

THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL:
THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY RUSSIAN SCHOOLMISTRESS SPEAKS
FOR HERSELF

By

PAMELA J. BONIFACE

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1988

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(History)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April 1991

© Pamela J. Boniface, 1991

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date August 25, 1991

ABSTRACT

In late nineteenth century Russia, a stereotype of schoolmistress as passive victim and amateur featured prominently in the dominant pedagogical discourse. Because present day historians have failed to consider the factors of gender and estate when presenting information concerning the living and working conditions and status of Russian teachers, this stereotype persists in contemporary literature concerned with that country's educational history. Through an analysis of 14 uchitel'nitsy's published memoir/articles, this thesis demonstrates that at least some of the women who entered teaching were competent and self-assured. In fact, almost all schoolmistresses -- who wrote and published their writings -- engaged in a counter-discourse challenging the stereotype.

The thesis presents its case by first establishing the context in which the pedagogical discourse took place. It then introduces the field of discourse and its participants -- the editors of the journals in which uchitel'nitsy published and the schoolmistresses themselves. In order to place the 14 schoolmistresses in their own context, they are compared with a group of schoolmasters who also wrote and with primary schoolteachers in general. Chapter 3 examines the advice schoolmistresses passed on to their colleagues and women intending to enter the profession. Chapter 4 discusses the layers of discourse schoolmistresses' memoir/articles contain.

This thesis attempts to prove that at least some Russian schoolmistresses possessed a gender and estate-determined professional ethic. The existence of such an ethic negates the stereotype of schoolmistress as passive victim. In the stereotype's place, uchitel'nitsy offered a self-created fiction of schoolmistress as servant of the people. Future studies must include this fiction in discussions that specifically concern schoolmistresses. This self-image, or at least the fluid world it suggests, must feature in any discussion concerning journal discourse of the period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii.
Table of Contents.....	iv.
List of Tables.....	v.
Acknowledgements.....	vi.
Preface.....	1.
The Problem Revealed.....	9.
The Field of Discourse and its Participants.....	39.
Teaching Through Journal Writing.....	75.
Layers Within the Discourse.....	108.
Conclusion.....	141.
Bibliography.....	150.
Appendix A.....	159.

LIST OF TABLES

Table I.	Feminization of the Teaching Profession in Rural Schools, 1880-1911.....	4.
Table II.	Sources of Funding for Rural Schools, 1879 and 1911.....	18.
Table III.	Average Teacher's Salary in European Russia, 1898.....	20.
Table IV.	Average Salary for 2314 Teachers with Varying Responsibilities, 1898.....	20.
Table V.	Teachers' Educational Backgrounds and Perceived Adequacy of Preparation for Teaching.....	62 and 63.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Bon for giving moral support and swift kicks in appropriate measure!

This thesis is dedicated to all the Russian women tishe vody - nizhe travy (quieter than water, lower than grass), whose voices and lives didn't enter the historical record. They are as much a part of Russian history as tsars, bureaucrats and dictators. Without them dynasties, empires and school systems would never have been possible. Ladies, I salute you!

As well, special thanks is due to the University of British Columbia's Interlibrary Loans division. It was only with their help that I obtained many of the Russian language sources required for this work.

Finally, I wish to thank the women graduate students of the UBC history department. Their humour, insight and helpfulness will always be remembered.

PREFACE

This thesis offers readers interested in Russian educational history an alternate perspective on both the developing, piecemeal educational system and the teachers who taught in its elementary schools. The thesis is multi-layered; however, it primarily features a dialogue between pedagogues and public elementary schoolmistresses (or uchitel'nitsy) concerning the role and duties of women teachers. Using R.J. Ware's articles concerning journal discourse as a unifying concept, this thesis will examine the relationship between journals and their readers and writers.(1) It will demonstrate how a dominant discourse (as expressed through a journal's editorial policy) came into conflict with a counter-discourse (which, in this case, was carried out by schoolmistresses).

The dominant discourse, which stressed the value of education and its importance to Russia's future, was created and reinforced by male intellectuals and pedagogues. "For those wanting change, education's appeal is especially seductive because it seems to offer a means of achieving social transformation without resort to violent, often uncontrollable, revolution."(2) As Allen Sinel, Patrick Alston and Ben Eklof have noted implicitly, the dominant discourse was rooted in pessimism.(3) Pro-education intellectuals and pedagogues emphasized the small number of schools and students in Russia, the abysmal completion rate of primary school students and the

poor quality of the numerous religiously-based schools.(4) They also bemoaned the pitiful economic and social status of primary schoolteachers -- especially schoolmistresses.

In the same way that a stereotype concerning women had developed in the writings of male liberal and radical writers of the late nineteenth century, a portrait of the perfect, passive and lady-like schoolmistress circulated through the male-dominated world of liberal, radical pedagogy.(5) The 14 women whose writings form the basis of this work took issue with this portrait and spoke against it in their writings. They presented their own informed perspectives on schoolmistresses in educational journals and -- by demonstrating an articulate understanding of pedagogical concepts and discourse -- entered directly into contemporary discussion to counter the stereotype concerning teachers. That is, they engaged in a counter-discourse.

In published articles (which as a result of their anecdotal and personal nature, I will hereafter refer to as memoir/articles), uchitel'nitsy also offered their readers practical advice concerning teaching and surviving in difficult social and economic circumstances. It is impossible to determine if the thoughts and attitudes of the 14 were representative of all Russian schoolmistresses in the period 1880-1905; however, following an intensive search of two prominent educational journals and a close survey of a third, I am convinced that their attitudes are representative of those

who wrote.(6) A further statistical comparison, discussed in detail in Chapter 2, suggests that they were also not atypical of the majority of schoolmistresses in the period 1880-1905.

During this period, the number of schools and schoolmistresses increased dramatically. While in 1880 only 4,900 teachers (close to one-fifth of the total 24,000) were women, by 1911 women occupied 83,376 teaching positions (more than 50% of the total 153,360).(7) For this reason their memoir/articles can be seen to offer a direct reflection of these women's self-image, if not their reality.

Schoolmistresses' memoir/articles could warrant our attention for this reason alone; however, this thesis looks beyond the uchitel'nitsy to the audience they expected to influence -- pedagogues, women entering and already in the profession, and male intellectuals who perpetuated the stereotype of schoolmistress as victim and martyr. It is the first such work, which is startling considering historians' recent profound concern for society's relatively powerless and mute majority.

The idea for this thesis grew out of a perceived omission in the literature concerning nineteenth century Russia's developing educational system. Significant work has been done concerning bureaucrats in the Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia (literally, the Ministry of Public Enlightenment, translated herein as the Ministry of Public Instruction), village and zemstvo (local government) schools and

Table I

Feminization of Teaching Profession in Rural Schools, 1880-1911

Provinces	Women Teachers as a Percentage of all Rural Teachers		
	1880	1894	1911
34 zemstvo	27.5%	41.4%	62.2%
13 nonzemstvo	10.8	23.9	35.8
3 Baltic	1.9	1.6	9.8
50 European	20.6	38.6	54.9
10 Polish	14.0	10.8	24.0
60 European (total)	20.0	36.4	53.8

Source: Eklof, Russian Peasant Schools, 186.

Note: Data included 26,000 teachers in 1880, 69,098 in 1894, and 126,501 in 1911. For provincial tabulations, see MNP, Odnodnevnaia perepis' 16:88, table 31.

radical zemstvo professionals.(8) However, the apolitical teacher -- especially the schoolmistress -- is almost missing from the discussion. When she does appear, the uchitel'nitsa is portrayed as a passive, much-abused figure.(9) As well, although women teachers composed 71 percent of zemstvo teachers and 55 percent of teachers overall, present day historians continue to explain issues such as teacher turn over by reference to male-only options.(10) For example, Ben Eklof suggests that teachers left the profession to become "clerks in the state-owned liquor stores, police constables, tax officials, or even pest exterminators."(11) It should be noted that none of these professions was open to women who left teaching.

Other gender-specific touchstones that have been applied unthinkingly to schoolmistresses include an assessment of economic poverty that -- as Eklof and Seregny note -- affected married teachers (the significant majority of whom were men) most. As well, teachers' professional ethic has been defined almost entirely in terms of their involvement in professional associations that sought to raise wages and establish trust funds for the education of teachers' children (again, usually the children of male teachers).

As the following chapters will demonstrate, uchitel'nitsy developed and fostered a self-image and a series of professional standards that were different in many ways from those of schoolmasters and male pedagogues. I believe that gender and class differences, virtually ignored until now, are the

foundations of these different concepts. When these differences are factored into a reading of schoolmistresses' memoir/articles, uchitel'nitsy writings offer interesting comment on the developing Russian educational system, and on the stereotype of woman and schoolmistress. Published and circulating among the educated public, these alternative gender-based concepts challenged (implicitly, if not directly) the existing discourse and offered an alternative perspective to readers -- especially women who favoured pedagogical journals.

Through their memoir/articles, uchitel'nitsy communicated with peers and pedagogues. They rejected pedagogues' abstract views of education, and offered advice and encouragement to the growing number of women entering the profession. In this advice and encouragement, schoolmistresses presented their solutions to the dichotomy of pedagogical theory and classroom reality. For this reason, as much as for their work in classrooms across Russia, the uchitel'nitsy featured in this thesis deserve recognition in the history of education in Russia. Up to now their personal and professional contribution to Russia's educational system has been ignored or undervalued.

Transliterations in this text follow the Library of Congress system. Dates are according to the Julian calendar.

Translations from Russian sources are my own unless otherwise indicated.

In order to simplify my prose and avoid the difficulties of translating a language with gendered words into ungendered English, I have translated uchitel'nitsa as schoolmistress and uchitel' as schoolmaster. Also, I have translated Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia (literally the Ministry of Public Education) as the Ministry of Public Instruction because this governmental department and the schools it administered seemed more concerned with instructing (or moulding) their students than enlightening them. Finally, I have deliberately left Russian words that frequently appear in English, such as zemstvo and guberniia, unitalicized.

Endnotes

1. R.J. Ware, "A Russian Journal and its Public: Otchestvennye Zapiski, 1868-1884," Oxford Slavonic Papers, (New Series Volume) 14 (1981): 121-46 and R.J. Ware, "Some Aspects of the Russian Reading Public in the 1880s," Renaissance and Modern Studies, 24 (1980): 18-37.
2. Allen Sinel, "The Campaign for Universal Primary Education in Russia," Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas, 30 (1982): Heft 4, 481.
3. Sinel, "Campaign"; Patrick Alston, "Recent Voices and Persistent Problems in Tsarist Education," Paedagogica Historica 16, 2. (1976): 203-15; and Ben Eklof, "Myth of the Zemstvo School: The Sources of the Expansion of Russian Education in Imperial Russia, 1864-1914," History of Education Quarterly 24 (Winter 1984): 561-84.

4. Sinel, "Campaign" 483-6 and Eklof "Zemstvo School". Interestingly, Eklof accepts pedagogues poor assessments of Russian schooling and then points out that basic literacy may have been enough to meet peasant needs.
5. see Barbara Heldt, Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987) and Toby Clymas "Memoirs of 19th century Russian Women-Physicians," a paper delivered March 1990 at the New England Slavic Association annual meeting.
6. I had direct access to 13 out of 17 years of Obrazovanie and 15 out of 27 years of Russkaia shkola. Of course, I supplemented these years with articles discovered in indexes.
7. Ben Eklof, Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy, 1861-1914. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983) 183.
8. see Eklof, Russian Peasant; Allen Sinel, The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973); and Scott Seregny, Russian Teachers and Peasant Revolution: The Politics of Education in 1905. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989).
9. see Eklof, Russian Peasant and Ben Eklof, "Face to the Village: The Russian Teacher and the Peasant Community, 1880-1914," Land Commune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial Russia and Early Soviet Society, Ed. Roger Bartlett, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).
10. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 341.
11. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 345.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM REVEALED

As noted in the Preface, this thesis will investigate and uncover schoolmistresses' contributions to and rejection of the dominant educational discourse. R.J. Ware, literary critic and historian, has stated that "one of the fundamental tasks of literary-historical study is 'the critical analysis of the reactions of the original readers of a work, the clarification of what was perceived and what remained unperceived in an author's work by his contemporaries'." (1) In order to fulfil this 'fundamental task', my thesis must first examine the broad context in which uchitel'nitsy wrote their memoir/articles; it should then assess the editorial policies of the three journals in which they published, and present any biographical information available on the women themselves. Once a foundation has been built (in Chapters 1 and 2), it will be possible to comprehend and peel back the layers of intended meaning in schoolmistresses' writings and to determine how the intended audience of memoir/articles received them.

As this thesis inhabits the world of late nineteenth century Russian pedagogical discourse, it seems prudent to begin by defining and situating the context and meaning of the discourse. To begin, discourse must be understood as dialogic or symbiotic in nature. That is, as ideas expressed by individuals in the public (journals, speeches, art, etc.) and

private (conversations, diaries, actions) sphere, discourse affects the recipient or audience and frequently elicits response. Ware has noted that response need not necessarily be on a verbal or literary level. It can be expressed through the emotional and cultural habits of a journal's writers and readers.(2) As evidence, he points to the editorial policy of Notes of the Fatherland, a 'thick' journal that sought to benefit Russia's masses by teaching intellectuals a combination of civic responsibility and modern social science.(3) Notes of the Fatherland's readers -- primarily members of liberal educated society (obshchestvo) and radical youth -- responded to the journal's editorial policy by participating in activities that benefited Russia's lower orders.(4)

Of course, discourse -- of the kind mentioned above -- is furthered on a multiplicity of levels with broader and narrower foci. Obviously, readers of Notes of the Fatherland responded to that journal's editorial policy not only through engaging in philanthropic work. They wrote to the journal and to family and friends about its content, and discussed specific journal articles with colleagues. Inevitably some readers were interested in the journal's philosophy, while others sought practical advice in its pages. As we shall see, uchitel'nitsy were no different in this respect.

The discourse that uchitel'nitsy featured in this thesis entered concerned (at its narrowest) teaching, (at its most general) pedagogy, and (at its most self-interested) the place

of the developing professions in the age of 'small deeds'. It also overlapped with contemporary discourse concerning the zhenskii vopros, or the 'woman question'. In order to situate better both discourses, this chapter will briefly discuss the status of education and the position of women in Russian during the late nineteenth century.

The Discourse Concerning Primary Education

Not surprisingly, most levels of the discourse concerning education overlap; however, the salient features of teaching, pedagogy and professional self-interest are as follows. Teaching is defined as the practical task of getting children into the classroom, keeping them there and educating them. Teaching included classroom dynamics, disciplining, reading comprehension tests, integrating the school into the community in which it was situated, and offering the children a glimpse of a different, less brutal world than the one to which they were accustomed. In other words, teaching was a series of techniques used judiciously in the task of educating children.

Pedagogy, on the other hand, comprised the ideologies and theories that surrounded the purpose of education and the actions of teachers. It was at the centre of the dominant discourse concerning education. During the period examined, a battle between the philosophies and supporters of vospitanie

(or, for the want of a better word, 'upbringing') and vocational education occupied centre stage within the discourse. Liberal and and pedagogues and intellectuals believed that vospitanie, or child-centred education, was the root of true learning. This technique required that individual attention be paid to each child and focused not only on a child's intellectual development, but also on his moral and physical progress.(5) Many of the pedagogues who propagated vospitanie believed (or at least wrote as though they believed) that it was the answer to society's problems.(6)

Since the greatness, the well-being, the industry, the finances, the peaceful cultural development of a country, the proper conduct of all its public institutions depend first of all on the quality of knowledge in the people, schooling must be as obligatory as military service and the payment of taxes.(7)

In other words, pedagogues believed that by developing appropriate (see Chapters 3 and 4) morals and decision-making skills among students of all Russian sosloviia (or estates), crime, poverty and brutality would become a thing of the past.(8) When present day historians writing about pedagogy in the late nineteenth century refer to 'the hidden curriculum', they mean vospitanie.(9)

Pedagogues and intellectuals who supported the philosophy of vospitanie saw education as more than the acquisition of a series of skills; it was also the acquisition of a moral and intellectual perspective, one emphasizing personal freedom and fulfilment. This philosophy conflicted explosively with one

which saw education as a series of tool skills that were necessary to individuals living in an increasingly industrialized and modernized state. As many scholars have noted, Russia -- with its unwieldy bureaucracy and outdated autocratic political system -- was unwillingly being forced into the modern world by a shrinking world market and the development of domestic industry.(10) While radical and especially liberal pedagogues (often Anglophiles) believed that this tardy transition from an agrarian to modern state offered Russia fantastic opportunity to profit from the public education experiences of other European countries, many individuals -- who were either conservative politically, members of the governmental hierarchy, or part of the Orthodox Church -- found the prospect of child-centred universal education frightening. This latter group believed the answer to Russia's problems was to provide a rigid vocational education to workers and peasants, one that would equip them for the tasks of factory workers, and to comprehend and utilize new agricultural techniques.

Theoretically, zemstvo (or local government) schools were supposed to engage in vospitanie, while parish church schools emphasized vocational education. Schoolmasters of the period noted and stressed a difference in the type and quality of zemstvo and church-parish education.(11) Such assertions, however, were more often likely to be political rhetoric than reflections of reality. As Jeffrey Brooks has noted, zemstvo school boards were frequently dominated by conservative gentry

members.(12) They were just as leery about giving factory workers and peasants the tools to engage in independent thought as the government and Church. That the traditional Russian power structure was concerned about the possible influence of the teacher is illustrated by the fact that zemstvo schoolteachers were subordinate to about 18 different officials or authorities:

including the inspector, the marshall of the nobility, the chairman of the local zemstvo board, the local land captain, the village priest, all members of the local school board, the diocesan Church hierarchy, and the peasant volost' office, including the clerk, the elder (both volost' and village), and the constable, along with the school trustee.(13)

The above subordination of a literate cultural messenger (the teacher) to local, often illiterate, authority obviously reduced the power of education to facilitate the economic and cultural changes pedagogues espoused. This, and similar situations, was at the heart of much contemporary debate -- especially debate concerned with professional development.

Following The Great Reforms and the expansion of educational institutions, the professions (including those of teacher and pedagogue) experienced tremendous growth.(14) However, in the period 1881-1905, because political parties, professional associations, conferences and meetings were restricted and spied upon by the suspicious Tsarist bureaucracy, professional men (and virtually all were men) had no say in the political or economic sphere. Well-trained but unable to

influence significantly governmental policy, these individuals engaged in what has come to be known as 'small deeds'.

'Small deeds' were activities that aimed through reformism to improve the conditions of life of Russia's lower estates. This philosophy, like vospitanie, was espoused by the dominant liberal discourse. And like the call for vospitanie and universal education, the philosophy of 'small deeds' flowered in the 1890s. The Age of Small Deeds was a time of personal contributions, and doctors, fel'dsheri (or medical orderlies), lawyers, journalists, and -- not surprisingly -- teachers participated in the cause. The work was often ground-breaking and difficult. Lack of resources and financial support often made even the simplest of tasks almost impossible.(15) Many of these professionals were idealists, who sought to improve the lives of others and thus to enrich their own. However, these new professionals had very little status and even less power in a country still possessed of an entrenched gentry and a conservative peasantry.

One way of increasing the power and status of individuals employed in the professions was to emphasize their importance to Russia's future and its underprivileged. William Wagner has noted that this was lawyers' strategy when they stressed the unjust nature of family law.(16) Traditional Russian family law, which upheld the absolute power of father and husband, was constantly attacked in law journals. Wagner claims that this was because patriarchal authority in the home recreated

autocratic authority in the state, which kept Russian professionals from participating in the governing of their country (as, for example, professionals -- especially lawyers -- did in Britain). Seen from this perspective, Russian lawyers' battle to reform family law, when the family was the foundation upon which tsarism was based, was in some measure self interested.(17) If the family was reformed, the state must be also. And inevitably the role lawyers would play in both the professional and political sphere would naturally increase, as would their standard of living.

A similar combination of 'small deeds' philosophy and self-interest can be seen in articles and speeches by famous pedagogues, and even in their espousal of vospitanie. It is especially obvious in the pages of journals they published. And, just as lawyers used graphic examples of family violence, and women and children's abject subservience to support their bid for reform of the legal system, pedagogues stressed the violence and immorality of peasant and worker families.(18) As well, they highlighted the dire situation of public schoolteachers: their low wages, their poor living conditions, their difficulties with local authorities and their tendency to flee the profession.(19) Out of this dire picture painted by pedagogues came the stereotype of the much-abused teacher.

The Difficult Life of a Schoolteacher

This stereotype of the unhappy and abused schoolteacher, which was central to the dominant discourse, did have strong basis in fact in the Russian context. In the 30 years following 1880, when the Ministry of Public Instruction turned its attention from secondary and university education, the number of primary schools in Russia exploded from approximately 25,000 to 100,749.(20) However, the system remained in conflict and underfunded. While the Ministry was in nominal control of all schools, 12 different types of primary schools -- run by different organizations and departments -- existed in Russia.(21) A large, and growing, number of private schools flourished. Russia's piecemeal educational system was a direct consequence of limited governmental resources. An near-empty treasury meant that instead of developing and building a centralized and ordered educational system (as in say, for example, France), the Russian government attempted to enforce standardized curriculum and teacher quality through centralized control over school budgets and strict -- although infrequent -- supervision over teaching.(22)

Because the central government set policy and budgets, and the local -- often rural -- schools carrying out these policies were responsible to parents, problems were inevitable.(23) Some problems were economic and environmental in nature, such as infrequent or tardy salaries and overdue school maintenance

Table II

Sources of Funding for Rural Schools, 1879 and 1911

	Percentage of funds supplied	
	1879a	1911
Central government	11.3%	45%
Zemstvo	43.4%	29.6%
Village commune	32.3%	14.8%
Church and philanthropic organizations b	1.3%	1.3%
Private	6.4%	6.0%
Fees	3.0%	1.6%
Other	0.7%	1.6%

Source: Eklof, Russian Peasant Schools, 89.

Note: The 1879 study included the fifty European province, whereas the 1911 School Census covered the entire Empire. However, because schooling was so infrequent outside European Russia, the data remain roughly comparable.

a) The figures in the original data add up to only 98.4%.

b) Includes local parishes and monasteries. The budget of the Holy Synod came from the central government.

payments. Others involved the persecution and defamation of teachers.(24) As has already been mentioned, teachers were subordinate to some 18 different authorities and for this reason it was difficult to appeal bad treatment, and almost impossible to determine to whom one was responsible.

Of course, it was not only teachers who had difficulty deciding for whom they worked. Peasants often believed the teacher was a government agent, while the government sometimes saw the teacher as a pawn of local interests. Not surprisingly, the elementary teacher was often the victim of conflicts between central and local authority, Ministry of Public Instruction and zemstvo, church and parish, and peasant community and priest or zemstvo.

In some cases where the peasant commune could not retaliate directly against an overbearing governmental official or proud village elder, the teacher (as his supposed representative) was punished. Because there was generally a division of salary and maintenance responsibilities between zemstvo (or town council or church) and peasant (or worker) community, even conflicts at the local level could result in great problems for the teacher. Consider, for example, the difficulties that could result if zemstvo and peasant commune fought. The zemstvo paid salary, provided school furniture, blackboards, slates, pens, library books and sometimes the school itself, while the peasant commune provided heat, light, building maintenance, teacher's quarters and often the school building.(25) In his article concerning

Table III

Average Salary

	Less than 120 r.	120-180r.	180-240r.	240-360r.	More than 360r.
No.	182	886	1735	1830	339
%	3.7%	17.9%	34%	36.8%	6.8%

Source: Blinov, Narodnyi uchitel' v Rossii, 76.

Note: Data from a survey of 5015 rural teachers of whom 4972 responded. Only 2314 differentiated between their position teachers or helping teachers, or in regards to their sex. a

Table IV

Average Salary for 2314 Differentiated Teachers

	Less than 120 r.	120-80r.	180-240r.	240-360 r.	More than 360r.
Schoolmaster	6.9%	8.6%	25.9%	41.9%	16.7%
Schoolmistress	6.4%	14.4%	36.4%	36.2%	6.6%
Male helper	57.1%	35.7%	3.6%	3.6%	----
Female helper	6.9%	37.2%	33.9%	22.0%	----

Source: Blinov, Narodnyi uchitel' v Rossii, 76.

the role of zemstva in elementary education, Jeffrey Brooks has noted that conflict between zemstvo and commune was common and that peasants often fought through withdrawal of services and zemstva through the use of state police, which tended to exacerbate difficulties.(26)

For a teacher, who was often living at subsistence level, such a battle could mean severe privation. In an article published in 1902, L. Blinov produced a survey of 4,972 male and female teachers and assistant teachers which showed that 55.6% earned less than 240 rubles a year.(27) Only 6.8% earned more than 360 rubles a year. In a chart that followed, he showed that in a smaller sample group 44.4% of schoolmasters earned less than 240 per annum, and so did 47.2% of schoolmistresses.(28) Such wages compared poorly with the 3600 rubles, 3000 rubles and 1,200 rubles zemstvo statisticians, agronomists and doctors respectively earned annually.(29) They were instead comparable to the 240 rubles earned by industrial workers.(30) A survey of budget studies compiled a few years after the above survey demonstrated that single teachers with an average income of 273 rubles only had 69 rubles of dispensable income after outlays on food and clothing. A 1900 study of teachers in Moscow district noted that 85% of teachers were in debt.(31)

While conflicts between opposing factions and low salaries caused teachers unsought difficulties, some teachers brought trouble upon themselves. Many stories exist of peasant communes

rejecting teachers or teachers' techniques and curriculum. In his book Twenty-five Years in the Countryside, S.T. Semenov noted how the members of one village disliked the lazy, urban-born schoolmistresses, who sat around drinking tea most days, schemed to marry and leave the profession, and ruined part of the harvest through improper threshing.(32) The schoolmistress E.S. wrote that the teacher for whom she first worked earned the enmity of the village by befriending a merchant, who was reputed to be an arsonist, and by taking bribes from the richer members of the community.(33) Semenov's uchitel'nitsa was simply insulted, called "baba" and "long hair".(34) E.S.'s schoolmaster was threatened by a drunken crowd intent upon taking the law into its own hands.

As far as community disapproval and rejection of a teacher's curriculum are concerned, Eklof notes numerous instances when parents kept their children away from school if the teacher was incompetent or was not teaching what parents considered important.(35) Often village communes forced teachers to teach church singing and basic literacy, rather than, for example, Russian literature and ethics. That is, many communities rejected vospitanie.

The Stereotype

As was mentioned earlier, pedagogues and intellectuals emphasized the difficulties faced by schoolteachers, stressing

their passivity and powerlessness. In so doing, they argued for dramatic structural change and standardization within the Russian educational system. Such changes would take schools out of the hands of peasant elders and local bureaucrats and place them under the direction of educational professionals -- that is, the above-mentioned pedagogues or their disciples.

Of course, it was in these pedagogues' best interests that the portrait they painted of both the educational system and that system's representative (the teacher) be pessimistic and dark. Vera Sandomirsky Dunham has noted that in Russian realist fiction of the period, society and lives tended to be painted unnaturally dark.(36) The same can be said of the portrait painted of lives and society by journal articles of the later nineteenth century. As R.J. Ware has noted, it is difficult to talk about thick journals' articles as fiction or non-fiction; most of their articles existed in an intermediate range of semi-fictional mixed genres. This is understandable given thick journals' desire not only to inform but also to motivate readers.(37)

Darkness in journal articles was also a natural result of the frustration writers and intellectuals felt in Russia's backward political and economic culture. In such a culture, where they were barred from democratic political office and the centres of bureaucratic power, intellectuals used their writing as a political tool. By emphasizing the limited and mainly negative results of the educational system, pedagogues

criticized its root (the oppressive, autocratic government) -- just as disgruntled lawyers attacked the traditionalist legal system by stressing the inequities of family law.

An understanding of this technique of argument-by-analogy offers an insight into methods of protest in nineteenth century tsarist society. It should also prevent the present day reader from accepting the contents of journal articles as fact. However, this has not been the case. Many present-day historians have ignored the political agenda of liberal journals as they mined pedagogical articles in an effort to identify the economic and social conditions in which teachers lived and worked. They have accepted as fact, a picture that was painted with distinct political goals.(38)

Interestingly, in order to flesh out their statistical and anecdotal-based re-creations, at least one contemporary historian has also woven Russian realist fiction into his work.(39) For example, Ben Eklof relates the troubles the schoolmistress in A.P. Chekhov's "Na podvode" (In the cart) has getting her already over-due salary in a section of his book Russian Peasant Schools, which discusses the precarious economic position of schoolteachers. In doing so, he piles fiction upon politically-biased fact and so reinforces the stereotypical portrait of the schoolteacher, particularly the uchitel'nitsa.

This stereotype concerning the schoolteacher occupied a prominent place in the discourse concerning education. And, in the case of schoolmistresses, was integrally connected to the

discourse surrounding the zhenskii vopros, or woman question.(40) The literary discourse concerning women had long emphasized women's passive, martyr-like qualities. Heroines since Karamzin's Poor Liza had shown strength and displayed femininity by suffering valiantly in service to family and social norms.(41) It is out of the convergence of these two discourses that Potapenko's short story "The General's Daughter", in which a genteel young woman dies of tuberculosis while teaching in the countryside, and Chekhov's pathetic character Irina in The Three Sisters come. In both literary examples, the women are trapped by the conventions that describe women. The general's daughter is doomed to death by a romantic literary ideal of service, while Irina is forced into teaching by her fiance's death and the need to find solace in activity:

Tomorrow I shall go alone, I'll teach in a school, and I'll give my whole life to those who may need it. It is autumn now, soon winter will come, it will cover everything with snow, and I shall work, I shall work... (42)

The stereotype of the nineteenth century schoolmistress was created and reinforced (even, as we have seen, into the twentieth century) by male intellectuals, which is a fact that was understood even by individuals of the period. As the writer N. Ia. Abramovich noted in his 1913 book Woman and the World of Male Culture, "Thus, we realize right away, that creative hunger and fantasies about the poetic cast of women's souls are not documents about women, but rather are testimonies concerning men's souls."(43) Despite the fact that such documented

commentary exists in the historical record, no study touching upon Russian female professionals has built it into that study's basic methodology. Specifically, neither pedagogues of the day nor intellectuals since have given appropriate attention to the writings of women who entered and happily remained within the teaching profession in surveys and articles concerning the social and economic conditions of public schoolteachers.(44)

By analyzing the memoir/articles written by 14 uchitel'nitsy, I hope to build a more realistic portrait of the daily life of a schoolmistress. As we will see, all but one of the 14 memoirs were written in deliberate opposition to the stereotype. Of course, since the memoirs were introduced in a politically-motivated discourse, it is highly unlikely that they are 'true' in the objective sense. However, they do represent a version of reality that the 14 authors believed was worthy of presentation to pedagogues, the public and other teachers.(45)

For individuals interested in the discourse concerning education in the late nineteenth century, these women's writings are of special interest, because they display a complex and lively understanding of the established educational discourse in both the style and content of the writing. As well, they offer a supplement to the discourse concerning the traditional place of women in Russian society. Of course, in order for the reader to understand the weight of this supplement, some attention must first be paid to the position of women within Russian society of the period.

The Position of Women

In this section, only the position of women who would have read about, if not participated in, the debate concerning the woman question will be discussed. In later chapters, the status and treatment of krest'ianki (women peasants) and rabot'nitsy (women factory workers) will be discussed as necessary. This section will therefor concern only women from the middle and gentry estates, the same women (interestingly enough) who came to form the majority of teachers in the period under analysis.(46)

In order to understand the world such women inhabited, it is essential to consider their legal and social conditions. First, women's freedoms were restricted in Russia, as throughout all nineteenth century Europe. Law codes subordinated single women to parents and then transferred authority to husbands upon marriage.(47) Much has been made of the fact that Russian women, in contrast to British or French women, owned property. However, ownership was of considerably less value when the administration of said property was in husbands' hands.(48) As well, Russian men held their wives' passports, without which it was impossible to travel, work, or get an education.(49) All the above restrictions and legislation would have had relatively little impact upon a woman with reasonable parents and a kind husband. However, for a woman involved in a unhappy relationship, the situation must have been almost unendurable.

Of course, divorce was an option, but a limited one. A rigid sexual double standard made it almost impossible for women to procure divorce -- even on the basis of adultery.(50) As well, social conventions that idealized wife and, especially, mother operated to encourage women to marry and to stay married. In her article "Mother-Child Relationships among the Russian Nobility", Jessica Tovrov describes how women were educated and trained from childhood to become house managers and social conveners -- that is, wives.(51) Such conditioning produced women who were firmly convinced that wedlock and motherhood were the hallmarks of femininity and the natural destiny of all women. As one young woman wrote, "I passionately want to be a woman and a mother -- both these feelings are equal in me. I will marry, even if love is not present in full measure."(52)

The social pressure to adhere to a traditional view of women as wife and mother was reinforced by a resounding lack of career and life alternatives. Following the university disturbances of 1863 (in which some women participated), women were barred from attending university courses -- even as auditors. Higher education could only be pursued in the medical faculty at the Military Surgical Institute and the few Women's Higher Courses still operating within the Empire.(53) Thus, self-fulfilment through higher education was closed to all but a few women -- as were most careers.(54) Educated women, who aspired to positions within the burgeoning professions, were disappointed.(55) Of the three jobs open to large numbers of

women in the late nineteenth century (factory worker, midwife and teacher), only teacher appeared respectable and so the competition for positions was great. Christine Johanson has determined that during the period 1880-4, over 1400 women failed to secure positions as teachers and governesses in Moscow guberniia alone.(56)

Teaching appeared respectable because it involved little manual labour, and it placed women among children, where -- according to social norms -- they were expected to be. In fact, in the writings of many pedagogues a strong connection was drawn between uchitel'nitsy and mothers. For example, in an extremely popular teachers' handbook from the period, the connection between educating women and producing teachers is stated explicitly. "If you teach five girls, it is equivalent to teaching 25 people; they will have children."(57) Of course, the connection between schoolmistresses and mothers was purely an abstract one, because in many Russian educational districts, women teachers were forbidden to marry.(58)

Although a common practice in many countries throughout the 1890s, and explicable in terms of fear for the health of pregnant women and of the disruption of a married schoolmistress' family life, such legislation created a dissonant situation.(59) That is, women teachers, who cared for children all day long, were forbidden from engaging in the most respected activity open to women in their society -- the bearing and raising of their own children. For schoolmistresses, the

familiar Victorian middle and upper class division of the world into male (public) and female (private) spheres was turned on its head. Uchitel'nitsy (often women from the middle and upper estates) were care-givers and nurturers in the public (not private) sphere, for which they were paid.

Alison Prentice has argued that teaching became a profession at the point at which the nurturing and educating of children was moved from the domestic to the public sphere;(60) that is, at the point where it ceased to be a private interaction, carried out by virtual amateurs. In a woman teacher's case, however, little (except the location of instruction) seemed to have changed. She was biologically suited to be a mother and, in so far as her activities as teacher replicated those of a mother, she could hardly have been seen as a professional -- in the conventional sense.(61) The majority of Russian schoolmistresses did not receive pedagogical training or participate in professional development conferences and courses. Thus, while she theoretically may have been a natural nurturer (and so a champion of vospitanie), the schoolmistress may not have been trained to nurture in a group setting. For this reason, she may not have been seen as the ideal teacher. Lacking a specialized professional education, the uchitel'nitsa had not been made over completely -- according to the dominant discourse's educational philosophy -- into a teaching professional.

As we will see, women who themselves taught, were not

willing to accept this equation (women=natural, but non-professional, teacher) so readily. They knew that the logistics of educating 50 children divided into three classes were very different from raising (and possibly educating) one or two at home. They also knew that an entirely different personality and set of skills were required to train and discipline children of a different estate. As well, they were required to develop coping skills to buffer rejection -- a product of their unmarried status and elevated estate -- by the communities in which they taught. In the opinions of schoolmistresses who wrote, women who could develop and hone such skills were professionals.

The above chapter has investigated the nature and purpose of the discourse concerning education, the conditions of life and work for Russian schoolteachers, the stereotype of the schoolteacher (especially the schoolmistress) that grew out of the discourse concerning education, and the position of women in middle and upper estates during the late nineteenth century. It has also demonstrated how the public discourse concerning women and education was dominated by men, who expressed professional and political frustration, self-interest, and personal need by emphasizing the dire conditions of less powerful people.

Pedagogues emphasized the poor economic and social conditions teachers laboured under; men emphasized the effect of the patriarchal and repressive family upon women. The nineteenth century literary critic Abramovich illustrated this tendency when he noted that men writing about women's souls were really discussing their own. In an article concerning the campaign for universal primary education in Russia, Allen Sinel showed how such transference operated in the discourse concerning education. Pedagogues believed that nothing was as valuable to Russia's future as the expansion of the educational system:

If the heavily taxed populace, the overburdened zemstvos and the indifferent and sometimes hostile government were to provide the immense resources needed to prove Strannoljubskij [a man who insisted that the educational system was ineffective] wrong, they would all have to be convinced [by pedagogues] that nothing was so vital to individual, local and national well-being as mass education. (62)

What they may really have believed (even subconsciously) was that nothing was as valuable to pedagogues as an expanded school system.

Perhaps the above statement is a little harsh and overly simplistic. However, it serves to illustrate the fact that the dominant discourse was created and reinforced by individuals with aims and biases. As R.J. Ware noted, these aims and biases were transferred to readers and writers through journals. A journal's audience then demonstrated support of editorial policy through actions (perhaps participating in 'small deeds') or writings. The dominant discourse thus spread into the lives of

people, who were required to act upon its logic and demands. As we will see, because the discourse was rooted in intellectuals' abstract and long-term desires, it offered little in the way of practical advice to the actors it inspired. In some cases, (for example, women who were stereotyped as passive and vulnerable) the actors were even hampered by the discourse.

The above chapter has established the context for the forthcoming investigation and interpretation of the purpose and meaning of uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles. The following chapters will reveal how schoolmistresses engaged in a counter-discourse that offered their educated and unmarried colleagues a positive self-image in a society that worshipped mothers. They will also uncover Russian schoolmistresses' fascinating professional ethic.

Endnotes

1. Ware, "Russian Journal" 121.
2. Ware, "Russian Journal" 122.
3. Ware, "Russian Journal" 133-4. 'Thick' journals were periodicals (generally published monthly) that offered intellectual and social comment on contemporary issues and events. They were the primary communication medium utilized by Russian intellectuals and educated society (obshchestvo) during the nineteenth century. In an enormous empire lacking an elected government or laws permitting professional associations and public meetings, they were the link that connected educated Russia and gave it a voice.

4. Ware, "Russian Journal" 136-7.

5. See A. Baulina, Zadachi sovremennago vospitaniia. (St. Petersburg: M.M. Stasliulevich, 1910), especially Chapter 18, for a full explanation of vospitanie.

6. Sinel, "Campaign" 485-97.

7. Sinel, "Campaign" 486-7. V.P. Vakhterov, "Vseobshchee nachal'noe obuchenie", Russkaia mysl' 15(1894) Book 7, otel II, 1-18.

8. Gregory L. Freeze, "The Soslovie (Estate Paradigm and Russian Social History," The American Historical Review vol. 91, 1 (February 1986): 11-36. In this article, Freeze attempts to define soslovie, a word that is not appropriately translated as either class or estate. Freeze shows how the definition of soslovie changed from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries. He also shows that it was a dynamic term, changing as the society which used it changed. Even a facile definition of soslovie must encompass categories of kinship, occupation, legal status, corporateness and distinctive culture. (Freeze 19).

9. See Eklof, Russian Peasant 419-437.

10. See Hans Rogger, Russia in the Age of Modernisation and Revolution, 1881-1917. (New York: Longman, 1983) in order to get a sense of the dramatic transformations taking place in society.

11. Byvshii uchitel', "Iz vospominanii sel'skago uchitelia," (Iz Permskoi gubernii), Obrazovanie, 5-6 (1896): Sect. 2, 106-8.

12. Jeffrey Brooks, "The Zemstvo and the Education of the People," The Zemstvo in Russia: An Experiment in Local Self-government, Ed. Terence Emmons and Wayne S. Vucinich, (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 250-9.

13. Eklof, Russian Peasant 222.

14. See Charles A. Ruud, Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982) and Richard S. Wortman, The Development of a Russian Legal Consciousness, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976) for descriptions of the growth of professionalism in two fields -- journalism and law.

15. See John F. Hutchinson, Politics and Public Health in Revolutionary Russia 1890-1918, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990) and Nancy Mandelker Frieden, Russian Physicians in an Era of Reform and Revolution, 1856-1905, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981) for examples of these difficulties.

16. William G. Wagner, "The Trojan Mare: Women's Rights and Civil Rights in Late Imperial Russia," Civil Rights in Imperial Russia, Ed. Olga Crisp and Linda Edmondson, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 65.

17. Wagner 66 and 78.

18. A. Anastasiev, Narodnaia shkola rukovodstvo dlia uchitelei i uchitel'nitsy nachal'nykh" uchilishch nastol'naia spravochnaia kniga, 7th ed, vol. 2, (Moscow: A.A. Stupin, 1910), 33 and 37. As well, see David L. Ransel, "Child Care Cultures in the Russian Empire," a paper delivered August 1988, at the Conference on the History of Women in the Russian Empire for a description of habits of child care and the comments of contemporary physicians and pedagogues.

19. As examples, see S.V. Anikina, "O material'noi i iuridicheskoi neobespechennosti russkago narodnago uchitel'ia," Russkaia shkola, 7-8 (1903) 217-28; "Antisanitarnoe shkol'noe zdanie," Russkaia shkola, 5-6 (1904), sect. 3, 101; "Begstvo narodnykh uchitelei," Russkaia shkola, 1 (1904), sect. 2, 107.

20. Eklof, Russian Peasant 287.

21. Ben Eklof, "Peasant Sloth Reconsidered: Strategies of Education and Learning in Rural Russia Before the Revolution," Journal of Social History 14, 3 (Spring 1981): 379. See A.I. Piskunov, Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR: vtoraiia polovina XIX v, (Moscow: Pedagogika, 1976) for descriptions of the various types of schools -- offering primary, secondary and advanced educations.

22. Eklof, Russian Peasant 102, 127 and 140-1; K. Barsov, "Sel'skaia shkola i uchitel'," Russkaia shkola, 5-6 (1896) 54-5.

23. Such conflicts were common in many countries. See Eugen Weber, "Civilizing in Earnest," Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976); Roger Thabault, Education and Change in a Village Community: Mazieres-en-Gatine, 1848-1914, trans. Peter Tregear, (New York: Schocken Books, 1971) 123, 165-6, and 206-7; and Polly Welts Kaufman, Women Teachers on the Frontier, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984) 21-37.

24. Eklof, Russian Peasant 186-94 and 234-7, and "Uchitel'nitsa Ivanova," Russkaia shkola, 10-11 (1901), sect. 2, 126.

25. Brooks, "Zemstvo" 258-9.

26. Brooks, "Zemstvo" 261.

27. L. Blinov, "Narodnyi uchitel' v Rossii," Vseobshchee obrazovanie v Rossii, Ed. D.M. Shakhovskii, (Moscow, 1902), 76.
28. Blinov 76. As well, he notes that different districts had radically different pay scales. 75.
29. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 345.
30. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 345.
31. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 345.
32. S.T. Semenov, Dvadstat'piat' let v derevne, (St. Petersburg: Kn--vo "Zhinzn' i znanie", 1895) 42-3.
33. Elizaveta Nikolaevna S., "Vospominaniia sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy," Russkaia shkola, 5-6 (1902) 39.
34. Semenov 42.
35. See Eklof, "Zemstvo School" and Eklof, "Peasant Sloth".
36. Vera Sandomirsky Dunham, "The Strong-Woman Motif," The Transformation of Russian Society, Ed. Cyril E. Black, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967) 482.
37. Ware, Russian Journal 124.
38. See Eklof, Russian Peasant, Seregny Russian Teachers and Scott Seregny, "Zemstvo Rabbits, Antichrists and Revolutionaries: Rural Teachers in Saratov Province, 1890-1917," Politics and Society in Provincial Russia: Saratov, 1600-1917, Ed. Scott J. Seregny, (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 113-38.
39. Eklof, Russian Peasant 234-5. Is it too much to suggest that by engaging in this tactic of mixing fact (statistics) with fiction, Eklof has entered the same semi-fictional world as the pedagogues upon whose writings he has based his research?
40. See the first section of Heldt, Terrible Perfection concerning the iconography of women; also refer to Dunham.
41. Sonia in Crime and Punishment and Anna Karenina are two good examples of this type of literary heroine.
42. Anton Chekhov, The Three Sisters, trans. and ed. Eugene K. Bristow, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1977), 157.
43. N. Ia. Abramovich, Zhenshchina i mir muzhskoi kul'tury: mirovoe tvorchestvo i polovaia liubov', (Moscow: Svobodnyi Put', 1913) 7.

44. Eklof quotes from A.V. Filotova; however, her work is really part of the discourse of the soviet period. For this reason, it does not feature in this thesis.

45. Just as Toby Clymas' article on women physicians does.

46. Blinov 68.

47. Wagner 68, and Dorothy Atkinson, "Society and the Sexes in the Russian Past," Women in Russia, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1977) 33.

48. Wagner 69 and Richard Stites, The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism 1860-1930, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978) 7-8.

49. Atkinson 32-3 and Wagner 66.

50. Stites 181-2 and Linda Edmondson, Feminism in Russia, 1900-1917, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984), 11 and 140.

51. Jessica Tovrov, "Mother-Child Relationships among the Russian Nobility," The Family in Imperial Russia: New Lines in Historical Research, Ed. David L. Ransel, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978) 15-43.

52. Quoted in Stites, 181.

53. Christine Johanson, Women's Struggle for Higher Education in Russia, 1855-1900, (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987), 89 and 100-1.

54. The women featured in A. Polianskii, Russkaia zhenshchina na gosudarstvennoi i obshchestvennoi sluzhbe, (Moscow: Tip. S. Skirmunt, 1901) were principally brought into the jobs they had through their connection with men already in the profession -- husbands, fathers, etc. No large-scale hiring went on.

55. See Johanson and Sophia Satina, Education of Women in Pre-revolutionary Russia, (New York: Smith College manuscript, 1966) 23.

56. Johanson 61.

57. Anastasiev vol. 2, 44.

58. See Catherine Ruane Hinshaw, "The Vestal Virgins of St. Petersburg: Schoolteachers and the 1897 Marriage Ban," a paper delivered August 1988 at the conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire.

59. Hinshaw makes an interesting argument that the basis of the legislation is to move women through the profession and on into other areas of the economy.

60. Alison Prentice, "The Feminization of Teaching", The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History. Ed. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 50.

61. Ssee Reddings S. Sugg, Jr., Motherteacher: The Feminization of American Education, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978), 79-83 for a brief discussion of American educational pioneer Catherine Beecher's argument that women 'naturally' were better suited than men for teaching.

62. Sinel, "Campaign" 485.

CHAPTER II

THE FIELD OF DISCOURSE AND THE PARTICIPANTS

As noted in Chapter 1, there was a dialogue between the editors and readers of all thick journals.(1) The editors promoted a new literature that would draw readers toward the editors' political convictions; readers and writers responded by absorbing and acting (writing) out the social and political convictions expressed in journals. "The 'thick' journal had become more than a convenient and potentially profitable literary vehicle; it came to occupy a special place in the emotions of the writers and in the cultural habits of the readers."(2) As Ware discovered, even in the case of literary journals, audiences consisted primarily of people involved full-time in education: pedagogues, teachers and students.(3) This was because the vocabulary and content of thick journals were accessible only to people with a high level of general education.

Because of the relatively sophisticated nature of journal articles, the dialogue between editors, writers and readers was of a comparatively elevated nature. It was rooted in the context that was introduced in Chapter 1, as well as in the life experiences of the participants. This chapter will examine the lives and social experiences of the individuals who generated and reinforced the dominant discourse concerning education through a survey of their journals; it will also examine the

lives, social experiences and situations of the uchitel'nitsy who created the counter-discourse. In order to place the schoolmistresses whose memoir/articles form the basis of this thesis in closer context, their educational and social profiles will be compared to a selected group of schoolmasters that also wrote memoir/articles and to primary schoolteachers in general.

A Survey of Three Educational Journals

The three journals this thesis examines -- Russkaia shkola (Russian School), Obrazovanie (Education) and Narodnoe obrazovanie (Elementary Education) -- that published articles by schoolmistresses were 'thick' journals that stressed educational issues. Beyond this, each journal had a specific socio-political orientation or editorial policy. As we already know, the editorial policy of Russian journals affected not only their content, but also the world view and habits of their audiences. (As we shall see, it also influenced that audience's writing style and the content of articles they wrote.) Needless to say, in order to understand the effect of a journal's editorial policy on readers, it is necessary to determine the nature of this policy. This section will be devoted to such a task. It will present what is known about the above journals' editors and publishers, as well as a discussion of each journal's content

and purpose. Journals will be discussed according to the number of memoir/articles by schoolmistresses each contains -- and therefore in order of their importance to this thesis.

Nine schoolmistress memoir/articles appeared in Ruskaia shkola. This journal was published in St. Petersburg from 1890 to 1917. Registered in 1889, its subtitle was "general pedagogical journal for school and family." In 1907, following a change in editor, the subtitle was altered to "general pedagogical journal for teachers and activists concerned with public education." (4) The change in name was long overdue, for Ruskaia shkola's content had always stressed the pragmatic aspects of public school teaching. This concern with the public education system was reflected even in the journal's structure. Ruskaia shkola was divided into sections offering teaching techniques, information about teachers' self-help organizations, advertisements concerning upcoming summer courses and openings of new pedagogical seminars, and reviews of textbooks. (5)

From its inception, Ruskaia shkola was edited and published alternately by Ia. G. Gurevich and his son Ia. Ia. Gurevich. Upon the father's death in 1906, the son took over editorial and publishing duties full-time. (6) The elder Gurevich was a famous teacher, intellectual and pedagogue, well-known in St. Petersburg's educated society. (7) Both this fact and his life's activities had a direct bearing on the journal he founded, and so warrant attention here.

The first and perhaps most important feature of Ia. G. Gurevich's career is that he graduated from the Historico-Philological Faculty at St. Petersburg University, which was the training ground for a significant number of pedagogues of the late nineteenth century. Following graduation, Gurevich taught at gymnasia first in Novgorod and then St. Petersburg. In 1883, he became director of a teaching school called Gurevich's Gymnasium and Real School. In the 1880s, he also was a lecturer on world history at St. Petersburg University and taught in women's higher courses. Finally, in 1890 he founded Ruskaia shkola and began to act as treasurer of the St. Petersburg Literacy Committee and as founder of other philanthropic institutions.

From the first, Ruskaia shkola was a weighty contribution to the discourse concerning education. The first 23 issues were between 240-400 pages each.(8) By 1901 and continuing to 1916, the monthly journal published substantial tomes comprised of one to three sections of 200-300 pages each. The journal was popular, and in 1903 some issues even went into second printing.(9)

In short, Ruskaia shkola was a journal founded, published and edited by a well-educated and famous teacher, intellectual and pedagogue (and then his son), which stressed the practical difficulties of teaching. Certainly, Ia. G. Gurevich's experience as a teacher of teachers influenced the journal's content and presumably determined its intended audience.

Russkaia shkola's subtitle and contents suggest that its primary audience was teachers and those preparing to enter the profession. Ia. G. Gurevich's education in St. Petersburg University's Historico-Philological Faculty, and his activity in later life on Petrograd's Literacy Committee and the boards of other philanthropic institutions, assure that he was in both social and professional contact with contemporary pedagogical thought.(10) As such, the attitude and perspective of his journal can be expected to reflect the dominant pedagogical discourse.

Narodnoe obrazovanie -- registered in St. Petersburg in 1896 and published 1898-1916 (11) -- is an interesting contrast to Russkaia shkola. This is because the journal was not the project of one pedagogue, but of the educational council attached to the Holy Synod. Also, unlike Russkaia shkola's descriptive subtitle, Narodnoe obrazovanie's subtitle -- "monthly pedagogical journal published by the Educational Council under the direction of the Holy Synod" -- does not tell the reader much about the journal's contents. However, it does suggest the journal's ideological perspective; it, like the Holy Synod, was surely conservative and heavily religious.

In contrast to the wealth of information concerning the famous and much-discussed editor of Russkaia shkola, no available information exists concerning Narodnoe obrazovanie's editor P.P. Mironitskii or A. Tumin, who prepared a systematic listing of Narodnoe obrazovanie's articles in 1908 and then

again in 1913.(12) As there is no ecclesiastical title in front of Mironskii's name (as there is in front of the names of priests and teachers who wrote to and for the journal) and considering that the Holy Synod was a secular body that oversaw the Orthodox Church's business, it seems logical to assume that the editor was a government functionary -- probably of a fairly conservative political orientation.(13)

Such a supposition is supported by the pedantic and unscholarly nature of the leaflets and brochures Narodnoe obrazovanie published between 1901 and 1916. They concerned school readings, school calendars and approved books, among them School Songs and School Rules of Church Singing. The journal also served to promulgate statutes and governmental instructions concerning the work of church schools.(14) Thus, the leaflets the journal published and many of its articles emphasized religious study, order and non-academic subjects. (As school years were often only six months long, an emphasis on singing resulted in a de-emphasis of reading.)

In summary, Narodnoe obrazovanie was an uneasy mixture of pedagogical and religious doctrine; as such, it reflected the position of the Holy Synod, which straddled the realm between religion and politics. As well, it reproduced parish schools' odd curriculum that split class time between academic and religious subjects, and authority between the teacher and the priest (who usually taught religion and singing). For this reason, the journal had two principal and relatively diverse

publics -- priests and teachers, many of whom were women. This diversified public is reflected in the journal's Table of Contents, which lists articles as different as "Universal Education," "School Work in the Community. Assorted News and Little Notes about School Work," and "School Singing."(15)

Narodnoe obrazovanie's non-scholarly content was in direct contrast Obrazovanie's lofty and abstract articles. Obrazovanie was a journal published in St. Petersburg from 1892 to 1909, which -- if we are to judge by its numerous changes of subtitle -- frequently changed focus.(16) When it was first published, Obrazovanie's subtitle was "a Pedagogical and Popular Science Journal". In 1902, the word "literary" was added to the subtitle. In 1906, it was renamed Education: a literary and socio-political journal (zhurnal literaturnyi obshchestvenno-politicheskii). Finally, in 1908, it was given the unwieldy subtitle "a Literary, Popular Science and Amateur Political Journal".

Such diversity was not limited to the journal's name. During its short existence, Obrazovanie had six editors and three publishers.(17) The first, the creator of the journal, was the famous historian and pedagogue V.D. Sipovskii. Like Ia. G. Gurevich, Sipovskii was born in 1843 and received a degree from St. Petersburg University's historico-philological faculty. He had been involved since 1876 in the publishing of Zhenskoe obrazovanie, from which the journal Obrazovanie had developed.(18) He was a frequent contributor to such journals

as Semiia i shkola (Family and School), Mir bozhii (God's World) and, probably as a result of his relationship with Gurevich, Russkaia shkola.

Although Obrazovanie was founded as a pedagogical journal, its transition to a literary, scientific and political forum began as early as 1895, when literary critic V.V. Sipovskii (son of the founder) became editor.(19) Frequent contributors included famous statisticians, scholars and literary critics such as P.F. Karterev, V.P. Ostrogorskii, A. Strannoliubskii, I. Paul'son, N. Pozniakov, N. Rubakin and D. Semenov.(20) Their less famous, but equally well-connected, relatives A. Ia. Ostrogorskii and D.A. Karyshev acted as editors and publishers at different times.(21)

Obrazovanie's abstract and fractured focus was reflected in the content of its articles. Short stories by A.P. Chekhov appear in the same issues as statistical comparisons of women's professional education in Europe.(22) Its articles are much more theoretical and academic than those of Russkaia shkola and Narodnoe obrazovanie, reflecting -- it must be assumed -- the interests of its editors and readership. Only two memoir/articles written by schoolmistresses appear in Obrazovanie; and, as we shall see, neither offered the kind of practical and helpful information that was an integral part of such writings in the two other journals surveyed. Both memoir/articles reflected the literary conventions of the time; one was typical of the portrait of uchitel'nitsy painted by

writers of the time, while the second was really an examination of great literature's effect upon young minds.

To sum up, Obrazovanie's discourse operated at an elevated and abstract level. Its content was diverse and interesting, not aimed at the prosaic needs and interests of teachers and students in pedagogical institutions and courses. That it did not print many articles written by teachers demonstrates the lack of interest evinced by St. Petersburg's intelligenty concerning the lives and career experiences of schoolteachers. The journal disseminated the dominant discourse to its readers, but allowed little if any of their counter-discourse to enter the journal.

The implications of this editorial policy are extensive, especially considering that Russkaia shkola and Obrazovanie had a similar political affiliation -- liberal and reformist. The editors attended the same educational institutions and participated in the same social and philanthropic organizations. The difference between their journals was primarily one of focus. Russkaia shkola's intended audience was schoolteachers or those interested in entering the profession. Obrazovanie spoke to society (obshchestvo) at large. It is unlikely, however, that their ideology and attitudes were significantly different.

Biographical Information Concerning Fourteen
Schoolmistresses

When conceptualizing this thesis, I deliberately chose to exclude the writings of part-time schoolmistresses, Sunday school teachers and women who ran their own school. This is why the famous memoirs of Kh. D. Alchevskaia and Aleksandra Shteven, although considered, are not featured in this work.(23) Instead, I was interested in that segment of women who made their living teaching elementary school and who were thus subject to the problems of dependency; that is, I sought out women who were required to live on a teacher's income, in a teacher's residence and, usually, in an alien community. Because the women whose journal articles form the basis of this essay were not well-known pedagogues or philanthropic ladies, they did not catch the interest of biographers. Information available about them is scarce, derived only from their own writings and Zaionchkovskii's bibliographic index. In some instances, it is incomplete or uncertain. As it is often impossible to determine when the schoolmistresses began teaching, their memoir/articles will not be presented chronologically. Instead, uchitel'nitsy writings have been grouped and presented according to a number of important and revealing characteristics. These characteristics include: the type and location of the school in which the schoolmistress taught, the education she had received, the number of classes

(or grades) for which she was responsible at any one time, the number of years she taught, and her social background.

As noted in the introduction, these memoir/articles represent a substantial number -- if not the complete collection -- of writings by elementary schoolmistresses. The first memoir I discovered was published in 1893, the last in 1914.

Uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles have been divided into two major groups: those written by women who taught in urban schools and those written by women who taught in rural schools. They will be presented in accordance with the number of years each schoolmistress taught. Biographical information concerning urban teachers will be presented first.

Aleksandra Tolmachevskaja began teaching in an Odessa primary school when she was 20 years of age. The school had several teachers, and each teacher taught a split-class. Tolmachevskaja received a gymnasium education and some practical pedagogical training through observing other teachers' classroom techniques. Tolmachevskaja's family had sunk from social prominence during her grandfather's lifetime into genteel poverty. She was the only uchitel'nitsa of the group who noted that she entered teaching for a political reason; she entered the profession in 1878, under the sway of narodnichestvo (populist) philosophy. Tolmachevskaja fought with the Odessa school board to obtain her teaching position and with a repressive school inspector. She taught for 20 years. Her

article "From the Diary of an Elementary Schoolmistress" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1914.(24)

The anonymous author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" taught for 10 years in a variety of schools. She had been a governess, and a teacher in a pansion and an orphanage before she got a job in a girls school in St. Petersburg. This last school is the subject of her memoir. The school had three classes and one teacher. I do not know if this teacher left teaching after 10 years, and if so where she went. She received no formal teacher training and came to the school in St. Petersburg with no teaching plan. This author published her memoir in Russkaia shkola in 1893.(25)

O. Pavlovich taught at a co-educational urban school for at least five years. Pavlovich was responsible for teaching three classes in a school that could afford assistant teachers and substitutes. She had a pronounced nervous condition that interrupted her teaching twice and which may have led to her retirement from teaching. Pavlovich was gymnasium-educated but received no formal training.(26) Her article "The Importance of Discipline in the Work of Vospitanie" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1895.(27)

E.R. taught in a three-class girls school in St. Petersburg for at least one year. She received no formal pedagogical training. As to her social background, she came from a different social class than the children she taught -- which is indicated by the fact that she could not understand their songs

or join in to play their games. She was frequently distressed by the make-believe games her students played, particularly those concerning drinking and violence. Her article "Pictures from School Life" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1898.(28)

The rural schoolmistresses are as follows. V. Karpinskaia trained as an assistant teacher to an uchitel' at an elementary school in Moscow. She taught at a number of multi-class schools during her 15 years in the profession. She entered the profession in 1882, at a young age. The article she wrote is less about her than a fellow teacher she met during her training -- Mar'ia Nikolaevna V.--, the idealistka. She seems very religious. Karpinskaia's article "The Idealist" appeared in Narodnoe obrazovanie in 1907.(29)

"Schoolmistress" I.K. Chuvashева taught in a northern backwoods rural school in Sosnovka. She taught both a Sunday school course and in the church-supported two-class elementary school. Chuvashева began teaching when she was 16 years old, after being educated at home. She did not have a teaching certificate, a fact that disturbed her greatly. She even commented in her text that she was afraid of not finding another job if she failed at her first. There is a mention in her memoir that she entered teaching partly through financial need. Following her first year teaching, she attended a zemstvo summer course. Chuvashева was strongly religious. Health problems forced her to leave the profession after 14 years of service.

Her article "Thank God for Everything!" appeared in Narodnoe obrazovanie in 1914.(30)

"Schoolmistress" V. Elanskaia taught in two rural church schools. Her memoir discusses the first school, which was located in S--kaia guberniia. It was a two-class school that placed great emphasis on religious instruction and hymns. Elanskaia led her students in religious processions. She taught for at least eight years. Her article "From the Memoir of a Schoolmistress" was published in Narodnoe obrazovanie in 1909.(31)

Olga Nikolaevna Ko--ka taught in a rural zemstvo school, a two-grade urban school with five sections and an assistant teacher, and in a gymnasium. Her memoir is concerned almost entirely with the year she spent as a teacher in the zemstvo school, which was located in a northeastern province in the village of Sh---v. Ko--ka received a gymnasium education, and - - unlike the majority of women featured in this thesis -- she also attended (and graduated from) a teaching seminary. That is, she received a teaching certificate through a pedagogical institution. Her pedagogical education was supplemented by a zemstvo summer school course, which taught classroom strategies, techniques for teaching reading and other practical skills. She entered the teaching profession at 19 or 20 years of age and was the sole supporter of her mother, younger brother and sister. (Her family had been relatively well-off before her father died.) Ko--ka was frequently at odds with the priest and bishop

of her district because her students often missed church to do homework. Olga Nikolaevna was forced to leave the rural school because of recurring health problems. She had taught for at least six years at the time she wrote her article and gave no indication that she intended to leave the profession. Her article "A Year in a Rural School" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1905.(32)

Ad. Sem. Simonovich taught school for five years in a rural school in a northern province. The school had three classes, and five lessons were taught each day. She left the one school she wrote about only when she became ill. She received no formal teacher training but was extremely well educated. Because she could speak French and could afford to visit Paris for a cure, it is logical to assume that she was from a relatively elevated soslovie. Her memoir "Notes from the Diary of a Rural Schoolmistress" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1893.(33)

Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. taught in three rural schools. The school that she wrote about is located 50 versts from the nearest town. It was a three-class school, and she was assistant teacher to a schoolmaster. Elizaveta Nikolaevna was 16 years old when she began teaching. She received her training at a large town school as an assistant teacher. She was not particularly religious; at one point in her memoir she relates how her breaking a fast upsets her students. (They think that she will go to hell.) E.S. left the school about which she

wrote after the uchitel' began to spread rumours about her and because she was offered a school of her own. Elizaveta Nikolaevna taught for at least three years. "Memoir of a Rural Schoolmistress" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1902.(34)

L. Guseva taught in a rural school with 40 students for at least one year. Her article was almost entirely concerned with vospitanie and the environment in which her students lived. Almost nothing is known about the writer herself. Her memoir/article "Notes of a Rural Schoolmistress" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1895.(35)

N.M. taught in a rural school in Petersburg province. The school had a four-year course. She was relatively well educated and emphasized classics by Tolstoi and Turgenev in her class. She made no reference to teacher training. She taught for at least one year. "From the Notes of a Primary Schoolmistress" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1897.(36)

A. Zelinskaia taught in a rural literacy school in Ekaterinoslav guberniia (on the Dnepr River) for at least one year.(37) The school, which was well supported by the local priest, had three classes. Zelinskaia was urban-born, and suffered nerve and health problems as a result of the filth and loneliness of rural life. It is probable that she came from an elevated estate, because she longed for cultural events and carried pictures of her family and friends with her to the school. She taught for at least one year. There is no indication of her education in her "Letter from the Provinces".

"From the Diary of a Rural Schoolmistress" was published in Obrazovanie in 1896.(38)

Although many of the above schoolmistresses taught at both rural and urban schools (but chose to write about only one type), N. Leont'eva emphasized that she taught at urban and rural schools. For this reason, her biographical paragraph has been separated from the rest of the uchitel'nitsy. She had students of all ages and grades -- mostly girls. Her literary and historical knowledge suggests that she had at least a gymnasium education. Her writing style and interests -- the books that great men read as children and that her students enjoy -- imply that she was a member of the gentry. She taught for at least eight years. "Concerning Children's Reading" was published in Obrazovanie in 1905.(39)

Some points concerning the above schoolmistresses that should be noted include: few of the women received practical pedagogical training, most were of a different background (usually a higher estate and urban born) than their students, many women taught in more than one school, and the average number of years for which they taught (keeping in mind that many probably taught for longer than the one year noted in their memoir) was 6.8. All, except Elanskaia, taught in a multi-class school, which meant that they were responsible for the simultaneous education and disciplining of approximately 50 students divided into two, three or four classes.(40) Theoretically, the more classes in a school, the more the

teacher was responsible for knowing and teaching her students.(41)

Half of the urban schoolmistresses, the anonymous author and E.R., taught in girls' schools. The remaining uchitel'nitsy taught co-educational classes. As most of these women were presumably educated in an urban setting, they themselves would probably have attended girls' schools. The transition to a co-educational setting, even as a teacher, must have been jarring.

The three schoolmistresses in church-parish schools -- Elanskaia, Chuvasheva and Karpinskaia -- taught for the longest periods and transferred the least. It is as though they were more closely tied to the community in which they taught. Probably the explanation for their length of service and duration of residence lies in the dual nature of the schools in which they taught. They were in service not only to the school (their students) but also the Church. For this reason, they closely resemble nuns -- particularly those of the teaching orders.

Finally, none of the schoolmistresses was married. This means that they were self-supporting and, particularly in the case of the urban-born rural schoolmistresses, living alone in an alien environment. Of course, it is possible that the schoolmistresses teaching in church-parish schools, who (as we will see) were usually priests' daughters, may not have been so lonely. They, at least, probably grew up in the countryside.

Biographical Information Concerning Five Schoolmasters

The following is a brief biographical survey of the five schoolmasters whose writings are offered as contrasts to the memoir/articles of uchitel'nitsy. As their small number indicates, they are not a complete sample of schoolmasters, who published articles in the same period and journals as the 14 schoolmistresses. Instead, they are a group chosen at random, whose writings nevertheless manifest numerous similarities with one another and striking differences with the writings of schoolmistresses. One such point of convergence and contrast is the small amount of personal information schoolmasters volunteered about themselves. (Only one schoolmaster -- Barsov -- offered significant biographical detail).-- Virtually all uchitelia articles were devoted to work-related issues.

Another point of convergence and contrast is that each one in group of schoolmasters taught in rural schools. Because schoolmasters' memoir/articles are so similar, divisions such as those applied above to uchitel'nitsy writings are not terribly instructive. Instead, schoolmasters' biographies will be presented in order of publication.

"Byvshii uchitel'" (Former schoolmaster) was employed in a rural school in Perm district. He spent at least one year in the profession and was in contact with other school teachers. In his memoir/article, "Byvshii uchitel'" indicated that he was aware of negative attitudes concerning his chosen profession.

"I know, that there is much that isn't enjoyable in the work of a rural schoolmaster, [however] I was entirely contented with it."(42) His relationship with the church-parish school and its teachers was poor. As far as the reader is able to tell, he was unmarried. "Byvshii uchitel'" published "From the Memoir of a Rural Schoolmaster" in Obrazovanie in 1896.

K. Barsov had been a clerk in an office before taking a special exam to become a schoolmaster. He entered the profession under the influence of narodnik (populist) literature and his experiences in military service. He taught for one year in a parish school in Moscow province and then transferred to a private school in a southern province. Barsov taught in this school for nine years, until he became ill. He was unmarried. His reference to military service implies that he was from the lower estates and was possibly a peasant. He published his article "Rural School and Schoolmaster" in Russkaia shkola in 1896.(43)

"Elementary schoolmaster" V. Simonovskii taught in a rural zemstvo school in Khorol, Polnavsk district. He taught for at least two years and was involved in an attempt to raise teachers' incomes and improve their conditions of work. His article was based on a survey that discussed the poor material conditions of elementary schoolteachers. He does not mention a wife. His short "Letter from the Provinces" was published in Russkaia shkola in 1897.(44)

Dido taught in a northeastern rural school that was attended by a substantial number of Viatka natives. He was what today we would call disgustingly ethnocentric, measuring his native students against his Russian ones and finding them lacking. Despite his knowledge of Greek and Latin, his presence in a small backwoods community implies that he was not well-educated (at least not pedagogically trained). He does not make mention of a wife. He taught for at least two years. Dido published "Notes and Observations" in Russkaia shkola in 1899.(45)

"Schoolmaster" A. Barakshin taught in rural school for 20 years, beginning in 1887. He taught in at least two schools; the first was a three-year, three-class school called Ugronsk in Vel'sk uezd, Vologodsk guberniia. He was not from the countryside, but was "drawn" there to teach peasant children. Barakshin had obviously read widely on the difficulties of rural life and had developed a plan to aid his integration into the peasant community. In his second year of teaching, he opened a Sunday school for adults. Barakshin's "From the Notes (zapisok) of a Rural Schoolmaster" was published in Narodnoe obrazovanie in 1902.(46)

All the schoolmasters in the above survey taught in a rural setting. None referred to specialized pedagogical training. None admitted to being from the peasant estate, although they appear to be from the lower orders. Apparently none was married. This survey group taught for an average of 10 years.

In the following section we will discover if this group of schoolmasters and the 14 schoolmistress were typical of men and women in the field. Such a study can assist us to understand the relationship of teachers who wrote to both their colleagues and the dominant educational discourse. It will establish the points at which the social backgrounds and experiences of the writers converge with and diverge from others in the profession. Just as placing journal editors' biographical sketches beside schoolmistresses' biographies told us something about the incongruity of theoreticians abstractly advising teachers, comparing the 14 uchitel'nitsy's educational and social backgrounds to other teachers may possibly tell us about their biases and goals. That is, it may help us to understand the counter-discourse.

Comparison With Other Primary Teachers

The following section will examine teachers' marital statuses, educations, class origins, years of service and the number of schools in which most taught. Following each discussion, comparisons will be made between the characteristics of teachers in general and the schoolmistresses and schoolmasters whose writings inform this thesis.

First, the question of marriage must be examined. In 1880, 85.2% of schoolmistresses were single, 10.4% were married and

4.4% were widowed/divorced, while in 1911 80.6% were single, 15.7% were married and 3.7% were widowed/divorced. By comparison, in 1880 50.6% of schoolmasters were single, 47.8% were married and 1.6% were widowed/divorced. In 1911, 53.7% were single, 44.2% were married and 1.4% were widowed/divorced.(47) What these statistics tell us is that the 14 uchitel'nitsy had the same marital status as the majority of women teachers, and a bare majority of schoolmasters -- they were single. Despite the substantial increase in the absolute number of married schoolmistresses -- as the number of women in total in the profession increased 17 times between 1880 and 1911 -- married uchitel'nitsy were still uncommon. However, none of the schoolmasters whose memoir/articles are quoted herein was married, which makes then a rather unusual group.

Second, according to a survey published by the Ministry of Public Instruction in 1903, the number of schoolmistresses who received a teacher's certificate after attending pedagogical institutions generally constituted only one-half to two-thirds of the number of women teaching in any one educational district.(48) For example, out of a total of 2,213 uchitel'nitsy teaching in St. Petersburg district, only 1,612 had such training. The statistics for schoolmasters were 1,732 out of 2,022. In Moscow district, the discrepancy in the statistics was more glaring. Only 4,968 out of 7,336 schoolmistresses had received training and a teacher's certificate at pedagogical institutions, while 3,389 out of 4,914 uchitel'ia had. In Riga

Table V

Teachers' Educational Backgrounds and Perceived Adequacy of Preparation for Teaching (based on teachers' comments)

Teachers' Education	Received Sufficient Preparation Overall	Had Insufficient Pedagogical Knowledge	Had Insufficient Pedagogical Experience
Teachers' seminaries	14.2%	21.8%	54.9%
Women's gymnasiums	8.2	35.7	67.6
Clerical seminaries	10.2	41.4	68.1
Urban schools (male teachers)	7.1	51.3	68.0
Women's pro-gymnasiums	9.9	44.4	58.3
Teacher certification examinations	10.1	51.0	66.8
Secondary and specialized education	11.3	32.7	62.9
Primary and incomplete secondary education	9.0	48.8	64.2
All respondents	10.3		72.3

Teachers' Education	Had Insufficient General Knowledge	Received Insufficient Preparation for Living Conditions
Teachers' seminaries	18.0%	31.8%
Women's gymnasiums	6.6	45.8
Clerical seminaries	10.6	27.7
Urban schools (male teachers)	13.6	24.8
Women's pro-gymnasiums	14.4	30.2
Teacher certification examinations	15.7	22.6
Secondary and specialized education	12.6	33.0
Primary and incomplete secondary education	14.6	25.9
All respondents	13.3	30.2

Source: Eklof, Russian Peasant Schools, 203.

Note: There were 13,812 respondents. The survey considered only teachers who had been working for at least three years. It should be noted that the lead question in the survey was weighted to emphasize shortcomings: "At the initial states of your teaching career, in which of the following areas and subjects did you experience the most severe shortcomings in background, training, and experience?"

district, the statistics were even more striking: only 192 out of 617 uchitel'nitsy had received teacher training, as opposed to 1,656 out of 3,652 schoolmasters.(49)

However, substantial numbers of women in all three districts had obtained teaching certificates as a result of taking a special exam. Women constituted 556 out of 791 teachers who had taken such an exam in St. Petersburg district. In Moscow district, women accounted for 2,281 out of 3,727 such teachers, while in Riga district such schoolmistresses represented 408 out of 1,206 special examination candidates.(50) (As there were only 617 female teachers in Riga district, this route into the profession was obviously particularly popular.) The above statistics demonstrate that a substantial percentage of Russian schoolmistresses did not receive pedagogical training. That they were able to pass the special exam to receive a teaching certificate argues that they received a fairly high level of academic education.

In a survey of teachers' education levels from 1890, L. Blinov noted that 0.5% of schoolmasters had received higher education, 66.5% vocational education, 11.7% secondary education, and 2.3% a primary education.(51) (The remaining teachers had either qualified through special exam or were not certified to teach.) In the same survey, he noted that 1.1% of schoolmistresses had received higher education, 30.1% vocational training, 52.6% a secondary school education and 1.2% a primary education. This fact tallies with the substantial number of

women among the 14 who had received no pedagogical education. Only one -- Ko--ka -- out of the 14 was trained in a pedagogical seminary; three -- Tolmachevskaja, Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. and Karpinskaia -- others received practical training as helping teachers. However, five schoolmistresses -- Simonovich, Tolmachevskaja, Ko--ka, Pavlovich and Leont'eva -- indicated that they received a gymnasium education. Surprisingly, in contrast to the majority of schoolmasters, none of the schoolmaster/authors received vocational training; one, Barsov, took the special exam and then worked as a helping teacher in a rural school.

Third, in 1891, only 10% of Moscow schoolmistresses had served more than ten years; by 1910, this figure had increased to 42%. In 1891, 28% of schoolmasters had served more than ten years; by 1910, 54.7% had served that long. In Vladimir province, the proportion of schoolmasters who worked for five years or more increased from 52% to 60% between 1898 and 1911, while among schoolmistresses the increase was from 30 to 45 percent.(52) Of the 10 schoolmistress who offered some indication of their length of service, nine recorded service of five or more years. Three, (Chuvashева, Karpinskaia and anonymous) recorded service of 10 or more years. Of the two schoolmasters who made reference to their length of service, two (Barsov and Barakshin) noted service of 10 years or more.

Of course, many primary teachers transferred school during their time in the profession. In Moscow province during the

1890s, for example, 49% of female teachers had been employed at one school, 34% at two schools, 11% at three and 6% at four or more. In the same province, 48% of male teachers had been employed at one school, 26% at two schools, 15% at three schools and 9% at four or more. In Vladimir province, 47% of schoolmistresses had been employed at one school, 30% at two schools, 16% at three schools and 7% at four or more. In the same province, 37% of schoolmasters had been employed at one school, 26% at two schools, 15% at three schools and 21% at four or more schools.(53) The statistics demonstrate that movement was common among teachers -- male and female. Karpinskaia, who taught in Moscow province, was not unusual in having moved school at least once. Nor was Ko--ka, who taught in a northeastern province (possibly Vladimir), for transferring school three times. Elizaveta Nikolaevna S., the anonymous author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" and N. Leont'eva also taught in at least two schools. Scanty information about the remaining teachers' careers prohibits further comparison; however, it is fairly safe to assume that if they had served in an unusual number of teaching positions it would have appeared in their memoirs. Thus, there is nothing unusual in the movement patterns of the women whose memoirs form the basis of this thesis. Little is known about schoolmasters' movement. Only one (Barsov) notes a school transfer -- that is, two schools in ten years. Barakshin, who taught for 20 years, does not record a transfer.

Finally, the social composition of primary school teachers must be considered. V.R. Leikina-Svirskaia's The Intelligentsia in Russia in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century notes that a survey of teachers from Pskov guberniia (which did not differentiate between men and women) found that of 203 teachers 54.4% were from the peasantry and meshchane (city dwellers, such as shop keepers and tradesmen), 18.1% were children of priests, 15.7% were children of gentry and chinovniki (or state functionaries), and 11.7% were children of merchants and honourary citizens (a title conferred upon persons not of noble birth for services to the state).(54) Leikina-Svirskaia also notes a survey in Riazanskii volost' that found that 37% of rural schoolteachers were children of clergy (more than half of uchitel'nitsy were the children of clergy), 31% were the children of peasants (58% of uchitel'ia were peasants), 4.5% of men were gentry-born, as compared with 16.7% of women.(55)

The bias among schoolmistresses toward urban-born women from middle and upper sosloviia is evident in the social backgrounds of the 14 uchitel'nitsy. Zelinskaia, Tolmachevskaia and Simonovich are urban-born gentry women. Karpinskaia, Elanskaia and Chuvasheva -- all three of whom published in the church journal Narodnoe obrazovanie -- were much more religious in word and action than any of the other schoolmistress, and they taught in church schools; possibly they were the daughters of priests. The attitude of most of the rest of the uchitel'nitsy toward their students -- a mixture of compassion

and horror at the filth and immorality of their lives -- suggests that they were of a more elevated estate than peasants and workers. None of the schoolmasters defined his social status; most interesting, none admitted to being a peasant, even though this social group provided the majority of men to the profession. Barakshin was obviously well-informed about the problems of teaching, probably from having read a great deal. (He was not a peasant, although he was "drawn" to teach peasant children.) Barsov, who was called to military service, was probably from the lower middle estates.

In sum, we have learned that the 14 schoolmistress/authors were representative of the majority of uchitel'nitsy in all areas except their length of service. They served for considerably longer than the majority of schoolmistresses in Vladimir province and Moscow. The five schoolmaster/authors, however, were not necessarily representative of male primary teachers -- either in their social, educational or service backgrounds. "Byvshii uchitel'" and Dido left the profession after a brief time; only Barakshin remained at his post for 20 years. None of the schoolmasters married, which places them in the bare majority of male teachers in the period studied.

The above chapter has introduced a number of facts that are invaluable to the following analysis of uchitel'nitsy

memoir/articles and the counter-discourse they contain. The chapter demonstrated how the educational and vocational experiences of intellectuals and pedagogues -- who controlled the dominant discourse -- contrasted with those of the 14 schoolmistresses, who created and reinforced a counter-discourse. It showed that male and female elementary teachers had different social and educational backgrounds, as well as needs once in the profession. The differences between male and female teachers were further emphasized by the content of the memoir/articles schoolmistresses and schoolmasters wrote. (We will see numerous examples of these differences in upcoming chapters.) Uchitelia volunteered very little personal information, while uchitel'nitsy wove such information into the body of their writings.

Further, we have seen how journals' political affiliations were reflected in the content of the articles they printed. Such biases and needs also featured in the memoir/articles each journal printed. Obrazovanie -- the abstract literary journal -- published a memoir offering a portrait of a passive, vulnerable and pathetic lady schoolmistress and an educated book review written by a well-educated schoolmistress. Narodnoe obrazovanie -- the Holy Synod's educational journal -- published tracts, featuring women who taught in rural schools for a great many years and who had strong religious faith. Russkaia shkola -- a practical teacher's handbook -- printed the largest number of memoir/articles. They were primarily concerned with prosaic

issues, such as discipline and teaching techniques and classroom dynamics.

In following chapters, we will see if -- despite the different political affiliations of the journals in which they published -- schoolmistresses engaged in a similar counter-discourse. If so, this would argue that the issue of gender is one of great importance and requires greater attention than it has received to date.

Endnotes

1. Ware, "Russian Journal" 126.
2. Ware, "Russian Journal" 122.
3. Ware, "Some Aspects" 26.
4. Spisok Russkikh Povremennykh Izdaniy s 1703 do 1899 god Svedeniyami ob Ekzempliarakh, (St. Petersburg: The Imperial Academy of Science, 1901) 760 and L.N. Beliaeva, M.K. Zinov'eva and M.M. Nikoforov, Bibliografiya Periodicheskikh Izdaniy Rossii, 1901-1916, Ed. V.M. Burashenko, O.D. Golubevaia and N.R. Morachevskii, (Leningrad: Ministry of Culture of the RSFSR, 1959), vol. 3, 61-2.
5. A review of the Table of Contents reveals the variety of articles and the regular division of the journal into sections dealing with teaching strategies, news from the provinces and announcements/advertisements.
6. Spisok 760.
7. I.A. Arsen'ev, ed., Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', (St. Petersburg: I.A. Efron, 1897), vol. 22, 911.
8. Spisok 760.
9. In addition to publishing the journal, Ia. Ia. Gurevich edited and published a 1913 handbook advising teachers on equipping their schools and a short 1914 lesson book on the teaching of Russian grammar and conversation.

10. Entsiklopedicheskii, vol. 22, 911.

11. Each reference text consulted offered different publication dates for Narodnoe obrazovanie. Spisok sets its publication dates from 1901-16, while Bibliographiia notes that the first edition came out in 1898 and leaves the date of its collapse to speculation.

12. Spisok 604.

13. This assumption is an extrapolation based on the character of other bureaucrats and officials in the Holy Synod, such as Pobedonotsev.

14. Spisok 604.

15. See Narodnoe obrazovanie Table of Contents in order to get a general sense of the contents and editorial policy of the journal.

16. Bibliographiia vol. 2, 503-4 and Spisok 640.

17. Spisok vol. 2, 503-4 and Entsiklopedicheskii vol. 21, 561.

18. Entsiklopedicheskii vol. 30, 58.

19. Entsiklopedicheskii vol. 30, 58.

20. Entsiklopedicheskii vol. 21, 561. See A. Strannoliubskii reference in Chapter 1.

21. Spisok 640.

22. As examples, see A.N. Strannoliubskii, "O zhenskoi professional'noi obrazovanii," Obrazovanie 2 (1896): 75-86; 3 (1896): 8-28; 4 (1896): 16-41.

23. Kh.D. Alchevskaia, Peredumannoe i perezhitoe, (Moscow, 1912) and A.A. Shteven, Iz zapisok sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy, (St. Petersburg: I.N. Skorokhodov, 1895). As well, A.V. Filatova, Vospominaniia uchitel'nitsy, (Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveshcheniia, 1929), while interesting and enlightening, has not been used because her work is part of Soviet discourse.

24. Aleksandra Tolmachevskaia, "Iz dnevnika narodnoi uchitel'nitsy," Russkaia shkola 4 (1914): 104-23.

25. "Pervyi god moei uchitel'skoi deiatel'nosti. (Iz vospomanii nachal'noi uchitel'nitsy)," Russkaia shkola 9-10 (1983): 38-64.

26. A gymnasium is a girls secondary school that offers a high level of education, generally grounded in language and

literature. The education a girl attending a gymnasium received was roughly equivalent the one received by a boy at a boys gymnasium. However, girls, unlike boys, could not apply to enter university on the strength of their gymnasium marks. See Satina 51-60 and A.I. Piskunov 127-52, especially 131-7. Satina's book is a very personal recollection of the pre-revolutionary period, while Piskunov's book is a useful reference tool.

27. O. Pavlovich, "Znachenie distsipliny v dele vospitaniia. (Nabliudeniia, priznaniia i zametki uchitel'nitsy nachal'noi shkoly)," Russkaia shkola 11 (1895): 39-53.

28. 31. E.R., "Kartinki shkolnoi zhizni. (Iz nabliudeniia uchitel'nitsy nachal'noi shkoly)," Russkaia shkola 7-8 (1898): 26-38; 9 (1898): 47-55; 10 (1898): 36-53.

29. V. Karpinskaia, "Idealistka. (Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy)," Narodnoe obrazovanie 2 (1907): Vol. 1, Book 2, 182-6.

30. I.K. Chuvashева, "Slava Bogu za Vse! (Vospominaniia derevenskoi uchitel'nitsy)," Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8 (1914): Vol. 2, 1-9; 9 (1914): 113-24; 10 (1914): 265-77; 11 (1914): 378-83.

31. V. Elanskaia, "Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy," Narodnoe obrazovanie 1 (1909): Vol. 1, 1-5.

32. Olga Nikolaevna Ko--ka, "God v sel'skoi shkole. (Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy)," Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1905): 51-76.

33. A.S. Simonovich, "Zametki iz dnevnika sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy," Russkaia shkola 12 (1893): 18-40.

34. Elizaveta Nikolaevna S., "Vospominaniia sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy," Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1902): 30-41.

35. L. Guseva, "Zametki sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy," Russkaia shkola 7-8 (1895): 63-8.

36. N.M., "Iz zametok nachal'noi uchitel'nitsy. (Chtenie v shkol i shkolnykh tipy)," Russkaia shkola 12 (1897): 80-92.

37. A literacy schools (or free/wild schools) were informal institutions in which students learned only the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic. There was no official school year and the teacher was paid according to the number of children taught. Because parents paid individually to keep children in schools, they often had a great say in what was taught in these schools. Parental interference in teaching and curriculum choice was common.

38. A. Zelinskaia, "Iz dnevnika sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy. (Iz Ekaterinoslavskoi gubernii)," Obrazovanie 5-6 (1896): Sect. 2, 103-5.
39. N. Leont'eva, "O detskom chtenii. (Iz nabliudenii uchitel'nitsy)," Obrazovanie 11-12 (1905): Sect. 2, 111-41.
40. The pupil-teacher ratio in town schools was 1:50. In village schools, it was 1:56. Sinel, "Campaign" 498. Eklof, Russian Peasant 303-07 gives pupil-teacher ratio breakdown by school type and area of the Empire.
41. The standard teaching programs for two and three-year schools (zemstvo and church-parish) are printed in Eklof, Russian Peasant 483-7.
42. Byvshii uchitel', "Iz vospominanii sel'skago uchitelia. (Iz Permskoi gubernii)," Obrazovanie 5-6 (1896): Sect 2, 106.
43. K. Barsov, "Sel'skaia shkola i uchitel'. (Vospominaniia i zametki)," Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1896): 45-55; 7-8 (1896): 25-31.
44. V. Simonovskii, "Pismo iz provintsii," Russkaia shkola 11 (1897): 346-7.
45. Dido, "Zametki i nabliudenii. (Iz zametok byvshago sel'skago uchitelia)," Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1899): 179-89; 7-8 (1899): 195-200; 9 (1899): 237-46; 12 (1899): 176-82.
46. A. Barakshin, "Iz zapisok sel'skago uchitelia," Narodnoe obrazovanie 3 (1902): 249-54.
47. Eklof, Russian Peasant 192.
48. Russian Ministry of Public Instruction, Statisticheskiiia svedeniia po nachal'nomu obrazovaniiu v rossiskoi imperii vur IV, (Dannya 1900 goda), Ed. V.F. Famorkorskii and E.P. Kovalevskii, (St. Petersburg, 1903) 276-77.
49. The small number of schoolmistresses in this educational district who received pedagogical training probably reflects resistance to women in the profession as a result of German influence on the Baltic educational system. See Catherine Ekstein Stodolsky, "Missionary of the Feminine Mystique: The Female Teacher in Prussia and Bavaria, 1880-1920," diss., SUNY-Stony Brook, 1987.
50. Stat. Sved. 276-77.
51. Blinov 67.
52. Eklof, Russian Peasant 207.

53. Eklof, Russian Peasant 209 and V.R. Leikina-Svirskaiia, Intelligentsiia v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka, (Moscow: "Mysl'", 1971), 165.

54. Leikina-Svirskaiia 163.

55. Leikina-Svirskaiia 163.

CHAPTER III

TEACHING THROUGH JOURNAL WRITING

Journal articles were a combination of entertaining and instructive reading for educated subscribers.(1) This was especially so of articles in journals concerned with education. In a section of A. Anastasiev's extremely popular Public School Handbook for Constant Reference for Schoolmasters and Schoolmistresses in Primary Schools, K.D. Ushinskii (a famous pedagogue of the 1860s) is quoted as saying that educational literature helps a teacher feel that his modest job is one of the greatest activities in history.(2) Through literature, Ushinskii writes, a teacher's findings and questions are not limited to his school (or worse die with him), but fly to the ends of Russia and engender controversy.(3) Educational literature also introduces teachers to thoughts about and the literature concerning the teachers' lives.(4)

On one level, schoolmistresses' memoir/articles, which described and offered advice concerning classroom and community difficulties, fulfilled this mandate and thus participated in the discourse. When participation in the discourse is defined in this way, it is obvious that even Zelinskaia's pathetic letter -- in which she described the squalid huts and grave-like quiet (mogil'naia tishina) of the village in which she taught, and her coarse, dirty students -- entered the discourse. Zelinskaia also offered advice of a sort to readers. In her

memoir/article, Zelinskaia related that she dealt with her personal and professional difficulties through writing in her diary and then submerging herself in work. "I think about all this [her poverty and loneliness], take it all up in my diary, and then cast it away and take care of a stack of notebooks -- which, on this occasion, contained a lesson on calligraphy." (5)

Obviously, all the schoolmistresses who published memoir/articles adopted this survival strategy (venting frustration through writing) to some extent or another. After all, they all wrote and were published. However, they also employed specific tactics in difficult classroom and community situations, which they then presented to their intended audience in anecdotal form. The first two schoolmistresses to publish memoirs -- A. Simonovich (whose article concerned the moral and intellectual characteristics of rural students) and the anonymous author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" (whose memoir/article offered advice to uchitel'nitsy by discussing her own classroom mistakes and successes) established a format that their sisters followed. (6) Through anecdote and description, Simonovich and the anonymous author demonstrated successful teaching and survival strategies to teachers and those entering the profession.

Articles written by schoolmistresses for Narodnoe obrazovanie used the same literary techniques. However, there was one significant difference between the memoirs written for Russkaia shkola and Obrazovanie, and those for Narodnoe

obrazovanie. Although articles (like V. Elanskaia's "From the Memoirs of a Schoolmistress") addressed an intended audience directly "(h)ello there, my spiritual relations ... future schoolmistresses", they were read by a wider audience that was made up of both priests and church-parish schoolteachers.(7) Thus, it is not surprising that the answers these uchitel'nitsy presented to community and schoolroom problems all had a religious basis. Even V. Karpinskaia, a supporter of vospitanie, noted that her mentor Mar'ia Nikolaevna V. gave her children a strong foundation in religion. "She [M.N.V.] was truly an ideal schoolmistress, raising children on a foundation of religion, truth and love."(8)

Despite the differences engendered by journals' editorial policies and audience demographics, there were many common features in schoolmistresses' published writings. First, memoir/articles written by schoolmistresses offered individuals entering the profession a foretaste of the problems of teaching 50 children in a multi-class setting, the difficulty of reconciling vospitanie with training and educating illiterate children, and the alienation and loneliness of village life. Second, for individuals already in the profession, these writings offered successful techniques for improving classroom discipline and teaching skills, as well as suggestions on how to integrate into peasant communities.

A 1911 survey found that 72.3% of teachers felt that they had insufficient pedagogical experience and knowledge, while

30.2% had received insufficient preparation for living conditions.(9) Almost 46% of graduates from women's gymnasia and 30.2% of graduates from pro-gymnasia (respectively, the highest and fourth highest response rate) believed that they had received insufficient preparation for living conditions. Also, only 8.2% and 9.9% of graduates from gymnasia and pro-gymnasia respectively believed that they had received adequate preparation overall. Articles, such as those written by the 14 uchitel'nitsy this thesis features, attempted to fill the gap between academic preparation and day-to-day experience. Presented in memoir form, they entertained as well as instructed.

Schoolmistresses' Solutions to Problems in the Classroom

As this chapter is presenting the straight-forward and self-declared advice of schoolteachers to their intended audience, it will present the advice and teaching strategies with a minimum of analysis. The following is a sample of just a few of the techniques schoolmistresses utilized in order to teach and ensure classroom discipline. The problems they attempted to solve were surely common. The techniques they offered as solutions suffice to demonstrate both the breadth of uchitel'nitsy's difficulties and these women's capacity for creative problem-solving.

Each of the following difficulties was rooted in the environment in which the schoolmistresses taught. For example, there were difficulties associated with teaching children, who lived in an oral culture, to read. N.M. (a rural teacher from Petersburg province who published in Russkaia shkola) had such a difficulty and set about investigating the reasons.(10) She found that some of her students had to walk three to five versts home every night and that such a walk left little time for reading. Others had simply heard that the books were khudaia (bad, or worthless) and chose not to read them. Instead of accepting the situation or blaming her own teaching skills, N.M. devised a multi-faceted strategy.

At first, she attempted to shame her students into reading by asking questions about the books in class, but the children simply answered "prochital'" (I have read (it)).(11) Realizing that she would be forced to supervise the children as they read, she put aside two precious hours a week for in-class reading. In addition, she permitted only her best readers to take books home. At home, these students read aloud to their family and received attention and positive reinforcement. In this way, N.M. drew a connection between the ability to read well and the possession of books, which made good reading skills desirable. N.M.'s teaching strategy would have been useful to teachers who were finding it difficult to get peasant children, brought up in an oral culture, to read. It offered a series of practical techniques that could be modified to suit different conditions.

Schoolmistresses also experienced difficulties associated with reconciling the abstract ideology of vospitanie to the daily grind of teaching. For example, believing that she should teach to the dictates of abstract pedagogy, the author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" (who taught in a girls school in St. Petersburg and published in Russkaia shkola) drew up an overly structured educational plan during her first year of teaching and corrected fundamental rather than small mistakes:

[In this article] I am not enlarging upon trifling mistakes and blunders in the training side of the work, I am speaking only about fundamental errors. The greatest that I know of, and that I suffered along with many educators, is a unconsidered general teaching plan, foolishly giving oneself a complete account of the relative importance of each subject and the importance of each section of the subject.(12)

Of course, this author found it difficult to keep to her abstract educational plan in a classroom environment. Instead, she talked to the children, in order to find out which subjects they enjoyed most, and neglected subjects they found boring. At the end of the year, she found that her students' writing and mathematical skills had suffered.(13)

Because of the difficulties that teachers faced when children are sidetracked by their moods, excitement about the weather, and anticipation of upcoming festivities, this schoolmistress advised her readers that "in school activities it is not necessary for her [the schoolmistress], it seems to me, to have talent, or enthusiasm, or fervour. It is necessary to have strength of character, consistency, to be organized, even

[to have] some narrowness of intellect..."(14) For this reason, the anonymous author decided to forego a strict and theoretical lesson plan. She spent more time teaching and lecturing to each class.(15) This uchitel'nitsa's advice was directed to teachers who were finding it difficult reconciling the theoretical constraints of vospitanie with the logistics of teaching, and to future teachers likely to experience the same difficulty.

Schoolmistresses also experienced difficulties associated with discipline. E.R. (who taught in a girls' primary school in St. Petersburg and published in Russkaia shkola) had difficulty keeping her large class (divided into three sections) busy and quiet. This must have been a common problem for the 14 schoolmistresses because, as we have seen, all but one taught in a multi-class school. Such numbers forced teachers to forego (or, at least, moderate) vospitanie and to engage in mass classroom strategies. E.R. offered her readers a variety of disciplining strategies. First, she compromised on classroom discipline, allowing children to break into small groups to work and to listen (rather than work) when other sections were reading aloud. Second, she appointed classroom monitors to help maintain some semblance of order and to act as assistant teachers.(16) By using classroom monitors, E.R. ensured that the students became accustomed to disciplining themselves -- and each other -- to an external standard. By allowing only the best students to become monitors, she created a reward system in which the quietest and most academically capable were

rewarded.(17) Obviously, such behaviour soon would come to be seen as valuable. E.R. enforced this behavioural value system by bringing gifts to school for the most improved student.(18)

Third, E.R. ensured that her students burned off excess energy by engaging in active, but structured, games in the school's recreation room.(19) In the recreation room, rules -- replicating order in the classroom -- prevailed. Imitative games, in which the girls played drunken people and violent parents, were forbidden in favour of skipping and ball games that emphasized order and routine. E.R.'s article was addressed to teachers who had difficulty controlling their three-section classes alone -- whether urban or rural.

Of course, E.R.'s disciplining techniques were not alone. Other schoolmistresses advised their colleagues to use a series of verbal and socializing techniques that produced much better results than corporal punishment. Such techniques were fundamental to the philosophy of vospitanie, particularly as regards the development of its moral facet (better known as self-control). These techniques were doubtless more familiar to women from the upper and middle estates than those based upon physical punishment. However, they were unfamiliar to peasant and working class children, who lived in physically violent worlds.(20) Their very unfamiliarity made them very successful.

A. Simonovich (a gentry woman, who taught in a rural school and published in Russkaia shkola) noted bluntly, "I even believe that a word has a stronger effect upon them than physical

punishment, to which they are completely dulled, since instruction in rural homes is very severe." (21) In order to prove that words provided a better deterrent to mischief and apathy than physical violence, Simonovich recorded that, while it was common for local peasants to steal not only from the lord but also from each other, only two children stole from the school during her five-year term. (22) By appealing to her students' reason, rather than their fear, Simonovich attempted to instill a form of internal discipline; she also utilized a much more subtle and painful form of punishment -- guilt.

The establishment of internal discipline was one of the most important hallmarks of vospitanie. Schoolmistresses -- who published memoirs in Russkaia shkola and Narodnoe obrazovanie -- were proud of their ability to utilize this technique. In V. Karpinskaia's memoir/article "The Idealist", Karpinskaia's mentor Mar'ia Nikolaevna V. (who taught in a religiously-based private school) used her ability to instill guilt feelings -- and her students' fear of isolation from their fellows -- to inflict refined punishment. The most striking example of Mar'ia Nikolaevna's techniques was presented following an instance when a child stole a pen:

"Children, you can go home!" cried Mar'ia Nikolaevna through the open classroom door, "but remember, I am not pleased with you. Stealing does not occur among decent children. I am repelled. Until the guilty one is found, I will not walk with you in the festival; there will be no games. Nothing! No one will move from seats [during class]. [The room] will be grave silent, later on there can be whispers -- the voices of malicious children." (23)

Needless to say, when the children found out that they

would regain Mar'ia Nikolaevna's trust and be rewarded once the thief was found, it required only 20 minutes for them to discover and offer him up to the schoolmistress. The following interaction is appalling; it features the little boy explaining and begging "tietia Masha" (Aunt Mary) and "little auntie" (tietien'ka) to forgive him and Mar'ia Nikolaevna declaiming in front of the entire class that "God sees and hears everything."

(24) Having made her point, the schoolmistress then asked the class if the student really took the pen and should suffer the consequences. The class yelled, "he didn't take it, aunt Masha, he never took it! ... He is ashamed." (25) Her object lesson is thus complete.

By presenting themselves as against the use of corporal punishment, the above schoolmistresses entered the discourse concerning education on the side of liberal pedagogues, who supported the development of internal forms of classroom control. The methods of control they adopted instead of corporal punishment might seem cruel and class-bound to us, but at the time such methods were viewed as positive and enlightened. The methods forced peasant and working class children to adhere to and utilize techniques other than violence to solve disputes. And, because many schoolmistresses asked the children in their care when a misdemeanour was detected "... to think only one minute: is it possible or necessary to act like that?", the children became aware that it was within their power to act appropriately. (26)

As we have seen, schoolmistresses offered a wide variety of competent advice to their intended audience; however, one further point should be made before turning to schoolmistresses' solutions to problems in the community: often the above strategies reflected the locale and situations of the teachers who used them. For example, N.M.'s strategy to encourage reading among her students worked with rather than against the peasant commune's social norms. Her strategy utilized that oral culture's custom of storytelling to make the ability to read a desired talent. When her students read to their families, they took on the mantle of storyteller and integrated literacy into existing cultural norms.

Likewise, E.R.'s disciplining techniques were the natural result of a three-section class. They also reflected something of the factory for which a growing number of children -- both urban and rural -- were being groomed. In a three-class school, there was a greater emphasis on order and regime. Also, the separation of powers among monitors and teacher closely replicated the separation of authority between factory owner and foremen. While E.R. may or may not have been preparing her students to enter the industrial labour force, she was certainly not looking to the 'community' to enforce her lessons and her students' skills. She was looking to her students. As we have seen, both rural and urban schoolmistresses appealed to their students to discipline their peers according to the uchitel'nitsa's rules rather than those of the community.

Such a technique was central to the moral dimension of vospitanie.(27)

Obviously, schoolmistresses -- who could assess the environment in which they lived and taught, and impose external values and techniques -- were far from passive. They were strong women with a vision of their duty.

Schoolmistresses' Solutions to Problems in the Community

In order to explain why rural life and difficulties had been so shocking to her at first, Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. wrote that "like the greater part of beginner schoolmistresses, [I] knew rural life only through books and stories." (28) Inevitably, little of what she and others read prepared them for life in the countryside. In the late nineteenth century, most literature and journal articles concerning rural life presented idealized portraits of peasants and liberal reformers. Because they were generally written by intellectuals unexperienced in the realm described, even fiction and articles, which offered negative assessments of rural life focused on big issues (such as, illiteracy, bad agricultural practices and peasant alcoholism). Little attention was paid to the daily risks taken by teachers faced with unsanitary conditions and disease. Even less space was dedicated to discussion of the politics necessary for survival in a rural community. Thus, many women (who may

have been convinced to enter the profession by articles written by pedagogues) would have been surprised by the number of unremarkable, yet difficult situations they encountered daily.

In many ways, schoolmistresses' problems in communities (especially peasant communities) in which they usually lived and taught were much more stressful and dangerous than the difficulties they encountered in the classroom. Among the 14 memoir/articles, there are two accounts of drunken crowds of muzhiki (male peasants) marching on a teacher's home to dispense vigilante justice.(29) In E.S.'s article, the crowd was looking for an alleged arsonist, who was known to be a friend of the teacher for whom she worked. Of course, the teacher was also threatened.(30) In Olga Nikolaevna Ko--ka's article, a crowd of drunken peasants marched on (but did not reach) her home. The crowd was seeking to punish her because she -- and not a local peasant boy (newly graduated from the teaching seminary) -- had received the posting to their school.(31) Such situations must have been very frightening and relatively frequent, if the 1 in 7 ratio gleaned from my research is any indication.

Uchitel'nitsy, particularly those who worked in the countryside, couldn't fail to understand the precariousness of their position. As representatives of a literate, outside authority, they presented a threat to local authorities, priest and commune elders -- as did schoolmasters:

An end to socially restricted literacy jeopardized the officials' traditional functions of interpreting the law, mediating with the outside world, and interpreting the sacred texts. On a simpler level, expanded literacy meant that anyone could verify the accounts of the village and volost' offices.(32)

Of course, as unmarried women, schoolmistresses presented an additional threat to social norms in the village. In a staunchly patriarchal world, in which wife beating was common, the schoolmistress was a woman with no man to govern her.(33) She was also living proof that girls could learn to read and, once having acquired this skill, need not necessarily marry. Rose Glickman has found that literate peasant women had a greater tendency to remain unmarried by choice.(34) This was because they could then find employment outside of the home and make their livings as teachers (usually in church-parish schools), readers for the dead, fel'dsheri and literate herbalists. Schoolmistresses may have been perceived as a socially disruptive role model upon which peasant girls could pattern.

The uchitel'nitsa's status, based as it was upon her education and social class, undermined established peasant power and family structures. Knowing that their position was a vulnerable one, schoolmistresses developed survival strategies. The following are just a few of the strategies -- the most common -- that schoolmistresses who wrote passed on to their sisters in the profession.

It should be noted that these strategies were more

important to women who taught in the countryside than to urban schoolmistresses. The explanation for this is primarily environmental. In the city, single female wage earners were common and literacy was a desirable skill.(35) Urban schoolmistresses thus had higher status and greater access to protectors.

I.K. Chuvasheva (who taught in a rural, two-class church-parish school and published in Narodnoe obrazovanie) faced a most difficult challenge when integrating into the northern community to which she had been posted. She was rejected outright by the villagers for a number of reasons. First, they had a relatively high standard of living already and thus felt that literacy was a useless skill.(36) "The members of the community are free to do anything they like," the priest explained to Chuvasheva. "Everyone squanders money on drink. Everyone is involved in forestry or fishing. They don't need a school."(37) Second, villagers were opposed to having a schoolmistress; already three schoolmistresses had taught at and left the school in two years.(38) The community had boasted to the priest before her arrival that Chuvasheva "won't be the first we have sent off." (Ne pervaiia tak otpravliaetsia).

Instead of taking the priest's advice and returning home, Chuvasheva -- who was afraid of never finding another teaching position because she did not have a teaching certificate -- decided to make herself invaluable to the community.(39) When only four children -- two boys and two girls -- reported to

school, she taught those that did to sing hymns (molenii). This impressed the community. As well, she gave Sunday readings (some "divine"). Soon, 50 or 60 people of all ages were attending her Sunday readings and saying afterward to chat.(40) Gradually, the schoolmistress won the trust of the community and the next school year 25 children -- eight of them girls -- entered grade one and four remained for grade two.(41) By using her imagination and demonstrating to the villagers that the ability to read was useful even in their self-sufficient community, Chuvasheva created a place for herself and her school.

Ben Eklof has noted many instances where the teaching of hymns and religious instruction were considered an unproductive burden by teachers.(42) It is worthy of note that the teachers he was investigating were employed in zemstvo schools and were mostly men, who believed that teaching was a profession with a value they should not have to promote.(43) In parish schools, however, religious study and hymn singing were integrated into the curriculum. Chuvasheva's article served the dual purpose of advising uchitel'nitsy on survival skills in a hostile community and demonstrating a direct relationship between the success of the school and that institution's symbiotic relationship with the church. For this reason, Chuvasheva's article offered the teachers who read it a survival strategy for use not only within the village community in which they lived and worked, but also within the political realm of the church-parish school system.

By contrast, Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. (who taught in a three-class rural school and published in Russkaia shkola) offered an entirely different series of strategies to her readership. E.S. was rejected in a more personal way than Chuvasheva. That is, she was rejected because she was the new teacher, rather than simply a schoolmistress -- any schoolmistress. She was the recipient of "cold looks" (kholodny byli vzliady krest'ian), and when she walked through town the villagers would watch her and comment out loud:

Usually when I went to town, my children [students] would catch sight of me and begin to yell "the new teacher is coming", and right away everyone would crowd into courtyards and looked through chinks [in their fences]. As I strolled along they came up with and made their remarks aloud concerning me, but as soon as I glanced back, they were all once again hiding. Thus, it was impossible to detect who had spoken.(44)

E.S. responded to this isolation and insult by becoming great friends with the children in her care. She became a "well-loved older sister" (starshaia liubimaia sestra), who had the children over as company on long winter nights.(45) At the same time, she became invaluable to the community as a doctor of sorts.

The nearest medical orderly, or fel'dsher, was seven versts away and the nearest doctor was 20.(46) Besides, not all the peasants had horses or were able to pay the fee for medical treatment either offered. Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. realized this and provided her services free of charge. After she had successfully nursed three children in the village back to health, she was accepted by the village. "Life was good for me

with the students and people, but the sun didn't always shine. We often ran up against clouds."(47)

One such cloud was the schoolmaster for whom E.S. worked. He resented her relationship with the people in the village and began to spread rumours about her. For a while, she lived with the hope that their relationship would improve, but eventually she decided to transfer schools. The last three paragraphs of E.S.'s article justify that transfer. As justification, Elizaveta Nikolaevna wrote that she had taught her students to love one another, that her post represented only the first step in her pedagogical activity, and that it was really the job (not her feelings) which was most important. "I was sorry to abandon everyone, but I didn't cry, -- no, I knew that I was going to another village, to a school, where I would do my well-loved work."(48)

Elizaveta Nikolaevna S.'s memoir/article offered teachers who read it complex solutions to a complex series of difficulties. First, she demonstrated how the company of children could solve the problem of rural loneliness.(49) Second, she showed how a teacher, as a healer, could become an accepted member of the community. Third, she demonstrated to teachers, who may have been unhappy in their posts, that it was perfectly acceptable for them to transfer schools if and when daily life became intolerable. She also justified their transfers through the philosophy of 'small deeds.' That is, E.S. emphasized that, as a teacher (and a healer), she was

valuable to all people in all villages and all children in all schools. When she moved, Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. insisted that she was not leaving the people; instead, she was moving on to others who needed her equally.

Another technique uchitel'nitsy utilized in order to protect themselves and to integrate into the village community was mentioned, but never discussed explicitly in any of the memoir/articles. However, the implications of the technique -- which involved teachers surrounding themselves with students and attempting to establish themselves in the position of "aunt" -- seem obvious. (As we have seen, V. Karpinskaia's mentor Mar'ia Nikolaevna V. was called tietia Masha (aunt Mary) by her students, even when she was punishing them.(50)) The technique was an attempt to create a pseudo-familial relationship with the children they taught. Out of this relationship came affection as well as security.

Former teacher and pedagogue P. Salomatin maintained that schoolmistresses were more liable to insult and assault -- both physical and sexual -- than schoolmasters.(51) One of the chief reasons for this was that the schoolmistress usually lived alone in an isolated hut or schoolhouse. (Remember most districts and townships forbade female teachers from marrying.) By encouraging children to spend evenings and nights with her, the uchitel'nitsa reduced the physical threat. In the city, where a schoolmistresses' status was higher and physical space more secure, such tactics were not adopted. In fact, in a letter

printed in S.K. Govorov's The Marriage Question in the Lives of Educators, a 38 year-old urban schoolmistress demonstrated that she had no need for such tactics. She described the negative results of having her biological niece live with her for a time. Instead of being a benefit, the niece's presence was a heavy and unpleasant weight on her social and professional life.(52)

Uchitel'nitsy acted the part of the "aunt" for another related reason. By offering tired parents some respite, that is by acting as a babysitting service, they hoped to earn some community support. The schoolmistress also confirmed her tie to the children and thus acted out an appropriate female role. Even among peasants, aunts and older sisters were women who cared for children alongside mothers. In fact, the most common reason why older peasant girls were prevented from attending school was that they were at home taking care of younger children.(53) By presenting herself in a nurturing (that is, child care) role, the uchitel'nitsa drew attention away from her status as what Ben Eklof has called an (educated and female) "outsider in the village". She instead hoped to integrate into the village by taking on tasks that were expected of someone of her gender. Martha Vicinus, author of Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920, has argued that single women commonly adopted this strategy of establishing surrogate families in order to appear respectable.(54)

This comparison of the teacher to the maiden aunt surely had resonance for young female readers, who had grown up in the

middle and upper estates. In her book Cordial Relations: The Maiden Aunt in Fact and Fiction, Katherine Moore shows that the maiden aunt was portrayed positively in nineteenth century fiction; she was also viewed as a helpmate by many children -- intervening between them and unthinking parents.(55) By writing as though the uchitel'nitsa was an aunt, the schoolmistress formed and presented her readers with a picture of the female professional that was very different (as we shall see) from the male vision of the professional. Lacking a vocabulary that held words for a single career woman, the schoolmistress compared herself to perhaps the one single lady she had ever known -- the maiden aunt.

Advice from Schoolmasters' Articles

Schoolmistresses' memoir/articles were primarily concerned with students, teaching techniques and the difficulties of living in a peasant community. By contrast, schoolmasters' articles were concerned with the raising and equalization of salaries, provision of better living quarters, improved social and educational benefits for teachers' children, and a significant improvement in schoolteachers' status. This divergence in content is easily explained; it reflects the divergent gender and class-based interests and needs of male and female writers and readers. For example, in 1911 44.2% of

schoolmasters were married, as compared to 15.7% of schoolmistresses.(56) As their memoir/articles presumably served the same purpose as uchitel'nitsy articles -- to give advice to those already in the profession and a foretaste of a schoolteacher's life to those preparing to become teachers -- it is not surprising that the five schoolmasters (although unmarried) should have emphasized the difficulties married teachers faced. It is logical that schoolmasters (who were more likely to marry) would have placed greater emphasis on their role as breadwinner, and on the problems therein.(57)

V. Simonovskii (who taught in a rural school and published in Russkaia shkola) presented a dire picture of the status of schoolmasters, which was striking but hardly unique. "If the position of an unmarried schoolmaster is unenviable, then the state of a teacher who has a family is positively hopeless. The life of a schoolmaster with a family is a sorrowful tale of material deprivation, difficult work and mental torture."(58) According to Ben Eklof's calculations, Simonovskii's description -- although pitiful --was accurate. Budget studies from 1900 and 1910 "showed that married teachers with two children spent 74 per cent of their annual income (372 rubles) on food; those with three children spent 86 per cent."(59)

Concern with issues of status is also directly attributable to teachers' genders and social backgrounds. As the majority of schoolmasters were peasants, who had sought a career other than farming, it is not surprising that they hoped to improve their

status through becoming teachers. Most, if we are to believe Eklof, were disappointed.(60) Schoolmasters' memoir/articles offered examples of teachers' (especially rural teachers') low status. K. Barsov (who taught in a rural school and published in Russkaia shkola) wrote, "and the clerk, the village constable, elders, etc. -- people not at all refined -- all, you see, want to play the role of a boss in front of the schoolmaster."(61) He also related a few stories to demonstrate the powerlessness of primary schoolteachers. For example:

on an alarming day, at the end of 18 years in an impoverished town mister innkeeper Karp Parfenov took it into his head by way of some petty official [who noted that the schoolmaster] ("doesn't make the sign of the cross before a meal, ordered eggs on fast day, goes around in a red shirt") caused a teacher in A---skoi school [to be called] "sitsilista" [socialist]... Pedagogical activity was closed to him, and he had to look for other work.(62)

Perceived as representatives of the government and literate culture, teachers faced other difficulties in peasant communities. For example, "Byvshii uchitel'", or Former schoolmaster, (who taught in a rural school in Perm province and published in Obrazovanie) described the difficulties teachers could experience with priests and parish schools. He phrased the conflict almost metaphorically, "The rural school, in which I served, and the church-parish [school] occupy two adjacent church houses."(63) Then "Byvshii uchitel'" showed how the priest and teacher battled for control of students in the peasant village. In opposition to the priest's communal

authority, the teacher offered better quality of instruction and a better success rate in the graduating exam.(64)

In the same way that schoolmistresses' memoir/articles offered their readers solutions to problems, schoolmasters' writings offered readers suggestions on how to deal with difficult situations. Just as uchitel'nitsy experienced different situations and circumstances than uchitel'ia, the solutions they offered varied radically -- as did the ways in which they were expressed. For example, in order to improve the status of schoolteachers and the quality of education in village communities, K. Barsov created and published a 10-point plan. It is as follows:

- 1) To build school buildings according to a drawn-up plan and furnish the school with model class furniture.
- 2) To commit a rural doctor to make periodic examinations of students.
- 3) To select a trustee for supplying poor students with clothes and shoes.
- 4) To give students breakfast with hot food.
- 5) To build a library in the school with sections: a) for children and b) for adults.
- 6) To improve the material status of teachers (salary and pension; provide schools on land with a garden and market-garden).
- 7) To build a free library for teachers and to organize the circulation of books on timed loans.
- 8) To invite teachers' representatives to commissions, to school councils, etc., when they consider questions that affect schools and teachers.
- 9) To make arrangements for teachers' congresses: a) at uezd and raion and b) guberniia.

10) To publish a newspaper strictly for rural teachers.(65)

In contrast to schoolmistresses' memoir/articles, which presented personal answers to problems in the classroom and community, Barsov's points were straight-forward demands for greater planning and investment in the educational system; as well, he asked for a greater say by teachers in their working and living conditions. His memoir/article was published in 1896 -- a period when professional association and conferences were viewed with suspicion by the government. For this reason, his program is strikingly political in nature.

V. Simonovskii's letter detailing the policies and expenditures of the Khorol zemstvo to improve the material conditions of rural teachers and to ensure proper upkeep of school buildings also offered readers a plan. Although it is implied rather than stated, Simonovskii is obviously presenting his letter as a basis from which other teachers can negotiate. His final sentence was almost a blessing. "From our souls we hope that this good example of the Khorol zemstvo will be followed by other zemstva in our guberniia."(66)

On a more basic level, both "Byvshii uchitel'" and A. Barakshin (who taught in a rural school and published in Narodnoe obrazovanie) advised teachers to plan ahead and work hard if they want to be accepted into rural communities; that is, to demonstrate that teachers deserved respect, instead of simply expecting it. Because the journals in which they

published had different agendas, the two men -- not surprisingly -- offer descriptions of divergent community pressures.

"Byvshii uchitel'" faced off against the local priest and commune elders, while Barakshin was the priest's ally but suspect to the peasant community.

Yet, interestingly, despite their divergent perspectives and place of publication, both offered similar basic advice to readers: win peasant support by giving villagers what they want. Of course, as should be expected, their definitions of peasant wants were different and reflected the bias of the journal in which each published. "Byvshii uchitel'" believed that peasants wanted to read. He wrote, "all these facts from my practical experience, and confirmed by other rural teachers, clearly convinced us of a conscious desire among the people for reading and thus the necessity of a school library, which exists in only some rural schools. And which I have never met in a church-parish school."(67) Barakshin, by contrast, believed that the people wanted a greater input into their church. He noted, "improving influence and circumstance ... permitted me to manage in the very first year of my service to form a largish choir from my students and we sang in the local church, and, as is well-known, peasants like this very much."(68) "Byvshii uchitel'" pleased the community by giving his students (their children) better reading skills, while Barakshin impressed the villagers by teaching their children to sing hymns.

This chapter has discussed the content and advice schoolmistresses and schoolmasters offered their readers in memoir/articles. Both groups offered descriptions of future lives to those preparing to enter the profession, as well as suggestions on how to change or improve conditions to those already employed as teachers. While schoolmistresses offered their audience individual (personal) teaching techniques and suggestions for integrating into male-dominated communities, schoolmasters suggested group action and province-wide strategies for raising teachers' standard of living and status.

The differences in article content are easily comprehensible when the educational and social backgrounds of male and female schoolteachers are taken into account. Most uchitel'nitsy received secondary education but not pedagogical training; also, a vast majority were urban-born. Thus, it is logical that schoolmistresses should offer advice on the skills which they lacked upon first entering the profession -- that is, teaching skills and rural survival skills. As most uchitel'ia had received some form of teacher training and the vast majority were peasant-born, little had to be communicated on the level of teaching or living in a peasant community. What did have to be discussed were the economic and social difficulties faced by teachers, especially those with families.(69)

As outsiders (particularly) in village communities, schoolmistresses were (often rightly) liable to attribute their difficulties to their class and gender. Thus, their answers to problems were personal and individual. Because schoolmasters were accustomed to rural life, they were more likely to attribute their difficulties to their jobs. For this reason, they sought redress of their difficulties through typically professional channels --that is, through demanding greater expenditures on education and increased participation in decision-making when it concerned schools and teachers.

All elementary schoolteachers -- who offered advice concerning and descriptions of the living and working conditions of teachers -- supported the dominant discourse (at least, superficially). The famous pedagogue K.D. Ushinskii had written that teachers should read and become involved with the literature concerning education. A. Anastasiev's widely-read teachers' handbook reiterated and supported this admonishment. Elementary teachers' descriptions of the difficulties they faced both in the classroom and in the community supported the dark picture pedagogues painted of teachers' lives (and thus of the educational system). Memoir/articles that noted instances where schoolmistresses were rejected because of their gender and schoolmasters were placed at the mercy of village gossips recalled the stereotype (created and reinforced by pedagogues) of elementary teacher as victim.

Reflections of this stereotype appeared in many

memoir/articles, as did vocabulary and situations espoused by journal editors. For example, vospitanie and concern with the importance of reading featured prominently in memoir/articles published in the liberal journals Russkaia shkola and Obrazovanie, and to a lesser extent in Narodnoe obrazovanie. By contrast, a majority of events in memoir/articles published in Narodnoe obrazovanie took place in a religious context -- often in a church. Doubtless, the articles written by schoolteachers seemed very useful to editors attempting to form 'emotional and cultural habits' among their readers. Surely, they were chosen for publication by journal editors, who were attempting to present a portrait of the ideal schoolteacher. What journal editors failed to notice, however, was that many of the memoir/articles (those written by uchitel'nitsy) contained another layer of discourse -- one that challenged the dominant discourse. Chapter 4 will provide an analysis of this counter-discourse.

Endnotes

1. Ware, "Some Aspects" 28.
2. Anastasiev vol. 2, 31.
3. Anastasiev vol. 2, 31.
4. Anastasiev vol. 2, 31.
5. Zelinskaia, Obrazovanie 105.

6. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 18 and "Pervyi god", Russkaia shkola 38.
7. Elanskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 5.
8. Karpinskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 186.
9. Eklof, Russian Peasant 203.
10. N.M., Russkaia shkola 81-84.
11. N.M., Russkaia shkola 81-2.
12. "Pervyi god", Russkaia shkola 49.
13. "Pervyi god", Russkaia shkola 50-1.
14. "Pervyi god", Russkaia shkola 52.
15. "Pervyi god", Russkaia shkola 63.
16. E.R., Russkaia shkola 7-8: 32-3.
17. Originally she had allowed all the students to act as monitors in turn but finally chose monitors based upon performance in homework assignments.
18. E.R., Russkaia shkola 7-8: 26.
19. E.R., Russkaia shkola 9: 47-55.
20. See Guseva, Russkaia shkola 64-5 on domestic violence; Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 35-6 on alcoholism; and Anastasiev vol.2, 33 on the immoral environment in which most peasant and working class children grew up.
21. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 34.
22. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 35.
23. Karpinskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 184.
24. Karpinskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 185.
25. Karpinskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 185.
26. E.S., Russkaia shkola 32.
27. This technique was probably easier to implement in urban settings where community values and traditions -- if they every existed -- broke down quickly. See Rose Glickman, Russian Factory Women: Workplace and Society, 1880-1914, (Berkeley:

University of California Press, 1984) 120 concerning married workers' and working women's separation from even the world of "zemliachestvo". Also, see Barbara Alpern Engel, "The Working Class Family in Urban Russia", a paper given August 1988 at the Conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire for an idea of the divisive and competitive nature of day-to-day living in Russian cities.

28. E.S., Russkaia shkola 30.

29. See Cathy Frierson, "Crime and Punishment in the Russian Village: Rural Concepts of Criminality at the End of the Nineteenth Century," Slavic Review, Spring 1987, 55-69 for examples of the violence of peasant vigilante justice.

30. E.S., Russkaia shkola 39.

31. Ko--ka, Russkaia shkola 64-5.

32. Eklof, Russian Peasant 226.

33. Rose Glickman, "Women and the Peasant Commune," Land Commune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial Russia and Early Soviet Society, Ed. Roger Bartlett, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), 312-338 and Atkinson, "Society and the Sexes in the Russian Past".

34. Glickman, "Women and Commune" 333. At present, there is not enough information to suggest that uchitel'nitsy acted as role models for the peasant girls that went on to teach in growing number in the period under examination.

35. Johanson 124 nn 13, "Literacy among urban women was more than thrice that of female peasants: 35.6 percent versus 9.8 percent." For a more complete breakdown of literacy in Russia see Rashin 284-311.

36. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 4.

37. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 4.

38. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 1.

39. Chuvashева persists in her position not only out of conviction and stubbornness, but because she is economically forced into teaching. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 1.

40. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 6.

41. Chuvashева, Narodnoe obrazovanie 9: 114.

42. Eklof, "Peasant Sloth" 356-8 and 371-4.

43. There is also the question of teacher status, which as we will see in Chapter 4, seemed to be lowered when teachers were forced to use such techniques.
44. E.S., Russkaia shkola 31.
45. E.S., Russkaia shkola 32 and 35.
46. E.S., Russkaia shkola 39.
47. E.S., Russkaia shkola 41.
48. E.S., Russkaia shkola 41.
49. N.D. Kivshenko, Dnevnik sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy, (St. Petersburg: Fontanka, 1887), 16-18.
50. Karpinskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 185.
- 51.. P. Salomatin, Kak zhivet i rabotaet narodnyi uchitel', (St. Petersburg: "Prometei", 1912), 58-60.
52. Govorov, 49.
53. Anastasiev vol. 2, 42.
54. Martha Vicinus, Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), 12.
55. Katharine Moore, Cordial Relations: The Maiden Aunt in Fact and Fiction, (London: Heinemann, 1966) 2-3. "There are few people whose youth has not owned the influence of at least one such dear good soul. It may be a good habit, the first interest in some life-loved pursuit or favourite author, some counsel enforced by narratives of real life: it may be only the periodical return of gifts and kindness ... we all owe something to such an aunt, the fairy godmothers of real life".
56. Eklof, Russian Peasant 192.
57. S.F. Ts, "V zashchitu zamushnikh uchitel'nits'," Russkaia shkola, 4 (1904): Sect 2, 64-7 notes that an average teacher's salary is sufficient for personal maintenance but is insufficient for supporting a family.
58. Simonovskii, Russkaia shkola 346.
59. Eklof, "Face to the Village" 345.
60. Eklof, Russian Peasant 220-237.

61. Barsov, Russkaia shkola 7-8: 30.
62. Barsov, Russkaia shkola 7-8: 30.
63. Byvshii uchitel', Obrazovanie 106.
64. Byvshii uchitel', Obrazovanie 108.
65. Barsov, Russkaia shkola 7-8: 31.
66. Simonovskii, Russkaia shkola 347.
67. Byvshii uchitel', Obrazovanie 107.
68. Barakshin, Narodnoe obrazovanie 251.
69. Especially as by becoming a teacher these peasant men were alienated from village life and community (through their education and altered expectations) in the same way as Sam Ramer's fel'dsheri. See Samuel C. Ramer, "Childbirth and Culture: Midwifery in the Nineteenth-Century Russian Countryside," The Family in Imperial Russia: New Lines of Historical Research, Ed. David L. Ransel, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978).

CHAPTER IV

LAYERS WITHIN THE DISCOURSE

As R.J. Ware has noted, the type of articles that appeared in journals required readers to do more than simply read them. They demanded that readers respond -- either through actions or by catching semi-concealed allusions and drawing unarticulated conclusions.(1) While Chapter 3 listed the advice (or calls to action) offered by primary schoolteachers, this chapter will uncover the subtle allusions and conclusions in uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles. It will do so by locating and examining "archetypal" moments in their texts.

Archetypal moments are points in texts that connect the anecdotal experiences of one individual with the dominant discourse. Such moments contained vocabulary and descriptions of behaviour that were heavy with meaning for the reader. One simplistic example of an archetypal moment occurred when schoolmistresses discussed the importance of vospitanie to their job. None of the 14 uchitel'nitsy this thesis investigates defined vospitanie. However, when they used this word, schoolmistresses were conveying their educational philosophy to readers and were indicating an understanding (no matter how limited) of the prevailing pedagogical discourse.

The presence of archetypal moments in texts calls attention to these texts' literary qualities. The presence of specific vocabulary, plot devices of greater or lesser subtlety, and

literary themes emphasizes this fact. The literary quality of these writings reminds readers that the uchitel'nitsy wrote their memoirs after the fact and thus chose to imbue specific incidents with a greater reality (or a higher meaning) -- a technique that implies purpose. As Chapter 3 demonstrated, part of this purpose was to teach. This chapter will show that memoir/articles were also written for the purposes of entering into and sometimes challenging the dominant discourse concerning education -- especially with reference to the portrait of the uchitel'nitsy.

One particularly interesting fact discussed in this chapter is the extent to which schoolmistresses used the vocabulary and literary techniques of the dominant discourse to further their particular interests. In other words, this chapter will indicate how they used literary techniques to establish a counter-discourse. In order to demonstrate that these interests were rooted in gender-based needs, this chapter will also examine schoolmasters' archetypal moments.

Methodology

While Chapter 3 matter-of-factly presented the contents and stated desires of schoolmistresses, this chapter will dig beneath the surface of uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles to uncover half-hidden meanings offered to an intended audience along with

advice concerning teaching. Vera Sandomirsky Dunham, who noted that realist fiction was darker than it needed to be, also wrote that Russian male writers and intellectuals accepted women's participation in public life and literary ventures only if they did not challenge men's egos.(2) Barbara Heldt has shown how women writers in nineteenth century Russia avoided directly challenging male literary figures -- who had created and continually reinforced the stereotype of the passive, martyred heroine -- by writing and publishing memoirs.(3)

The memoir -- written at home for self or family -- was considered to be a domestic art and craft and thus a suitable vehicle for women writers. "Women writers grew up and remained inside houses: domestic interiors or gardens figure as the chief locus of their writing."(4) However, the limited geographical range of women's memoirs did not limit their power or insight. These memoirs frequently referred to social issues, such as economic oppression and sexism.

For schoolmistresses -- who lived and worked in the public sphere -- memoir writing was a tricky undertaking.(5) As was noted earlier, there were few career alternatives for women. Uchitel'nitsy could not afford to alienate their employers or the pedagogues who controlled the educational discourse. For this reason, while (as we will see) they opposed the embarrassing stereotype of schoolmistress as passive martyr, female teachers were reduced to presenting their opinions in a type of code.(6) This means that instead of stating opinions

in the body of the text, schoolmistresses offered opinions and self-perceptions in text details.(7) Indicating the political and covert nature of such a text, feminist literary critic Patricia Yaeger calls similar women's writings "terrorist texts".(8) And she maintains that through these text details and anecdotes (or archetypal moments), uchitel'nitsy attained "an unprecedented power of dialogue with the dominant tradition, a power, above all, of interrupting that tradition and revealing its violence."(9)

In the following section, we will see how uchitel'nitsy deliberately connected their work to the world of 'small deeds' reformism and 'service to Russian people'. Also, schoolmistresses demonstrated through anecdotal comment and archetypal moment that they were capable, powerful people. As Toby Clymas' article on women physicians revealed, they did so in a similar ways as other contemporary female professionals. "In the initial sections [of her memoir/article], [Dr. Aptekman] sets out to debunk the negative image society has of the woman physician." (10)

Archetypal Moments that Demonstrate Schoolmistresses' Positive Self-image

Aleksandra Tolmachevskaja (who taught in an Odessa multi-class, multiple-teacher school and published in Russkaia shkola)

offered her readers the most straight-forward rationale for her choice to become a teacher. She began teaching in 1878, under the spell of narodnichestvo (or populist) literature. "People who were young then lived through an interesting ideological time and went 'to the people' with conviction. It was necessary to prepare yourself, and we greedily fell upon it all." (11) By naming narodniki as her role models, Tolmachevskaja emphasized her desire to serve the people. She also indicated her developed political ideology.

Tolmachevskaja reinforced the importance of her political ideology through a series of meaningful descriptions, which deliberately connected her memoir/article (published in 1914) with the Russian revolutionary tradition. First, Tolmachevskaja indicated that the Russian people's difficulties weighed heavily upon her. Just as a number of Russian revolutionaries, Vera Zasulich among them, were unable to dismiss the difficulties experienced by workers and peasants from their minds, Tolmachevskaja and her cousin, Masha, found themselves unable to dance or laugh or sleep without thinking about the benighted masses (temnoi narod). (12) Second, she and Masha stayed up all night and swore dramatically to serve the people. As she described it, the scene is reminiscent of Herzen's and Orgarev's oath on the Sparrow Hills:

Masha in ecstasy seized my hand. "Swear by this sombre, befouled heaven, swear by these shining stars, swear by this night and on your life that you will serve the people..."
 "I swear!" I repeated in a voice weakened by emotion. "I swear!" (13)

Third, Tolmachevskaja noted how her decision to become a teacher was strongly opposed by her family and how she persisted despite them in her decision.(14)

Tolmachevskaja thus offered her decision to become a teacher as one natural to an energetic young woman who was raised at a specific time in Russia's history -- a time in which the phrase 'service to the people' was common currency. She presented her decision in this way to place it in a wider context -- a context in which such a decision represented higher values and a respected alternative to matrimony. Thus, when she became a teacher, Tolmachevskaja was not just taking up a career but also entering into service to the 'people'. Such service had its own emotional and social rewards. And, it was in fulfilment of the dictates of a contemporary discourse.

Although they began teaching closer to the turn of the twentieth century, a similar desire to serve is present in the memoir/articles of Olga Nikolaevna Ko--ka (who taught in a rural zemstvo school and published in Russkaia shkola) and V. Elanskaia (who taught in a rural church parish school and published in Narodnoe obrazovanie). This is not surprising because the period 1890-1905 was synonymous with the era of 'small deeds'. As Chapter 1 noted, 'small deeds' were individual actions of a reformist nature carried out by Russian professionals and other educated persons. Because Russia was an autocracy, it was impossible for these individuals to change conditions of life or work for the country's people through

legislation (as, for example, in England). Instead, members of obshchestvo (educated society) created philanthropic organizations or sought employment with zemstva. Their service to the people was of a personal, not (overtly) political nature.

Both Ko--ka and Elanskaia used the analogy of being on fire to describe their desire to teach, to serve. Ko--ka wrote: "I burned (ia gorela) with a desire to go soon to a rural school, in order to give every thing of myself to it. My dreams were ardent, my soul was bursting..."(15) Elanskaia wrote: "I didn't live, I burned. My soul lived...I didn't know (then or now) boredom or melancholy."(16) By using such descriptive and resonant phrases as the above, both schoolmistresses conveyed a passion, a fervour, that was almost missionary in quality.

Because of the type of school in which Elanskaia taught and the ideological slant of the journal in which she published, such a passion for service is understandable. Parish schoolmistresses were most frequently clergymen's daughters or peasant girls trained at parish schools.(17) Thus, her passion for service can be seen to have developed quite logically out of the service and missionary ethic emphasized in the New Testament, which she surely had studied throughout her education. It also offered a devotional justification for her unmarried status. The "burning" and the awakening of soul that Elanskaia experienced as an uchitel'nitsa were directly attributable to her service to the church and thus to God. The female teachers, who read her article, would have understood

this at once and found her testimony invigorating and reinforcing.

For these readers, the literal truth of Elanskaia's article was not the issue. Instead, what it implied and offered was of greater importance. Elanskaia's memoir/article offered her intended audience a justification other than selfishness or economic need for a woman to enter the teaching profession. It subsumed a personal need (perhaps to avoid the violence and oppression of peasant life) under the greater call to service. Thus, Elanskaia's memoir/article assured her readers that a church-parish schoolmistress served God and her students, and only then her own will.

In the same way, it is impossible to separate Ko--ka's article and the statement that she "burned with the desire to go to a rural school" from the context in which she offered it to Russkaia shkola's readers. We have already determined that Russkaia shkola encouraged and supported 'small deeds' reform, a task that included offering positive role models and practical tips on performing the deeds. Olga Nikolaevna's article should be viewed in this light. While mention is made of the difficult economic situation her family fell into after the death of her father, Ko--ka is adamant that she had wanted to teach even before her father's death. "In the first gymnasium class, I always explained the lessons to poor students, and in the fourth class [a year before her father's death] I already gave private lessons teaching children to read."(18) Even if Ko--ka had not

actually experienced an almost physical need to teach in a rural school at age 19, she would have been aware -- because she trained in a teaching seminary and most probably read pedagogical journals -- that such a statement was expected of a schoolmistress role model.(19) This is not to say that Olga Nikolaevna did not honestly feel the "burning"; rather that by using such a phrase, she deliberately entered the discourse surrounding education and demonstrated that her personal anecdotes were of more than passing interest to pedagogues and teachers. Her memoir/article represented the trials, tribulations and triumphs of an individual committed to 'small deeds' reformism.

Schoolmistresses' Archetypal Moments That Challenged the Dominant Discourse

In Chapter 3, Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. remarked that she, like many beginning teachers, had no exposure to rural life other than through books and stories. Obviously, the only exposure most had to the lives of rural schoolmistresses was also through fiction and journal articles. As we have seen, the dominant discourse concerning schoolmistresses painted a romantic portrait of the uchitel'nitsa as a genteel woman fighting a courageous (and ultimately doomed) battle against ignorance and immorality. Her passivity and self-abnegation were qualities designated as attractive by a society led by

liberal male writers and intellectuals. The literary construction of schoolmistress must have been very appealing to altruistic young women. By contrast, the reality of a schoolmistress' life (particularly, a rural schoolmistress') must have been a great shock. The reality of powerlessness and dependency was surely not as romantic as it had been made to seem.

Uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles offered a foretaste of this shock to young women preparing to enter the profession and empathy to schoolmistresses, who had already experienced the shock. Uchitel'nitsy communicated their challenge to the dominant discourse through archetypal moments. The following are just a few of the most striking archetypal moments written with an intended audience of female elementary teachers in mind. The first such archetypal moment concerns bright, talented students doomed to physical deprivation, moral corruption and life-long frustration by a lack of career alternatives and the stop-gap, one-sided educational system.

Aleksandra Tolmachevskaja presented perhaps the most brutal moment of all when she discussed the hunger her students experienced daily and noted how each day she had to decide which children needed lunch most:

Brother and sister Makarov, workers' children, were stunted in their growth. Our school doctor discovered that their stomachs were swollen with hunger. The little girl had frightened eyes and was submissive. The father fed the family by begging ... We, along with the doctor, collected a little something from among friends and dispatched four individuals to the orphanage to eat lunch each day. Noon. My hand reached the little box where the money for

luncheon was kept when 10 hands rose silently and pleading eyes watched me.

Whom to send? They all rose: there poor "sleeveless" Sashka. Her hand raised, she smiled ingratiatingly ... Little G., in whose eyes were terror and expectation of his share ... Whom to send? (20)

The irony of this moment is that it is placed (deliberately) directly prior to a description of a mandatory gymnastics class in which Tolmachevskaja's hungry students were forced to participate. The implication of such a structural parallel is that the school board -- which decided that a gymnastics class was mandatory for the health of the students -- failed to provide the food that would have more significantly improved their health.(21)

Obviously, Tolmachevskaja offered this archetypal moment in order to demonstrate that it was her personally -- and not members of the school board (no doubt under the influence of modern pedagogy) -- who engaged in a difficult battle for her students' survival. In other words, through this archetypal moment, Tolmachevskaja was demonstrating that she was active and competent, while persons who created and supported the dominant discourse were unfamiliar with students' real needs.

N.M. (who taught in a rural school and published in Russkaia shkola) offered a similar critique of the stop-gap and misdirected educational system. Like Tolmachevskaja's, her critique is indirect but pointed. It is based in descriptions of a number of her most talented and charming students. One such description concerned a boy (M.T.), who loved nature --

especially birds -- and read and re-read the short stories in Bogdanov's book From the Life of Russian Nature.(22) M.T. hoped to live his life studying birds. Another description concerned a romantic boy (I.T.), who longed to visit the steppes after reading about them in the works of Gogol.(23) Another child (V.) had a talent for painting and was only allowed to paint after his father found the pictures would sell.(24)

Viewed in isolation, these descriptions could appear to be simple descriptive colour, added to ensure a reader's emotional identification with the schoolmistress. However, when seen in total, they present a disturbing picture, especially to N.M. -- who saw that none of these children succeeded in using their talents -- either as a naturalist, a poet, or a painter:

Thus it was with many of the talented heads in the families of V., I.T. and M.T., and others of whom I have no memory ... by necessity these young people, at the end of their school course, but the majority even earlier, depart to perform seasonal labour in St. Petersburg. And Petersburg favours no one: it oppresses everything that was nice in them; it drives everyone to imitation of the same standard. It is a pity that all capacities go to seed without development ... It is bad that Petersburg, or other big city, with their inns and cheap amusements commonly kill in them [ex-students] newly awakened intellectual wants. It is too bad! Too bad!(25)

The inexorable brutality of this waste of human potential is central to uchitel'nitsy writings, as is its profound emotional impact upon schoolmistresses themselves.

By discussing this impact, schoolmistresses shared their pain with colleagues. They also condemned a system that educated children just enough to make them useful to the industrial machine, but not enough to save them from the evils

of city life. Pedagogues' claims that a basic education through vospitanie would reduce immortality were thus disproved.(26)

A. Simonovich (a rural schoolmistress who published in Russkaia shkola) also wrote a memoir/article that disagreed with the importance pedagogues attached to basic education. Her article, presented in a diary format, is powerful and stunning in its matter-of-factness:

November 14, 1889

N... finished the course. He passed the examination easily and his smart answers drew the attention of his examiner. He continued to visit school. He was bored at home ... for him it would be necessary to carry on in learning.

February 27, 1890

N... went to work in a tea shop: his responsibilities included whiling away his time washing tea dishes, brewing tea, serving his customers and recording the receipts in a book. He earns 3r. 50 kop. a month. Here's the career for an intelligent, talented boy.

November 10, 1891

V... an interesting boy: pale, blond, blue-eyed, loves verse...

April 17, 1892

Today V... spent a long time studying a map of Europe and asked me how far it was to the Atlantic Ocean. "Why do you want to know?" I asked. "I want to walk to the ocean and then take a boat and strike out for America," he answered.

September 15, 1892

Pale V... has not found himself in America, rather a tea shop, (in which) he earns 3 r. a month. (27)

Obviously, a basic education and extraordinary natural ability were not sufficient to substantially alter peasant children's futures. By demonstrating this, Simonovich was showing that alone education -- pedagogues' universal panacea -- was insufficient to change Russian society. "The whole future of

Russia rests on these children: their evolution/development depends upon the cessation of crop failures, hunger, epidemics, in other words, all types of hardships, which trouble Russia at the present time."(28)

Thus, while pedagogues offered literacy as a cure for Russia's ills, which ranged from low factory productivity to alcoholism, uchitel'nitsy were pointing out that education was just one component in improving the lives of the people. Childrens' bodies had to be taken care of as well as their minds. And they had to be offered some future possibilities. One schoolmistress noted that it was frustration resulting from a lack of opportunities following their school days, and not illiteracy, that sparked a good deal of rural violence and crime.(29)

Not surprisingly, schoolmistresses challenged not only pedagogues' assessment of the importance of literacy; they also attacked the rhetoric that emphasized the importance of the schoolteacher. The philosophy of vospitanie implied that a good teacher and a good upbringing in the classroom would change a child's life completely. Uchitel'nitsy's descriptions of starved, brutalized and socially frustrated students demonstrated that the teacher was not the only influence on a child's life. When Simonovich noted that despite her great influence only nine out of 150 students chose different careers and futures from their parents, she was calling attention to the influence of family and community.(30) Three schoolmistresses

offered their readers a definitive assessment of a teacher's comparatively minor effect on her students' lives.

E.R. (who taught in a girls school in St. Petersburg and published in Russkaia shkola) wrote that a teacher had great moral responsibility, but little power. After describing a situation in which a very nice girl became pregnant after leaving school and going to work in a factory, E.R. wrote:

Is it possible for our school -- in which they stay for all of three years -- to save, develop and enhance good feelings, thoughts and inclinations in them? [A school] which they leave at 12 or 13 years of age -- a most disagreeable age for girls? It is terrible and painful! To feel vividly one's impotence along with enormous moral responsibility...(31)

Later in the same section of her article, E.R. concluded that a teacher's principal task was to demonstrate the importance of continued learning to her students. Such teachers:

would hamper no one, but could give them [the students] -- the enormous majority of whom through their whole life must be confined to darkness -- in three short orderly years in our elementary school, support and direction on the path to further self-education.(32)

Thus, in E.R.'s assessment, the teacher is more of a guide and a helper than a saviour. She is certainly not all-powerful.

O. Pavlovich (who taught in an urban school and published in Russkaia shkola) offered a similar assessment of teachers' work and of elementary schools. She did not believe that schooling could change children; however, Pavlovich was convinced that there were long-term benefits of encouraging a student's positive (that is, well-behaved and hard-working) behaviour:

I don't wish, of course, to say that our elementary school, like all elementary schools in general, can produce in children both strength of will and firmness of character. (Emphasis in original.) No, it is not possible for it to give these to people of completely different intellectual, moral and physical attitudes -- about which nothing can be done -- but it ought to lay down a stone foundation for further development. (33)

Pavlovich believed that school could not mould all of the children that entered. It could, however, serve as a support for those that entered with strong wills and characters, and as a benchmark of morality for the rest.

The author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" offers a similar assessment of the role of the elementary school in students' lives. After noting that the nice lessons of and attention to moral issues in schools were nothing when weighed against a hard life that from 11 or 12 years of age was carried on in a workshop or factory, she wrote:

Can our elementary school give much to these children? ... First, the majority of them bear a true love of reading, which becomes a need. The second [thing] that remains with them from school are memories of good school days, of school life with its cheery work and happy animation, with its festive occasions, with its joys and cares. (34)

The anonymous author obviously believed that students took academic skills (particularly reading skills) with them when they left school. They also took pleasant memories of learning without the threat of corporal punishment and of school celebrations. As the majority were condemned to a life of drudgery, the pleasant memories may have proved invaluable (and perhaps more useful than reading skills) over the long term.

What is most striking about the anonymous author's assessment of the role of the elementary school in her students' lives is that she never once mentioned a lasting (or even basic) moral result of education. By neglecting to discuss or credit this moral dimension of education, she challenged the efficacy of vospitanie -- the intellectual, physical and moral 'upbringing' that provided the foundation of liberal pedagogy and the dominant discourse.

Uchitel'nitsy also challenged the dominant discourse in another, more self-interested, way. In Chapter 3, I noted how schoolmistresses' decision to act as and to call themselves "aunts" and "older sisters" allowed uchitel'nitsy -- particularly those employed in the countryside -- to present themselves as 'typical' women. That is, by emphasizing the nurturing aspects of their profession and by engaging in nurturing even after class hours, uchitel'nitsy reduced the threat they presented to the power structures and social norms of the peasant commune. This self-definition served another purpose, however -- one which extended even into urban environments. In the same way as the American champion of women teachers Catherine Beecher constantly emphasized women's 'natural' ability to teach, Russian schoolmistresses used their gender as a tool when competing with schoolmasters (the majority of whom had pedagogical training) for teaching positions.(35) As Nezametnyi (Insignificant) -- who was a history and geography teacher in a women's progymnasium -- noted, the different

education male and female teachers received was a known and much discussed fact.(36)

For a contemporary reader, it may be difficult to understand how schoolmistresses challenged the dominant discourse by insisting that some people (even without pedagogical training) were naturally gifted as teachers. First, it must be understood that such an assertion directly contradicted pedagogues' support of the professionalization of teaching. That is, pedagogues were continually discussing the importance of training a cadre of teachers to adhere to their educational philosophies and teaching strategies. The assumption was that only teachers with appropriate training and professional indoctrination could teach students correctly (in accordance with the contemporary educational discourse). Schoolmistresses without vocational training were simply viewed as fodder for the educational system. Perhaps it is this fact which explains the general circulation of the stereotype of schoolmistress as passive and incapable.

That schoolmistresses used gender (and gender stereotypes) to their advantage in the sphere of public debate does not mean that they actually believed that women were more capable, more natural, teachers as a result of their biology. The amount of practical advice schoolmistresses offered women colleagues in their memoir/articles argues against this. Instead, it suggests that they saw an advantage in the discourses concerning women and education that could be used by women teachers to increase

their representation and improve their positions within the profession.(37) Consider, for example, the hidden agenda that was being transmitted to pedagogues and the educated public by schoolmistresses, who noted that their students' home and social environments often worked against vospitanie. Such women offered children a more refined environment in which to spend their free time. Were not uchitel'nitsy suggesting that by hiring a woman a school board was ensuring a wider (intellectual, moral and physical) education for its students and a greater boon to the community?(38) After all, the schoolmistress was forbidden to marry and thus lacked children of her own. Such a woman would doubtless be lonely and would respond to her 'natural' desire to nurture by spending a good deal of her free time with her students. Thus, for an equal or lesser wage, school board and peasant community would receive a greater number of productive hours a week.

In the case of church-parish schoolmistresses, women presented themselves as a strong resource for the ecclesiastical -- as well as the educational -- community. V. Elanskaia marched her students through the town on religious holidays, and instilled and reinforced religious values among the young people of the village.(39) I.K. Chuvashева taught the peasant community to sing hymns and read church readings, and bonded with them during a lovely Easter service at the end of her first year of teaching.(40)

In the case of secular schoolmistresses, women offered all of their students an enthusiasm for reading and a chance to learn behaviours from the middle and upper estates. To those children who displayed "appropriate" behaviour (see above and Chapter 3 for details), uchitel'nitsy offered a chance to spend more time reading and acting out the values of the middle and upper estates. Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. noted that "As a reward for good behaviour and work, I read something to students after class, or told stories, or showed pictures ... The very best encouragement, the best reward for students was permission to spend the night at school." (41) The implication is that during that night the students were being read to and educated. Further, (schoolmistresses implied) as a result of their natural gentleness and refinement, female teachers offered students an environment that was in sharp contrast to their social world and home lives. Consider, for example, the subtext when E.R. forbade her students even to imitate behaviour they had seen at home in the games room:

Sometimes the children "play pretend"; these games suggest grievous thoughts: that the children see and hear at home such things [as are in] their imitative games! The favourite [game], "reflecting daughter-mother" was strictly forbidden to them ... The mother was always coarse, loud, beating and punishing her children mercilessly. The children were naughty, shifty, noisy, duping the watchful mother at every possible moment and breaking away from under her supervision. (42)

Another benefit that unmarried schoolmistresses discussed in their memoir/articles was social intervention. For example, L. Guseva (who taught in a rural school and published in

Russkaia shkola) often intervened in the lives of her students:

It is good for an educator to desire always to have the opportunity to become familiar with the home environment of her students: she calls on the family, looks at it closely, talks with the children, if necessary calls in the doctor. Thus it will be seen what actions should be forthcoming. If it turns out to be the harmful influence of comrades [that are causing a student's bad behaviour], it is possible to remove the child from their midst; what is more, if the family is bad, it is possible ... to have a conversation with the parents and explain to them the consequences of their evil influence on the child.(43)

Intervention, such as Guseva's, is of the same type as middle class female philanthropists. In the eyes of twentieth century readers, it may appear maternal, self-assured and class-bound. It would have appeared enlightened to Guseva's educated contemporaries.

In summary, schoolmistresses challenged the dominant educational discourse that presented uchitel'nitsy as passive and incompetent by using the discriminatory legislation governing uchitel'nitsy's private lives to their advantage. They emphasized the great sacrifices (greater than schoolmasters) they were required to make as teachers. In doing so, they demonstrated how much more committed they were to their students and the goals of the educational system than were male elementary schoolteachers. By emphasizing their own 24-hour commitment, uchitel'nitsy implied that schoolmasters, who were permitted to marry, were not serving the people but themselves - a fact seemingly proven by their overriding concern with wages and teachers' status. In other words, uchitel'nitsy

demonstrated in their writings that teaching was a job for schoolmasters but a conscious philanthropic act for schoolmistresses.(44)

Schoolmistresses' emphasis on the extra-curricular lessons they offered their students also reveals that they understood, at least subconsciously, the class dynamic at work in the task of educating Russia's peasant and working class children. Women, who had received a gymnasium or perhaps higher education, were naturally capable of teaching children without inflicting corporal punishment. Many had been trained according to the dictates of internal discipline themselves. Schoolmasters, the majority of whom were from the peasant estate, would probably have had to be trained not to beat children who misbehaved or rejected learning.

The Philosophical Content of Schoolmasters' Memoir/articles

Having established that uchitel'nitsy's archetypal moments -- whether concerned with a schoolmistress' desire to teach, issues of discipline, or students' extra-curricular activities -- were rooted in the discourse concerning education and women, we must now turn to a discussion of the philosophical content of schoolmasters' memoir/articles. Such a task is rather more simple, and less intriguing, because schoolmasters' memoir/articles were not as literate or multi-layered as those

written by schoolmistresses. For this reason, the following section is, in many ways, a more in depth analysis of the issues discussed in Chapter 3.

This section will discuss three archetypal moments, beginning with a consideration of schoolmasters' material and social difficulties. As Chapter 3 dealt in detail with the parameters of poverty and teachers' low status, little space need be devoted to a discussion of meagre salaries and dependence. Instead, I will suggest how schoolmasters' commentary on teachers' economic and social difficulties connected with the dominant pedagogical discourse. One point must be made before beginning an analysis of schoolmaster memoir/articles, however. Unlike uchitel'nitsy, uchitelia offered no counter-discourse to the dominant discourse which was created and controlled by pedagogues. The following section will suggest possible reasons for this alliance of pedagogue and schoolmaster.

The most obvious point at which uchitelia memoir/articles connected with the dominant discourse concerns the notion that a schoolmaster's status reflected the status of education. Stated bluntly, usually in a situation where the teacher was not respected, neither was the school nor what the school had to offer. As we saw in Chapter 3, schoolmasters frequently complained about their salaries, and living and working conditions. "The life of a schoolmaster with a family is a sorrowful tale of material deprivation, difficult work and

mental torture."(45) In dominant pedagogical discourse, it was emphasized that the meagre salary the Ministry of Public Instruction and local zemstvo paid teachers for their skills reflected and reinforced a perception that education was unimportant.(46) To pedagogues -- who believed that education (through vospitanie) would reduce and possibly eliminate moral vices, change the authoritarian nature of Russian society and increase the strength of Russia's economy -- teachers' low status and poverty were of great concern. By printing teacher memoir/articles that emphasized the low priority the government attached to education, the editors of journals were implicitly lobbying for reform. By writing letters and memoirs with this emphasis, uchitelia were reflecting and entering into the discourse.

Another archetypal moment in which schoolmasters entered into and supported the dominant pedagogical discourse involved school inspectors' visits. After noting that his students passionately loved to read and knew a great deal, K. Barsov described one such visit and the inspector's narrow-minded and petty attitude:

The method of seating in class -- and other things were exposed to sharp criticism. "What is this!," said the displeased voice of the inspector. "They don't know how to sit." And taking a student's arms, shook him and forced him to sit straight, to be erect; the boy was embarrassed at such unwonted treatment. My soul felt badly for him, but what could I do? Tell me, reader, is there a crime in this: for a student to lean against the back of a bench or lean on his elbows? Do rules preserve a certain body posture? I think not, and I later satisfied myself that in Swedish schools -- which are the model arrangement -- hardly anyone worries about [the position of students']

torsos ... But "mister" inspectors have nothing to do with this [advanced pedagogical thought]. Bearing is the only thing they think necessary.(47)

By drawing attention to the petty concerns of school inspectors, Barsov was doing two things. First, he was indicating that he supported the liberal philosophy of education, which was more concerned with the skills students learned than the physical discipline they received. Second, by confirming the appropriateness of his teaching techniques after the departure of the inspector by reference to a book (or perhaps article) which described and commended the "model" Swedish style of education, Barsov demonstrated that he was under the sway of the dominant pedagogical discourse. That is, Barsov -- unlike the 14 uchitel'nitsy -- needed frequent coaching on the appropriate professional behaviour of teachers. His teaching style, with its emphasis on reading, was thus a product of professional development and educational literature -- not natural inclination. Barsov's demonstrated interest in and need of pedagogical reference texts reinforced the dominant pedagogical discourse.

Barsov's description of the misguided aims and petty behaviour of the school inspector (school inspectors were bureaucrats and personal noblemen in the Table of Ranks) served the same end. As representatives of the autocratic and conservative Russian state, school inspectors were generally more interested in maintaining the status quo and enforcing disciplinary measures than in promoting child-centred

education.(48) By noting that the Ministry of Public Instruction's bureaucrats had no knowledge of the "Swedish model" and other "advanced" educational models and theories, Barsov was arguing that those persons who did (ie. pedagogues) should have been in positions of authority. By doing so, he strode confidently into the world of journal discourse.(49) He was arguing, like the educated individuals and professionals whose hands wrote or guided all journal discourse, that the trained experts and not amateurs (such as schoolmistresses) or bureaucrats should influence the direction of new fields.(50)

In a similar vein, secular schoolmasters also participated in the contemporary intellectual discourse by arguing that church-parish schools provided inferior education. By showing how local priests (who were not trained teachers) interfered with teachers' duties in such schools and bullied or bribed parents to send their children to church-parish schools, schoolmasters were arguing for the efficiency of secular schools and the importance of having teachers (not priests) in control of schools.(51) This argument is reminiscent of the one voiced by schoolmistresses, in which they argued that uchitel'nitsy offered school boards and communities more 'natural' skills and longer work weeks than male teachers. By indicating their more extensive pedagogical knowledge, greater dedication to the school and better student performance on exams, secular schoolmasters were seeking professional advantage over church-parish schoolteachers.(52)

The above chapter has shown how uchitel'nitsy's and uchitel'ia's writings reflected, supported and challenged the dominant educational discourse. It has also shown, through an analysis of archetypal moments, how points of emphasis in the writings of both gender groups reflected the basic needs and desires of each. For example, schoolmistresses emphasized their 'natural' ability to nurture children in order to ensure their continued (and growing) presence in Russia's elementary schools. By contrast, schoolmasters asked for improved living and working conditions by couching their need in rhetoric calling for a greater appreciation of education.

Archetypal moments reflected authors' educational and social backgrounds as well as gender, just as did the practical strategies discussed in Chapter 3. For example, schoolmistresses -- two-thirds of whom were from the middle and upper estates -- generally lacked specialized teacher training and thus demonstrated how their natural (estate) beliefs and attitudes were intimately connected with child-centred pedagogy. Not surprisingly, uchitel'nitsy's answers to classroom and community problems were generally of a personal nature. Schoolmasters, on the other hand, had comparatively less general education and came from a lower estate. Their claim to the position of teacher was founded on their vocational training --

a training reflected in their continued use of reference texts written by pedagogues. Instead of relying upon themselves for answers to classroom and community difficulties, schoolmasters' answers came from 'the experts' and were structural (usually developing out of professional organizations and ethics) in nature.

The above discoveries are significant and demand a reassessment of previous scholarship concerning teachers (in particular) and pedagogical discourse (in general). Obviously, class and gender affected teachers, determining their experiences and responses to difficulties. These factors must be examined in future studies. In the same way, the multi-layered quality of pedagogical discourse must be considered from now on. Up to this point, the discourse has been treated as politically-charged, but basically factual. It must now be understood as a series of fictions or creations, each with its own logic.(53)

One of the most important fictions contained within the pedagogical discourse has remained hidden under layers of meaning until now. It was the fiction of 'schoolmistress as servant of the people.' It was created by schoolmistresses themselves to challenge the dominant fiction of 'female teacher as martyr.' In a counter-discourse, carried out using the same vocabulary and with the identical parameters as the dominant discourse, schoolmistresses compared their decisions to enter the teaching profession with those of other servants of the

people -- narodniki and saints. Uchitel'nitsy also demonstrated that they were strong, capable, creative problem solvers, who (because of their gender and the legislation that prohibited marriage for schoolmistresses) were dedicated teachers 24 hours a day. It was this dedication (and not vocational training or professional associations) that made uchitel'nitsy professionals.

To the present-day reader, the semi-concealed allusions and unarticulated conclusions in the memoir/articles upon which this thesis is based are difficult to see. However, for a nineteenth century female reader, used to interacting with obscure texts, these allusions and conclusions would have been readily apparent. Undoubtedly, they served as rally points for the increasing number of women entering the teaching profession.

Endnotes

1. Ware, "Russian Journal" 133.
2. Dunham 479.
3. See Heldt Terrible Perfection.
4. Barbara Heldt, "Codes for Women in Autobiographical Fiction: Prophecy and Lament", a paper given August 1988 at the Conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire.
5. Vicinus 12. A single woman's public writings must have been under a similar type of scrutiny as her public life. In her writings, such a woman had to justify a new domestic and public

ethic, had to achieve an improved economic position, and had to establish surrogate families in order to appear respectable.

6. Toby Clymas' article makes a similar point. Thanks to Toby for sending me her unpublished paper. It helped me to focus my thoughts.

7. Naomi Schor, Breaking the Chain: Women, Theory, and French Realist Fiction, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), x.

8. Patricia Yaeger, Honey-Mad Women: Emancipatory Strategies in Women's Writing, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 3. "But in focusing on these terrifying moments we neglect the woman writer's ecstatic espionage, her expropriation of the language she needs, her own invention of a terrorist text."

9. Yaeger 156.

10. Clymas, "Russian Women-Physicians." 3.

11. Tolmachevskaja, Russkaia shkola 103-4.

12. Tolmachevskaja, Russkaia shkola 106. See Jay Bergman, Vera Zasulich: A Biography, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983) for examples of such behaviour.

13. Tolmachevskaja, Russkaia shkola 106. See Martin Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, (London: Harvard University Press, 1961) 50-1 and 214.

14. Tolmachevskaja, Russkaia shkola 106. See Barbara Alpern Engel, Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

15. Ko--ka, Russkaia shkola 52.

16. Elanskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 5.

17. Eklof, Russian Peasant 195.

18. Ko--ka, Russkaia shkola 51. Ko--ka writes that even while at the teaching seminary, her overwhelming desire to teach (and not her difficult financial position) forced her to overtask her strength and teach outside of class. Inevitably, she became seriously ill and was never again strong.

19. O. Kaidanova, Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniia vo Rossii i SSSR na osnove lichnogo opyta i nabliudenii, (Canada, 1938) 170-95 and E. Sveshnikova, "Iz perepiski s sel'skimi uchitel'nitsami," Russkaia shkola 1 (1896): 75-86; 2 (1896): 51-62. Both authors discuss techniques used to train teachers

(especially girls) to be good teachers and detail the attitudes of their teachers.

20. Tolmachevskaia, Russkaia shkola 117.

21. Tolmachevskaia, Russkaia shkola 117-8.

22. N.M., Russkaia shkola 85.

23. N.M., Russkaia shkola 89.

24. N.M., Russkaia shkola 86-7.

25. N.M., Russkaia shkola 92.

26. Famous pedagogues, V.P. Vakhterov among them, developed a series of schemes that would ensure universal education at an affordable cost. Of course, sacrifices had to be made in the scope of education offered by these schemes. For example, Vakhterov presented a plan to the Moscow Committee of Literacy in 1894 that seemed a pragmatic answer to the problem of ensuring universal public education. In the plan, he argued that children should spend no more than three years in school and a restriction against peasant girls attending should be enforced. Sinel, "Campaign" 498-501.

27. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 32.

28. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 40.

29. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 33.

30. Simonovich, Russkaia shkola 30.

31. E.R., Russkaia shkola 10: 43.

32. E.R., Russkaia shkola 10: 53.

33. Pavlovich, Russkaia shkola 53.

34. "Pervyi god" 64.

35. See Suggs, Jr. 42-7 and Meyers 493-506. Suggs' book talks about Catherine Beecher's beliefs about women's natural talents as teachers. Meyers' article details the familiar battle between male and female teachers in a profession in which gender meant prestige.

36. Nezametnyi, "Reviziia," (Iz vospominanii uchitel'ia), Russkaia shkola 4 (1903): 70-84.

37. Many thanks to Marjorie Theobald, who suggested this interesting possibility in a stimulating conversation that took place during her tenure as a guest lecturer at the University of British Columbia.

38. Anastasiev vol. 2, 33. In this section, K.D. Ushinskii is quoted concerning the importance of role models to children from bad homes.

39. Elanskaia, Narodnoe obrazovanie 2.

40. Chuvasheva, Narodnoe obrazovanie 7-8: 6 and 8-9.

41. E.S., Russkaia shkola 34.

42. E.R., Russkaia shkola 9: 55.

43. Guseva, Russkaia shkola 64-5.

44. Eklof, Russian Peasant 229-33 and 237 and Seregny, Russian Teachers Chapter 3.

45. Simonovskii, Obrazovanie 347. See Dido, Russkaia shkola 9.

46. Sinel, "Campaign" 488. Schoolmasters, especially those with families, were required to work summers for extra money. Schoolmasters worked as supervisors in distilleries and in the fields. Barsov, Russkaia shkola 7-8: 26. (Schoolmistresses may have given lessons, which kept them in the field of education.)

47. Barsov, Russkaia shkola 5-6: 55.

48. Of course, a great deal of attention has been paid to school inspectors and bureaucrats within the Ministry of Public Instruction who encouraged the development of a standardized, 'professional' school system. Lenin's father was such an administrator.

49. Wortman's book The Development of a Russian Legal Consciousness demonstrates how a similar desire for professionalization grew through the nineteenth century in the Tsarist Ministry of Justice and gradually resulted in the development of a professional ethos among its employees.

50. Such a demand lies at the base of Barsov's 10 point plan that demanded specific 'enlightened' actions and required that teachers have a say in decisions that affected them and the school system.

51. Byvshii uchitel', Obrazovanie 106-8 and Barsov, Russkaia shkola 5-6: 47 and 54. See Sinel, "Campaign" for the dominant discourse concerning church-parish schools 484-6.

52. See Meyers on how such a conflict developed and concluded in France.

53. See Natalie Zemon Davis, Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987).

CONCLUSION

In Chapter 1, "The Problem Revealed", I set myself the task of analyzing the reactions of the original readers of schoolmistresses' memoir/articles. My aim was to determine what was perceived and unperceived in these authors' works by their contemporaries. In order to do this, it was necessary to establish the context in which the memoir/articles had been written. Chapter 1, therefore, discussed the discourse concerning education, the position of schoolteachers in late nineteenth century Russian society and the status of women in Russia's autocratic and patriarchal culture. Chapter 2 next presented an analysis of the three journals in which a majority of uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles had been published and offered biographical information concerning the 14 schoolmistresses. Uchitel'nitsy educational and social backgrounds were then compared to a sample of schoolmasters who also wrote memoir/articles and a significant number of other schoolteachers. Then Chapter 3 demonstrated that schoolmistresses taught and offered advice to their colleagues and young women just entering the profession. Finally, Chapter 4 used the parameters of feminist literary criticism to reveal the layers of meaning contained within uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles. Through these layers of meaning, schoolmistresses carried on a counter-discourse with the dominant pedagogical discourse and communicated with their sisters.

This thesis has demonstrated how the discourse concerning education was symbiotic in nature. Educational literature transmitted words and expectations to teachers who acted upon, or wrote in response to, them. The number of such individuals, moved by the discourse but mute, can not be calculated. What has been determined by this thesis, however, is that schoolmistresses saw the discourse as powerful and thus entered it with the intention of supplying readers with new cultural and emotional values.

In a recently published work concerning the role of single women in the battle for improved women's rights and career opportunities, Martha Vicinus has argued that single women's ascribed role in private and public life was simultaneously "drastically limiting and immensely liberating." (1) "I believe," Vicinus wrote, "that women are never passive participants in the larger culture but actively transform and redefine their external constraints." (2) Her book illustrated this point by demonstrating how single Victorian women entered formal institutions (most philanthropic in nature) and within them developed leadership skills, friendship networks and a power base for public work. (3) Of course, it was not easy for the women Vicinus discussed to enter the public sphere and remain there successfully. The prejudices of their male-dominated society frequently made professional life difficult. "Probably the greatest achievements of Victorian women were in

the area of philanthropy, yet even here we find them encouraged to remain amateurs."(4)

The 14 schoolmistresses whose writings form the basis of this thesis experienced difficulties similar to those of the women in Vicinus' book. They were relegated to the position of poor, passive stereotypes by the male-dominated pedagogical discourse of the period. In a world that was becoming increasingly professionalised, the competent single woman teacher without vocational training (the amateur), was viewed as a threat -- both by pedagogically-trained male teachers and the male pedagogues who sought influence in the Russian state through controlling the discourse concerning education. In the vast majority of published uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles, schoolmistresses challenged the dominant pedagogical discourse that painted women teachers as passive and incompetent.

In mounting this challenge, Russian schoolmistresses used similar tactics as women physicians who were fighting the same battle. "But while the reading public sought to learn from these women's memoirs about the lives and plight of the less fortunate, the women [doctors] writing their memoirs had other, more compelling motives: namely to shatter the cultural hall of mirrors and to inscribe themselves as competent individuals and useful, contributing members of society."(5) Through anecdotes and descriptions, schoolmistresses and women physicians demonstrated that they were fully capable of dealing with a wide range of difficult situations. They also offered -- through the

anecdotes -- helpful advice to colleagues and young women preparing to enter the professions.

Through their anecdotes, schoolmistresses also offered subtle comment. For example, they demonstrated their 'natural' teaching abilities and implied that as a result of legislation that prohibited female teachers from marrying they were more accessible to their students than schoolmasters. Such accessibility made them more useful and productive to school boards. Through descriptions, schoolmistresses also emphasized the great sacrifice that they were required to make upon entering the teaching profession. In a society that worshipped marriage and motherhood, schoolmistresses were barred from family life. Thus, by becoming a teacher, women indicated sacrifice and a desire (which sometimes had a physical manifestation) to serve the people; it was an archetypal action in the era of 'small deeds.'

Of course, as we have seen, not only schoolmistresses engaged in representative actions or included archetypal moments (describing these actions) in their memoir/articles. Both male and female teachers included advice and archetypal moments in their writings. However, the emphasis and content of advice and moments were very different. Schoolmistresses, who were primarily urban-born and from the middle and upper estates, stressed the difficulties of rural living and offered solutions to the problem of isolation from the peasant commune. Some, like Elizaveta Nikolaevna S., sought a especially close

relationship with their students. Others, like I.K. Chuvashева, were accepted after setting up a course of Sunday school readings for the entire village.(6) As well, because the majority of uchitel'nitsy had not received pedagogical training, memoir/articles also offered suggestions concerning discipline and classroom dynamics. E.R., for example, suggested that teachers in a multi-class situation should employ monitors, while the author of "The First Year of My Teaching Activity" counselled teachers to be firm and strict above all else.(7)

By contrast, the memoir/articles written by schoolmasters -- who were mostly rural-born, from the lower estates and pedagogically trained -- emphasized the economic and social difficulties encountered by teachers -- especially married teachers. K. Barsov, for example, related a story of the ease with which rumour could destroy a teacher's career. V. Simonovskii offered a description of the hard life and "mental torture" of a married schoolmaster's life.(8) The content of schoolmasters' writings is a direct reflection of the fact that their previous life experiences had not prepared them for alienation from the community in which they lived and taught.

There were also great philosophical differences in the writings of male and female teachers. Schoolmistresses' memoir/articles challenged the dominant pedagogical discourse's easy, unproven assertions concerning the value and nature of education, as well as the position of women. For example, A.S. Simonovich demonstrated that even talented students needed more

than a basic education to change their lives; they needed career options and a chance to continue in school.(9) Aleksandra Tolmachevskaja showed that schoolmistresses were committed to 'small deeds' reformism and to changing the lives of Russia's lower orders by describing her decision to become a teacher in a way similar to descriptions offered by a number of revolutionaries.(10)

By contrast, schoolmasters' writings constantly referred to and reinforced the dominant pedagogical discourse. For instance, K. Barsov indicated that when in doubt as to how to proceed in the classroom, he located a reference text describing "model" classrooms. In doing so, Barsov abdicated his personal authority to the "experts."(11)

The differences between schoolmaster and schoolmistress article content were obviously rooted in class and gender issues. Because schoolmistresses tended to see their difficulties as class and gender-based (and thus as personal), they offered personal solutions to social problems. Better put, they offered personal anecdotes which demonstrated that an uchitel'nitsa could solve teaching and community problems alone. By comparison, because schoolmasters tended to be familiar with the environment in which they taught, they emphasized structural or group solutions to their problems. For example, they showed that zemstva needed to put more money toward both teachers' wages and the equipping and maintenance of schools. They also emphasized the necessity of developing teachers' associations,

naming teachers' representatives to liaise with the government and creating a newspaper just for teachers.

It is possible that the difference in the type of solutions offered by uchitel'nitsy and uchitel'ia may have originated in the different career alternatives open to Russian men and women, as well as schoolmistresses' understanding (perhaps subconscious) of the different behaviours expected of men and women. It may be that women teachers were cautious in expressing a desire for better working and living conditions because they had much fewer career alternatives than schoolmasters (who pressed for teacher representatives and professional association) and thus, they were forced to solve career problems privately and in-person. Certainly, the lack of complaints from schoolmistresses concerning the economics of teaching and teachers' low status is reflected in the small number of women who participated in teacher activism -- such as professional associations and pedagogical conference planning committees.(12)

Of course, if it could be proved that such conditions prevailed and schoolmistresses deliberately avoided conventional professional organization, this thesis would be strengthened. As it stands, sufficient information exists to demonstrate that schoolmistresses developed a professional ethic and series of survival techniques that met and reflected their gender and class needs. The primary discovery of this thesis is that while life may have been difficult for the majority of

schoolmistresses, at least some were developing and passing on strategies to permit themselves and other women to continue to live and prosper in the teaching profession. These schoolmistress/strategists offered their advice to sister colleagues by interrupting and reinterpreting the dominant discourse.

Because uchitel'nitsy used the vocabulary and literary conventions of the dominant discourse, it is possible that the (male) editors of the journals in which they published did not notice, or at least did not realize the extent of, the counter-discourse. However, schoolmistresses -- the intended audience -- would understand the intent and meaning of uchitel'nitsy memoir/articles. The intended audience would understand them because memoir/articles simultaneously offered their female readers the stereotypical portrait of woman as martyr (that is, the romantic dream to which many in the profession -- and those about to enter -- aspired) and the reality of a teacher's life. For women already in the profession, this dissonance would ring true. Meanwhile, women about to enter the profession would be warned.

My greatest hope is that following an analysis of the content and nature of uchitel'nitsy articles the portrait of the passive, powerless and mute schoolmistress has finally been laid to rest.

Endnotes

1. Vicinus, 12.
2. Vicinus 7.
3. Vicinus 7. The work is totally dedicated to demonstrating this.
4. Vicinus 22.
5. Clymas 3.
6. See Chapter 3, section 2.
7. See Chapter 3, section 1.
8. See Chapter 3, section 3.
9. See Chapter 4, section 3.
10. See Chapter 4, section 2.
11. See Chapter 4, section 4.
12. See Seregny, Russian Teachers for an example of the small number of politically active female teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Russian Sources

Abramovich, N. Ia. Zhenshchina i mir muzhskoi kul'tury: mirovoe tvorchestvo i polovaia liubov'. Moscow: Svobodnyi Put', 1913.

Anastasiev, A. Narodnaia shkola rukovodstvo dlia uchitelei i uchitel'nitsy nachal'nykh uchilishch nastol'naia spravochnaia kniga. 7th ed. 2 vols. Moscow: A.A. Stupin, 1910.

Arsen'ev, I.A., ed. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'. 82 vols. St. Petersburg: I.A. Efron, 1897.

Barakshin, A. "Iz zapisok" sel'skago uchitelia." Narodnoe obrazovanie 3 (1902): 249-254.

Barsov, K. "Sel'skaia shkola i uchitel'." (Vospominaniia i zametki)." Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1896): 45-55; 7-8 (1896): 25-31.

Baulina, A. Zadachi sovremennago vospitaniia. St. Petersburg: M.M. Stasiulevich, 1910.

Beliaeva, L.N., M.K. Zinov'eva and M.M. Nikiforov. Bibliographiia Periodicheskikh Izdanii Rossii, 1901-1916. 4 vols. Ed. V.M. Burashenkov, O.D. Golubevaia and N.R. Morachevskii. Leningrad: Ministry of Culture of the RSFSR, 1959.

Blinov, L. "Narodnyi uchitel' v Rossii." Vseobshchee obrazovanie v Rossii. Ed. D. M. Shakhovskii. Moscow, 1902. 63-84.

Byvshii uchitel. "Iz vospominanii sel'skago uchitelia. (Iz Permskoi gubernii)." Obrazovanie 5-6 (1896): Sect. 2, 106-108.

Chuvasheva, I.K. "Slava Bogu za Vse! (Vospominaniia derevenskoi uchitel'nitsy)." Narodnoe Obrazovanie 7-8 (1914): Vol. 2, 1-9; 9 (1914): 113-24; 10 (1914): 265-77; 11 (1914): 378-83.

Dido. "Zametki i nabliudeniia. (Iz zametok byvshago sel'skago uchitelia)." Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1899): 179-89; 7-8 (1899): 195-200; 9 (1899): 237-46; 12 (1899): 176-82.

Elanskaia, V. "Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy." Narodnoe obrazovanie 1 (1909): Vol. 1, 1-5.

Filatova, A.V. Vospominaniia uchitel'nitsy. Moscow: Rabotnik Prosveshcheniia, 1929.

Govorov, S.K. Brachnyi vopros v bytu uchashchik'. (Nachal'noi shkoly). Moscow: A. I. Mamontov, 1903.

Guseva, L. "Zametki sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy." Russkaia shkola 7-8 (1895): 63-8.

K--ka, Olga Nikolaevna. "God v sel'skoi shkole. (Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy)." Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1905): 51-76.

Kaidanova, O. Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniia vo Rossii i SSSR na osnove lichnogo opyta i nabliudenii. Canada, 1938.

Karpinskaia, V. "Idealistka. (Iz vospominanii uchitel'nitsy)." Narodnoe obrazovanie 2 (1907): Vol. 1. Book 2, 182-86.

Kivshenko, N. D. Dnevnik sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy. St. Petersburg: Fontanka, 1887.

Leikina-Svirskaiia, V.R. Intelligentsiia v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka. Moscow: "Mysl'", 1971.

Leont'eva, N. "O detskom chtenii. (Iz nabliudenii uchitel'nitsy)." Obrazovanie 11-12 (1905): Sect. 2, 111-41.

Ministerstvo Narodnago Prosveshcheniia. Statisticheskiiia svedeniia po nachal'nomu obrazovaniiu v rossiskoi imperii vur IV. (Dannyya 1900 goda) Ed. V.F. Farmorskorskii and E.P. Kovalevskii. (St. Petersburg, 1903).

Ministerstvo Narodnago Prosveshcheniia Otdeleniie Promyshlennnykh Uchilishch. Materialyi trudy komissii po voprosam'' zhenskago professional'nago obrazovaniia. St. Petersburg: Tipo-Litografiia, 1904.

N.M. "Iz zametok nachal'noi uchitel'nitsy. (Chtenie v shkol i shkolnykh tipy)." Russkaia shkola 12 (1897): 80-92.

Nezametnyi. "Reviziia. (Iz vospominanii uchitel'ia)." Russkaia shkola 4 (1903): 70-84.

Paskhalov, Ia. "Odin den' v sel'skoi shkole." Russkaia shkola 3 (1897): 142-146.

Pavlovich, O. "Znachenie distsipliny v dele vospitaniia. (Nabliudenii, priznaniia i zametki uchitel'nitsy nachal'noi shkoly)." Russkaia shkola 11 (1895): 39-53.

"Pervyi god moei uchitel'skoi deiatel'nosti. (Iz vospomanii nachal'noi uchitel'nitsy)." Russkaia shkola 9-10 (1893): 38-64.

Piskunov, A.I. Ocherki istorii shkoly i pedagogicheskoi mysli narodov SSSR: vtoraiia polovina XIX v. Moscow: Pedagogika, 1976.

Polianskii, A. Russkaia zhenshchina na gosudarstvennoi i obshchestvenoi sluzhbe. Moscow: Tip. S. Skirmunt, 1901.

E.R. "Kartinki shkolnoi zhizni. (Iz nabliudenii uchitel'nitsy nachal'noi shkoly)." Russkaia shkola 7-8 (1898): 26-38; 9 (1898): 47-55; 10 (1898): 36-53.

Rashin, A.G. Naslenie Rossii za 100 let (1811-1913 gg.): statisticheskie ocherki. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe statisticheskoe izdatel'stvo, 1956.

Elizaveta Nikolaevna S. "Vospominaniia sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy." Russkaia shkola 5-6 (1902): 30-41.

Salomatin, P. Kak zhivet i rabotaet narodnyi uchitel'. Petrograd: Tip. "Prometei", 1912.

Semenov, S.T. Dvadstat'piat let v derevne. Petrograd: Kn--vo "Zhinz'n' i znanie", 1915.

Shteven, A.A. Iz zapisok sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy. St. Petersburg: Tip. I.N. Skorokhodov, 1895.

Silov, V. Zhenshchina zamuzhen. Moscow: Tip. I.I. Pashkov, 1897.

Simonovich, A. S. "Zametki iz dnevnika sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy." Russkaia shkola 12 (1893): 18-40.

Simonovskii, Nar. Uch. V. "Pismo iz provintsii." Russkaia shkola 11 (1897): 346-47.

Spisok russkikh povremennykh izdaniy s 1703 do 1899 god svedeniami ob ekzempliarakh. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademiia nauk, 1901.

Strannoliubskii, A.N. "O zhenskom professional'nom obrazovanii." Obrazovanie 2 (1896): 34-50; 3 (1896): 8-28; 4 (1896): 16-41.

Sveshnikova, E. "Iz perepiski s sel'skimi uchitel'nitsami." Obrazovanie 1 (1896): 75-86; 2 (1896): 51-62.

Tolmachevskaia, Aleksandra. "Iz dnevnika narodnoi uchitel'nitsy." Russkaia shkola 4 (1914): 104-123.

Tret'iakova, O. "'Sovremennyi' Tit Tityn." Obrazovanie 5 (1901): 35-37.

S.F. Ts. "V zashchitu zamushnikov uchitel'nits'." Russkaia shkola 4 (1904): Sect 2, 64-67.

"Uchitel'nitsa Ivanova." Russkaia shkola 10-11 (1901): Sect. 2, 126.

Zaionchkovskii, P.A. Istorii dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii v dnevnikh i vospominaniakh: annotirovannyi ukazatel' knig i publikatsii v zhurnalakh. Moscow: Kniga, T.3, Ch. 4.2 1980; Moscow: Kniga, T.4, Ch. 4.3 1985.

Zelinskaia, A. "Iz dnevnika sel'skoi uchitel'nitsy. (Iz Ekaterinoslavskoi gubernii)." Obrazovanie 5-6 (1896): Sect. 2, 103-105.

English Articles

Alston, Patrick. "Recent Voices and Persistent Problems in Tsarist Education." Paedagogica Historica 16 2(1976): 203-15.

Atkinson, Dorothy. "Society and the Sexes in the Russian Past." Women in Russia. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1977. 3-38.

Brooks, Jeffrey. "The Zemstvo and the Education of the People." The Zemstvo in Russia: An Experiment in Local Self-government. Ed. Terence Emmons and Wayne S. Vucinich. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 243-278.

Clymas, Toby W. "Memoirs of 19th century Russian Women-Physicians." A paper-in-progress given at the New England Slavic Association annual meeting March 30-31 1990.

Dicks, Henry V. "Some Notes on the Russian National Character." The Transformation of Russian Society. Ed. Cyril E. Black. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967. 636-651.

Dudgeon, Ruth A. "The Forgotten Minority: Women Students in Imperial Russia, 1872-1917." Russian History 9 (1982): 1-26.

Dunham, Vera Sandomirsky. "The Strong-Woman Motif." The Transformation of Russian Society. Ed. Cyril E. Black. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967. 583-495.

Eklof Ben. "Face to the Village: The Russian Teacher and the Peasant Community, 1880-1914." Land Commune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial Russia and Early Soviet Society. Ed. Roger Bartlett. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990 339-62.

----- "The Myth of the Zemstvo School: The Sources of the Expansion of Russian Education in Imperial Russia, 1864-1914." History of Education Quarterly 24 (Winter 1984): 561-84.

----- "Peasant Sloth Reconsidered: Strategies of Education

and Learning in Rural Russia Before the Revolution." Journal of Social History 14 3(Spring 1981): 355-85.

Engel, Barbara Alpern. "The Working Class Family in Urban Russia." A paper in progress given at the Conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire held at the University of Akron and Kent State University 11-14 August 1988.

-----, "Mothers and Daughters: Family Patterns and the Female Intelligentsia." The Family in Imperial Russia: New Lines of Historical Research. Ed. David L. Ransel. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978. 44-59.

Freeze, Gregory L. "The Soslovie (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History." The American Historical Review 91 1(February 1986): 11-36.

Garrison, Dee. "The Tender Technicians: The Feminization of Public Librarianship, 1876-1905." Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women. Ed. Mary S. Hartman and Lois Banner. New York: Octagon Books, 1976. 158-78.

Glickman, Rose. "Women and the Peasant Commune." Land Commune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial Russia and Early Soviet Society. Ed. Roger Bartlett. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990. 321-38.

Greene, Gayle. "The Uses of Memory in Feminist Fiction." Paper in progress. Given at the University of British Columbia, October 24, 1990.

Hajnal, J. "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective." Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography. Ed. D.V. Glass and D.E.C. Eversley. London: Edward Arnad, 1965. 101-43.

Heldt, Barbara. "Codes for Russian Women in Autobiographical Fiction: Prophecy and Lament." A paper in progress given at a conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire held at the University of Akron and Kent State University 11-14 August 1988.

Hinshaw, Catherine Ruane. "The Vestal Virgins of St. Petersburg: Schoolteachers and the 1897 Marriage Ban." A paper in progress given at a conference on Women in the History of the Russian Empire held at the University of Akron and Kent State University 11-14 August 1988.

Meyers, Peter V. "From Conflict to Cooperation: Men and Women Teachers in the Belle Epoque." The Making of Frenchmen: Current Directions in the History of Education in France. Ed. Donald N. Baker and Patrick J. Harrigan. Waterloo: Queens University Press, 1980. 493-506.

Ramer, Samuel C. "Childbirth and Culture: Midwifery in the Nineteenth-Century Russian Countryside." The Family in Imperial Russia: New Lines of Historical Research. Ed. David L. Ransel. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978. 218-35.

Ransel, David L. "Child Care Cultures in the Russian Empire." A paper in progress given at the Conference on the History of Women in the Russian Empire held at the University of Akron and Kent State University 11-14 August 1988.

Seregny, Scott J. "Zemstvo Rabbits, Antichrists and Revolutionaries: Rural Teachers in Saratov Province, 1890-1907." Politics and Society in Provincial Russia: Saratov, 190-1917. Ed. Scott J. Seregny. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989. 113-38.

Sinel, Allen. "The Campaign for Universal Primary Education in Russia." Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas 30 (1982): Heft 4, 481-508.

-----". "Count Dmitrii Tolstoi and the Preparation of Russian School Teachers." Canadian Slavic Studies III, 2 (Summer 1969): 246-62.

Tovrov, Jessica. "Mother-Child Relationships among the Russian Nobility." The Family in Imperial Russia: New Lines in Historical Research. Ed. David L. Ransel. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978. 15-43.

Wagner, William G. "The Trojan Mare: Women's Rights and Civil Rights in Late Imperial Russia." Civil Rights in Imperial Russia. Ed. Olga Crisp and Linda Edmondson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. 65-84.

Ware, R.J. "A Russian Journal and its Public: Otchestvennye Zapiski, 1868-1884." Oxford Slavonic Papers (New Series Volume) 14 (1981): 121-46.

-----". "Some Aspects of the Russian Reading Public in the 1880s." Renaissance and Modern Studies 24 (1980): 18-37.

English Books

Abbott, H. Porter. Diary Fiction: Writing as Action. Ithaca: University Press, 1984.

Alston, Patrick. Education and the State in Tsarist Russia. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

Andrew, Joe. Russian Writers and Society in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1982.

Auerbach, Nina. Romantic Imprisonment: Women and Other Glorified Outcasts. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Bridger, Susan. Women in the Soviet Countryside: Women's Roles in Rural Development in the Soviet Union. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Brooks, Jeffrey. When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Edmondson, Linda. Feminism in Russia, 1900-1917. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.

Eklof, Ben. Russian Peasant Schools: Officialdom, Village Culture, and Popular Pedagogy, 1861-1914. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Engel, Barbara Alpern. Mothers and Daughters: Women of the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Frieden, Nancy Mandelker. Russian Physicians in an Era of Reform and Revolution, 1856-1905. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Glickman, Rose. Russian Factory Women: Workplace and Society, 1880-1914. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Grumet, Madeleine R. Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Hans, Nicholas. The Russian Tradition in Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Heldt, Barbara. Terrible Perfection: Women and Russian Literature. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.

Hingley, Ronald. Russian Writers and Society in the Nineteenth Century. 2nd edition. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

Hubbs, Joanna. Mother Russia: The Feminine Myth in Russian Culture. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Hutchinson, John F. Politics and Public Health in Revolutionary Russia 1890-1918. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Hutton, Marcelline Judith. "Russian and Soviet Women, 1897-1939: Dreams, Struggles, and Nightmares." Vol. 1 and 2. Diss. The U of Iowa, 1986.

Johanson, Christine. Women's Struggle for Higher Education in Russia, 1855-1900. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987.

Kaufman, Polly Welts. Women Teachers on the Frontier. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Mallon, Thomas. A Book of One's Own: People and Their Diaries. New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1984.

Manning, Roberta. The Crisis of the Old Order in Russia: Gentry and Government. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Mason, Mary Grimley and Carol Hurd Green, eds. Journeys: Autobiographical Writings by Women. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1979.

Moore, Katharine. Cordial Relations: The Maiden Aunt in Fact and Fiction. London: Heinemann, 1966.

Porter, Cathy. Fathers and Daughters: Russian Women in Revolution. London: Virago, 1976.

Rogger, Hans. Russia in the Age of Modernisation and Revolution, 1881-1917. New York: Longman, 1983.

Ruud, Charles A. Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Satina, Sophia. Education of Women in Pre-revolutionary Russia. New York: Smith College manuscript, 1966.

Schor, Naomi. Breaking the Chain: Women, Theory, and French Realist Theory. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Scott, Joan Wallach. Gender and the Politics of History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Seregny, Scott J. Russian Teachers and Peasant Revolution: The Politics of Education in 1905. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Sinel, Allen. The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Stites, Richard. The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism and Bolshevism 1860-1930. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Stodolsky, Catherine Ekstein. "Missionary of the Feminine Mystique: The Female Teacher in Prussia and Bavaria, 1880-1920." Diss. SUNY-Stony Brook, 1987.

Suggs, Jr., Reddings S. Motherteacher: The Feminization of American Education. Charolettesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978.

Vicinus, Martha. Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1850-1920. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Weber, Eugen. Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Wortman, Richard S. The Development of a Russian Legal Consciousness. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Yaeger, Patricia. Honey-Mad Women: Emancipatory Strategies in Women's Writing. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

APPENDIX A

PREAMBLE TO THESIS DEFENSE OF "THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL: THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY RUSSIAN SCHOOLMISTRESS SPEAKS FOR HERSELF"

Good Afternoon.

I want to tell you before I begin this 15 minute presentation that I am very grateful for the time. It will allow me to present the implications of the thesis I have written. This presentation will not summarize the contents of the thesis. (I assume we are all now familiar with its content.) Instead, this presentation will indicate the greater importance and larger implications of the work. And the implications are many.

By way of introduction, let me describe the ideological and disciplinary context of this thesis. First, it stands at the crux of a number of disciplines -- Women's Studies, Literary Criticism, the History of Education, and, of course, History proper. Each of these disciplines has its own ethos and set of preconceptions. Each, in other words, takes certain information for granted and finds certain situations and issues intrinsically interesting. The History of Education, for example, continues to be fascinated with the concept that schools are tools of social control. While History proper (as a discipline) searches events and ideologies for cause and effect.

As far as ideologies are concerned, this thesis treads a fine line between the "objective", "scientific" ethos which is at the base of History. (This ethos is a product of History's 19th century development.) And the subjective -- which does not mean

incorrect -- ideology that underpins Feminist Literary Criticism. While History (rooted as it is in "cause and effect" and documentary analysis) has in large and continues to emphasize the politician, the bureaucrat, the general, and the mass (or the people), literary criticism (particularly, concerning women's writings) tends to emphasize the unique, the solitary, the individual. This thesis has attempted (in so far as its limited scope has allowed) to demonstrate the symbiotic relationship between the individual and the general population. In doing so, it has it has attempted to demonstrate how the individual appears in, and is really central to, History.

Consider what this piece of writing has taught us about the relationship of the schoolmistress to educated society, schoolmasters and herself. In conceiving my thesis, I looked to Joan Wallach Scott -- who wrote in her book Gender and the Politics of History -- that "to pursue meaning, we need to deal with individual subjectivity as well as social organization, and to articulate the nature of their interrelationships." (Scott 42)

As noted in my Preface, I chose Russian schoolmistresses as the subject of my thesis because they were strangely absent from or mute in the history of the Russian educational system. I chose to cast my thesis as a dialogue of sorts, as a symbiosis, in order to offer my readers content and considerations that I think are absent from or mute in the majority of conventional histories. I offered my readers ambiguity of meaning and individuality of characterization -- two human and dynamic characteristics too often

strained out of conventional histories in order to make room for solid "cause and effect". That is, facts which "prove" that a certain person did such a thing for this specific reason.

At present, a war is being waged over the nature of "women's history". On one side, are those who believe that women's history is simply another subsection of social history -- that is, of "history from below". What this means is that women, who form an absolute majority of the population in most countries at present and down through History, and who assume the primary responsibility of caring for the family (most societies' embryonic social unit) have been relegated to the position of a minority. The emphasis of conventional History remains a few "great men".

In the opposing camp, are those who believe "we can not write women into history, for example, unless we are willing to entertain the notion that history as a unified story was a fiction about a universal subject whose universality was achieved through an implicit process of differentiation, marginalization, and exclusion. Man was never, in other words, a truly universal figure." (Scott 197)

My work -- needless to say -- supports the second of these assumptions. Through its reference to and use of dialogue, discourse and symbiosis, The Personal is Political: The Late Nineteenth Century Russian Schoolmistress Speaks for Herself has revealed how the process of the marginalization of women in the discipline of History has occurred in one field. It has also suggested and utilized a technique for introducing women into

textbooks and the very ethos of that field. Through its discussion and use of text and subtext, this thesis has challenged the very concept of universality upon which much History is unfortunately based.

Like Martha Vicinus, I believe "that women are never passive participants in the larger culture but actively transform and redefine their external constraints." (Vicinus 7) My thesis (and this preamble) support such a belief.

Pamela J. Boniface

Concluding note: The analogic quality of the foregoing thesis can not fail to be noticed by the reader. The underlying thesis it presents -- that men judge women's participation in the public sphere through the construction of stereotypes that exceptionalize women -- has a universal relevance. Such a process of marginalization ensures that men's conceptions of the 'right' types of professional conduct will never be challenged or overthrown.

Thus, the native gifts that women bring to business, academia, education and government (including consensus decision-making and a more democratic approach to task allocation) are portrayed as charming abberations -- not new alternatives. As the halls of academe have been my haunt for the last two years, I find this conclusion has tremendous implications for the careers and self-images of all female scholars. We must be aware of tendency of the

male intellectual to theorize concerning our wishes and motivations.

During my first week in a graduate program, for example, I was asked when I intended to have children. I was 23 (and married) and had a great deal of time to decide upon this most personal of questions myself. I, not surprisingly, drew a conclusion from the timing and content of this question: that the male scholar who had asked believed married women in academia are simply biding time until their most important of careers -- that of mother -- is begun. I also sensed an eagerness on the part of the individual in question to have some say in (or to have some control over) this decision.

As I proceeded with my research, I was surprised and saddened to see that such a desire for control on the part of males in positions of authority has been a feature of professional women's experience for many years. My thesis has been an attempt to draw attention to this subtle dynamic. I hope that it has been informative.

May we all soon have the freedom to speak for ourselves.

August 24, 1991

University of
British Columbia