Around the end of the 1920s, Vygotsky introduced his integrative framework for psychological research to the Soviet Union. This framework was not abandoned and forgotten until its rediscovery in Russia and America in the 1950s, as some claim. In fact, even after his untimely death in 1934, Vygotsky remained the spiritual leader of a group of his former students and collaborators, who became known as the Kharkov School. This paper reconstructs the early intellectual history of Vygotskian psychology, as it emerged, around the time of Vygotsky’s death, in the research program of the Kharkov School.

INTRODUCTION: VYGOTSKIAN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE KHARKOV SCHOOL

Not only was Lev Vygotsky an extremely talented and versatile psychologist, he was also a gifted teacher, fostering a generation of younger scholars who continued his wide-ranging research, even after his untimely death in 1934. From the 1920s through the early 1930s, Vygotsky, his closest collaborators—Alexander Luria and Aleksei N. Leontiev—and their associates, conducted a wide range of psychological studies on verbal thinking and practical intellect in children, the development of memory and attention, concept formation, educational psychology, the psychology of art, human developmental pathology, neuropsychology, and the ethno-cultural study of minorities.

Behind this seemingly eclectic array of studies initiated by Vygotsky stands a profound, highly ambitious theoretical and methodological framework (Vygotsky, 1927/1997). For a variety of reasons, Vygotskian psychology after Vygotsky developed in several directions that no longer readily reveal their common source. For example, there is no immediately apparent link between Luria’s early cross-cultural Central Asian expeditions and his neuropsychology; Leontiev’s theorizing on activity, consciousness, and personality; Zaporozhets’ psychology of perception, movement, or emotion; Zinchenko’s psychology of involuntary remembering; Elkonin’s research on the psychology of play and learning; Galperin’s quest to define the object of distinctly psychological research; or Bozhovich’s psychology of personality development (Minick, 1997). Furthermore, while the names of Luria and Leontiev are quite familiar in the West, outside Russia little is known about other students of Vygotsky and their work. James Wertsch (1994) is right to say that “This lacuna in our knowledge is clearly our loss.”
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Several historical studies do focus on specific members of Vygotsky’s circle, beginning with Vygotsky himself; however, none of these studies show how all these individual threads were intertwined within a shared framework for research. A number of scholars advocate a contextual or situational approach to the history of psychology (Danziger, 1990), specifically, to the history of Vygotskian psychology—one that takes the larger social and cultural context and the multiple interrelations between different actors and their ideas into account (Shchedrovitskii, 1980/2004; Stetsenko, 2003, 2004, 2005; Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004). Although there have been a few recent attempts to present the big picture of the history of Vygotskian psychology (Karpov, 2005; Venger, 1994; V. P. Zinchenko & Morgunov, 1994), they are all limited in one way or another. A complete analysis of the complex interrelations between all the immediate students of Vygotsky and their followers—the major figures of the school—still remains to be done.

This paper is a first step toward creating a more comprehensive portrait of the Vygotsky circle and its impact on psychology. Specifically, we focus on a group of Vygotsky’s students who left Moscow in the early 1930s to establish a research center in the Ukrainian city of Kharkov, relatively far from the dangers of life in the capital of Stalin’s Soviet Union—a group that writers in the history of science typically refer to as the Kharkov group, or the Kharkov School of Psychology (Bakhurst, 1990; Cole, 1980; Ivanova, 1995, 2002; Kozulin, 1986, 1990; A. A. Leontiev, 2005; A. N. Leontiev, 1999; Sereda, 1994; Sokolova, 2003; Valsiner, 1988; Yasnitsky & Ferrari, 2008; V. P. Zinchenko, 2003; V. P. Zinchenko & Morgunov, 1994).

In fact, the history of the Kharkov school in the 1930s has been called a “blank spot in the historiography of psychology” (Sokolova, 2003), and a “major hiatus in American knowledge about Soviet psychological research” (Cole, 1977). The only systematic account we have of the early Kharkov school, and of research done there in the 1930s, comes from the personal notes of Alexei N. Leontiev, nominal leader of the school. They were first presented by his son Alexei A. Leontiev (A. A. Leontiev, 1983) —a prominent psychologist himself—and first published in 1988 under the title Materials on Consciousness (A. N. Leontiev, 1940–1941/1988). The impact of this publication was considerable: Leontiev’s account has been repeated and disseminated by many later authors (Ivanova, 1995, 2002; A. A. Leontiev, 2005; Sokolova, 2001) and is thought to be virtually the sole, or certainly the most authoritative, source on the history of the school.

However, there are several reasons to question the reliability of Leontiev’s account. First, consider the context of Leontiev’s presentation. By his own admission, in these Materials on Consciousness, Leontiev did not attempt to recount the entire history of the school, but—like elsewhere (A. N. Leontiev, 1967; 1967/1983)—he focused on how study of the specific problem of consciousness evolved in the Soviet psychology. Second, Leontiev presents a very detailed and thorough report on research done in Kharkov in the first half of the 1930s (the period of 1932–1933 and 1934–1935 that Leontiev refers to as the first and the second...
cycle of research, respectively). In contrast, the second half of the 1930s, or the third and the fourth cycles of research (1935–1936 and from 1936 onward), is only briefly outlined. This second half of the 1930s is precisely when Leontiev left Kharkov for Moscow and, later, Leningrad, which might explain why his report on the research done in Kharkov on that time is, presumably, so fragmentary. Third, even a cursory review of the studies published by members of the Kharkov school in the 1930s reveals many discrepancies between Leontiev’s account and the research done. For example, even studies on sensation and perceptual development, or on animal psychology (zoopsychology), foundational for Leontiev’s doctoral dissertation—completed by 1939 and defended in Moscow in 1940 (and so obviously known to him)—are not included in his Materials on Consciousness.

These lacunae in Leontiev’s canonical story set the stage for our own study of the history of the Kharkov School, and of other early Vygotskian psychology after Vygotsky.3

RESEARCH DATA AND HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

This paper is based on an analysis of publications made during the prewar period between 1931 and 1941 and materials from later publications, as well as archival materials from Kharkov.4 In addition to consulting previously published studies, the first author visited archives and libraries in Kharkov, where he uncovered many previously undiscovered texts from and about the early Kharkov school. The sources that we used in this study fall under several general categories:

1. Research overviews found in a number of publications of the 1930s–1960s describing the main problems and themes of their research (Galperin, 1934; Goldenberg, 1934; Kolomiets’, 1934; Lebedinskii, 1933a, 1936a; A. R. Luria, 1960; Rokhlin, 1936a, 1936b; Rybnikov, 1940; Shmelkin, 1934; Zeigarnik & Rubinshtein, 1960).

2. Secondary literature, including compiled lists of authors’ publications and commentaries to the volumes of selected works of the key figures typically prepared by their students or collaborators. For example, bibliographies are available for Bozhovich, Elkonin, Leontiev, Luria, and Zaporozhets (see Bozhovich, 1995; Elkonin, 1989a; Homskaya, 1992/2001; A. A. Leontiev, Leontiev, & Sokolova, 2005; A. N. Leontiev, 1983; A. R. Luria, 2003; Zaporozhets, 1986). Another important resource is biographic and memoir literature by the scientists themselves or the members of their families (Elkonin, 1983, 1983/1984; Galperin, 1983, 1983/1984; Ginevskaya, 2005; Morozova, 1983; Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 1996, 1999).

3. Our paper provides an overview of studies done at the Kharkov school in the 1930s. While Kharkov is our main focus, the work done there is intimately connected to that done in Moscow, Leningrad, and Poltava that need to be taken into account to really understand the directions Vygotskian psychology took at that time. Thus, in this paper we (somewhat illegitimately) refer to all these studies as belonging to the Kharkov School of psychology. Our very inclusive use of the term Kharkov school serves as an umbrella term for a range of post-Vygotskian studies done in the Soviet Union soon after the death of Vygotsky and continuing until the beginning of the Soviet-German war (WWII). One of the reasons for doing this is that the considerable mobility of the individual members of the group between 1930 and 1940 makes it virtually impossible to clearly distinguish between the Moscow, Leningrad, and Kharkov periods in the lives of Vygotsky, Luria, and Leontiev as well as several other individuals, who frequently commuted between these three cities, working and studying at a number of organizations in all three cities simultaneously.

4. There is an increasing scholarly interest in Soviet psychology of the 1930s, and many previously unpublished materials have recently been published (A. A. Leontiev, Leontiev, & Sokolova, 2005; A. N. Leontiev, 1994, 2003; A. R. Luria, 2003; E. A. Luria, 1994; Voiskunskii, Zhdan, & Tikhomirov, 1999; Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 1996, 1999). Even so, resources on the history of this period of the development of Vygotskian psychology remain extremely scarce. Publications by Vygotskian scholars in 1930s are especially rare and inaccessible because many are written in Ukrainian—and few of those written in Russian have been included in later republications, nor have many been translated into English.

Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences DOI: 10.1002/jhbs
3. Archival materials, including official documents (e.g., reports, orders, personal files, stenographic transcripts) from the main organizations within which research was done.

4. Manuscripts of that time, some of which still remain unpublished (Galperin, 1936; Lebedinskii, 1938a; A. R. Luria, 1941; G. I. Voloshin, 1939; Zaporozhets & Lukov, 1936). A number of important manuscripts have been reported to exist (Bassin, 1938; A. R. Luria, 1937, 1940; Zaporozhets, 1934, 1937, 1939b; Zaporozhets & Asnin, 1934), but we do not yet have access to these.

The relationships between all this material are enormously complex, making systematic scientific analysis difficult. Often a completed study was only available to members of the “inner circle” of the school, even though it clearly influenced subsequent research. At its best, the earlier research was briefly presented in the later works by the members of the school, and the full text versions of these scholarly papers are still not available to the broader research community. Quite often a researcher on the history of science in the Soviet Union of that period has to take into account the phenomenon of “retroactive impact” of early unpublished studies on the later works. Sometimes such studies are published much later.5

HISTORY OF THE KHARKOV SCHOOL

The Decade of 1931–1941: General Overview

The history of the Kharkov school of psychology can be logically divided into two parts: (1) 1931–1936 marks the establishment of the Kharkov school and its institutionalization; (2) 1938–1941 is a time of maturation and scientific reflection. The boundary between the two, 1936–1937, shows a relative decrease in research and the (presumably deliberate) “disappearance” of members of the school from public life.

Several things are worth noting about the period of 1931–1936 and the establishment of the Kharkov school: First, there was the meeting of the Moscow and Kharkov researchers, and the establishment of a joint research group. Second, interdisciplinary research centers were founded at three separate institutions in Kharkov: the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy (UPNA), Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy (UNDIP), and Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute (KDPI). Third, between 1933–1936 the younger generation scholars—Zaporozhets, Zinchenko, Galperin, Asnin, Lukov, Bozhovich, Khomenko, Bassin, and Aranovskaya—completed their PhD (Candidate of Science) studies. Fourth, the UNDIP was transferred from

5. The seventy-year history surrounding the publication of the manuscript reportedly written by Bozhovich in 1935 (Bozhovich, 1935) is a perfect illustration of this “retroactive impact” and of the immense complexity in reconstructing the intellectual history of this period. To the best of our knowledge, the first reference to it is found in the classic monograph published in 1964 (Zaporozhets & Elkonin, 1964) and translated into English in 1971 (Zaporozhets & Elkonin, 1964/1971). This Bozhovich work was featured in Chapter 5 of the Development of Thinking (Zaporozhets, Zinchenko, & Elkonin, 1964, 1964/1971), where it is enigmatically referred to as a study done under the supervision of Vygotsky (p. 207); a few pages later it is mentioned in the context of work completed under the guidance of Leontiev (p. 212), and yet three pages later (p. 215) Vygotsky’s supervision is mentioned again (respectively, pp. 201, 217, and 220 of the English edition of 1971). Characteristically, this work of Bozhovich, actually written in 1935 and first presented to the general reader almost 30 years later, was an important contribution to Vygotskian psychology. It was clearly known to the inner circle of Vygotskian researchers—most likely also to Vygotsky himself—and it definitely affected later studies in this tradition. It was finally published in Russian in the journal Cultural-Historical Psychology more than seventy years after it was written (Bozhovich, 1935/2006a; 1935/2006b; 1935/2006c). Interestingly enough, according to Bozhovich herself, the actual study began in 1929 in Moscow, lasted for three years and was completed in Kharkov, well before Vygotsky’s death in 1934. Therefore, it turns out to be one of the first Kharkov-based studies known to us that demonstrates the transition from the Moscow studies of the early 1930s to the Kharkov developments over the decade of the 1930s and beyond.
Kharkov to Kiev in 1934, immediately following the official designation of Kiev as the capital of Soviet Ukraine; and the Kharkov branch of the Scientific Institute of Pedagogy was then re-organized into the Kharkov Institute of Pedagogy, where the Kharkov group continued their work until the end of 1936, when the Institute was finally closed down (Yarmachenko, 2001). Fifth, the notorious decree of the Communist Party on “paedological perversions”—which officially banned studies in the field of paedology (i.e. an interdisciplinary study of the child)—also had a considerable negative affect on all psychological research nationwide (Joravsky, 1989). Finally, at the end of 1936 and beginning of 1937, the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy was renamed the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Institute (P. V. Voloshin, 1994) and its Psychological Sector significantly reduced (Haenen & Galperin, 1989). The only unit that survived the reorganization was the Department of Clinical Psychology.

The period from 1937–1941 is distinct from the first period of the school in several ways. First, by the second half of the 1930s the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute became the main research center of the Kharkov School and remained its head organization until the summer of 1941. Second, during this period the first regular publications of the Kharkov School appeared. Due to a significant publication backlog, both older and newer research was first published. This is also when the first scientific conferences were organized under the auspices of the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute. Third, a new series of doctoral (candidate) studies were conducted by the students of Vygotsky’s students, that is, second-generation Vygotskians (Kotlyarova, Gordon, Titarenko, Kontsevaya, Mazurenko, Aks, Voloshin, Kozis, Margolis). Fourth, the “old Vygotskians” (Leontiev, Zaporozhets, and Bozhovich) undertook advanced doctoral research projects;6 Leontiev completed his dissertation by the end of the 1930s, whereas those of Zaporozhets and Bozhovich were interrupted by the beginning of the war.7 Let us now consider these points in more detail.

The Founding of the Kharkov School (the First Period of 1931–1936)

The history of the Kharkov school of psychology starts around the end of 1931, when a group of Vygotsky’s students and collaborators left Moscow for Kharkov—then capital of Soviet Ukraine—to head a major psychological research center at the newly established Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy (UPNA). This group included Vygotsky’s long-term collaborators Luria, Leontiev, and Lebedinskii8—all three prominent scholars—as well as the younger generation of Vygotsky’s students, Zaporozhets (with his wife Ginevskaya), and Bozhovich. Vygotsky’s students in Kharkov were joined by local researchers Galperin, Asnin, Zinchenko, Lukov, and Khomenko, among others, who greatly contributed to the school’s foundation and its original research program. As was standard practice then (and probably for financial reasons), group members held several jobs at different places simultaneously. By the end of 1933, many Vygotskian researchers had also settled into Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy (UNDIP) (in the fall of 1932) and Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute (KDPI)

6. In the Soviet Union, the first academic degree—Candidate of Sciences (Kandidat Nauk)—is roughly equivalent to the North American degree of Doctor of Philosophy, or PhD. It was awarded upon successful completion of the candidate’s dissertation. However, a second academic degree—Doctor of Sciences (Doktor Nauk)—was superior to the first and normally required a larger dissertation on a fundamental scientific topic.

7. Reportedly, Zaporozhets completed his dissertation before 1941, but did not defend it. All his prewar work, including his dissertation, perished in a building in Kharkov, destroyed during the war (Ginevskaya, 2005).

8. Luria and Leontiev both worked at UPNA, frequently commuting between Moscow and Kharkov. They came to Kharkov every month for twenty days between 1932 and 1934, when they both returned to Moscow (Luria in the spring, Leontiev in the fall of 1934). Importantly, however, even after their departure, neither lost contact with the research group in Kharkov, and from time to time they visited Kharkov. Characteristically, A. N. Leontiev refers to the “year of his work in Ukraine” as the period of 1931–1936 (A. N. Leontiev, 1999).
in the fall of 1933), both also in Kharkov. While several dissertations were completed by Kharkov school members at the UNDIP, the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy remained the main research center for the school until the Central Committee of the Communist Party 1936 decree on “paedological perversions.”9

Alexander Luria was the founder and first director of UPNA’s Psychological Sector from 1931 until early 1934, when he returned to Moscow to join Medical Genetic Institute (MGI) (in October 1933) and—already after Vygotsky’s death in June 1934—the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine (VIEM) (in October 1934) (E. A. Luria, 1994, p. 73). After Luria, L. L. Rokhlin became the head of the Psychological Sector of UPNA (Galperin, 1934; Shmelkin, 1934; Zatonskaya, 1934).10 Vygotsky also participated in founding the Psychological Sector at UPNA in 1931–1932 and supervised research of the Kharkov group. In the very beginning of 1934, Vygotsky was involved in a very similar project: he was invited to organize a new major psychological research unit at the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine (VIEM) in Moscow, for him a unique “opportunity to carry out all his plans and create a well-organized team of researchers that he was dreaming about all his life and that would take the responsibility of carrying out everything the genius had in his mind” (A. R. Luria, 1935/2003). We know just a few details about the actual arrangements and can only guess what the proposed research program of this Department at VIEM might have been (Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 1996, 1999). It is most likely that the Psychological Department at VIEM would have been organized with the Sector of Psychology at UPNA serving as a model and a prototype for the new research unit.

The earliest and fullest account of the internal structure of the Psychological Sector and the main research themes dates back to Galperin’s article “Psychological Sector” in the first collection of the works of the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy published in 1934 as the information materials for the participants of the First All-Ukrainian Psychoneurological Conference (Galperin, 1934). In this paper, Galperin presents three main research units of UPNA’s Psychological Sector as the main center of psychological activity in Ukraine at that time: (1) the Department (Otdel) of General Experimental and Genetic (i.e., Developmental) Psychology, (2) the Department of Clinical Psychology, and (3) the Department of General

9. The first attack on paedology in Ukraine took place well before the 1936 All-Union campaign against the use of tests in the Human Sciences, such as paedology or psychotechnics (i.e., applied or industrial psychology). Indeed, as Lev Kopelev noted, “In Ukraine 1937 began in 1933” (cited by Subtelny, 1988). The campaign of 1933 was clearly politically motivated and its main target was Skrypnik, the Commissar (i.e., the Minister) of Education of Ukraine and his politics of Ukrainization. Following accusations of the “nationalist deviation,” “lack of vigilance,” “Trotskyism,” and even “fascism,” Skrypnik committed suicide on 7 July 1933. Orest Subtelny points out that “the destruction of Ukrainian institutions, begun in 1930, now reached its high point” (Subtelny, 1988, p. 419). Subsequently, leading figures in education in Ukraine in 1933–1934 were ostracized, fired, and some of them were even arrested. Most notably, the victims of this campaign were the group of scholars of the so-called “Kharkov school of pedagogy” (Sokolyanski, Protopopov, Zhaluzhnyi, Volobuev, etc.), all reflexologists and paedologists affiliated with the Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy and Kharkiv State Pedagogical Institute (Institute of Corrective Pedagogy, 2000–2002; Ivanova, 1995; Yarmachenko, 2001). This is why the group of Vygotskian scholars, the Kharkov psychologists, explicitly distanced themselves from either paedology or pedagogy (P. I. Zinchenko, 1934) and chose Psychoneurological Academy—under the auspices of the Ukrainian Ministry of Health—as their head organization. “Thank God, we had nothing to do with Skrypnik (we were in the system of Narkomzdrav [i.e. Ministry of Health] . . . ),” remarks A. N. Leontiev in his Memoirs recorded in 1976 by A. A. Leontiev (A. N. Leontiev & Leontiev, 2005, p. 378). Two other institutions that should be mentioned in this context are the Poltava State Pedagogical Institute in Poltava, Ukraine, where Bozhovich was appointed Head of the Department and the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages, where Zinchenko worked until the early 1960s, when it merged with the Kharkov State University. The role of these institutes in the history of the post-Vygotskian psychological research in 1930s is considerably less significant.

10. On the basis of available documents we can not confirm the claim that it was A. N. Leontiev who, “after Luria’s permanent departure—took over the administration of the entire psychology division from him” (A. A. Leontiev, 2005, p. 33).
Psychological Theory—headed by Leontiev, Lebedinskii, and Galperin, respectively. While Galperin’s department was a cross-sectional unit with scholars from different fields, the other two departments were specialized units with their own distinct agendas and research teams.

According to Galperin (1934), Leontiev’s Department of General Experimental and Genetic Psychology contained three psychological laboratories, each pursuing a specific research problem. The Laboratory of Animal Psychology (zoopsychology) focused on the study of instinctive behavior and skill—as opposed to cultural, mediated, distinctly human behavior. The Laboratory of Child Psychology focused on three research themes: (a) “development of thought and introspective processes in childhood”; (b) “investigation of inter-functional relations as a method of developing children’s psychological characteristics”; and (c) the applied psychological research theme “the psychology of the perception (alternatively, “the psychology of osmyshlenie,” perhaps best translated as understanding) of visual elements of a book by preschoolers.” Finally, the Laboratory of General Experimental Psychology focused on two research themes: (a) “alteration of the internal meaning of speech in its development” and (b) “forming motor skills under the conditions of higher psychological activity.” A more detailed (although somewhat cryptic) account of the actual research done at UPNA’s Department of General Experimental and Genetic Psychology is found in the archival materials for Leontiev’s presentation at an October 12th research meeting with Vygotsky in Moscow, in 1933. The five research projects that Leontiev presented to Vygotsky were studies on (1) “transfer” as a means of concept formation; (2) “word origin”; (3) “speech and practical intellect”; (4) “development of reasoning”; and (5) “concept acquisition” (A. N. Leontiev, 1933/1994).

Lebedinskii’s Department of Clinical Psychology studied psychological processes in patients with cortical brain lesions, primarily those with aphasia and related disorders like alexia, agraphia, and various kinds of agnosia. The central problem for this group of researchers was the role of inner speech and its loss in a wide range of cortical brain damage syndromes. This main work was accompanied by a number of supplementary and auxiliary studies on the specificity of psychological processes in clinical settings, as well as the restoration and vicarious substitution of psychological functions after brain injury. A special series of studies focused on the methodological issue of how to investigate patients with cortical brain lesions, aiming to develop new techniques and clinical approaches to replace the outdated methods of investigation widely practiced in neurological and psychiatric clinics at that time.

Luria, the founder and the first Director of UPNA’s Psychological Sector, is usually only briefly mentioned in scholarly accounts of the history of the Kharkov school of psychology. However, even after his departure to Moscow in 1934, Luria was closely associated with the Kharkov group, especially with the Department of Clinical Psychology and its program of psychological research on pathology initiated by Vygotsky and Luria in the early 1930s (Zeigarnik & Rubinstein, 1960). The close affinity between the psychological background of the Kharkov school and Luria’s “post-Kharkov” work in Moscow reveals itself in a series of studies by Lebedinskii and Luria and their collaborators on heredity and cultural environment in the development of identical twins done in the early 1930s at the Medical-Genetic Institute (Lebedinskii, 1932; A. R. Luria, 1936; A. R. Luria & Mirenova, 1936a, 1936b)—studies that pioneered psychogenetic research in the Soviet Union (Grigorenko & Ravich-Shcherbo, 1997).

11. This was a study on the child’s perception of book illustrations done upon request from the Kharkov Institute of Polygraphy (Zaporozhets, 1981).

12. The format and historical circumstances of this meeting and who exactly participated in it besides Vygotsky and Leontiev remain unknown.
One such study was discussed at the UPNA scientific conference on genetics and variability held in Kharkov in January 1936 (A. R. Luria, Mirenova, & Morozova, 1936). Another of Luria’s important scientific contributions was his research on the impact of cultural factors on human development conducted during his two psychological expeditions to Central Asia (Nell, 1999). These expeditions took place in the summer of 1931 (A. R. Luria, 1931a; 1931b; 1932b) and 1932 (A. R. Luria, 1933; 1934). Both expeditions were organized by local and Moscow institutions, as well as—for the second expedition—the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy (specifically mentioned in A. R. Luria, 1933; 1934). However, for a number of reasons, the results of these cross-cultural studies were not published for the next four decades (A. R. Luria, 1976). Unfortunately, this early psychogenetic and cultural-psychological research was abruptly halted in the 1930s. Scientific discourse and the style of scientific criticism gradually changed from rational discussion of the relative strengths and weaknesses of these scientific theories to base, politically motivated, and very emotional arguments about scientists’ loyalty to Communist ideas and their struggle with opportunism and with digressions from the general course of the Party and true Marxist and Communist science.\(^{13}\) Many promising and diverse ideas in Soviet behavioral and human sciences from the 1930s onward ended as a result of the political oppression, arrest, and even physical execution of prominent scientists of the time (Yāroshevskii, 1991).\(^{14}\)

The All-Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy (UNDIP).

The second largest research center of the Kharkov school of psychology, before 1936, was the All-Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy (UNDIP). Most dissertations by younger researchers of the Kharkov school were completed and defended there in mid-1930s.\(^{15}\) A brief report in 1934 in *Komunistychna osvita*\(^{16}\) on early research done by the “group headed by Professor Leontiev” provides an overview of a series of research projects, presumably done in fulfillment of the Candidate of Sciences degree. The overview states that

\(^{13}\) For examples of such academic discourse in the Soviet Union in the 1930s, see the articles by Talankin, Razmyslov, Rudneva, and others in the special issue of the *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 38(6), 2000, on “Criticizing Vygotsky.”

\(^{14}\) Thus, for instance, Lebedinskii’s and Luria’s collaborator Anna Nikitichna Mirenova was arrested in February 1945, charged with “participation in counter-revolutionary group and terrorist intentions,” sentenced in October, and executed in November of the same year (see http://lists.memo.ru/d58/f384.htm#n27). Director of the Medico-Genetic Institute, Solomon Grigor’evich Levit was arrested in January 1938, and—on charges of espionage and participation in counter-revolutionary terrorist “saboteur-subversive” organization—sentenced and executed in May 1938 (http://lists.memo.ru/d51/f38.htm#n19).

\(^{15}\) Generally, by 1936, many post-graduate dissertations had been completed by the members of the group. During this period Candidate of Sciences dissertation projects were developed by Asnin, Zaporozhets, Zinchenko, Kholmenko, Lukov (UNDIP or KDPI, Kharkov, all defended in Kharkov around 1936–1937), as well as Galperin and Voloshin (UPNA/UPNI, Kharkov). Lukov defended his dissertation in Leningrad around 1939. Lebedinskii presented the material of his 1931 monograph (Lebedinski, 1931) as the Doctor of Sciences dissertation and defended it in February 1936, at UPNA. On the basis of his 1932 monograph on affect published in English in the United States (A. R. Luria, 1932a), Luria prepared his Doctor of Sciences dissertation and defended it in Tbilisi, in 1937. Little is known about the Candidate of Sciences dissertations of Bozhovich, Mistyuk, and, possibly, Rozenblyum, also seemingly prepared during this time.

Later, in the second half of the 1930s, Doctor of Sciences dissertations were prepared by Leontiev, Zaporozhets, and Bozhovich. Leontiev’s dissertation was defended in Leningrad in May 1941, while Bozhovich and Zaporozhets were interrupted by the outbreak of the war. The dissertations of Aranowskaya, as well as of younger researchers like Gordon, Kotlyarova, and Mazurenko, were completed only after the war.

\(^{16}\) That is, *Communist Education*, a rather obscure journal published in Kharkov by the Ministry of Education of the Soviet Ukraine.
the group worked on the problem of “learning and development” and that a collected-works publication was to be submitted by 1 October, 1934 (Kolomiets’, 1934). The themes developed included the problems of the child’s naïve understanding and practical experience, and the problem of formal schooling (Bozhovich, Zaporozhets, Asnin, Mistyuk); the role of discourse in the classroom (Sverdlykov’skyi, Asnin); psychological analysis of forgetting (Zinchenko); overcoming inadequate understanding in learning (Khomenko); and interest and motivation (Zaporozhets). However, these collected works, for some reason, were not prepared and submitted to the publisher until 1936. And soon they were afterward revoked by the authorities and banned. (Although, luckily, the galley proofs of the book have been preserved, the planned publication of these early works never took place and they still remain unpublished.)

Kharkov School after 1936 (the Second Period of 1937–1941)

As mentioned earlier, the decree of 1936 and the purges that it triggered had a devastating affect—not only on research in paedology or psychotechnics, but also on psychology. Very dramatic was the reorganization—rather the “devastation” (Savenko, 2003)—of the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy that followed its transformation into the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Institute. As a result of this reorganization all that remained of the Psychological Sector was the group of psychologists affiliated with the Department of Clinical Psychology, renamed into Laboratory of Clinical Psychology. The Departments of Genetic Psychology and General Psychological Theory were closed down (Haenen & Galperin, 1989; Naiman, Yudin, & Vol’fovskii, 1940); and the other members of the larger research team were dismissed by the end of 1936.

The campaign of 1936 had direct impact on the lives and academic careers of the early generation of Vygotskian scholars. By the end of 1936, Luria had quit all the institutions he had worked for and transferred to full-time studies at the Medical Institute in Moscow—an action probably instrumental in saving his life (E. A. Luria, 1994). Meanwhile, Leontiev had been dismissed from all his academic and research positions and remained unemployed for a while (A. A. Leontiev, Leontiev, & Sokolova, 2005). Philip Bassin resigned from UPNA and left Kharkov for Moscow in 1936 (Savenko, 2005, 2006). Alexander Zaporozhets was detained and interrogated by the NKVD (precursor of KGB) authorities not less than six times on charges of “anti-Soviet activity,” but was eventually—miraculously—released (Ginevskaya, 2005). Another painful loss for the group was Anatolii Rozenblyum, who was...
arrested around 1937 and perished (Noskova, 1997, 2005; V. P. Zinchenko & Morgunov, 1994). It is sometimes claimed that the decree of 1936 against paedology “led to the end of the Kharkov school” (Haenen, 1996, p. 38) and, at first glance, the group does seem to disappear from public academic life from 1936–1937. We find virtually no trace of the Kharkov School in an overview of Russian psychological research done in 1938–1939 (Rybnikov, 1940). However, we hope to show that researchers at the Kharkov school continued their work throughout the entire decade of the 1930s until the beginning of the war in 1941. In fact, the second half of this decade was a very productive period of scientific research for the Kharkov School, one that resulted in important new scientific insights. The most important studies of this period were done under the auspices of the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute (KDPI), which gradually became the main research center of the school. The first KDPI scientific conference (Scientific Session) was held in 1938, launching a series of such conferences that were major scientific events. Specifically, the KDPI Scientific Sessions in 1940 and 1941, as well as the Conference on Pedagogy and Psychology held in Kiev in 1940, generated several publications that show the wide range of studies done at the Kharkov school. In fact, the research of the Kharkov school that was published between 1939 and 1941 represents all the main trajectories of empirical work at the school, including work done before 1936. These studies are reviewed in the next section.

Vygotsky’s Psychology and the Kharkov School: Research Overview

Vygotsky’s Psychological Theory and Empirical Research in Kharkov

Our discussion of the Kharkov school would be incomplete without mentioning Vygotsky’s inspiration. In fact, the studies done in Kharkov in the 1930s only make sense from the perspective of the research program introduced by Vygotsky. Likewise, we argue that Vygotskian psychology cannot be completely understood without knowing how it developed through the early work of Vygotsky’s students and collaborators.

In fact, Vygotsky was in close contact with the Kharkovites in the early 1930s, and visited both Kharkov and nearby Poltava several times to meet Bozhovich and the main group from Kharkov. Vygotsky even studied at the Medical Department of the UPNA in the early 1930s and occasionally lectured in Kharkov (Ginevskaya, 2005; Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 2005).

19. In our effort to investigate the fate of Anatoli Rozenblyum, we came across an extremely valuable resource published online by the International Historical-Enlightenment Human Rights and Humanitarian Society Memorial (http://www.memo.ru/eng/), “The Victims of Political Terror in the USSR” (http://lists.memo.ru/), which presents information on more than 1.3 million victims of political purges (“cleansings”) in Stalin’s Soviet Union. According to the source, Rozenblyum Anatolij II’ich, a psychologist from Kharkov employed by Poltava State Pedagogical Institute, was arrested on 29 January, 1938, charged with “active participation in anti-Soviet socialist-revolutionary [i.e., one of the two leftist political parties that survived the Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917] terrorist organization,” and convicted and executed on the same day of 22 September, 1938, in Kiev, Ukraine (http://lists.memo.ru/d73/f331.htm#n3). Despite the differences in the patronymic name of Anatoli Rozenblyum in different accounts—Anatoli Iosifovich (Noskova, 1997, 2005) versus Anatoli Il’ich (http://lists.memo.ru/d73/f331.htm#n3)—we have all reason to believe that this is the same person. According to an alternative account, Anatoli Rozenblyum died of mushroom poisoning (A. A. Leontiev, Leontiev, & Sokolova, 2005), which seems to be a mistake.

20. Most notable are the collections of scientific papers published as Scientific Notes of the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute (Vol. 1, 1939, and Vol. 6, 1941), Scientific Notes of the Kharkov State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages (1939), and Scientific Works of the All-Republican Scientific Conference on Pedagogy and Psychology in Kiev (1941). In addition, we discovered unique full-text archival materials of the first KDPI Conference of 1938 that have not yet been published.
1996, 1999). The Kharkov group also held a series of research meetings with Vygotsky. For instance, we know that one such meeting—known as an “internal conference”—was held in the winter of 1932–1933, where Vygotsky reportedly gave an eight-hour presentation on current problems for cultural-historical psychology. During another important research meeting with Vygotsky that took place in October of 1933, Leontiev presented results of the studies he directed at the Department of Genetic Psychology of UPNA (A. N. Leontiev, 1933/1994). Finally, the last work published by Vygotsky in his lifetime was his presentation at the First All-Ukrainian Psychoneurological Conference held in Kharkov during the summer of 1934. Deathly ill, Vygotsky never presented the paper itself, so a full-text article was published in the volume of the Conference abstracts (Vygotsky, 1934a; 1934/1960b; 1934/1997).

Likewise, the Kharkov School’s empirical studies are fundamentally grounded in the Vygotskian research program and their common root in Vygotsky’s cultural-historical psychology of higher mental functions is apparent. Thus, for instance, by the summer of 1934, representatives of all three departments of UPNA’s Psychological Sector shared the assumption that “formation of higher intellectual forms of psychological activity over the course of the history of society is decisive for psychological development” (Galperin, 1934, p. 34). At the Department of General Theory of Psychology of UPNA the interrelations between psychology and physiology and the place of psychology among other Human Sciences, the development and degradation of higher mental functions, and the methodology of distinctly psychological research were all investigated. This work resulted in a number of theoretical papers written by the members of the School that still need to be assessed in relation to Vygotsky’s theory (Asnin, 1938, 1941a/1980, 1941a/1981; Galperin, 1935; Lebedinskii, 1938c; A. N. Leontiev, 1940–1941/1994).

For Vygotsky, studying human mental life scientifically meant studying its historical development. Vygotsky’s entire research program aimed to investigate the development of culturally mediated, or “higher,” mental functions. Vygotsky and his collaborators emphasized three main lines of development, namely: (1) the evolutionary development of Homo sapiens as a biological species, (2) the historical development of modern, cultural man, and (3) the ontogenetic development of a human child into an adult (Vygotsky & Luria, 1930). As a product of all three lines of development, cultural man “may be understood and explained scientifically only by analyzing the three different paths that make up the history of human behavior” (Vygotsky & Luria, 1930/1993, p. 36). Another important principle of Vygotsky’s psychology that was first introduced in the end of 1930 was the requirement for the two parallel lines of research: the study of normal development was complemented by the investigations of degradation and decomposition of higher mental functions, most often in clinical settings (Vygotsky, 1930/1982, 1930/1997). The most concise formulation of this fundamental principle of Vygotskian theory can be found in Vygotsky’s last presentation “on development and degradation of higher mental functions,” delivered on 28 April, 1934, at the conference of the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine in Moscow, a month and a half before his death (Vygotsky, 1934/1960a).

Thus, the program of Vygotsky’s psychological research was extremely broad, covering normal human development and developmental pathology and decline. There is no agreement

---

21. Some fragments related to the discussion of the problem of consciousness in psychology were later published based on Leontiev’s and Zaporozhets’ notes as “Problem of Consciousness” (Vygotsky, 1932/1968). For some reason, a later edition dates this text as a presentation of the winter of 1933–1934 (Vygotsky, 1933/1982), and special investigation is needed to determine the exact date when this important meeting took place.

22. Vygotsky was hospitalized on 9 May and died a month later on 11 June, 1934 (Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 1996, 1999).
about the overall assessment of the scientific contribution of the larger Vygotsky School, and heated debates about Vygotsky’s legacy still continue. In scholarly literature on Vygotskian psychology there are at least three conflicting perspectives on the role that Vygotsky’s students played in Vygotskian research program development: (1) Every single idea of Vygotsky was developed by his students; (2) Vygotsky’s students distorted his cultural-historical psychological theory in their work on so-called activity theory, or, more precisely, the activity approach in psychology; and (3) both cultural-historical and activity approach constitute two complementary paradigms within the larger Vygotsky School. Typically, interrelations between Vygotsky’s cultural-historical theory and Leontiev’s activity-oriented psychology are the focus of the numerous discussions of scientific legacy of Vygotsky. In contrast, we suggest that investigation of the many and diverse ways Vygotsky’s thought was developed in his students’ work in a wide range of contexts will provide a much richer account of the history of psychology and of the heuristic potential of Vygotsky’s theory. Our overview of the work done by the Kharkov group hopes to advance the discussion of the fundamental issues of Vygotskian theory and how it was developed and still can be developed today.

According to Galperin (1934), experimental research in UPNA’s Psychological Sector had two major goals: First, the study of human thinking, speech, and practical activity—including their interrelations and relations to other psychological functions at different stages of human development, carried out at the Department of the General and Genetic Psychology; second, analysis of the degeneration of distinctly human higher mental functions caused by organic or functional damage to the human brain, carried out at the Department of Clinical Psychology.

**Developmental and General Psychology: “Ape” and “Primitive”**

As already mentioned, the Department of the General and Genetic Psychology experimentally investigated all the three lines of development important to Vygotsky. The triad of “ape, primitive, and child” (Vygotsky & Luria, 1930; 1930/1993) was mirrored in the three Laboratories of Animal, General, and Child experimental psychology (Galperin, 1934). Thus, experimental research on the psychology of underdeveloped rural population of Uzbekistan conducted by Luria in his two Central Asian expeditions (A. R. Luria, 1931a; 1932b; 1933; 1934; 1976) aimed at experimental research on “primitive” people under the conditions of rapidly changing social environment. This research was received very negatively by officials in the Soviet Union in the early 1930s and, as a result, Luria’s academic career, his freedom, and even his life, were threatened—which may explain his move to the Ukrainian Psychoneurological Academy by the end of 1931 (E. A. Luria, 1994). For political reasons, the research on “primitive” people in Vygotskian cultural-historical psychology was put on hold for several decades until the studies of Luria’s students Tulviste and—in the United States—Cole (Cole, Gay, Glick, & Sharp, 1971; Cole & Means, 1981; Cole & Scribner, 1974; Tulviste, 1991).

However, the other two main lines of Vygotskian developmental research remained in relatively better standing with official Marxist science of that time, and a number of studies on animal and child psychology were conducted by the Kharkov researchers in the 1930s. With minor exceptions (Zaporozhets, 1941c) most of the psychological studies by Zaporozhets, Dimanshtein, Solomakha, and Bassin on sensation and perception in animals done under Leontiev’s supervision were published by A. N. Leontiev in his doctoral dissertation, prepared by 1939 and defended in May of 1941 in Leningrad. An offshoot of these studies with animals was experimental investigation of sensation formation and development in adults that was carried out by Leontiev and his collaborators—in consultation with P. P. Blonskii,

According to Leontiev’s plan, sketched around 1940, all these studies were part of a major research project that was to continue until 1948–1949. The results of these studies were to be published as a monumental three-volume monograph on “the development of the psyche (mind)” that Leontiev had already partly completed by 1941. Unfortunately, the unpublished materials perished during the war (A. A. Leontiev, Leontiev, & Sokolova, 2005). These lost manuscripts were never restored and only a very brief summary of this project was published after the war (A. N. Leontiev, 1947, 1947/1981a, 1947/1981b).

Developmental and General Psychology: “Child”


Experimental studies in the fields of child and general psychology made up a considerable part of research at the Department of General Experimental and Genetic Psychology of UPNA. Within this broad topic, Vygotsky’s students in Kharkov focused on investigating mediated, or “higher” mental functions—especially their genesis, structure, and interrelations (Vygotsky, 1931/1960; 1931/1998). In addition to studies on children’s practical intellect, several studies were conducted on thinking, including (1) a post-Piagetian study of children’s reasoning (Zaporozhets, 1942; Zaporozhets & Lukov, 1941; Zaporozhets & Lukov, 1941/1980, 1941/2002), (2) “transfer” mechanisms in thought development (Asnin, 1956, 1941b, 1941b/1980; A. N. Leontiev, 1933/1994), (3) the effect of formal schooling on children’s worldviews (Bozhovich, 1936, 1937, 1945, 1945/1980; Bozhovich & Zinchenko, 1941, 1941/1980), and (4) the development of children’s visual-operational and visual-imagic thought (Asnin, 1941b/1980; Khomenko, 1941b, 1941b/1980).

A separate series of studies was conducted on the age-related characteristics of (1) voluntary and involuntary remembering in children and adults (Galperin, 1938; P. I. Zinchenko, 1936, 1937, 1939/1983, 1939a, 1939b, 1939b/1980, 1941), (2) the psychology of motion (Asnin, 1939, 1941b, 1941b/1980; Galperin, 1937, 1937/1980; Kotlyarova, 1946), and (3) the development of perception (Ginevskaya, 1941; Gordon, 1941; Khomenko, 1939; Kotlyarova, 1940, 1946; Mistyuk, 1941; Zaporozhets, 1940, 1941a, 1941a/1980, 1941a/1986b)—specifically, the perception of art by children (Aranovskaya, 1940, 1945; Khomenko, 1938, 1940, 1941a, 1941c, 1941c/1980; Kontsevaya, 1941; Titarenko, 1941; Zaporozhets, 1948, 1949, 1949/1986).

Another of Vygotsky’s essential contributions to developmental psychology was his work on the role of play (Vygotsky, 1933/1966; 1933/1967) and learning (Vygotsky, 1935a; 1935c) in human development. This line of research remained largely underdeveloped in Vygotsky’s own writings and is a facet of his theory most clearly articulated through collaborative work of his students. The Kharkov group focused mainly upon studies within lab settings (for discussion, see Asnin, 1941a; 1941a/1980; 1941a/1981) as well as natural settings of children’s play and learning environments. A wide range of the studies on learning were conducted by Vygotsky’s students at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute of Pedagogy and at the Pedagogical

Another remarkable development of Vygotsky’s theory by his students in the late 1930s was their increasing interest in the unconscious and their research on usanovka (what in German is called Einstellung, or in English, “set” or “attitude”)—a term they most probably borrowed from the Georgian school of Dimitry Uznadze (Piaget & Lambercier, 1944; Uznadze, 1939, 1966). Several studies of “set” were published (Aks, 1941; Galperin, 1941a, 1941a/1980, 1941b), and the major unpublished work on usanovka by Bassin—reportedly written by 1944 (Savenko, 2006)—was probably an important landmark in the long standing interest in the unconscious as understood within the context of the Vygotskian paradigm (Bassin, 1968, 1969, 1978). Indeed, the unconscious as an integral part of cultural historical and activity-oriented psychology still needs its own proper and detailed investigation.

Clinical Psychology and the Study of Pathology

The history and the work of UPNA’s Department of Clinical Psychology and related clinical research done in the 1930s is the least explored connection to Vygotsky in contemporary writings, and an unwritten chapter in the history of the Kharkov school. Vygotsky himself was interested in the pathology of development from the earliest stage of his scientific career. In 1924, he defined his scientific and professional credo as “educating blind-deaf-mute children” (Vygodskaya & Lifanova, 1996; 1999), an interest he subsequently developed in his work. Vygotsky’s main research on the pathology of development and on clinical psychology were studies of aphasia and of dementias like Parkinson’s or Pick’s diseases (Samukhin, Birenbaum, & Vygotsky, 1934; Vygotsky, 1935b, 1935/1956, 1935/1983), schizophrenia (Vygotsky, 1932; 1932/1956; 1933; 1934b; 1934/1994), or the localization of brain functions (Vygotsky, 1934a; 1934/1960b).

In particular, the role of language in human development was investigated through clinical cases of speech pathology—specifically, aphasia (Galperin & Golubeva, 1933; Kozis, 1934; Lebedinskii, 1933b, 1934, 1936b, 1941; Lebedinsky, 1936; A. R. Luria, 1932/1933, 1940, 1943, 1947, 1947/1970). These studies, and Vygotsky’s later work on the localization of brain functions (Vygotsky, 1934a), significantly contributed to Luria’s neuropsychology (A. R. Luria, 1966). Vygotsky’s study on schizophrenia was developed through several studies of concept formation (Bassin, 1938), action structure (Lebedinskii, 1940; Lebedinskii, Artyukh, & Voloshin, 1938, 1938/1939; Zaporozhets, 1939b) and speech disorders in schizophrenia (Bassin, 1938; Lebedinskii, 1938b; Tatarenko, 1938).

The research of clinical psychologists at the Kharkov school in the 1930s was closely related to work done simultaneously in Moscow by another large group of Vygotsky’s students at the All-Union Institute of Experimental Medicine (VIEM), the Experimental Defectological Institute (EDI) and several other educational and research organizations studying developmental psychology (Morozova, 1947; Shif, 1935, 1944; L. S. Slavina, 1944, 1947) and abnormal development, or defectology (Boskis, 1939; Levina, 1936, 1940; Morozova, 1944; Pevzner, 1941; Pevzner, Zankov, & Shmidt, 1933; Zankov, 1935; Zankov & Solov’ev, 1940).
Indeed, in parallel with this work in Kharkov, another important group of Vygotsky’s students in Moscow continued the studies he had initiated in clinical and pathological psychology (Birenbaum, 1934; Birenbaum & Zeigarnik, 1935; Dubinin & Zeigarnik, 1940; Kaganovskaya & Zeigarnik, 1935; Samukhin, 1935; Samukhin, Birenbaum, & Vygotsky, 1934; Zeigarnik, 1934, 1940, 1941; Zeigarnik & Birenbaum, 1935). These studies led to wartime efforts in several military hospitals to restore motion and higher mental functions, under the supervision of Luria (Galperin, 1943; Galperin & Ginevskaya, 1947; A. N. Leontiev & Ginevskaya, 1947; A. N. Leontiev & Zaporozhets, 1945; A. R. Luria, 1947, 1947/1970). However, a detailed investigation of the studies done by this larger circle of Vygotsky’s followers not associated with the Kharkov school is beyond the scope of our paper.

**EPILOGUE**

Our overview of the history of the Kharkov school ends in 1941, with the beginning of German military action on the territory of the USSR. However, the development of Vygotsky’s theory did not stop with the war. After the war, Vygotsky’s psychological theory developed in a number of directions. The most well known was “activity theory,” typically associated with Vygotsky’s older contemporary and opponent, S. L. Rubinshtein, and with Vygotsky’s student and collaborator, A. N. Leontiev. However, within the activity-oriented school there are actually several distinctive lines of research, including (1) Galperin’s stepwise model of forming mental actions (Arievitch & Stetsenko, 2000; Arievitch & van der Veer, 1995, 2004; Haenen, 1996), (2) research on perception and motor skills development by Zaporozhets and his associates (Venger, 1994), and (3) studies on play and learning activity by Elkonin, Davydov, and their collaborators in several research centers across the former Soviet Union (Davydov, 1996, 2004; Elkonin, 1989b; Repkin, 1997/2003a, 1997/2003b; Repkin & Repkina, 1997).

The largest group of Vygotsky’s followers in the Soviet Union developed his theory under the banner of “activity theory.” Indeed, V. Zinchenko (1996) describes this phenomenon as a “strange situation,” when “the authors of studies carried out in strict correspondence with the conceptual framework of cultural-historical psychology, and using a causal genetic method, interpreted the results in terms of the psychological theory of activity” (V. P. Zinchenko, 1996/2001, p. 51–52). Furthermore, he adds that “Zaporozhets, Lisina, Leont’ev, and later many others (whether or not consciously and intentionally) carried out studies that might have been conceived by Vygotsky in that they departed from the classical oppositions of subjective vs. objective, the material vs. the ideal, and discovered a new ontology for psychology” (V. P. Zinchenko, 1996/2001, p. 52).

But although several activity-oriented versions of Vygotsky’s psychology were developed, much of the research done in the Vygotskian tradition seems to have bypassed the activity-oriented framework. For instance, neither Luria nor any of his associates working on neuropsychological problems aligned themselves with the activity approach (Brushlinskii, 1998); instead, they continued to develop Vygotsky’s ideas on the role of language in human development, and on the affective-semantic and dynamic structure of consciousness. These Vygotskians were instrumental in establishing neuropsychology as a field of scientific research (Akhtutina, 1996, 1996/2003; Homskaya, 1992/2001); other lines of research in medical and pathological psychology associated with Vygotsky’s followers were influenced by—yet remain parallel to—the activity-oriented framework (Lebedinskii & Myasishchev, 1966; Zeigarnik, 1962, 1962/1965, 1986). Finally, L. Bozhovich’s research group explored problems of personality development in children (Bozhovich, 1968; Bozhovich &
Blagonadzhina, 1961, 1972; L. I. Slavina, 1958, 1966) and expressed explicit critique of the some of the activity theory claims.

Following Akhutina (2004), we believe that Vygotsky’s overall scientific project can only be understood as spanning the two complementary lines of inquiry from both the cultural-historical and natural-scientific perspectives. In this light, it is remarkable to consider how all these different psychological schools, despite their differences, fall under the broad framework laid down by Vygotsky. The flexibility, breadth, and heuristic potential of Vygotsky’s theorizing seem particularly important today, given that the fragmentation of science is increasingly acknowledged as an acute problem. Our study of the Kharkov school is a first step toward a historical analysis that hopes to reconstruct Vygotsky’s integrative research program—but a lot of work remains to be done.
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