

PROBLEMS OF METHODOLOGY OF HISTORY WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY COURSE OF “THE HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL SCIENCE”

Oleg V. Sinitzyn¹

The research is relevant due to the need to determine the role and place of theory and methodology of history in the structure of the university course of “the History of Russian historical science” as an academic discipline today. The purpose of the article is to identify the traditions of teaching in this area, integrating the results of the researching theoretical and methodological problems of history in the past and at the present level of study and interpretation. The leading approach to the study of this problem is the analysis of the fundamental theoretical problems of history as reality and the examination process. Main results of the research are systematization of the author’s experience of teaching the course of history of national historical science in Kazan Federal University. The basic elements of methods of joining the most important methodological problems of historical science into the course of historiography are revealed in the article. The article can be useful for teachers and students in studying the course of historiography, research methods, as well as national and world history.

Keywords: historiography ; methodology ; historical education ; the history of Russia.

INTRODUCTION

The history of the national historical science as an academic discipline is a systematically completed at the higher historical education (Naumova & Shiklo, 2011) and requires appropriate theoretical and practical justification on the basis of the Federal state educational standard of Russia of the third generation (FSSES3+).

The methodological component is the basis of teaching the course “History of the national historical science” (Chubaryan, 2014). Students need to understand that the formation of historical science in Russia has become, on the one hand, a gradual transformation into scientific knowledge, and secondly, stimulated the development of its methodological foundations. The development of historical knowledge contributed to the fact that the methodological position of historians have changed and evolved depending on the internal trends of science and from external influences (Porshneva, 2008).

The methodological turn to the scientific rationalism was difficult in our historical knowledge: from N.M. Karamzin’s “historical romanticism” to Evers-Polevoy’s “criticism”, to S.M. Solovyov’s “historicism” and to the “historical sociologism” of .V.O. Klyuchevsky.

In Soviet historiography the situation is somewhat different as with the study of methodological problems, and their teaching in high schools unlike pre-

¹ Professor of the Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia, *E-mail: olvsin@yandex.ru*

revolutionary historiography. This is because the concept of “methodology of history” was just a synonym for “Marxist-Leninist methodology” or “materialistic understanding of history” at the time, and therefore the terminology seemed unnecessary. Therefore, most Soviet historian’s interest in methodological problems of the history and historiography were missing which adversely affected specific historical research and occurrence into the world historiographical space (Smolensky, 2008). The exceptions include the work of A.I. Danilov (1963) at the Tomsk University, where the proceedings of “Methodological and historiographical issues of historical science” has began publication under his editorship and initiative since 1963. He was also engaged in teaching of special courses on methodological issues (Mogil’nitskii, 2006). After leaving A.I. Danilov from Tomsk, his disciple B.G. Mogil’nitskii, continued the publication of this collection and read lectures on the methodology of history. Since the mid 70-ies of XX century at the historical faculty of the Moscow state University I.D. Kovalchenko had read a course of lectures on “Methodological problems of historical knowledge”, which is reflected in excellent monograph “Methods of historical research” at the end of the 1980 (Kovalenko, 2003).

Since 90-ies of XX century the State educational standards of higher education include historical discipline “The Philosophy and methodology of history” which is closely connected with teaching the historiography of the Russian history as the history of national historical science.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The most important principle of research is the principle of historicism, which is understood as the analysis of the phenomena of the past within the unique social, economic, political, and cultural context of their epoch or any historiographical phenomenon (the concept of the scientist, position directions, and schools) should be considered in the development and in connection with its contributing factors.

The author tried to use the achievements of national historiography, mainly oriented to identify the political conditionality builds scientists and foreign institutional vision the history of science in the first place, drawn to its structural and functional features. These algorithms are complementary to each other, comprehensively analyzing the ratio of external and internal moments in the formation and development of historiographical schools, trends, movements and personalities.

Theoretical and methodological basis of research are the conceptual status of scientific research in the field of studying the problems of teaching historiography at the University. The most important methods of historiographical analysis: *comparative-historical method* allowing to perform the necessary comparison of different historical concepts with a view to identifying their common features, characteristics, identity and extent of borrowing, *a method of periodization*, aimed

at the selection stages in the development of historical science to detect the leading directions of methodological thought, revealing new elements in its structure and *systematic-chronological method* focusing on the analysis of the movement of scientific thought, change of concepts, views and ideas in a chronological sequence that allows to reveal regularities of accumulation and deepening of historiographical knowledge.

RESULTS

Adoption of the principle of rationalism

The main methodological principle of Russian historiography of the XVIII century is rationalism, the philosophy of mind, common sense human thinking. It is embodied in the work "History of Russia from the most ancient times" (2005) written by "the father of Russian history" V.N. Tatishchev for the first time in practice. In the preface, the scientist clearly stated the problem of history as a science and the requirements for historians. He argued strongly against misconceptions about the futility of history and the rationalist positions, argued that knowledge it is mandatory for every person, without which he "can't be perfected, wise and helpful". However, he stressed that "the whole philosophy is grounded on history and supported by history".

"Not to accept fables for the truth", from the historian Tatischev demanded the ability to place historical "supplies" (documents) from the standpoint of common sense. Being a rationalist, he believed that "all actions come from the mind or stupidity". Therefore, he explained the course of many historical events of national history by the actions of individuals.

In the second half of XVIII century historian and official historiographer M.M. Shcherbatov (2010) developed methodological ideas of V.N. Tatishchev (2005).

M. M. Shcherbatov (2010) interprets all historical process from a rational position, considering that the basis of all processes is the psychology of the acting person. For the first time in the national historiography, assuming the history of Russian autocracy as the main criterion of periodization, he began to consider it in close connection with the nobility, especially noble birth, being the founder of the class-representative concept of Russian history. Sharply criticizing the Church and civil legends, Shcherbatov (2010) sought to explain the emergence of specific historical circumstances.

The pinnacle of methodology of Russian noble rationalism became a "History of the Russian state" written by N.M. Karamzin (1791). In the Preface to his work Karamzin is most clearly expressed views on the aims and objectives of history. By defining history as "the sacred book of the Nations," the primary and indispensable, he allocated that the historian is not a chronicler and its most important task is to study "the properties and relationship of acts". The historian

“ought to specify the place”, strictly guided by the documents”, because “civil history does not tolerate fictions, portraying what is or was and not what could be”.

Particular importance has his famous notes to each volume of text, which often exceed the number of pages of the volume itself. Here Karamzin was often distracted from his monarchical concept expressed by the original judgment, which could not be placed in the official text. He caused extensive extraction from archival sources, and some of them were lost during the fire of Moscow in 1812 and has survived due to the work of Karamzin.

Critical branch in the Russian historiography of the XIX century

The second quarter of XIX century was marked by the emergence and development of the critical trend in Russian historiography. The most prominent of its representatives were I.F.G. Evers (1835) and N.A. Polevoy (1997). Despite the difference in subject studies, they share a commitment to interpret facts and events in the spirit of the philosophy of history, critical attitude to sources and authorities, the desire to fully establish the historical truth, the rejection of a simplified explanation of the events of the past.

I.G. Evers (1835) was a historian of law and his attention was paid to the study of the laws and customs, because they “externally testify to the inner grounds of national activity”. Thus, disclosure of internal patterns is becoming a major. The purpose of the research Evers (1835) is to show the gradual progress of law on the basis of the Russian history, arising from the Patriarchal state of civil society. The method of Evers (1835) was to compare the events of Russian history from the European, in showing the transition of one event to another. Evers (1835) argued that every phenomenon is the result of certain historical circumstances.

N.A. Polevoy (1997) criticized the concept of N.M. Karamzin (1989). The story in his understanding “is not a smoothly written chronicle of the times of the past”, it is a practical test of philosophical notions about the world and the humanity, it depicts the course of humanity, society, and morals of each age and nation, it produces outputs and generating reasons. Thus, the task of history was to find the truth, and in showing the regularities of the historical process. Such a task is possible only if the historian will abandon long-standing notions, will be exempt from “dilapidated authorities”. He believed that the words “Russian state” was the main mistake of Karamzin, the Russian state started to exist only since the overthrow of the Mongol yoke and in this view the explanation “the whole of the ancient history of Russia can be the history of the Russian people only, not the history of the Russian state” changed completely. Therefore, in contrast to N. M. Karamzin (1989), N.A. Polevoy (1997) titled his most important work “The History of the Russian people”.

Positivism in the methodology of the Russian historiography of the second half of the XIX century

S.M. Solovyev (1888) that made a significant contribution to the study of General theoretical and special historical problems of Russian and world history, occupies a special place in Russian and world historiography of the XIX century.

The main task of the historian by Solovyev (1888) was to destroy “the mix of eras, putting each of them with its corresponding character, to understand a constant course of history, the continuity of phenomena, and natural legitimate release of some phenomena from others follow-up from previous”. Solovyev nominated the idea of inner regularities, the principle of historicism in the first place. This is one of the strengths of his historical works.

S.M. Solovyev (1888) defined history as the science of national self-knowledge. He emphasized that life has every right to offer issues of science: “science has a duty to answer the questions of life”. At the same time he pointed out that “theory cannot live without practice”. Idealization of the past was unacceptable for Solovyev (1888). His own historical conception was based on the recognition of domestic laws, causation of historical development, laws of the progress. This idea in lectures he clearly expressed with one characteristic phrase: “Natural and necessary”, Solovyev (1888) required a comprehensive analysis of the concrete reality from historians.

S.M. Solovyev (1888) believed that three main factors determine the essence of the driving forces of the historical process, there are: 1) the nature of the country where people live; 2) the nature of the tribe to which it belongs; 3) the external environment influence, coming from the peoples that surround it. It was a new word in the historical science of that time.

All suggestions have been implemented by Solovyev (1888) in his main work “The history of Russia from ancient times” (1851-1879) in 29 volumes.

Another main representative of the Russian historical science of the second half of XIX – early XX centuries was V.O. Klyuchevskiy (1887). In the methodology he fully shared the positivist view of history as a descriptive science, whose main task is the description of the “uniqueness of local combinations”. But unlike many historians positivist Klyuchevskiy attached great importance to the role of the economic factor, arguing that “political facts are derived from the economic, as their consequences”. At the same time he noted that sometimes our “political facts went ahead, giving the direction of the economic life of the people”.

Strengths historical concept of Klyuchevskiy (1887) was the connection of history and modernity. He argued that “studying the grandfathers grandchildren learn”, i.e. studying the ancestors we learn ourselves. The whole historical process was regarded with the idealistic position by him. The leading position in his conception is to take public ideas which become “historical factors like the forces of nature made by them”. The main forces of the historical process, Klyuchevskiy

(1987) considered human personality, human society and nature, combining geographic, economic and social factors of development. Klyuchevskiy gave an innovative periodization of Russian history, linking it with colonization. He argued that the history of Russia is the history of the country, which colonized... relocation were the main fact in the near or distant ties were all the other facts. This approach largely brought him to the teacher S.M. Soloviev (1988). Klyuchevskiy (1987) examined each period of historical development in the light of geographical, political and economic characteristics.

The historical conception of V.O. Klyuchevskiy (1987) revealed most fully and convincingly in his "Course of Russian history", which harmoniously combines extraordinary imagery and brightness of the presentation with the depth of scientific content.

DISCUSSIONS

Affected in this study the problem was considered in a higher education textbook on the historiography of history of Russia (Naumova & Shyklo, 2011), the textbook on the theory and methodology of history (Smolensky, 2008) in the staging plan in the introductions to these editions. In the terminology dictionary on the theory and methodology of historical science necessary for students conceptual framework forming the basis of the teaching of the history of national historical science (Chubaryan, 2014) and in the monograph of I.D. Kovalchenko the leading role of theory and methodology in scientific knowledge that has direct relevance to the history of Russian historical science is characterized comprehensively (Kovalchenko, 2003). The positive experience of teaching historical and theoretical disciplines at the Ural Federal University and Tomsk state University in close connection with the historiographical problems of historical science presents in the articles of O.S. Porshneva (2008) and B.G. Mogilnitskii (2006). Thematically closest to this research are the monograph of V.P. Korzun (2000) and the article of S.P. Ramazanov (2007), but the authors mainly affect the chronological period of the late XIX–early XX centuries. Examined in this study aspect is the emergence and development of historical science in Russia in the XVIII-XIX centuries, when the methodology of history as an independent scientific discipline are not yet formed, but the author reveals the movement of the scientific thought of the Russian historians in the development of their conceptual approach to the coordinate of constructing a systematic history of Russia, which are the focus in the presented methodology of teaching the history of Russian historical science in Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University.

CONCLUSION

Thus, this study shows the importance of methodological problems of historical science in the development of historical knowledge in Russia in the XVIII-XIX

centuries and the coverage of these processes in teaching the course “the History of Russian historical science” in Kazan (Volga region) Federal University. In this course, students will be summarized excerpts from the works of outstanding historians N.M. Karamzin (1989), S.M. Solovyev (1988), V.O. Klyuchevskiy (1987). It is also proposed to perform tasks for independent work. The purpose of the task consists not only in the practical consolidation of the knowledge on the subject, but also in the formation of a comprehensive and adequate understanding of the formation and nature of modern theoretical and methodological concepts. The main teaching method is the independent work of students with methodical materials and scientific literature.

Recommendations

The material of the article of interest to professionals who are engaged in teaching in higher education the history of national historical science, history of Russia, philosophy, theory and methodology of history.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Chubaryan, A.O. (2014). ‘Theory and methodology of historical science. Terminologic dictionary’. Moscow: Akvilon.
- Danilov, A.I. (1963). ‘Methodological and historiographical questions in historical science’. Tomsk: Tomsk University Publ.
- Evers, I.F.G. (1835). ‘Right oldest ruses in its historical’ disclosure. St. Petersburg.
- Karamzin, N.M. (1989). ‘History of the Russian state’. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka.
- Klyuchevskiy, V.O. (1987). ‘Compositions’. Vol. 1. Moscow: Mysl.
- Korzun, V.P. (2000). ‘Images of historical science at the turn of XIX-XX centuries. Analysis of the national historiographical concepts’. Ekaterinburg-Omsk: Omsk University Publ.
- Kovalchenko, I.D. (2003). ‘Methods of historical research’. Moscow: Nauka.
- Mogilnitskiy, B.G. (2006). ‘The creative path of A. I. Danilov and the problem of continuity in the development of Russian historical and theoretical thinking of the twentieth century’, Dialogue within times. Almanac of intellectual history, 17: 200-223.
- Naumova, G.R. and Shiklo, A.E. (2008). ‘Historiography of history of Russia: textbook on history’. Moscow: Akademiya.
- Polevoi, N.A. (1997). ‘The history of the Russian people’. Vol. 1. Moscow: Veche.
- Porshneva, O.S. (2008). ‘The methodology of history in the transformation of the epistemological foundations of historical studies (the academic content of the course)’, Dialogue within times. Almanac of intellectual history, 22: 239-250.
- Ramazanov, S. P. (2007). ‘Methodological research and the traditions of Russian historical thought’, History of thought. Russian thinking tradition. 4: 39-49.

Shcherbatov, M.M. (2010). 'Selected works'. Moscow: ROSSPEN.

Smolenskiy, N.I. (2008). 'Theory and methodology of history : textbook for students of higher educational institutions'. Moscow: Akademiya.

Solovyev, S.M. (1988). 'Compositions'. Vol. 1. Vol. 1-2. Moscow: Mysl'.

Tatishchev, V.N. (2005). 'The history of the Russian'. T. 1. Moscow: Art.