

PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE



UDC 378:371

<https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-33-1-38-44>

Cultural And Historical Factors in The Formation of The Russian Education Model in the 19th Century

V. N. Goncharov¹ ✉, O. Yu. Kolosova², P. G. Nemashkalov²

¹North Caucasus Federal University, 1, St. Pushkin, Stavropol, Russian Federation

²Stavropol State Pedagogical Institute, 417 “A”, St. Lenin, Stavropol, Russian Federation

✉ vgn1968@rambler.ru

Abstract

The degree of autocratic power influence on the complex process of the national education system formation in the 19th century is being investigated. It is noted that the domestic education system formation coincided with the deep processes of the great Russian culture formation. Having synthesized the achievements of European socio-political thought and the idea of humanism, the spiritual and moral foundations of Orthodoxy, it gave the world a special form of cultural values that have become a significant contribution to the world culture. These historical processes have largely predetermined the need to revise the attitude of the state in the issue of public education and the development of education. The authorities faced a difficult task, it was necessary to carry out large-scale transformations while maintaining the inviolability of the state's monopoly in the field of autocratic ideology.

Keywords: Russian Empire, public education, Russian Orthodox Church, gymnasium, university, teacher.

For citation. Goncharov V. N., Kolosova O. Yu., Nemashkalov P. G. Cultural And Historical Factors in The Formation of The Russian Education Model in the 19th Century / V. N. Goncharov, O. Yu. Kolosova, P. G. Nemashkalov // Scientific Almanac of Black Sea Region Countries. — 2023. — Vol. 33. No. 1. — pp. 38–44.

<https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-33-1-38-44>

Культурно-исторические факторы в становлении модели российского образования в XIX веке

В. Н. Гончаров¹ ✉, О. Ю. Колосова², П. Г. Немашкалов²

¹Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, Российская Федерация, г. Ставрополь, ул. Пушкина, 1

²Ставропольский государственный педагогический институт, Российская Федерация, г. Ставрополь, ул. Ленина, 417 «А»

✉ vgn1968@rambler.ru

Аннотация

Исследуется степень влияния самодержавной власти на сложный процесс становления национальной системы образования в XIX в. Отмечается, что становление отечественной системы образования совпало с глубокими процессами формирования великой русской культуры. Синтезировав достижения европейской общественно-политической мысли и идеи гуманизма, духовно-нравственные основы православия, она дала миру особую

форму культурных ценностей, которые стали существенным вкладом в мировую культуру. Данные исторические процессы в значительной степени предопределили необходимость пересмотра отношения государства в вопросе просвещения населения и развития образования. Перед органами власти стояла сложная задача, нужно было провести широкие преобразования с сохранением незыблемости монополии государства в сфере самодержавной идеологии.

Ключевые слова: Российская империя, народное образование, Русская Православная Церковь, гимназия, университет, учитель.

Для цитирования. Гончаров В. Н., Колосова А. Ю., Немашкалов П. Г. Культурно-исторические факторы в становлении модели российского образования в XIX веке / В. Н. Гончаров, О. Ю. Колосова, П. Г. Немашкалов // Научный альманах стран Причерноморья. — 2023. — Т. 33. № 1. — С. 38–44.

<https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-33-1-38-44>

Introduction. From the first years of his reign, Alexander I returned the principles of autocratic policy in the management of the state adopted by Catherine II based on the principles of moderate liberalism in the context of enlightened absolutism. The adopted course towards a large-scale transformation of the state structure model led to an understanding of the inevitability of reforming the education system in the country. Under the leadership of Graf P.V. Zavadovsky who was appointed as a Minister of Education, the work on the development of a new school charter and the implementation of the first reforms started.

In the Decree of Alexander I to the Governing Senate “On the Arrangement of Public Schools” dated January 24, 1803, it was especially noted that “public education in the Russian Empire is a special state part, introduced by the Minister of this department and the school headquarters, is under his jurisdiction” [1, p. 70]. In parallel, “Preliminary Rules of Public Education” were adopted which were most vividly described by one of the contemporaries N. M. Karamzin in “the Bulletin of Europe” in 1803, he wrote that: “Alexander, multiplying universities and gymnasiums, also says: let there be light in huts! A new, great era begins from now on in the history of the moral education of Russia” [1, p. 72].

Materials and Methods. This study was conducted on the material of a number of different historical documents. By applying historical, descriptive and comparative methods of the scientific study, cultural and historical factors that influenced the model of education in Russia in the 19th century are established.

Results. The basic principles of educational policy were based on the advanced ideas of their time: secularity and unity of the public education system, but, depending on the political course, they were constantly revised and adjusted. Initially, the curriculum of the gymnasiums did not provide for the teaching of the Law of God, that could be considered to be evidence of striving for secular education at this level. However, in 1809, in the gymnasium of the Kazan school district, this “lack” was corrected, and since 1819 reading of Holy Scripture along with the catechism had become a compulsory subject [11, p. 243].

In accordance with the adopted standards, four levels of education were introduced: parish schools, county schools, provincial schools or gymnasiums and universities. Parish and county schools were to replace small schools, and gymnasiums were to replace the main schools. County schools were planned, if possible, to be created in each county, gymnasiums in each provincial city. Schools of several neighboring counties made up the educational district, in each of these districts it was supposed to create a university over time. One or two neighbouring parishes were to maintain one parish school which was prescribed to be opened in small towns, but above all in the village for the rural class.

Work on university charters started at the discussion of the Commission on Schools on September 18, 1802, the article “planning the charter on public education” compiled by V. N. Karazin [16, pp. 122–123] was questionable. At the same meeting, the draft charter of Moscow University, developed by the Special Committee, was discussed in order to bring it in line with the new principles of public education. During the preparation of the university charter, some statesmen proposed taking the French education system as a basis, while others focused on German universities with their autonomous structure. Throughout 1803, a commission worked on the compilation of the “general” university charter, N. I. Fus, N. Ya. Ozeretskovsky, F. I. Yankovich and F. M. Klinger were included in it. As a result of the work, each university of the empire received a separate charter, but all of them differed among themselves only in details, in fact it was the first «general» charter of Russian universities which later became the legal basis for the announced reform [5, pp. 53–58].

The borrowed idea of creating educational districts was implemented on the basis of the state structure of the Russian Empire, its social and economic development, taking into account cultural and national properties. A peculiarity of Russian education is considered to be a peculiar territorial structure: there was a trustee at the head of the school district, who was the plenipotentiary representative of the imperial government, who was entrusted with overseeing the activities of the university and controlling affairs in the field of education in the territory entrusted to him. Initially, prominent public and state figures were appointed trustees who made a significant contribution to the formation of the domestic model of education and determined the vector of its development for many decades ahead. The first trustee of Moscow University was Graf P.I. Shuvalov, the trustees of the educational districts were I. F. Kruzenshtern, E. V. Putyatin, N. I. Pirogov, Graf S. S. Uvarov, and others [15, p. 103].

In educational institutions, the «method of teaching» developed in the 80s of the 18th century was adopted. The charter of 1804 considered the teacher to be an official, not recognizing his rights to pedagogical creativity. Particular attention in the charter was paid to pedagogical goals and responsibilities. Thus, the general tone of these instructions was aimed at benevolence and respect for teachers. The main activity of the teacher was aimed at ensuring that students “understand the subjects transferred to them clearly and correctly”. He had to care more “about the education and sophistication of the mind” of children, “than about filling the memory”, to arouse the students “hunt for attachment to the sciences”, etc. The new rules were a more progressive version of public education than those didactic requirements that were formulated in 1786, the essence of which was to memorize and consolidate the educational material [3, p. 302].

The study subjects were to have a practical purpose. For example, a teacher of mathematics and physics conducted excursions introducing students to the equipment of local enterprises, and a natural history teacher collected minerals, herbs, soil samples together with students, and also told students about their signs and useful properties. The lessons were conducted with visual aids, so each gymnasium had a library, geographical maps, atlases, globes, drawings and machine models. The gymnasiums were completely maintained at the expense of the empire’s treasury.

From the very beginning of the large-scale transformations, the developing education system experienced difficulties in providing educational literature at different levels. At the beginning of the 19th century, the Ministry of Education carried out work on the creation of textbooks for gymnasiums, and in some subjects for county schools. First of all, foreign professors who taught at Russian universities were involved in the creation of educational literature. Teaching aids of Russian scientists were rarely accepted as compulsory textbooks for school.

Universities played a special role in providing the necessary educational literature, students were taught in schools with the help of their publications. While books published by the Ministry of Education were very rarely included in the educational institutions of the province. Many teachers conducted classes with the help of their student lecture notes compiled by them during their studies at universities. Thus, the pedagogical base of the teaching staff was the scientific and methodological views of university professors. The experience they gained in mentoring in the process of obtaining education themselves was implemented in subsequent professional pedagogical activities.

The curriculum of the gymnasium did not provide the study of the Russian language which ended in county schools. They studied Latin, German, French grammar, believing that the native language is well known. S. S. Uvarov was the first who introduced Russian grammar into the gymnasium course in 1811. At that time, he was a trustee of the St. Petersburg school district, and at the end of the decade the subject was introduced in all gymnasiums [11, p. 243].

Initially, universities were given wide autonomy, within the framework of which they held elected councils, where professors elected a rector and deans. Universities were allowed to create scientific societies, open printing houses, publish newspapers, magazines, educational and scientific literature. In relation to students, professors took only humane measures of influence. Students, in turn, could create various societies and clubs.

The emperor's special Christian mission left an imprint on carrying out transformations in the field of education. The strengthening of religious influence on the school owes its institution to changes in the religious views of the emperor and his entourage. On October 24, 1817, the Ministry of Spiritual Affairs and Public Education was established, headed by Prince A. N. Golitsyn. The value of association was that "Christian piety should always be the basis of true enlightenment" [13, p. 375]. This ministry significantly complicated the situation in the field of education, caused an increase in tension in relations between academia and the clergy. In the end, Alexander I was forced to admit that this ministry "somehow failed", and he decided to «abolish the complex» department.

The equality of estates idea remained on paper, the government forbade the admission of serf's children to the gymnasium, it was difficult for children of merchants, craftsman and bourgeois to enter this educational institution. In 1819, tuition fees were introduced. In the same year, natural science, philosophy, political economy, natural law, aesthetics that could contribute to the development of "free-loving" sentiments were excluded from the curricula of all schools. In this form, the system of Russian education entered a new stage of its development in the era of the reign of Nicholas I. Despite the fact that some progress was made in the education system, the educational reforms of the first quarter of the 19th century were unfinished.

With the accession of Nicholas I to the Russian throne, the attitude of the state towards secular education for representatives of the lower classes sharply changed. First of all, this affected immigrants from the peasant class. In gymnasiums and other educational institutions, according to the emperor, they, on the one hand, carry «bad skills», on the other, "are being accustomed to the kind of life, to the way of thought and concepts that do not correspond to their state" [14, p. 239].

On the 8th of December in 1828, the emperor approved the new charter of county and parish gymnasiums and schools, according to which only three levels of a comprehensive school were preserved: parish, county schools and gymnasiums. In the new concept of education, gymnasiums were separated from schools. P. N. Milyukov described these transformations as follows: "The Alexander's staircase of educational institutions had been divided into parts, but a completely special, independent whole was made from each one" [12, p. 293].

For primary education, it was allowed to open private educational institutions, in strict accordance with the Regulation of April 16, 1834 "On Home Mentors and Teachers" established by the government. This type of school was equated with a provincial school, and teachers engaged in home schooling were employees of provincial schools with the corresponding ranks. Close supervision of the home schools' activities was established.

The private initiative announced by the government in the educational space of the empire, against the background of the oppression of humanitarian education in state educational institutions, served as an impetus for the spread of private educational institutions. Arising in different parts of the empire, they made a significant contribution to the domestic education development. Examples of such institutions were: Richelieu Lyceum in Odessa, Yaroslavl Lyceum, Lazarevsky Institute of Oriental Languages in Moscow, A. A. Shirinsky-Shikhmatov school for peasant children in the village of Arkhangelsk, Smolensk province [2, p. 184].

Using the support of the government, the Russian Orthodox Church during this period also tried to integrate into the system of creating specialized educational institutions for representatives of the clergy. In 1841, the Mikhail-Arkhangelsk Monastery was established in Odessa with a shelter-school for female orphans, which was opened in 1844. The monastery was called an "educational abode" and for the first time the rules for the upbringing of girls-orphans of the clergy for students in the future in such educational programs were formulated.

Fifteen schools had been opened at the convents of the Russian Orthodox Church by 1848, and at the beginning of the next decade there were more than 20. As the chief prosecutor of the Synod noted in his reports: all schools existed "without any allowance from the treasury". The main form of support for students was the received charitable donations and only partially paid tuition fees. After the end of the established program, the girls received a manual before marriage, and as the chief prosecutor of the Synod emphasized: "in gratitude for their education" [7, p. 52–53] they assumed the

obligation to teach peasant daughters the literacy and principles of the Law of God free of charge, “and teach with special success” [8, pp. 56–57].

The privileged noble class in teaching their children preferred closed private boarding schools which served as replenishment of public officials of various levels. The lyceum program provided general education with a predominance of humanitarian sciences. The maximum number of hours was given to teaching grammar, historical sciences, literature, especially foreign languages. Great merit in the development of this direction belongs to M. M. Speransky who stood at the origins of the creation of the Imperial Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum.

Large-scale transformations of the education system had not spared the structures of higher education. In July 1835, new charters for Russian universities were introduced. Their main essence was that now the learning process was carried out in faculties: philosophical, legal and medical. The state opened technical universities, damaging the development of humanitarian education. The teaching staff of universities was divided into professors, junior scientific assistants and lecturers, distributed over the faculties, headed by deans. Many academic freedoms of students and faculty members had been restricted or revised.

The large-scale reforms of Alexander II affected all spheres of society. The elimination of social discrimination in the education system became the basis for the return of the principles established by Catherine II, temporarily forgotten under Nicholas I. The reforms were aimed at restoring the educational hierarchy of educational institutions.

At the same time, the church began to actively oppose the spread of physical, mathematical and natural sciences. The synod sharply raised the issue of increasing the material well-being of clergy of various levels. The way out was to entrust the clergy with teaching children literacy and introduce payment for this activity from the state treasury. In the direction of this program implementation in 1864, a provision was established on parish guardianship and church schools. The secular school had a clear prospect of being completely destroyed, but the authority and influence of D. A. Tolstoy did not allow a complete return to the past experience, although the church impact on the nature of the education system development in the country and its content remained quite strong.

During this period, the Russian Orthodox Church carried out the active role of involving women in the field of education through the establishment in dioceses, on the initiative of local clergy, women’s schools at local funds. The chief prosecutor of the Synod noted in his reports that “deeply aware of the need for the education of their female children and increasingly convinced of the beneficence of the female spiritual and educational institutions established for this”, the clergy is actively engaged in their opening and improvement. The walls of these educational institutions in the monasteries were open to girls of any origin, and not only to the clergy [4, p. 192]. The initiative to attract convents to charity belonged not only to state power, but also to the women themselves. The wives of the monastery clergy, nuns and novices were engaged in teaching. In the late 60s, the charity work of convents began to go beyond the monastery itself. However, the attitude to the active participation of monasteries in charitable activities was controversial, including among the clergy.

The involvement of girls in the educational system led to the emergence of church-teacher schools in the 70s and 80s of the 19th century which trained teachers for parish schools and a number of monastery schools that had a program of 6-year diocesan schools. Charitable and educational institutions began to appear in existing monasteries. The program of the bulk of schools at convents did not go beyond primary education: the Law of God, Church Slavic literacy, Russian, arithmetic, calligraphy, singing, needlework. The purpose of such schools was to train teachers for parish schools.

Graduates of diocesan schools focused on pedagogical activities, which continued, as a rule, until marriage. After the introduction of pedagogy as a compulsory subject in the second half of the 1860s elementary schools began to be created at schools for girls of the clergy and diocesan women’s schools: “it is reasonable to attach knowledge acquired at the school to business for developing skill”. In these schools, education was free, and classes could be attended by people of any age [10, pp. 135–136].

In the early 1880s, at the initiative of the Chief Prosecutor of the Synod K. P. Pobedonostsev, the idea of creating a system of primary schools controlled by the Orthodox clergy arose. According to the “Rules on parochial school”, primary schools were established under the leadership of parish priests and the Synod. Church schools were of one-year and two-year types, and literacy schools were also opened. Literacy schools were the most numerous and cheapest type of educational institutions that the “people” opened, they were opened mainly by priests, since the maintenance of this type of educational institution did not require large costs. Despite the fact that they never ceased to exist, but their equalization with the educational institutions of the empire negatively affected the development of the population literacy [11].

The main trend in the domestic education development at the end of the 19th century was the restriction of access to higher education. The policy of restrictions in the field of education led to the fact that in Russia as a whole a fairly low percentage of the population literacy had remained by the end of the century. In particular, the imperial power tightened the rules for entering the gymnasium. On the 18th of June, in 1887, a circular letter was sent to all trustees of educational districts which went down in history under the name of the circular letter “on children of kitchen maids” [6, pp. 432–433].

Discussion and Conclusions. Russian society always felt worried about the issues of education, its structure, content and organization. Reforms of the education system, its criticism and disputes over reforms are an integral part of the Russian society life for the reason that it traditionally considers the education system to be a certain lever of influence on the mass consciousness, a powerful incentive for the country’s development. If we turn to the history of our country, to the history of general development, we can note that the essence of this dispute has remained unchanged for three centuries, over the years the content of some concepts has been developing and deepening, but even today the same questions are more and more relevant: “Whom to teach? What to teach? How to teach?”

The clergy gave several generations of women who worked in the field of public education. Most of the graduates after graduation began to teach in parish schools or schools of the Ministry of Education. Graduates of theological schools went to the most remote places where men refused to go, received a crummy salary from the spiritual department or the Ministry of Education, and literally sacrificed their lives for education and providing the necessary assistance to the local population. The scale of their activities is difficult to assess.

References

1. Anisimov V. V. Universitetskie uchebnye okruga: istoriya i sovremennost [University educational districts: history and modernity]. *Pedagogy*. 2000. No. 2. pp. 70–73 (in Russian).
2. Antologiya pedagogicheskoy mysli v Rossii pervoy poloviny XIX veka [Anthology of pedagogical thought in Russia in the first half of the 19th century]. Moscow. *Pedagogy*. 1987. 560 p. (in Russian).
3. Antologiya pedagogicheskoy mysli Rossii XVIII veka [Anthology of pedagogical thought of Russia of the 18th century]. Moscow. *Pedagogy*. 1985. 480 p. (in Russian).
4. Belyakova E. V., Belyakova N. A., Emchenko E. B. Zhenshina v pravoslavii: cerkovnoe pravo i rossijskaya praktika [Woman in Orthodoxy: church law and Russian practice]. Moscow. Kuchkovo field. 2011. 704 p. (in Russian).
5. Golovina V. F. Stanovlenie vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossijskoj imperii v nachale XIX veka: pravovoj aspect [Formation of higher education in the Russian Empire at the beginning of the 19th century: legal aspect]. *Bulletin of Nizhny Novgorod University named after N.I. Lobachevsky*. 2014. No. 3(2). pp. 53–58 (in Russian).
6. Dmitriev S. S. Xrestomatiya po istorii SSSR [Chrestomathy on the history of the USSR]. In 3 volumes. V. III. Moscow. *Uchpedgiz*. 1952. 1952 p. (in Russian).
7. Izvlechenie iz vsepoddannejshego otcheta ober-prokurora Svyatejshego Sinoda za 1851 g. [Extraction from the Most Faithful Report of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod for 1851]. Saint Petersburg. 1852 (in Russian).
8. Izvlechenie iz vsepoddannejshego otcheta ober-prokurora Svyatejshego Sinoda za 1852 g. [Extraction from the Most Faithful Report of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod for 1852]. Saint Petersburg. 1853 (in Russian).
9. Izvlechenie iz vsepoddannejshego otcheta ober-prokurora Svyatejshego Sinoda za 1867 g. [Extraction from the Most Faithful Report of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod for 1867]. Saint Petersburg. 1868 (in Russian).
10. Rubakin N. Gramotnost [Literacy]. *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary*. V. 9A. Saint Petersburg. 1893 (in Russian).
11. Kapterev P. F. Istoriya russkoj pedagogiki [History of Russian pedagogy]. Saint Petersburg: Aletheia. 2004. 560 p. (in Russian).

12. Milyukov P. N. Ocherki po istorii russkoj kultury [Essays on the history of Russian culture]. Moscow. Progress. 1994. 528 p. (in Russian).
13. Russkij biograficheskij slovar [Russian biographical dictionary]. V. I. Saint Petersburg. 1896 (in Russian).
14. Hrestomatiya po istorii SSSR [Chrestomathy on the History of the USSR]. Compiled by A. C. Orlov, V. A. Georgiev, N. G. Georgieva, T. A. Sivokhina. Moscow. OOO TK Velby. 2002. 170 p. (in Russian).
15. Hrestomatiya po istorii shkoly i pedagogiki v Rossii [Chrestomathy on the history of school and pedagogy in Russia]. Moscow. Enlightenment. 1986. 432 p. (in Russian).
16. Shestakov P. D., Mysli N. M. Karamzina o vospitanii. Stati, napisannye dlya proizneseniya v torzhestvennom sobranii Kazanskogo universiteta v stoletnij yubiley N. M. Karamzina. [Thoughts of N. M. Karamzin on education. Articles written for the speech at the solemn meeting of Kazan University on the centenary of N. M. Karamzin]. Kazan. 1866 (in Russian).

Submitted for publication 11.01.2023.

Submitted after peer review 10.02.2023.

Accepted for publication 10.02.2023.

About the Authors:

Vadim N. Goncharov, Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Philosophy, Humanitarian Institute, North Caucasus Federal University (1, St. Pushkin, Stavropol, 355017, RF), vgn1968@rambler.ru

Olga Yu. Kolosova, Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in Philosophy, Professor of Philosophy and Socio-Humanitarian Disciplines Department, Stavropol State Pedagogical Institute (417 “A”, St. Lenin, Stavropol, 355029, RF), kolosova.07@mail.ru

Pavel G. Nemashkalov, Ph.D. (Advanced Doctorate) in History, Professor of Theory and Methodology of History and Social Studies Department, Stavropol State Pedagogical Institute (417 “A”, St. Lenin, , Stavropol, 355029, RF), paul_2@rambler.ru

Conflict of interest statement

The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.