47 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 34.

48 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні напрoвлення. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 62.



- 2) real (actual);
- 3) hybrid (aka 'dachaization')<sup>49</sup>.

There are also five main types of rurality:

- 1) caused by the growth of anthropogenic pressure on the environment, primarily in cities;
- 2) socio-cultural and natural, based on religious and environmental motives;
- 3) boom in cottage construction in the suburban area;
- 4) seasonal migration of summer residents;
- 5) forced migration<sup>50</sup>.

According to O. Pavlov, one of the four scientific categories-identifiers of 'Rural studies' is 'Ruralism'<sup>51</sup>. This concept was introduced into scientific circulation in the 1950s by the intellectual efforts of L. Wirth, a representative of the Chicago sociological school. In particular, in his work "Life in the City," he compared the lifestyles of urban and rural areas in the United States and Western Europe. He emphasized the "fusion" of urban and rural lifestyles into a single whole. This process, according to the sociologist, is an indisputable fact. In this context, he argued that "urbanism is no longer identical to industrialism, and ruralism is no longer identified with non-mechanized labor. This is due to the standardization of lifestyles. Accordingly, rural life, as we know it today, "begins to look archaic in our eyes; we increasingly look at it as a relic of another era"<sup>52</sup>. This definition of "ruralism" by L. Wirth, in our opinion, is not a definition of the term, since it does not reveal its meaning/content, but rather an explanation of it by applying the method of "from the opposite". Accordingly, it is debatable.

Thus, it is sufficient to assume that before L. Wirth introduced this term into scientific circulation, "ruralism" was understood only as "non-mechanized labor", "rural patriarchal way of being", which is an "anachronism" in relation to modernity and was not in wide scientific circulation. This opinion is supported by O. Pavlov, who noted that the concept of "ruralism" is the least developed concept compared to other categories of ruralism. One of the rationalism theorists explains the above situation by the fact that the term "agrarianism" is more widely used in science. At the same time, he believes that "agrarianism" and "ruralism" are

not the same thing. In particular, "agrarianism" does not replace "ruralism," which "conveys the broad content of this ideological trend." Thus, O. Pavlov interprets "ruralism" as an ideological trend that occupies a special place in the theory of ruralism. Central to "ruralism" is the anthropo-rural discourse, which is associated with the world of feelings, experiences, worldview, mental and transformative activities to "remake" a person in the rural space and increase his or her life-affirming role in social development. "The social significance of ruralism lies in the fact that the future of the entire society, not just its rural component, depends on whether it is presented as a reflective nostalgic consciousness or as a half-boyish lament for the primary patriarchal way of life, or as a worldview and ideology that reflects and promotes rurality and ruralization"<sup>53</sup>. The historical mission of ruralism, the researcher argues, "is not so much to replace the habitat of rural society as to replace 'homo ruralistucus' itself"<sup>54</sup>.

Offering his own understanding of "ruralism," O. Pavlov calls for focusing not on the triad "way of life - its resource and factor - subject," but on its reflection in the thinking activity of the researcher who traces the historical evolution of the process in the interconnection of its components. Guided by such considerations, he proves that the systemic role in understanding the essence of ruralism as a certain system of beliefs about the rural way of life is played by the assessment of the attitude of peasants and the whole society at a certain stage of its development to the land, and through this attitude - the definition of social values<sup>55</sup>.

Considering "ruralism" as an ideological current that occupies a special place in the theory of ruralism, O. Pavlov analyzes its evolution as a system of views on agricultural labor, the village and the peasantry<sup>56</sup>. In his opinion, the origins of ruralism, thoughts, views, ideas that fall under the definition of "ruralism" are represented in the intellectual heritage of D. Mendeleev, O. de Balzac, N. Berdyaev, K. Marx, V. Raymont, J. Horvath, J. Knap, L. Tolstoy, I. Franko, A. Fet, O. Vasilchikov, O. Herzen, M. Chernyshevsky, S. Bulgakov, V. Chernov, S. Maslov, P. Sorokin, O. Chayanov, G. Studensky, M. Oganovsky,

49 Ibid. С. 64, 72.

50 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 35.

51 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научные направления. Одесса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 74.

52 Вирт Л. Жизнь в городе // Избранные работы по социологии. Сборник переводов. М.: ИНИОН, 2005. С. 119 – 131, 127.

53 Павлов О. Сутність теоретичних засад руралістики: понятійно-категоріальний апарат. *Економіка АПК*. 2016. № 5. С. 36.

54 Павлов О. Руралізм як світогляд та ідейна течія: історичний вимір. *Регіональна історія України*. 2018. Вип. 12. С. 159.

55 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научные направления. Одесса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 76.

56 Павлов О. Руралізм як світогляд та ідейна течія: історичний вимір. *Регіональна історія України*. 2018. Вип. 12. С. 162 – 180.

L. Litoshenko, B. Brutskus, M. Kondratiev, M. Tulaykov, M. Makarov, members of the socio-political organization “Peasant Russia” that existed in Prague in the 1920s, and others<sup>57</sup>.

In this way, he understands ruralism as both socio-economic agrarian thought and a certain trend in fiction. However, such an understanding of “ruralism” gives grounds for its identification with these phenomena, for its understanding on the basis of similarity with another, rather than self-determination - self-identification. The above analysis deserves critical remarks in view of the fact that, apart from Ivan Franko’s work, it does not present the Ukrainian narrative itself. Whereas the latter took place in the second half of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries and is reflected, for example, in the creative intellectual heritage of P. Kulish<sup>58</sup>, M. Kotsiubynskyi, O. Kobylanska, D. Dontsov, V. Lypynskyi, M. Hrushevskyi, and P. Skoropadskyi. In addition to “Peasant Russia,” there was the Ukrainian Academy of Economics in interwar Czechoslovakia, in the Poděbrady region. Its scientific and pedagogical staff, in particular, H. Simantsiv<sup>59</sup>, maintained close intellectual relations with A. Švěhla, M. Hodži, J. Kettner, and other well-known experts on agrarian-peasant issues<sup>60</sup>.

The analysis proposed by O. Pavlov, in our opinion, would only benefit if the author expanded the subject field of his research and provided more convincing arguments in favor of distinguishing “ruralism” from “agrarianism.” Pavlov’s reasoning does not clearly show that “agrarianism” and “ruralism” are not the same thing; on the contrary, it shows their ideological and fundamental kinship, especially their peasant-centeredness. In our opinion, “ruralism” means “agrarianism of the second half of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries”, the evolution of agrarianism in the light of the development of knowledge, research methodologies, and new civilizational and global challenges. In particular, our research has shown that agrarianism has a broad and narrow meaning. In the broad sense, Central and South-Eastern European agrarianism of the second half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century is a holistic socio-cultural phenomenon, a phenomenon of

the history of Central and South-Eastern Europe of the second half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century, caused by objective-subjective-subjective factors that are the object of knowledge. In a narrower sense, Central and Southeastern European agrarianism is a system of peasant-centered ideas of various subjects of the socio-cultural space of Central and Southeastern Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century, and their practical implementation. Concretizing a narrower understanding of the Central and South-Eastern European agrarianism of the second half of the nineteenth - first third of the twentieth centuries, we state that this is a system of ideas about peasants, peasants about themselves, about the peasantry as an active subject of history capable of independent state-building; a component of the state’s domestic economic policy aimed at solving the agrarian/peasant question; as self-awareness of peasants, as peasant political culture and political consciousness, as the practical realization of peasant hopes and ideas about their just future; a component of social, party and political thought<sup>61</sup>.

In terms of its ideological and semantic content, our understanding of “agrarianism” coincides with the understanding of “ruralism,” with a correlation of chronological boundaries that do not contradict but complement each other. Here are the arguments in favor of our position. First, the circumstances of the formation of both phenomena are similar: the cyclical-historical recurrence of “turning to the land”. Secondly, both “agrarianism” and “ruralism” are the discovery of the “peasantry” for the world in the second half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century and the second half of the twentieth century - the beginning of the twenty-first century, respectively. Thirdly, both “agrarianism” and “ruralism” are strategies for the integrated development of the village, peasantry, rural areas, their socio-economic, socio-cultural and other components, taking into account the chronological limits of the existence of these phenomena, and the tools for its implementation. Fourthly, the ignoring by ruralists of the agrarian practices of solving the agrarian issue, the

57 Павлов А. Руралістика: теорія, методологія, научні напрoвлення. Одеса: Астропринт, 2018. С. 75 – 104.

58 Корновенко С. Хутірська філософія П.Куліша: біля джерел українського аграризму. *Український історичний журнал*. 2020. Ч. 5. С. 64 – 76.

59 Корновенко С., Глібішук М., Ільницький В., Компанієць О., Лозовий В., Пасічна Ю., Тельвак В. Селяноцентричний феномен Української революції 1917 – 1921 рр.: аграризм. Черкаси, 2021. С. 167 – 184.

60 Корновенко С., Компанієць О. Українсько-чехословацький аграристський дискурс 1920-х – 1930-х рр. *Український селянин*. 2022. Вип. 28. С. 14-26. Корновенко, С., Тельвак, В. Аграризм як селяноцентричний феномен країн Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи другої половини ХІХ – першої третини ХХ ст. *Український селянин*. 2020. Вип. 24. С. 10 – 16.

61 Корновенко С., Тельвак В. Аграризм як селяноцентричний феномен країн Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи другої половини ХІХ – першої третини ХХ ст. *Український селянин*. 2020. Вип. 24. С. 10 – 16.

peasant revolutionary subjectivity of 1902-1933 deepens the already existing contradictions in “ruralism” regarding its peasant-centeredness as a phenomenon declared by the scientific school of V. Yurchyshyn and not represented in the categorical apparatus of “ruralism”. Fifth, the approach of complementarity proposed by us does not contradict the self-sufficiency of both agrarianism and ruralism, but only confirms the continuity in the development of scientific and theoretical thought and practices of its implementation, and expands the heuristic possibilities of both. Sixthly, both agrarianism and ruralism are based on the same methodology of the civilization approach, the Annales school, the socio-cultural approach, etc. Seventh, our approach does not deny the civilizational significance of the peasantry, and strengthens the balance between global and local studies of the peasantry as a multidimensional, objectively existing historical phenomenon. Eighth, both phenomena are an alternative to both local and global socio-economic, socio-political, sociocultural, technological, etc. progress, a “third way.” Ninth, while agrarianism is a heuristic scientific tool for studying the pre-industrial, industrial peasantry, ruralism is a post-industrial one. In this way, synergy or complementarity is achieved, i.e., the expansion of chronological boundaries, object and subject fields of research, the volume and thoroughness of the new scientific knowledge gained, etc. Tenthly, the intellectual work of ruralists, as evidenced by the analysis of the works of its representatives, concerns the 1980s-2000s. Representatives of this methodological trend do not have works on the agrarian history of Ukraine, for example, the second half of the nineteenth and first third of the twentieth centuries.

Our position is confirmed by the understanding of “ruralism” by ruralists themselves. In particular, O. Pavlov unequivocally and reasonably states that “ruralism is designed to form a systematic view of the prospects and ways of rural development in a post-industrial society”<sup>62</sup>. This, in our opinion, is the heuristic potential of ruralism. Indeed, the threat to Ukraine’s national security also comes from neglecting the existing problems of rurality.

The heuristic potential of ruralism is fully revealed in studies related to the agrarian history of Ukraine in the 2000s: rural branding as a marketing tool and management function; methodological foundations of rural branding; characteristics of rural areas in the context of the branding approach; socio-economic determinants of rural branding; concepts of rural brand formation, etc<sup>63</sup>.

In this regard, the study of the mental map of images of rural areas of modern Ukraine, based on the ruralism methodology, is indicative. Given its scientific, practical, and socio-political significance, it is relevant. It represents the objects of identification in the perception of certain subjects of identification, which characterizes their type of thinking, level of consciousness and attitude to these natural and socio-spatial formations. According to the findings of ruralists, the majority of the population of Ukraine, including rural residents, do not perceive rural areas as a desirable place to live. In particular, the most part of young people do not formulate prospects for their life trajectory in rural areas. The researchers’ arguments that rural areas have a negative image among Ukrainian citizens as a place of permanent residence and life are reasonable<sup>64</sup>.

Equally scientifically significant, in particular for domestic policy in modern Ukraine, its ethno-cultural component aimed at consolidating the Ukrainian political nation, are the results of studying the structure of the ethnic composition of rural areas during the 2000s. The ruralists convincingly revealed that the highest index of ethnic mosaicism of the rural population as of 2018-2019 is characteristic of Odesa (0.64), Chernivtsi (0.45), Donetsk (0.45), Luhansk (0.44), and Zaporizhzhia (0.43) regions. The lowest scores are typical for Volyn (0.02), Ivano-Frankivsk (0.02), Ternopil (0.02), Lviv (0.03), Vinnytsia (0.04), Chernihiv (0.05), and Cherkasy (0.05) regions. The average value of the ethnic mosaic index for Ukraine is 0.25. It contrasts with the index of ethnic mosaicism in the city. The latter is 0.48. Rural areas in the Central-Northern and Western regions of Ukraine are predominantly mono-ethnic; the Eastern-Southern region is bi-ethnic; and Chernivtsi, Odesa, and Zakarpattia regions are mixed<sup>65</sup>.

62 Павлов О. Руралізм як світогляд та ідейна течія: історичний вимір. *Регіональна історія України*. 2018. Вип. 12. С. 181.

63 Павлов О., Павлова І. Руралістичні засади брендингу сільських територій Південного регіону України. Одеса: Астропринт, 2019. С. 57 – 260.

64 Павлов О. Руралізм як світогляд та ідейна течія: історичний вимір. *Регіональна історія України*. 2018. Вип. 12. С. 182 – 183.

65 Павлов О., Павлова І. Руралістичні засади брендингу сільських територій Південного регіону України. Одеса: Астропринт, 2019. С. 24 – 25.

**The conclusions.** Consequently, summarizing the above, there are sufficient grounds to state: **first**, rural studies is a relatively new methodology that was formed in the 1960s - 1980s. As a reflection on the processes of globalization, it was the result of a return to “face the peasants”. It represents a new understanding of the nonlinear multidimensional interaction of rural and urban subsystems of society; **secondly**, rural studies unites all scientific areas that study certain components of the rural territorial subsystem of society; **thirdly**, the conceptual apparatus of rural studies includes “rurality”, “rural development”, “ruralization”, “ruralism”, “rural history”; **fourthly**, rural history, according to ruralists, despite the controversial theoretical development of the concept, is a component of ruralism, an independent branch of historical science in the context of ruralism, which is both theoretical and empirical history, the subject field of which is rural space and rural territories; **Fifth**, the heuristic value of rural studies in general and ruralism in particular is that the latter is designed to form a systematic view of the prospects and ways of rural development in a post-industrial society. The heuristic potential of ruralism is fully revealed in studies of the agrarian history of Ukraine in the 2000s. The authors of this article have not found any works based on ruralism that deal with earlier periods of Ukraine’s agrarian history, so it is not possible to talk about the heuristic potential of ruralism in relation to earlier periods of Ukraine’s agrarian history; **sixth**, the ruralists’ thesis that rural history is broader than agrarian

history or the history of the peasantry requires additional theoretical elaboration. In particular, the understanding of the essence of rural history and its scientific tools proposed by ruralists requires additional argumentation. Given the results of the analysis of their proposed considerations of the essence of rural history, they, in the opinion of the authors of the article, only strengthen the understanding of the latter as a synonym for agrarian history; **seventh**, ruralists do not provide a coherent system of convincing evidence in favor of their thesis that “‘agrarianism’ and ‘ruralism’ are not the same thing. On the contrary, the considerations offered by ruralists provide sufficient grounds to speak of ruralism as the agrarianism of the second half of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries; **eighth**, there are no fundamental differences between agrarianism and ruralism; they complement each other as methodological paradigms. For example, while agrarianism is a heuristic scientific tool for studying the pre-industrial, industrial peasantry, ruralism is a post-industrial one. In this way, synergy or complementarity is achieved, i.e., the expansion of chronological boundaries, object and subject fields of research, the broad character and thoroughness of the new scientific knowledge gained, etc.

**Funding.** The article contains the results of a study based on the fundamental research ‘Socio-cultural space of Ukraine in the second half of the nineteenth century - the first third of the twentieth century: the peasant world’ (state registration number: 0123U101600).

#### References:

1. Afanasev, V. (2005). Istoricheskaya sotsiologiya Danilevskogo, Shpenglera i Sorokina. [Historical sociology of Danilevsky, Spengler and Sorokin]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya. [Sociological research]*, 5, S. 129 – 137. [in Russian].
2. Bondar, V. (2008). Suchasna istoriografiiia ahrarnoi istorii Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XIX – pochatku XX st. na storinkakh «Ukrainskoho istorychnoho zhurnalu» [Modern historiography of the agrarian history of Ukraine in the second half of the 19th - early 20th centuries. on the pages of the «Ukrainian Historical Journal»]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zbirnyk [Ukrainian Historical Collection]*, 11, 337 – 351. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bondar, V. (2008). Vitchyzniani selianoznavchi instytutsii yi yikh rol u vvychneni istorii ukrainskoho selianstva poreformenoj doby. [Domestic institutions of peasant studies and their role in the study of the history of the Ukrainian peasantry of the post-reform era]. *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini. [Historiographic research in Ukraine]*, 19, 178 – 210. [in Ukrainian].
4. Farenii, I. (2019). Kontseptsiiia natsionalnoi ahrarnoi burzhuaznoi revoliutsii pochatku XX st. akademiika M.I. Yavorskoho. [The concept of the national agrarian bourgeois revolution of the beginning of the 20th century. Academician M.I. Yavorsky]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 21, 130 – 136. [in Ukrainian].
5. Honcharevskyi, V. (2011). Tsyvilizatsiinyi pidkhid do istorii: suchasnyi ukrainskyi dosvid (1991-2009) [Civilization approach to history: modern Ukrainian experience (1991-2009)]. Kyiv: Lohos. [in Ukrainian].

6. Hotsuliak, V. (2010). Aktualni pytannia metodolohii ta instytutstionalizatsii istorii selianstva v dzerkali istoriohrafii [Current issues of methodology and institutionalization of peasant history in the mirror of historiography]. *Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu. Seriya Istorychni nauky. [Bulletin of Cherkassy University. Series Historical sciences]*, 182, 16-20. [in Ukrainian].
7. Kalakura, Ya. (2022). Ukrainska istoriohrafia na perelomi: vid metodolohichnoho monizmu do yevropeiskykh oriientyriv. [Ukrainian historiography at a turning point: from methodological monism to European landmarks]. Kyiv: «VPTs Kyivskiy universytet». [in Ukrainian].
8. Kornovenko, S. & Kompaniets, O. (2022). Ukrainsko-chechoslovatskyi ahrarytskyi dyskurs 1920-kh – 1930-kh rr. [Ukrainian-Czechoslovak agrarian discourse of the 1920s - 1930s.]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 28, 14-26. [in Ukrainian].
9. Kornovenko, S. & Telvak, V. (2020) Ahraryzm yak selianotsentrychnyi fenomen krain Tsentralnoi ta Pivdenno-Skhidnoi Yevropy druhoi polovyny XIX – pershoi tretyny XX st. [Agrarianism as a peasant-centric phenomenon of the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe in the second half of the 19th - the first third of the 20th century]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 24, 10 – 16. [in Ukrainian].
10. Kornovenko, S. (2020). Khutirska filosofia P.Kulisha: bilia dzherel ukrainskoho ahraryzmu [The peasant philosophy of P. Kulish: near the sources of Ukrainian agrarianism] *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal. [Ukrainian Historical Journal]*, 5, 64 – 76. [in Ukrainian].
11. Kornovenko, S., Hlibishchuk, M., Ilnytskyi, V., Kompaniets O., Iozovyi, V., Pasichna, Yu. & Telvak, V. (2021). Selianotsentrychnyi fenomen Ukrainkoi revoliutsii 1917 – 1921 rr.: ahraryzm [The peasant-centric phenomenon of the Ukrainian revolution of 1917-1921: agrarianism]. Cherkasy. [in Ukrainian].
12. Liakh, S. (2021). Metodolohiia istorii: klasyka i praktyka. [Methodology of history: classics and practice]. Zaporizhzhia: Vydavnychi dim «Helvetyka». [in Ukrainian].
13. Melin, Zh. (1914). Nazad k zemle. [Back to the ground]. Moskva : Trud. [in Russian].
14. Pavlov, A. (2015). Identifikatsiya i klassifikatsiya selskikh territorii: teoriya, metodologiya, praktika. [Identification and classification of rural territories: theory, methodology, practice]. Odessa: Astroprint. [in Russian].
15. Pavlov, A. (2015). Ruralnii kontekst globalnogo ekonomicheskogo razvitiya Ukraini. [Rural context of global economic development of Ukraine]. *Modern Science – Moderni Veda*, 5, 15 – 22. [in Russian].
16. Pavlov, A. (2018). Ruralistika: teoriya, metodologiya, nauchnie napravleniya. [Ruralistics: theory, methodology, scientific directions]. Odessa: Astroprint. [in Russian].
17. Pavlov, O. & Pavlova, I. (2019). Ruralistychni zasady brendynhu silskykh terytorii Pivdennoho rehionu Ukrainy. [Rural principles of branding of rural areas of the Southern region of Ukraine]. Odesa: Astroprint. [in Ukrainian].
18. Pavlov, O. (2015). Predmetne pole silskoi istorii yak skladovoi ruralistyky. [the subject field of rural history as a component of rural studies]. *Rehionalna istoriia Ukrainy [Regional history of Ukraine]*, 9, 69 – 86. [in Ukrainian].
19. Pavlov, O. (2016). Sutnist teoretychnykh zasad ruralistyky: poniatiino-katehorialnyi aparat. [The essence of theoretical foundations of rural studies: conceptual and categorical apparatus]. *Ekonomika APK [Economy of agro-industrial complex]*, 5, 30 – 37. [in Ukrainian].
20. Pavlov, O. (2018). Ruralizm yak svitohliad ta ideina techiia: istorychnyi vymir. [Ruralism as a worldview and ideology: historical dimension]. *Rehionalna istoriia Ukrainy [Regional history of Ukraine]*, 12, 157 – 186. [in Ukrainian].
21. Portnova, T. (2016). Liubyty i navchaty: selianstvo v uiavlenniakh ukrainskoi intelihentsii druhoi polovyny XIX st. [love and teach: the peasantry in the ideas of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the second half of the 19th century]. Dnipropetrovsk: LIRA. [in Ukrainian].
22. Prysiazhniuk, Yu. (2018). Ukrainske selianstvo v konteksti suchasnykh doslidnytskykh zavdan. [Ukrainian peasantry in the context of modern research tasks]. *Ukrainskyi selianyn. [Ukrainian peasant]*, 20, 74 – 79. [in Ukrainian].
23. Prytula, Kh. (2015). Sotsialno-ekonomichni rozvytok silskykh terytorii: rehionalnyi vymir. [Socio-economic development of rural areas: regional dimension]. Lviv: DU «Instytut rehionalnykh doslidzhen imeni M.I. Dolishnoho NAN Ukrainy». [in Ukrainian].
24. Smolii, V. (2006). Peredmova [Foreword]. *Istoriia ukrainskoho selianstva. [History of the Ukrainian peasantry]*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].

25. Stelmakh, S. (1997). Paradyhmy istorychnoi dumky u XX stolitti. [Paradigms of historical thought in the 20th century]. *Politychna dumka [Political opinion]*, 4, 153 – 169. [in Ukrainian].
26. Stelmakh, S. (2005). Istorychna nauka [Historical science]. *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy [Encyclopedia of the history of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 3. [in Ukrainian].
27. Vasylchuk, H. (2006). Problemno-teoretychni priorytety suchasnykh dysertatsiinykh doslidzhen z istorii Ukrainy 20 – 30-khrr. XX st.: istoriohrafichnyi dyskurs. [Problem-theoretical priorities of modern dissertation studies on the history of Ukraine 20-30 years. 20th century: historiographical discourse]. *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnoho universytetu im. I. Franka. [Bulletin of Zhytomyr State University named after I. Franko]*, 30, 22 – 28. [in Ukrainian].
28. Virt, L. (2005). Zhizn v gorode [Life in the city]. *Izbrannie raboti po sotsiologii. [Selected works on sociology]*. Moskva: INION, 119 – 131. [in Russian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 05.09.2023

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 12.11.2023