Введение. Методическое наследие российских педагогов прошлого представляет интерес для современной теории педагогики и образовательной практики. Цель статьи заключается в обобщении методических взглядов видного ученого второй половины XIX – первой половины XX вв. Ивана Степановича Михеева (1876–1940). Актуальность педагогического наследия Михеева объясняется соответствием его методических взглядов установкам современных российских специалистов в области преподавания русского языка и литературы среди нерусских народов Среднего Поволжья.

Материалы и методы. Ведущие методы исследования – анализ научной литературы и биографический метод, а также исторический, региональный и аксиологический (ценостный) методологические подходы.

Результаты. И. С. Михеев предложил систему обучения нерусских народов чтению и письму на их родном и русском языках. Он предложил начать обучение грамоте на родном языке учащихся. После овладения элементарными навыками они должны были перейти к преподаванию на русском языке на так называемых “разговорных уроках”. Михеев назвал свой подход к обучению “методом целых предложений”. Для тех, кто владеет устной родной речью, главное – овладеть письменной речью, что влечет за собой необходимость достаточно детального изучения грамматики. Для детей “нерусского происхождения” наиболее актуальной задачей является овладение живой разговорной речью. В условиях, когда школьное обучение обычно длилось не более двух-трех лет, задача овладения грамматикой не должна была выдвигаться на первый план.

Обсуждение. Идея – обучение незнакомому языку методом целых предложений – была выдвинута Михеевым в качестве основы его методологических взглядов. Она нашла дальнейшее продуктивное развитие в современных методах преподавания иностранных языков. Новаторство подхода Михеева заключалось в том, что он указал на принципиальную разницу в подходах к обучению русскому языку русских и нерусских детей. Методика, разработанная И. С. Михеевым, включала на начальном этапе отработку простейших синтаксических образований вместо утомительного запоминания грамматических форм. Таким образом, ученики приобрели способность составлять простые, но целые предложения за относительно короткое время. То есть они могли выразить свои мысли на правильном русском языке. Подход Михеева требовал совершенно разных методик и учебников русского языка для русских и для нерусских школьников.

Выводы. Видный методист-филолог и просветитель нерусских народов Среднего Поволжья Михеев внес весомый вклад в развитие образования и методическую науку, периодической печати и литературы. Методические идеи Михеева актуальны и понятны, и представляют собой значительную ценность для современной российской педагогической науки и образования. Современные педагоги полиэтнических регионов России высоко оценивают и активно используют его наследие. Теоретические и методические труды Михеева, его детские книги и драматические произведения включают в себя аксиологическое, гуманистическое содержание, и до настоящего времени оказывает существенное воздействие на современную методическую мысль. В силу этого его работы заслуживает самого внимания дальнейшего изучения.
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I. S. Mikheev's contribution to the development of methodological science and education of non-Russian peoples of the Middle Volga region

**Introduction.** The methodological heritage of Russian teachers of the past is of interest to the modern theory of pedagogy and educational practice. The purpose of the article is to generalize the methodological views of a prominent scientist of the second half of the XIX – first half of the XX centuries Ivan Stepanovich Mikheev (1876-1940). The relevance of the pedagogical heritage of Mikheev is explained by the correspondence of his methodological views to the attitudes of modern Russian specialists in the field of teaching Russian language and literature among the non-Russian peoples of the Middle Volga region.

**Materials and methods.** The leading research methods are the analysis of scientific literature and the biographical method, as well as historical, regional and axiological (value) methodological approaches.

**Results.** I. S. Mikheev proposed a system of teaching non-Russian peoples to read and write in their native and Russian languages. He suggested starting the development of literacy in the native language of students. After mastering elementary skills, they had to move on to teaching in the Russian language in the so-called “conversational lessons”. Mikheev called his teaching approach “the method of whole sentences.” For those who speak oral native speech, the main thing is to master written speech, that entails the need for a sufficiently detailed study of grammar. For “non-Russian-born” children, the most urgent task is to master live conversational speech. In conditions when schooling usually lasted no more than two or three years, the task of mastering grammar shouldn't have been brought to the fore.

**Discussion.** The idea, – teaching an unfamiliar language by the method of whole sentences, – was put forward by Mikheev as a basis of his methodological views. It found further productive development in modern methods of teaching foreign languages. The innovation of Mikheev's approach consisted in the fact that he pointed out the fundamental difference in approaches to teaching Russian to Russian and to non-Russian children. The methodology developed by I. S. Mikheev included at the initial stage the elaboration of the simplest syntactic formations instead of tedious memorization of grammatical forms. Hence pupils acquired the ability to compose simple, but whole sentences in a relatively short time. That’s they were able to express their thoughts in the correct Russian language. Mikheev's approach required completely different methods and textbooks of the Russian language for Russian and for non-Russian schoolchildren. The methodological ideas of Mikheev are still relevant today, and represent a significant value for modern Russian pedagogical science and education. Modern teachers of multiethnic regions of Russia highly appreciate and actively use the heritage of Mikheev.

**Conclusions.** A prominent methodologist, philologist and educator of the non-Russian peoples of the Middle Volga region, Mikheev made a significant contribution to the development of education and methodological science, periodicals and literature. Mikheev's methodological ideas are still relevant today, and are of considerable value for modern Russian pedagogical science and education. Modern teachers of multiethnic regions of Russia highly appreciate and actively use Mikheev's legacy. The theoretical and methodological works of I. S. Mikheev, his children's books and dramatic works include axiological, humanistic content, and to this day have a significant impact on modern methodological thought. That’s why, it deserves the most careful further study.

**Keywords:** Mikheev, Kazan guberniya, Vyatka guberniya, Ashmarin, Markova, Shcherba, Kazan School of Linguistics, Baudouin de Courtenay

**For Reference:**
INTRODUCTION. THE URGENCY OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of educating of small nations has long existed in many countries. It’s becoming more and more relevant at the present time, since the importance of the ethnic factor is constantly increasing in the modern international community. This problem is of particular importance for such a multi-ethnic country as Russia. In various historical periods in our country there were educators who devoted their lives to the education of their ethnic groups. Among them is a prominent methodologist and educator Ivan Stepanovich Mikheev.

The purpose of the proposed article is to give, if possible, a complete description of his methodological heritage, to show its relevance for the modern domestic education system and methodological science.

The theme of national enlightenment is naturally reflected in the works of foreign and Russian scientists. Research, in particular, is carried out in different areas. First of all, one can note the introduction of sustainable didactic models into the foreign-language and foreign-cultural educational rural school environment [1]. The translation of transnational and transcultural educational models of a larger nation to a smaller one also arouses interest of scholars [2]. More specific issues, such as the development of curricula and manuals for the peoples of African countries also become the subject of consideration by researchers [3]. The problem of immigrant students also seems to be important [4]. Mutual activities of school, community and church also attracts attention of scientists and practical teachers [5]. Rural minority student engagement with a healthcare pipeline program is another important problem that attracts the attention of researchers [6]. «Crucial support, vital aspirations», – these are college and career aspirations of rural Black and Latin middle school students, that are thoroughly investigated [7]. Close attention is paid to comparative studies of Chinese children’s literature and foreign children’s literature [8]. The problem of adaptation of children in a foreign cultural environment also attracts attention of historians of pedagogy [9].

Russian scholars, historians also pay attention to the topic of the history of national enlightenment [10]. This is evidenced by a fairly large number of dissertations and monographs, as well as publications in periodicals [11]. Among the research directions, various aspects of the development of national enlightenment are highlighted, including state policy in the field of education of non-Russian peoples, features of the development of a small nation school [12].

Christian enlightenment of small nations in the Middle Volga region in the last quarter of the XVIIIth – early XXth centuries is a relatively popular theme of domestic historians [13]. At the same time, the name of I. S. Mikheev himself, who made a very significant contribution to the development of education in the Middle Volga region, somehow fell out of the field of view of Russian researchers. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that among the prominent educators of the non-Russian peoples of the Middle Volga region, Ivan Stepanovich Mikheev should justly occupy one of the first places. However, until recently, it wasn’t accepted to mention it in the scientific press. This was explained by the fact that he, like many other representatives of the advanced Soviet intelligentsia, became a victim of unjustified repression in the 1930s.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

The leading research methods are the analysis of scientific literature and the biographical method, as well as the historical, regional and axiological (value) methodological approach. The last of these approaches makes it possible to identify the most valuable in the methodological views of a famous scientist; something that hasn’t lost its relevance for pedagogical science and practice up to this day. The author used the materials of some leading scientific and pedagogical periodicals of foreign and domestic origin, including "Espacio, Tiempo y Educación" (Spain), "The History of Education & Children’s Literature" (Italy), "Journal of Research in Rural Education" (USA), "Pedagogy", "Questions of Pedagogy", "Humanitarian Treatise", "Russian in the National School", "Pedagogy. Questions of theory and practice", "Elementary education", Humanitarian Treatise, "Questions of literature", etc, as well as the works of Russian and foreign researchers of historical and pedagogical science; among them S. Polenghi, X. Taylor, A. Sh. Asadullin, N. I. Ashmarin, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, A. K. Markova, I. S. Mikheev, N. I. Ilminsky, L. V. Shcherba, etc.

RESULTS

Facts of biography

I. S. Mikheev was born on June 19 (July 1), 1876 in the village of Oshtormo-Yumya, Mamadysh district, Kazan province (now Kukmor district of the Republic of Tatarstan) in a peasant family [14, p. 120].

After graduating from the Kazan non-Russian Teachers’ Seminary in 1895, he worked as a teacher’s assistant at the central Udmurt school in the village of Stary Karlygan, Urzhum district, Vyatka province. This school was opened with the active assistance of the educator of the non-Russian peoples Nikolai Ivanovich Ilminsky, and its purpose was to train teachers for national schools. The school coped with the task quite well; the first generation of the initially small Udmurt intelligentsia came out of it, and among them the famous poet and public figure Kuzebai Gerd (Kuzma Pavlovich Chaynikov), the first Udmurt poetess and ophthalmologist Ashalchi Oki (Akilina Grigoryevna Vekshina) [15, p. 55].

An extremely important factor that contributed to the formation of Mikheev, as a future teacher, was his communication with the Udmurt educator, director of this school KuzmaAndreevich Andreev [16, p. 89]. K. A. Andreev was the founder of the school [17, p. 35]. In 1896-1913, Mikheev was a teacher of the exemplary primary Udmurt School at the Kazan Teachers’ Seminary. After his dismissal in 1913, – he was accused of participating in unrest of students at this seminary, – Ivan Stepanovich was engaged in publishing and developing educational and methodological literature in Kazan until 1917. At his own expense, he published a desktop calendar-yearbook in the Udmurt language. It was one of the very first books published for Udmurts. The first calendar for 1905 was published in 1904; the last, for 1910, in 1909. The calendar was a solid volume, in which a wide variety of household, agricultural, local history and other information was printed. All this could be of interest to an ordinary, primarily rural resident. The Udmurt calendar also contained various information and practical tips on farming and treating diseases with folk remedies. It published articles about the life and luxury of the royal court and the poverty of peasants, poems of democratic content as well. All this, in the end, served as a reason for banning its publication.
In 1918-1920, I. S. Mikheev continued his work at the seminary. In 1919, he was elected a full member of the Society of Archeology, History and Ethnography at the Kazan University. In 1920-1924, I. S. Mikheev was in charge of the Votsky publishing sub-department at the People's Commissariat for Nationalities in Kazan. He was also the editor of a number of Udmurt publications. In 1924-1929, he was a lecturer at the Kazan University and at the Faculty of Oriental Pedagogical Institute. In 1929-1936 he worked in the pedagogical institutes of the Uzbek SSR in Khojent, Stalinabad and Samarkand. Here he received the academic title of associate professor and was presented with the title of "Hero of Labor". This title was established in 1927 by the Central Executive Committee of the USSR and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR. It was awarded to persons who had special merits in the field of production, scientific activity, state or public service, and who had worked as workers or employees for at least 35 years.

In 1938, the assignment of this title was discontinued due to the establishment of the title "Hero of Socialist Labor". In 1936, he moved to Yoshkar-Ola, where he worked at the Mari Pedagogical Institute at the Department of the Russian Language and Methods of Teaching.

In 1937, he was accused of criticizing the programs of the People's Commissariat of Education; this was qualified as anti-Soviet activity. The fact that these programs weren't worth a damn was clear to almost any teacher [18, pp. 31-32]. Another thing is that in those years few people dared to speak verbally on this subject, as Mikheev did, and in print it was impossible at all.

The remarkable teacher was declared, as it was then accepted, "an enemy of the people", and in 1937 he was shot. According to other sources, Mikheev was executed in 1941 or even in 1944. It should be noted that the then authorities were particularly wary of the manifestations of ethnic independence of the so-called "small" peoples [19, p. 71]. In this regard, the national cultural and ethnographic societies that existed since the early 1920s were closed, and their leaders and active members were subjected to repression [20, p. 59].

In the 1950s, all charges against the outstanding teacher were dropped, and Mikheev was fully rehabilitated. Practically this is all that is known about his life.

**I. S. Mikheev and his methodical views**

Mikheev is the author of a large number of methodological manuals and textbooks on the Udmurt and Russian languages, as well as on other subjects of the school curriculum for Russian and, in particular, national schools. His contribution to the development of the Russian language teaching methods in Udmurt schools is especially significant. He actively opposed dogmatic teaching, following N. F. Bunakov [21], V. P. Vakhterov [22], V. I. Vodovozov [23], N. A. Korf [24], D. D. Semenov [25] and other prominent Russian teachers of the second half of the XIXth century, and he believed that the task of the school is, first of all, to awaken in the child his mental and moral forces.Unlike many teachers and missionaries, he saw in mastering the Russian language by representatives of non-Russian peoples of the Russian Empire not a means of Christianizing, but a reliable way of their spiritual and moral development, a sure way of introducing these peoples to the great Russian culture, and through it to the world culture.

I. S. Mikheev proposed a system of teaching non-Russian peoples to read and write in their native and Russian languages. He suggested starting the development of literacy in the native language of the students. After mastering elementary skills, they had to move on to teaching in the Russian language in the so-called "conversational lessons". In teaching
in Russian, he considered the main thing to be the assimilation of "elementary syntax", which was taken primarily from the practice of live conversational speech, oral and written exercises. Mikheev called his teaching approach "the method of whole sentences." This approach corresponded to the system of N. I. Ilminsky (1822-1891), that had been put forward shortly before. Mikheev considered himself a faithful follower of the ideas of this outstanding educator of this non-Russian peoples of the Middle Volga region. Mikheev's ideas completely coincided with Ilminsky's views, but already, so to speak, at a new historical turn. In teaching the Russian language to Middle Volga "foreigners", Mikheev also adhered to the views of the founder of the Kazan Linguistic School Ivan Alexandrovich Baudouin de Courtenay (1845-1929), who advocated the study, first of all, of modern, living languages, and he demanded objectivity in the process of mastering them [26]. Baudouin de Courtenay understood the inadmissibility of the mechanical transfer of categories of one language to another language, and considered direct communication with native speakers of the studied language as an urgent necessity.

**DISCUSSION**

In the most complete form the methodological views of I. S. Mikheev in the pre-October period found their reflection in the works "Grammar exercises in elementary school" (Kazan, 1916), "Russian grammar. Elementary course" (Kazan, 1914), etc. When developing these methodological manuals, he wondered why the Middle Volga "nationals", living in a Russian-speaking environment and constantly communicating with the Russian population, nevertheless, relatively rarely master a pure literary oral language, and even more so, a written language. The reason for this, he saw in the fact that in national schools at that time, the study of the Russian language usually didn′t go beyond memorizing samples of declensions and conjugations. At the same time, the syntax was completely ignored. It brought little benefit and didn′t contribute to the spiritual and moral development of children. In addition, a teacher was forced at the same time to inform students of a significant number of obscure terms that burdened their memory and didn′t give practical conversational skills, the development of which would justify spending time and effort on boring terminological exercises.

I. S. Mikheev proceeded from the fact that the grammatical structure of the languages of these peoples is in many respects similar to the Russian language. Much deeper differences are observed in the field of syntax and phraseology. Therefore, a "national", who has hardened grammatical forms of the Russian speech through a simple memorization, and who doesn’t know how to combine them correctly with each other, is, according to Mikheev, a common phenomenon. As a result, "a pupil begins to avoid using them, and the inevitable consequence of this phenomenon is the impoverishment of his language" [27, p. 4]. I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay noted in this regard: "Natural selection" encourages choosing an easier option, and namely, "own", national" [28, p. 45]. And since, according to him, "there isn’t and can’t be a single pure, unmixed linguistic whole", the unmistakable use of language forms, in particular grammatical ones, is achieved only when a pupil studies the whole sentence. Otherwise pupils can’t compose even the simpliest Russian phrase. The grammatical form is just an abstraction, a symbol; its meaning is revealed only as part of the whole sentence [28, p. 363]. Mikheev makes it clear that the study of the Russian syntax by "nationals" should be carried out from the very beginning of school education.
and, moreover, it should become fundamental in the study of the Russian language [29, p. 109]. This idea, – teaching an unfamiliar language by the method of whole sentences, – was put forward by Mikheev as the basis of his methodological views. It found further productive development in modern methods of teaching foreign languages [30].

Thus, the outstanding linguist L. V. Shcherba noted that "the study of a live spoken language is a more specific and at first publicly available task... For people who aren't grammatically educated, it's necessary to put the study of a live spoken language as something more concrete in the foreground ..." [31, p. 101].

L. V. Shcherba distinguished two types of methods in this regard. The first type of methodology, used in the study of a foreign (or non-native) language, requires starting training with the presentation of live structural and lexical material. The second type of methodology is based on supposition that pupils are generally familiar with the need to master grammatical rules from the very beginning of work. The scientist also rightly pointed out that the development of economic and political needs dramatically increased the importance of speaking in another language [32, pp. 159-160].

In modern Russian psychology, there is also a widespread idea that the study of the Russian language by native speakers of another language should begin not with sounds and letters, but with a whole utterance, that is, with a sentence.

The modern psychologist A. K. Markova suggests, using the concept of "utterance" as the basis for teaching a non-native language, that characteristics of a language are developed and concretized in the process of mastering the subject and in the student's own speech practice. All sections of the program for teaching a non-native language represent a concretization of this concept, and each new stage of work represents the assimilation of an utterance in a new content, the "overgrowth" of the original concept with new features [33, p. 54].

The innovation of Mikheev's approach consisted in the fact that he pointed out the fundamental difference in approaches to teaching Russian to Russian and to non-Russian children. For the first ones who speak oral native speech, the main thing is to master written speech, which entails the need for a sufficiently detailed study of grammar. For "non-Russian-born" children, the most urgent task is to master live conversational speech, i.e. the first type of methodology, according to Shcherba. In conditions when schooling usually lasted no more than two or three years, the task of mastering grammar shouldn’t have been brought to the fore. Mikheev's approach required completely different methods and textbooks of the Russian language for Russian and for non-Russian schoolchildren.

The methodology developed by I. S. Mikheev included at the initial stage the elaboration of the simplest syntactic formations instead of tedious memorization of grammatical forms. Hence pupils acquired the ability to compose simple, but whole sentences in a relatively short time, that's they were able to express their thoughts in the correct Russian language. At the same time, he refused to work with compound sentences for almost the entire period of teaching in elementary school. At first glance, this may seem like a "step backwards", a manifestation of conservatism, provincialism and a desire to limit the possibilities of "non-Russian" children in mastering the largest possible amount of educational material.

But the methodist proceeded from the fact that by practicing on samples of live speech made up of simple sentences, "nationals" would gradually get used to the "correct structure" of the latter, and imperceptibly for themselves they would imitate these samples when presenting their own thoughts, and then, at their own pace, they would begin to master complex sentences naturally. In this way, he pointed out, they would master "an easy and
clear syllable" and "save themselves from the promiscuity of style," a phenomenon invariably noted by all non-Russian students who started studying complex sentences before they learned to speak and write simple sentences [34, p. 7]. Mikheev’s idea that teaching the Russian language by representatives of the Middle Volga peoples should begin not with the study of individual words and sounds, as it was universally accepted, but with whole simple sentences, – as well as not with morphology, but with syntax, – was actively supported by Nikolai Ivanovich Ashmarin (1870-1933), full member of the Academy of Sciences, professor, founder of Chuvash linguistics, compiler of the dictionary of the Chuvash language in 17 issues, permanent co-author of Mikheev. N. I. Ashmarin saw the innovative approach of Mikheev in the refusal to study "fragments of speech and dry samples of declensions and conjugations" at the initial stage of teaching the Russian language [34, p. 18].

The well-known Kazan professor A. I. Emelyanov was also a like-minded person and assistant of I. S. Mikheev [35, p. 87].

Mikheev based on the principle of practical orientation in the study of the Russian language and the brevity of the period of study of non-Russian children at school. That’s why he reduced some sections of the traditional program, leaving the most necessary ones in terms of mastering oral speech. So, in morphology, he retained only the division of letters into vowels and consonants, and the division of words into syllables. He excluded the word formation department from the etymology department, motivating it as follows: "Why should students have an idea about the root and suffix if their vocabulary is extremely limited?"

The methodologist also refused to study Russian grammar in two traditional directions: "parts of speech" and "parts of a sentence", which, according to him, introduced "bifurcation" into the consciousness of non-Russian pupils who constantly confused adverb with circumstance, noun with subject, etc. Moreover, the term "part of speech" itself was considered by I. S. Mikheev unsuccessful due to its vagueness and uncertainty. The student, in response to the teacher's question "What is a part of speech?" reads a line of the poem and says: "That's part of the speech." And he is, in fact, right, Mikheev notes, because the natural division of speech consists in the fact, first of all, of separate sentences.

The mentioned abbreviations were reflected in his textbooks. Instead of grammatical material he paid great attention to conversational lessons based on the most common Russian phrases and expressions. According to I. S. Mikheev, work on typical phrases and mastering conversational cliches should occupy a central place in the work of a Russian language teacher. Another prominent Kazan educator of that time, V. A. Bogoroditsky, held the same opinion [36, p. 135].

This provision was further developed in the doctoral dissertation of N. Z. Bakeeva [37] and in the monograph of professor R. B. Garifyanova [38]. It implemented in the system of exercises in programs and a series of textbooks on the Russian language for Tatar schools [39]. It also found its use in the ABC for them [40]. V. F. Gabdulkhakov also considers the mastery of coherent speech to be the basis and main goal of learning, and all other aspects, including grammatical information, should be subordinated to it [41, p. 7]. Teachers of the Udmurt Republic believe that in grades 1-3, children should learn only the most accessible grammatical phenomena, but the main attention should be paid to enriching the lexical stock of children and the formation of oral conversational skills [42].

The reduction of grammatical material in the process of teaching non-Russian children was a practical implementation of the idea of Mikheev to give students only the amount of grammatical material that’s necessary for practical, living possession of it. In this regard,
A. Sh. Asadullin highlights Mikheev's lack of passion for grammar, "that can't be said about some textbooks for modern national schools" [43, p. 3]. It's impossible not to note an obvious fact that the above-mentioned program cuts were forced. In conditions when the majority of non-Russian schoolchildren studied Russian for only two or three years, or even less, it was necessary, first of all, to ensure the students' practical knowledge of the language, and not an assimilation of theoretical knowledge about it. Language skills also open up opportunities for reading literature in Russian, and this is a direct path to mastering the spiritual and moral richness of the Russian literature.

In his manuals, Mikheev advised, before giving a child a creative task, to disclose the methodology of its implementation. So, depending on the topic of the essay or dialogue, the child could go to the horse yard or to the bazaar, listen to the speech of the seller and the buyer, write down individual expressions, and only then to proceed to compose the text. This methodological advice is in full accordance with views of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, who urged "not to impose categories alien to the language, but to seek out what really exists in it" [44, p. 13].

The methodological provisions put forward by Mikheev and other advanced enlighteners of that time (V. A. Bogoroditsky, M. H. Kurbangaleev, N. A. Bobrovnikov, etc.) are used in modern methodological literature. In the "ABC" by A. I. Sazhina (for the Udmurt school), the idea of Mikheev about the development of pupils' speech on life material was developed. A. I. Sazhina believes that household items, school furnishing, animals, nature, etc. can serve as topics for conversational lessons. Assessing the role of Mikheev in the development of a new, original methodology as innovative, and pointing out that this methodology fully takes into account the basic didactic principles (clarity, consistency, transition from easy to more difficult, etc.), Mikheev's contemporary, the educator Ivan Vasilyevich Yakovlev noted with regret that "no manual, no textbook of other authors intended for non-Russian schools, has paid serious attention to Mikheev's ideas" [45, p. 24].

Prominent Kazan methodologist A. N. Rozhdestvyn shared the opinion of I. V. Yakovlev about the value of Mikheev's methodological innovations in the field of studying Russian grammatical forms, and also emphasized the desire of their author to use the natural method in teaching [46, p. 339]. Mikheev's teaching manuals were highly appreciated by school teachers. Their positive reviews of his textbook "Visual Russian Primer", containing 470 drawings, were included in the published in Kazan in 1910 "Catalog of textbooks and teaching aids by I. S. Mikheev". His theoretical and methodological works were actively used in educational institutions in multiethnic regions of Russia.

They were applied in Turkey, China, Japan and Arab countries. In these countries, the small books of the series "Essays on Pictures" compiled by Mikheev, which included short stories for reading of an informative and moralizing nature, – "Caught!", "Bear Hunting", "Prank leads to trouble", "Honest Boy", etc., – were particularly popular. A total of 10 books were published in seventeen editions.

For primary pupils who started learning Russian, they served as initial books for reading. In addition, this literature, saturated with moral content, contributed to the spiritual and moral development of children.

For characterizing I. S. Mikheev as an educator and teacher, it's important to note his contribution to the development of the national dramatic art. In the first Udmurt play ("Don't steal!"), published in Kazan (1906), he satirically denounced the development of capitalist relations in the village. He considered capitalism a deviation from ideal, universal norms of life. Heroes of the play were carriers of enlightenment ideas. They opposed
the acquisitiveness manifested in person of the rich priest Eshkey. They considered the preservation of the old, pre-capitalist way of life and good community relations and traditions to be the most acceptable way of life. They denied state justice; it’s replaced by the court of the patriarchal community. In the same years, Mikheev created the play "Stupid Anton" about the corrupting influence of the city on a peasant. In the story-legend "I drove the devil for three years!" he showed the social stratification in the depths of the village community, portrayed the priest in a satirical light.

The modern critic G. N. Pospelov pointed out that in his plays, Mikheev was supposedly the least of all an educator, because, according to Pospelov, "the ideal turned to the past didn’t contain the features of enlightenment" [47, p. 128].

We disagree with this statement and believe that enlightenment, as a phenomenon, is meaningful, first of all, and is turned into the past, into some initial stages of the development of culture and education. At the same time, we agree with the literary critic A. G. Shklyaev, who claimed that Pospelov tried to narrow positive specific historical content of the enlightenment and judged about the literary merits of the play of Mikheev with hindsight [48, p. 136].

Mikheev took part in the so-called Multan case. Then a group of Udmurt peasants was falsely accused of human sacrifice [49]. In the work "Are the Buddhists Votyaks?" he sharply and evidently criticized the Vyatka priest N. N. Blinov, who questioned the acquittal of the Multan Udmurts by the court. This work called for the affirmation of the national dignity and self-consciousness of Udmurt people [50].

CONCLUSIONS

The scientific heritage of I. S. Mikheev, and, above all, his textbooks, produced, according to the philologist-methodologist A. Sh. Asadullin, "a genuine revolution in the teaching of the Russian language in non-Russian schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" [51, p. 116]. It was in his works that the methodology of teaching the Russian language to the Middle Volga peoples (Mari, Udmurts, Tatars, etc.), according to Z. V. Suvorova, embarked on a truly scientific track [52]. Russian language teaching in national schools was shifted by Mikheev from the formal study of the grammatical system towards its practical development, which played a major role in educating the peoples of the Volga region, in introducing them to the riches of Russian culture. His methodological ideas were supported in the works of scholars of subsequent generations.

Russian researcher F. K. Ermakov noted that the teachers of the older generation who happened to work in schools in the 1900s-1930s recognized that the assimilation of the Russian language by non-Russian students according to the textbooks of Mikheev proceeded as a process of developing practical skills and abilities in the Russian language, which allowed them to quickly learn how to read, write and speak Russian correctly.

Russian scholars recognize that the foundations of modern methods of teaching the Russian language to the Middle Volga peoples are based on the views of I. S. Mikheev [53, p. 270]. A similar assessment of his methodological heritage was given by his contemporaries. I. V. Yakovlev emphasized his merits as one of the first authors of special textbooks for non-Russian pupils, which took into account phonetic, lexical, grammatical, syntactic and other features of the corresponding national languages and dialects.
He found the superiority of Mikheev's textbooks in the fact that studying according to them, "pupils in one year master the Russian language better than pupils in two years according to textbooks for Russian schools." In addition, Yakovlev noted, that the success of schoolchildren in learning Russian has a positive effect on the development of other subjects [54, pp. 241-242].

Before 1917, Mikheev published more than thirty fiction books, textbooks, and the same number after October. In the 1920s, he was an indispensable participant in all teachers' congresses and conferences and enjoyed great authority among school teachers. He was surrounded by universal love and recognition in the following years. At the same time, according to researchers, the methodological legacy of Mikheev remains largely unclaimed. A. Sh. Asadullin, K. Sh. Gubasheva and other researchers also note with regret that the activities of I. S. Mikheev have been little studied, and his works have become a bibliographic rarity [55]. Therefore, due to their inaccessibility to the average teacher, and only for this reason, the methodological recommendations set out in them can't actually be widely used in a modern national school [56]. The author of this article included an essay about Mikheev in the book "100 great teachers" [57]. All of the above allows us to make an assumption about the essential significance of his methodological heritage for pedagogical science, teaching practice and spiritual and moral education of the younger generation, emphasizes the relevance of the study of the life and work and scientific heritage of this prominent scientist.
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