

The Institute of Art History and the Problem of Aesthetic Education in Russia in the First Quarter of the 20th Century*

Vitaly Ananiev

Ananiev Vitaly Gennadievich¹
Saint-Petersburg State University
Department of Museum Studies
Universitetskaja nab. 7-9
199034 Sankt-Peterburg
Russian Federation
e-mail: v.ananbev@spbu.ru

Muzeológia a kultúrne dedičstvo, 2016, 4:2:9-20

The Institute of Art History and the Problem of Aesthetic Education in Russia in the First Quarter of the 20th Century

The article is devoted to the activity of the Institute of Art History, related to the development of aesthetic education in Russia. The author analyzes archival materials related to the Institute's work in the first quarter of the twentieth century. The problem of aesthetic education is considered in the overall context of Russian intellectual life of this period.

Key words: Institute of Art History, V.P. Zubov, F.I. Shmit, art education, museum education, museum object as learning material, Petrograd.

The study of educational strategies and practices in the humanitarian field is one of the important directions of historical research, which is still characterized by the presence of significant numbers of unresolved discernments. As it was noted by L. A. Sychenkova: "In the rich heritage of the Russian Art Critics of the 20th Century daring experiments in the field of art education, which anticipated the latest approaches in the system of modern higher education, still remains virtually thoughtlessly unexplored. These experiments are interesting in our time not only as a fact of the history of art education, but also as a source of constructive ideas for the development of modern training of humanitarians of different profiles, first of all, cultural studies, professional museologists and art historians".²

In her article L. A. Sychenkova characterizes the actual art direction in teaching activities of the researchers (V. P. Zubov, F. I. Schmidt, and I. I. Ioffe) associated with one of the centres of intellectual life of Petrograd – Leningrad in the late 1910's – 1920's, the Institute of history of art (hereinafter – the Institute).

However, from foundation's inception, the Institute became the centre of not only art education but also aesthetic education per se, the development of which was considered at the turn of the 19th and 20th Centuries as one of the most important areas of humanitarian activity.

* I'm sincerely grateful to Olga Krivenkova (Saint-Petersburg) and Dr. T. Felix Breedlove (Washington, DC) for the support with English translation of this text.

¹ Ananiev Vitaly Gennadievich is a Candidate of Science in History, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Museology at the Saint-Petersburg State University.

² SYCHENKOVA, Lidiya. *Pervye jeksperimenty v sfere iskusstvovedcheskogo obrazovanija: Nezapolnennyj probel v istorii nauki ob iskusstve*. Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta. Serija: Gumanitarnye nauki, 156, 2014, 3, pp. 223-231 (p. 223).

In this paper, based on the archival materials of the Institute, some of which haven't previously attracted the attention of researchers and haven't been introduced into academic circulation, we'll try to trace how the development of this direction of activity of the Institute took place.

The activities of the Institute began with the lectures. December 3, 1912, St. Petersburg School District delivered the certificate No. 36527, on the opening of the courses of count V. P. Zubov. The count, art historian and philanthropist, was committed 'to the temporary duties of the Director of the aforementioned Institute'.³ August 28, 1916, the Minister of Public Education sent to Zubov an Affirmed Statute (Charter) of the 'Institute of the History of Arts' to 'carry it into effect'. A copy of the Charter was directed also to Petrograd Temporarily manager of the school district.⁴

The Institute was defined as 'a special private high school for students of both genders. Its purpose was 'to promote the study of art, both Russian and foreign, and to promote scientific communication in the field'. At the Institute 'systematic courses are read and practical classes on history of arts, archaeology and adjacent sciences are conducted and the courses for teachers (both male and female) of secondary and higher elementary schools are organized, in an ardent attempt to prepare them for artistic/historical excursions and for the analysis of monuments of art in the classroom'.⁵ Thus, the arrangement of the specialized courses for teachers was indicated as a direction of work of the Institute in this charter confirmed by the minister.

In a special note addressed to the Minister of public education by the Council of the Institute (signed by Director V. P. Zubov and Academic Secretary V. N. Rakint), dated November 10, 1916,⁶ the latest fact was particularly mentioned. The council noted that the approval of the Charter of the Institute as a higher educational institution changed its goals, that 'grew out of the requirements to create highly trained teaching staff that could acquaint pupils of the higher elementary schools and secondary schools with the monuments of art (varied classroom discernments, excursions, sightseeing with students of the most important architectural monuments, museums, etc.)'. Thereupon, the Institute planned in the 1916 – 1917 academic year, special courses for teachers with 'practical studies on the analysis of monuments, artistic and aesthetic excursions and methodological examinations of art collections'.⁷

This direction was prepared by the previous activities of the Institute. In the summer of 1916, a special Commission on the problems of aesthetic education in secondary school was organized, besides the director and academic secretary, A. A. Brock, O. F. Waldhauer, V. Ya. Kurbatov, A. N. Benois, I. E. Grabar and headmasters of a number of large gymnasiums and specialized schools of St. Petersburg were included.⁸ The first meeting of the commission was held on June 16, 1916. The issues of the publication of textbooks and manuals on aesthetic education in middle school and the formation of slide collections were discussed.⁹ At the third meeting, December 14, the participants requested 'giving it the nature of the permanent commission, where educational authorities and teachers of secondary educational institutions

³ Central'nyj Gosudarstvennyj Arhiv Literaturny i Iskusstva Sankt-Peterburga (hereafter, CGALI SPb), f. 82, op. 1, d. 2, l. 11.

⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 2, l. 1.

⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 2, l. 2.

⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 2, l. 12-15 rev.

⁷ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 2, l. 14.

⁸ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 1-2.

⁹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 4-5.

could address for information and guidance on the issues of aesthetic education in secondary school'.¹⁰ There were varied issues, that were planned for future perusal: such as, speaking about the decoration of the schools with original colour lithographs and woodcuts.¹¹ It was planned to make a list of the monuments of St.-Petersburg, which it was necessary to take pictures for school slides.¹² As an expert in the history of the city and its culture, devoted art historian and professional chemist, V. Ya. Kurbatov proposed in some cases to use the photos stored in the Museum of Old Petersburg. Several lists were made (monuments of Western European and Russian Art), which took into account the experience already applied in St. Petersburg Gymnasiums (list of monuments of the inspector of the gymnasium of Alexander II in Peterhof M. M. Izmailova).¹³ The task of forming a special aesthetic environment for the educational process was one of the most important in Europe at that time. Under the influence of the ideas of one of the founders of museum pedagogy, the reformer of art education A. Lichtwark in Germany, several exhibitions were organized, some were dedicated to the exemplary design of classrooms, and an all-German movement for arts education was organized, conducting meetings with artists and pedagogues, asking for the reform of teaching art.¹⁴ In the matter of the academic study of art on a formal basis, the Institute developed advanced European trends.

The actual training of the pedagogues started there a little later, but, of course, it also reflected the keen interest of the Institute to the problem of aesthetic education. In February 14, 1917, the Institute sent the department of public education a letter in which it informed them, 'to meet the urgent needs in the training of teachers of higher elementary schools and secondary schools to acquaint the students with the monuments of arts', it was ready before special courses for such teachers were organized, to provide them with free access to the lectures delivered that year at the Institute, and allowed them to use its auxiliary departments (library and collection of diapositives).¹⁵ The idea of the organization of the specialized courses was not forgotten, but under the terms of this revolutionary time, an attempt to implement the aforementioned immediately failed. However in 1917, the problem of aesthetic education was present in the beginnings of the Institute.

In March 1917, in the premises of the Institute, a meeting of artists and scientists was held on the organization of the Ministry of the Arts. According to the results, a commission was made to motivate the resolution adopted at the meeting and to develop issues related to the organization of independent Department or Ministry of Fine Arts.

Its first meeting was held on March 10, 1917. On the proposal of V. N. Rakint the participants decided not to restrict only to the question of motivation, but to prepare a draft of a provisional organization of the office, 'which was realizable even in crucial time'. It was decided to work in seven sub-committees; one was dedicated to art and history of education. Eminent art critics and art historians, museum curators, such as, D. V. Aynalov, A. V. Golovan',

¹⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 9.

¹¹ A. N. Benois and V. P. Zubov made a list of artists that could be engaged: CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 9.

¹² CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 9 rev.

¹³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 4, l. 11-12, 12 rev., 18-21, 22-25, 26-28 rev.

¹⁴ FISHMAN, Sterling. Alfred Lichtwark and the Founding of the German Art Education Movement. In: *History of Education Quarterly*, 6, 1966, 4, pp. 3-17.

¹⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 5, l. 5-5 rev.

V. P. Zubov, N. P. Kondakov, V. N. Rakint, D. A. Schmidt became its members.¹⁶ Almost all of them had a teaching experience, also as the professors and lecturers of the Institute.

At the second meeting of the commission, March 2, 1917 new members were co-opted for the board, including the classicist of international reputation F. F. Zelinsky, who became the chairman of the sub-commission on art education. The subcommission also included S. A. Zhebelev and A. A. Brock,¹⁷ and soon academicians M. I. Rostovtsev, N. Ya. Marr and V. V. Bartold were co-opted.¹⁸

According to archival materials of Institute, the sub-commission examined the problem in many dimensions: for example, S. A. Zhebelev prepared a note on the creation of the departments of Art History in the universities (dated May 7, 1917),¹⁹ and O. F. Waldhauer about the desired organization of the teaching of archaeology in Russian Universities.²⁰ A report on the teaching of art history in higher technical educational institutions was presented by V. Ya. Kurbatov (who was chemist himself).²¹ The issues, connected with the new (for the turn of the century) form of organization of scientific and educational activities, as cultural and historical institutions, were discussed: O. F. Waldhauer talked about the archaeological institutes, N. L. Okunev about the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople, a project of the Caucasian historical-archeological Institute was discussed, V. N. Rakint made a report about art-historical institutions in general, and in addition V. P. Zubov gave a presentation of the project of the Russian Institute in Rome.²² On March 27, 1917, a report was delivered by A. A. Brock, dedicated on the whole to the importance of aesthetic education of the people, the role of the school in this process.²³ The author noted that 'for the conclusion of the affair, guided visits to monuments and museums were recommended for viewing those works of art that were discussed in the classroom'.²⁴ Apparently, the meetings of the sub-commission continued till May 11, 1917.²⁵

The accumulated methodological experience, theoretical developments in the field of aesthetic education, obtained in the course of discussion of the reports, were realized in 1918, when the Institute finally embodied the project of conducting courses for teachers. In 'The History of the Institute', published in 1924, it was written: 'One of the most gratifying memories for the people associated with the Institute is connected with the spring of 1918'.²⁶ Moreover, it was stressed that 'this experience proved to be extremely successful: it gave a highly educated, sensitive and attentive audience; from the same auditorium of holiday courses came out more than a dozen of the best students of the Institute and subsequently the scientific staff of the Institute and other related to it institutions'.²⁷

¹⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 7, l. 105-106.

¹⁷ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 7, l. 107.

¹⁸ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 61.

¹⁹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 15-15 a rev.

²⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 16-16 rev.

²¹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 22-31.

²² CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 61.

²³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 45-50.

²⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 60.

²⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 8, l. 16-16 oб.

²⁶ Kratkij otchet o dejatel'nosti Rossijskogo Instituta Istorii Iskusstv. In: *Zadachi i metody izučbenija iskusstv*. Saint-Petersburg, 2012, p. 192.

²⁷ Ibid.

A three-week vacation course for teachers of secondary and higher primary schools were held by the Institute from Monday 7 (20) May to Sunday 27 May (June 9) 1918 with the aim of preparing them for the analysis of the monuments of art in the classroom and to the artistic and historical excursions with the students.²⁸

The disciplines on art history were read by M. I. Rostovtsev, O. F. Waldhauer, V. P. Zubov, N. P. Sytchev, V. Ya. Kurbatov, I. I. Zharnovsky, on the methodology (about the principles of art education, Introduction to the Study of Art) by A. A. Brock, A. V. Golovan'. Classes of Waldhauer on 'Ancient sculpture in the Hermitage' and 'The Antique vases of the Hermitage' were to be held at the museum, on 'Museum of Plaster Casts at the Academy of Arts' – in the Academy. Sytchev's lectures 'The basics of the ancient art of pre-Petrine era' were accompanied by the demonstrations in the repository of the Department of Old Art at the Russian Museum (now called the Russian State Museum). Kurbatov's course 'Acquaintance with the Monuments of Russian Art of the Imperial Period' was assumed to be accompanied with the visits to the palaces, churches and other art monuments of St. Petersburg. Due to the closure of the Hermitage Art gallery classes of Zharnovsky dedicated to 'Paintings of the Hermitage' had to be accompanied with the slides and photographs in the classrooms of the Institute.²⁹

In addition, it was assumed to organize for students artistic and historical excursions to the prominent suburbs of Petrograd – former royal and imperial residences Gatchina, Tsarskoe Selo, Pavlovsk and Peterhof. Lectures were held in the evenings, visits to museums, palaces and churches were carried out in the daytime, excursions – during the holidays. The chairman of the commission of these courses were M. I. Rostovtsev, secretary – O. F. Waldhauer.³⁰ The courses aroused great interest among the teachers. 110 people paid in, two were admitted for free.³¹ Serious preparatory work preceded the courses. At the beginning of May 1918, 100 copies of course programmes were to be distributed between the members of the Teachers' Congress.³² Negotiations with museums about the possibility of holding classes on their territory began. The direct contacts of students with the real objects, visualization of the studied material were important and progressive features of the teaching strategy for that time. In many respects, they coincided with an active emerging paradigm for museum and pedagogical activity. Negotiations with museums passed differently.

April 24, 1918, the Institute sent a letter to the board of the art department of the Russian Museum with a request to visit the repository 'each time under the guidance of a teacher of the Institute N. P. Sytchev'.³³ The answer signed by the director of the art department P. I. Nerodovsky was received on May 13, 1918, it reported that 'Arts council of the Russian Museum don't see any obstacles to the attendance and the examination'.³⁴ It was more difficult to come to the agreement with the Hermitage. At the request of the Institute to allow the participants of the course attendance and survey of the Museum of ancient sculpture and a collection of antique vases 'each time under the guidance of professor of the Institute O.F. Waldhauer',³⁵ signed by the chairman of the commission of the conduction of the courses

²⁸ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 27, l. 3.

²⁹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 27, l. 3 rev.

³⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 27, l. 4.

³¹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 8-27.

³² CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 6.

³³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 4.

³⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 7.

³⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 3.

academician Rostovtsev and Acting Director Rakint, the Council of the Hermitage on April 27, 1918, refused.³⁶

According to the minutes of the Council of the Hermitage, the request of the Institute caused almost panic among the staff of the museum. At the meeting of the board of curators of the Hermitage, held on April 25, 1918, a petition 'of the Institute of History of Arts of count Zubov' was rejected by all votes against two (probably O. F. Waldhauer and D. A. Schmidt, who actively cooperated with the Institute), 'because of the fear that other organizations will require the same admittance to the Hermitage, while its protection at present is insufficient'.³⁷ A certain spice to the situation gave not only the fact that the some members of the Hermitage staff spoke as the lecturers on the courses, but also the fact that at that time the founder of the Institute, Count V. P. Zubov, was in Moscow, where he examined the safety of the Hermitage objects, evacuated there in 1917 during the World War First. His report on this matter was heard by the council immediately after the announcement of the application of the courses.³⁸

The query, however, wasn't closed completely. In the new circumstances of Revolution the matters were dealt differently. On June 5th, the Council was forced to return to this issue. It turned out that the group of students applied for admission to the museum to the representatives of the new government, and on June 4th, the authorized commissioner of the Commissariat of property of the Republic I. V. Kimmel demanded from the council to satisfy this requirement. Waldhauer stated that he learned about the petition after it was filed. In any case, June 4th, the Commissar of the Hermitage and Winter Palace, G. S. Yatmanov in a telephone conversation with the curator of the department of classical numismatics of the Hermitage, E. M. Pridik 'in the most categorical form has required the admittance of the aforesaid excursion and all the same'.³⁹ Senior curator of the Department of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance Ya. I. Smirnov suggested three possible ways to settle the issue, which so precisely reflected the spirit of the times and the genius loci of the Hermitage and the personality of the academician that it is essential to cite them completely: '1) To close the doors to keep out the sightseers despite the order of the Commissioner Kimmel 2) to completely obey the order, and 3) to allow the sightseers, but to explain to them that it is contrary to the decision of the Hermitage and to give an opportunity to those who do not wish to go against the opinion of scientific board of the Hermitage to refuse a visit'.⁴⁰ In the end, the council decided to concede the request of the Commissar, and to allow the sightseers to inspect the department of sculptures on the 7th and 8th of June from 10 to 12 hours a day, 'calling on these days a sufficient number of attendants', but to report about the incident at the next meeting of the new governmental body, Collegium of museums and protection of monuments of art and antiquities.⁴¹ However, the next day O. F. Waldhauer wrote a report stating that 'in such circumstances students do not consider it a possibility to visit the Hermitage'.⁴² The incident was closed, but afterwards the relationship between the Hermitage and the Institute remained complicated.

Apart from visiting the museums of Petrograd, as it was noted above, tours to suburban palaces, recently converted to museums, were planned. Their conduction was also fraught with

³⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 5.

³⁷ *Zhurnaly zasedanij Soveta Jermitezha*, 2 vols, Saint-Petersburg, 2001, I. 1917 – 1919 gody, p. 40.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid, p. 56.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 57.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 56.

⁴² Ibid, p. 58.

difficulties. For example, a letter was sent to authorized commissioner of Commissariat of property of the republic with the request to provide an unimpeded inspection of the Grand Alexander Palace in Tsarskoe Selo (on the 11th of June), Peterhof (June 2nd) and Gatchina (June 9th), under the guidance of Kurbatov.⁴³ Similar letters were sent to arts council of the Gatchina Museum of Art and History,⁴⁴ to the commandant of Tsarskoe Selo Palace⁴⁵ and to the Art Commission for acceptance of the property of the Tsarskoe Selo Palaces. The organizers of the course wanted to ensure a visit to the Great Palace, Hermitage in Tsarskoe Selo (one of the minor palaces) and to those rooms of the Alexander Palace, 'which will be recognized as possible to show to the tourists'.⁴⁶ The new government of Bolsheviks was more disposed to cooperate than the academic curators of the Hermitage Museum, and on the 31st of May 1918, the Institute received a letter from Commissioner Kimmel with the notification that he 'made the order to provide all sorts of assistance'.⁴⁷

The courses took place and were recognized quite successful. On the 20th of July 1918, the newspaper 'The Petrograd Teacher' wrote that 'students left the Institute inspired, cheered up, full of energy for the labour expecting in the new academic year'. Moreover, the course participants organized a pedagogical society, which took over the development of the issues set by the courses.⁴⁸

Soon planning of autumn vacation courses for teachers was begun, because 'not all who wanted could get on the first spring session of vacation courses'.⁴⁹ From the 5th - the 16th of September, seventy persons signed up.⁵⁰ To arrange the second classroom for the autumn session of vacation courses the Institute received on August 29th, from the Council of the Petrograd Teachers 'Union a loan of 1 500 rubles, on condition to return the money till the end of October of the same year'.⁵¹ On September 5th, an additional 2 000 rubles were received on the same conditions.⁵² 120 rubles were paid to the typography 'Avedon' for the printing of programmes.⁵³ The courses were held from September 7th - 30th. In the program, among other disciplines, the following activities were mentioned: Waldhauer - Museum of Ancient Sculpture of the Pavlovsk Palace (1 lecture); Zharnovsky - Hermitage Paintings (8 lectures); Zubov - Pavlovsk and Gatchina (each course included 3 lectures), etc.⁵⁴ In the premises of the Institute an exhibition of colour reproductions of paintings (of Dutch, German, Italian schools) was arranged for students, there they could receive explanations.⁵⁵

To conduct the courses were difficult, not only from the organizational point of view, but also from a financial stance. In addition to the charges of 1918, the cost of the 'art history excursions' for students (3 000 rubles), the organization of free vacation courses for teachers of secondary and higher educational institutions (5 400 rubles) were included, as well as the

⁴³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 28-28 rev.

⁴⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 29.

⁴⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 31.

⁴⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 30-30 rev.

⁴⁷ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 32.

⁴⁸ A. W. Nechajannaja radost'. In: *Petrogradskij učitel*, 1918, 17-18 (20 July), p. 7-8.

⁴⁹ *Kratkij otchet o dejatel'nosti* (see note 26 above), p. 192.

⁵⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 43-48 a.

⁵¹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 50.

⁵² CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 52.

⁵³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 26, l. 53.

⁵⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 54, l. 16 rev.

⁵⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 54, l. 17.

costs needed to arrange public readings on popular art for the masses (7 500 rubles).⁵⁶ The Institute which existed to a great extent on the money of its founder, Count V. P. Zubov, in the new post-revolutionary conditions of economic ruin and Civil War had not only to wage a constant struggle to find funds, but also to repel the attacks of the new government systematically making attempts to reduce the staff and to cut its funding. Vacation courses for teachers weren't conducted any more, but a related line of work continued in a new form – the form of Art and Educational Society, whose establishment was announced after the first courses.

Probably initially the Society operated without any institutional framework, on the principle of commissions as they existed at the Institute before the revolution, and with the same members. But in 1919, a query was raised about the inclusion of the aforementioned society into the structure of the Institute as the special department that would not only regulate the work, but also to give it certain financial stability. June 10, 1919, the Institute hosted a meeting of the Commission on the possibilities of the introduction of pedagogical disciplines into the curriculum. A. A. Brock was Chairman, B. P. Bryullov, V. A. Golovan', V. B. Echeistov, A. A. Pochinkov, O. M. Ryndina attended. By majority vote, the audience recognized the necessity of the introduction at the Institute, a group of 'specific subjects and practical exercises for exploring the issues of aesthetic education and education for individuals wishing to devote themselves to pedagogical activity'.⁵⁷

July 1, 1919, the board of the Institute decided to offer to the Council of the Institute to make a Commission on the organization of the Artistic-Pedagogical Department from the members of the Council of the Institute and the Council of Pedagogical Societies.⁵⁸ On August 22, 1919, a scheme of an organization from the beginning of the 1919 – 1920 academic year of the appropriate department, an explanatory note and the draft estimates were sent to the Department of Scientific Institutions and Higher Educational Establishments.⁵⁹ The scheme supposed that the structure of the Department consisted of 4 docenturs: a) the introductory courses (essence and purpose of art education, the history of aesthetic instruction and education, artistic education, with practical training, 3 annual hours per week); b) didactics of art education on the primary level of the school (with practical exercises, 2 annual hours per week); c) the same for the upper grades (3 annual hours per week); d) method of conducting excursions (2 annual hours per week). The courses were planned to start from January 1, 1920. The note pointed that in the work of the department 'a centre of attention falls not on lectures but on practical classes', and persons who 'have already received sufficient artistic and historical training' are admitted for education.⁶⁰ Thus, it was planned to create a training model that could be called practice-oriented.

The argument in favour of the establishment of the new department was closely connected with the actual problems of that time. In the explanatory note to the scheme it was mentioned that art education was one of the vital tasks of a new school, but staff for the teaching of relevant disciplines was missing in the country. The Commissariat for Education introduced in the curriculum of the Unified Labor School, a course on the history of art, but the lack of

⁵⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 12, l. 6 rev.

⁵⁷ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 35, l. 45.

⁵⁸ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 37, l. 10.

⁵⁹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 1.

⁶⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 2.

qualified teachers 'has served as a barrier in many schools to the correct formulation of the subject'.

No higher educational institution that could prepare such staff existed. The Institute, supplementing its plan with "special research subjects", could take on these functions.⁶¹ August 23, a message with the approval of the establishment of the proposed department, 'the costs of organization and maintenance were charged to the balances of estimates for the second half of 1919' came from the Department.⁶²

In July – August of 1919 the work of the society was held as a sequence of individual reports and discussions: the reports were delivered by A. A. Brock, 'The Nature and means of art education', L. G. Orshansky 'Art in the early years of a child's life', A. A. Pochinkov 'The Purpose and Methods of Art Education at the Senior Secondary School', N. D. Flittner 'From the Practice of Guided Tours', O. F. Waldhauer 'Method of acquaintance with the monuments of art at the senior secondary school'. The entrance was free, the meetings were held on Saturdays.⁶³ When the consent of higher authorities was obtained, the work on staffing of a new department began: August 19th, the requests to confirm the balloting for the position of lecturers were sent to some employees of the society. The supposed disciplines were also defined. In the end, on September 4th, were elected as the lecturers of the Institute in the new department: V. I. Beyer for reading an introductory course and the course on 'Didactics on the Primary Level School', L. G. Orshanskii – 'Teaching of Aesthetics in Pre-School Age', A. A. Pochinkov – 'Didactics at Upper Secondary School', B. P. Bryullov and N. D. Flittner – 'Methods of Conducting Excursions'.⁶⁴

The new department had its own special features, which distinguished it from other departments of the Institute, this particularity had to be taken into account while the rules of admission were determining. There was no coincidence that the 20th of October, 1919 A. A. Brock, on behalf of the board of professors of the Department, asked the Council of the Institute if 'access was open to a wide circle of teachers of a united school <...> and having in mind that knowledge of art history is certainly not a necessity' to listen to lectures and participate in seminars, to formulate the admission rules in the following way: all teachers of first and second stages of the unified labor school are admitted to the courses, and all persons over 16 years of age, who successfully passed the Colloquium on the History of Art are accepted as students. The decision on the admission of students for practical training 'is provided to the relevant teachers'.⁶⁵

The position of lecturers of the new department within the Institute's structure wasn't defined initially. But on the 15th of July, 1920 at a meeting of the Council of the Faculty of History of Fine Arts, it was decided that the lecturers of the Department were members of this Faculty.⁶⁶ The staff tried to attract to its work the attention of the broad community and government structures. For example, on the 25th of October, 1920 at a meeting of the Council of the Institute B. P. Bryllov asked to inform the district boards of Education that there was

⁶¹ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 3.

⁶² CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 7.

⁶³ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 5-6; CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 35, l. 57.

⁶⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 43, l. 54, 55, 55 a, 56, 69, 70.

⁶⁵ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 42, l. 8-8 rev.

⁶⁶ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 65, l. 1.

an Art-Pedagogical Department in the Institute⁶⁷. However, attention led to directly opposite results.

In the autumn of 1921 the Academic Centre (one of many new governmental bodies of early soviet years, devoted to the culture and science) demanded to reduce the staff of the Institute by 40%, as a result Orshansky was discharged on November 1 1920st.⁶⁸ Other employees of the department were affected with these measures, its work began to fade, which was due not only to the external pressure. As the authors of the brief outline of the history of the Institute, noted in 1922, 'This society, worked until 1921, then actually stopped the activity as a newly formed Institute of excursions devoted itself to the aforementioned queries'.⁶⁹ Actually, many of the active members of the Society and the department became lecturers of this new institution.

However, pedagogical subjects didn't disappear from the plans of the Institute. On June 27, 1924, the Presidium found desirable the proposal of Count V. P. Zubov, of the 'establishment of the Institute preparatory school or College so that young people who graduated from this school, continued their education at the Public courses at the Institute'.

On July 9, 1924 at the meeting of the Presidium a director's report was listened to on his personal negotiations in state organization, devoted to the Leningrad professional education. According to him, it became clear that the organization recognized the desirable education in the College (from the autumn of 1924, a special College composed of 1, 2 and 3 classes) as a preparatory institution for entering Public courses at the Institute. A special Commission with Brock (former Director of the Protestant Reformation College), Waldhauer, Kozhin and Pochenkov was created to develop a plan of teaching there.⁷⁰

However, this undertaking was not implemented. Moreover, this plan can be looked at as a Swan song of the founder of the Institute, as at the end of 1924, Zubov resigned his duties as director, and in early 1925 he left the Soviet Union. The last attempt to address the pedagogic subject was connected with the activity of his successor, the new director of the Institute, prominent Art Historian F. I. Schmidt. In his works of the turn of the 1910 – 1920th an important place occupied the popular at that time problems of pedology, in which Schmidt saw one of the possible keys to the comprehension of general laws of development of art and psychology.⁷¹ It wasn't coincidence therefore that in developing his former activities in Ukraine in this direction (creation in Kharkov and Kiev exhibitions and research museums of children's drawings),⁷² Schmidt in the Institute decided to continue research in this area.

Under the pressure of external circumstances the Committee of the Sociological Study of Art was created in the Institute determined to become a general structure to coordinate the activities of all departments.⁷³ It was intended to organize a series of sections in the structure of this Committee. The Pedologic Section was determined to become one of them. The queries that were included in the range of it interests were determined as follows: 1) a normal way of

⁶⁷ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 35, l. 90.

⁶⁸ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 90, l. 15.

⁶⁹ *Kratkij otchet o dejatel'nosti* (see note 26 above), p. 192.

⁷⁰ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 1, d. 147, l. 75.

⁷¹ SCHMIT, Fyodor. *Pochemu i zachem deti risujut: Pedologicheskij i pedagogicheskij očerok*. Moscow, 1924, 197 pp.

⁷² YUKHNEVITCH, Marina. *Obrazovatel'nyj muzej (pedagogicheskij, škol'nyj, detskij)*. Moscow, 2007, p. 75-77.

⁷³ KUMPAN, Xenia. K istorii vozniknovenija Sockoma v Institute istorii iskusstv (Eshhe raz o Zhirmunskom i formalistah). In: *Na rubezhe dvuh stoletij: Sbornik v chest' 60-letija Aleksandra Vasil'evicha Lavrova*. Moscow, 2009, pp. 345-360.

associative emotional development of figurative thinking of children and the acquisition of those motor skills that were necessary for artistic expression, 2) the dependence of the artistic achievements of children from sex, origin (nationality, class) and general context, 3) deviations from the norms (standards) determined by the peculiarities of physical development, inherited and acquired diseases and defects, 4) limits and methods most useful pedagogical (educational and academic) impact on children. Special attention in the work of the section was planned to be placed on the development of research methods of children (psychotechnics, development of questionnaires, tests).

A creation of the archive of original documents for the study of children's creativity was supposed, for this purpose links with the corresponding institutions were installed (especially rural). The fourth point of the programme announced the necessity of the connection with museum guides, directors of children's theatres and museum section of the same committee.⁷⁴ As far as we can judge from survived documents, this project existed only on paper. The greater part of Schmidt's directorship (second half of the 1920's) fell on the period of increasing pressure on the divisiveness of the Institute by the strengthening machine of a totalitarian state.

Eventually this pressure would lead to the deletion of this unique institution and repression of its director and several employees. In the early 1930's, the Institute was abolished, and many people who were involved in its work (as teachers and students) arrested.

Varied discernments related to aesthetic education, were present in the plans and projects of the Institute. Typical for it were the diversity of forms of its development, the active usage of the adaptation mechanisms that gave the opportunity to develop the selected themes in these particular conditions by selection of the most adequate forms: commissions, courses, societies, department, college. On the content level the check of the chosen topic with relevant concepts: the aesthetic organization of the learning environment, by the introduction of extracurricular forms of work, pedagogical developments were organized. In the difficult conditions of the first post-revolutionary years the Institute acted as the centre of support (at least intellectual) for some throwback to pre-revolutionary practices of undertakings, and when specialized structures were created for its implementation (for example, an Institute of Excursions), gave them not only experience, but also, experts necessary for professional development.

Sources

Archive sources:

Central'nyj Gosudarstvennyj Arhiv Literatury i Iskusstva Sankt-Peterburga, f. 82.

References:

FISHMAN S. Alfred Lichtwark and the Founding of the German Art Education Movement.

In: *History of Education Quarterly*, 1966. Vol. 6. № 4, pp. 3-17. ISSN 1748-5959.

KUMPAN, K.A. Institut istorii iskusstv na rubezhe 1920 – 1930-h godov. In: *Konec institucij kul'tury dvadcatykh godov v Leningrade. Po arhivnym materialam*. Moscow : NLO, 2014, pp. 8-128. ISBN 978-5-444-80182-6.

⁷⁴ CGALI SPb, f. 82, op. 3, d. 8, l. 40.

- KUMPAN, K.A. K istorii vozniknovenija Sockoma v Institute istorii iskusstv (Eshhe raz o Zhirmunskom i formalistah). In: *Na rubezhe dveh stoletij: Sbornik v chest' 60-letija Aleksandra Vasil'evicha Lavrova*. Moscow : NLO, 2009, pp. 345-360. ISBN 978-5-86793-657-0.
- SCHMIT, Fyodor. *Pochemu i zachem deti risujut: Pedologicheskij i pedagogicheskij ocherk*. Moscow, 1924, 197 pp.
- SYCHENKOVA, L.A. Pervye jeksperimenty v sfere iskusstvovedcheskogo obrazovanija: Nezapolnennyj probel v istorii nauki ob iskusstve. In: *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*. Serija : Gumanitarnye nauki. 2014. T. 156. Kn. 3, pp. 223-231. ISSN 1815-6126.
- YUKHNEVITCH, M.Yu. *Obrazovatel'nyj muzej (pedagogicheskij, sbkol'nyj, detskij)*. Moscow : NP «STOiK», 2007. ISBN 978-5-902970-11-8.