INTRODUCTION

For understanding idiosyncrasies of the Ukrainian sculpture of the 20th century, which may be deemed as the most vivid and fertile period in terms of novel ideas and discoveries, it is worth outlining its history in brief. The development of the Ukrainian art during many centuries is not characterized by the monolithic continuity as compared to many other European countries. The main reason for this is the non-contiguosness of the state institution in Ukraine and of the economic upsurge, which serves as one of the insurances of fruitful development of art in general.

Church and religious system in the most of European countries became the main instigator and the ideological center of influence in the process of formation of artworks and was a considerable mover of cultural development. However, if in the Catholic countries, sculpture in the round was the key artistic tool in the religious sphere, the Orthodox (Byzantine) Christian tradition in Ukraine (starting from Kyivan Rus of the 9-13 centuries as a period of the biggest upsurge in the Ukrainian history) directed the artistic expression into the two-dimensional depictive space - first of all, icons, fresco paintings, mural decorations, mosaics etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Sculpture had an opportunity to express itself mainly in flat stone reliefs and wooden work of plastic arts. Alternatively, according to the researcher B. Pevnyi, sculpture in the round did not have corresponding conditions for developing for a long period up until the end of the 18th century, when under the influence of the Catholicism in the west and the Petersburg academyism in the east, it started being actively used not only for the decorative purposes in architecture, but also as a self-existent art form. In equal measure, we can assume that that was the absence of the great tradition of the Ukrainian sculpture in the round that incited Alexander Archipenko to search for his own models of archetypes in the legacy of pre-Christian art, which on the territory of Ukraine dates back to ancient times - the Paleolithic age, the works of the Mezine man site, terracotta figurines of Trypillia, stone “steppe-babas”, embossed embellishments of the Scythians and Sarmatians (PEVNYI, 2005), as well as in the polychromy of the sacred works of art.

Ukrainian sculpture on the cusp of the 19th and 20th centuries (through the prism of Alexander Archipenko’s work)

In this context it is fair to say that it is the creative work of Alexander Archipenko that most prominently marks the transition of the Ukrainian sculpture on the cusp of the 19th and 20th centuries. The artist absorbed and materialized a great deal of artistic tools: the sculpture in realistic and cubicistic interpretations, painting, polychromy of three-dimensional forms, modern materials, engineering, handling the illusion of positive and negative space in sculpture, theoretical and philosophical researches, in which he proved the logic nature of his artifices. Archipenko managed to create a multitudinary and provocative, at that time, plastic language as a result of tight connection with multicultural context of the Western Europe and the USA, where he spent the most of his life.

A certain connection of the high development of painting, mosaics and painting of icons since the times of the Kyivan Rus are outlined, to explain that these were the Ukrainian artists of the beginning of the 20th century that rose to prominence by active usage of color in sculpture.
As M. Protas, an art critic, states, the departure from the Renaissance paradigm in the direction of abstract vision of “biocosmic” depths of symbolic and generalized forms preconditioned the turning of artists to color as to an additional emotional, musical and impressional element of artistic structure, which disestablished a superannuated academic scheme. Modernism, correlating with symbolism, enhances the attention to the mystical, emotional and mental inner life of a personality, translating into the authorly and subjective vision of topic and a manner of plastic expression (PROTAS, 2006).

Early polychrome dimensional compositions of A. Archipenko “Medrano I” (1912), “Carrousel Pierrot” (1913), and later artworks “Vertical figure” (1935), “Architectural figure” (1950) etc. clearly demonstrate the artist's practices, in which he unites the plasticity of shape with colorful spots. For the artist, a new colorful sculpture was a new technique and a new esthetics that combines color with shape, their intertwining, mixing, domination of color over shape or vice versa, their harmony, contrast or rhythm, which in their aggregate gave an extended range of artistic tools.

We can see that all of Archipenko's multicolor artworks, be it relief or dimensional, complement his conviction that nature not only does not separate the shape from the color, but also unites them in an endless number of variations. This unification enhances the abstract expressivity of the oeuvres of the artist, helping to express the spiritual and the symbolic. M. Protas states that the Renaissance scheme, which was transformed by the modernism, made abstract by the impressionism, and introduced into the fourth artistic dimension by avant-gardism, was enriched by Archipenko's idealistic idea of “cosmic dynamism”, which became central in the philosophical and plastic views of the sculptor (PROTAS, 2006).

Sinewy artistic style of A. Archipenko presents itself in the use of concave and convex shapes, with the help of which he exploited the illusion of light and shadow. The deconstruction of the natural shape arose from the inversion of positive and negative elements. This interpretation of dimensions runs through all the directions of his oeuvre – from the sculpture in the round, among which “The Statue” (1916), “Geometric Sitting Woman” (1920), “Glorification of Beauty” (1925), to “sculpto-painting” and reliefs. The compositions “Sitting Figure” (1947) and “Looking forward” (1947) were created from a modern as of that time material – plexiglass – inside of which an electric light was installed.

A. Archipenko made an empty space around the sculpture (or a via opening in it) as an important compositional element as the physical and material shapes of it. From that moment on they became tantamount. The artist uses empty spaces instead of a real artwork in the oeuvres “Walking Woman” (1914-1915), “Woman combing her hair” (1915), “Statue” (1915) etc. This approach influenced the means of interconnection of space and sculpture during the following decades to a great extent.

In the art of different periods, with the advent of new technical devices, a lot of artists researched the issue of movement, in particular, E. Muybridge – in photography, the Italian futurists – first and foremost, in painting, thus declaring a new cultural value. Avant-garde searching, concentrated on the fixation of the idea of movement, was started by Archipenko in the sculptures “Carrousel Pierrot” (1913) and “Medrano” (1913-1914), but had a much more radical continuation in the created by him machine “Archipenture” (1927), through which he led out the dynamism from the sphere of illusiveness and symbolic visualization into the sphere of the material and physical. The mechanical apparatus made of metal consisted of 110 tapestries with images, that rotated and formed in their entirety a new, constantly changing planar composition. The “kinetic painting” was created, which embodied the conviction of Archipenko that the world existed in a constant movement and all the elements in it were interconnected. The artist's invention was radical for the artistic world, since it was a unique amalgamation of painting, time and space. “Archipenture” is one of the most indefectible forms of the modern art, since here the author managed to fully plunge into the problem of dynamism, which till that time remained unsolved in the static painting (ARCHIPENKO, 1960).

**Features of Ukrainian sculpture in the first half of the 20th century**

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Ukrainian sculpture transforms as a result of the shift in the artistic mentality. Innovations occurred on many levels of deep geographic and cultural split of the country, divided between different state and political systems, in the conditions of
the rigid competition of artistic groups, artistic and stylistic platforms of modernistic and realistic trends and the pro-revolutionary avant-garde (PROTAS, 2006). One of the key creators of constructivism, Volodymyr Tatlin (who, according to some sources, was born in Kharkiv and for a long time studied and worked in Odessa and Kyiv), was also hovered up by the idea of combining art and technological inventions. The helicoid “Model of the Monument to the Third International” (1919-1920), a true embodiment of the ideas of avant-garde and constructivism, was a symbol of infinitude, constant movement upwards and cyclical reinvention. The artist developed a prototype of a flying vehicle “Letatlin” (1929-1932), which, as well as the inventions of Archipenko, declared the equality of space and shape, flowing from one into another. Ideas of introduction of color in shape and space are present in V. Tatlin’s “Pictorial relief” (1915-1916).

In this context, it is worth recalling the experiments of Volodymyr Baranov-Rossine (born in Kherson, and spent most of his life in France), who invented and patented an “Optophonic piano” (1916) - a device that combined the playback of music with visual projection of over three thousand colors. Already at the beginning of the 20th century, the artist concentrated on the search of the tools of interactive art, which would become developed and popular only at the end of the century. Thus, the first in the world music and light show was held. The artist also wipes out the clear delineation of art forms and integrates color in the oeuvres “Rhythm” (1915), “Symphony” (1914), “Polytechnic sculpture” (1930-s) etc. This is the period when sculpture starts to depart from the traditional three-dimensionality of the human body for the sake of the spatial feeling and researching of time and movement. Moreover, a number of artists, such as Vasyl Yermylov (who mainly worked in painting), embodied the motto of the European functionalism and minimalism “less is more” already during the 1920-s: sculptural reliefs “portrait” (1923), “Male portrait” (1923), “Experimental composition with natural things” (1920-s) were marked with uttermost laconism and purism. The artist used a radically geometrized visual language, color, combination of lustrous and light-absorbing materials, avoided truistic psychologism and concentrated on the architectonics of shapes - all this brought the artwork of V. Yermylov closer to the sphere of design.

Starting from 1918 the Lenin’s “Plan of Monumental Propaganda”, with the help of which the government aimed at strengthening their political ideas, started to be implemented. Ivan Kavaleridze is one of few sculptors who managed to integrate the uttermost cubism interpretations of the depicted figures while creating monuments - we are referring to the monument to Artem in Bakhmut (1923), the monument to T. Shevchenko in Poltava (1925), and the monument to Artem in Sviatohirsk (1927). This is a unique example, since these are the monuments of a truly avant-garde trend in the Ukrainian sculpture of that period, and, as M. Protas states, the searches for the synthesis of arts often produced unexpected solutions. However, the gigantomania of totalitarian state that monopolized and resymbolized the invention of avant-gardists already manifested itself in the works of monumental propaganda. The advantage belongs to the ensemble monuments and not to intimate ones (PROTAS, 2006).

At the end of 1920-s, the Soviet regime stopped showing interest in avant-gardism, and later on totally prohibited free artistic experiments, focusing instead on monumental art. Sculpture in this context started to play one of the key roles, since it was a forceful tool of ideological propaganda. Correspondingly, the life conditions of artists in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic were poles apart from those in the democratic countries of the world. Political closure, totalitarian regime control of the creative activities in the sphere of culture, including control over sculptors, kept the Ukrainian artists in the ideologically conservative medium. The real facts of the artistic process of that time were the existence of generally accepted schemes and patterns of shape and image-creation, and the individualistic creative thinking was alien to the official Soviet art and in a variety of different ways stood condemned and was rooted out. According to O. Holubets, avant-garde trends of the first quarter of the 20th century were based on total freedom, dynamic, grassroots show of social protest, and in this it was a far cry from socialist realism, which was the incarnation of the global state policy, the expression of servitude, total coercion, an environment, in which defiance and demonstration of your artistic convictions posed direct risk to your life (HOLUBETS, 2012).
About Ukrainian sculpture in the second half of the 20th century

Considerable part of works did not suggest any novel and original solutions in terms of shape, embodying to a great extent a cold academic correctness and demonstrating the cult of a trained physical body. The Soviet artistic critique urged artists to turn to the legacy of antiquity, which was widely discussed, was topical but was beheld from the perspective of party ideology. Nevertheless, we deem it inexpedient to phrase a monosemous statement that the Ukrainian sculpture of that period zeroed in on ideological and plastic primitivization. Historical and political conditions of every society pose their limits and challenges, within which artists react in a present in them manner, using or generating such a system of artistic expression, which resonates with the philosophical time and space tendencies the most. The oeuvres of such artists as V. Boroday (HOLUBETS, 2012), V. Borysenko (HOLUBETS, 2012), T. Bryzh (HOLUBETS, 2012), Ye. Dzyndra (PROTAS, 2006), V. Znoba (PROTAS, 2006), D. Krvavych (PROTAS, 2006), A. Kushch (PROTAS, 2006), M. Lysenko (PROTAS, 2006), S. Lvtvyenko (PROTAS, 2006), E. Mysko (PROTAS, 2006), I. Severa (PROTAS, 2006), V. Sydur (HOLUBETS, 2012), and others were notable for the intense search for the tools of artistic expression. The historical period, with the exception of “mental thawing” of the end of 1950-s - beginning of 1960-s and the second half 1980-s, marked by an eventful social and political movement for the independence of Ukraine, falls upon the years of Stalinism and stagnation, when a free artistic thought was determined by the dictate of the official ideology. But despite this, a number of artists, who came on the verge of 1950-s - 1960-s, provided a solid basis for the creative evolution of sculpture for the future generations.

In this context, it is appropriate to highlight the creative work of Teodoziya Bryzh (Lviv city), who turns to plastic searches related to cubist and modernist plastic solutions of the early 20th century, to a more subjective way of transforming shapes than many other sculptors of the period and life environment of the artist. The works that most clearly characterize the sculptor’s style and plastic thinking are the compositions "Icarus" (1972), "Archer" (1976), the decorative and park works "Two" (1967), and the monument to the artist L. Levitskyi (1974), in which geometrized wings in the shape of two letters "L" intertwine and form a sinewed spatial abstract object.

At the same time, the works of Vadym Sydur (born in Dnipro city) can be considered particularly bold. The sculptor, having passed through the mill of the World War II, embodies dramatic human images, and any and all works of the artist can be attributed to architectonic sculpture with a higher degree of generalization. This is observed in his works "After the War" (1962), “Sorrow Formula” (1972), and "Wailing" (1979). Works of plastic art of V. Sydur are rough, brutal, as if the author intended to preserve the primary image of ragged elements of industrial origin. The artist’s non-conformism manifests itself in avant-garde installations, true assemblages such as "Modern Crucifixion" (1975), which explained the fact of the rejection of the artist by the official artistic line of the Soviet Union.

The art of Ukrainian artists, which developed outside of Ukraine in the second half of the 20th century, had no restrictions of a single official style like socialist realism or naturalism. That is why Ukrainian sculptors, the most famous of whom are I. Bukoyemska (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), M. Dzyndra (MYSIUA, 2001), P. Kolisnyk (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), R. Kostyniuk (YATSIV, 2014), H. Kruk (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), K. Milonadis (KACHUROVSKYI, 1973), L. Molodozhanyn (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), A. Pereyma (FEDORUK, 1996), M. Chereshnovskyi (PEVNYI, 2005), and M. Urban (KACHUROVSKYI, 1973) had the opportunity to incarnate creative ideas in accordance with individual preferences. The life and culture of a people constitute a unity in spite of temporal or territorial distances, according to S. Hordynskyi: “The life of a nation must at all times be wholesome and not recognize ruptures – if any ruptures appear, the nation itself produces the necessary forces to fill those ruptures. Therefore, the artistic process in emigration is quite natural and expectable; everything incapable of life and artificial will come off, but what remains will become an organic component of the Ukrainian culture” (BEREHOVSKA, 2015).
Trends of Ukrainian artists in exile

In the 20th century, there were three waves of emigration from Ukraine – a multitude of artists left, who integrated themselves into the development of Western art and created new avant-garde trends. We observe a combination of classicist methods of shape-creating with various modifications of Modernist and Post-Modernist plastic thinking. The borders of the stylistic and plastic and conceptual language of sculpture were very wide: from realistic expressionism and sophisticated naturalism – H. Krü (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), L. Molodozhany (STELMASHCHUK, 2013), M. Chereshniiovsky (PEVNYI, 2005), etc.) to radical abstractionism (above named A. Archipenko (ARCHIPENKO, 1960), as well as K. Milonadis (KACHUROVSKYI, 1973), M. Urban (MARTIN, 1973), A. Pereyma (FEDORUK, 1996), M. Dzyndra (MYSIUA, 2001), R. Kostyniuk (YATSIV, 2014) etc..

These are the creations of such artists as Mykhailo Urban that are of especial interest. The sculptor was born in Galicia (Western Ukraine) in 1928 and, after leaving for the United States, spent most of his life in Chicago. At first, he was engaged in painting and only later switched to abstract sculpture. That is why he was able to synthesize these two types of art so effectively – color and volumetric shape. Among the most important works of the artist are “White relief” (1968), “Election Dream” (1967-1968), “Pulsing Shape” (1969), “Parallel Counterpoint” (1971), “Structure with Three Negative Rectangles” (1972), which are mostly made of wood and metal (MARTIN, 1973). In the sculpture work of M. Urban, a close connection with the trends of American minimal art of the 1960s and 1970s can be traced, where geometric horizontal and vertical shapes are contraposed. The artist’s plastic interest is focused on the architectonics of monumental forms, their consolidation and integrity. Urban does not limit himself to the shape of the sculpture, but uses formal geometric volumes, dissected by colored planes, from which the symbolism of the images arises. In these laconic patterns, the spirit of the Ukrainian origins of the sculptor is apprehended (KACHUROVSKYI, 1973).

With regard to the work of Kostiantyn Milonadis, who was born in Poltava (1926) and migrated to Chicago, USA, in 1951, one of the main tasks of the artist became studying the movement and dynamics with the help of sculpture tools, which 40 years after the “Archipenture” and “Letatlin” reinterpreted the problems of kinetics. The artist’s works embody the spirit of the era, in which technology and industrialization are integrated into all walks of life. Researcher V. Kachurovskyi notes that in the history of art, there were facts of involvement of moving elements into artworks, but it was in the 20th century that artists took up the issue of movement as an aesthetic element consciously and profoundly and led it to its successful implementation in artistic creation. Dynamism, instead of antecedent stability, has become the main characteristic of contemporary sculpture (KACHUROVSKYI, 1973). Each kinetic sculpture, including “Wave Conqueror” (1964), “Kinetic Construction 2” (1978), “Construction of Springs No.7” (1978), “Kinetic Construction” (1979), and “Untitled” (1981), resonates with the environment because it is sensitive to the slightest vibrations. To some extent, the works by K. Milonadis are conceptually related to the “Mobiles” series of abstract kinetic sculpture of an American artist A. Calder. According to O. Fedoruk, the principles of dynamism determine the main criteria for the existence of kinetic sculpture, which abnegates its understanding as a static volume in space. The shaped mass was replaced by lines of moving structures; material mass was superseded by and reduced to minimalism of the elementary plane or line (FEDORUK, 1996).

With regard to the work of Aka Pereyma, who graduated from an art school in the USA, the influence of Ukrainian folklore and ornament of Easter eggs can be traced. Monolithic artist’s compositions are characterized by radical geometrization of volumes, and, according to O. Fedoruk, “their abstract and somewhat locally emphasized cubic shapes demonstrate vigour, steadiness, and affirm the static spaciousness of an object in space. The plastic arts, which organically combine flatness and volume with a smooth texture enhance a sense of stability, and a confident arrangement of rhythms” (FEDORUK, 1996). The sculpture of A. Pereyma “Slave” (1967) can be clearly classified as belonging to a category of assemblage, where by means of electric welding it combines household items (chains, rakes, shovels, nails etc.) to create an experssional dramatic image. The works “Two” (1973), “Untitled” (1973), “Cut out Circle” (1974) can be described as installations, formally minimalistic abstract sculptures with the use of color.
Mykhailo Dzyndra began his active creative life when he migrated through Western Europe to the United States in 1944. The artist is a striking representative of the abstract art and has created hundreds of sculptures throughout his life, more than 800 of which he brought to Ukraine in the 1990s into a museum that he built at his own expense. His artworks are characterized by a bold search for compositions that combine sinewy form, clear silhouette, bright color, diverse textures and lace-work. With his work, M. Dzyndra affirms freedom from academic cannons, and maximally departs from the realistic image. "Red Abstract" (1969-1973), "Frightened Soldier" (1970-1971), "Bent Forms" (1976), "Monumental Sculpture" (1976), and "Dance" (1977) are biomorphic sculptures that combine the qualities of architectonics, simplicity, laconism and minimal expression, and clearly reflect the artistic philosophy of the sculptor. The aforementioned and other Ukrainian abstraction artists have radically broken with previous ideas of a direct reflection of reality, using instead a subjective shape-creating analysis of the human body and space (MYSIUHA, 2001).

Conceptual rise in the sculpture of modernism at the beginning of Ukrainian independence

If to analyze the last decade of the 20th century, the emergence of Ukraine as an independent state in 1991 was the decisive factor, which led to dramatic transformations, including those in cultural life. First of all, there was the elimination of the artificial political and territorial, as well as of the cultural isolation of Ukraine from the world, and the opening of borders for artistic exchange and dialogue. The researcher Y. Onukh notes that "at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, there was nothing that happened in the global and in the Ukrainian art that could be called a border line. Since 1991, we have witnessed, first and foremost, the slow changes in social and, at the same time, artistic consciousness. We had to live and work in reality with a special emphasis on the prefix "post" - in the post-Soviet reality, the post-industrial or post-modern reality. And on this sharp bend we need to look for the most important and interesting impetuses for further reflection" (KADAN, ONUKH, STOROZHENKO, 2005).

The conscious commitment to conceptual leap did not lead young sculptors to a radical departure from academic realism, on the traditions of which they were brought up within the walls of the Ukrainian academies of arts. Sculpture develops unevenly - it is characterized by multi-vector artistic practices that are amalgamated into new forms. At the same time, widely different ways of creation, from the pragmatist and media forms of creation, which in their search for the topical definitively try to distance themselves from the usual models and schemes to the classical and traditional forms of expression, which persist, advancing the aesthetic values of harmony, beauty and the sublime.

It is worth mentioning some of the most generational Ukrainian sculptors, who emerged during this period (after 1991). They are P. Antyp (PROTAS, 2006), M. Bilyk (PROTAS, 2006), O. Dyachenko (PROTAS, 2006), L. Kozlov (PROTAS, 2006), M. Malysko (HOLUBETS, 2012), Ya. Motyka (PROTAS, 2006), V. Oderkivskyi (born in 1955) (PROTAS, 2006), O. Pinchuk (PROTAS, 2006), V. Tatarskyi (PROTAS, 2006), L. Yaremchuk (PROTAS, 2006) and others. The artists, taking their conceptual rise in the sculpture of modernism, try to find new forms in the range from figurative interpretation with realistic or more subjectified form to installations with minimalistic means of expression, and to gradually affirm a new vision of the world through the lens of the Ukrainian culture. Since the late 1980s, numerous open-air symposia, primarily monumental and decorative stone sculptures, have helped to renew and intensify the conceptual search of artists. At the same time, according to M. Protas, in the 1990s, the type of symbolic monument, implemented by purely sculptural means of expression in fusion with architectural elements, continued to develop (PROTAS, 2006). Thus, we see that the new decade demonstrates the affirmation of renewed individual and authorial creative expression in the Ukrainian sculpture.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to analyze in its entirety the phenomenon of the Ukrainian sculpture of the 20th century, in which the examples of radically contraposed artistic paradigms and ideological directions are discernible: from the artifacts of modernism and avant-garde to the sculpture of the Soviet totalitarian environment. The analysis of the main examples was concluded with the creativity of the artists of already independent Ukraine, which is
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characterized by a clearly pronounced movement of integration with the West, and accordingly, the artistic space defined the culturally Western vector of development.

In summary, it is worth noting that the Ukrainian artists are contributing to the initiation of innovative ideological and plastic concepts in sculpture in the 20th century. This applies to the works of modernism and avant-garde: cubism, constructivism, abstract art, polychrome and kinetic sculpture, as well as postmodern practices, minimalist art, installation and assemblage. Not only did the avant-garde project give rise to a new conceptual thinking, it in essence wiped out the boundary between different types of art: sculpture, architecture, painting (and, somewhere, music) acquired a new manifestation, complementing each other.

We see that the integrity of the phenomenon of the Ukrainian art and sculpture has been challenged by different political systems and countries: artists lived and worked in Ukraine within the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Ukrainian People’s Republic, the USSR, as well as in the USA, Canada and Western European countries. However, despite the division into mainland art and diaspora art, Ukrainian sculpture is a wholesome cultural phenomenon, the evolution of which lasted and continues to last in inseparable unity with the world art.

The evolution of Ukrainian sculpture continued under the sign of the aforementioned two major paradigms, where the first half of the century honed the meaningful content of “modern” (as something new), according to the programmatic line of Modernism, and the second half (more precisely from the mid-to-late 1960s) outlined the boundaries of the concept “contemporary” (actual, nowadays) according to the world-view models of Post-Modernism. The artistic issues discussed in this article require more in-depth research, focusing on narrower topics and conceptual problems.
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Ukrainian sculpture of the 20th century: main ideological and plastic transformations

Escultura ucraniana do século XX: principais transformações ideológicas e plásticas

Escultura ucraniana del siglo 20: principales transformaciones ideológicas y plásticas

Resumo
Neste artigo tentamos demonstrar a inseparabilidade da escultura ucraniana a partir da cultura global criando processo apesar do isolamento cultural e político como uma república componente da União Soviética por mais de 70 anos do século XX. Há uma diferença considerável no caráter da criatividade dos escultores ucranianos, que viviam e trabalhavam dentro das fronteiras da União Soviética, e aqueles, que migraram para a Europa Ocidental ou América e tiveram a oportunidade de experimentar livremente a forma e as ideias. Neste artigo, a atenção especial é dedicada às personalidades que fizeram as transformações ideológicas e plásticas mais significativas na escultura do século XX em relação às épocas anteriores, ou seja, à escultura da vanguarda e do modernismo. A última década do século XX foi marcada pelo fim do isolamento cultural da era soviética do mundo democrático, quando um poderoso fluxo de informações penetrou na arena artística da já independente e aberta Ucrânia, e simultaneamente apareceram os exemplos de várias tendências e estilos conceituais – da arte pop e instalação à arte performática que influenciou o desenvolvimento da escultura.

Palavras-chave: Escultura. Arte Ucraniana. Vanguarda. Modernismo. Policromia.

Abstract
In this article we attempt at demonstrating the inseparability of Ukrainian sculpture from global culture creating process despite cultural and political isolation as a component republic of the Soviet Union for over 70 years of the 20th century. There is a considerable difference in the character of creativity of Ukrainian sculptors, who lived and worked within the borders of the Soviet Union, and those, who migrated to Western Europe or America and had an opportunity to freely experiment with shape and ideas. In this article, particular attention is dedicated to those personalities that have made the most significant ideological and plastic transformations in the 20th-century sculpture with respect to the previous epochs, i.e., to the sculpture of avant-garde and modernism. The last decade of the 20th century was marked by the end of the Soviet-era cultural isolation from the democratic world, when a powerful stream of information penetrated the artistic arena of already independent and open Ukraine, and simultaneously the examples of various conceptual trends and styles appeared - from pop art and installation to performance art, which influenced the development of sculpture.
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Resumen
En este artículo intentamos demostrar la inseparabilidad de la escultura ucraniana del proceso de creación de la cultura global a pesar del aislamiento cultural y político como una república componente de la Unión Soviética durante más de 70 años del siglo 20. Hay una diferencia considerable en el carácter de la creatividad de los escultores ucranianos, que vivieron y trabajaron dentro de las fronteras de la Unión Soviética, y aquellos que emigraron a Europa Occidental o América y tuvieron la oportunidad de experimentar libremente con la forma y las ideas. En este artículo, se dedica especial atención a aquellas personalidades que han realizado las transformaciones ideológicas y plásticas más significativas en la escultura del siglo 20 con respecto a las épocas anteriores, es decir, a la escultura de vanguardia y modernismo. La última década del siglo 20 estuvo marcada por el final del aislamiento cultural de la era soviética del mundo democrático, cuando una poderosa corriente de información penetró en la arena artística de la Ucrania ya independiente y abierta, y simultáneamente aparecieron los ejemplos de varias tendencias y estilos conceptuales, desde el arte pop y la instalación hasta el arte de performance, que influyó en el desarrollo de la escultura.
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