Alexander GANCHEV, Yuliia UZUN

"Demography as history": methods of studying the past[1] (II)

Rezumat
„Demografia ca istorie": metode de studiere a trecutului (II)

În prezentul articol se încearcă o conceptualizare teoretică și metodologică a reconstituirilor istorice și demografice în contextele „cliometriei" și „istoriei sociale" în același timp. Sunt date caracteristicile instrumentelor specifice, este dezvăluită tehnica procedurilor cognitive. Metodologia cercetării demografice a fost adusă în concordanță cu analiza tipologică a unităților microsociale ale activității umane (familie, clan, comunitate). Revizuirea și descrierea metodelor specifice se realizează în conformitate cu experiența istoriografică generală, precum și cu practica modelării cantitative specifică proceselor de creștere a populației într-o anumită regiune. Aceste studii se bazează pe identificarea și prelucrarea digitală a formularelor – surse din secolul al XIX-lea – începutul secolului XXI. Se propune un set de instrumente care va îmbunătăți critica internă și din exterior a acestui tip de surse. O atenție deosebită se acordă metodelor istorice și demografice specifice de identificare și interpretare: coeficienți, indicii și indicatori. Ele se încadrează în contururile științei istorice, sunt relevate valoarea și potențialul lor euristic. Această înțelegere contribuie la dezvoltarea unor semnificații suplimentare în științele umaniste. Metodologia specifică aprobată este prezentată ca potențial pentru extrapolări ulterioare către medii socioculturale și perioade istorice. În general, se pune problema despre perspectivele și posibilitățile cercetării istorice și demografice în contextul studierii trecutului comunităților; influențele reciproce ale instituțiilor și practicilor sociale, pe de o parte, și factorilor de reproducere a populației, pe de altă parte.

Cuvinte-cheie: demografie istorică, metode calitative și cantitative, instituții sociale, practici sociale, Bugeac.

Резюме
«Демография как история»: методика изучения прошлого (II)

В статье конкретизируется попытка теоретико-методологического осмысления историко-демографических реконструкций в контекстах «клиометрики» и «социальной истории» одновременно. Представлена характеристика конкретного инструментария, раскрывается техника познавательных процедур. Методика демографических исследований приведена в соответствие с типологическим анализом микросоциальных единиц человеческой жизнедеятельности (семья, род, община). Обзор и описание конкретных методов осуществляются в соответствии с общим историографическим опытом, а также практикой конкретного количественного моделирования процессов прироста населения определенного региона. Данные исследования базируются на выявлении и цифровой обработке формулярных источников XIX – начала XXI в. Предлагается инструментарий, который позволит объективно подходить к такого рода источникам. Отдельное внимание уделено конкретным историко-демографическим приемам выявления и интерпретации: коэффициентам, индексам и показателям. Они вписываются в контуры исторической науки, указывается их эвристическая ценность и потенциал. Такое понимание способствует выработке дополнительных смыслов в гуманитарных науках. Апробированная конкретная методика подается как потенциальная для дальнейших экстраполяций на социокультурные среды и исторические периоды. В целом, ставится вопрос о перспективах и возможностях историко-демографических исследований в контексте изучения прошлого общностей; взаимовлияниях социальных институтов и практик, с одной стороны, и факторов воспроизводства населения, с другой.

Ключевые слова: историческая демография, качественные и количественные методы, социальные институты, социальные практики, Буджак.

Summary
"Demography as history": methods of studying the past (II)

The article provides specifics to an attempt at theoretical and methodological comprehension of historical and demographic reconstructions in the contexts of both "cliometrics" and "social history". The characteristics of the specific toolkit are described and the technique of cognitive procedures is revealed. The methodology of demographic research is in line with the typological analysis of microsocial units of human activity (family, clan, community). The review and the description of specific methods are carried out in accordance with the general historiographic experience and the practice of the specific quantitative modelling of the population growth processes in a particular region. These studies are based on the identification and digital processing of formulary sources of the 19th – early 21st centuries. The article proposes a toolkit to improve the external and internal criticism of these types of sources. Special attention is paid to specific historical and demographic methods of identification and interpretation: coefficients, indices, and indicators. We fit them into the contours of historical science and expose their heuristic value and potential. This understanding contributes to the development of additional meanings in the humanities. The tested specific methodology is presented as potential for further extrapolations to sociocultural environments and historical periods. Overall, the paper highlights the issue of the prospects and possibilities of historical and demographic research in the context of studying the past of communities, as well as the issues of mutual influences of social institutions and practices, on the one hand, and population reproduction factors, on the other.

Key words: historical demography, qualitative and quantitative methods, social institutions, social practices, Budzhak.

Problem statement

Understanding the knowledge of humankind's past as a process of modelling unreflected processes with the help of qualitative and quantitative tools evokes the need to characterise a specific historical methodology. The substantiation and testing of this approach are based on general epistemological and gnoseological principles discussed in the previous publication. This paper will try to characterise such research methods within the framework of the declared historical and demographic perspectives. In the context of connecting two historiographic landscapes – social history and quantitative modeling of the past – it seems possible to identify the potential, as well as heuristic tools for understanding demographic procedurality. Articulation and discussion of this research area can be conducted by highlighting the efficiency of quantitative and qualitative methods. A specific implementation at the methodology level organically integrates the historical demography perspectives as a way of interpreting the past experience of mankind, as well as individual population-and-cultural divisions.

It is essential to understand historical experience as a set of multiple-factor relationships that are not directly manifested in the sources. Looking at the facts not only as the results but also as potential leads us to the variability of both the past and its interpretation options. The dichotomy of including an event or trend in the established parameters of what has already happened can become a prerequisite for schematisation or simplification in the system of cause-and-effect relationships.

Social practices and institutions have become the scope of historical and demographic research. Ordinary events are included in mass character and typicality parameters, allowing us to speak at a certain generalisation level. Thus, two interrelated questions come forward: What categories of social reality shall we explore? How/in what way shall we do it? This is how methodological perspectives are transformed into specific methods of representing the human past in the historian's toolkit.

Qualitative and quantitative methods of social practice analysis

Qualitative methods of analysis are involved in addressing social reconstructions and identifying factors, modelling the historical and demographic development processes of a certain population group. Most of them are methods of social history – a relatively new scientific branch that "autonomies" the social in relation to political, cultural, and economic phenomena while emphasising the need for interdisciplinary approaches to identifying its scope (Тревельян 1959: 15).

Many researchers, who get down to this distinctive operation, indicate that the scope of social history is difficult to define. T. Zeldin points out the definition's polemical nature: "The word «social»... is rather a slogan than a definition" and is limited to stating only one crucial feature: "social history constantly introduces new research objects to study". The latter is referred to the historical research itself. The author expresses hopes that the themes actualised by social history will put an end to "the tyranny of the idea of evolution and the chronological approach to history" (Зелдин 1993: 155, 160).

R. Zider allies with the idea that the scope of social history is poorly captured (through the rapid dynamics of the objects included in it and the methods of their verbal fixation), yet he suggests a more "technical" version of the definition: "Social history is the history of the social, that is, the entire complex of relations between people". In addition, he indicates that the sciences differ not by their scopes but by formulating problems and methods for solving them (Зидер 1993: 164). Among the methods that social history adds to general historical methods, there are prosopographic (analysis of the characteristics of individuals or groups based on written sources – autobiographies, letters, interrogation protocols, etc.), interview-recollection, or oral history (please note that here it emerges as a research technique close to that used by ethnographers), statistical correlation analysis, etc. Moreover, it is argued that it is not about the invention of new methods but about changing views on existing methods. The same is true for the topicality – it is not so much about its expansion (in particular, towards gender studies, everyday life studies, small groups, microhistory, etc.), but about new combinations of theoretical and empirical, the pluralism of possible prospects for clarifying a particular topic in one way or another, avoiding the dogmatisation of one of them (Зидер 1993: 175). R. Zider demonstrates the implementation of this "program" in his book "The Social History of the Family in Western and Central Europe" (Зидер 1997).

This scientist sees the family as a complex system that "summarises the influence of the society macrosystem and functionally implements the tasks of reproducing the labour force, social structures, the formation of sexes' behaviour stereotypes, the norms of parents-children and adults-the-elder-

ly relations, regulates premarital and marital sexual behavior" (Зидер 1997: 5). At family level, this researcher looks at the problem of the relationship between social, economic and political phenomena: "The family should not be explored outside of its socio-political and economic context. The family is understood not as a «world in itself», but as a social microcosm where social relations are displayed, people live and work; these people are socialised by a certain society and then themselves socialise the generations that come to replace them" (Зидер 1997: 8). Such a research approach allows us to use the material to trace the relationship between the forms and levels of human integration, without going into the interpolation of ideological constructs in empiricism.

Since social history has been singled out, the view of the relationship between social, economic, and political systems has undergone a noticeable modification. J. Trevelyan sees social history as "a necessary link between social and political history", believing, quite in the Marxist spirit, that "social phenomena are continued by economic conditions almost to the same extent as political events are continued by social conditions" (Тревельян 1959: 15). However, today such statements do not withstand the test of empirical material, where the connections between these systems do not seem so straightforward.

Social history in France, associated initially with the School of Annales, also undergoes noticeable modifications during the 1970–1990s. Structuralist determinism and the drive for totality dominated the 1950s and 1960s (F. Braudel and his students, as well as Marxists), giving way to tracking multi-linearity, "games of scale", microlevels, mastering the basic concepts of pragmatic sociology (actor, transition displacement, networks, etc.) and abandoning final interpretations (Трубникова, Уваров 2004: 138-147). Regarding the modern intellectual atmosphere of France, the experts indicate "...the strive to consider social realities not so much as objectively existing initial parameters into which a person is «squeezed», but as a mobile interconnection of individual and collective actors. Each of these acting individuals is empowered with the freedom of choice or the freedom of manoeuvre and can reach agreements with others to form the eternal mobile and changeable social fabric" (Трубникова, Уваров 2004: 146). This branch framework is accountable for developing the historical anthropology of families (Анри, Блюм 1997).

In the United States, the 1960s brought about the trend of studying social microlevels and empirically tracing their connection with microlevels. The small group's sociology is making notable progress. Among these, the family is also considered the most independent and stable social unit. All other small groups (private clubs, boards of directors, military units, etc.) have been proven to be better than the family as they are integrated into larger social communities and have a comparatively shorter life span compared. At the same time, there is a complex interweaving of these micro-societies since the same individual can be a member of 5–6 small and large groups (Миллз 1972: 82; Воугел1972: 163-174; Мердок 2003). Seeing the family as a collision field of social and individual pressure forces that affect a particular person creates a productive perspective to elaborate on the trichotomy of "individual – group – society". It boosts the development of methods for analysing internal processes in a group, including with members of the group itself. They participate in the study, observe and characterise the relationships within it. One can also trace the influences of culture on group processes (Миллз 1972: 83, 90-92).

The study of the social history of the family, its development, mechanisms of adaptation, preservation of traditions, and the emergence of innovative elements is only possible with its structural analysis. Werner Konze, a German researcher, insisted on seeing the social and the structural as identical, urging to take into account not "res gestae" (*action, event flow* – the author), but structures in their continuity and transformation (Кокка 1993: 176). Most specialists in European family history at the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries adhere to the typology suggested by the Cambridge Group of Researchers in the History of Population and Social Structures (Ласлетт 1979: 132-137; Ласлетт 2004: 270-271). The structure of households proposed by them according to their kinship composition is based on the statistical data of the 16th–19th centuries and covers England, France, Serbia, Japan, and Colonial America. Another typology is based on statistical and demographic data from the late 20th century (Ганцкая 1984: 16-28; Ганцкая 1987: 5-15). Besides characterising individual elements of the family composition, it pays attention to the relationships within the family and its representatives' social and national affiliations. Consequently, the first typology characterises households by kinship composition, based on data from the 16th–19th centuries,

and is the result of a macro-comparative analysis. The second is that the family typology takes social and ethnic indicators into account, is based on modern concrete historical research, and is the result of system analysis. This operational classification is based on Soviet experience in the historiography of the study of kinship structures and social life (Кон 1967; Кон, Афанасьева 1973: 20-24; Александров 1976; Бромлей, Кашуба 1982; Бромлей, Кашуба 1987: 35-82; Пономарев 1989; Перковський 1979: 37-46; Слюсар 2011: 62-72).

The typological scheme also emphasises the determinant nature of the connection between types of marriages and socioeconomic conditions (Хаджнал 1979: 14-70). It substantiates the existence of two models of marriage: Eastern and Western European marriage models. The Bulgarian researcher M. Todorova has significant developments on the European and Balkan experiences in studying historical and demographic processes (Тодорова 2002; Тодорова 2006).

Pure historical analysis methods are productive in three variants of comparative historical retrospectives: *genetic, diffuse, and typological developments*. The comparative genetic method enables us to trace the formation and main stages of the functioning of both the community as a whole and its main components (families, territorial-neighbouring communities, and individual trends in demographic and social practices). The influence of external factors on the reproduction of the regional communities of Bessarabia can be demonstrated by using diffuse and typological methods. Synchronic and diachronic measurements contribute to disclosing historical and ethnocultural originality at the micro level of social reality. The idea of a community as a system with a complex interdependence pattern leads to applying *structural-functional analysis* to the characteristics of the family and internal family organisation. It should be pointed out that this seemingly static technique reveals a considerable potential for revealing the dynamics of social institutions' transformation and the stability of individual features in the historical and demographic context. These fundamentals of qualitative analysis are based on counter techniques – perspective (when an event or process is perceived as a potential for further development) and retrospective (when we find an explanation for existing phenomena by identifying factors of influence in the past).

The system of qualitative arguments is verified by quantitative modelling. The statistical (quantitative) methods are the key to understanding and explaining the historical and demographic reality. Combining quantitative and qualitative analysis results makes it possible to create a synthetic methodological model of historical research.

The model should be based on a digital database at the level of an individual and their characteristics (gender, age, social status, level of education, etc.), included in family groups and territorial communities. As a rule, the sources for compiling the database are mass and formulary sources (audit censuses, church records, official censuses, registers, household books, etc.). Accordingly, specific source-study methods of criticism and processing are applied to them – from archaeographic identification to empirical differentiation based on individual indicators.

The demographic process reconstruction exploits demographic methods and techniques. In particular, *the construction of sex and age pyramids, the component method of establishing specific indices, grouping features in the tables*, etc. As a result, these indicators are introduced into the general research outline, explaining the natural factors of historical processes and their variability.

No matter how large the electronic database of empirical materials is, it cannot cover the entire array of the regional community, which can amount to millions of people at a two-centuries scale. That is why the principles of the sampling method and its representation are developed. In some sources corpora, these are random arrays ("snowball method"), while the others feature mathematical modelling and selection according to historical and ethnocultural variability logic.

Such tasks require a more detailed insight into using quantitative methods while analysing historical sources. These special source study techniques are brought about by the need to turn qualitative characteristics into statistically verified data and then, on the contrary, to transform quantitative indicators into a narrative story. Amid the rapid development of historical informatics, these specific research tools are extremely diverse and are constantly being improved. This situation is explained by the specifics of the document forms used by historians and the continuous improvement of scientific problems. However, in all its variability, two main types of analysis can be clearly outlined: *traditional (classical) and formalised (quantitati-*

ve, content analysis) (Проблемы 1970; Новикова 1978: 144-151; Рабочая 2003: 318). A significant difference between them does not mean consistent intransigence – they complement each other, pursuing one goal – to obtain relevant and reliable information that provides for research tasks.

The document analysis within the framework of each specific study is a reasonably independent and creative process. The choice of the analysis type directly depends on the source's form, structure, and content, as well as research tasks and the potential to solve them. Traditional analysis is based on the perception, understanding, awareness, and interpretation of the document's content in connection with the purpose of the work (Маслова 2013: 249-253). If the research scope comprises historical sources, then, as a rule, traditional analysis is used to establish the authenticity and reliability of the facts presented in it. For this purpose, *internal and external criticism techniques* are employed (Фарсобин 1983: 26-28). These two sides of the source study procedure almost completely correspond to the two varieties of traditional analysis in sociology (Рабочая 2003: 320). External analysis is used to establish the type of a document, its form, time and place when it emerged, authorship, the purpose of creation, relevance, and reliability of the context. Meanwhile, the internal analysis explores possible options for disclosing the document content.

Since the external criticism of formulary mass sources is a textbook topic for historical science, we will focus on the internal aspects of criticism. Structured indicators associated with an individual in family/community contexts require *aggregation and interpretation procedures*. This is why databases are created to serve as a mega-source, where each specific demographic property receives its specific value in a kind of knowledge matrix. This principle (randomness VS regularity) provides for a formalised type of *content analysis*. To a certain extent, the generalisation of empiricism leaves no questions about the relevance and subjectivity inherent in the traditional method of document analysis.

Such quantitative modelling and formalised analysis methods were generated as early as the late 19th – early 20th centuries (E. Durkheim, N. Kareev, and others). However, they become well-established only in the 1940s after G. Laswell school's effective activity (Lasswell 1946; Lasswell 1947). Since then, the essence of content analysis has been perceived as the translation of verbal information into a more objective form in the transformation from text to extra-textual reality, which refers to social (or intellectual) reality in all its diversity. This version of the analysis is "a research technique for obtaining conclusions by comprehending the content of the text about the state and quality of social reality" (Таршис 2015: 122-124).

This historiographic experience of using content analysis delivers the main principles of its application (Рабочая 2003: 322):

1) When a high degree of accuracy and objectivity in the analysis is required;

2) When a significant volume and unsystematised material and its direct use is extremely challenging;

3) When the categories essential for the study purpose are characterised by a certain frequency of occurrence in the studied documents;

4) When the language of information sources and its specific characteristics are of great importance.

In the 1960s, content analysis techniques become widespread and popular in various Humanities. The founder of the grounded theory, Barney Glaser, brings the content analysis to the spotlight, seeing it as a "comparable method of quantitative analysis" (Glaser, Strauss 1968; Glaser 1998). Studying the side content aspects gradually becomes an essential tool for understanding reality. The "digital" and "micropersonal" revolutions are leading to a real outburst in the use of content analysis and its varieties. However, this is not so much a historian's technological re-equipment but the setting of their tools into new epistemological and gnoseological perspectives. In particular, the processing and interpretation of a large data matrix are difficult to imagine without technical assistance in its processing (Zhongwei 2015: 59-88). However, cliometric tools are involved when setting research tasks and analysing the variability of historical and demographic processes.

Based on this statement, we will focus on *qualitative-quantitative reconstructions* as a method to analyse the content of mass formulary sources. It enables us to identify and measure a variety of facts and trends displayed indirectly in these historical corpora of sources. Due to the specific data processing through content analysis, one can determine indirect information of reality (at our level – unmotivated and unreflected demographic factors and the consequences of social processes). This historiographical experience – the integration of a separate factor into typological series, the knowledge of the

manifestations of the private through public contexts – allows us to choose and justify quantitative approaches in studying historical and demographic transformations.

In a comparative perspective with other research methods, the peculiarities of using content analysis comprise the procedure itself as it implies counting the frequency and volume of mentions of certain meaningful units in the researched text. In this context, it is viewed as an extensive, generalising analysis, the success of which directly depends on the constancy, homogeneity, single-scale, and repeatability of information. These properties are inherent in mass historical documentation, where the frequency of repetition of a content unit and the category of analysis has a direct trend to reflect its significance. But, of course, these individual indicators should be seen as conditional – one must not idealise them but subject them to reasonable criticism. The relationship between frequency and meaning in them is somehow interrupted and may not be observed at all, given that the development and the length of a meaningful unit – rather than its frequency – is something that makes it significant.

It serves as a basis for recommending the application of content analysis to study a large volume and unsystematised material, "the direct use of which requires the selection of a representative part from the general set of documents to satisfy the researcher's needs" (Методы 2009: 88-109; Богомолова 1992; Приборович 2011: 153-159). In this context, there is a clear rule on how to reliably fix the necessary characteristics (*the formalisation principle*) – the totality of all the formal sociodemographic properties of an individual in the context of their relationship with similar ones amid a family / territorial community. Frequency verification makes it possible to generalise these individual properties to diachronic and synchronous perspectives, taking into account the manifestation frequency (the principle of statistical significance).

The description of the content analysis procedure includes the sample formation, determining an analysis unit, the processing, and the interpretation of the results. The nature of the source selection and the need to adhere to the representativeness principle in each corpus leads to creation of a significant and reliable database in terms of its volume. The corpus of updated data in each selected sampling is based on the logical representativeness of the entire array.

The analysis unit is an individual in the context of their social connections. This is why they select households (families), characterised by their immanent structural content according to formal features. The calculation unit is the personal qualities of each family member. Therefore, family information is used for social reconstruction, while individual data is used for demographic reconstruction. It serves as a basis for a matrix of knowledge: typological research schemes of family institutions, their structural subdivisions, variability of personal demographic characteristics, etc. This allows for relevant research of certain aspects of the ethnodemographic development of the studied community and its ethnocultural variability.

The material processing uses the textbook methods of *statistical analysis*, which gain productive distribution in source studies and history. Historical informatics actively exploits correlation, dispersion, regression, and cluster variants of statistical generalisation and ordering of empirical data (Историческая 1996). In our case, information from sources is processed in correlation with them. In particular, correlation analysis is a variant of the statistical study of the stochastic dependence between random variables. Comparing two or more groups of variables, one can detect the relationships between them. For example, comparing mortality rates exposes their dependence on endogenous and exogenous factors; comparing them with fertility indices, one can highlight the patterns of the traditional or modern type of population reproduction. The correlation coefficient estimates make it possible to reconstruct demographic processes as a whole more thoroughly. At the same time, they lead to more accurate conditional assumptions regarding the actual and hypothetical levels of knowledge. In particular, this procedure is applied to population growth and decline – a process in which two levels are determined: real data and internal indicators of these processes. The comparative operation allows the researcher to highlight population reproduction's natural and mechanical factors.

It is logically continued in the use of data *regressive analysis* techniques. A given formal value – chronology – allows us to identify how specific sociodemographic indicators depend on gradual (conditionally linear) development. The randomness of this dependence is demonstrated in a correlation way, while the functionality, where it manifests itself, is revealed by regression. This approach makes it possible to analyse the dependence on a

group of factors that determine long-term trends in population reproduction (a vivid example is the mortality structure and the realisation of demographic potential; a direct correlation between the birth rate and the death rate; marriage as an indirect model for displaying sex and age factors, etc.). The combinational potential of regression analysis is used when establishing specific coefficients of demographic processes: mortality, birth rate, marriage rate, and population growth/decline factors. All deviations from simple regression are perceived as "hints" in the search for exogenous factors and, accordingly, the historical reality that determines this stochastic process.

The instrument of *dispersal analysis* proves to be productive. It makes it possible to determine the "demographic transitions" and the quality of their individual stages. Each demography's thematic plot is perceived as a discrete and continuous random set of variables. Their interdependence and, accordingly, the dependence on the formal chronological principle makes it possible to carry out statistical grouping and generalisation measures, determining the significance of the links between the individual components. These demographic indicators become the basis for identifying potential and typological features. Variance analysis is functional when exploring synchronous territorial variations. Comparison of specific indicators in any colony with the average ones reveals the general and specific features of the demographic state and development.

The next variant of mathematical statistics methods, which is gaining effective use, is *cluster (cohort) analysis*. Identification of mode (the most stable indicator in the aggregate) in some demographic measurements is based on the principles of formal differentiation into clusters, the signs of which are age, gender, and temporal characteristics. This multivariate statistical procedure, generalising empirical diversity, helps to structure demographic processes' sex and age aspects. We apply them to formulate certain conditional cohorts: arithmetic-formal (with a selection step of 5 years), historical, and social (children and adolescents, people of reproductive and elderly age). Similarly, cluster analysis is applied to conditional generations throughout the entire period. Chronological sections determined by a source-study base also reflect the research procedure for determining the stage generation in historical dynamics. This approach focuses scientific operations on critical indicators in the 15–20-year context. The perspective is determined by the ability to trace cluster transformations from their emergence to completion.

Conclusions

The developments of "social history" and "cliometrics" make it possible to adequately study the immediate social environment of the past: practices and institutions, placing emphasis on the micro-levels of social life. Such categorical enriching of the previous scientific and terminological apparatus with new meanings allows us to reveal and characterise a past experience as a result and, at the same time, as a potential for the development of events. The processuality and mobility of an individual in the context of their social characteristics (primarily family groups) enables us to move away from rigidity and axiology in their behaviour and highlight the essential "motives" of their everyday life.

At the same time, the active application of formulary mass sources through digital data processing developed within the framework of "historical informatics" (more broadly, quantitative methods in historical science) creates fundamentally new techniques in providing empirical foundations for social reconstructions. The contextual inclusion of an individual case/biography in typical databases brings about opportunities for interpreting destinies as elementary levels of life activity and moving the motives into the category of historical process factors.

Applying specific epistemological procedures proves to be effective in analysing transformations, understanding their essential characteristics, and identifying their factors and dynamics. Extrapolation of the "theory of demographic transitions" into the regional social environment makes it possible to identify the general and the specific, tracing these processes synchronous and diachronic variability. In particular, to demonstrate the trends of modernisation/urbanisation in the agrarian (traditional) society.

Demographic processes from individual aspects of the human past are emancipated and legalised in the subjectivity of historical experience. In turn, it is perceived as a multidimensional matrix of potential, from which cause-and-effect relationships "opt for" the possible/actual path of the real past. The shifted focus from public to private life enables innovative quantitative modelling tools to show new perspectives in explaining the human experience.

Note

[1] This article continues A. Ganchev's and

A. Prigarin's paper "Demography as history: historical and anthropological methodological contexts".

References

Glaser B. G. 1998. Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.

Glaser B. G., Strauss A. L. 1968. Awareness of dying. Chicago: Aldine.

Lasswell G. D. 1947. The analysis of political behavior. London.

Lasswell G. D., Smith B. L., Casey R. D. 1946. Propaganda, Communication and Public Order. Princeton.

Todorova M. N. 2006. Balkan family structure and the European pattern: demographic development in Ottoman Bulgaria. Budapest: CEU.

Zhongwei Zhao. Computer microsimulation and historical study of social structure: A comparative review of SOCSIM and CAMSIM. In: Revista de Demografia Historica. XXIV. Vol. 2, p. 59-88.

Александров В. А. 1976. Сельская община в России: (XVII – начала XIX в.). Москва: Наука. / Aleksandrov V. A. 1976. Sel'skaia obshchina v Rossii: (KhVII – nachala KhIKh v.). Moskva: Nauka.

Анри Л., Блюм А. 1997. Методика анализа в исторической демографии. Пер. с фр. С. Хока Ю. Егоровой. Москва: РГГУ. / Anri L., Blium A. 1997. Metodika analiza v istoricheskoj demografii. Per. s fr. S. Khoka Iu. Egorovoj. Moskva: RGGU.

Арсеньев К. И. 1844. Исследования о численном соотношении полов и народонаселении России. In: Журнал Министерства внутренних дел. Ч. 5, № 1, с. 5-47. / Arsen'ev K. I. 1844. Issledovaniia o chislennom sootnoshenii polov i narodonaselenii Rossii. In: Zhurnal Ministerstva vnutrennikh del. Ch. 5, no. 1, s. 5-47.

Архангельский Г. И. 1872. Влияние урожаев на браки, рождаемость и смертность в Европейской России. In: Сб. сочинений по судебной медицине и гигиене. Санкт-Петербург. Т. 1. / Arkhangel'skij G. I. 1872. Vliianie urozhaev na braki, rozhdaemost' i smertnost' v Evropejskoj Rossii. In: Sb. sochinenij po sudebnoj medicine i gigiene. Sankt-Peterburg. T. 1.

Арьес Ф. 1992. Человек перед лицом смерти. М.: Прогресс-Академия. / Ares F. 1992. Chelovek pered litsom smerti. M.: Prohress-Akademia.

Богомолова Н. Н. 1992. Контент-анализ. Москва: Изд-во Моск. ун-та. / Bohomolova N. N. 1992. Kontent-analiz. Moskva: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta.

Бромлей Ю. В., Кашуба М. С. 1982. Брак и семья у народов Югославии: опыт историко-этнографического исследования. Москва: Наука / Bromlei Iu. V., Kashuba M. S. 1982. Brak i semia u narodov Iuhoslavii: opyt istoriko-etnohraficheskoho issledovania. Moskva: Nauka.

Бромлей Ю. В., Кашуба М. С. 1987. О некоторых проблемах семьи у сербов. Этносоциальные аспекты изучения семьи у народов Зарубежной Европы. Москва, с. 35-82. / Bromlej Iu. V., Kashuba M. S. 1987. O nekotorykh problemakh sem'i u serbov. Etnosocial'nye aspekty izucheniia sem'i u narodov Zarubezhnoj Evropy. Moskva, s. 35-82.

Воугел Э. Ф. 1972. Семья и родство. In: Американская социология. Перспективы. Проблемы. Методы. Ред. Г. В. Осипов. Москва, с. 163-174. / Vouhel E. F. 1972. Semia i rodstvo. In: Amerikanskaia sociologia. Perspektivy. Problemy. Metody. Red. H. V. Osypov. Moskva, s. 163-174.

Ганцкая О. А. 1987. Семья: общие понятия, принципы типологизации. In: Этносоциальные аспекты изучения семьи у народов зарубежной Европы. Москва, с. 5-15. / Ganckaia O. A. 1987. Sem'ia: obshchie poniatiia, principy tipologizacii. In: Etnosocial'nye aspekty izucheniia sem'i u narodov zarubezhnoj Evropy. Moskva, s. 5-15.

Ганцкая О. А. 1984. Семья: структура, функции, типы. In: Советская этнография, № 6, с. 16-28. / Hantskaia O. A. 1984. Semia: struktura, funktsii, tipy. In: Sovetskaia etnohrafia, no. 6, s. 16-28.

Зелдин Т. 1993. Социальная история как история всеобъемлющая. Thesis. Вып. 1. / Zeldyn T. 1993. Social'naia istoria kak istoria vseobemliushchaia. Thesis. Vip. 1.

Зидер Р. 1997. Социальная история семьи в Западной и Центральной Европе (конец XVIII–XX в.). Москва: ВЛАДОС. / Zyder R. 1997. Social'naia istoria sem'i v Zapadnoi i Central'noj Evrope (konets XVIII–XX v.). Moskva: VLADOS.

Зидер Р. 1993. Что такое социальная история? Разрывы и преемственность в освоении «социального». Thesis. Вып. 1, с. 164. / Zider R. 1993. Chto takoe social'naia istoriia? Razryvy i preemstvennost' v osvoenii «social'nogo».Thesis. Vip. 1, s. 164.

Историческая 1996. Историческая информатика: учеб. пособие. Под ред. Л. И. Бородкина, И. М. Гарсковой. Москва: Мосгорархив. / Istoricheskaia 1996. Istoricheskaia informatika: ucheb. posobie. Pod red. L. I. Borod-

kina, I. M. Garskovoj. Moskva: Mosgorarkhiv.

Кокка Ю. 1993. Социальная история между структурной и эмпирической историей. Thesis. Вып. 2, с. 176. / Kokka Iu. 1993. Sotsial'naia istoria mezhdu strukturnoi i empiricheskoi istoriei. Thesis. Vyp. 2, s. 176.

Количественные 1984. Количественные методы в исторических исследованиях: учеб. пособие. Под ред. И. Д. Ковальченко. Москва: Высш. шк. / Kolichestvennye 1984. Kolichestvennye metody v istoricheskikh issledovaniiakh: ucheb. posobie. Pod red. I. D. Kovalchenko. Moskva: Vysh. shk.

Компьютеризированный 1999. Компьютеризированный статистический анализ для историков. Под. ред. И. Бородкина, И. М. Гарсковой. Москва. / Komp'iuterizirovannyj 1999. Komp'iuterizirovannyj statisticheskij analiz dlia istorikov. Pod. red. I. Borodkyna, I. M. Harskovoi. Moskva.

Кон И. С. 1967. Социология личности. Москва: Политиздат. / Kon I. S. 1967. Sociologiia lichnosti. Moskva: Politizdat.

Кон И. С., Афанасьева А. Н. 1973. Исторический процесс и смена поколений. Преемственность поколений как социологическая проблема. Москва, с. 20-24. / Kon I. S., Afanas'eva A. N. 1973. Istoricheskii protsess i smena pokolenii. Preemstvennost pokolenii kak sociologicheskaia problema. Moskva, s. 20-24.

Корсаков С. 1841. Законы народонаселения в России. Материалы для статистики Российской империи. Санкт-Петербург. Т. 2, с. 205-383. / Korsakov S. 1841. Zakony narodonaselenia v Rossii. Materialy dlia statistiki Rossijskoj imperii. Sankt-Peterburg. T. 2, s. 205-383.

Куркин П. И. 1938. Рождаемость и смертность в капиталистических государствах Европы. Москва: Союзоргучет. / Kurkyn P. I. 1938. Rozhdaemost' i smertnost' v kapitalisticheskikh gosudarstvakh Evropy. Moskva: Soiuzorguchet.

Ласлетт П. 2004. О классификации домовых сообществ: (разъяснения редакции к типологии домохозяйств Питера Ласлетта). Семья, дом и узы родства в истории. Под общ. ред. Т. Зоколла, О. Кошелевой, Ю. Шлюмбома; отв. ред. О. Е. Кошелева; пер. с англ. и нем. К. А. Левинсона, пер. с фр. Л. А. Пименовой. Санкт-Петербург, с. 270-271. / Laslett P. 2004. O klassifikacii domovykh soobshchestv: (raz"iasneniia redakcii k tipologii domokhoziajstv Pitera Lasletta). Sem'ia, dom i

uzy rodstva v istorii. Pod obshch. red. T. Zokolla, O. Koshelevoj, Iu. Shliumboma; otv. red. O. E. Kosheleva; per. s angl. i nem. K. A. Levinsona, per. s fr. L. A. Pimenovoj. Sankt-Peterburg, s. 270-271.

Ласлетт П. 1979. Семья и домохозяйство: исторический подход. Брачность, рождаемость, семья за три века. Москва, с. 132-137. / Laslett P. 1979. Sem'ia i domokhoziajstvo: istoricheskij podkhod. Brachnost', rozhdaemost', sem'ia za tri veka. Moskva, s. 132-137.

Маслова В. А. 2013. Принципи і прийоми дослідження концепту. Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Сер.: Філологія. Соціальні комунікації. Т. 26 (65), № 1, с. 249-253. / Maslova V. A. 2013. Principi i prijomi doslidzhennia konceptu. Vcheni zapiski Tavrijs'kogo nacional'nogo universitetu imeni V. I. Vernads'kogo. Ser.: Filologiia. Social'ni komunikacii. T. 26 (65), no. 1, s. 249-253.

Мердок Дж. П. 2003. Социальная структура. Пер. с англ. А. В. Коротаева. Москва: ОГИ. / Merdok Dzh. P. 2003. Social'naia struktura. Per. s angl. A. V. Korotaeva. Moskva: OHY.

Методы 2009. Методы анализа текста и дискурса. С. Тичер, М. Мейер, Р. Водак, Е. Веттер. Харьков, с. 88-109. / Metody 2009. Metody analiza teksta i diskursa. S. Ticher, M. Mejer, R. Vodak, E. Vetter. Xar'kov, s. 88-109.

Миллз Т. М. 1972. О социологии малых групп. In: Американская социология. Перспективы. Проблемы. Методы. Ред. Г. В. Осипов. Москва, с. 82. / Millz T. M. 1972. O sociologii malykh grupp. In: Amerikanskaia sociologiia. Perspektivy. Problemy. Metody. Red. G. V. Osipov. Moskva, s. 82.

Новикова Т. В. 1978. Применение контент-анализа должностных инструкций в социально-психологическом исследовании. In: Социологические исследования, № 4, с. 144-151. / Novikova T. V. 1978. Primenenie kontent-analiza dolzhnostnykh instrukcij v social'no-psikhologicheskom issledovanii. In: Sociologicheskie issledovaniia, no. 4, s. 144-151.

Новосельский С. А. 1916. Смертность и продолжительность жизни в России. Петроград: тип. Министерства внутренних дел. / Novosel'skij S. A. 1916. Smertnost' i prodolzhitel'nost' zhizni v Rossii. Petrograd: tip. Ministerstva vnutrennikh del.

Перковський А. Л. 1979. Еволюція сім'ї і господарства на Україні в XVII – першій половині XIX ст. In: Демографічні дослідження. Київ. Вип. 4, с. 37-46. / Perkovs'kij A. L. 1979. Evoliuciia sim'i

i gospodarstva na Ukraini v XVII – pershij polovini XIX st. In: Demografichni doslidzhennia. Kiiv. Vip. 4, s. 37-46.

Пономарев А. П. 1989. Развитие семьи и брачно-семейных отношений на Украине. Киев: Наукова думка. / Ponomarev A. P. 1989. Razvitie sem'i i brachno-semejnykh otnoshenij na Ukraine. Kiev: Naukova dumka.

Приборович А. А. 2011. Контент-анализ – форма исторического исследования. Роль личности в истории: реальность и проблемы изучения: науч. сб. по материалам 1-й Междунар. науч.-практ. Интернет-конф. Редкол.: В. Н. Сидорцов (отв. ред.) и др. Минск, с. 153-159. / Priborovich A. A. 2011. Kontent-analiz – forma istoricheskogo issledovaniia. Rol' lichnosti v istorii: real'nost' i problemy izucheniia: nauch. sb. po materialam 1-j Mezhdunar. nauch.-prakt. Internet-konf. Redkol.: V. N. Sidorcov (otv. red.) i dr. Minsk, s. 153-159.

Проблемы 1970. Проблемы контент-анализа в социологии. Москва. / Problemy 1970. Problemy kontent-analiza v sociologii. Moskva.

Рабочая 2003. Рабочая книга социолога. Редкол.: Г. В. Осипов (отв. ред.) и др. Москва. / Rabochaia 2003. Rabochaia kniga sociologa. Redkol.: H. V. Osipov (otv. red.) i dr. Moskva.

Слюсар Л. І. 2011. Еволюція шлюбу в Україні: XVII – початок XX сторіччя. In: Демографія та соціальна економіка, № 2, с. 62-72. / Sliusar L. I. 2011. Evoliuciia shliubu v Ukraini: XVII – pochatok XX storichchia. In: Demografiia ta social'na ekonomika, no. 2, s. 62-72.

Стешенко В. С. 2010. Дослідження народжуваності й плідності у реальних поколінь жінок України: висновки для сьогодення. In: Демографія та соціальна економіка, № 1, с. 3-14. / Steshenko V. S. 2010. Doslidzhennia narodzhuvanosti j plidnosti u real'nikh pokolin' zhinok Ukraini: visnovki dlia s'ogodennia. In: Demografiia ta social'na ekonomika, no. 1, s. 3-14.

Таршис Е. Я. 2015. Контент-анализ. In: Социологический словарь. Отв. ред. Г. В. Осипов и др. Москва, с. 122-124. / Tarshis E. Ia. 2015. Kontent-analiz. In: Sociologicheskij slovar'. Otv. red. G. V. Osipov i dr. Moskva, s. 122-124.

Тодорова М. 2002. Балканското семейство. Историческа демография на българското общество през османския период. София: Амицития. / Todorova M. 2002. Balkanskoto semejstvo. Istoricheska demografiia na b'lgarskoto obshchestvo prez osmanskiia period. Sofiia: Amicitiia.

Тревельян Дж. М. 1959. Социальная история Англии. Москва. / Trevel'ian Dzh. M. 1959. Social'naia istoriia Anglii. Moskva.

Трубникова Н. В., Уваров П. Ю. 2004. Пути эволюции социальной истории во Франции. In: Новая и новейшая история, № 6, с. 138-147. / Trubnikova N. V., Uvarov P. Iu. 2004. Puti evoliucii social'noj istorii vo Francii. In: Novaia i novejshaia istoriia, no. 6, s. 138-147.

Фарсобин В. В. 1983. Источниковедение и его метод: опыт анализа понятий и терминологии. Москва. / Farsobin V. V. 1983. Istochnikovedenie i ego metod: opyt analiza poniatij i terminologii. Moskva.

Хаджнал Дж. 1979. Европейский тип брачности в ретроспективе. Брачность, рождаемость, семья за три века. Под ред. А. Г. Вишневского, И. С. Кона. Москва, с. 14-70. / Khadzhnal Dzh. 1979. Evropejskij tip brachnosti v retrospektive. Brachnost', rozhdaemost', sem'ia za tri veka. Pod red. A. G. Vishnevskogo, I. S. Kona. Moskva, s. 14-70.

Alexandr Gancev (Odesa, Ucraina). Doctor în istorie, Professor, Universitatea de Stat de Tehnologii Intelectuale și Comunicații.

Александр Ганчев (Одесса, Украина). Доктор исторических наук, профессор, Государственный университет интеллектуальных технологий и связи.

Alexander Ganchev (Odessa, Ukraine). Doctor in History Science, Professor. State University of Intellectual Technologies and Communications.

E-mail: Alexander_Ganchev@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0201-2270

Iulia Uzun (Odesa, Ucraina). Doctor în studii politice, docent, Universitatea Națională „I. I. Mecinicov".

Юлия Узун (Одесса, Украина). Доктор политических наук, доцент, Одесский национальный университет им. И. И. Мечникова.

Yuliia Uzun (Odessa, Ukraine). PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor, "I. I. Mechnikov" Odessa National University.

E-mail: uzun.ulia76@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-3575-3139