



A MACHINE FOR DEVELOPING A WORLDVIEW

Alexander Liarsky

Higher School of Printing and Media Technologies, St Petersburg State University
of Industrial Technologies and Design
13 Dzhambula Lane, St Petersburg, Russia
lam732007@yandex.ru

Abstract: The article studies manuscript school magazines from the beginning of the twentieth century. One of the aims of such publications was considered to be the formation of a worldview. A brief sketch is given of the development of ideas of a worldview in Russia in the nineteenth century, and a survey of those practices whereby school magazines may have furthered its formation. The social situation of the publication of a school magazine is examined: the struggle of the activists with the passive masses, censorship and self-censorship. The conclusion attempts to extend our understanding of the history of the beginning of the twentieth century, taking into account the data obtained.

Key words: worldview, school magazines, history of ideas.

To cite: Liarsky A., 'A Machine for Developing a Worldview', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 2020, no. 16, pp. 162–184.

doi: 10.31250/1815-8927-2020-16-16-162-184

URL: <http://anthropologie.kunstkamera.ru/files/pdf/eng016/liarsky.pdf>

Alexander Liarsky

A Machine for Developing a Worldview¹

The article studies manuscript school magazines from the beginning of the twentieth century. One of the aims of such publications was considered to be the formation of a worldview. A brief sketch is given of the development of ideas of a worldview in Russia in the nineteenth century, and a survey of those practices whereby school magazines may have furthered its formation. The social situation of the publication of a school magazine is examined: the struggle of the activists with the passive masses, censorship and self-censorship. The conclusion attempts to extend our understanding of the history of the beginning of the twentieth century, taking into account the data obtained.

Keywords: worldview, school magazines, history of ideas.

Among the texts produced by children and adolescents themselves at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, school magazines — which had been published in Russia since the eighteenth century — occupy a special place. School magazines to which Sumarokov, Pushkin, Gogol and Zhukovsky contributed are known [Smirnov 1901], and from a later period Mayakovskiy [Balabanovich 1956], and Mandelshtam [Balashova 2007: 109]. The publication of school magazines was not confined to the capital, but was widespread throughout the Empire (see, for example: [Egorova 2008: 105–6]). There is quite an extensive literature about this kind of source, with the monograph by Yu. B. Balashova [Balashova 2007] deserving special mention; see also: [Ledeniova 2010; Vasilyev 2012; Eremin 2013; Kazeeva 2017; Tarumova 2017].

The present article contributes to a series on school magazines that I began some years ago [Lyarskiy 2013; Liarskiy 2014], and is devoted to a single problem: the development of a worldview. When schoolchildren attempted to explain to themselves why they were publishing a magazine, among other explanations, the following was often put forward: the magazine was needed because it helped ‘develop a worldview’. What was actually meant by this phrase; how a magazine might assist in developing a worldview; and what this pre-occupation with worldview contributes to the

Alexander Liarsky

Higher School of Printing and
Media Technologies, St Petersburg
State University of Industrial
Technologies and Design
13 Dzhambula Lane,
St Petersburg, Russia
lam732007@yandex.ru

¹ Fragments of the paper were published at the initial stage of the research as part of [Liarsky 2016].

understanding of certain processes in Russian history: these are the questions that this article addresses.

As a source base, I shall use the collections of manuscript school magazines that were formed around two educational establishments in St Petersburg: the Vyborgskoe Eight-Class Commercial School (Russian Vyborgskoe vosmikklassnoe kommercheskoe uchilishche, VVKU) [MD NLR, f. 1091], and the Vvedenskaya Boys' Classical Grammar School (*gimnaziya*) [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189]. In addition, I shall make recourse to the scattered issues of manuscript school magazines preserved in RGALI (Moscow) [RGALI, f. 1345, manuscript collection] and RGIA [RGIA, f. 733]. It is important that whereas magazines came to RGALI, for example, fortuitously and unsystematically, the collections at the MD NLR and TsGIA were deliberately assembled (on the VVKU collection see: [Leykina-Svirskaya, Selivanova 1993], and on the Vasilyev collection see: [Dianin 1926]), and reflect the collectors' liberal (in the first case) or radical left-wing (in the second case) convictions. It is fundamental that these are basically magazines and newspapers issued without any supervision by teachers or the school administration, that is, adult influence was mediated.

So, when schoolchildren began to issue their own magazine (frequently as a group of like-minded individuals, or belonging to the same form, often in secret from their teachers), many of the first issues opened with articles outlining their programme. And precisely the idea of 'developing a worldview' was among the most widespread justifications, one that appealed to schoolchildren for many years. *Popytka zhurnalistiki* (Essays in Journalism), the magazine of a Moscow classical grammar school in the 1890s, opened with the following text: 'When we pass from adolescence into young adulthood, when we begin to be interested in our surroundings, so interested that we find it hard to live without understanding them, when our eyes are opened to much that previously seemed unclear and indefinite, then one manifestation of this period is the magazine; which is why this normal path towards the study of our surroundings and towards developing a worldview — the magazine — is so popular amongst school pupils <...> The period of self-development has dawned. We must not miss it. Our life is so short, the years pass so quickly, that we must treasure every unoccupied hour and use it wisely. Losing no time, we must (since it is both moral and profitable) make it our main aim to develop a worldview' [Smirnov 1901, 8: 53–5]. In 1908 the magazine *Rassvet* (The Dawn) offered its pages to its readers in order to 'unite litterateurs, readers and critics'. In the editors' opinion, 'this literary work will also make it easier for us to develop a worldview' [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 44, f. 8v].

These ideas are repeated in a more radical form in the school newspaper *Zadachi* (Tasks) (1913, St Petersburg): 'It is essential that as he enters into life, a person must make a conscious decision which way he is to go: to the right or to the left <...> It [secondary school. — A.L.] systematically and obstinately crushes the spirit of social responsibility and the capacity for joint action in solidarity.' For this reason, the main task of *Zadachi* was 'preparation for the active struggle in the sense of the development of convictions' [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 149, f. 1–1v]. An article in the same journal says: 'How to live? How to act in one situation or another? How to make best use of our strength and our abilities in order to be of the greatest use to ourselves and others? These are the most essential questions for us, which must be answered before we enter into life, at our school desks, so as to enter upon the wheel of life with a solidly formed worldview which no mischance in life can overturn' [Ibid., f. 3].

Furthermore, as the publishers of the philosophical grammar-school journal *Kosmos* (Cosmos) (published in 1911 in St Petersburg by pupils of the fifth and sixth forms of the city's grammar schools) believed, with a worldview one could 'make a contribution to the history of human thought. Anyone can do this, since every person has his own worldview which necessarily has important individual aspects, and it is not possible for two absolutely analogous individuals to exist' [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 109, f. 7]. In this remarkable manner, having a worldview guaranteed that its possessor could make a contribution to the history of culture and philosophy.

What exactly was meant by 'a worldview'? Let us refer to the first definition of this concept in Russian, in the appendix to Toll's dictionary¹ in 1866: 'A worldview is an outlook on the origin, direction and existence of the world and all that is therein; to a certain extent, a person's moral position depends on his worldview. The worldview is, as it were, a personal, individual philosophical system, which is formed in every thinking person under the influence both of his upbringing and of all his life thereafter; it is therefore capable of change' (cited from [Sorokin 1965: 315]). Although this definition may seem self-evident, at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth, the interpretation of this word was more serious and more profound for the adolescent authors of the magazines than it is for us. This is to be seen most clearly not in dictionaries, which explain the meaning of the word, but in memoirs, which demonstrate its significance. Thus, the recently published

¹ Felix-Emmanuel Toll (1823–1867) was a former radical and political prisoner who worked as a writer and journalist after his return to St Petersburg in 1857. His *Table-Top Dictionary of Information on All Areas of Knowledge* (1863–1864) was a three-volume compendium whose contents included glosses on philosophical terms recently assimilated into the Russian language [Eds.].

memoirs of L. V. Rozental several times mention the development of a worldview, above all against the background of contemporary political events (the first Russian revolution and the time immediately afterwards): ‘The main thing is to fight. To extirpate any form of oppression. Fraternity, equality, liberty! <...> But then there began a period of strict adolescent honesty with myself. I was forced to acknowledge quietly, only to myself, that I was not ready for the great labour of self-sacrifice. <...> And it was as if I had been released from a heavy burden. But I still remained true to my exalted convictions. I decided that first of all I must set about developing my personal worldview. Or, as we used to say then, defining my “sense of the world”’ [Rozental 2010: 468].

In another fragment, the memoirist, who was a pupil at the Tennishev School,¹ speaks of the development of a worldview as a process of collective maturation: ‘We also started closed domestic circles with serious but somewhat vague aims. At first, in the middle forms, we confined ourselves to reading aloud together the works of literature that were considered classics <...> But later, as we grew up and entered the senior forms, we also met to discuss ideas, to talk over, as we used to say then, “questions of our personal worldview”’ [Rozental 2010: 491–2].

Another ‘Tennishev Boy’, Osip Mandelstam, suggested in detail what such a worldview could look like:

A copy of The Scales² under the desk, and next to it the slag and metal shavings from the Obukhov factory, and not a word, not a sound, as though by some conspiracy, about Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, or Pisarev; Balmont, however, was held in high regard and his imitators weren’t bad; and the Social Democrat is at the throat of the Populist, drinking his SR [Socialist Revolutionary. — Eds.] blood, and the latter calls in vain upon the princes of his church — Chernov, Mikhaylovsky, and even — the Historical Letters of Lavrov. Everything that represented an attitude toward life was greedily devoured. I repeat: my schoolmates could not endure Belinsky on account of the diffuseness of his attitude toward life, but Kautsky was respected, and so was Protopop Avvakum, whose autobiography, in the Pavlenkov edition, was made a part of our study of Russian literature. <...> Early, O Erfurt Program, you Marxist propylaea, too early did you train our spirits to a sense of harmoniousness, but to me and to many others you gave a sense of life in those prehistoric years when thought hungered after unity and harmoniousness, when the backbone of the age was

¹ A famous secondary school, officially a ‘commercial college’ but actually offering a broad liberal education, founded by Prince Vyacheslav Tennishev in 1898 [Eds.].

² *The Scales* (Russian *Vesy*) was a famous ‘new arts’ journal edited by the Symbolist poet and critic Valery Bryusov, which ran between 1904 and 1909.

becoming erect, when the heart needed more than anything the red blood of the aorta! Is Kautsky Tyutchev? Surely he was not gifted with the power to evoke cosmic sensations <...>? But just imagine — for a person at a certain age and at a certain moment Kautsky <...> is Tyutchev [emphasis in the original. — Eds.], that is, the source of a cosmic joy, the bearer of a strong and harmonious attitude toward life, the thinking reed, and a cover thrown over the abyss [The Prose of Osip Mandelstam 1986: 100–1].

This was not merely a reflection of the situation in some particular educational establishment. In his book *Revolution on My Mind*, Jochen Hellbeck analyses the diary of Zinaida Denisevskaya (born 1887), who wrote at the beginning of the twentieth century, while at her girls' classical high school, of her attempts at 'self-development': "I must clarify to myself my political and social views, and formulate them if they are not there." "The main thing is to work out my worldview. But it just won't be worked out — an absolute standstill — anguish and despair." Five years later she still complained: "I lack an integral worldview; because I can't clearly and logically explain all of life to myself" [Hellbeck 2009: 120].

So, people born at the end of the nineteenth or beginning of the twentieth century knew that everyone should have a worldview, that it needed to be developed, and that one mechanism for developing the worldview could be a magazine published within a circle of schoolmates. However, before looking at how that mechanism worked and what results the work might give, we should understand what sort of idea of the final result they had. For this we must go beyond the dictionary definition, and consider the combination of contexts in which the concept of 'a worldview' might acquire a meaning for schoolchildren of the end of the nineteenth or beginning of the twentieth century.

The history of the concept of the 'worldview' in Russian culture is as yet unwritten, and the present article can only give a sketchy and preliminary account of milestones along the way. Historians of language and historians of philosophy unanimously connect the origin of the concept with classical German philosophy (a calque of the German *Weltanschauung*) [Lvov 2014; Shcherbakova 2015], and the dissemination in Russia of the words *mirovozzrenie* and its synonym *mirosozertsanie* with the intellectual movement of the 1830s and 1840s [Sorokin 1965; Vinogradov 1982; Levashov 2008].

V. V. Vinogradov connected the emergence of the word with the effect exerted on Russian culture by 'that lively intellectual work begotten by Hegel's philosophy among the Russian intelligentsia from the thirties to the fifties' [Vinogradov 1982: 365–6]. In Yu. S. Sorokin's opinion, the establishment in Russia of the meaning of the word to which we are accustomed (the entirety of someone's

views on the world) may be connected with the writings of Belinsky and the reception of Hegelianism therein. In his articles, Belinsky referred to the people's view of the world as an instinctive inner 'outlook on the world', to a poet's view of the world, which is 'his personal sense of his own existence in the lap of nature', and so on [Sorokin 1965: 314]. However, in the context of the subject of this article, it is more important to trace the course of discourse about the development of the worldview, about the conscious effort that is needed to acquire it, and about the dynamic aspect of the concept.

Research into the history of the development of philosophical ideas connects the transition from passivity to activity in the idea of the worldview with the name of the religious preacher and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) [Kolesnikov 2010: 223]. From Schleiermacher's point of view, the self-consciousness of the ego must take an active attitude towards the worldview, otherwise the ego will inevitably be swallowed up by the material:

*The vile source of this great evil is that people have a sense only for the external community of the sensible world, according to which they want to measure and model everything. <...> This is all that people now seek and find, whether in friendship, marriage, or the fatherland; they do not seek and find help to complete the development of their individuality, or to enrich their inner life. In these ends every community binds the individual with the first ties of education. From an early age, the young spirit is burdened with alien ideas and accustomed to a life of servitude, rather than **getting space for itself and the opportunity to explore the full extent of the world and humanity.***

O, what lamentable poverty in the midst of wealth! [*The Early Political Writings...* 1999: 192–3; emphasis mine. — A.L.]

One of the first people in Russia to insist on the independent development of convictions as an active and necessary process was I. V. Kireyevsky, an admirer of Schleiermacher's sermons: 'There was a time, not very long ago, when it was possible for the thinking man to compose for himself a firm and definite way of thinking that embraced altogether life and the mind and taste and habits of life and literary predilections <...> there were full, complete, finished systems. Now there are none <...>. In order to build one's full worldview out of contradictory thoughts, one must choose, put them together for oneself, search, doubt, go back to their very source <...> now everybody has to put his own way of thinking together for himself [Kireevskiy 1979: 202].

This text was published by Kireyevsky in 1845. Its central thrust was the need to be active in working out one's convictions. However, all

in all it would seem that the main channel of the idea of the worldview into Russian culture, which arrived in a manner transformed by Hegelianism, was less Slavophile circles such as those of Kireyevsky, than those of their opponents, the Westernisers. It was here that this idea acquired a connection with social progress, and not with religious self-awareness. Moreover, it was among the Westernisers that it acquired overtones of Hegelian dialectics. The earliest Russian text known to me in which these questions are directly addressed is A. D. Galakhov's article 'Russian Literature in 1847' [Galakhov 1848]. As was the author's intention, the article had not only a literary and critical character, but also a 'social' one, and it was unabashedly 'tendentious' and 'progressive'. Its author praised Iskander's *Who Is to Blame?*, preferring it to Goncharov, joined in the criticism of Gogol's conservative tract, *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, and so on. At the same time the first, introductory part of Galakhov's text also discusses questions of 'the development of a modern worldview'. The general dynamic of the article is based on the philosophical ideas that were popular among the 'men of the forties': the essence of progress consists in the development of 'human personality in all its fulness'. 'Life has descended from the sphere of ideal aspirations to solid earth — to the ground of positive goods and real existence <...> an awareness of the real interests of life and the provision of every member of society with them — that is the business and activity of modern man.' In life itself, constant development was important, and its goal and mechanism was the worldview: 'The uninterrupted motion of the living being is at the same time its uninterrupted alteration. The great secret of the improvement of the world lies in this combination of motion and alteration <...> Coming to a newer view of the world, we either deny that which was previously considered true, or acknowledge as true that which was previously considered false, or else, in the end, we acquire something new that we did not know before: as a result of such rejections and propositions a clearer revelation of truth emerges, a gradual improvement of life' [Galakhov 1848: 5]. Here is a signal case of the reception in Russia of the Hegelian dialectic of evolution.

Galakhov goes on to assert that a worldview has the following proper characteristics. Firstly, it is by its very nature a product of the work of consciousness, the result of an awareness of reality, whereas in 'unconscious' life there are no convictions. Secondly, a developed worldview implies action towards the transformation of the world: if a person has become aware of how the world ought to change, (s)he has an obligation to work in that direction. The author of the article even divides people into three types: to the first he assigns conservatives, those who believe that change is harmful and 'mankind's happiest state is the status quo.' To the second he assigns

those people who, though aware that progress is right, do not attach themselves to it definitively: ‘They are left with only the feeling of new life, without the life in reality, with only ideas of the world order, without applying those ideas to a really modern world <...> If someone who understands the purpose of society does not want, or lacks the spiritual strength to make a reality of what he has understood, he resembles the unfortunate man who, in the words of the poet, has departed from mortals but is not going to the gods.’ To the third type he assigns ‘normal, healthy’ people. ‘They differ from the first in that their view of society is opposite to theirs, and from the second by acknowledging that opposition in all its fullness and power, acknowledging it not only in thought, but in deed, in serving society’ [Galakhov 1848: 6–7].

Thirdly, Galakhov considers that it is people with the correct worldview that are the drivers of progress: ‘The foundation, by virtue of which we renounce something or return to something, was the fruit of the most recent inventions, the latest research, and it will itself bear fruit: it will lay the foundation of the next worldview. That which has outlived its time becomes in its turn the driver of life. In this fruitful interaction of past and present, and in their connection with the future, in this work without end or respite, in this formation of a modern worldview <...> lies the true merit of reason, the greatest sweetness of life’ [Galakhov 1848: 5–6].

Man is thus transformed from the object of the action of blind historical forces into the rational subject of historical development; (s)he receives the status of the driver of history and progress, and the worldview becomes simultaneously the product of progress and one of its driving forces. The division of people into three parts, the conservatives, the progressives and the neutrals, corresponds to the typical Hegelian triads of dialectical evolution.

As Galakhov’s biographer asserts, Belinsky, who had written his own text on the same subject, ‘A View of Russian Literature in 1847’, responded positively to this introductory part of the article: ‘Anyone who reads the general part of my article and yours will indeed think that we had agreed to say the same thing’ [Mazaev 1893: 251]. Although there is nothing about the worldview in Belinsky’s text itself, the general context does indeed coincide: ‘Progress only refers to that which develops by itself <...> Any organic evolution is attained through progress, and the only thing that evolves organically is that which has its own history, and the only thing that has its own history is that in which every phenomenon is the inevitable result of that which precedes it and is explained by it’ [Belinskiy 1956: 283]. Evidently, the idea of developing the worldview, even if it was not entirely shared by Belinsky, was one that he at the very least did not find objectionable.

Further, making a bridge between the middle of the nineteenth century and its end, even the most fragmentary overview must mention Peter Lavrov's *Historical Letters*. In Lavrov's view, even the very process of history may be interpreted as a consistent change of worldviews. In a certain sense, for Lavrov progress and the progressive worldview are the same thing: inasmuch as the driver of history is the famous 'critically thinking' personality, progress itself is only possible in the constant working of progressive thought, and the condition for both moral and social progress is activity in accordance with one's worldview [Lavrov 1965: 41, 273–4, 288]. Considering the wide distribution and extraordinary influence of Lavrov's letters, one may assert that it was this work that made the development of convictions and a worldview the moral duty of anyone who wanted to be 'a bearer of progress'.

Evidence that by the end of the nineteenth century the idea of the worldview as such had become established, obvious to all, and taken for granted, is provided by N. I. Kareev's brochures¹ [Kareev 1894; 1895], and above all by the criticism that descended upon these texts [Vvedenskiy 1896; Glinskiy 1900; Volynskiy 1900]. The critics disputed the essence of Kareev's philosophical approach, were inclined to disparage him for eclecticism, and often criticised him for his bad style. However, the most important thing is that they all reproached him for banality. As that pillar of populism, N. K. Mikhaylovsky, expressed it, Kareev had wasted his energy 'on defending propositions that nobody disputes' [Glinskiy 1900: 372]. In the opinion of Glinskiy himself, '[t]he contents of all Mr Kareev's brochures are rich and fine, but boring and somewhat redolent of those "copybook maxims" and that commonplace morality that the youth of today are already quite sick of' [Ibid.: 374]. The critic Volynsky called Kareev's works 'the lifeless routine of pedagogical precepts and banal arguments' and 'cold phrases without any original content' [Volynskiy 1900: 459–60]. It must thus be concluded that Kareev's views on what a worldview actually was and where it came from were sufficiently entrenched in the ideas of the educated community for him to be reproached for triteness and a lack of originality. For this very reason we should pay the closest attention to them.

The ideas expressed by Kareev were indeed little different from the ideas of the forties (it was not without reason that Volynsky likened Kareev's brochures to a translation of 'a mediocre German

¹ N. I. Kareev was a well-known Russian sociologist and historian at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. At the end of the nineteenth century he wrote a series of books for young people in education, which were about self-education and the development of the worldview. These books were extremely popular. *Letters to the Students about Self-Education* went through ten editions, and *Conversations on the Development of the Worldview*, five.

composition on philosophy' [Volynskiy 1900: 456]). Young people desirous of understanding the world must strive for a worldview that was 'as integrated, complete and harmonious as possible'. Developing a worldview required working on oneself, effort and overcoming 'cowardice of thought, laziness of thought, and dogmatism of thought'. And the author indicates specially that it is a matter of developing a worldview: 'I would ask you to pay attention to the very expression "developing a worldview". I say "developing" <...> to point out the purely active character that it should have by means of self-education in the philosophical, scientific, moral and general humane views that the human worldview is made up of <...> any other acquisition of any ideas whatsoever differs by its purely passive character, as is usually the case in a cultural environment that stands on a low culture of development' [Kareev 1894: 31–2].

True progress is connected with an active worldview because it 'is created by the effort of personal thought,' and moreover 'the cultural growth <...> of an entire society <...> is measured above all by the degree of evolution of active and critical thought.' A worldview must have a practical direction. Kareev explains that by the integrity, completeness and harmony of a worldview he understands the following: 'Integrated, i.e. that it should encompass the whole world, all areas of thought and life, both of nature and of man; complete, i.e. that every area should be studied from every side; and harmonious, i.e. that all the ideas should be reduced to a system that excludes contradictions between them' [Kareev 1894: 51]. Such a worldview necessarily contains demands of the outside world, which are called an ideal. 'A worldview cannot be either integrated or complete or harmonious unless it exists both for the satisfaction of the requirements of thought and as a guide through life.' The ideas that are the foundation of the worldview 'will guide him [the person. — A.L.] both in his individual actions and in his whole behaviour' [Ibid.: 65].

It is known that Kareev's books produced a serious response among young people, and he received a large number of letters with questions and requests from his readers. Some of these letters are kept in the Manuscript Department of IRLI (Institute of Russian Literature (The Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences, St Petersburg). An acquaintance with these letters allows one to affirm that the ideas proclaimed by the professor were close to his young audience. Some of them simply quote Kareev's text. Thus in 1917 a seventeen-year-old grammar-school boy wrote to the professor: 'I would like to make my knowledge more systematic, fill in the gaps left by secondary education, expand my mental horizon and have the sort of encyclopaedic programme that would assist in developing "an integrated, complete and harmonious worldview"

and would introduce me to the circle of questions that interest contemporary society' [MD IRLI RAS, f. 422, op. 1, d. 11, f. 57].

In 1911, a nineteen-year-old correspondent also discussed the development of a worldview. 'If I were to write, professor, that I want to be perfect, that would be ridiculous. In that case, let me at least approach perfection gradually! I am not interested at present in politics, or society, or morality, or economics, as something separate, because I do not have an integrated worldview, and therefore I can be distracted by particularities, forgetting the generality. When I develop my worldview, then I shall choose myself a speciality' [MD IRLI RAS, f. 422, op. 1, d. 11, f. 165].

Thus, by the end of the nineteenth century the ideas of the worldview and its development, which had been current in Russian culture for over half a century, were part of a sort of list of self-evident things, and anyone who preached them risked being accused of propagating banalities. Furthermore, 'acquiring a worldview' was not just an idea, but, as we have seen, the 'personal experience' of young people at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. But it is also described by people who grew up in the 1870s and the 1890s (see, for example: [Peshekhonov 1906: 60–4]). This means that it is a matter of categories and feelings with which several generations of the Russian intelligentsia were familiar. It is no accident that one of Kareev's correspondents, the mother of five children, was complaining in 1914 that she had not succeeded in forming a correct worldview in her children [MD IRLI RAS, f. 422, op. 1, d. 11, ff. 76–7].

Thus, when they asserted that the aim of the school magazine was to develop a worldview, the pupils of the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century had in mind a known and self-evident process that had a solid status and long tradition in Russian culture. The very understanding of the worldview implied an idea of progress, and likewise, that the driver of progress was a correct worldview, and that this worldview must by its nature possess the characteristics of system, completeness, integrity, harmony and absence of contradictions. The main thing was that that concept of the worldview which was diffused in Russian culture implied both activity in acquiring the ideas of which the worldview was composed, and activity in applying the worldview to life.

Obviously, taking part in producing magazines was not the only way of acquiring a worldview. For many people reading books was more important, as were 'the immediate impressions of life, personal example and the living word' [Peshekhonov 1906: 64]. Kareev's correspondent mentioned above had hoped to develop her children's worldviews with the help of literary discussions 'where alongside the immortal works, social, moral and philosophical questions would

be raised' [MD IRLI RAS, f. 422, op. 1, d. 11, f. 77]. Nevertheless, we shall only concern ourselves with school magazines, since these texts allow us to proceed from contemplative discussions and memoirs to a direct observation of the process.

What was meant by the process called developing a worldview? We can examine it in two ways: on the one hand, it is a question of the acquisition of a world of ideas and knowledge, of reading books and composing texts in a literary or journalistic form. This is what the children had in mind when they spoke of developing a worldview with the help of a magazine. On the other hand, the magazine can be regarded as a social situation in which, once they were in it, the schoolchildren were forced to acquire the relevant practices. The very fact of creating a magazine, newspaper or collection of texts involved the pupils in situations connected with organising themselves, and opposition to the school administration, and at the same time in a situation of a kind of everyday participation in the life of society. From this point of view the magazine did assist in forming a worldview, creating as it did a field of experience. However, this only became evident to the children themselves after they had grown up, and the magazine was no more than a memory.

Let me first give a summary of the ideas that the magazines contained. Given the general liberal and radical left context, it is not surprising that the authors of the magazines of the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth often described themselves as 'the intelligentsia of the future' [Smirnov 1901, 8: 65] or 'the new intelligentsia' [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 657, f. 249v]. Nor is it surprising that in these magazines there are frequent discussions of the questions which we include among the 'eternal questions' of the Russian intelligentsia: their relationship with the people, with the authorities, the search for an ideal, the correlation between the personality and society, relations between fathers and children, and so on. It may be affirmed that the children assimilated a definite canon of the intelligentsia, and in spite of all the doubts to which the First Russian Revolution gave rise, the canonical idea of service and self-sacrifice remained triumphant (on these subjects in more detail see: [Lyarskiy 2013; Liarskiy 2014]).

It is this example of the assimilation of the canon of the intelligentsia that can be traced in the biographical material. It would be wrong to say that the only sources of human actions are the thoughts that were pondered at school. Nor are there any grounds for asserting that the worldview ever becomes the only driver of human actions; but it would also be unpardonable to ignore those examples when the discourse is prolonged into the biography. In the collection of the VVKU, a school with liberal traditions, there are children's magazines from the time of the First World War. The idea of self-

sacrifice, which was especially topical in wartime, soars through the pages of the school publications. The only teacher to whom the VVKU school editions devoted a separate article was one who had gone to the front as a volunteer. He had no need to go, being exempt from military service. This is how the article describes him: ‘Last year we had occasion to encounter such heroism of spirit, such profound depth of ideas, that the encounter with it remains a mark on the soul <...> One must not use chance circumstances to avoid the fate of all one’s comrades without any moral right to do so <...> He was clearly aware that here, in his place, he was being useful, was at least something, at least a unit in the life of society. And there he would be nothing. But how could he acknowledge the rightness and sufficiency of this, so as to stay behind <...>? How could he overcome in himself the feeling of self-deception, of compromise, of self-consolation?’ [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 658, ff. 30–30v]. And his pupils followed his example: it is known that some of the girls would become nurses, and twenty-four of the thirty-six male school-leavers in the four years up to 1916 joined the army [Leykina-Svirskaya, Selivanova 1993: 69–70].

One of the girls who went to war was Olga Smelova. Her notes, made on separate sheets of paper in 1916, have survived. Amongst the rest there is this record: ‘17 Oct. 1916. No, I cannot stay here any longer. <...> What right have I to live warm and at my ease when millions of people are suffering, when my comrades are suffering, and I — just because I am a woman — am privileged and do not have to go <...> Two years have been lost, our generation is at the war and we shall come back together and then we shall work for the good of Russia’ [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 922, ff. 8–10]. Finding herself in the same position as the teacher (she did not have to go to war), the girl took the decision to volunteer, and justified her decision almost in the same words as those used in the article. And this decision was taken at a time when the ‘patriotic intoxication’ of 1914 was a thing of the distant past, and two weeks after Olga Smelova wrote those lines, on 1 November 1916, Pavel Nikolayevich Milyukov, the leader of the Kadet group in the Duma (whose daughter, incidentally, studied at the same school as Smelova) would make his famous speech with the refrain ‘Stupidity or treason?’

But all is not as obvious as it might seem at first sight. There is a curious detail in this story: Olga Smirnova left school before the beginning of the First World War, in 1913. We have no evidence that she could have read the school article. It is quite possible that the coincidence of words is not at all the result of having studied at a particular educational establishment, but the result of having read the same books and known the same people. When Olga Smelova was at school, she participated in the school magazine *Vesna* (Spring). The only text certainly written by her was entitled ‘Do We

Have Comradeship in Class?', in which she expresses regret that true friendship is so rarely met with at school: 'Looking at us from outside, one might say that we are all very friendly; but it is enough to look closely at our lives to be bitterly disillusioned. We have no common interests. <...> It will be hard to live without comrades' [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 645, f. 10]. The value of friendship and school comradeship is an extremely widespread idea both in the school subculture of the beginning of the twentieth century, and in the subculture of the intelligentsia in general. This was an important value for the VVKU. Olga Smelova herself belonged to a community of friends whose members had agreed that they would obey the special rules of the circle of friends, and put their signatures to these rules. Olga Smelova's signature was in first place [Ibid., f. 51]. It is impossible not to notice that, of all the arguments for the necessity of self-sacrifice listed in Smelova's diary, it is that of sharing the fate of her generation and her comrades that can be correlated with the experiences of her schooldays. It may not, of course, have been the decisive argument, but it is one that touched a multitude of memories and feelings that she had acquired during her youth. Nor can we shut our eyes to the fact that most of the girls in the first four classes to leave the VVUK did not become nurses and did not go to the front. But Smelova's case allows it to be seen that ideas that one has made one's own in childhood may become relevant in later life.

This, the first part of our discussion, appears evident and expected, inasmuch as it concerns texts and ideas. But the school magazine has not been studied from the point of view of practice. And it was practice that was important to those who were active in publishing the magazine. From their example it can be seen that developing a worldview is not only a matter of reading books and writing texts.

Above all, the experience of working in the editorial team is an experience of arguments and discussions about the 'direction of the magazine'. This is characteristic of all those published over a long period of which I am aware. Most magazines did not run for more than one or two numbers, but if they continued, and moreover were put out not by the class, but by the 'whole school', conflicts, as the editorial team changed over, were inevitable. Thus when there was a change of the editorial team of the Vvedenskoe Grammar School's satirical *Nedotykomka* (Touch-Me-Not), and it was taken over by politically radical sixth-formers (among them, for example, Vladimir Prussak, a future SR and poet of the ego-futurist tendency), the character of the texts changed accordingly: they became more sharp and revolutionary than before.

O bloody hour, O final hour,
I know, believe, you hover near,

Myriads of victims to devour,
Sounding the last trumpet here.

<...>

We are bold though we be few,
Held fast by the love we feel
To the killing that we do
In the name of the ideal.

[TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, d. 103, f. 54]

When the abrupt change of editorial policy provoked criticism from teachers and from moderate authors, the editors (who were youths of sixteen and seventeen) responded with jesuitical rhetoric: there is no censorship in the magazine, if you like you can send in different articles, join in the polemic, urged the editorial. The readers' bewilderment is incomprehensible, wrote the editors: on the one hand, the radicalisation of the magazine is connected with the awakening of social activity in Russia. On the other, although everyone has the opportunity to participate in the journal, 'it is, of course, the most active readers (evidently those with the most character) who try to make use of this opportunity. That is, you get the *Nedotykomka* that you deserve' [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, d. 103, f. 60v]. The change of line was thus explained exclusively in terms of objective reasons, including the wishes of the readers.

However, the surviving preparatory materials for *Nedotykomka* prove incontrovertibly that the magazine, which proclaimed itself to be only a platform for opinions [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 102, f. 1], was censored by its editors and moreover quite severely, and not in connection with the quality of the texts, but their tendency. For example, the journal was sent a series of caricatures ridiculing the financial shenanigans and excessive pretensions of the editorial team (one of them showed the school inspector being pricked in the bottom with a pen by one of the boys from round a corner; the caption proclaimed 'You are doing great and necessary work!'). The boy who drew the caricatures specially added a note to one of them: 'Vasilyev, if you don't put this in the magazine, I won't collaborate any more' [Ibid., d. 107, ff. 10–1]. But in fact, not a single one of these caricatures appeared in the magazine. So, the claim of objectivity as a justification for the change of course had no foundation in fact: it amounted to a usurpation. In another publication of the VVKU, a liberal school, the clash between editors and contributors led to open conflict [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 633, ff. 257–8].

As they learnt the complexities of editorial activity by experience, the children acquired habits not only of censorship, but of self-censorship. They understood which topics might be discussed publicly, and which might not. Sometimes this was established in

the course of a polemic within the editorial team. Thus, there survives a note from one of the editors of *Nedotykomka* to another: ‘If the magazine is going to put itself at the service of sports and athletics, and even go as far as advertising circus wrestlers <...> not only will I take no part in its work, but I shall be actively hostile to it’ [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 107, f. 123]. Sometimes writers themselves acted as impediments to their own activities. Thus in 1915, Vera Leykina, a pupil at the VVKU, wrote an article in which she reproached her classmates for neglecting ‘the lesser works’. ‘I dedicate this article to all of you who loaf about in search of some “great work” <...>. What do you call a great work? The service of mankind, but not just service, no — always with some theatrical backdrop <...> You want to present new ideas to the world, improve it with new content <...> yet you cannot take up the education of your own brothers and sisters’ [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 658, ff. 171–171v]. Though Vera was herself an organiser of the *Shkolnaya mysl* (School Thought) magazine, she, intriguingly, lacked the resolution to place this text even in her own publication (it is known to us only from a surviving draft).

Sometimes it could be felt that a subject was taboo in public discourse from the reaction of classmates. Certain subjects were met with a sharp rebuff, as for example a text on the hardships of the war [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 633, f. 198], and some, such as the subject of love, were received in absolute silence [Ibid., ff. 249–249v]. The authors of embarrassing texts did not return to subjects that the community did not approve of.

Another important problem for the producers of school magazines was one that typically faces activists, the problem of the ‘passive masses’. Any school magazine, if it came out for long enough, ran into a shortage of readers and contributors. This situation was understood by the active participants in the magazine as a triumph of ‘indifferentism’.

The editorial team was already complaining of a lack of material in the third issue of *Nedotykomka* for 1910 (the first year it came out) ‘since our regular contributors are asking for a breathing space, and it is undesirable to publish blank pages.’ The magazine, wrote the young people, is a mirror, and ‘it would be undesirable for that mirror to reflect only emptiness in the readers’ heads’ [TsGIA SPb, f. 2189, op. 1, d. 102, f. 17]. And this issue did indeed come out with blank pages, and this practice was repeated in the next. At the VVKU, where the school press was much more strongly developed, the problems of passivity were correspondingly more acutely felt. By 1916 *Shkolnaya gazeta* (The School Newspaper) was beginning to express the idea that ‘indifferentism’ should be opposed, if not by compulsion, then by insistently involving people in the life of society.

‘Does a form, even by a majority of votes, have the right to deprive the members of the form of the right of free choice?’ writes one of the authors of the paper. ‘Firstly, the project that has been carried through in our form does not abolish freedom of choice, but merely limits it; and secondly, a form, like any other organisation, has a perfect right to limit freedom of choice’ [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 633, f. 241v]. The children were thus fated to follow the path of all social activists and inevitably run up against the question of the priority of the common cause over private causes. Moreover, the activists naturally regarded the cause in which they were engaged as the common cause. The world of the activists of school journalism was altogether binary: you were either an activist or ‘indifferent’. Either a hero or a Philistine. Thus Vera Leykina wrote in her article ‘Personality and Social Order’, that ‘development is progressive, for it excludes a return to exhausted forms.’ From this point of view someone could either further progress or hinder it. ‘If someone organises the masses, implants consciousness, if he simply struggles against the reactionary current, he furthers evolution, accelerates it and does away with many of the sufferings which it brings with its forcible inevitability’ [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 658, f. 42v]. Her classmate also erected a binary structure in his school composition: ‘The whole remarkable number of people and characters may be divided into two provisional groups: people who live “by habit”, and people who strive to understand what life is and what a person’s role in life is <...>. So who does drive life? The latter do, of course because, of course, they live by the fact that life itself in its beauty comes to meet those who move and believe <...>. So some are the passive mass, and others the swift-flowing stream <...>. Time will tell which are the stronger; indeed, it has already told, and the people who are bound by the chains of habit and tradition are departing from life, devoid of all energy’ [Ibid., d. 60, ff. 34–5v]. In the social situation of school magazines, children became convinced of the rightness of these ideas through their own experience.

To sum up, school journalism was a special social mechanism whereby those who practised it hoped to ‘develop’ a worldview for themselves. In this aspiration schoolchildren were the heirs to the tradition of the Russian intelligentsia of the 1840s. The ‘men of the forties’, principally the so-called ‘Westernisers’, borrowed the concept of the ‘worldview’ from German philosophy and interpreted it as the symbol and driver of progress. This understanding was directly presented to young people in the literature of the 1890s (Kareev). Thus, from the point of view of ideas, a succession of generations is visible. And, as we have seen from the example of Olga Smelova, these ideas were quite capable of being transformed into a personal biography. But along with ideas, adolescents also assimilated in the course of this righteous work (editing and writing

for the school magazine) social practices which no ideals would presuppose, such as editorial intrigues and conflicts and the habits of self-censorship. Furthermore, as the youthful activists absorbed the new reality, they began to have ideas that contained destructive principles, yet whose power was reinforced by their experience as fighters against the inert masses.

From this point of view, the ‘worldview component’ of school magazines may fit not only the concept of a ‘succession of generations’, but also the wider context that connects pre- and postrevolutionary Russia. Thus, Hellbeck maintains in his work on the self-awareness of Soviet people during the Stalin period that a most important characteristic of the revolutionary intelligentsia ‘was consciousness. Concentrated in exemplary individuals — writers, critics, ideologues — consciousness was the ability to see the laws of history and comprehend one’s own potential as a subject of historical action <...> The rational clarity of consciousness was attained in personal struggle against dark and chaotic forces, in the social world as well as within the individual. The criterion for such order and clarity was the possession of a “harmonious social worldview” that situated the individual on the “correct and just path” and signified the beginning of his “new life”. <...> You did not fully live before developing a worldview that disclosed the light’ [Hellbeck 2009: 17–8]. The heroes of Hellbeck’s book, such as the well-known writer Dmitri Furmanov, or the schoolmistress Zinaida Denisevskaya, developed the necessary worldview using diaries and books.

The examples that we have examined show that the search for a worldview was not only characteristic of the revolutionary intelligentsia. Rather, a broad group of schoolchildren at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth had developed special ritualised practices for developing the worldview by means of school magazines. All in all, the search for a worldview was an important part of growing up for many adolescents of the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth. What stands out here is thus the universality both of the idea that it was necessary to develop a worldview, and of the means of acquiring one. The fact that the communist worldview could afterwards be welcomed by many educated people may well be connected with the fact that it neatly fitted the criteria formulated for any worldview: it was integrated, complete and harmonious, and required conscious activity for the sake of the people and progress. As Nadezhda Mandelshtam recalled (and she, incidentally, was the same age as many of the people I have focused on here): ‘Psychological factors that worked in favor of capitulation were the fear of being left out in the cold, of not moving with the times, and the need for an all-embracing “organic world-view” (as it was called) which could be

applied to all aspects of life. There was also the belief that the victory was final, and that the victors were here to stay for all eternity' [Mandelshtam 1983: 166]. Evidence that this could indeed be the case is provided by the notes of P. A. German, headmaster of the VVKU, dated 2 March 1924:

Yes, we are standing on the shore, yes, we are the emigrants of ideas, and may already have crossed over, while the swift current flows inexorably past us <...> Of course, we may ask, and perhaps quite rightly ask, 'What about those who are going with the flow, where will they end up?' Yes, perhaps there is very little there that is positive, but there is an abyss of possibilities. There is a positive foundation, which has grown up historically, and that foundation is the struggle for the rights of the disenfranchised classes. Never mind that this struggle does not look very nice, never mind that there are lots of dirty hands grabbing at power <...> But the death of the leader has given rise to the cult of the leader. Its structure is already there, beginning with external phenomena and forms ('Lenin corners', and so on) and ending with the aspiration (conscious or half-conscious) to find and establish the positive foundations of the worldview that inspired him to his dreadful struggle and lit the unquenchable flame of his energy and constancy and the firmness of his steps on a long, hard road. And it may be — and it not only may be, but I firmly believe, I almost know, that here, in the aspiration to discover those positive foundations, of such an integrally constructed life of the human spirit, such a spontaneously powerful and irrepressible aspiration, on this road we shall find a way to apply young strength and creative impulses [MD NLR, f. 1091, d. 74, ff. 11–4].

German, the organiser of the VVKU, co-operated with the authorities after the Revolution, and worked, so long as his health allowed it, as the headmaster of a comprehensive labour school, although he had been an opponent of the Bolsheviks in 1917. As may be seen, Nadezhda Mandelshtam was right about many things: in German's note there are both a consciousness of being isolated and cut off, and a recognition of the power of the victors' worldview.

Thus, a cultural practice that had been widespread in the nineteenth century, and recognised as normal in those strata of society that formed the intelligentsia, was not only taken for granted as a sign of a 'conscious' individual before the revolution, but continued to be an active force after 1917. However, over the course of time, the practices aimed at the self-conscious 'formation of a worldview', like the belief in progress and in the possibility of creating a just world, inexorably vanished, dissolving once and for all in the catastrophes, or deadening routine, of historical experience over the course of the twentieth century.

Abbreviations

- MD IRLI RAS — Manuscript Department, Institute of Russian Literature (The Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences
 MD NLR — Manuscripts Department, National Library of Russia
 RGALI — Russian State Archive of Literature and Art
 RGIA — Russian State Historical Archive
 TsGIA SPb — Central State Historical Archive of St Petersburg

Archival materials

- Manuscript Department, Institute of Russian Literature (The Pushkin House), Russian Academy of Sciences, f. 422 (N. I. Kareev, 1850–1931, historian).
 Manuscripts Department, National Library of Russia, f. 1091 (P. A. German).
 RGALI, f. 1345 (Miscellaneous manuscripts of writers, academics and public figures).
 RGIA, f. 733 (Ministry of Popular Enlightenment).
 TsGIA SPb, f. 2189 (papers of Yu. M. Vasilyev).

Sources

- Balabanovich E. Z., ‘Zhurnal “Poryv”’: novye materialy dlya biografii Mayakovskogo’ [The *Poryv* Journal: New Materials for the Biography of Mayakovsky], *Izvestiya AN SSSR*, 1956, vol. 15, is. 3, pp. 260–4. (In Russian).
- Belinskiy V. G., ‘Vzglyad na russkuyu literaturu 1847 goda’, Belinskiy V. G., *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy v 13 tt.* [Collected Works in 13 Vols.], vol. 10: *Statyi i retsenzii: 1846–1848* [Articles and Reviews: 1846–1848], ed. by A. G. Dementyev. Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR Press, 1956, pp. 279–359. (In Russian).
- Dianin S. A., *Revolyutsionnaya molodezh v Peterburge, 1897–1917 gg.* [The Revolutionary Youth in Petersburg, 1897–1917]. Leningrad: Priboy, 1926, 248 pp. (In Russian).
- Galakhov A. D., ‘Russkaya literatura v 1847 godu’ [Russian Literature in 1847], *Otechestvennye zapiski*, 1848, vol. 61, no. 1, section V, pp. 1–30. (In Russian).
- Glinitskiy B. B., *Ocherki russkogo progressa: Statyi istoricheskie, po obshchestvennym voprosam i kritiko-biograficheskie* B. B. Glinitskiy [Sketches of Russian Progress: Articles on History, Social and Critico-Biographical Issues by B. B. Glinitskiy]. St Petersburg: Tovarishchestvo khudozhestvennoy pechati, 1900, [2]+II+[2]+579 pp. (In Russian).
- Kareev N. I., *Pisma k uchashcheysya molodezhi o samoobrazovanii* [Letters to the Students about Self-Education]. St Petersburg: Tipografiya M. M. Stasyulevicha, 1894, [4]+203 pp. (In Russian).
- Kareev N. I., *Besedy o vyrabotke mirosozertsaniya; Prodolzhenie ‘Pisem k uchashcheysya molodezhi o samoobrazovanii’, s kratkim ukazatelem samoobrazovatel’nogo chteniya* [Conversations on How to Develop

- Your Worldview: Follow-Up to 'Letters to the Students about Self-Education', with a Short Bibliography on Self-Education]. St Petersburg: Tipografiya M. M. Stasyulevicha, 1895, [4]+179 pp. (In Russian).
- Kireevskiy I. V., *Kritika i estetika* [Criticism and Aesthetics]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979, 439 pp. (Istoriya estetiki v pamyatnikakh i dokumentakh). (In Russian).
- Lavrov P. L., *Filosofiya i sotsiologiya: Izbrannyye proizvedeniya: v 2 t.* [Philosophy and Sociology: Selected Works: In Two Vols.], vol. 2. Moscow: Mysl, 1965, 703 pp. (Filosofskoe nasledie: FN). (In Russian).
- Mandelshtam N., *Hope Against Hope: A Memoir*, trans. from the Russian by M. Hayward, with an introduction by C. Brown, 5th ed. New York: Atheneum, 1983, XVI+431 pp. (Atheneum, 218).
- Mazaev M. P., 'Aleksey Dmitrievich Galakhov. (Biograficheskiy ocherk)' [Alexey Dmitrievich Galakhov. (Biographical Sketch)], *Istoricheskiy vestnik*, 1893, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 238–56. (In Russian).
- Peshkxonov A. V., *K voprosu ob intelligentsii* [On the Intelligentsia Question]. St Petersburg: Russkoe bogatstvo, 1906, 104 pp. (In Russian).
- Rozental L. V., *Nepriremchatelnye dostovernosti. Svidetelskie pokazaniya lyubiteley stikhov nachala XX veka* [Unremarkable Plausibility: Testimony from Poetry Lovers of the Early Twentieth Century]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2010, 803+[1] pp. (In Russian).
- Smirnov S., 'Uchenicheskie zhurnaly i sborniki' [School Manuscript Journals and Collections], *Vestnik vospitaniya*, 1901, no. 6, pp. 83–115; no. 7, pp. 59–96; no. 8, pp. 44–85; no. 9, pp. 34–53. (In Russian).
- The Early Political Writings of the German Romantics*, ed. and trans. by F. C. Beiser, reprinted ed. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, XLI+203 pp. (Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought).
- The Prose of Osip Mandelshtam: The Noise of Time*, trans. with critical essays by C. Brown. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1986, 249 pp. [Reprint: Originally published: Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965].
- Volynskiy A. L., *Borba za idealism: Kriticheskie statyi* [The Struggle for Idealism: Critical Articles]. St Petersburg: N. G. Molostvov, 1900, [2]+III+[3]+542 pp. (In Russian).
- Vvedenskiy A., *K voprosu o vyrabotke 'mirosozertsaniya'. Kriticheskiy analiz broshyur prof. N. Kareeva* [On the Question of the Development of a 'Worldview': A Critical Analysis of Professor N. Kareev's Brochures]. Sergiyev Posad: 2-ya tipografiya A. I. Snegirevoy, 1896, 29+[1] pp. (In Russian).

References

- Balashova Yu. B., *Shkolnaya zhurnalistika serebryanogo veka* [School Journalism of the Silver Age]. St Petersburg: St Petersburg State University Press, 2007, 111+[2] pp. (In Russian).

- Egorova M. V., *Povsednevnyaya zhizn uchashchikhsya i uchiteley Urala v XIX — nachale XX veka* [The Everyday Life of Students and Teachers in the Urals in the Nineteenth — Early Twentieth Century]. Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli, 2008, 215 pp. (In Russian).
- Eremin A. I., ‘Mirovospriyatye provintsialnykh gimnazistov v nachale XX v. (po materialam rukopisnogo zhurnala “Shkolnye dosugi”)’ [The Worldview of Provincial Classical High School Students in the Early Twentieth Century (Based on the Materials of the *Shkolnye dosugi* Manuscript Journal)], *Vestnik Rossiyskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*, Series: *Istoricheskie nauki. Istoriya Rossii*, 2013, no. 10 (111), pp. 18–42. (In Russian).
- Hellbeck J., *Revolution on My Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin*, 1st Harvard University Press paperback ed. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 2009, XI+436 pp.
- Kazeeva E. A., ‘Obraz klassicheskoy gimnazii na stranitsakh rukopisnogo zhurnala “Shkolnye dosugi”’ [Classical Gymnasium Image on the Pages of the Handwritten Journal *Shkolnye dosugi*], *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 2017, no. 9 (75), pp. 48–52. (In Russian).
- Kolesnikov M. A., ‘Filosofskoe ponyatie “mirovozzrenie”: istoricheskiy analiz evolyutsii’ [The Philosophical Concept of ‘the Worldview’: A Historical Analysis of Its Evolution], *Prepodavatel XXI vek*, 2010, no. 4, pp. 222–7. (In Russian).
- Ledeniova Zh. A., ‘K istorii gimnazicheskoy zhurnalistiki (po materialam rossiyskikh pedagogicheskikh zhurnalov XIX — nachala XX vv.)’ [On the History of Journalism in the Classical High School (Based on Russian Pedagogical Journals of the Nineteenth — Early Twentieth Century)], *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, Series: *Filologiya. Zhurnalistika*, 2010, no. 1, pp. 144–9. (In Russian).
- Levashov E. A., *Istoriya slov russkogo literaturnogo yazyka XVIII–XX veka: Annotirovannyi ukazatel literatury, izdannoy s 1918 po 1970 gg.* [The History of the Russian Literary Language in the Eighteenth to Twentieth Centuries: Annotated Index of Literature Published from 1918 to 1970]. St Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, 2008, 199 pp. (In Russian).
- Leykina-Svirskaya V. R., Selivanova I. V., *Shkola v finskom pereulke* [The School in Finskiy Lane]. St Petersburg: Prostsenum, 1993, 160 pp. (In Russian).
- Liarskiy A. B., “‘My sami sozdali sebe svoj mir...’: shkolnye rukopisnye zhurnaly i gazety nachala 20 veka kak faktor sotsializatsii’ [‘We Created Our Own World by Ourselves...’: Early 20th Century School Handwritten Press as a Factor of Socialization], *Noveyshaya istoriya Rossii*, 2014, no. 2, pp. 179–96. (In Russian).
- Liarskiy A. B., ‘Slovar shkolnikov rubezha XIX–XX vv.: mirovozzrenie’ [School Lexicon at the Turn of the XIX–XX Centuries: World-View], *Pechat i slovo Sankt-Peterburga (Peterburgskie chteniya — 2015)* [Print and Language of St Petersburg (St Petersburg Readings,

- 2015)]; in 2 parts, part 1: *Knizhnoe delo. Kulturologiya. Mezhkulturnye kommunikatsii: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* [The History of the Book. Cultural Studies. International Communication: A Collection of Scholarly Articles]. St Petersburg: St Petersburg State University of Industrial Technologies and Design, 2016, pp. 86–91.
- Lvov A. A., 'Formirovanie ponyatiya mirovozzreniya v nemetskoj klassicheskoj filosofii' [Formation of the Term Weltanschauung in the German Classical Philosophy], *Vestnik Murmanskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnicheskogo universiteta*, 2014, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 693–7. (In Russian).
- Lyarskiy A. B., 'Shkolnye rukopisnye zhurnaly i gazety kontsa XIX — nachala XX veka kak faktor sotsializatsii' [School Handwritten Journals and Newspapers of the Late XIX — Early XX Centuries as a Factor of Socialization], *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Series: Istoriya*, 2013, no. 2 (22), pp. 117–25. (In Russian).
- Shcherbakova M. V., 'Osobennosti formirovaniya mirovozzrencheskoj problematiki v nemetskoj klassicheskoj filosofii' [Features of Formation of World View Problem in German Classical Philosophy], *Vestnik Povolzhskogo instituta upravleniya*, 2015, no. 4 (49), pp. 118–22. (In Russian).
- Sorokin Yu. S., *Razvitie slovarnogo sostava russkogo literaturnogo yazyka. 30–90-e gody XIX veka* [The Evolution of Russian Literary Lexis in the 1830–90s]. Moscow; Leningrad: Nauka, 1965, 565 pp. (In Russian).
- Tarumova N. T., "'Zakadrovaya" istoriya arkhivnykh dokumentov' [Behind Scenes' History of Archival Documents: Fragments of Research], *Yaroslavskiy pedagogicheskiy vestnik*, 2017, no. 2, pp. 317–22. (In Russian).
- Vasilyev P. V., 'Peresmotr predstavleniy o roli uchashchegosya v shkolnom pedagogicheskom protsesse v rossiyskoj pedagogike nachala XX veka' [The Revision of the Concepts of the Student Role in School Teaching as Reflected in Russian Pedagogy of the Early Twentieth Century], *Vestnik Vyatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2012, no. 1–3, pp. 142–4. (In Russian).
- Vinogradov V. V., *Ocherki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo yazyka XVII–XIX vekov* [Essays on the History of the Russian Literary Language of the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries], 3rd ed. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1982, 529 pp. (In Russian).

Translated by Ralph Cleminson