

К.В. Umbrashko, N.E. Bulankina

IVAN IV THE TERRIBLE: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL AND LITERARY MYTH IN HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL STANDARD

The article deals with one of the most specific issues of Russia's history, identified in the Historical and Cultural Standard of Liberal Education, in terms of Subject Concepts, approved by the State, i.e. «The Role of Ivan the Terrible, in Russia's history: reforms and their cost/consequences». The authors analyze the texts of historiographical and literary origin for identification of some of the crucial issues of the Ivan's IV Reforms as topical ones, which still provoke further investigation in modern educational and scientific environment, in the aspect of new educational values.

Keywords: historiography; literary myth; Ivan IV; Russian reforms; Subject Concepts; Historical and Cultural Standard (HCS).

Introduction

The topicality of one of the most famous and, at the same time, controversial historical figures of Russia's history, the first officially crowned ruler, Tsar Ivan IV Vasilyevich the Terrible (Grozny) (1533–1584), is connected with different aspects, and is still under investigation in our times. First, the topicality may be explained, both in a narrow sense (Ivan's IV Reforms, in fact, Central government – the Tsar – the reign of Ivan the Terrible), and in a broad one (their consequences in the Time of Troubles and for Russian reforms of other eras), because of its great past in Russian history after his reign. Second, as is the case, the topical issues of the problem under discussion are considered to be an integral part of the Concept of a new educational complex on Russian history, where one can find out texts of various studies and controversial opinions on the above problem, since the years of the XVIII century [1]. Third, to tell the truth, the topical issues are still under discussion, still considered to be controversial, mostly, among historians and educators of our time. Fourth, these Concepts are based mostly on the ratio of oprichnina, and some other reforms of Ivan IV (i.e. reforms of the «Elected Rada»). Fifth, in recent decades, the topicality of Ivan's reforms has arisen again in Russian historiographical studies. And not only there, because of many factors, among which, the image of the notorious Tsar, Ivan IV the Terrible is presented in different spheres of Russian culture, theater, cinematography, literature, paintings, and elsewhere. Almost everywhere, and in different situations, Ivan the Terrible, is depicted far from being a positive character / hero of his time! [2–4].

By the same token, of particular interest, it has become one of the topical issues in Russian society, when there in the educational space, the problem of Subject Concepts in Liberal Education, both in History and in Literature, has also arisen in the list of 'difficult questions' of Russia's History, and when the Concept of a new Educational Complex on Russia's history, the holistic Concept itself, started to be approved by the State. As is the case, according to Russian historians and publicists, there existed several Concepts where the authors have a try to explain the pecu-

liarities of both the character and the reign/management of Ivan IV. Into the bargain, there is, this factfile as still controversial, and not of a helping hand for secondary teachers of the Humanities, particularly, for History and Literature teachers, who have to give grounds for students' objective thinking, while working with students of different ages [2–4].

Thus, the mentioned topical questions, in a way, cover the problematic space for the authors' research, and as is the case, *the aim of the study* is seen in the trial to problematize the solution of one of the difficult issues of Russia's history, identified in the Concept of a new educational and methodical complex on Russia's history (the Concept), developed and approved both by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science of Russian Federation, in collaboration with the Russian Historical Society. The state document caused a wide interest and hot discussions on the part of the historical and pedagogical community. After its publication in 2013 [1, 5–7] there appeared some manuals and articles dedicated to the importance and guide-lines of the Concept in the educational space of Russian schools [5].

Methodology and programme of the research

As is the case, the value sphere of an individual, as practical activities show, has become of special interest / importance due to the fact, that the world system of values of the past centuries, based on stability and ratio of socio-economic formation, has survived its time: the gap with the cultural traditions turns onto ideological disorientation of people / members of the society, the destruction of the value sphere of their mentality. And there, in the situation like that, the information and educational environment started to be changed; the role of the effectiveness of pedagogical education, the significance of system training and retraining / upgrading of specialists in the space of *recurrent education* associated with the periods of «teaching» and «non-learning», is increasing [8]. These and some other questions also made up the problem essence for the article *in the aspect of axiological approach*. One of the most important tasks of the research is to study the processes of educational value-developing professional environment, providing the support and sustainable development of inno-

vations in education in the aspect of the concept of an individual language of a modern teacher of the Humanities. The programme of the research covers several stages – the study of historiographical sources, state documents of educational essence, and literary resources of the 19–20th centuries.

In the framework of the above theses and stages of the research programme, if we do try to observe the subject of the reform of the XVI century and their role in Russia's history, then, in Russian historiography, we'll come across and find out the analysis and discussion of the following reforms of Ivan IV:

– Written (*prikaznaya*) reform.

The creation of central government – *orders* (until the midsixties – 1660s they were called *huts*). Petition Hut, the Ambassadorial Order (Departments / Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Local Order (distribution of estates), the Discharge Order (Armed Forces Headquarters), Criminal Order (Department for struggle with criminal elements), Provincial Order (Department for installation of order in Moscow).

– Reform of the Central administration. The essence lies in the limitation for local works / actions.

– Military reform which determined what amount of land should permit for an armed warrior to go out on a horse; if the estate or estates of the feudal lords were large enough, the warrior should take along his armed slaves.

– Tax reform determines the cancellation of feeding.

– Judicial reform. In 1550 a new code of laws was adopted. The adoption of a new version of the «Tsar's Sudebnick» was associated with the adoption of a new status for Ivan IV – the first officially crowned ruler.

– Church reform. Domestic political reforms have led to major military and foreign policy successes.

– Oprichnina as a reform was established from 1565 to 1572 in the Moscow government.

Thus, in Russian historical science, these and some other reforms have been actively discussed since the XVIII century. Historians and publicists have proposed at least three concepts in which the peculiarities of the character and reign of the first Russian Tzar are under investigation. At the heart of all these concepts there is the ratio of oprichnina and other reforms of Ivan IV (reforms of the «Elected Rada») [9–11].

1. *The Concept of «Two Ivans».*

This historiographical concept began to take shape in the late XVI – early XVII century. More distinctly it was described in the XVIII century in the historical work of M.M. Shcherbatov [11]. But it gained popularity after the publication of N. M. Karamzin's «History of the Russian state» in the early XIX century.

«The great historian» pointed out the following concept about the beginning of the oprichnina reform eloquently, «We start to describe the terrible change in the heart of the Tsar and in the destiny of the Tsardom». And further on: «Is it likely that the beloved sovereign, adored, could have fallen into the abyss of the horrors of tyranny from such a height of all his good works, happiness, and glory? But the evidence of the good and the evil is equally convincing, irrefutable; it remains only to imagine and notice this amazing phenomenon in its gradual changes. History is not able to solve the question of moral freedom of man; but assuming it in its judgment about the works

and temperaments of characters, history explains them both, first, by natural properties of people, and second, by circumstances or impressions of the things that influence the soul. Ivan was born with ardent passions, with a strong imagination, with a mind even more acute than firm or thorough. His poor upbringing, having spoiled his natural inclinations, left him room for correction in one Faith: for the most daring libertines of Tsars did not dare then to touch this Holy feeling. Friends of the Fatherland and the good works in the circumstances of emergency were able to touch it and influence upon it by saving horrors and striking his heart; they outwitted the young man from the nets of the bliss, and with the help of the pious, meek Anastasia, carried out him on the path of the virtue. The unfortunate consequences of Ivan's disease upset this great union, weakened the power of friendship, made up a change».

And then «Moscow froze in fear. Blood poured; in prisons, in monasteries the victims groaned; but... the tyranny yet matured: the present was terrifying the future! There is no correction for the tormentor, always more and more suspicious, more and more ferocious; blood-drinking does not quench, but increases the thirst for blood: it becomes one of the most terrible passions, inexplicable for the mind, because it is madness/paranoia, in light of the execution for people and for the tyrant himself. – It is a curious thing to see how this Tsar, until the end of his life being hard venerated by the Christian Law, wanted to accept his Divine teaching along with his unprecedented ferocity: that to justify the judges in the form of justice, claiming that all the martyrs were traitors, sorcerers, the enemies of Christ and of Russia; being humble before God and people, he called himself a vile murderer of the innocent, ordered to pray for them in Holy temples, but was comforted with the hope that his sincere repentance would become for him a salvation, and after getting rid of earthly greatness, in the peaceful space of the Monastery of Saint Kyril Belozerskii, someday he will live a peaceful life of a Monk!» [9. P. 1–5; 12–13].

Purposefully, we gave a lengthy extract from the «History of the Russian State» to make clear the idea why in 1862 the official authorities of the Russian Empire refused to place the image of the figure of Ivan IV on the monument of «Millennium of Russia», which was opened in the Kremlin of Novgorod the Great.

There appeared the development of the above ideas in the Kljuchevsky's work named «The Course of Russia's history», brightly and vividly emotional expressed. He wrote: «The oprichnics were put into not instead of the boyars, but against the boyars; their mission could be of not rulers, but only executioners of the earth. This was the political futility of the oprichnina: caused by the collision, the reason of which was the order, not man, it was directed against individuals, but for order. As is the case, we can say that the oprichnina did not answer the question of priority. It could have been instilled in the mind of the Tsar by a wrong understanding of the status of both the boyars and his own position / status / mission. The idea was largely the product of the Tsar's over timid and scared imagination. Ivan directed it against the terrible sedition, as if it was in the boyars' environment threatening to the existence of all members of the tsar's family, and, thus, whether

the danger was real and so terrible. By the same token, along with the oprichnina, the political power of the boyars was undermined by the conditions directly or indirectly created by the Moscow's gathering of Rus» [10. P. 172–173].

If we step aside from the great speech of historians, you can see that according to the historiographical concept of «Two Ivans» the reign of Ivan the Terrible can be divided into two periods. The first half of his reign concerns prudent activities of the Tsar, Ivan IV, the wise management of foreign and domestic policy, thanks to the reforms of the Elected Rada. The second half of it may be qualified as the folly and even madness / paranoia of the Tsar, the rejection of the reforms of the Elected Rada, holding the oprichnina reforms, unjustified mass torture and executions, the defeat of Novgorod, the Great.

As is the case, one can find out the second concept which discovers the correlation/ratio of the oprichnina and Ivan's other reforms.

2. *The Concept of «accelerated centralization».*

This concept is most thoroughly described in S.M. Solovyov's «History of Russia since ancient times».

The historian wrote: «The Nature, the method of Ivan's actions historically are explained by the struggle between the old and the new, by the events that took place in the infancy of the Tsar, during his illness and afterwards; but can they be morally justified by this struggle, by these events?» And further on: «Some people would like to justify and connect his cruel actions and deeds with the severe moral state of the time; indeed, the moral state of the society in the times of Ivan IV seems to us not at all attractive; we have seen that the struggle between the old and the new has been going on for a long time and it has adopted a character that could not contribute to the softening of the morals long before, could not lead to a careful treatment of life and honor of man; indeed, the rigidity of the morals is expressed in written monuments of that time: among the measures and devices for the establishment of attire, the cessation of abuse, one can find out cruel means as the only ones which can stop the evil...» [11. P. 688–689].

The meaning of this concept is that the oprichnina is a logical continuation of the previous reforms of Ivan IV. This Russian state is not a random game of fate, but the end of a long process of a struggle between the tribal / feudal landholders and central government (the Tsar), i.e. state relations in Russia and the victory of the state system along with the approval of the Russian centralized state.

According to S.M. Soloviev ideas in his dissertation «The History of relations between the Russian princes of the Rurik house», the period «from Ivan III to the suppression of the Rurik dynasty will present the final triumph of state relations over the tribal ones, for the celebration they pay by terrible, bloody struggle with the dying order of things» [12].

This concept, the second Concept of oprichnina, was especially popular among Soviet historians of the twentieth century. It is quite understandable. I.V. Stalin considered Ivan IV to be a great hero of Russia's history. Historians picked up the thesis of the leader and teacher of all the times and developed it in their scientific texts.

3. *«The End of the World» Concept.*

The third concept of the reforms of Ivan IV in the Russian historical science is associated with the reign of Ivan IV

as a whole, and the oprichnina reform, in particular. For example, the developed by I.N. Danilevsky's concept of the reign of Ivan IV can be called «The End of the World». According to the concept, «all Ivan's the Terrible actions are motivated by his considerations on faith and common sense. From other cruel tsars, he was different in terms of what and how he tried to explain his right deeds in personal messages where he contradicted with those who were out of his power» [13]. Ivan IV, the first officially crowned «Tsar of all the Russians», thought of himself as Chosen by God and prepared the entrusted to him by God people – the people of the Muscovite state, Muscovy for the Second Coming, which the theologians of the XVI century was scheduled for 7077 year from the Creation. It is the year of 1569 from the birth of the Christ. The date fits in the chronology of the Oprichnina reform: the years of 1565–1572 from the birth of the Christ, or years of 7073–7080 from the Creation. Mass torture and executions of the Muscovites was an attempt to cleanse the souls of the body suffered men, and to prepare them for the Last Judgment.

By the same token, in the framework of the research programme, we address the readers' attention to the literary myth about Ivan the Terrible to unfold the information-educational space of literary sources, that can depict the picture of Russia's history since the XVIII century till nowadays, to some extent. There we can see that the myth and the discussion of it does not end in our times in the literary works of an epic nature (M.Yu. Lermontov), and drama (N.K. Tolstoy, V.I. Kostylev), historical novels by ed. Radzinsky (2011), O. N. Fomina (2014), A.A. Bushkova (2012) and some other authors of our time who also attempted to investigate the life of the first ruler of «all the Russians», who has himself formally called *Tsar*.

From literary sources we do know, that Vasily III's son, Ivan IV, the first officially proclaimed Russian Tsar, took the throne in 1533 at the age of 3, with his mother as regent. After 13 years of court intrigues he had himself crowned «Tsar of all the Russians». The word «tsar», form the Latin *caesar*, had previously been used only for a Great Khan or for the Emperor of Constantinople [3, 4, 14, 15].

Ivan IV's marriage to Anastasia, who was from the boyar Romanov family, was a happy one – unlike the five ones who followed her death in 1560, which was a turning point in Ivan's IV happy life with Anastasia. Believing her to have been poisoned, he instituted a reign of terror that earned him the sobriquet, nick-name «The Terrible» (*Grozny*), literally «formidable») and nearly destroyed all his earlier good works. In a fit of rage he even killed his eldest son and heir, Ivan [4, 15].

His subsequent career was indeed terrible, though he was admired for upholding Russian interests and tradition. During his active reign (1547–1584) Russia defeated the Tatar khanates of Kazan and Astrakhan, thus acquiring the whole Volga region and a chunk of the Caspian Sea coast and opening the way to Siberia. His campaign against the Crimean Tatars, however, nearly ended with the loss of Moscow.

Ivan's interest in the West and his obsession with reaching the Baltic Sea foreshadowed Peter the Great, but he failed to break through and only antagonized the Lithuanians, Poles and Swedes, setting the stage for the Time of Troubles.

His growing interest led to a cruel attack on Novgorod, finally snuffing out that city's golden age. These facts are depicted in the trilogy / novel by Valentin I. Kostylev, named «Ivan the Terrible», that cover three parts, «Moscow on the move» (1942), «Sea» (1945), and «The Neva Frontline» (1947). The novelist [2, 14] speaks of the Tsar as a wise, far-sighted, not only looking forward to the future of Russia, but also the future [14. P. 215–216].

In some literary works the Tsar is depicted as a great man who expanded the limits of Romanov family, Russia, a man who laid the foundations of the state system, who created a real state of the loose mass of semi-independent feudal estates. The person who carried out the most serious reforms in many areas of life – reforms which, again without exaggeration, just also turned old obsolete Russia into the present state. Most often, however, he was portrayed as a repulsive executioner, shedding blood left and right – just for fun and fun for the sake of his natural sadism, for the love of executions and torture. The figure of Ivan the Terrible is too majestic and complex to approach it with primitive judgments and abstract, drooling intellectual humanism, which has never brought to good in our history [3, 4].

Let us refer to M.Y. Lermontov's «Song about Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich, young guardsman and merchant Kalashnikov» [15] where the poet depicts Ivan the Terrible as a person, both cruel, and merciful, giving and laughing, even having a smile on his face, a person who does care about his guardsmen / servants' life and health. We read: The red sun does not shine in the sky, the blue clouds do not admire them: then at the table in a Golden crown, grozny (terrible) Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich sits... And laughing, Ivan said: «Well, my faithful servant! Take the necklace of pearls. Before the marriage send the precious gifts to your Alyena Dmitrievna: As you love – celebrate the wedding, – do not be angry... Smiling, the Tsar commanded to bring some sweet wine from overseas to his guardsmen. And all drank Glory to the Tsar!» And all of a sudden, when the Tsar sees that one of the brave fighters does not, we read, «...a violent fellow lowered his head to his broad chest, here *the Tsar frowned his black eyebrows*, And brought upon him the keen eyes *like a hawk*, looked down from heaven, upon the young, *the gray-winged dove*,... Here on the ground, the Tsar turned with a stick like an iron struck ...Here said the Tsar a groznoe / terrible word» [Ibid.].

Thus, as we see Ivan the Terrible is perhaps one of the most ambiguous and odious personalities in Russia's history. A talented statesman, a wise reformer, and a bloody tyrant, a man who plunged his people into chaos of monstrous repression. What was he, Ivan the Terrible, the founder of the Moscow Tsardom, the sovereign, who had a great and very ambiguous influence on the course of historical events? What role did he play in the formation and decline of a grand power [3, 4]?

The stream of his thoughts and desires were unpredictable. He combined a cruel tyrant and a naive child, and his entourage was called the servants of the devil. He gave orders for executions, and then spent long nights in penitential prayer, he wore a monastic robe and changed seven wives... the Day of his death were predicted by Lapland

witches... the Great sovereign of a great country – who is he really [Ibid.]?

Discussion of the results

Now let's address our attention to the Concept of a new educational and methodical complex on Russia's history (hereinafter – the Concept), developed by the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Science, and the Russian historical society. After its publication in 2013 [1, 6, 7] there appeared several manuals and articles explaining the importance and timeliness of the Concept [5. 16–18], where problem questions and discussions concerned the substantive aspect of the Concept, the «internal» characteristics of the document, the elements of «internal criticism» in the terminology of source studies. In particular, a lot of controversy is found out in the Historical and Cultural Standard. The authors define it as a section of the Concept where subjective assessments of historical epochs, events, parties and personalia dominate over the statement of facts. Actually, it is a working program for teaching Russia's history from ancient times to the present day with a conceptual apparatus, a chronological table and a list of the most important historical events and personalia.

But we come to the conclusion about the criteria and principles of selection of «historical events and personalia», which are not quite obvious and vivid. First, who determined their «value» and «importance» for history? Second, whether what does seem valuable and important today, tomorrow, will be of little value or unimportance? And was it valuable and important yesterday? The above questions for the «historian» are often inconvenient for the «contemporaries», but they are inevitable and predictably provocative questions. Most of the discussion points are neutralised by the explanatory note of the Concept of the new educational and methodical complex on national history but not all of them. *The first part of the Concept covers theoretical and methodological approaches to the teaching of history in general school at the present stage of development of pedagogy, psychology, methodology, historiography, philosophy.* Actually, this is the «Concept» of teaching history. The authors of the Concept propose a certain convention, a kind of a treaty that fixes the level of today's ideas about the historical process. In addition, such a «contract» gives balanced assessments, which are shared by the majority of the historical, scientific and pedagogical community [10. P. 4]. The Historical and Cultural Standard is *the second part of the Concept.* The third one is a list of «difficult questions» on Russia's history. This is the smallest part of the Concept, which is of an applied nature. The authors correctly point out that the new Concept is aimed at improving the quality of historical education, and educational aspect of the history of citizenship and patriotism. The competence approach is the main requirement for the Federal state educational standard for primary, general and secondary (complete) education that is the basis for history as integrative and significant part of Russia's culture.

Returning to the historiographical assessments of Ivan IV, one should bear in mind the fact that this «difficult question» of Russia's history is formulated as «The role of

Ivan IV the Terrible, in Russian history: reforms and their price». In the Standard the fact is put forward into section II of «Russia in the XVI–XVII centuries from the Tsar of all the Russians». Now, we'll quote the explanatory note: «The inconsistency of this period of history was reflected in the years of the first Russian Tsar, Ivan the Terrible, when the Tsarist reign was of a despotic character. The strengthening of the monarchy and state centralization of the country contributed to the creation of a system of departments of the centralized management of orders, depending on the power of the Tsar. However, the monarchy co-existed with the caste institutions while periodically, since the middle of XVI century, convened the district councils and elected local authorities». Further on: «the complexity of solving domestic political problems was aggravated by the difficult geopolitical situation in which the Russian state existed in the XVI century. Having a success in the Eastern direction (the annexation of the Middle and Lower Volga region, Western Siberia), throughout this period the country was forced to keep most of its troops on the southern borders. At the same time, the country faced the combined opposition of its Western neighbors». At long last: «...the social and economic crisis generated by the long and unsuccessful Livonian war for the Baltic Sea became the reason for the beginning of enslavement of peasantry» [7. P. 23–24].

As for the work programme for teaching history it covers different aspects of «Russia in the XVI century, from the facts of Ivan's IV personality and his reforms of mid XVI century to Russia at the end of XVI century with the problem of oprichnina, its reasons and nature, oprichnina terror and the defeat of Novgorod and Pskov, Moscow executions of 1570, results and consequences of oprichnina. The price of Ivan's reforms» [Ibid. P. 25–26]. And there we see that, by the same token, the Concept contrasts oprichnina with all other reforms carried out in the reign of Ivan IV. It seems that its authors adhere to the briefly described concepts that explain the peculiarities of the rule of the first Russian Tsar, i.e. namely, the concept of «Two Ivans». But in the light of the Concept the latter fits in both the second concept («accelerated centralization»), and the third one («End of the World»). However, we should not forget that, first, in modern Russian historical science there are other historiographical concepts of the reign of Ivan IV in general sense, and its basic reform in particular. Second, it undoubtedly takes into account literary and artistic myths of Ivan IV the Terrible [19].

Conclusion

At the turning point of the 1990s–2000s, a socially significant conceptual innovation was a significant expansion of the concept of «education». Today, education is understood as everything that is aimed at changing attitudes and behaviors, as well as actions of people through the formation and development of new skills, abilities, algorithms for continuous personal development and self-improvement. Over the past twenty-five years in Novosibirsk region there has fundamentally changed the status of the social institute of the system of training and retraining of teachers in the modern socio-cultural space. The changes also affected the approach to the formation, development and implementation of additional professional educational programs. Personality-activity, communicative-discursive and reflective approaches have become the basic methodology of the system for cultural self-realization of a modern teacher. Along with educational services in the system of traditional «formal education», followed by a system of monitoring of educational results and obtaining a special document, a certificate of second higher education or a document on professional development or retraining, there are many ongoing changes in the organizational order within the «non-formal education», prevailing in the global humanitarian universe [20].

The adoption of Subject Concepts, educational programs and standards by the State is becoming a new milestone in the history of Russian education. The aim of further research is to actualize the problem of solving one of the difficult issues in Russia's history, identified in the Concept of a new educational and methodical complex on Russian history, developed in the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation together with the Russian historical society, which caused a wide resonance of the historical and pedagogical community. The presentation of the authors' materials on the prospects of effective mastery of humanitarian knowledge, in particular, in the historical context, which concerns «difficult questions» of Russia's history also served for some conclusions of critical origin about the need for further research in the sphere of professional growth of teachers of the Humanities. It concerned, firstly, the aspect of cultural self-determination of the individual in the space of upgrading history teachers. The purpose of such research is further development of the subject component of professional training and the formation of a system of professional skills of teachers in the aspect of modern educational values.

REFERENCES

1. Russian Historical Society. (n.d.) *Kontseptsiya novogo uchebno-metodicheskogo kompleksa po otechestvennoy istorii* [The concept of a new educational and methodical complex on national history]. [Online] Available from: <http://rushiistory.org/proekty/kontseptsiya-novogo-uchebno-metodicheskogo-kompleksa-po-otchestvennoj-istorii.html>. (Accessed: 4th June 2019).
2. Kostylev, V.I. (1992) *Ivan Groznyy* [Ivan the Terrible]. Vol. 2(2). Moscow: Pressa.
3. Tolstoy, A.N. (1960) *Sobranie sochineniy v desyati tomakh* [Collected Works in 10 vols]. Vol. 10. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. pp. 589–746.
4. Tolstoy, A.K. (1981) *Sobranie sochineniy v dvukh tomakh* [Collected Works in Two Volumes]. Vol. 2. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. pp. 6–134.
5. Vyazemsky, E.E. & Strelova, O.Yu. (2015) *Pedagogicheskie podkhody k realizatsii kontseptsii edinogo uchebnika po istorii* [Pedagogical approaches to the implementation of the concept of a single history textbook]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
6. Gefter, M. (2013) *Kontseptsiya novogo uchebno-metodicheskogo kompleksa po otechestvennoy istorii* [The concept of a new educational and methodical complex on national history]. [Online] Available from: <http://gefeter.ru/archive/10162>. (Accessed: 4th June 2019).
7. Kommersant.ru. (2013) *Kontseptsiya novogo uchebno-metodicheskogo kompleksa po otechestvennoy istorii* [The concept of a new educational and methodical complex on national history]. [Online] Available from: <http://www.kommersant.ru/docs/2013/standart.pdf>. (Accessed: 4th June 2019).

8. Kallen, D. & Bengtsson, J. (1973) *Recurrent Education: Strategy for Lifelong Learning. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development*. Paris: Center for Education Research and Innovation.
9. Karamzin, N.M. (1989) *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiyskogo. Reprintnoe vosproizvedenie izdaniya 1842–1844 gg. v trekh knigakh s prilozheniem* [History of the Russian state. Reprint reproduction of the 1842–1844 edition in three books with the application]. Vol. 9–12. Moscow: Kniga.
10. Klyuchevsky, V.O. (1987) *Sochineniya: v 9 t.* [Works in 9 vols]. Vol. 2. Moscow: Mysl'.
11. Soloviev, S.M. (1989) *Sochineniya: v 18 kn.* [Works in 18 books]. Book 3. Moscow: Mysl'.
12. Soloviev, S.M. (n.d.) *Istoriya otnosheniy mezhdru russkimi knyaz'yami Ryurikova doma* [The history of relations between the Russian princes of Rurik's home]. [Online] Available from: http://dugward.ru/library/solovyev_s_m/solovyev_s_m_istoria_otnosheniy.html. (Accessed: 4th June 2019).
13. Danilevsky, I.N. (n.d.) *Lektsiya 22 – Ivan Groznyy* [Lecture 22 – Ivan the Terrible]. [Online] Available from: <https://statehistory.ru/1207/Lektsiya-22---Ivan-Groznyy--lektor--I-N--Danilevskiy->. (Accessed: 4th June 2019).
14. Kostylev, V.I. (1992) *Ivan Groznyy* [Ivan the Terrible]. Vol. 2(1). Moscow: Pressa.
15. Lermontov, M.Yu. (1975) *Stikhotvoreniya. Poemy* [Poems]. Moscow: Ekonomika.
16. Umbrashko, K.B. & Fedina, N.G. (2017) *“Trudnye voprosy” otechestvennoy istorii i varianty ikh resheniy* [“Difficult issues” of national history and options for their solutions]. Novosibirsk: NIPKiPRO.
17. Oleynikov, I.V., Umbrashko, K.B. & Fedina, N.G. (2018) *“Trudnye voprosy” istorii Rossii pervoy poloviny XX veka* [“Difficult issues” of the history of Russia in the first half of the 20th century]. Novosibirsk: NIPKiPRO.
18. Oleynikov, I.V., Solovieva, E.A., Umbrashko, K.B. & Fedina, N.G. (2018) *Reshenie “trudnykh voprosov” istoriko-kul'turnogo standarta kak mekhanizm modernizatsii sodержaniya predmeta v ramkakh realizatsii kontseptsii novogo UMK po otechestvennoy istorii* [Decision of “difficult issues” of the historical and cultural standard as a mechanism for modernizing the content of a subject in the framework of implementing the concept of the UMC on Russian History]. Novosibirsk: NIPKiPRO.
19. Shcherbatov, M.M. (1770–1791) *Istoriya Rossiyskaya ot drevneyshikh vremen: v 7 t.* [History of Russia from Ancient Times: In 7 vols]. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences.
20. Bulankina, N.E. & Umbrashko, K.B. (2018) Regional history in the formation and development of the personality of students. *Sibirskiy uchitel'*. 1(116). pp. 69–74.

Umbrashko Konstantin B. Novosibirsk Institute of Professional Skills Improvement & Vocational Retraining of Education Workers (Novosibirsk, Russia). E-mail: hitstorian09@mail.ru

Bulankina Nadezhda E. Novosibirsk Institute of Professional Skills Improvement & Vocational Retraining of Education Workers (Novosibirsk, Russia). E-mail: NEBN@yandex.ru

К.Б. Умбрашко, Н.Е. Буланкина

ИВАН IV ГРОЗНЫЙ: ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ И ЛИТЕРАТУРНЫЙ МИФ В ИСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНОМ СТАНДАРТЕ

Ключевые слова: историография; литературный миф; Иван IV; российские реформы; предметные концепции; Историко-культурный стандарт (ИКС).

Целью данного исследования является историографическая и литературоведческая актуализация одного из «трудных вопросов» русской истории, обозначенных в Историко-культурном стандарте (ИКС), который является частью Концепции нового учебно-методического комплекса по отечественной истории. Этот вопрос звучит так: «Роль Ивана IV Грозного в Российской истории: реформы и их цена». Источниковая база, на которую опирается данное авторское исследование, представлена историографическими и литературно-художественными источниками. Это сочинения М.М. Щербатова («История Российская от древнейших времен»), Н.М. Карамзина («История государства Российского»), С.М. Соловьева («История России с древнейших времен»), «История отношений между русскими князьями Рюрикова дома», В.О. Ключевского («Курс русской истории», «Афоризмы и мысли об истории»), М.Ю. Лермонтова, А.К. Толстого, А.Н. Толстого, В.И. Костылева. Кроме того, использованы учебные и методические источники. В ходе исследования были выделены следующие позиционные линии. В последние десятилетия в отечественной историографии особенно популярной стала тема реформ эпохи Ивана IV как в узком смысле (реформирование в период правления самого Ивана IV), так и в широком смысле (связь реформ Ивана IV с российскими реформами других эпох). В отечественной исторической науке реформы Ивана IV активно обсуждались с XVIII в. Историки и публицисты предложили несколько концепций, объясняющих особенности характера и правления первого русского царя. В их основе лежит соотношение оценки опричнины и других реформ Ивана IV (реформы «Избранной Рады»): «два Ивана», «ускоренная централизация», «Конец Света». Эти концепции должны были повлиять на текст ИКС. В данной статье авторы приходят к выводу, что ИКС противопоставляет опричнину всем остальным реформам, проводимым в эпоху Ивана IV. Авторы Историко-культурного стандарта в объяснении особенностей правления первого русского царя и его реформаторской деятельности придерживаются в основном концепции «двух Иванов». Но в его логику вписываются и концепция «ускоренной централизации», и концепция «Конца Света». В современной отечественной исторической науке существуют и иные историографические концепции правления Ивана IV в целом, его опричной реформы и реформ «Избранной Рады» в частности. Кроме того, ИКС, несомненно, учитывает литературно-художественные мифы об Иване IV Грозном.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Концепция нового учебно-методического комплекса по отечественной истории. URL: <http://rushistory.org/proekty/kontsepsiya-novogo-uchebno-metodicheskogo-kompleksa-po-otchestvennoj-istorii.html> (дата обращения: 04.06.2019).
2. Костылев В.И. Иван Грозный : роман : в 2 т. М. : Пресса, 1992. Т. 2, кн. 2. 640 с.
3. Толстой А.Н. Собрание сочинений : в 10 т. М. : Худож. лит., 1960. Т. 10: Пьесы. Иван Грозный. 790 с.
4. Толстой А.К. Собрание сочинений : в 2 т. М. : Худож. лит., 1981. Т. 2: Драматические произведения. Смерть Иоанна Грозного : трагедия в пяти действиях. Статьи. 790 с.
5. Вяземский Е.Е., Стрелова О.Ю. Педагогические подходы к реализации концепции единого учебника по истории : пособие для учителей общеобразовательных организаций. М. : Просвещение, 2015. 78 с.
6. Концепция нового учебно-методического комплекса по отечественной истории. URL: <http://gefiter.ru/archive/10162> (дата обращения: 04.06.2019).
7. Концепция нового учебно-методического комплекса по отечественной истории. URL: <http://www.kommersant.ru/docs/2013/standart.pdf> (дата обращения: 04.06.2019).
8. Kallen D., Bengtsson J. *Recurrent Education: Strategy for Lifelong Learning. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development*. Paris : Center for Education Research and Innovation, 1973. 88 p.

9. Карамзин Н.М. История государства Российского. Репринтное воспроизведение издания 1842–1844 гг. : в 3 кн. с прилож. М. : Книга, 1989. Кн. III, т. 9–12.
10. Ключевский В.О. Сочинения : в 9 т. / послесл. и коммент. сост. В.А. Александров, В.Г. Зимина. М. : Мысль, 1987. Т. 2: Курс русской истории, ч. 2. 447 с.
11. Соловьев С.М. Сочинения : в 18 кн. / отв. ред. И.Д. Ковальченко, С.С. Дмитриев. М. : Мысль, 1989. Кн. III: История России с древнейших времен, т. 5–6 783 с.
12. Соловьев С.М. История отношений между русскими князьями Рюрикова дома. URL: http://dugward.ru/library/solovyev_s_m/solovyev_s_m_istoria_otnosheniy.html (дата обращения: 04.06.2019).
13. Данилевский И.Н. Лекция 22: Иван Грозный. URL: <https://statehistory.ru/1207/Lektsiya-22---Ivan-Groznyy--lektor---I-N--Danilevskiy> (дата обращения: 04.06.2019).
14. Костылев В.И. Иван Грозный : роман : в 2 т. М. : Пресса, 1992. Т. 2, кн. 1. М. : Пресса, 1992. 640 с.
15. Лермонтов М.Ю. Стихотворения. Поэмы. М. : Экономика, 1975. 335 с.
16. Умбрашко К.Б., Феина Н.Г. «Трудные вопросы» отечественной истории и варианты их решений : учеб.-метод. пособие. Новосибирск : Изд-во НИПКиПРО, 2017. 108 с.
17. Олейников И.В., Умбрашко К.Б., Феина Н.Г. «Трудные вопросы» истории России первой половины XX века / под ред. А.В. Запороженко : учеб.-метод. пособие. Новосибирск : Изд-во НИПКиПРО, 2018. 184 с.
18. Олейников И.В., Соловьева Е.А., Умбрашко К.Б., Феина Н.Г. Решение «трудных вопросов» Историко-культурного стандарта как механизм модернизации содержания предмета в рамках реализации Концепции нового УМК по отечественной истории : учеб. пособие. Новосибирск : Изд-во НИПКиПРО, 2018. 156 с.
19. Щербатов М.М. История Российская от древнейших времен : в 7 т. СПб. : При Императорской Академии наук, 1770–1791.
20. Bulankina N.E., Umbrashko K.B. Regional history in the formation and development of the personality of students [Региональная история в становлении и развитии личности обучающихся] // Сибирский учитель : науч.-метод. журнал. 2018. № 1 (116). С. 69–74.