

УДК 016 : [93/94+37] : 378.4(477.54) «18/191»

S. M. Kulysh  
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

## MODERN HISTORICO-PEDAGOGICAL LITERATURE ON KHARKIV UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES IN THE 19<sup>th</sup> – EARLY 21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY

*У статті з історико-педагогічної точки зору аналізується наукова література 90-х рр. ХХ ст. – початку ХХІ ст., присвячена діяльності Харківського університету дореволюційної епохи, подальшого розвитку педагогічної науки, суттєвого поліпшення системи підготовки науково-педагогічних кадрів, втіленню до навчального процесу методичних новацій.*

**Ключові слова:** історико-педагогічні науки, науково-педагогічні кадри, університет, методичні новації.

*В статье с историко-педагогической точки зрения анализируется научная литература 90-х г. ХХ ст. – начало ХХІ ст., посвященная деятельности Харьковского университета дореволюционной эпохи, дальнейшему развитию педагогической науки, существенному улучшению системы подготовки научно-педагогических кадров, внедрению методических новаций.*

**Ключевые слова:** историко-педагогические науки, научно-педагогические кадры, университет, методические новации.

*The article provides historical and pedagogical viewpoint on scientific literature ranging from the 1990-s to the beginning of the 21 century dedicated to the activity of Kharkiv University before the revolution, further development of pedagogics, considerable improvement in scientific and pedagogical staff training, introduction of methodological innovations into pedagogical activity.*

**Keywords:** historical and pedagogical sciences, historical and pedagogical staff, methodological innovations, university.

**Relevancy and Focus.** The research of historical pedagogic works on the activity of Kharkiv University in the 1990s–early 21<sup>st</sup> century presents a comprehensive analysis of the sources and the characteristics of social, economic, public, political, psychological, and pedagogic drivers.

**Goal:** to research into the scientific, pedagogic, academic, and tutorial activity of Kharkiv University in 1805–1917 analysed in the historical pedagogical literature of the 1990s–early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Analysis of Research and Publications.** Most of the historical pedagogic works on the activity of Kharkiv University were published in the pre-revolutionary period and during the 1990s–early 21<sup>st</sup> century. Research objectivity, freedom of academic discussion, rejection of ideological and political stereotypes, and a deeper anthropologic discourse is characteristic of the second half of the 1990s–first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

It is our opinion that most works from the Soviet period and several years of the post-Soviet period share a fundamental drawback of indoctrinated fixation on exposing predominantly «retrograde», «anti-educational», and «anti-pedagogic» policy practiced by the authorities, ministers for people’s education, and trustees. The confrontation arisen between part of the faculty and the officials would often be presented as a token of the former’s revolutionary inclinations and their spirit of opposition. This tendency is especially evident in booklets and monographs on the activity of the academics, whose research and pedagogic activity continued after the October Revolution [8, 13, 19, 26, 27].

Without denouncing certain achievements of the past in the native and foreign historiography, liberal historical pedagogic studies of the late 19<sup>th</sup>–early 20<sup>th</sup> century, contemporary researchers have gradually reached the most efficient correlation between describing the traditions and innovations in the University

life and explaining the reasons and consequences of changes in the University policy. As emphasized by Professor S. I. Posokhov, contemporary researchers set new research goals and pay much more attention to sources, expanding “the inventory of research techniques” and making more profound conclusions [18, p. 257–258]. In particular, since the 1990s, the Department of Ukrainian Studies of Kharkiv University headed by Professor V. V. Kravchenko has performed impressive work in research and publication of the legacy of D. I. Bahaliy.

Naturally, the attributes of the past did not disappear immediately, so in some publications of the late 90<sup>th</sup> one can find some assessments that are incompatible with reality. For example, at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, in a biographical sketch of Professor Schyolkov, the University lecturers A. I. Doubrovych, A. I. Stoykovitch, J. B. Shad are described as reactionaries and obscurantists [28, p. 67–68].

Scientific papers of the historical and pedagogical nature of the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries are usually characterized by the comprehensive analysis of the sources of socio-economic features, political, psychological and pedagogical factors. Much attention is paid to the aspects of developing professional and pedagogical competence of scientific and pedagogical staff; their focus on innovation (in modern terms) and teaching methods, the relationship between professors and students, the university and the government are also taken into account.

The scientists also considered some aspects of personal component of professional and pedagogical competence, interpersonal impacts of the scientific and pedagogical staff. The article does not analyze the papers dedicated to scientific and social activities of the university lecturers.

«The Bulletin of Kharkiv University» (historical aspect) (2001) analyzes various issues on using a great number of sources. After reviewing Voronezh University publication Professor S. I. Posokhov expressed sensible ideas on the discussion held by D. Karpachev, L. Posokhova, L. Laptev, V. Chesnokov. He made an attempt to reveal the real reasons why it was to be the Kharkiv City where the University was to be founded [16, p. 271]. G. Stroukova not only focused on the positive features of the University Charter in 1884, but also demonstrated that professors often looked for their own corporate benefit, requiring an excessive expansion of the educational establishment autonomy limits. It was of no accident that the University Academic Council eliminated the statement about the «pseudo-scientific teaching and professors failing to perform their duties» [23, p. 241] from the conclusion about the level of the university staff work (prepared by the committee of 12 professors).

The beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is marked by the extension of scientific and pedagogical as well as historical and pedagogical research in Russian Federation too. The dissertation by L. V. Artiomova is focused on the role of the People’s Education Ministry and of the universities preparing their scientific and teaching staff [1]. O. M. Goroshko considers the dynamics of the dissertation practice during the period of 1724–1919 [5]. The changes in quantitative and qualitative values of a university teaching staff, the features of its pedagogical, scientific and methodological training abroad as well as in the local educational establishments were overviewed by other Russian scientists and presented in the scientific articles, dissertations and monographs by O. A. Vishlenkova, I. G. Voropayev, M. V. Grybovskiy, S. S. Dergaeva, O. M. Dokin, Yu. V. Eidelnant, T. I. Kagramanova, D. O. Kaznachejev, V. G. Kinelyov, G. V. Kukushkina, O. M. Lauta, N. V. Lovyannikova, Yu. M. Mantrov, M. B. Napso, F. O. Petrov, T. M. Kharlamova, D. O. Khohlova, L. R. Shakirova and others.

For the first time the article by O. V. Skrypnyuk and S. I. Posokhova has concentrated on both the history of the activity and the historiography of the works concerning The Department of Pedagogy [8]. Brief reviews of the period from 1950s to the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century by I. Yu. Krachkovskiy, M. I. Marchenko, M. Yu. Dostal, P. Ya. Korzh, L. V. Gorina, S. I. Liman, T. G. Pavlova, V. I. Chesnokov, L. P. Lapteva, O. S. Marchenko, L. O. Chuvpylo and others presented the general analysis of the educational work in the realm of the humanities.

The biggest amount of works dedicated to the scientific and pedagogical activity of the university staff belongs to the Medical Department. The bibliography list of 2004 is as long as 44 pages, a third of these works was published in the post-war period, and 38 works date from the 1990s to 2004. However, their majority throws light upon the scientific but not the methodological work [9, p. 261–305].

The chief achievement in the historical and pedagogical science at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century is a review where 200 years of the university activity is considered. The prerequisites of the university foundation in Kharkov were scrutinized by the group of 17 authors, who specified the crucial role of V. N. Karazin's and the trustee S. Y. Pototskiy. Comparing to the previous works of the kind, the work gives a more profound and a wider account of the scientific and methodological process of the Pedagogical Institute and the pedagogical courses activity. Individual professors' work in certain times and under certain social and political conditions is delineated in the review [25]. There appear short sketches of Kharkov Universities rectors within the period of the 200 years, including that of Kharkov University [22]. S. I. Posokhov was among the pioneers to have considered the influence of the University on the social opinion and the chronology of the staff striving for the university autonomy [17].

The scientists of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century considerably advanced in their studies of the events, phenomena, personalities, and socio-political situation influencing the scientific-pedagogical process in the University.

It is important to note that in 2005 a historiographic work was published that analyzes the educational process development during the pre-revolutionary period (before 1917) [14].

It is worth mentioning O. Samoylov's article about the scarcity of studies regarding the technique of admission examinations to universities in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, whereas the scientist also states that the history of the university education still wants some large-scale researching [20].

N. Davydova briefly comments on the attempt of turning Kharkiv University into an exclusively Ukrainian institution in 1907 [6]. The analysis of the scientific and social activities of Professor M. Drynov is continued in the studies of Russian researcher L. Gorina who glimpsed into his teaching activity [4].

A vast review of the University past is presented in the collective monograph analyzing Professor Y. Riedin's works, his heritage a scientist, historian and manager [24].

The turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century has also become distinctive in terms of publishing the biographical sketches dedicated to S. Pototskiy, V. Karazin, V. Bouzeskul, V. Pilcher, D. Bahaliy, Kh. Rommemo, D. Kachenovskiy, M. Lounin, V. Dzhunkovskiy, P. Lavrovskiy, M. Klochkov, O. Zemin, O. Paliumbetskiy, O. Potebnia, M. Drynov, F. Openkhovskiy, M. Kulchytskiy to name but a few. The article of S. Posokhov, as a review of the references covering the course of management conflicts at the dawn of the University, may be considered an important contribution.

Professors of Mathematics T. Osyrovskiy, A. Pavlovskiy, Ye. von Bayer, and V. Imshenetskiy have been praised as talented lecturers in the article of Yu. Tsekhmistro.

In his article, Yu. Tsekhmister characterizes the following professors of mathematics as talented lecturers: T. F. Osipovskiy, A. F. Pavlovskiy, E. von Bayer, V. H. Imshenetskiy.

The monograph of R. Pfrepper resulted from joint German-Russian research. It presented consolidated statistics on the number of German adjuncts and professors in Russian universities in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. In particular, in 1819, 52% of professors of Kharkiv University were those coming from abroad (mostly from Germany), while the number of their counterparts in Moscow University was only 21%; the respective figures for 1820 are 35% and 20%, for 1835 – 2% and 10% [29, p. 7–8]. In S. I. Posokhov's opinion, the presence of foreign professors, primarily from Germany, contributed to the growth of national awareness; yet, on the other hand, it generated political discords. In any case, their contribution into maintaining high standards of academic practices in Kharkiv University is beyond doubt [15].

Scholars continued researching the problem which was definitely the key one for the University, namely, that of teaching staff training and filling vacant posts. The problem was addressed in the works by A. Aleksyuk, L. Vovk, N. Dem'yanenko, M. Evtukh, L. Zelenska, S. Zolotukhin, A. Ivanov, A. Martinenko, M. Mykytyuk, S. Posokhov, B. Stuparyk, O. Sukhomlinsky and others. Historiographic works were reinterpreted, new methodological approaches were suggested and new empirical data were obtained. The level of generalization grew, as well as the quality of research, the thematic range of which expanded; in particular, it concerned the innovations in the teaching and research activities of the University staff in different historic / social epochs.

The specificity of teaching and research activities of the University professors was explored in depth. These professors are: P. O. Lavrovskiy, O. P. Zemina, M. Lunin, D. I. Kachenovsky, P. Tsytovycha,

A. Palyumbetskoho, I. P. Skvortsov, M. V. Klochkova, M. A. Valyashko, P. Shymlyanskaya, O. Potebni M. F. Sumtsova, Y. K. Redin, K. Voigt, M. Petrov, A. Yakobiya and others.

The profound monograph by V. Ye. Beneri presented the results of in-depth research into the issue of self-study in Ukrainian higher educational establishments in the second half of the XIXth – the end of the XXth centuries. Its content is considerably broader than the title suggests: beside shedding light on the multifunctional purpose of self-study work, ways of organizing it and the specificity of the teaching staff activities, it addressed such issues as stages in the development of pedagogics, teacher training at universities, the technology of filling teaching vacancies; it also characterized teaching and research activities of some professors [2].

The works of some authors came to be an important landmark. Here belong the works of those who analysed the content of lectures, practical classes, and other forms of teaching and educating students as well as the methods and techniques employed in the process, namely, of such authors as Ya. V. Denysenko, I. M. Shorobury, A. Bogdashina, M. Timoshenko, V. K. Vasilyev, L. Kurylo and others.

The research of S. I. Posokhov enabled him to draw an important conclusion on the problem of defending dissertations, doctorate ones in particular. Indeed, the requirements for candidates who applied for the degree at Kharkiv University were very high; infrequently, subjective factors were at work, especially personal ambitions, rivalry of different schools of thought. That is why not only D. I. Bahaliy had to defend his dissertation in another university, but other authors of dissertations as well.

Works of a number of authors addressed solely pedagogical aspects of university education. They stressed the necessity for departure from imitating blindly the principles of western pedagogics, emphasized the need to observe cultural traditions of one's nation and to give secular (not religious) education to the younger generation. L. O. Malto once again pointed out that the pre-revolutionary Kharkiv University was a leader in teaching the courses of pedagogics, didactics, teaching methods, especially at the School of History and Philology [7, p. 308–309; 12, p. 332–333].

The historiographic article of O. L. Kirdan is of an informational / statistic nature. Integrating the data presented in three monographs, it evaluates the degree to which the problem of managing higher educational establishments in Ukraine in the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries was studied [10].

To sum up, the above named historiographic works consider the data which characterise education in the empire on the whole, thus failing to elucidate the specificity of historic / pedagogic publications on the functioning of Kharkiv University.

A substantial research which analyses managerial / pedagogical and research / pedagogical characteristics of professors of the XIXth century was conducted by a group of Russian scholars. Its significance is enhanced by the fact that it paid great attention specifically to the pre-revolutionary Kharkiv University. It assessed the effectiveness of curators' decrees, the quality of professors' work, the part that the university staff took in discussing drafts of ministry regulations, Statutes inclusive. Besides, 119 pages hold new archive documents concerning Kharkiv University, most importantly, of the first half of the XIXth century [3].

Using state-of-the-art pedagogical tools, a short article by L. Kurilo presented an overview of the research into an eternal problem of the significance and content of university lectures. The author also presented in detail the content of the course «General Psychology with Elements of Pedagogics» [11], which professor S. Gogotskiy delivered in Kiev University.

In 2012–2013, there came out publications addressing such problems as development of university education and prominent figures in the sphere of pedagogics and teaching. They were authored by B. Abashnyk, A. Grachev, T. Goncharuk, N. Dem'yanenko, N. Kolhushkina, I. Kostenko, L. Lysychenko, A. Maystruk, Y. Radchenko and others. M. I. Markevich pointed out the high informativeness of research / pedagogical and historical / pedagogical works by D. I. Bahaliy. At the same time, she remarked that his approach to annalistic sources was outdated; he underestimated their historiographic artistry; his works lacked principally new conclusions [11].

In spite of a rather broad range of research, there is no unified picture of the innovatory activities of the teaching staff and administrators of Kharkiv University in 1805–1917. There is a vast field for retrospective study, for expanding the generalisations of scholarly research which could turn out to be useful in outlining the prospects for applying creatively the past achievements in the present-day practice of university education. The period from the end of the XIXth century and up to the beginning of the XXth century is being researched rather thoroughly, while the preceding epoch is studied much less exhaustively. There is a lack of monographs which consider the activities of certain curators of Kharkiv educational district, of Kharkiv University presidents, deans, famous and distinguished professors. The problem of social and financial states of the teaching staff calls for in-depth research and systematization. It should be considered how the status changed in the course of the century, taking into account the level of inflation and the rise in the standards of living. The scholarly legacy is not sufficiently studied from the point of view of its correspondence with the tempo of development of science, education, and didactic requirements. It is important to reconsider all the aspects of running education, including the problem of relationship between teachers and students, the true role of the grading system, the development of auxiliary educational establishments, as well as to decide on the main and secondary problems of teaching staff training.

It is impossible to include into an article of a limited size all the authors of the end of the XXth – the beginning of the XXst centuries who wrote about the university of the XIXth century, as well as to consider all the problems which Kharkiv university was to face at the time.

#### Literature

1. Артемова Л. В. Роль Министерства народного просвещения и университетов Российской империи в истории развития разрядов наук и испытаний на ученые степени 1802–1917: дисс... канд. истор. наук: спец. 0700.02 «отечественная история» / Л. В. Артемова. – Невинномыск, 2002. – 260 с.
2. Бенера В. Є. Самостійна робота студентів у вищій школі України: історичні трансформації (друга половина XIX – кінець XX ст.) / В. Є. Бенера. – Рівне : ППДМ, 2011. – 640 с.
3. Вишленкова Е. А. Русские профессора: университетская корпоративность или профессиональная солидарность / Е. А. Вишленкова, Р. Х. Гамуллина, К. А. Ильина. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2012. – 656 с.
4. Горина Л. В. Марны Дринов: историк и обществен. деец / Л. В. Горина. – София: Академ.изд-во «Проф.Марны Дринов», 2006. – 239 с.
5. Горошко О. Н. Роль Министерства народного просвещения, Академии наук и университетов Российской империи в истории развития института диссертаций: 1724–1919: дис.... канд. истор. наук: спец. 07.00.02 «Отечественная история» / О. Н. Горошко. – Пятигорск, 2002. – 273 с.
6. Давидова Н. В. Спроба українізації Харківського університету в 1907 р. / Н. В. Давидова // Там само. С. 21–23.
7. Демченко Н. М. Тенденції розвитку освіти другої половини XIX століття в педагогічних концепціях слов'янознавців Лівобережжя / Н. М. Демченко // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія : Педагогіка і психологія : Зб.наук.праць. – Вип. 38. – 2012. – С. 306–311.
8. Игнациус Е. И. Владимир Андреевич Стеклов 1864–1926 / Е. И. Игнациус. – М. : Изд-во «Наука», 1967. – 211 с.
9. Історія Харківського університету за двісті років : у 3 част.: Сист. бібліогр. покажч. / Уклад. : М. Г. Швалб та ін.; наук.ред.: С. І. Посохов, О. О. Кучер; ред. О. С. Журавльова. – Харків : ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2007. – 752 с.
10. Кірдан О. Л. Історіографія проблеми управління вищими навчальними закладами України XIX–початку XX століття / О. Л. Кірдан // Проблеми сучасної педагогічної освіти. Зб. статей. Серія : педагогіка і психологія. – Ялта : РВВ КГУ, 2011. – Вип.31. – Ч. 1. – С. 119–125.
11. Маркевич М. І. Давньоруське літописання в історіографічній спадщині Дмитра Багалія / М. І. Маркевич // Вісник Черкаського університету. Історичні науки. – 2012. – № 9. – С. 8–17.
12. Мільто Л. О. Підготовка педагогічних кадрів в університетах дореволюційної Росії / Л. О. Мільто // Там само. – С. 330 – 335.

13. Наумов И. А. Дмитрий Матвеевич Синцов (очерк жизни и научно-педагогической деятельности) / И. А. Наумов. – Харьков, 1955. – 72 с.
14. Павко А. І., Курило Л. Ф. Вітчизняна університетська освіта в імперську добу : історіографічні та методологічні аспекти / А. І. Павко, Л. Ф. Курило. – К.: Знання України, 2005. – 120 с.
15. Посохов С. И. Роль «немецкого образца» в процессе становления и развития университетов России XIX века: оценки и мнения в российской публицистике и историографии / С. И. Посохов // Научные ведомости Белгородского гос. ун-та. Серия : История. Политология. Экономика. Информатика. – 2008. – Т. 5. – № 1. – С. 170–179.
16. Посохов С. І. Історія університетів України на сторінках «Российских университетов» / С. І. Посохов // Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. – № 526. – Історія. – Вип.33. – Харків: НМЦ «СД», 2001. – С. 270–276.
17. Посохов С. І. Наближення університетської реформи : Харківський університет і громадська думка в середині XIX ст. / С. І. Посохов // Схід/Захід (Харків). – 2005. – Вип. 7. – С. 228–247.
18. Посохов С. І. Образи університетів Російської імперії другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. в публіцистиці та історіографії / С. І. Посохов. – Харків: ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2006. – 368 с.
19. Прокудин Ю. Н. Выдающийся русский ботаник XIX столетия В. М. Черняев / Ю. Н. Прокудин. – Харьков : Изд-во ХГУ им. А. М. Горького, 1953. – 51 с.
20. Самойлов О. Ф. З досвіду організації та проведення вступних іспитів до університетів України другої половини XIX ст. / О. Ф. Самойлов // Наукові праці Миколаївського держ. гуманіт. ун-ту імені Петра Могили комплексу «Києво-Могилянської акад.» Істор. науки. – 2006. – Вип.39. – Т. 52. – С. 11–15.
21. Скрипник О. В., Посохов С. І. Педагогічна освіта в Харківському університеті XIX – поч. XX ст.: проблеми історії та історіографії / О. В. Скрипник, С. І. Посохов // Наукові записки кафедри педагогіки : Зб.наук.праць. – 2001. – Вип. 6. – С. 205–213.
22. Служение Отечеству и долгу. Очерки о жизни и деятельности ректоров харьковских вузов (1805–2004 годы). – Харьков : Золотые страницы, 2004. – 744 с.
23. Струкова Г. О. Вплив Статуту 1884 р. на постановку навчального процесу в Харківському університеті / Е. С. Струкова // Там само. – С. 240–248.
24. Філіппенко Р. І. Є. К. Редін – професор Харківського університету : Монографія / Р. І. Філіппенко, С. М. Куделко. – Харків : ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна, 2008. – 228 с.
25. Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна за 200 років / В. С. Бакіров, В. М. Духопельников, Б. П. Зайцев та ін. – Харків : Фоліо, 2004. – 750 с.
26. Хотинский Е. С. Академик Н. Н. Бекетов. Очерк о жизни и деятельности / Е. С. Хотинский. – Харьков: Кн.-газетн. изд-во, 1950. – 36 с.
27. Цесевич В. Академик Александр Михайлович Ляпунов / В. Цесевич, А. Шульберг. – Одесса: Обл-е изд-во, 1951. – 58 с.
28. Черников Ю. Т. Заслуженный профессор Иван Петрович Щелков 1833–1909. Научное издание / Ю. Т. Черников – Харьков: изд-во ХГУ, 1996. – 119 с.
29. Pfrepper R. Webevorgange Deutschrussische Wechselbeziehungen in der Physiologie des 19. Jahrhunderts / R. Pfrepper. – Aachen : Copyright Shaker Verlag, 2009. – 300 s.