



Age-Period-Era: Temporal visions and periodisation constructions in the works of Ukrainian researchers of educational history (mid 19th – 80s of the 20th century)

Mykola Haliv

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor
Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
82100, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7068-3124>

Vasyl Ilnytskyi*

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor
Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University
82100, 24 Ivan Franko Str., Drohobych, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X>

Abstract. The study relevance is stipulated by the lack of research in Ukrainian and foreign historiographical science on the temporal visions and periodisation constructions of Ukrainian scholars who, from the 40s of the 19th century to the 80s of the 20th century, studied various aspects of the educational history, such as educational policy, schooling system, educational movements, pedagogical ideas, educational figures' biographies, etc. The article aims were to present the study results of domestic scholars' views on the phenomenon of historical time and to highlight the characteristic features of temporal constructions introduced into the study of educational history. In the course of the study, the author used general scientific methods (abstraction, analysis and synthesis, induction, deduction, classification, generalisation), interdisciplinary methods (contextual and interpretative, lexical and semantic, logical and semantic, critical, structural and systemic) and special historical methods (historical and genetic, historical and comparative, historical and systemic, periodisation, retrospective), which made it possible to comprehensively, multidimensionally and representatively clarify the domestic researchers' views on the phenomenon of historical time and to identify the key approaches to the periodisation construction of the past in works on educational history. The study revealed the following characteristic manifestations of temporal constructions introduced by researchers into works on the educational history from the mid 19th to the end of the 20th century: 1) the lack of clarity in the use of temporal nominations, which manifested itself not only in the concepts identification of "period", "era", "stage", but also in the unconstructive systematisation of these concepts; 2) linking the time periods of school development and pedagogical thought to political, economic and, to a lesser extent, cultural and educational events; 3) the initial dominance of conventional periodisation approaches (for example, the history division into centuries or the reigns of successive monarchs), after which the theoretical

Suggested Citation:

Haliv, M., & Ilnytskyi, V. (2024). Age-Period-Era: Temporal visions and periodisation constructions in the works of Ukrainian researchers of educational history (mid 19th – 80s of the 20th century). *Society. Document. Communication*, 9(1), 8-19. doi: 10.69587/sdc/1.2024.08.



and conceptual principle based on the formation theory was established; 4) the belief of most scholars that time intervals – periods, stages and epochs – actually existed in the past, and therefore the historian of education can identify them in the research course and show them in a scientific narrative

Keywords: historical time; periodisation; educational history; narrative; Ukrainian historians

Introduction

The historical narrative focus on demonstrating the past has always relied on chronology in its diachronic and synchronic versions. Undoubtedly, researchers in various social life spheres, including education, build temporal constructs based on the temporal visions existing in science and their own understanding of temporality. At the same time, they actively use different chronometric terminology and seek to mount a periodisation framework for the unfolding of historical processes in the educational sphere both at the macro level (educational history of certain countries, peoples/nations, civilisations) and at the micro level (educational history in regions and locuses, history of certain educational institutions, biographies of educational figures, teachers, and others).

It is worth noting that contemporary scholars continue to understand historical temporality as a phenomenon. In particular, American and European scholars characterise temporality in culture and nature through the prism of global history based on interdisciplinary analysis (Ekström, & Bergwik, 2022). Different concepts of temporality in the media history study are proposed by the Finnish researcher Ju. Kortti (2022). Current trends in the history of modern temporality are revealed by A. Fryxell (2019). F. Brodel's concept of the time multiplicity in history is still being comprehended (Chakraborty, 2024). In a recent article by J. Martin & K. Myers (2023) analyses the problem of time and memory in the educational history. The historiography of the educational history of Central and Eastern Europe, and thus approaches to the construction of chronological markers, is considered in Yu. Gulczyńska *et al.* (2023). Several researchers are working to analyse the concepts of time in historical didactics (Barsch & Hubner, 2023). Among contemporary Ukrainian historians, O. Yas (2023) studies the problem of historical time in history research in the most analytical way. His latest works, however, are devoted to the temporal images of the Russian-Ukrainian war, which is quite natural, given the civilisational challenges facing Ukrainian science, including the historical one.

In general, we have to state that there is a lack of research on temporal visions and periodisation constructions in the works of Ukrainian scholars who studied the educational history (schooling, pedagogy, biographies of educational figures, etc.). It should be emphasised that it is needed to analyse the works of those scholars who lived on the territory of Ukraine during the specified period of time. At the same time, of course, we should rely on the boundaries of the Ukrainian historical and

geographical space through the prism of the current political borders of Ukraine. In this case, the principle of territoriality assumes paramount importance. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the texts of both ethnic Ukrainians and some scholars who had a different national origin but lived in Ukraine for a long time (meaning teachers of Kyiv higher education institutions of the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries, such as M. Volodymyrskyi-Budanov, M. Petrov, and V. Rodnikov).

It should be noted that the works chosen for analysis are those that were published in a fairly wide timeframe, from the mid 19th century, when the first studies of the educational history by domestic authors appeared, to the 80s of the 20th century, when the Bolshevik version of Marxist theory was undermined and began to be pushed out of historical science in Ukraine. During this time, historical studies were influenced by positivism, neo-romanticism, neo-Kantianism, and Marxism. Such a broad historiographical background creates opportunities for a more generalised characterisation of the issue under study.

Consequently, the article purpose was to present the study results of domestic researchers' views (mid 19th – 80s of the 20th century) on the phenomenon of historical time and to highlight the characteristic features of temporal constructions introduced into the studies of educational history. The study objectives were to analyse the historiography and sources, define and apply the methodology of scientific research, reveal the key aspects of the temporal visions of Ukrainian researchers who worked in educational history field, and find out the periodisation and temporal constructions they compiled.

The contextual and interpretative method allowed to establish the contexts of temporal visions formation by Ukrainian educational historians and to interpret the information contained in their narratives on the basis of contextualisation. Lexical and semantic and logical and semantic methods are needed to clarify the semantic aspects of the historians' language, which is full of metaphors and tropes. The critical and structural and systematic methods helped to avoid bias in the selection and interpretation of historical texts by domestic scholars.

The use of the historical and genetic method made it possible to trace the genesis of temporal visions and periodisation constructs in works on the educational history. The historical and comparative method made it possible to identify scholars' common and different views on the periodisation of the past by comparing

the works of different authors of different times in the educational history. The use of the historical and systemic method was the key to building our material in the proper sequence, coherence and holism. The historical and typological method was used to determine the typological characteristics of the periodisation concepts of education researchers of past. In analysing the historiography of the issue, it was applied the retro-spection method, which allowed to outline the main achievements in the research field of national historians' temporal visions.

The dynamics of the historical time phenomenon

The understanding of the historical time phenomenon is presented primarily in the works of history philosophers, in particular R. Collingwood (1996), P. Aron (2005), M. Mudrovic (2014). In particular, the researcher, relying on F. Dosset's thesis that "history has broken into pieces", speaks about time variability in view of historiography's departure from national metanarratives and the emergence of "smaller" history areas (Mudrovic, 2014).

A significant contribution to the comprehension of the historical time category was made by historians who dealt with theoretical and methodological problems of historical science. Among them, first of all, it is worth mentioning the French historian, representative of the "Annales school" F. Braudel and his famous works on the short, medium and long duration of historical time (Braudel, 1958). German historian R. Kozellek (2005) emphasised that history is embodied in time in the sense that due to the inexorable progress of time itself, "today" changes, and with increasing distance, it changes in the past. He also noted the variability of "epoch" and "period" concepts, which is evident in the works of many historians, including those who study the past of education. It is also worth noting the philosophical and journalistic work of P.J. Corfield (2007) "Time and the Shape of History", in which the author proposes a return to "big history" without the traditional division into periods and epochs.

The culturally determined vision of time is advocated by the German researcher J. Rüsen (2010). He emphasises that ideas about time passage, which are crucial for interpreting the human world, are based on various time categories. They are used in various structures, such as cyclical, linear, kairos, apocalypse, etc. They are used to draw appropriate expectations from experience, such as ruin, progress, continuity, repetition, change, etc. They combine the actual course of time with the intentions and self-assessments of the subjects who use them. Ideas about time, covering the past, present, and future, organise historical thinking and form its content, that is history. A time passage concept also organises historical narrative as a kind of explanation. In general, he considered the historian's mastery of historical time to be a culturally determined procedure.

Many scholars have paid attention to the historical time periodisation architectonics. For our work, the

considerations of the famous Polish historian and history theorist E. Topolsky (2012) is particularly important. He emphasised that periodisation belongs to the most important means used in the creation of historical concepts by which past reality is constructed, and at the same time constitutes one of the most important and powerful factors in the formation of historical images in the public consciousness. Among the more recent works, we note the publications of D. Neumann (2011) on the role of periodisation in historical research, and O. Steinberg (2018) on the actualisation of the 19th century British historian E. Freeman's views on history periodisation. The article by H. Jordheim (2014) analyses the problem of the multiplicity of times and its conceptualisation in the historiographical tradition. Harvard University Professor D. Armitage (2012), noting the gradual revival of *Longue durée* concept in intellectual history, proposed a model of transtemporal history, which is formed through serial contextualism to create histories of ideas spanning centuries and even millennia.

Special importance was attached to periodisation by experts in the field of "edutainment history". Here it should be mentioned the works of P. Stearns (1987), H. Gómez Galán (2015). The latter, by the way, emphasised the didactic need to form feedback between the chronological dimension of time (perception and measurement of physical time) and historical time (knowledge of time in human history). In a recent publication by R. Phillips (2023), who is actively involved in Open Educational Resources projects, noted the following, "Periodisation is a key tool when it comes to historical research, we must always define our time period in relation to the historical event or process being studied, and our students must define that period as well. Without defining time periods, we cannot expect students to engage in historical thinking practices such as contextualisation, cause and effect relationship, or continuity and change over time. Without periodisation, we would be swimming in a big puddle of history. Periodisation helps us to create lanes for swimming so that we can better understand and organise historical narratives".

Among the Ukrainian researchers, it is worth mentioning the works of O. Yas (2014) and O. Bohdashyna (2010), who revealed the temporal visions of famous Ukrainian historians. The approaches of national historians of education and pedagogy to the periodisation of the past were outlined by O.V. Cherkasov (2006), M. Haliv (2018). However, they talked about the main approaches (formational, civilisational, cultural, etc.) to the temporality of education history, without analysing the characteristic features of temporal constructions introduced into works on the education history. Some aspects of this problem are highlighted in the works of M. Haliv and V. Ilnytskyi (2022; 2023). Therefore, authors can state that historical science has not yet published a work devoted to clarifying the peculiarities of Ukrainian researchers' views of the second half of the 19th – 20th

centuries on historical time and its periodisation and narrative representation.

From the “humanity era” to the amplification of time nominations

First of all, it should be noted that the Ukrainian narrative of the education history was characterised by an understanding of the time linearity, which is quite natural given the spread of the Judeo-Christian interpretation of time. It was characterised by the idea of a time axis, according to which history is moving towards a certain goal, the Last Judgement and the God's Kingdom. Formed in the Middle Ages, this time concept penetrated the historians' works, eventually being supplemented by the three-phase scheme characteristic of Hegel's historiosophy that followed Ancient World – Middle Ages – Modern Time.

Given the influence of religious doctrine, national education historians of the second half of 19th – early 20th centuries saw Christianity as the centre of human history, and Jesus Christ's life as the central event. P. Yurkevych (1870) spoke about the pre-Christian and Christian epochs in the culture history in general and education in particular, analysing the thoughts of the German scientist K. Schmidt (1870). However, this idea was most clearly expressed by M. Lileiev. In a course of lectures on pedagogy history (1879), he wrote: “Pedagogy history, along with the history of mankind as a whole, passes through the same development stages. Developing in parallel with world history, it also has epochs and periods of development in common with it. Christianity is its core point, around which the entire subsequent history of mankind revolves. Historical nations of pre-Christian times usually did not go beyond their nationality. Before Christ, there were only mainly national gods, only national human virtues... With the advent of Christianity in world history, every person learns to recognise and respect their humanity in themselves, and their brothers in other people. The era of humanity and mankind is coming, and education is learning its character...”.

Historians' understanding of time is reflected primarily in periodisation narratives models. Analysing the periodisation and temporal representations of national historians of education and pedagogical thought, we can identify several of their main characteristics.

The first of those is *the lack of clarity in temporal nominations usage in the works of Ukrainian educational historians (“era”, “epoch”, “period”, “age”, etc.)*. Thus, the term “era” was understood by scholars either as a certain time period or as a fateful short-term moment in history. Already in the work of I. Mykhnevich (1843) on the history of schooling in the southern Ukrainian lands stated that 1811 constituted an “epoch” in the development of Kherson schools. The vision of one year (1848) as an “epoch” also appeared in S. Tomaszewski's (1905) study on the history of the Berezhany gymnasium (1905). Small time periods (a few years and decades), given their

importance (in researchers' eyes) for education and culture in general, were also sometimes given the meaning of an “epoch”. Thus, the Kyiv researcher M. Vladimirsky-Budanov (1874) called the end of the 16th century the second epoch of enlightenment of Rus by Christian principles from Greece.

Some scholars identified periods within which they saw the epochs. In particular, M. Vladimirsky-Budanov (1884) divided the Kyiv University history (1884) into two main periods, within which he saw smaller epochs, including transitional ones. In particular, he noted: “...the era of 1855-1863 was a time of general revival, an impulse to reform, and at the same time of unrest and turmoil. Like any transitional era, it is a two-faced Janus, marked by excesses and violent unrest, but at the same time by hot impulses to work in the administrative, public, and scientific spheres”. V. Domanytskyi, who was in fact an epigone of S. Miropolskyi in his views on the education history, distinguished, in particular, “ages” and “epochs” within the periods of development of the folk school in Rus. At the same time, he called one of the periods, from the Peter the Great's reforms to the establishment of the Ministry of Education, “the era of Western European influence on our school” (Manuscripts Institute..., n.d.; 1879.).

Historians used the “period” and “epoch” concepts as equivalent. N.I. Petrov (1895), covering the Kyiv Collegium history of the second half of the 17th century (1895), noted that the period following the “Mohyla era” was chosen for the research, “one of the most troubled and dark periods” of this institution history. We can see that for the scholar, period follows era, and the period is longer (1647-1701) than the epoch (1631-1647). D. Bagaliy (1904) in his essay on Kharkiv University history wrote: “The year 1835 marks the end of the first period in Kharkiv University life, and with the advent of a new statute, the second epoch of its historical existence begins”.

Instead, K. Korzh (1912) used the term “stages” without specifying which time periods he meant. Speaking about the Ukrainian citizenship struggle for the Ukrainian people's national rights in education field, he noted that these struggles “were in different stages of their growth”. G. Popov (1913) also spoke about the development stages of culture and pedagogy, and G. Korkushko (1926) wrote about the development stages of universal education idea. The past researchers of education have treated the concept of “era” quite freely. Thus, K. Kharlampovych (1899), in the work on Western Rus Orthodox schools, stated that the letter of Antiochian Patriarch Yakym to the Lviv Brotherhood of the 1 January 1586 “opens a new era in the history of brotherhoods”. Galician education historian A. Androhovych (1919) used the term “Josephine era” to refer to the end of the 18th century.

The Soviet historians of education views on historical time (especially those who were active in the 1920s) were often distinguished by an understanding of time

dynamism, its fluidity and instability. Even P. Abramovych (1925-1926) noted the relativity of "our transitional era", where every day is different, where the meaning of not only words but also numbers changes. O. Nazarevsky (1928), in an article on the student riots in Kyiv in 1884, spoke of events that "began to grow at a rapid pace". Looking at the past through the fundamental myths of revolution and progress led to the conclusion that, for example, the French Revolution was "one of the most interesting moments in world history", there was an "intermediate period in history" between revolutions (Ivanytsa, 1926), and in education, "the same age-old change of gradual and reactionary periods and elements" was observed (Korkushko, 1926).

The absence of consistent use of periodisation terms was also noticeable. In particular, Y.P. Ryappo (1927) wrote about the ten-year age of building education in Ukraine, which he divided into three stages, the first of which he again called "age". A few pages later, he wrote about the 1917-1920 period, which he included in the "age", linking it to changes in political power in Ukraine. L. Yehorova (1928), speaking about the "ages" of the development of children's literature in Soviet Ukraine, called the second stage a "period". All these examples demonstrate the arbitrariness and instability of periodisation definitions, the lack of scientifically based approaches to "playing with time" in Ukrainian educational history researchers' studies.

Political, economic, cultural and educational markers for dividing time in education history

For domestic scholars, a characteristic and rather simplified method of constructing historical time was *to link time periods of the development of schooling or pedagogical ideas to political, economic, cultural and educational events*. Since the mid 19th century, education history researchers linked past time periods to certain political events in educational field, primarily legislative changes. For example, A. Andriyashov (1865) linked the periods of school history in Chernihiv region to governmental orders and statutes on education. A similar approach was expressed by D. Bagaliy (1904), who related Kharkiv University history periods to the emergence of state university statutes, and K. Kharlampovych (1907), who identified the history periods of the Kazan Theological Academy in view of the emergence of the statutes under which the institution operated.

The historian M. Corduba (1895) criticised N. Mukhin for periodising the Kyiv Brotherhood Monastery's history on the basis of the periodisation of the brotherhood school-academy and suggested that it should be built "in connection with the general history of Ukraine". Thus, the researcher, in fact, expressed his commitment to periodisation reduction from periods of Ukrainian history to periods of school history in Ukraine. The Transcarpathian scholar Y. Peshina (1929), analysing ancient Roman education, considered it within the framework

of four political "stages" (education in the time of the republic, the empire-"kingdom", the decline of the state and the like).

Of course, many scholars have tried to base periodisation on pedagogical processes and phenomena. For example, M. Linchevskii (1870) saw two periods in the history of brotherhood schools: 1) before P. Mohyla, they were dominated by the "Greek element" that influenced the pedagogical principles and methods of the Greeks; 2) since P. Mohyla, the pedagogy of the brotherhood schools, and especially the Kyiv Epiphany School, has been dominated by the "Western Jesuit element". G. Popov (1913), argued that the first 16 centuries from Christ birth for Europe were a time of "discipleship", preparation for independent pedagogical creativity, meaning the total imitation of ancient pedagogical models in the Middle Ages. The history of independent pedagogical creativity in Europe, according to G. Popov, begins in the 17th century. Also V. Rodnikov (1914), using general historical periodisation components, such as "Middle Ages", "Mongolian epoch" ("harsh Tatar epoch"), used the concept of "phases" for pedagogical processes. In particular, he called the foundation of Moscow University in 1755 "a new phase in the development of our education". Moreover, he associated the 19th century as a new epoch in the history of Russian pedagogy with the emergence of a "universal pedagogical ideal".

An example of the focus on pedagogical aspects in the history of schooling is the periodisation of the the Kyiv Academy history (1916) proposed by M. Petrov (1919). He distinguished the following periods: 1) the existence of a fraternal school and college as a secondary school teaching sciences up to and including philosophy in 1615-1689; 2) the introduction of theology into the course of sciences in 1689, after which it became a higher school; 3) the introduction of many secular subjects into the curriculum of the Academy in the 1760s, which brought the institution closer to a secular gymnasium; 4) the reorganisation of the institution under the new statute of the Academy from 1819 to the present time. If earlier the history periodisation of the Kyiv Academy was based on the dating of well-known historical events (such as the merger of the brotherhood school with the Lavra School in 1631 or the granting of the status of an academy by Tsar Peter the Great in 1701), M. Petrov took changes in education content as his starting point. True, the beginning of the latter period coincides with the institutional reform of the institution in 1819, but it also entailed changes in the content components of the educational process.

Similarly, Galician education historians based their history periodisation schemes of certain schools on pedagogical aspects. For example, S. Tomaszewski (1906) distinguished three periods in the history of the Berezhany gymnasium, according to changes in curricula and general tendencies in the organisation of secondary schooling. Covering the history of the academic

gymnasium in Lviv, A. Androhovych (1925) distinguished three periods in its past, which he divided into phases. The phases were based on changes in the content of education (according to the Jesuit curriculum and the Marxian curriculum). He divided the development of the Lviv Seminary into phases, giving them the meaning of periods. I. Krypiakevych (1926), noting that the Lviv Brotherhood School “passed through different stages in its development”, associated them with the change of teachers and the success of students in their studies.

Soviet scholars, under the influence of Marxist doctrine and ideological postulates, often combined the periodisation of educational phenomena with political, economic and proper pedagogical factors. In particular, V. Arnautov (1927), in his essay on the history of social education in Ukraine, proposed to be guided by “signs of stages of economic development” when drawing up the periodisation, but only in the main features, so as not to get confused in the details. Thus, he divided the construction of the social education system into two periods such as 1) military communism (1917-1921); 2) the first years of the NEP (1921-1926). He expressed confidence that for the future educational historian in Ukraine, these “economic stages” will be like the starting point for analysing the past. At the same time, the researcher identified several stages in each era, including three in the first (the first, second, and third coming of Soviet power to Ukraine), and two in the second (adaptation of social education to the NEP, restoration of primary education). Similar structures were built by Y. Ryappo (1927), dividing into stages the “ten-year revolutionary period of educational construction in our country”. He saw three stages in it, a) the acute civil war and interventions of 1917-1920; b) the struggle for existence in 1920-1924 (lack of a sustainable budget, crop failure and famine); c) the rise on the “economic front”. Similarly, L. Yehorova (1928) identified the following stages of development of Ukrainian children’s literature in Soviet Ukraine as follows 1) the revolution of 1917-1920; 2) economic ruin of 1920-1923; 3) recovery from the economic hard times of 1924-1928. In these three periodisation schemes, a mixture of factors is evident, among which economic and political factors played a key role, and educational and pedagogical factors played a supporting role. Obviously, such interpretations were considered to be in line with the Marxist doctrine of “base and superstructure”.

Such approaches persisted in the following decades. Scholars even linked the periodisation of preschool history to party congresses and all-Union meetings. Political events also determined the stages of historical and pedagogical science development. Thus, O. Dzeverin (1957) identified the following periods of historical and pedagogical science development in the Ukrainian SSR as follows, 1) the beginning of historical and pedagogical knowledge transition to the service of workers (1917-1920); 2) the unfolding of the struggle for Marxist research of historical and pedagogical problems in

connection with the construction of the Soviet education system (1920-1931); 3) historical and pedagogical science development on the basis of historical instructions of the CPSU and the Soviet government on school and education of the younger generation (1931-1957).

From the conventional periodisation to the formation theory

The third characteristic feature of periodisation construction in scientific narratives on the educational history was the gradual transition from *conventional periodisation approaches* (for example, dividing history into centuries or the reigns of successive monarchs) to the *theoretical and conceptual principle of understanding the discreteness of historical time*.

For example, the history of education and pedagogy division into centuries was used by O. Kochubynsky (1893) and V. Rodnikov (1914), who wrote about the 17th century as a separate epoch. V. Rodnikov called both the 13th and 16th centuries as epochs, and M. Makaveisky (1904) – the 17th century. Western Ukrainian researcher R. Zaklinsky (1904) also divided the history of primary schooling into centuries, naming, in particular, one of the sections of his work “A View of the People’s Schools in the 18th Century”.

The reigns of monarchs as periods or epochs in the schooling history were mainly considered by scholars with conservative political and ideological preferences. For example, M. Vladimirsky-Budanov (1884) in his work on the history of St. Volodymyr’s University (1884) identified two main periods in the institution’s history during the reigns of Emperors Mykola I and Oleksandr II. I. Levitskyi (1903) singled out the “reformation epoch” of the Austrian Emperor Joseph, M. Petrov, preparing the second volume of “Acts and Documents Relating to the History of the Kyiv Academy: Division II” (1905), grouped there materials of 1750-1762. The extreme boundaries of this period were based on the beginning of K. Razumovsky’s hetmanate and the accession of Catherine II (Petrov, 1905). V. Domanyskyi, following S. Miropolskyi, divided the history of public schooling in Rus into two halves – before the reign of Peter I and after.

The periodisation of the past of education associated with the activities of church leaders should be viewed in the same vein. Hence, M. Bulgakov (1843) noted: “Fifteen years, during the lifetime of Petro Mohyla, were one beautiful day for the Collegium he organized”. H. Bulashev (1894) called the epoch in the history of parochial schools of the Kyiv diocese the time of Metropolitan Arsenii (late 1850s – 1860s) (Bulashev, 1894). M. Petrov, describing the situation of the Kyiv Academy during the reign of Empress Catherine II (1906), divided this time into three “epochs”: 1) the epoch of Metropolitan Arsenii Mohylianskyi (until 1770), 2) the epoch of Metropolitan Havryil Kremenetskyi (until 1783), 3) the epoch of Metropolitan Samuil Myslavskyi (until 1796) (Petrov, 1905). It should be noted that O. Hrushevskyi (1907) in his review

of M. Petrov's article (1907) opposed the use of the term "epoch" for small periods.

The conventional periodisation manifestation was also the recognition of the activity of a certain person as an epoch in the history of education. P. Yurkevych, 1870 (1870) pointed to Plato and Ya.A. Komenskyi as "the main pedagogical epochs" that "really brought new and higher beginnings into the pedagogical world". In 1885, the same idea was repeated almost verbatim by N. Markov (1885), however, instead of Plato, he named Socrates (Markov, 1885). "Only such a person could do what Ushynskiy did – create an epoch in the history of Russian education" (Makkaveyskiy, 1896), wrote M. Makkaveyskiy in 1896 in his work on the pedagogical views of K. Ushynskiy. He also used the term "Lockean epoch", and in a comprehensive article on education among ancient Jews, the same scholar spoke of the "Mosaic epoch" (Makkaveyskiy, 1901). A researcher from Drohobych, Z. Kultys (1908) wrote about M. Bobzhynskiy as a man who, as the head of the Provincial School Council in Galicia, launched a new epoch in the history of local education. Galician educational historian V. Levitskiy (1925) called M. Shashkevych an epoch in the development of the Ukrainian folk school in the Habsburg state.

The Soviet historical science continued to use both old and new conventional approaches. For example, P. Turco (1936) used the traditional concept of the "Peter's epoch", and S. Zbanduto (1941), under the influence of new political and ideological realities, spoke of the "Stalinist epoch". There was also a segmentation of time by the categories of centuries, as L. Baik & B. Mityurov (1965) did regarding the 19th century. However, it should be emphasised once again that domestic educational historians working in the USSR mainly relied on the political and economic periodisation principles defined by the formation theory.

Time division: Confidence and doubts

The historical narratives analysis in the educational history has made it possible to document *the belief of many scholars that historical periods, stages and epochs actually existed in the past, and therefore the historian can discover them in the course of research*. In particular, M. Vladimirsky-Budanov (1874) in his work on public education in Russia from the 17th to the early 19th centuries (1874) wrote that the "historical course" of Russian public education makes it possible to present state and public measures in relation to it in the following historical sequence 1) communities and corporations were engaged in education in the 17th century, 2) social classes – in the first half of the 18th century, 3) the state – in the second half of the 18th century. According to his opinion, the past reality itself indicates the stages of public education development.

Similar views can be seen in the remark of N. Petrov (1985) about the "distinctive features of each epoch" of the Kyiv Academy. Obviously, he perceived epochs

as real fragments of the past. Therefore, the epoch was seen as a temporal phenomenon independent of historians' thinking, and researchers should only identify it, see the distinctive features of epochs and reflect them in the narrative.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, researchers in the educational history, possibly under the influence of neo-romanticism, began to understand the arbitrariness of the researcher's periodisation schematisation. For example, K. Kharlampovych (1898) saw two periods in the history of Western Russian schooling in the 16th – early 17th centuries, the boundary between which was the 1570s and 1580s. His words – "...we consider it quite convenient to divide it (the time under study – Author) into two parts" – show an understanding of the dependence of periodisation on the visions of the historian, who is "comfortable" with dividing time. In a review of A. Yablonovsky's work (1902), the scholar criticised the historiography periodisation of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy proposed by the Polish scholar, considering it too fragmented. In his opinion, it is too fatiguing for the reader and does not correspond to the "essence of the matter", because there is no reason to divide the first 60-70 years of the institution's existence into three periods, since there were no changes in the internal life of the collegium during this time. Although K. Harlampovych was well aware of the opinion of M. Petrov, who divided the life of the Kyiv Collegium in the second half of the 17th century into three time intervals.

The Soviet scholars' views on the periods and stages of development of education and pedagogy tended to recognise the reality of stage-like intervals in historical time. This was certainly prompted by the formation theory imposed on scientists and the authority of Marxists recognised in the USSR, who repeatedly wrote about past periods as if they had actually existed. Thus, P. Turco (1936), criticising the historical and pedagogical textbook by A. Pinkevych for the unclear chronological framing of the epoch of "pre-war imperialism", pointed to V. Lenin's opinion, according to which the beginning of imperialism was in 1900-1903.

Only during the period of de-Stalinisation were there attempts to take a different look at the periodisation of the history of school and pedagogy, to define its parameters, and to point out the variability of approaches to determining time periods. At the All-Union Meeting of Pedagogical Historians held at the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in 1957, the following periodisation of the history of public education, schooling and pedagogical science in the USSR was adopted: 1917-1920, 1921-1930, 1931-1941, 1941-1945, 1945-1957. It was reflected in the curriculum and textbooks on the history of pedagogy (1957-1966) (SAOR. F. R7401. Op. 1. Ref. 15. Pp. 25, n.d.). An interesting phenomenon in this regard was the discussion on the periodisation of the history of the Soviet school and pedagogy that took place in the journal "Soviet Pedagogy" in 1958-1959.

Although Ukrainian scholars almost did not participate in it (with the exception of V. Strumynskyi, who, however, worked in Moscow), one cannot deny its influence on the visions of researchers in Ukraine. It is worth noting that many materials on the topic of the discussion were sent to the editors of "Soviet Pedagogy" but were not published. The discussion generally focused on a number of issues: the principles and criteria of periodisation; the number of periods and their time frames; the names of periods; the connection between the periodisation of the history of the Soviet school and pedagogy and the periodisation of the history of society as a whole.

Conclusions

Consequently, Ukrainian historians who studied the educational history in the 40s of the 19th century – 80s of the 20th century were characterised by an understanding of the linearity of time, despite the fact that they were influenced by different historical conditions, philosophical ideas, doctrines (romanticism/neo-romanticism, positivism, Marxism, and others) and theoretical concepts. Hegel's three-phase scheme of history (Ancient World – Middle Ages – Modern Age) and later the formation theory developed by Marxists, which envisaged the changeability of social and historical formations, were crucial for their temporal visions and periodisation constructions.

The research has shown that domestic researchers of the educational history (educational policy, schooling, educational ideas, biographies of educational figures, and others) have for a long time used various terms to denote certain periods of time, but they were not always clearly structured and graded. The concept of "epoch" was often used not only to describe large-scale and long historical periods, but also rather short calendar units (for example, a year or a decade). The concept of "period" was expanded to include "epochs" or was considered equivalent to "epoch". The concepts of "stage", "era", and "phase" were used in the same unstable way. It was only in the 1950s and 1960s, in view of the broad scientific discussion on the periodisation of Soviet schooling and education, that the first consistent attempts to organise this terminological diversity appeared. The arbitrariness and instability of periodisation definitions testified to the lack of scientifically based approaches to "playing with time" in the historical narratives of Ukrainian scholars.

It has been found that domestic researchers used different criteria to formulate periodisations of the educational history, often constructing temporal and narrative schemes based on political, economic and cultural history. Already in the first works on the educational history (40s–50s of the 19th century), they linked certain periods of time to political events and legislative changes. Educational and pedagogical processes in such constructions were usually interpreted as structurally subordinate phenomena, and thus received at best the status of "phases" or "stages". However, there were exceptions, as some scholars (for example, M. Petrov, I. Krypiakivych,

S. Tomashivskyi) tried to go beyond exclusively political periodisation options and attempt to construct historical periods of certain educational phenomena (primarily institutions), taking into account pedagogical aspects such as changes in the content of education, the emergence of new academic disciplines, reformatting of teaching staff, and the like. Under the influence of Marxist doctrine and ideological postulates, Soviet scholars often combined the periodisation of educational phenomena based on political, economic and pedagogical factors, giving preference to the first two. A vivid illustration of this statement was the attempts of Soviet researchers to adapt to the educational history of the 19th and early 20th centuries the three-stage periodisation of the liberation movement in Russia formulated by V. Lenin. There were also cases of an extremely primitive reduction of the periodisation of the educational history to the five-year plans for the development of the national economy of the USSR.

The article records and highlights the manifestations in the works of domestic scholars of the educational history of the use of conventional periodisation models, resorting to the division of historical time into centuries or taking into account the years of the monarchs' reign or the activities of church leaders. Some scholars attached importance to the 16th, 18th, and 19th centuries in the educational history, while others linked educational periods to the reigns of Russian and Austrian (Austro-Hungarian) emperors. A manifestation of conventional periodisation was the recognition of a certain person's activity (for example, Plato, Ya.A. Komenskyi, K. Ushynskyi, O. Popovych) as an "epoch" in the educational history. It should be noted that conventional approaches to the formulation of periods were also included in Soviet historical science, so Ukrainian scholars who studied the educational history within the framework of Soviet scientific discourse sometimes resorted to segmenting time into categories of centuries.

It has been established that many Ukrainian scholars in their works on the educational history were convinced that historical periods (periods, stages, phases) actually existed in the past, and therefore directly or indirectly expressed confidence in the ability of historians to identify them. Initially, such ideas were formed under the influence of the positivist doctrine and its inherent belief in the historian's ability to establish the truth (including the "correct" and "accurate" periods and stages). Subsequently, these visions were determined by the dominance in the Soviet scientific discourse of the formation theory and the epistemic authority of Marxists recognised in the USSR, who repeatedly wrote about past periods as if they had actually existed. At the same time, in the works of Ukrainian scholars, there are also certain doubts about the reality of "periods" and "stages", which demonstrate an awareness of the dependence of periodisation schemes on the views of the researcher. Undoubtedly, such reflections were the result of the influence of neo-romantic views that gradually undermined

positivist postulates in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and their emergence in the Soviet era was determined by certain intellectual shifts in Ukrainian historical scholarship during the de-Stalinisation years.

A promising area for further research is to identify the temporal visions of Ukrainian researchers in other spheres of public life (economics, science, art, and others).

References

- [1] Abramovych, P. (1925-1926). To the history of the founding of the Volyn Institute of Public Education in Zhytomyr. *Notes of the Volyn Institute of Public Education named after Ivan Franko*, 1, 3-16.
- [2] Andriyashov, A. (1865). *Materials for the history of educational establishments of the Chernihiv Directorate from 1789 to 1832*. Kyiv: University Printing House.
- [3] Androhovych, A. (1919). Ivan Lavrovsky. One of the pioneers of the Ukrainian revival in Galicia (1773-1820). *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society*, 28, 51-120.
- [4] Androhovych, A. (1925). From the past Academic Gymnasium in Lviv. *Ukrainian School: Edition of the "Uchitelska Hromada" Magazine in Lviv, III (XXIV)*, 7-9 (49-51), 15-23.
- [5] Armitage, D. (2012). What's the big idea? Intellectual history and the longue durée. *History of European Ideas*, 38(4), 493-507. doi: 10.1080/01916599.2012.714635.
- [6] Arnautov, V.O. (1927). A brief outline of the history of the social movement in Ukraine. *Notes of the Kharkiv Institute of Public Education*, 2, 3-17.
- [7] Aron, R. (2005). *Introduction to the philosophy of history: Essay on the limits of historical objectivity*. Kyiv: Ukrainian Center of Spiritual Culture.
- [8] Bagaliy, D. (1904). *Experience in the history of Kharkiv University (based on unpublished materials). Volume 2 (from 1815 to 1835)*. Kharkiv: Parovaya Tipografiya i Litografiya M. Zylberberg and S-via.
- [9] Baik, L., & Mityurov, B. (1965). *The state of public education, schools and pedagogical thought in the western Ukrainian lands during the reign of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy (lectures on the history of pedagogy course for correspondence students)*. Drohobych: DDPI named after I.Ya. Franko.
- [10] Barsch, S., & Hubner, A. (2023). [Concepts of time in science education and history didactics: Towards an interdisciplinary approach to environmental history](#). In *Why history education?* (pp. 311-322). Frankfurt: Wochenschau Verlag.
- [11] Bohdashyna, O. (2010). *Positivism in historical science in Ukraine (60s of the 19th - 20s of the 20th century)*. Kharkiv: "Apostrophe".
- [12] Braudel, F. (1958). Histoire et Science sociales: La longue durée. *Annales ESC*, 4, 725-753.
- [13] Bulashev, G.O. (1894). From the history of parish schools in the Kyiv diocese. *Proceedings of the Kyiv Spiritual Academy*, 10, 205-247.
- [14] Bulgakov, M. (1843). *History of the Kyiv Academy*. St. Petersburg: Zhernakova.
- [15] Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv. (n.d.). *F. 1720: Gennady Evgenievich Zhurakovsky – professor of pedagogy, corresponding member of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR. Op. 1. Ref. 6: The work "Studies on the history of the bourgeois educational movement in Ukraine in the early 60s of the 19th century." Part II (1859-1863). Studies on the history of the Ukrainian educational movement from the time of the emergence of the old Kyiv community (typescript)*. Kyiv.
- [16] Chakraborty, S.R. (2024). "Longue Durée", "Conjoncture", "Event": Notion of plural time in history. Retrieved from http://www.mcrq.ac.in/IWM_Migration_2021/Abstracts_2021/Subhas%20Ranjan%20Chakrabarti.pdf.
- [17] Cherkasov, O.V. (2006). *The formation of the theoretical and conceptual foundations of the study of the history of education in Ukraine in the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries: The source science aspect*. Kyiv: NPU named after M.P. Drahomanova.
- [18] Collingwood, R.J. (1996). *The Idea of history*. Kyiv: Osnovy.
- [19] Corduba, M. (1895). *N. Mukhin. Kyiv-Bratskyi ochletsky monastery, historical essay, c., 1893; I. Kamanin. More about the antiquity of the brotherhood and school in Kyiv*. Lviv: Records of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.
- [20] Corfield, P.J. (2007). *Time and the shape of history*. New Haven: Publisher Yale University Press.
- [21] Dzeverin, O.G. (1957). Development of historical and pedagogical science in the Ukrainian SSR. In *Scientific notes of the Research Institute of Pedagogy of the Ukrainian SSR. Volume VI. Pedagogical series: Development of public education and pedagogical science in the Ukrainian SSR 1917-1957* (pp. 135-189). Kyiv: "Soviet School".
- [22] Ekström, A., & Bergwik, S. (Eds.). (2022). [Times of history, times of nature. Temporalization and the limits of modern knowledge](#). New York, Oxford: Berghahn.

Acknowledgements

Authors would like to express our gratitude to the Centre for East European Studies (Lviv) for their assistance in conducting the research.

Conflict of Interest

None.

- [23] Fryxell, A. (2019). Time and the modern: Current trends in the history of modern temporalities. *Past & Present*, 243(1), 285-298. doi: [10.1093/pastj/gtz012](https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz012).
- [24] Gómez Galán, J. (2015). [Historical and chronological time in education: A new theoretical framework](#). *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 11(5), 77-86.
- [25] Gulczyńska, Ju., Rébay, M., & Kasperová, D. (2023). History of education in Central and Eastern Europe: Past, present and future. *History of Education*, 52(2-3), 355-398. doi: [10.1080/0046760X.2023.2166597](https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2023.2166597).
- [26] Haliv, M. (2018). *Ukrainian historical and pedagogical narrative (mid XIX – late XX century): Epistemological principles*. Drohobych: RV DDPU named after I. Franko.
- [27] Haliv, M., & Ilnytskyi, V. (2021). The methods of internal criticism of written sources in the works of Ukrainian historians: on the example of scientific narratives on the history of education (1840s – 1930s). *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica*, 1(25), 281-297. doi: [10.29302/auash.2021.25.1.14](https://doi.org/10.29302/auash.2021.25.1.14).
- [28] Haliv, M., & Ilnytskyi, V. (2023). [Education between “class” and “nation”: The influence of the theory of class struggle on Ukrainian educational historiography \(1920s-1980s\)](#). *Echa Przeszłości*, 24(2), 123-139.
- [29] Hrushevskiy, O. (1907). Readings in the church-historical and archeological society at the Kyiv Theological Academy. *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society: A Scientific Journal Dedicated to the Forefront of Ukrainian History, Philology, Ethnography, Published in Lviv Every Two Months under the Editorship of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy*, 79(5), 236-237.
- [30] Ilnytskyi, V., & Haliv, M. (2022). Theoretical argumentation in the historical narrative of Ukraine of the second half of the 19th – first half of the 20th century (on the example of research in the history of education). *Eminak*, 3(39), 66-80. doi: [10.33782/eminak2022.3\(39\).591](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3(39).591).
- [31] Ivanytsa, G. (1926). To the Marxist methodology of the history of pedagogy (Problem of socio-genetic analysis). *Notes of the Kyiv Institute of Public Education*, 1, 9-21.
- [32] Jordheim, H. (2014). [Introduction: Multiple times and the work of synchronization](#). *History and Theory*, 53(4), 498-518.
- [33] Kharlampovych, K. (1898). *Western Russian Orthodox schools of the 16th and early 17th centuries, their relationship to pagans, religious education in them, and their merits in the defense of the Orthodox faith and the church*. Kazan: Typo-lithography of the Imperial University.
- [34] Kharlampovych, K. (1907). *Orthodox theological encyclopedia*. St. Petersburg.
- [35] Kharlampovych, K.V. (1899). Western Russian church brotherhoods and their enlightening activities in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. *Christian Reading*, 2, 372-390.
- [36] Kochubynsky, A. (1893). *John Amos Comenius in the historical destiny of his people*. Odesa: Type. Pieces Troops of the Odessa Military District.
- [37] Kolesnyk, I. (2000). *Ukrainian historiography: XVIII – beginning of XX centuries*. Kyiv: Geneza.
- [38] Korkushko, G. (1926). General education in pre-revolutionary Russia. *The path of education / Path of enlightenment: Pedagogic Journal*, 1(45), 1-8.
- [39] Kortti, Ju. (2022). Temporalities and theory in media history. *Media History*, 28(4), 1-13. doi: [10.1080/13688804.2021.1940906](https://doi.org/10.1080/13688804.2021.1940906).
- [40] Korzh, K. (1912). From the history of public education in Ukraine. *Light. Ukrainian Pedagogical Journal*, 9, 25-37.
- [41] Kozellek, R. (2005). *The past is the future. On the semantics of historical time*. Kyiv: Spirit and letter.
- [42] Krypiakievych, I. (1926). Lviv fraternal school of the 16th-17th centuries. On the occasion of the 340th anniversary of the foundation of 1586-1926. *Ukrainian School: Publication of the “Uchitel'ska Hromada” Magazine in Lviv*, 17-18(59-60), 1-10.
- [43] Kultys, Z. (1908). *Sprawozdanie direkcji c. k. gimnazjum w Drohobyczu za rok szkolny 1908*. Drohobycz.
- [44] Levitskyi, I.E. (1903). *A look at the development of lower and higher schooling in Galicia in 1772-1800 and the development of Russian-folk schooling in 1801-1820*. Lviv: Printing house of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.
- [45] Levitskyi, V. (1925). *History of education and training. Textbook for school and general use*. Lviv: New Ukrainian School Publishing House.
- [46] Linchevskii, M. (1870). Pedagogy of ancient brotherly schools and mainly ancient Kyiv Academy. *Proceedings of the Kyiv Theological Academy*, 7, 104-154.
- [47] Makkaveisky, N. (1895). Pedagogy of John Locke. *Proceedings of the Kyiv Theological Academy*, 5, 134-158.
- [48] Makkaveisky, N. (1896). *K.D. Ushinsky and his pedagogical ideas*. Kyiv: G.T. Korchak-Novitskago Typographi.
- [49] Makkaveisky, N. (1901). Education among old Jews. *Proceedings of the Kyiv Theological Academy*, 5, 117-142.
- [50] Makkaveisky, N. (1904). *Pedagogical dreams of Catherine the Great and Betskyi. From the history of education in Russia*. Kyiv: Typ. I.I. Gorbunova.
- [51] Manuscripts Institute of the National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadskyi. F. 95. Case. 36. (n.d.). *Vasyl Mykhailovych Domanytskyi. Essays on the history of elementary school. Vol. And until 1238, Vol. II from 1238 to 1569. 42 sheets*. Kyiv.

- [52] Manuscripts Institute of the National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadskyi. F. 127. Case. 31. (1879). *Archive of M.I. Lyleeva. Lyleev Mikhail Ivanovich. Course of lectures on the history of pedagogy Program on the history of pedagogy for students of Prince Bezborodko Historical and Philological Institute. 1908-1909 Autographs. 301 sheets.* Kyiv.
- [53] Markov, N. (1885). *Teacher of the new Christian world of the Slavs, Amos Comenius.* Chernihiv: Typography of the Provincial Board.
- [54] Martin, J., & Myers, K. (2023). "Timeless memories": Memory and temporality in histories of education. *History of Education*, 52(6), 991-999. doi: [10.1080/0046760X.2023.2256289](https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2023.2256289).
- [55] Mudrovic, M.I. (2014). [Time, history, and philosophy of history](#). *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, 8, 1-26.
- [56] Mykhnevich, I. (1843). *A historical view of the educational institutions of Novorossiya and Bessarabia.* Odesa: Gorodskaiia typografiia.
- [57] Nazarevsky, O. (1928). The anniversary of Kyiv University and the student uprisings of 1884. In M. Hrushevskyi. (Ed). In *A hundred years. Materials from the public and literary life of Ukraine in the 19th and early 20th centuries* (pp. 224-250). Kyiv.
- [58] Neumann, D. (2011). [In defense of memorization: The role of periodization in historical inquiry](#). *Social Education*, 75(4), 210-214.
- [59] Peshina, Y. (1929). Preschool education of children and its history. *Teacher. Uzhgorod*, Ch. 7-8, 226-229.
- [60] Petrov, M.I. (1919). Kyiv Academy (On the occasion of the past 300th anniversary of its existence). *Notes of the Historical and Philological Department of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*, 1, 3-17.
- [61] Petrov, N.I. (1895). *Kyiv Academy in the second half of the 17th century.* Kyiv: Typography G.T. Korchak-Novitskago.
- [62] Petrov, N.I. (1905). *Introduction. Acts and documents related to the history of the Kyiv Academy: Department II (1721-1795).* Kyiv: Typography I.I. Chokolova.
- [63] Phillips, R. (2023). The power of periodization. *OER Project Blog*. Retrieved from <https://community.oerproject.com/b/blog/posts/the-power-of-periodization>.
- [64] Popov, G. (1913). *Introduction to the history of European pedagogy. Adapted from F. Regener by H. Popov.* Kyiv: Typography of the Imperial University of St. Vladimir
- [65] Rodnikov, V. (1914). *History of Russian pedagogy.* Kyiv: N.Ya. Ogloblina
- [66] Rüsen, J. (2010). [New ways of historical thinking](#). Lviv: Chronicle.
- [67] Ryappo, Y. P. (1927). *Public education in Ukraine during ten years of the revolution.* Kharkiv: State Publishing House of Ukraine.
- [68] State archive of Odesa region (SAOR). F. R-7401. (n.d.). *Hrytsenko Mikhail Semenovych, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Odessa Pedagogical Institute named after K. D. Ushinsky. Op. 1. Ref. 6. Manuscript of the monograph "Essays on the history of school and pedagogy of the Ukrainian SSR (1917-1961)", 503 sheets.* Odesa.
- [69] State archive of Odesa region. F. R-7401. (n.d.). *Hrytsenko Mikhail Semenovych, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Odessa Pedagogical Institute named after K. D. Ushinsky. Op. 1. Ref. 15. Manuscript of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences "Development of the general education school in the Ukrainian SSR (1917-1967)", Volume I, 449 sheets.* Odesa.
- [70] Stearns, P.N. (1987). Periodization in world history teaching: Identifying the big changes. *The History Teacher*, 20(4), 561-580. doi: [10.2307/493757](https://doi.org/10.2307/493757).
- [71] Steinberg, O.Y. (2018). The unity of history and periods? The unique historical periodization of E.A. Freeman. *Modern Intellectual History*, 15(3), 651-679. doi: [10.1017/S1479244316000263](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1479244316000263).
- [72] Tomaszewski, S. (1905). An overview of the development of Brzeżański Gymnazyum (1789-1905). Part pierwsza. In *Sprawozdanie dyrekcyi c.k. Gimnazyum więzowego w Brzeżanach za rok szkolny 1905* (pp. 3-62). Brzeżany: Nakładem fundussu szkolnego.
- [73] Tomaszewski, S. (1906). An overview of the development of Brzeżański Gymnazyum (1789-1905). Part two. In *Sprawozdanie dyrekcyi c.k. Gimnazyum więzowego w Brzeżanach za rok szkolny 1906* (pp. 63-105). Brzeżany: Nakładem fundussu szkolnego.
- [74] Topolsky, E. (2012). *How we write and understand history: Secrets of historical narrative.* Kyiv: K.I.S.
- [75] Turco, P.A. (1936). The ancient world, the Middle Ages, the beginning of the new time. *Communist Education: Scientific and Pedagogical Journal*, 1-2, 135-139.
- [76] Vladimirsky-Budanov, M. (1874). *Public education in Russia in XVII century to the establishment of ministries (Prints from the Journal of the Ministry of National Education).* St. Petersburg: Typography V.S. Balasheva.
- [77] Vladimirsky-Budanov, M. F. (1884). *Fiftieth Imperial University of St. Vladimir. 1834-1884. Speech, pronounced at the jubilee act of the University.* Kyiv: Printing house of the Imperial University of St. Vladimir.
- [78] Yas, O. (2014). [Historian and style. Prominent figures of Ukrainian historiography in the light of cultural eras \(beginning of the 19th - 80s of the 20th century\), \(parts 1 and 2\)](#). Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine.

- [79] Yas, O. (2023). *On the breaks of historical time, or Temporal images of the modern Russian-Ukrainian war: A lecture*. Kyiv: National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Institute of History of Ukraine.
- [80] Yehorova, L. (1928). Development stages of Ukrainian children's literature in 10 years. *The Path of Education: Pedagogical Journal*, (2-3) (70-71), 14-24.
- [81] Yurkevych, P.D. (1870). Ideas and facts from the history of pedagogy. *Journal of the Ministry of National Education*, 1-42, 127-188.
- [82] Zaklinsky, R. (1904). About elementary schools from ancient times. *Teacher*, 20, 317-320.
- [83] Zbanduto, S.F. (1941). Pedagogical ideas of A.M. Gorky. *Proceedings of the Odessa State University. Collection of the Department of Pedagogy*, 2, 5-40.

Доба-період-епоха: темпоральні візії та періодизаційні конструкції у працях українських дослідників історії освіти (середина XIX – 80-ті рр. XX ст.)

Микола Галів

Доктор педагогічних наук, професор
Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка
82100, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7068-3124>

Василь Ільницький

Доктор історичних наук, професор
Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка
82100, вул. Івана Франка, 24, м. Дрогобич, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X>

Анотація. Актуальність роботи зумовлена відсутністю досліджень в українській та закордонній історіографічній науці темпоральних візій і періодизаційних конструкцій українських учених, які від 40-х рр. XIX до 80-х рр. XX ст. вивчали різноманітні аспекти історії освіти: освітню політику, систему шкільництва, просвітницькі рухи, педагогічні ідеї, біографії освітніх діячів тощо. Мета статті полягала у тому, щоб представити результати дослідження поглядів вітчизняних науковців на феномен історичного часу та виокремити характерні риси часових конструкцій, запроваджених до студій історії освіти. У процесі дослідження використано методи загальнонаукові (абстрагування, аналіз і синтез, індукція, дедукція, класифікація, узагальнення), міждисциплінарні (контекстуально-інтерпретаційний, лексико-семантичний та логіко-семантичний, критичний, структурно-системний) та спеціально-історичні (історико-генетичний, історико-порівняльний, історико-типологічний, історико-системний, періодизації, ретроспективний), які дали змогу комплексно, різноаспектно і репрезентивно з'ясувати погляди вітчизняних дослідників на феномен історичного часу та визначити апробовані ними ключові підходи до конструювання періодизації минулого у працях з історії освіти. У результаті дослідження встановлено такі характерні прояви часових конструкцій, запроваджених дослідниками до праць з історії освіти від середини XIX до кінця XX ст.: 1) відсутність чіткості вживання часових номінацій, що проявилось не лише в ототожненні понять «період», «доба», «етап», але і неконструктивній систематизації цих понять; 2) пов'язуванням часових проміжків розвитку школи та педагогічної думки до політичних, економічних і менше до культурно-освітніх подій; 3) початкове домінування конвенційних періодизаційних підходів (наприклад, поділ історії на століття чи часи правління чергових монархів), після яких утвердився теоретично-концептуальний принцип, що спирався на формаційну теорію; 4) наявність у більшості вчених переконаності у тому, що відрізки часу – періоди, етапи та епохи – насправді існували в минулому, а тому історик освіти може їх виявити в процесі дослідження і показати у науковому наративі

Ключові слова: історичний час; періодизація; історія освіти; наратив; українські історики