

## МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ІСТОРИЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ ТА ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ

УДК 94 (438)

V. Kirieieva

## THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF THE LATE XVIIIth CENTURY IN MODERN RUSSIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

*The article gives the analysis of the main directions of the French revolution' research during the late eighteenth century in modern Russian historiography. The attention emphasised on the process of gradual departure from the Marxist interpretation of the revolutionary events in 1789–1799, and the beginning of a scientific debate among historians on the pages of scientific journals in the late 80-s to mid 90-s of the XXth century. Characterized the main approaches in modern Russian historical science regarding the interpretation of key problems of the French revolution: the essence of feudalism, the characteristic of the notion of absolutism, the place and role of the Jacobins in the revolutionary process, understanding and characterization of the events events during 1794–1799. Drawn attention to the scientific research of leading Russian historians: A. Ado, D. Bovykin, A. Chudinov, B. Smirnov, L. Himenova, A. Gordon and other. The outlooks of further research on the issue are described.*

**Key words:** *Russian historiography, the revolution, the Jacobins, feudalism, absolutism, round table, the thermidorians.*

**Background.** The French Revolution of the late XVIIIth century and to this day remains a field of view of researchers, scholarly discussions and causing prejudice constant appeal to a new generation of historians to the study, reflection and attempts to give a coherent, complete picture of the events of 1789–1799 years. The study of the subject is one of the central academic pursuits of modern Russian historians, that try, bringing a rich heritage of previous pre-revolutionary and Soviet scientists in particular, present a fair and devoid of stamps, analysis of the revolutionary events of the late XVIIIth century in France.

**The aim of our research** studies is an attempt to analyze new approaches to understanding the French Revolution of the late XVIIIth century in modern Russian historiography.

**Analysis of recent research and publications, and the main material.** The revolutionary events in France during 1789–1799 contemporary Russian historiography payed great attention. Attempts to move away from formal methodologies in the study of revolutionary events in France historians did back in 1988, launching under the auspices of the Institute of General History, RAS the practice of «round tables», where leading scientists tried to move away from biased assessments of historical events and tried to update methodological approaches in the revolution study [1]. Previously, most research has focused on the study of the historical role of the masses and the left-wing revolutionary activity, especially the Jacobins, where it saw the Bolsheviki predecessors. According to the wording of A. Ado, Soviet historiography was «Jacobinscentrism» studied the revolution «from below» and «left» [1]. However, the beginning of political democratization in the late 80 's, the XXth century, the collapse of the USSR radically changed the situation and led to a departure from the traditional marks.

It was part of the first round table A. Ado outlined the future prospects of Russian historical science on understanding the revolutionary events, pointing to «the need for fresh thinking on a number of issues of the French Revolution' history, in search of new approaches upgrade issues, reviewing some schemes» and overcome «Jacobinscentrism». This call was supported by young historians who have raised in their speeches the problems previously ignored Soviet historiography: the mentality of the French people (Z. Chekantseva and E. Obychkin), the history of the nobility (L Pimenova) and the bourgeoisie (E. Kiseleva and A. Revyakin) Girondins' history (E. Huseynov).

However, the main debate on the «round table» launched two problems – France transition from feudalism to capitalism and Jacobinism. Contrary to the traditional Soviet historians thought that the French Revolution was a definite distinction between feudalism and capitalism, A. Ado proposed to consider it as the «most important» event-border «during a long time informal transition: decay and destruction of the old, the formation and establishment of a new capitalist society», which lasted over the XVI–XIX centuries.

The scientific debate has caused the problem of handling by historians the term «feudal-absolutist», which was used by Soviet historians on the characteristics of the old order. L. Pimenova noted that the term «feudalism» «claims to comprehensiveness, indicates formational affiliation and can characterize anything: economic, social relationships, state ideology. What was feudal in France during the XVIIIth ? Which side of life, we do not take for consideration, it always looks like ambiguous and does not fit into the framework of the definition of «feudal system». Of course, she continued, this time remained feudal origin items, mainly state legal system, but can we consider them crucial or key? Recognizing all discussion of this issue, L. Pimenova, but also expressed her view: «At the present level of knowledge we have no reason to characterize the system of social relations in pre-revolutionary France as a whole feudal system» [2 , p. 94-95].

In later works the author has convincingly argues that the French economy before the revolution was multistructural and although liege complex relationship existed before the revolution, and in some parts of them it survived, in no way, played a decisive role in the economy in the XVIIIth century. Even in areas with an archaic structure of the economy proportion liege obligations in income seniors landowners rarely exceeded 40 %, while in the developed regions was even smaller. Most modern scholars are inclined to believe that the present level of knowledge has no reason to characterize the system of social relations in pre-revolutionary France as a whole feudal system [ 3].

However, until now scholars, still served by established: the Soviet era terminology. Some works can still be found the phrase «schedule feudal relations» [4 , p. 23] and even the claim that on the eve of the Revolution «feudal relations prevailing in French society ...» [5 , p. 367]; the other way is called «liege» and the guilt is the feudal or the liege [6 , p. 59, 63, 76]. In some later studies have consistently used only the concept of «liege order» or «order liege».

Cautiously modern historians have begun to apply the concept of «absolutism» [7]. However, in the post-Soviet historiography point of view in Western science ( in particular the study of H. Henschel), the desire to abandon the concept of «absolutism» did not found the reflection. In most studies the concept of «bsolutism» is present, but its content variant. Some authors mean by absolutism «is not limited to laws rule» [8], others point out that the «supreme and indivisible power of the king did not mean tyranny, that wicked rule. It was based on state laws, however imperfect they may seem» [6 , p. 27].

Original attempt to discuss the problem of absolutism, gathered under one cover article leading national experts on the history of the old order, was the publication of a special issue of «French Yearbook» in 2005, dedicated to this subject. None of the authors do not put it in favor of the thesis about the absolute power of the kings in France. As stressed by V. Malov, the term «absolutism» as a synonym despotic government, «came into use only in the XIXth century, but «absolute» the French monarch has long believed, but the meaning of this definition does not include a first concept of omnipotence and rather – completeness, perfection, and constant declarations omnipotence King combined with real limits of his power» [9 , p. 7].

One of the most controversial issues were related to the assessment of the Jacobin Terror and the Jacobin republic entire period 1793–1794 yy. M. Bolhovitinov, E. Chernyak, V. Smirnov proposed adjustments to previously unequivocally positive image of the Jacobins, given that the Jacobins created a system of a state terror. They criticized characteristic of Soviet historiography thesis of «bourgeois narrowness» of the French Revolution, emphasizing, for example, that the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen «expressing universal ideals» and not only «the interests of the bourgeoisie» [1].

Trends initiated by «round table» in 1988, reflected in historical studies, published in Russia with the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution. Among a large number of books, scientific articles greatest scientific weight had collections of documents revolutionary period, the originator of which was A. Ado. Continued explored themes that were not illuminated, so A. Gordon investigated the causes collapse of the Girondins [10] M. Molchanov worked on portraits of political Montagnards [11]. In the mid 90's, the XXth century, leading Russian scientists A. Gordon, A. Chudinov and S. Blumenau published studies that have become a significant milestone in overcoming stereotypes of the Soviet era in interpretations of Jacobinism.

Thus, A. Gordon, continuing the tradition of historiography, considering the Jacobin rebellion in 1793 as «popular» and «deeply patriotic» as «the climax of the Great Revolution». He believes that through the Jacobin dictatorship France overcame feudalism in agriculture and foreign intervention. [10] He believes that the Jacobins were inextricably linked to the social reality of the era: «For the Jacobin illusion of universality wings of interest not only and not the bourgeoisie as a huge not bourgewa of French society» [12 , p. 386].

Instead S. Blumenau opposed «idealization» Jacobins, against those who think their political practice «progressive» [13, p. 3]. A. Chudinov described Jacobins as sincere, but dangerous utopian that existed in the «clouds of Utopia» in complete isolation from reality. The scientist claimed that «moral utopia robesp'yerystiv contrary to the real needs of all segments of French society ... but making your selection, the Knights « Kingdom of virtue» would not retreat. Blinded by the dream, they floated «on a bloody cloud» over the sea of tears and suffering that flooded their homeland. France was on the edge of disaster. To save her, I had to throw off the yoke of utopia. This was 9 Thermidor ... » [14 , p. 47, 54].

In October 1995 there was a new «round table» on «Jacobinism historical outcomes of the French Revolution», which was methodological pluralism former Soviet historians [15]. The main debate focused historical role of Jacobinism. A. Chudinov still insisted that «it is impossible to link the policy of Robespierre and his followers with the real interests of any social group of French society». A. Gordon, however, argued that the Jacobins reflected the interests of the masses. He criticized attempts to «dejacobinisation» revolutionary history and stressed «the international significance of Jacobinism». In his view, modern history has made «a step in the direction of the Jacobin» came to the practice of state regulation of the economy and public policy of the social security. These arguments clearly demonstrated that modern Russian historiography is emerging. It is the result of a break with the Soviet historiography, but retains many of its traditions.

«Change of milestones» in the Evaluation of the French Revolution of the XVIIIth century, reflected, above all, in the works of Chudinov. Thus, in the article that opened revived «French Yearbook» and was called «Change of milestones: the 200th anniversary of the Revolution and Russian historiography» [16], the author noted that «the process was driven by the logic of science itself and those social and political changes that took place in the country. Launched in the mid 80's, the XXth century, gradual weakening and then complete disappearance of ideological pressure of the Communist Party and the state constantly pressured to Soviet historians of the French Revolution, opened for free to search and experiment in the methodology for creative perception of advanced foreign science achievements, including those of its directions that take a critical stance towards Marxism. «Changes in reporting the events of their assessments and scientist also linked to the change of generations in 1976 died A. Manfred, 1985 – V. Dalin, 1995 – A. Ado, 1997 – G. Kucherenko. At the present, said A. Chudinov, when leadership in the study of the French Revolution passed to their students, expanded «methodological range of research revolution. A fundamental reassessment in the Russian science of the role non-Marxist trends in no way associated with the rejection of a truly scientific achievements «classical» and, in particular, Marxist historiography» [16 , p. 23].

A somewhat different interpretation of the historiographical turn reasons outlined by V. Smirnov. If A. Chudinov put forward the results of scientific studies, V. Smirnov changes in ideology and politics. He wrote: «One of the reasons A. Chudinov calls» ideological bias away from topics and methodological pluralism ... However, if the ideological bias of the Marxist approach is really missing in most post-Soviet historians work, it does not mean that they are free from ideological bias of a different kind. Any attempt to understand the historical process, event, person, inevitably comes from existing historian of ideas, beliefs, superstitions, myths, that of belief systems, and therefore of ideology. «Under»general direction and tone of the post-Soviet historiography ... certainly far from Marxist bias, but it is responsible – even if the authors do not notice - that system of views and values, which is prevalent in Russian society and which can be called liberal-conservative» [17 , p. 224].

Developing this idea, V. Smirnov describe changes taking place in the Russian historiography of the French Revolution in the broader context of changes in our social attitude

towards revolutionaries and the revolution in general, the emergence of interest in figures counterrevolutionary camp. «The prevailing atmosphere of fierce criticism of all Marxist revolutionary or Soviet, feeling kind of allergy to Marxism, they (*modern historians – V.K.*) primarily sought to discard old dogmas and expand the scope of research, doing analysis of phenomena that are not paid attention or have not mentioned their predecessors. If Soviet historians have focused on socio- economic issues and especially class interests, post-Soviet historians have shown interest rather political reform mentality elites, immigrants, counterrevolutionaries» [17 , p. 225].

On the other hand, now is really active the development areas that were completely unexplored in Soviet historiography. There are works devoted to the Vendee [18] Thermidor coup [19], ideology counterrevolution [20], the role of Freemasons in the revolutionary events [22].

To the focus of researchers and get new personalities, of which we still have not been contacted or had written: J. Necker, E. Burke, L. de Bonald, E.ZH. Siyes, Louis the XVI, Louis the XVII and Louis the XVIII [ 23].

**Conclusions.** Thus, modern Russian historiography is a kind of transition and trying to overcome the old methodological approaches in the evaluation of the French Revolution during the late XVIIIth century. It inherited from the Soviet era. Along with traditional areas of studies on the causes of the revolution, its nature, places of various party factions, modern scholars are beginning to apply also to those issues that until now were covered indirectly, did need new assessments.

#### References

1. Actual problems of studying history of the Great French Revolution: (Materials of «round table», 19-20 sept. 1988). – М., 1989.
2. L.A Pimenova French monarchy of the late old order in the modern historiography: Between history of political culture and the political history of events / L.A. Pimenova. // French Yearbook-2000. – Moscow, 2000.
3. L.A Pimenova Imagination of «feudalism» of pre-revolutionary France in the XVIII century. / L.A. Pimenova. // feudalism: concept and realy. – М.: Institute of Common History of Sciences, 2008.
4. V.G. Revunenkov History of French revolution. / V.G. Revunenkov. – SPb. , 2003.
5. World History. The Great French revolution. – Moscow – Minsk , 2001.
6. A.V. Revyakyn The Great French revolution. / History of Europe. In 6 t. - Vol 5 – М. , 2000.
7. A.V. Chudinov «Royal autocracy» in France: History of a myth . / A.V. Chudzhynov. // French Yearbook 2005. – М., 2005.
8. V.V. Shishkin Royal yard and Political struggle in France in the XVI–XVII centuries. / V.V. Shishkin . – SPb., 2004 .
9. V.N. Malov Three phases and two ways of the French absolutism' development. /V.N. Malov. // French Yearbook 2005. – М. , 2005.
10. A.V. Gordon The falling of zhyrondists. / A.V. Gordon. – М., 1988.
11. N.N. Molchanov Montanyary. / N.N. Molchanov. – М. , 1989.
12. A.V. Gordon Illusions and realy of the Jacobinism // Saint-Just L.A. Speech. Treatises. / A.V. Gordon. – М. , 1995 .
13. S.F. Blumenau Disputes about the revolution of French historical science in the second part 60-70's of the XXth century. / S.F. Blumenau . – Bryansk, 1994.
14. A.V. Chudinov In the clouds of utopia: Georges Couthon's life and dreams // Couthon J. Favourite works. 1793–1794. / A.V. Chudinov. – М., 1994.
15. Jacobinism in historical results of the Great French Revolution. Materialsof «round table». // Modern and Contemporary History. – 1996. – № 5. – S. 73–99.
16. A.V. Chudinov The change of milestones: the 200th anniversary of the revolution and Russian historiography. / A.V. Chudinov. // French Yearbook 2000: 200 years of French Revolution 1789–1799 yy.: Results of anniversary. – М., 2000.
17. V.P. Smirnov Red life of the one edition. / V.P. Smirnov. // Modern and Contemporary History, 2002. – № 3.
18. S.E. Letchford Vandeyk War 1793–1796 yy. Some theoretical problems. / S.E. Letchford // Modern and Contemporary history. The Unsversity's manual. – Saratov, 1998.
19. D.Yu. Bovykin The Revolution expired? The Results of Termydora. / D.Yu. Bovykin. – М., 2005.
20. V.Yu. Sergienko The French revolution with constitutional monarchys regard. (Experience of immigrations). / V.Yu. Sergienko // French Yearbook. – М., 2001.
21. D.Yu. Bovykin Religion and the church in political project of Louis the XVIII and his environment ( 1795–1799 ) . / D.Yu. Bovykin. // French Yearbook 2004. – М., 2004.
22. A.V. Chudinov Masons and the French revolution: discussion of two centuries. / A.V. Chudinov. // Modern and Contemporary history. – 1999. – № 1.
23. D.A. Rostyslavlev Louis the XVIII and Political Programs of French immigration during the epoch of revolution in the XVIIIth century. ( Materials by archives on External Policy of the Russian Empire). / D.A. Rostyslavlev // French Yearbook. – Moscow, 2000.

Одержано редакцією 01. 09. 2014

Прийнято до публікації 20. 11. 2014

**Анотація. Кіреєва В.О. Французька революція кінця XVIII ст. в новітній російській історіографії**

У статті подається аналіз основних напрямів дослідження Французької революції кінця XVIII ст. в новітній російській історіографії. Основна увага звертається на процес поступового відходу від марксистської інтерпретації революційних подій 1789–1799 рр. та започаткування наукової дискусії серед істориків на сторінках наукових журналів у кінці 80-х – середині 90-х рр. ХХ ст. Подано характеристику основних підходів в сучасній російській історичній науці щодо інтерпретації ключових проблем французької революції кінця XVIII ст.: суті феодалізму, характеристики поняття абсолютизм, місця та ролі якобінців в революційному процесі, науковому осмисленні та характеристиці розгортання подій 1794–1799 рр. Проаналізовано наукові студії провідних російських істориків: А. Адо, Д. Бовикіна, А. Чудинова, В. Смірнова, Л. Піменової, А. Гордона та інших. Окреслено перспективи подальших досліджень з проблеми.

**Ключові слова:** російська історіографія, революція, якобінці, феодалізм, абсолютизм, «круглий стіл», термідорианці.

**Аннотация. Киреева В. А. Французская революция XVIII в. в новейшей российской историографии.**

Статья посвящена анализу основных направлений исследования Французской революции конца XVIII в. в новейшей российской историографии. Основное внимание обращается на процесс постепенного отхода от марксистской интерпретации революционных событий 1789–1799 гг и начало научной дискуссии среди историков на страницах научных журналов в конце 80-х – середине 90-х гг. Охарактеризованы основные подходы в современной российской исторической науке по интерпретации ключевых проблем французской революции: сущности феодализма, характеристике понятия абсолютизм, места и роли якобинцев в революционном процессе, научному осмыслению и характеристике развития событий 1794–1799 гг. Обращено внимание на научные исследования ведущих российских историков: А. Адо, Д. Бовыкина, А. Чудинова, В. Смирнова, Л. Пименовой, А. Гордона и других. Определены перспективы дальнейших исследований по проблеме.

**Ключевые слова:** российская историография, революция, якобинцы, феодализм, абсолютизм, «круглый стол», термидорианцы.

УДК 94 (477.82):930.1

О. В. Марушенко

**УКРАЇНСЬКО-ПОЛЬСЬКИЙ КОНФЛІКТ 1943 р. НА ВОЛИНІ У ВІТЧИЗНЯНИХ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНИХ ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯХ**

В статті аналізуються основні тенденції та особливості дослідження сучасною вітчизняною історіографією окремих аспектів українсько-польських відносин в роки Другої світової війни, зокрема Волинської трагедії 1943 р., яка стала кульмінаційною подією взаємних конфліктів у ХХ ст. і не може вивчатися й без врахування діяльності ОУН і УПА, трагічного протистояння між УПА та Армією Крайовою на західноукраїнських землях.

В статті охарактеризовані організаційно-інституційні засади розвитку історіографії проблеми, збільшення документально-джерельної бази і активізація дослідницьких зусиль вітчизняних істориків у даній тематичній ніші, зумовлені, зокрема, відзначенням 70-річчя як трагічних подій на Волині, так і завершення Другої світової війни.

Звертається увага на недостатньо з'ясовані аспекти теми, зокрема, соціально-економічні фактори українсько-польського протистояння, роль німецького і радянського чинників у провокуванні й розпалюванні конфлікту, демографічний сегмент досліджуваної теми і питання кількісної оцінки жертв Волинської трагедії.

Охарактеризовані сучасні концептуально-теоретичні підходи до вивчення теми, пов'язані з використанням методів соціальної, культурної історії, проведенням мікроісторичних досліджень, вивченням локального контексту, впровадженням антропологічного і просопографічного підходів.

**Ключові слова:** історіографія, українсько-польські відносини, Волинська трагедія, Організація українських націоналістів, Українська повстанська армія, Армія Крайова.

**Постановка проблеми.** Важливим явищем сучасного етапу розвитку вітчизняної історичної науки є виникнення і становлення за останні понад двадцять років такого її окремого і самостійного науково-дослідницького напрямку, як історіографія українсько-