Abstract
This paper is aimed at attempts to clarify the features of the study period, during the reign of the second Romanov in Russian historiographical thought the XIX c., on materials published in the reign of Nicholas I. The Age of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich attracted the greatest interest to historians, who saw him as the central figure of the Moscow State in the XVII century. The study used a variety of historiographical methods; the key one used in the study is a comparative analysis of historical research and systematic approach to the development of history as a single process. Results of the study are presented in three areas - the authentic sources of the XVII century, monographs, periodicals materials of Nicholas I epoch. All areas vary in volume of the work, the breadth of the use of sources, the quality of their publications in different thematic emphases. Each of the areas has a conclusion according to the intended purpose of the study. Historians of Nicholas I epoch laid the foundations of the structure of works and outlined basic directions in the further disclosure of the included then in the fundamental works of the titans of Russian historical thought in the XIX - XX centuries.
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1. Introduction
The research theme is determined by the trend of modern science to the humanization of scientific historical knowledge. The relevance of the theme is determined by deeper study materials during the reign of the second Romanov printed in the second quarter of XIX century, as it was in the epoch of Nicholas fell during the formation of the Russian national historiography of science.

In modern conditions of development of science in order to outline prospects for further research, it is important to identify the accumulated (often isolated) results, historical and archaeological studies. Proposed historiographical research is important for understanding the process of studying by the Russian historians the development of Russian historical science in general.

The XVII century is one of the critical periods of Russian history. In the center of the fateful century is the figure Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich was born in March 9, 1629, came to the throne of the Russian state in July 1645 and died in January 30, 1676. Alexei Mikhailovich was crowned, his personality was the eponym of the era.

In different periods historians characterized the second Romanov in accordance with established scientific beliefs. His contemporaries called him the “quietest”, historian V. O. Kljuchevskij called Alexei Mikhailovich “good man” and “glorious Russian soul”, according to S. F. Platonov, the tsar was “a remarkable person”, S. M. Solovyov characterized Alexei Mikhailovich as tsar distinguished “kindness” and “softness”. In opinion of N. I. Kostomarov, tsar “was unable to reign,” but “his high-profile titles for them and was ready to shed blood”. However, from the standpoint of Kostomarov, “purity of his morals was flawless”.

K. F. Valishevskij wrote that “despite his softness and kindness, Alex loved the dirty tricks” also punished “severely and without mercy for the innocent guilty” but, according to the author, he was “one of the most highly moral monarchs of all times”.

In the historical literature Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich...
The Epoch of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich in Russian Historiography during the Reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855)

The Epoch of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich in Russian Historiography during the Reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) has contradictory images. But it should be noted that they were formed by direct use of materials open to the second quarter of the XIX century.

In this article the authors think that Russian historiography of the XIX century was formed as an independent discipline, which had new concepts and directions. For a full historiographical picture it is necessary to consider the scientific concept of the second quarter of XIX century.

The dominant trend in the first half of the XIX century was conservative. The largest representative of this trend was the N. M. Karamzin. The essence of the theory of the historian is expressed in the title of his work “History of the Russian state”. According to the author of the concept, the history is a combination of the rulers, their specific individual features. One of the most active supporters of the historian Karamzin was I. P. Saharov.

In the twenties of the XIX century critical direction began to form. A new trend in historical science manifested itself in the controversy over the works of N. M. Karamzin. With criticism of the scientific concept of the historian and the definition of a new system of “pragmatic history” in the thirties made historian N. G. Ustrjalov. The followers of N. G. Ustrjalov were A. P. Zernin, M. P. Pogodin.

At the same time M. T. Kachenovskij created “skeptical school”. His course of Russian history Kachenovskij always began with a critical analysis of historical literature, which subsequently became the basis for his concept. M. N. Katkov, I. M. Snegirjov, I. E. Zabelin belonged to this school.

The big influence on Russian historiography in the thirties of the XIX century had Slavophile circle. The ideas expressed by its representatives (I. D. Beljaev, A. N. Popov, D. Jazykov), expressed the main provisions of the Slavophile doctrine - skepticism about the historical perspective of European civilization.

Opponents of Slavophiles were Westerners, their opinion was that Russia should be developed on western European way. Their ideas are partially separated by writers and publicists - N. V. Medem, V. N. Majkov.

In the mid-forties of the XIX century a new concept has been created, according to which the driving force of the historical development was the state. Its founders were historians S. M. Solovyov and K. D. Kavelin. These names created a new direction in historical science, which was named the “public school”.

In the same period revolutionary democratic concept based on the views of V. G. Belinskij, A. I. Herzen and historian-democrat A. P. Shchapov was born. The concept of largely contributed to the preparation of conditions for the spread in Russia materialistic understanding of history.

All these scientific historiographical concepts contributed to the establishment of the term “historiography”, which in the second quarter of XIX century had a modern interpretation. Historiography is a set of historical research relating to any period or problem.

The aim of the study. On the basis of the materials published in the second quarter of XIX century to determine the list of scientific preferences of historians of Nikolas I, studied during the reign of the second Romanov.

The novelty of the study. The reign of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov has long attracted the attention of historians, but there is no detailed analysis of the historiographical research on the selected theme. However, creating their works modern historians of the XXI century use actively the materials published in the epoch of Nicholas. This work is intended to fill this gap.

2. Literature Review

This chapter describes the historical sources of the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich published in the epoch of Nicholas - the legislative collection of Speranskij; “The acts collected in libraries and archives of the Russian Empire Archaeological expedition of the Imperial Academy of Sciences”; “Acts of historical, collected and published by the Archaeological Commission”; “Palace discharges”.

In the second chapter, the authors analyzed the monographic works of historians in the period 1825-1855. Key works were studies by researchers V. N. Berh and P. E. Medovikov. The rest of the works of historians are not directly related to the stated theme, but researchers at the presentation of the material applied to the activities of the second Romanov - D. N. Bantysh-Kamenskij, P. V. Pavlov, A. N. Polevoj. In addition to monographs, the textbooks were considered appropriate given period. Tutorials-textbooks are like a mirror of the historiographical situations, so the analysis of the textbooks required for the drawing up of a complete historical picture. In the reign of Nicholas I the system of education has changed. The government closely monitored the published literature. Primary education
was represented by writing of A. O. Ishimova, the middle - by I. K. Kajdanov, high school - by N. G. Ustrjalov. The third chapter is devoted to the periodical publication of the second quarter of the XIX century. Magazines with different political beliefs were used. Conservative magazines have been presented by "Moskvityanin", "Herald of Europe", "Moscow News", "Library for Reading", "Son of the Fatherland", "Russian audience". The bourgeois-democratic trend was characteristic of "Moscow Telegraph". Democratic views are reflected in the journal "Notes of the Fatherland", "Contemporary".

To create a complete historiographical picture of the XIX century it considered to complete the study by documents, printed in the newspapers of the second quarter of XIX century - Yaroslavl Provincial Gazette, Voronezh Provincial Gazette, Vladimir Provincial Gazette, which add more objectively the achievements of science in the study of the era of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich.

3. Methods of the Study

This work was based on the principles of historicism, a complex, critical, comparative analysis of historical research, a systematic approach to the development of history as a single process. Methods of political biographies, problem-chronological and dialectical approach to the study of historical research were used.

3.1 Empirical Methods

Historical and systematic, historical-genetic method “survey” of the source, the complex method of using different types of sources, the method of contextual analysis of “historical semantics” of their terminology were used in this work.

4. Results

This study leads to the following conclusions. Despite the seeming absence of little-known places in the detailed study of the period of the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich - biography, political activity, creativity and personal characteristics of the second Romanov in the vast majority of the studies were of secondary importance in relation to the general historical and historiographical issues.

In the study of the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich in the national historiography of the second quarter of XIX century there are three areas: authentic sources of the XVII c., monographs and articles published in scientific journals. All areas vary in volume of the work, the breadth of the use of sources, the quality of their publications in different thematic emphases. Main events, defined the features of the epoch of Nicholas, are socio-political situation in the country and the level of development of historical science.

In the study of the historical sources during the reign of the second Romanov the following conclusions were made:

In the era of Nicholas I archeographers-scientists were interested actively in letters and other writings of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, a lot of them have been published for the first time, which gave impetus to the expansion of source base of most studies. Thus, the formation of the source base started to become the property of the researchers. Thus, in 1856 the first publication was devoted entirely to the second Romanov. The basis of the collection included original letters of A. I. Matjushkin previously published in the "Acts of the Archaeological Expedition" and the letter of N. I. Odoevskij published earlier in the journal "Moskvityanin", the letters to St. Cyril-Belozerksy monastery were taken out of the fourth volume of the "Acts of the Archaeological Expedition" and the third volume of the "Supplement to the Acts historical, collected and published by the Archeological Commission". The fact of the publication of the letters of Bartenjov was an event in the scientific life of Russia in the middle of the XIX century. This can be seen from the active attention of the critics. In 1857 two articles were published - I. E. Zabelin in the journal "Notes of the Fatherland" and the unknown author of "Contemporary". Both reviewers used the appearance of the publication to express their own ideas, not only about archeographic quality of work, but also on the published literature, and the time of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich;

Historical sources published during the second quarter of XIX century are characterized by relatively low archeographic quality: the absence of comments, the systems, the transmission characteristics of paleographic sources, discrepancies between publications and scripts. The publication of the letters in the "Acts of the Archaeological Expedition" has a number of differences with the collection Bartenjov. This is due to fuzzy reading documents compilers. Sometimes the discrepancies make sense of uncertainty source. For example, in the letter to A. I. Matjushkin published in the "Acts of the
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Archaeological Expedition”, a phrase devoid of meaning: “dvuh Shirjaev dikomyh, da novinu dikomyh, tol’ko ih u sebja, a ne dobyli s verv’ju” 20. The collection Bartenjov, this phrase is printed: “dvuh: Shirjaevu dikomyt, da Modinu dikomyt, tol’ko ih u sebja a ne vabili v verv’ju” 29. Consequently, we are talking about preparing for the hunting of two falcons named Shiryai and Modin and whose names are used in other places of publication. Sometimes there is a mistranslation in the “Acts of the Archaeological Expedition” in the letter of 13 March 1655 we can see the date “summer 7165”. 108 discrepancies were found as a result of the comparison of publications in the collection of Bartenjov and “Supplement to the historical Acts, collected and published by the Archaeological Commission” 30. The main mass of them are in the writing of words. For example, in the letter dated May 23, 1650 there were the following differences:

“Supplement to the historical Acts, collected and published by the Archaeological Commission”:
Prislati;
gusjonkov net;
utjonkov net;
Pisan.
“Collection of the letters of P. I. Bartenjov”:
Prislat’;
gusekov net;
utkov net;
Pisano.

The majority of publications, made in the second quarter of the XIX c., do not have any system and high level of archeography. But collections of sources, published by government agencies and private works of archeographs, are still actual in modern historical science. The monographs of the historians I. L. Andreev31, A. N. Bohanov32, A. A. Preobrazhenskij33, G. V. Talina34 are based on materials published in the epoch of Nicholas.

After analyzing the monographic works of historians of the second quarter of the XIX century conclusions can be drawn:

In the Nicholas epoch first monographic works in historiography were devoted to the person and work of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich (Berh, Medovikov). Studies had, of course, scientific character, but did not meet the goals that the authors have set themselves. Historians only summarized previously known facts, fundamentally new in these works there is nothing35.

All research in the national historiography differed apparent incompleteness of information. First, historians used mostly materials of Russian and foreign contemporaries of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich - Kotoshikhin, Oleary, Meyrberh, Collins, etc. Naturally, any era contemporaries were inclined to exaggerate the achievements of the ruler, which led to a distortion of historical reality. Second, not all authentic sources of the XVII century, published in the era of Nicholas I were used by scientists, and if used, the majority of historians did not have critical approach to the studied sources. Third, all of the studies contain factual errors. Historians did not own sources to the extent that was necessary to create a completed work.

Preferences of the historians of Nicholas epoch were evolved according to the selected areas of political activity of Emperor Nicholas I. For example, the legislative reform carried out under the leadership of Speransky, awakened interest in the analysis of the Sobornoe Ulozhenie of 1649 military reform conducted by Nicholas I, paid attention to the uniform of previous years. Financial reform of Kankrin aroused interest in the monetary policy of Alexei Mikhailovich. Emperor Nicholas I was interested in the heraldry, which is also reflected in historical science in the works of A. B. Lakier.

An active foreign policy of Emperor Nicholas I led to appearance of a number of monographs devoted to diplomatic relations between Russia and the countries of East and West during the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich. For example, the Orthodox Church, presented at the famous formula of the era of Nicholas I, was due to the ideas of the Russian Orthodox mission among the other Slavs - the Balkans and the Austrian Empire. In the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich there also was the idea of Russian Orthodox mission in the West but in the question of the accession of the Malorossiya. Polish question was very acute during the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich and in the reign of Nicholas I. Therefore, professional historians could not leave this problem without attention. Historians of Nicholas time were indifferent to the subject of enslavement of the peasants, but in the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich Sobornoe Ulozhenie of 1649 serfdom peasants claimed hereditary, and the term spying runaway peasants became indefinite. Thus it was completed the process of legislative registration of serfdom. For Nicholas I the peasant question was closed and settled.

In addition, the preferences of the historians of the second quarter of the XIX century were formed in accordance with the interests and hobbies of the ruling emperor. So, Nicholas I positioned himself with Peter I,
therefore, historians have filled autobiography of Alexei Mikhailovich with facts from the life of his great son. They distorted the true characteristic of the second Romanov, artificially created the elements of similarity. Thus, they were not interested in Alexei as a person.

In the national historiography all works were full of panegyric and apologetic characteristics. For example, historians V. N. Berh and S. Dobroklonskij did not hide his admiration with regard to Alexey Mikhailovich. In their works historians A. B. Lakier, M. N. Kapustin had brilliant position of defenders of monarchy.

It seemed to historians of Nicholas time, everything that happened in the pre-Peter I era, in the XVII century, including during the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, archaic, noteworthy only as some “prerequisites of reform” as the original building material, from which Peter had to build their empire. The same position is shared by historians of historiography in the XVIII century. This idea became the foundation of historiographical trends of the second quarter of the XIX century – Westerners.

Journalism in the second quarter of XIX century actively took part in and had an influence on the development of national historiography and had the following results:

In Russian periodicals of Nicholas epoch appeared previously unpublished historical documents of the XVII century. As the magazines were in constant competition, editions published sources in accordance with the definition of their chosen subjects. So the editors of “Notes of the Fatherland” published only documents relating to foreign policy. In the journal “Moskvityanin” diametrically opposite topics were presented - internal politics and personal characteristics of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, and the editors of “Library for Reading” printed sources with minor expert commentary.

Interest to sources describing the history of Russia in the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich in the epoch of Nicholas was not only among professionals but also among fans. So, part of the documents published in the journal “Moskvityanin” were given by professional historians who had a liberal education and were scientists. The document “Treatment of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich” was granted by an assistant of the director of the Moscow Armoury A. F. Veltman (1800-1870), a diploma of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich from 1649 has been extracted from the Archives of the Novgorod State Chamber and was printed by the historian I. K. Kuprijanov (1820-1878). However, the first two sources published in the journal “Moskvityanin” were provided to individuals who did not have a direct relationship to science. In 1841, “Disposal of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich about the former famine in 1651” was reported by Mr. Ivanov (full details were not known), and in 1843 “The letter of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich about Kolyada” was presented by the merchant V. I. Borisov from Shuja.

Democratic magazines “Notes of the Fatherland” and “Contemporary” laid the foundation for creativity for titans of the XIX century – I. E. Zabelin and S. M. Solovyov. The historian I. E. Zabelin in the early fifties of this century published articles in the journal “Notes of the Fatherland.” Those studies were the basis for the fundamental works - “Home life of Russian tsars in the XVI and XVII centuries”, described especially the daily life of the tsars of pre-Peter I era. Articles of historian S. M. Solovyov were published in the journal “Contemporary”, they were also included in the basic work of a research “History of Russia since ancient times”.

Works done by translators of Nicholas epoch was the first experience to publish the notes of foreigners. On the basis of their translations, published in periodicals of the second quarter of the XIX c. were published full works of foreigners in the XX century. For example, the first translation of the work of J. Reytenfels was published only in 1905 by A. V. Stankevich (1821-1912), which was publish firstly in “Readings in the Society of Russian History and Antiquities”, and only then as a separate publication. The work by A. Lizek was fully published in the XX century.

There were following characteristic features of the national historiography of Nicholas I epoch in the study of the time of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich.

In the second quarter of XIX century the study of the era of Alexei Mikhailovich was conducted through the prism of reform efforts of Peter the Great. That period had the foundations for the reforms of Peter I. The researchers constantly compared the father and the son in different directions, forming a picture of Alexei Mikhailovich not as an independent historical figure, but rather as a precursor of Peter the Great.
5. Conclusion

In the writings of researchers of Nicholas epoch images of the tsar were formed. Alexei Mikhailovich was called “wise” and “reasonable” as he correctly chose the policies that led to the transformative reforms of the XVIII century. “Kind” because he took care of all his people. The tsar took care of pilgrims, who settled at the royal court, and the Russian people thought that their governor was kind and honest. “Merciful”, Alexis paid great attention to such manifestations of Orthodox concerns about sovereign subjects like giving charity for the spiritual and secular holidays. It should be noted that the understanding of charity not only in Alexis epoch, but also in the framework of successive reigns was left unchanged. All official documents, particularly the ceremonial ranks among the epithets each of the first Romanov, and especially of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, certainly used the term “pious emperor”, so he was God’s representative on the earth. Alexei Mikhailovich was named tsar warrior because of participation in a military campaign during the Russian-Polish war.

Researchers of Nicholas epoch laid the foundations for the structure of works and outlined basic directions for the further disclosure of the topics included then in the fundamental works of the titans of Russian historical thought in the XIX - XX centuries - V. O. Kljuchevskij, S. M. Solovyov, I. E. Zabelin.
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