

## INTRODUCTION

The year 2020 turned out to be too special in the history of mankind. Living in a pandemic has once again brought to the fore the medical field and the figure of the physician, with whom, in addition to traditional utilitarian problems, today we associate broader issues, such as freedom and coercion, the boundaries of private and public, the balance between survival and development. A certain public inquiry is also directed to the historian. The history of medicine has been updated in relation to various parameters: from great changes and discoveries in medicine to the most important for the humanities social and ideological content of medicine. Issues of the medical environment, dialogue between doctor and patient, medicalization of the space, creation of pathological texts are relevant for research today. And the challenge to the humanities here is obvious.

It is very important that professional historiography, even outside social issues, has worked quite fruitfully in this area, the scientific relevance of which is undeniable. Therefore, the supply of historical and medical research

today is very large – it's academic journals<sup>1)</sup> and book series<sup>2)</sup>, special institutes at universities<sup>3)</sup>. It is significant that the only Ukrainian precedent also appeared and functioned similarly: the specialized historical and medical journal “Ahapit” from 1994 to 2004 was published under the auspices of the National Museum of Medicine of Ukraine<sup>4)</sup>.

---

<sup>1)</sup>*Journal of the History of Medicine and allied Sciences; Social History of Medicine; Medical History* (Cambridge); Iranian Research office for the History of the Persian Medicine publishes *The Journal of Research on History of Medicine*; Croatia has *Acta medico-historica Adriatica*. In Germany, *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* (Sudhoffs Archiv) is published, etc.

<sup>2)</sup>Cambridge University Press presents this series as *Cambridge Studies in the History of Medicine*, well-known Publishing house Routledge has been issuing History of Medicine series since 2015, the same series we have in Oxford University Press, Manchester University Press publishes *Social Histories of Medicine* edited by David Cantor. Known for its research in Central and Eastern Europe Central European University (Vienna-Budapest) (CEU) published *CEU Press Studies in History of Medicine* edited by Marius Turda etc.

<sup>3)</sup>In particular, Institut für Geschichte der Medizin at the University of Giessen Justus-Liebig, Institut für Ethik und Geschichte der Medizin at the University of Greiswald, Das Institut für Geschichte der Medizin und Ethik in der Medizin at the Charité Clinic in Berlin. Similar institutes exist at the universities of Dresden, Warzburg, Dusseldorf, Göttingen, Munich, and Bochum. These are practically transformed university departments at medical faculties.

<sup>4)</sup>See: *Ahapit: ukrainskyi istoryko-medychnyi zhurnal*. Kyiv, 1994–2004. (№1–15). A total of 15 issues (5 of them paired) of the journals were published. Unfortunately, the edition is now inconspicuous, and the texts are not freely available. Interestingly, at one time it was the only Ukrainian humanitarian journal indexed in Scopus, and in 15 years none of the 43 indexed articles received at least one citation in that database.

It should be noted that the specialization of research has led to a certain separation of such studies. A professional historian has often been left out of these challenges, leaving the history of medicine in the hands of physicians. This often led to the loss of social and cultural contexts. Today we can say with certainty about the existing methodological division in one case – these are the works by the researchers with a medical degree studying the history of medicine. Such texts mainly concern personalities, institutions, methods of treatment. The lack of historical education in their authors can significantly affect the interpretation of sources, hence the widespread reasoning about the “health care system” in Kievan Rus, etc<sup>5</sup>).

At the same time, in parallel, there is a “medical history” primarily of social orientation, which studies the spread of medicine as a means of control and change; acquisition of new social roles by medicine and growth in society; introduction of hygiene, pharmaceuticals and attention to the “body structure”. New challenges lead to “new rules” for writing texts. “New Historicism” has combined a medical certificate with a “classic work”, and the medical field is increasingly trying to see through literary texts.

---

<sup>5</sup>Even on Ukrainian material, there are more such publications than a historian could expect. Only one relevant index contains 1232 items of texts on the history of medicine published between 1992 and 2011. This is also a good opportunity to get an idea of the most researched issues. See: «Istoriia medytsyny ta okhorony zdorovia v Ukraini»: naukovo-dopomizhnyi pokazhchyk literatury. Chastyna 3 (1992–2011 rr.). Kyiv, 2012.

Looking at the Ukrainian historiography of medicine of the XVIII–XIX centuries (with its roots from the Soviet times), one can see a number of very important changes in the 60–70 s of the XX century. In this case it is necessary to recognize a rather significant historiographical heritage, which is represented by a number of works and activities of several rather bold in a number of statements and interpretations of sources of historians (Stepan Verkhratsky, Valentyn Otamanovsky, and Mykola Borodiy)<sup>6</sup>. But at its core, this area appears to be rather poor, not systematized enough and not evenly researched.

Obviously, due to the tendency to interdisciplinarity, the most significant changes should be expected from reading medical advice, handwritten collections of treat-

---

<sup>6</sup>Verhratskij S. Pervye gorodskie i uezdnye vrachi i pervye bol'nicy na Ukraine. *Ocherki istorii medicinskoj nauki i zdavoohraneniya na Ukraine*. Pod red. B. Petrova, V. Bratusya i K. Duplenko. Kiev: Gosudarstvennoe medicinskoe izdatel'stvo URSS, 1954. S. 130–150; Verkhratskyi S. Storinky istorii medytsyny na Ukraini. *Materialy do istorii rozvytku okhorony zdorovia na Ukraini*. Pid red. kand. med. nauk K. Duplenka. Kyiv, 1957. S. 15–57; Otamanovskij V. Reformy v Rechi Pospolitoj, napravlennye na sozdanie gosudarstvennoj sistemy zdavoohraneniya i ih znachenie dlya Pravoberezhnoj Ukrainy. *Sovetskoe zdavoohranenie*. 1959. № 7. S. 35–41; Otamanovskiy V. Pershi apteky na Ukraini. *Farmatsevtichnyi zhurnal*. 1960. №2. S. 60–68; Borodij N. Mediki na Ukraine v XVIII veke. *Sovetskoe zdavoohranenie*. 1980. № 9. S. 64–67; Borodii M. Arkhivni dzherela z istorii medytsyny na Livoberezhnii Ukraini u XVIII st. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 1981. № 9. S. 136–141; Borodii M. Do istorii borotby z chumoiu na Ukraini v XVIII st. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 1984. № 5. S. 82–90; Borodii M. Zarodzhennia medychnoi osvity na Ukraini (do 200-richchia). *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 1987. №10. S. 141–144.

ments, which are slowly becoming more visible to explain ideas about disease and healing<sup>7)</sup>. Another popular topic is the history of epidemics, which contributes to a broader interpretation of the emergence of inpatient care in the context of state initiatives, both in eastern Ukraine and on “both sides” of the Dnieper<sup>8)</sup>. Anti-plague research is designed to look at change, it operates in terms of success or failure, focuses on modernization, and brings to the fore the figure of an imperial official<sup>9)</sup>. Somewhere behind is another frozen world, “medical” ideas of which will be manifested as a side effect of the study of cases of magic, miraculous healings, expectations of worshippers<sup>10)</sup>. This is another example of the multiplicity of pos-

---

<sup>7)</sup>Dysa K. Porady pro reproduktsiui v medychnykh tekstakh u rannomodernii Ukraini. Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiiia. Istorychni nauky. Kyiv, 2019. T. 2. S. 74–84; Kostohryz K. Medychni poradnyky Hetmanshchyny v systemi vchenoi ta populiarnoi medytsyny. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zbirnyk*. Kyiv, 2017. Vyp. 19. S. 347–360.

<sup>8)</sup>See the analysis of the imperial policy on medicine in Oksana Mykhed's recently defended dissertation: Mykhed O. Not by Force Alone: Russian Incorporation of the Dnieper Borderland, 1762-1800. Doctoral dissertation. Harvard, 2014. Chapter 4. Public Health and the Establishment of Russian Rule in the Russo-Polish Borderland, 1762–85. P. 212–277.

<sup>9)</sup>See for details: Shandra V., Karlina O. Epidemii ta borotba z nymy v Ukraini (kinets XVIII – pochatok XX st.). *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*. 2020. № 5. S. 37–54; Podhorna A. «Dytiacha chuma»: vispa v Yevropi XVI–XVIII st. ta pershi sproby borotby z neiu na Poltavshchyni. *Sumska starovyna*. Vyp. LIV. Sumy, 2019. S. 10–12.

<sup>10)</sup>See, for example: Kizlova A. Viddzerkalennia ochikuvan bohomołtsiv u yikhnikh darakh do sviatyn Kyieva (kinets XVIII – kinets XIX st.). *Proseminarii. Mediievistyka, istoriia Tserkvy, nauky ta*

sible interpretations and the effectiveness of an interdisciplinary approach.

In the context of interdisciplinarity, it is also worth acknowledging the intrusions of “anthropology” and ethnography, which seek to study the phenomena of “folk medicine” with common examples from the past. These materials and generalized works on the history of “folk ideas”<sup>11)</sup> are essentially an important guide for historians to cross the boundaries between the humanities and the need for more diverse methodologies.

The listed above gives optimism to hope that in the nearest future the history of medicine will occupy an important place in the interdisciplinary studies of Ukrainian history. At least there are all the grounds for this, along with existing precedents and role models. This publication is an attempt to ask some questions, which are not

---

*kultury*. Vyp. 7. Kyiv, 2008. S. 299–307; Kizlova A. Molebni ta khresni khody z moshchamy sviatykh i chudotvornymy ikonamy pid chas epidemii u Kyievi XVIII–XIX st. *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho universytetu*: zb. nauk. pr. Chernivtsi: ChNU, 2012. Vyp. 590/591: Istoriiia. Politychni nauky. Mizhnarodni vidnosyny. S. 240–244; Yakovenko N. Tvorennia lokalnykh «prostoriv viry»: topohrafiia i sotsialna stratyhrafiia palomnytstv v Ukraini XVIII stolittia (za knyhamy chud Pochavskoi ta Okhtyrskoi bohorodychnykh ikon). *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*. Tom CCLXXI. Lviv, 2018. S. 209–230.

<sup>11)</sup>Boriak O. *Baba-povytyukha v kulturno-istorychnii tradytsii ukrainsiv: mizh profannym i sakralnym*. Kyiv, 2009; Maierchuk M. *Rytual i tilo. Strukturno-semantychnyi analiz ukrainskykh obriadiv rodyynnoho tsyklu*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2011; Ihnatenko I. *Narodna medytsyna ukrainsiv Serednoho Polissia: tradytsii ta suchasnist (na polovykh etnohrafichnykh materialakh)*. Kamianets-Podilskyi: «Medobory–2006», 2013.

always completed with answers. However, these aspects are united territorially, they relate primarily to the imperial medical initiatives in “under-Russia” Ukraine. The locality of the problems raised is supplemented by certain chronological vagueness, regional peculiarities, and, finally, the heterogeneity of imperial practices. On the other hand, in all the considered plots, medicine, along with the ideologues of salvation, appears as one of the important means of control, part of the discourse of power in certain areas. In this book, despite the significant gaps, this is quite clear.

We consider another important aspect that the medical factor allows to “stitch” the history of the XVIII and XIX centuries, the history of the Hetmanate (and other areas) and the Ukrainian provinces with their features and heritage. This is a very interesting era with the co-existence of “new” scientific knowledge and traditional religious worldview, which is especially noticeable in terms of the history of medicine. Yes, one of the topics of this issue is devoted to the first attempts at vaccination. We see a surprising paradox when technologies could have successfully prevented smallpox in the early 19th century, but the unpopularity of vaccination made it impossible to make significant progress in fighting the disease for hundreds of years. New medical knowledge alone is not able to “disenchant” the world. This is well illustrated by today’s argument in discussions about the (in)expediency of vaccinations – here traditional culture often dominates over the “scientistific”, partly regardless of education or social status, which can also be interpre-

ted in terms of *longue duree*. Thus, the title of this book is a paraphrase of Max Weber's famous metaphor of "disenchantment of the world" with "intellectualization and rationalization inherent to our era"<sup>12</sup>). In our case, it is a question of deprivation of faith in miraculous healing, new interpretations of the disease, the beginnings of medicine as a social institution with control and dominance. However, as, in fact, everywhere, we will see a great coexistence of rationalization and old traditional views. In many ways, it is the core that unites the parts of this work.

It should be noted that this publication was planned before the outbreak of the epidemic and was seen as an attempt to study both by doctors of sciences and young researchers, combining social and imperial history with the history of medical practices. It was planned to focus primarily on women and children as objects and subjects of medicalization. In part, this has succeeded, particularly in stories about Siamese twins, obstetrics and smallpox. On the other hand, we are talking about a totally patriarchal society with the appropriate specificity of sources and activity of men in any field. Therefore, all the texts (of different scope and approaches) still seek to show the great complexity of the emergence of what is now considered constant and familiar – the medical system.

Obviously, some plots of the book will seem to our colleagues too descriptive and ascertaining. At this stage,

---

<sup>12</sup>See rather inaccurate translation into Ukrainian of "disenchantment of the world": Veber M. Pro vnutrishnie poklykannia do nauky. *Veber M. Sotsioloheia. Zahalnoistorychni analizy. Polityka*. Kyiv: Osnovy, 1998. S. 336.

we did not seek conceptualization. We see the main purpose of the publication in reviving interest in the history of medicine on Ukrainian material, intensifying relevant discussions and research. The field for activity here is too large and unfilled. Among other things, with regard to the territories (including the former ones) of the Hetmanate or Slobozhanshchyna, the history of pharmaceuticals is still to be studied, with rather unexplored but important precedents of pharmacies in Kyiv, Lubny and Kharkiv in the XVIII century. Another potentially interesting issue is the military advance of the empire, which brings systematic and controlled (albeit with reservations) medical care. The Russo-Turkish war of 1734–1739 not only led to the territorial gains and an epidemic, but also to the emergence of inpatients first in Kharkiv and later in the hetman's capital Hlukhiv. And here it may turn out that according to the rules of medicine and pharmacy, Kyiv was significantly ahead of other cities in this area, which is again explained by the political parameters of the city with special status and the most important size. Therefore, the state of medicine helps to explain certain parameters of the city's existence, and later, probably, will become one of the markers of urban space. Similarly, medicine is often an example of intercultural contacts. Apparently, the first newest (in civil font) printed book on medicine in Ukraine was written in Yiddish and published in a Jewish private printing house<sup>13)</sup>. After all, we

---

<sup>13)</sup>This is a book by Moshe Marcuse «Ozer Yisrael», published in Poritsk (Volyn) in 1790. The only analysis of this work: Sharafanenko O. *Likarska knyha Moshe Markuze «Ozer Israel»:*

are talking about time and space, where the importance of the Church cannot be ignored, or whether new medical “knowledge” and traditional church practices regarding healing or avoiding illness can be substantially contrasted. The period of XVIII–XIX centuries is the time when quite strict and effective sanitary measures were taken to save from the epidemic, but at the same time there were processions and prayers for the same purpose. It should be assumed that the regular participants in both “procedures” could well be the same figures, and it remains to be seen what they considered a more effective way to “*disenchant the disease*”.

VOLODYMYR MASLIYCHUK,  
IGOR SERDIUK