

**10. HISTORY
OF TEACHER EDUCATION
(INVITED SESSION
OF BALTIC ASSOCIATION
OF EDUCATIONAL
HISTORIANS)**

Chairs:

**Dr. Habil. Marc Depaepe (Belgium),
Dr. Aīda Krūze (Latvia)**

SATURA RĀDĪTĀJS / CONTENTS

LITERATŪRAS MĀCĪBU METODIKAS PAMATIDEJAS 20. GADSIMTA 70.–80. GADOS	784
BASIC IDEAS OF METHODS OF TEACHING LITERATURE IN THE 70–80 OF THE 20 TH CENTURY	
<i>Dagmāra Ausekle, Elita Stikute</i>	
СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ И РАЗВИТИЕ ПЕДАГОГИКИ КАК УЧЕБНОЙ ДИСЦИПЛИНЫ В СОВЕТСКОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ: ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ	789
THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGY AS A TEACHING SUBJECT IN SOVIET EDUCATION: A HISTORIGRAPHIC ANALYSIS	
PEDAGOĢIJAS KĀ STUDIJU DISCIPLĪNAS RAŠANĀS UN ATTĪSTĪBA PADOMJU LAIKA IZGLĪTĪBĀ: HISTORIGRĀFISKA ANALĪZE	
<i>Татьяна Курилова</i>	
CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL AND EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS – A SUBJECT IN THE TEACHER TRAINING CURRICULUM (LATVIA, THE LATE 19TH CENTURY – 2004)	799
BĒRNI AR SPECIĀLĀM UN ĪPAŠĀM VAJADZĪBĀM – MĀCĪBU PRIEKŠMETS SKOLOTĀJU IZGLĪTĪBAS PROGRAMMĀS (LATVIJĀ 19. GS. BEIGĀS – 2004)	
<i>Iveta Ķestere, Dita Nīmante</i>	
SCHOLASTICISM IN MEDIEVAL SCHOOLS	813
SHOLASTICISMS VIDUSLAIKU SKOLĀS	
<i>Dalia Marija Stančienė, Juozas Žilionis</i>	
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE PRIVATE RUSSIAN TECHNICAL SCHOOL OF ENGINEER NIKOLAJ OKOLO-KULAK	823
INŽENIERA NIKOLAJA OKOLO-KULAKA PRIVĀTĀ KRIEVU TEHNIKUMA DARBĪBA	
<i>Alīda Zigmunde</i>	

LITERATŪRAS MĀCĪBU METODIKAS PAMATIDEJAS

20. GADSIMTA 70.–80. GADOS

BASIC IDEAS OF METHODS OF TEACHING LITERATURE IN THE 70–80 OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Dagmāra Ausekle, Elīta Stikute

Latvija

Anotācija

Rakstā tiks skatītas galvenās latviešu literatūras mācību metodikas attīstības tendences 20. gadsimta 70.–80. gados, skatot šo laikposmu kā daļu no sistēmas, kur tiek turpināti iepriekšējās divās desmitgadēs aizsāktie procesi un veidojas pāreja uz atjaunotās Latvijas brīvvalsts laikā iezīmēto paradigmu maiņas nepieciešamību skolas mācību un audzināšanas darba organizācijā.

Tiks izvērtēts spilgtāko 70.–80. gadu latviešu literatūras mācību metodiķu devums literatūras mācīšanas metodikas attīstībā, kā arī aplūkota literatūras kā mākslas mācību priekšmeta specifika, iezīmēti galvenie viedokļi literatūras mācību metodikā.

Atslēgvārdi: latviešu literatūras mācību metodikas attīstības tendences 20. gadsimta 70.–80. gados, literatūras mācību priekšmeta specifika, literatūras mācību darba veidi, padomju laika ideju pārmantotība mūsdienu literatūras didaktikā.

Ievads

21. gadsimts iezīmē kardinālas pārmaiņas dažādās indivīda un sabiedrības dzīves jomās. Šīs pārmaiņas skar gan materiālo, gan garīgo cilvēka dzīves sfēru. Nepieciešamība pārkārtoties un pārmaiņu straujums rada psiholoģiska diskomforta izjūtu lielākajā sabiedrības daļā. Tas attiecas ne tikai uz vecākās un vidējās paaudzes cilvēkiem, bet arī uz jauniešiem, tāpēc arvien biežāk tiek izteikta prasība veikt nepieciešamās izmaiņas izglītības sistēmā, lai skolēni būtu sagatavoti tiem izaicinājumiem, kurus jau tagad izvirza globalizācijas procesi un kuri nākotnē būs vēl sajūtamāki. Ja zināmu izmaiņu nepieciešamību atbalsta lielākā daļa, tad par šo izmaiņu raksturu un būtību vienotības nav. Atbalstot viedokli, ka jauniešus nepieciešams labāk sagatavot darba tirgus prasībām, ir saprotama tendence lielāku uzmanību pievērst eksakto mācību priekšmetu apguvei, taču tas nedrīkst notikt uz humanitārā cikla priekšmetu rēķina. Jau J. A. Students 1933. gadā izdotajā grāmatā “Vispārīgā paidagōģija: zinātne un māksla sevis un citu audzināšanā” norāda uz galveno 20. gadsimta pretrunu. Tā izpaužas vajadzībā pēc cilvēcības un garīguma laikā, kad reālajā dzīvē aizvien vairāk vērojama morālā degradācija, tiekšanās pēc materiālajām vērtībām un personīgās labklājības, kas bieži vien tiek nodrošināta uz savu līdzpilsoņu rēķina.

Vēsture atkārtojas. Arī 21. gadsimta sākumā par vienu no galvenajiem uzdevumiem izglītības un audzināšanas jomā kļūst personībai bīstamo utilitārisma un pragmatisma tendenču pārvarēšana, tie tiecas nostiprināties gan izglītības saturā, gan skolēnu sasniegumu vērtēšanā.

Pedagoģijas ideju attīstības izpēte ilgākā periodā ļauj izdarīt secinājumu, ka idejas, kurām kādā teritorijā zināmā laika posmā dažādu iemeslu dēļ nav bijusi iespēja izpausties, vienmēr atgriežas, tomēr arī “nelabvēlīgajā periodā” to klātesamība ir jūtama un slēptā veidā ietekmē notiekošos procesus. Pie šādas atziņas nonāk arī profesors Jānis Anspaks monogrāfijā “Pedagoģijas idejas Latvijā”.

“20. gadsimta beigu posma raksturīgākā īpatnība ir tā, ka 20.–30. gados dzimušās atziņas, idejas un koncepcijas par personības attīstību un izpēti saglabā **savu nozīmību** visos turpmākajos audzināšanas teorijas un prakses attīstības posmos. Vēl vairāk – arī 21. gadsimtā šīs atziņu

bagātības it kā atdzimst no jauna, veidojot fundamentālus pamatus bērna personības izpratnei un pieejai tās izpētei no viengabalainības pozīcijām.” (Anspaks, 2003., 390.)

Pēdējā desmitgadē bieži ir izskanējis viedoklis, ka viss, kas bijis literatūras mācību metodikā padomju periodā, nav vērā ņemams un pat varbūt atmetams, jo notika izglītības satura pakļaušana komunistiskās propagandas mērķiem un arī mācību process tika organizēts tā, lai veidotu totalitārajam režīmam padevīgus pilsoņus. Tomēr bez ieskata šajā vidusposmā nav iespējams veidot saistīti starp uzdevumiem, kas tika risināti pirmās Latvijas brīvvalsts laikā, un to pārmantojamību mūsdienās.

Orientācija uz mācību procesu kā aktīvu tā dalībnieku mijiedarbību

J. A. Students savā izglītības un audzināšanas sistēmā galveno vietu ierādīja audzinātājam māksliniekam, jo uzskatīja, ka audzināšanas māksla izpaužas spējā sajūsmināt un aizraut, stimulēt un neuzkrītoši vadīt. Par cilvēka dzīves mērķi viņš uzskatīja pašpiepildīšanos, t. i., savu gara dāvanu izkopšanu līdz pilnībai. Tas saskan ar mūsdienās aktuālās humānās pedagoģijas galvenajām tēzēm. A. H. Maslovs par galveno cilvēka dzīvē uzskata pašrealizāciju un par galveno izglītības uzdevumu – palīdzēt indivīdam augt pilnvērtīgas cilvēcības virzienā un aktualizēt visas viņā esošās potenciālās iespējas (Maslovs, 2002., 228.). Šis process nenorisinās tikai klases telpā, tas attiecas uz katru cilvēku un ilgst no viņa piedzimšanas līdz aiziešanai no dzīves, kuras laikā viņam ir nepieciešami uzlidojuma, augstākā pārdzīvojuma, insaita mirklī. Šādi mirklī ir nepieciešami katram cilvēkam neatkarīgi no laikmeta, valsts un sabiedriski politiskās iekārtas, kurā viņš dzīvo un kura nodrošina viņa spēju radoši uztvert pasauli.

Staļinisma laiks izslēdza jebkuru radošo izpausmju iespējamību no mācību procesa dalībnieku puses, bet īsais atkušņa periods 50. gadu otrajā pusē radīja pamatu tām pozitīvajām pārmaiņām, kas īpaši samanāmas kļuva 70.–80. gados. Ja pirmajos pēckara gados un 50.–60. gados dominēja oficiālās, par vienīgajām pareizajām atzītās padomju pedagoģijas nostādnes, tad 70.–80. gados oficiālās ideoloģijas frāzes parādījās galvenokārt teorētisko rakstu un praktiskās pieredzes materiālu ievados, bet to galvenajā daļā autori pievērsās patiesu pedagoģiskās loģikas diktētu problēmu risinājumam. 1985. gadā iznākušajā I. Freidenfelda un V. Ūsiņa grāmatā “Mācību procesa pilnveide skolā” liela uzmanība veltīta skolēnu izziņas darbības aktivizēšanai, izziņas patstāvīguma un intelektuālā darba prasmju un iemaņu veidošanai, mācīšanās motīvu veidošanai un mācību individualizācijai. Atšķirībā no agrāk dominējošās tendences, kad uzsvars tika likts uz mācīšanu, kas ir viena no autoritārās pedagoģijas iezīmēm, kuru kultivē totalitārā vara, grāmatas autori akcentē domu, ka pedagoga un skolēnu sadarbību mācību procesā nevar izteikt formulā – vadītājs un vadāmie.

“Mūsdienu mācību procesu raksturo pedagoga un skolēnu savstarpēji nosacīta mijiedarbība. Pedagoga darbība (mācīšana) tiek virzīta tā, lai organizētu skolēnu mērķtiecīgu darbību (mācīšanos), kuras gaitā viņi nevis vienkārši uzņem “gatavu” informāciju, bet gan to iekšēji adaptē, pārstrādā atbilstoši savai pieredzei un intelektuālās attīstības līmenim, kā arī apgūst darbības veidus, paņēmienus, kas izmantojami mācīšanās procesā.” (Freidenfelds, Ūsiņš, 1985., 9.)

Problēmiskā pieeja literatūras mācībās

Orientācija uz mācību procesu kā aktīvu visu tā dalībnieku mijiedarbību akcentēta arī 70.–80. gados izdotajos metodiskajos materiālos latviešu literatūrā, kā arī 80. gadu otrajā pusē sagatavotajā “Literatūras mācīšanas metodikā”. Mijiedarbība tiek īstenota ar mācību līdzekļu palīdzību, izmantojot dažādas mācību formas un metodes. Aplūkojot mācību metožu kompleksas izvēles un izmantošanas iespējas literatūras stundās, ir uzsvērtā doma, ka reproducēšana un jaunrade mācību procesā ir cieši saistītas un atrodas dialektiskā

vienotībā. Šī mijiedarbība jārespektē tādēļ, lai nepieļautu vienpusību skolēnu izziņas darbības organizēšanā.

Skolēniem mācīšanās ir izziņas process, kura gaitā viņi iedziļinās parādības būtībā, apjēdz un izprot šīs parādības. Iedziļināšanās parādības būtībā literatūras stundās veicina **problēmiskā izklāsta metode**, kad “skolotājs izvirza problēmu, pats to iztīrā, taču vienlaikus audzēkņiem norāda tās risināšanas ceļu, kas viņiem veicams, iedziļinoties problēmai piemītošās un skolēnu izpratnei pieejamās pretrunās, kā arī paskaidro risināšanas gaitā saglabājamo domu secību” (Skatkins, 1984., 179.).

Problēmmācību pamatā ir amerikāņu psihologa, filozofa un pedagoga Dž. Djuī (1859–1952) darba skolas ideja. 1894. gadā Čikāgā viņš izveidoja darba skolu, kurā mācību pamatā bija nevis mācību plāns, bet spēles un darbības izziņa. Skolas mācību metodes, jaunie apguves principi sākotnēji netika teorētiski pamatoti un formulēti koncepcijas veidā, bet popularitāti ieguva 20. gadsimta 20.–30. gados.

Problēmisko mācību būtība ir tā, ka skolēniem uzdod *secīgus uzdevumus*, t. i., noteiktus *izzinošus uzdevumus*, un *skolēni ar skolotāja palīdzību vai patstāvīgi veic radošus meklējumus* to risināšanā. Problēmmetodes *pamatā ir didaktikas sistēma*, ka balstās uz *zināšanu radošas apguves* un darbības spēju likumsakarībām un ietver *mācīšanas un mācīšanās specifisku paņēmieni kompleksu*.

Problēmiskā mācīšanā ir četri galvenie posmi:

- vispārējās problēmsituācijas izprašana,
- tās analīze un konkrēto problēmu formulēšana,
- problēmu risināšana, izvirzot un pamatojot hipotēzi, kam seko pamatojumu pārbaude,
- problēmas atrisinājuma pareizības pārbaude.

Problēmiskās mācīšanās *būtība ir radīt problēmsituāciju* un virzīt skolēnu darbību tā, lai viņi *patstāvīgi šo mācību problēmu atrisinātu*. Problēmiskus uzdevumus *nevar atrisināt ar esošajām zināšanām*, un tāpēc skolēniem jādarbojas, lai viņi *iegūtu jaunas zināšanas*. Jautājumi, uz kuriem ir viegli atrodamas atbildes, nav problēmjautājumi, jo neprasa radošus meklējumus.

Metodiķis Jānis Rudzītis ir adaptējis Krievijā izstrādāto problēmpieeju, izstrādājis pedagoģiski psiholoģisko pamatojumu problēmpieejai latviešu literatūras didaktikā, bagātinājis ar savu un skolotāju-metodiķu pieredzi. Jāņa Rudzīša novatoriskie metodiskie palīglīdzekļi, rosinātājlīdzekļi, rosinājumi esošo un topošo literatūras skolotāju profesionālās domāšanas izkopšanai, problēmuzdevumu sērijas nenoliedzami ir ļoti liels atbalsts un palīgs jebkuram skolotājam, kurš par savu svētu pienākumu literatūrā kā mākslas priekšmetā uzskata tādus aspektus kā skolēnu radošo pašizpaušmi, emocionālo un intelektuālo attīstību, vērtīborientāciju. Īpaši liela nozīme J. Rudzīša pedagoģiskajam devumam bija padomju laikā, kad literatūra tika apgūta pēc biogrāfiskās un vēsturiskās metodes un mācību grāmatās nebija nekādu mācību uzdevumu.

Savos darbos Jānis Rudzītis aizsācis dialogu par pedagoģisku problēmsituāciju radīšanu arī literatūras skolotāja domāšanā. Viņš norāda, ka, aktīvi iesaistoties pedagoģiski māksliniecisku uzdevumu risināšanā, literatūras skolotājam ir iespējams izkopt savas profesionālās spējas, bagātināt zināšanas, prasmes un iemaņas, kas nepieciešamas skolēnu radošās darbības vadīšanai literatūras kā vārda mākslas stundās (Rudzītis, 1995.). Lai šāda sadarbība noritētu veiksmīgi, autors skaidro atsevišķu jēdzienu būtību un izpratni (problēma, jautājums, uzdevums, mācību uzdevums, mācību problēma, pedagoģiska problēmsituācija).

Skolas darbam raksturīgi *mācību uzdevumi*. Daļa no tiem ietver pretrunu, kuru skolēns izjūt kā grūtību, ko pārvarēt neizdosies ar viņa zināšanām un radošās darbības pieredzi. Tā rodas

problēmsituācija – izzinošās personas īpašs psihisks stāvoklis. Problēmsituācijā galvenais elements ir darbības subjekts, uzdevumā – veicamās darbības modelis, problēmā – pretrunas. Kā zināms, literatūras mācībās ļoti svarīga ir skolēna emociju rosināšana, līdzpārdzīvojums. Izmantojot problēmpieeju literatūras stundās, skolēns, skolotāja rosināts, risina mācību uzdevumu, izvirzot sev jautājumus un meklējot uz tiem atbildes, t. i., veido dialogu ar daiļdarbu. Meklējumdarbības vēlamais rezultāts ir *atklājums*, kuru skolēns izdara pats sev, **pārdzīvojot to kā subjektīvi nozīmīgu vērtību** (Rudzītis, 1995).

Organizējot mācību procesu tādā veidā, tiek pārvarētas pretrunas, kuras rada totalitārā uzraudzības sistēma, nosakot skolotāja darbību mācību un audzināšanas uzdevumu īstenošanā, kad novārtā paliek skolēna iekšējā dzīve – vajadzības, intereses un garīgā pasaule. 70.–80. gados literatūras didaktikā arvien vairāk notiek orientācija uz skolēna personiski ieinteresētu attieksmi pret mākslas darbu un tajā attēlotajām parādībām, kas ir galvenais nosacījums iespējami pilnīgākai un dziļākai šī darba uztverei. Ir svarīgi, lai skolēns mākslas darbā ieraudzītu ne tikai *vispārnozīmīgas* problēmas, bet lai tās būtu **personīgi viņam nozīmīgas** un tuvas, jo mākslas darbam cilvēka dzīvē būs nozīme tikai tad, ja viņš to *patstāvīgu* pūliņu rezultātā pārvērtīs par savas garīgās dzīves saturu.

Literatūras kā mākslas veida personiski ieinteresētas uztveres nepieciešamība

70.–80. gados uzmanība tiek pievērsta arī 20. gadsimta 30. gados izvirzītajai un mūsdienās aktualizētajai idejai par skolotāju kā režisoru, kurš apvieno skolas, ģimenes un ārpuskolas aktivitātes skolēnu izglītošanā un audzināšanā, optimāli sabalansējot skolēnu darbu stundā ar piedalīšanos dažādās studijās un pulciņu darbā, kā arī virzot skolēnu lasīšanas intereses vēlamajā virzienā.

Cenšoties attīstīt skolēnos literatūras kā mākslas veida izteiksmes un uztveres specifikas apjautu, metodiskajā literatūrā uzmanība tiek pievērsta rakstnieka piederībai noteiktam literatūras virzienam un ar to saistītajām daiļdarba interpretācijas problēmām, vārda un tēla attiecībām dzejā un tēla veidošanas specifikai dramaturģiskā darbā.

Īpaša problēma padomju perioda literatūras didaktikā ir skolas domraksts. Sākotnēji dogmatisma un reproducēšanas gultnē ievirzītais mācību stils, protams, neveicināja skolēnu patstāvību domāšanā un radošās darbības pieredzes apguvi. Skolēni netiecās pēc patstāvības spriedumos (kas zināmās situācijās pat varēja kļūt bīstami), bet reproducēja skolotāju izteikumus un mācību grāmatās izlasīto. Nebija iespējams kritisks piedāvāto faktu izvērtējums, un neveidojās (vai arī netika izteikta) sava attieksme pret daiļliteratūras darbu. Panākumi šajā jomā lielā mērā bija atkarīgi no katra literatūras skolotāja pilsoniskās stājas un pedagoģiskās prasmes. Ja vecāko klašu skolēni savā skolotājā saskatīja cilvēku, kam drīkst uzticēties, kas kopīgā mācību procesā bija spējis atraisīt viņu iztēli un saskarsmē ar mākslas darbu radīt augstākā pārdzīvojuma mirkļus, viņi atbildēja ar gudriem un dziļiem domrakstiem, kuros atklājās viņu patiesā vērtīborientācija un pasaules uzskats. Arī metodiskajā literatūrā arvien retāk tika uzsvērta zināšanu pārbaudes funkcija domrakstu mācībā, bet arvien vairāk akcentēta virzība uz skolēnu psihiskās darbības aktivizēšanu un personības veidošanu, meklējot stimulatorus skolēnu prāta un jūtu darbības aktivizēšanai un tos metodiski racionāli izmantojot.

Lai gan totalitārās varas spiediens saglabājās līdz pat Padomju Savienības sabrukumam, tomēr 70.–80. gados tas jūtami mazinājās un didaktikā iestrāvoja jaunas, spirtas vēsmas. Var piekrist profesoram Anspakam, ka Latvijas pedagogu gatavību pārmaiņām raksturo spēja savā teorētiskajā un praktiskajā darbā sekot nevis šauri ideoloģizētiem saukļiem, bet gan pedagoģiskajai loģikai, nekad neaizmirstot pedagoģiskā procesa galvenās idejas un vērtības, to veidošanos pēc saviem iekšējiem likumiem (Anspaks, 2003, 387).

Izmantotie informācijas avoti

1. Anspaks J. Pedagoģijas idejas Latvijā. RaKa, 2003.
2. Freidenfelds I., Ūsiņš V. Mācību procesa pilnveide skolā. R.: Zvaigzne, 1985.
3. Kārklis R. Sacerējumi-psihiķu darbības aktivizētāji. R.: Zvaigzne, 1976.
4. Latviešu valodas un literatūras mācīšanas jautājumi. R.: Zvaigzne, 1974.
5. Literatūras mācīšanas metodika. Palīgglīdzeklis skolotājiem. R.: Zvaigzne, 1991.
6. Metodiski norādījumi skolotājiem literārās lasīšanas mācīšanā 4.–7. klasē. R.: Zvaigzne, 1985.
7. Rudzītis J. Literatūras mācības skolā. RaKa, 2000.
8. Rudzītis J. Problēmsituācijas literatūras stundā. R.: Zvaigzne, 1993.
9. Rudzītis J. Problēmisks dialogs ar daiļdarbu klasē. R.: 1995.
10. Vidusskolas didaktika. R.: Zvaigzne, 1980.
11. Маранцман В. Г., Чирковская Т. В. Проблемное изучение литературного произведения в школе. Пособие для учителей. М.: Просвещение, 1977.
12. Маслоу А. По направлению к психологии бытия. М.: ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2002.
13. Оконь В. Основы проблемного обучения. М.: Просвещение, 1968.

Summary

The article deals with the main methodological development tendencies of teaching Latvian literature in the 70–80 of the 20th century, viewing this period as part of the system in the framework of which the processes of the former two decades are continued, with a gradual transition to the necessity of changing the paradigms worked out during the period of the regained independence of Latvia.

The article gives the evaluation of the contribution of the most notable methodologists of Latvian literature teaching.

Specific features of literature as a subject of art are dealt with; the basic tendencies in creating teaching content are evaluated; the main standpoints of the methods of teaching literature are pointed out.

Keywords: the main methodological development tendencies of teaching Latvian literature in the 70–80 of the 20th century, the most notable methodologists of Latvian literature teaching, specific features of literature as a subject of art, the main standpoints of the methods of teaching literature.

**СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ И РАЗВИТИЕ ПЕДАГОГИКИ КАК УЧЕБНОЙ
ДИСЦИПЛИНЫ В СОВЕТСКОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ:
ИСТОРИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ**

**THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGY AS
A TEACHING SUBJECT IN SOVIET EDUCATION:
A HISTORIGRAPHIC ANALYSIS**

**PEDAGOĢIJAS KĀ STUDIJU DISCIPLĪNAS RAŠANĀS UN
ATTĪSTĪBA PADOMJU LAIKA IZGLĪTĪBĀ:
HISTORIGRĀFISKA ANALĪZE**

Татьяна Курилова
Латвийский университет

Аннотация

В статье рассмотрены проблемы становления и развития в советском образовании программ по курсу «Педагогика». Анализ программ и педагогической литературы советского времени позволил выделить четыре временных периода, каждый из которых отражает специфические особенности развития курса.

Ключевые слова: учебная дисциплина, педагогика, программа по педагогике, цели курса, содержание курса, темы курса.

Введение

Курс педагогики, являющийся основным в профессиональной подготовке учителя в советском образовании, и по содержанию, и по форме разрабатывался, систематизировался и совершенствовался в течение многих десятилетий (1917 – начало 90-х гг.). Анализ первоисточников позволяет выделить в развитии курса 4 последовательных периода, каждый из которых отражает специфические особенности становления курса.

Характеристика 1-го периода (1917 – конец 20-х гг.)

Пришедшие в 1917 году к власти большевики намеревались использовать образование как инструмент своего влияния. Однако, в начальный период, вопросы образования относительно политических проблем не были для власти первостепенными. Поэтому педагогика 20-х годов представлена разными мнениями и идеями о целях и путях воспитания человека нового общества. Анализ литературы позволяет выделить 2 альтернативных подхода к решению проблемы. Сторонники одного подхода выдвигали для обсуждения и реализации те идеи, которые педагогическая мысль наработала на рубеже 19–20 веков (Блонский, 1918; Вентцель, 1918; Шацкий, 1918). Представители другого подхода в своих высказываниях начинают отождествлять методологию педагогической науки с методологией марксизма (Комаровский, 1929).

На страницах педагогической печати активно обсуждается проблема нового содержания подготовки учителя (Фридман, 1928). Разные авторы и коллективы предлагают для обсуждения составленные ими программы (Корнейчук, 1928). В эти годы педагогические учебные заведения работают по прежним или разработанным самостоятельно программам (4).

Анализ первоисточников 2-го периода (30 – годы)

В 1931 году схема типовой программы по педагогике была составлена институтом марксистско-ленинской педагогики по поручению учебно-методического Совета Наркомпроса. Программа состояла из пяти разделов. Первый раздел включал основы марксистско-ленинской диалектики в педагогике, классовые основы воспитания, основные черты педагогики пролетариата на основе учения Маркса, Энгельса, Ленина. Во втором разделе рассматриваются вопросы социалистического строительства и классовой борьбы пролетариата. Третий раздел посвящен реконструкции школ. Четвертый – педагогике капиталистического общества. Пятый раздел рассматривает методологию педагогики (Архангельский, 1931).

На Всероссийской конференции кафедр педагогики и педологии представляет схему программы по педагогике М. Эпштейн. Он делает акцент на особом выделении элементов теории воспитания в двух различных по своему классовому содержанию системах, на разработке проблем и задач, которые позволяют рассмотреть все вопросы педагогики с точки зрения диалектического материализма (Эпштейн, 1932).

Попытка разрешить проблему систематического изложения теоретического курса советской педагогики с точно выделенным кругом знаний была сделана в 1933 году (25). Схема программы включала следующие проблемы:

1. Сущность, значение и цели советской педагогики.
2. Система народного образования.
3. Учебные планы и программы школы.
4. Методы обучения в политехнической школе.
5. Организационные формы образовательной работы школы.
6. Учебник.
7. Дисциплина.
8. Деткомдвижение.
9. Внешкольная работа.
10. Учитель.
11. Организационно-педагогические вопросы школы.

Марксистско-ленинская педагогика определяется как наука о воспитании, образовании и обучении в целях создания поколения способного установить коммунизм.

В пояснительной записке сказано, что в основу программы положено изучение школы, которая является основным орудием партии и Советской власти в деле воспитания, образования и обучения подрастающего поколения.

При проработке первой темы центральное место занимает изучение основ коммунистического воспитания. В текст программы включены подтемы: классовая сущность воспитания и образования в буржуазном обществе и задачи пролетариата; цель и задачи воспитания, образования и обучения подрастающего поколения в условиях диктатуры пролетариата; принципы и содержание коммунистического воспитания в школе; предмет и метод педагогики.

Приобретение четких и определенных методологических установок марксистско-ленинской педагогики составляет основную задачу изучения этой темы. После этого студенты приступают к ознакомлению с системой народного образования в СССР, Франции, Германии и США.

Темы 3–7, X, XI раскрывают основные вопросы содержания, методов и организации школы. Они дидактически вооружают студента как будущего педагога.

В 8-й теме рассматривается проблема деткомдвижения и его задач в школе, раскрывается сущность деткомдвижения как общественно-политической организации, история развития детских организаций в стране и в капиталистических странах, а также содержание, методы, организационные формы пионердвижения.

Тема 9 рассматривает внешкольную работу как одну из форм коммунистического воспитания, ее развитие в империалистических странах, в России при самодержавии и после Октября.

В пояснительной записке дается план раскрытия каждой темы: марксистско-ленинская трактовка проблемы; теория и практика строительства советской школы; теория и практика буржуазной школы; критическая оценка буржуазной педагогики; раскрытие и критика «право» и «лево» оппортунистических извращений марксистско-ленинской педагогики.

В материалах обсуждения и в периодической печати указывалось, что программа выгодно отличается от прежних тем, что речь в ней идет действительно о педагогических проблемах. К недостаткам относили недостаточное разоблачение классового характера буржуазной школы, различных извращений и их методологических корней (Алексинский, 1933; Риндич, 1934).

Не все педагоги были согласны с таким направлением в развитии содержания педагогического образования, пытались развернуть его к ребенку.

Резко критикует курс педагогики П. П. Блонский. По его мнению, это скорее курс политграмоты и собрание текущих правительственных документов и циркуляров о школе. Он особо выделяет необходимость знания учителем возрастных особенностей детей. Недостаточно разработанными, по мнению П. П. Блонского, являются такие разделы как методы педагогики, система различных концепций сущности воспитания (свободное воспитание, воспитание как внушение (дрессировка), воспитание как развитие (идеалистическая и материалистическая разновидности), различные теории образования, проблемы содержания воспитания и образования (Блонский, 1934, 1935).

На совещании заведующих кафедрами педагогики и психологии, основная задача которого состояла в том, чтобы в соответствии с постановлением ЦК ВКП(б) от 4 июля 1936 года перестроить программы по педагогическим дисциплинам, принята схема программы, значительно отличающаяся от предыдущих (13). Первый раздел программы включал 3 части.

I часть – предмет и метод педагогики. Во второй части рассматривались цель и система коммунистического воспитания ребенка. Эта часть включала такие проблемы как формирование коммунистического мировоззрения, воспитание всесторонне развитой личности, умственное образование, нравственное воспитание, эстетическое воспитание, физическое воспитание, политехническое обучение. В III части рассматривались политика и система народного образования в капиталистических странах, в дореволюционной России и в СССР.

Второй раздел программы, включающий 4 части, назывался возрастной педагогикой. В I части рассматривалось воспитание ребенка до 3-х лет. Вторая часть была посвящена дошкольному воспитанию. Она включала рассмотрение следующих проблем: дошкольное воспитание в историческом развитии, анатомо-физиологические и психологические особенности развития дошкольника, режим, воспитание простейших навыков, игра и ее значение в дошкольном возрасте, классификации игр, игрушки дошкольника и требования к ним, первое знакомство ребенка с окружающей действительностью, переход в школу, дошкольные учреждения, требования к дошкольнику. В третьей части рассматривались проблемы воспитания и обучения школьника. Были выделены такие

вопросы как, учение о школе и основы дидактики; воспитание и обучение в младшем, среднем и старшем школьном возрасте, основы школоведения.

Проблемы учебного плана, программ, учебников, организационных форм и методов обучения, проверки и оценки знаний учащихся, дисциплины и школьного режима, общественных организации и внеклассной работы рассматривались отдельно для каждой возрастной группы.

Среди проблем среднего и старшего возраста изучалась профориентация. В части школоведения были включены вопросы, касающиеся оборудования школьного здания, управления и руководства школой.

Отдельной четвертой частью программы было определено воспитание ребенка в семье.

Становление курса педагогики проходило трудно. После постановления о педологических извращениях 1936 года программы менялись почти каждый год, т.к. признавались неудовлетворительными и ошибочными. В апреле 1937 года на заседании Ученого Комитета по педагогическим наукам было отмечено, что в преподавании педагогики можно отметить много ошибок: изложение курса не имеет строго выдержанной системы; построение курса носит эклектический характер; в изложении тем при обилии критики отсутствует подлинно научная марксистская критика; темы трактуются вообще, студенты не вооружаются позитивными знаниями; в преподавании имеет место отрыв курса от опыта советской школы; в лекциях делается чрезвычайно большой исторический экскурс.

Первоочередной задачей дальнейшей работы было определено «выкорчевывание» всех извращений в теории и практике советской школы (12).

Решения февральского - мартовского Пленума ЦК ВКП(б) 1937 года, поставившего вопрос о необходимости усиления воспитательной работы, оказали значительное влияние на обсуждение проекта программы по педагогике на заседании Совета при Нарком просвещения РСФСР. К серьезным недостаткам обсуждаемого проекта были отнесены: слабое раскрытие философии марксизма; отсутствие необходимой ясности и четкости в характеристике материализма и идеализма; недостаточная критика и разоблачение буржуазных педагогических теорий, а также теорий, сводящих роль школы и учителя только к вооружению детей определенными знаниями и игнорирующими работу по политическому воспитанию учащихся и т.п. Совет подчеркивает, что программа по педагогике как по содержанию, так и стилю изложения должна быть большевистским документом, мобилизующим учительство на борьбу за школу Маркса-Энгельса-Ленина-Сталина. В программе на 1937/38 учебный год впервые самостоятельной была выделена тема «Пионерорганизация и комсомол» (15).

В программе, утвержденной Всесоюзным Комитетом по делам высшей школы при СНК СССР в августе 1938 года, впервые обозначилось название раздела «Общие основы педагогики». Раздел включал такие проблемы как предмет педагогики, философские основы педагогики, цель коммунистического воспитания, источники педагогики, методы научно-педагогических исследований, педагогика и другие науки. Второй и третий разделы программы были посвящены воспитанию детей до школы и школьного возраста. Государственная политика СССР в области народного образования и школы выделена в четвертом разделе. Пятый раздел составляет теория образования и обучения. В этом разделе рассматривались следующие проблемы: умственное развитие; общее и политехническое образование; принципы советской теории образования и обучения; содержание образования и обучения, организация учебной работы; методы; проверка и оценка знаний; учебные пособия.

Раздел VI, называемый «Теория коммунистического воспитания», включал воспитание коммунистической морали; воспитание большевистской воли и характера; воспитание физическое и эстетическое. Отдельными разделами в программе рассматривались комсомольская, пионерская и ученическая организации в школе; школа и семья; внеклассная и внешкольная работа; учитель советской школы и школоведение (16).

В предвоенные годы структура программы менялась незначительно, изменялась последовательность разделов, уточнялось их название (17).

Анализ источников 3-го периода (40-е – конец 60-х гг.)

В феврале 1941 года на совещании по вопросам педагогики и психологии была поставлена задача пересмотра учебных планов и программ для педагогических учебных заведений. В частности, был поставлен вопрос о необходимости перестройки курса педагогики в ВУЗах (23). Работа в этом направлении была прервана Великой отечественной войной и возобновлена после ее окончания.

Программа педагогики, утвержденная Наркомпросом РСФСР в ноябре 1944 года, занимает особое место в истории развития педагогического знания для образования учителей. В структуре программы впервые, как основные, выделяются разделы «Теория воспитания» и «Теория обучения» (19).

В теории воспитания начинают оформляться такие темы как 1. Основы нравственного воспитания, 2. Воспитание советского патриотизма, 3. Трудовое воспитание, 4. Воспитание сознательной дисциплины, 5. Эстетическое воспитание, 6. Физическое воспитание и военно-оборонная работа, 7. Организация и воспитание ученического коллектива, 8. Комсомольские, пионерские и ученические организации в школе, 9. Внеклассная и внешкольная работа, 10. Учитель советской школы, 11. Воспитание ребенка в семье и в школе.

Впервые выделены, как отдельные, темы 2, 3, 7. В разделе «Теория обучения», рассматриваются традиционные дидактические темы: учение о процессе обучения, содержание обучения, урок и методы обучения. Отличительной особенностью раздела является выделение отдельной темой принципов обучения.

Анализ программ курса педагогики 1946, 1947, 1949, 1951, 1954, 1957 гг. показывает, что в эти годы структура программ не менялась.

Содержание курса излагалось в 4 разделах: общие основы педагогики, теория обучения, теория воспитания, управление и руководство школой.

Материалы XX съезда КПСС (1956 г.), Закон об укреплении связи школы с жизнью и о дальнейшем развитии системы народного образования в СССР (1958 г.) поставили в центр внимания работников системы педобразования проблемы общего и политехнического образования на основе соединения обучения с производительным трудом. Эти документы определили направление развития советской школы в условиях развернутого строительства коммунизма.

На Всероссийском совещании заведующих кафедрами педагогики 15 декабря 1959 года было указано, что одной из центральных задач педагогического образования является подготовка в высшей школе людей, способных осуществлять Закон об укреплении связи школы с жизнью.

На совещании ставится вопрос о коренном пересмотре курса педагогики.

Предлагаемый проект новой программы, специально подготовленной к совещанию, нацелен на освещение вопросов связи обучения и воспитания с практикой коммунистического строительства, на решение проблемы соединения обучения с

производительным трудом, на содержание форм и методов политехнического и профессионального образования. Большое внимание уделяется не только раскрытию содержания воспитательной работы, но и ее методике и формам организации различных видов деятельности учащихся (8).

В программе 1961 года (редактор И. Т. Огородников) по сравнению с программой 1957 года следует отметить иную логику изложения материала. В новой программе выделено 5 разделов: общие вопросы педагогики; содержание коммунистического воспитания и образования; теория обучения; теория и методика воспитания; школоведение.

В первом разделе «Общие основы педагогики» на основе программы КПСС раскрываются предмет и метод науки, дается характеристика роли коммунистического воспитания в период развернутого строительства коммунизма. Далее рассматриваются факторы, влияющие на формирование подрастающего поколения и показывается ведущая роль воспитания по сравнению с такими факторами как наследственность и среда.

Второй раздел программы посвящен содержанию коммунистического воспитания и образования. Вводя этот раздел, авторы стремились целостно рассмотреть весь круг вопросов, касающихся тех черт и качеств личности, которые в процессе воспитания и обучения необходимо развивать и формировать.

В третьем разделе программы, посвященном теории обучения, рассматриваются темы: «Сущность процесса обучения», «Принципы обучения», «Учебные планы и программы школы», «Методы обучения», «Формы организации учебной работы». Содержание излагается в традиционной, устоявшейся в советской педагогике логике.

Четвертый раздел «Теория и методика воспитания» рассматривается в двух аспектах: по составным частям коммунистического воспитания и по организационным формам воспитательной работы. В первом аспекте в программу включены такие темы как «Сущность процесса воспитания», «Методы нравственного воспитания», «Методы трудового воспитания», «Методы эстетического воспитания». Во втором аспекте – «Ученический коллектив в школе», «Комсомольская, пионерская и ученическая организации в школе», «Формы внеклассной работы», «Учитель и классный руководитель», «Воспитание детей в семье». Раздел школоведения построен в традиционной логике (18).

Дискуссия о перестройке преподавания педагогики, начатая И. Т. Огородниковым, затронула все основные вопросы перестройки курса педагогики в соответствии с решениями XXII съезда и новой Программой партии. Главными задачами в воспитании подрастающего поколения партия выдвинула формирование научного мировоззрения, коммунистического отношения к труду и коммунистической нравственности (Огородников, 1962 г.).

Дискуссия показала, что в новой программе по педагогике необходимо:

- 1) более основательно раскрыть место и задачи подготовки нового человека в строительстве коммунизма, его черты и качества, пути формирования, цели и задачи коммунистического воспитания подрастающего поколения;
- 2) полнее раскрыть понятие и сущность всестороннего развития личности в период строительства коммунизма;
- 3) включить все новое, что намечено в Программе партии в области народного образования и рассмотреть перспективы его развития в ближайшие десятилетия;
- 4) при анализе сущности обучения необходимо полнее раскрыть такие принципы, как воспитывающий характер обучения, научность, связь образования с жизнью;

- 5) разработать тему «Воспитание научного мировоззрения» и методику воспитания пролетарского интернационализма и социалистического патриотизма. (Афанасьева, 1962, Тихонов, 1963).

На рубеже 50-х – 60-х гг. сложившаяся система преподавания педагогических наук, при которой на 2 курсе изучалась педагогика, а на третьем - история педагогики, вызвала серьезную критику. Основным недостатком такой системы критикующие указывали логический разрыв курсов, слабое влияние курса истории педагогики на задачи теоретической и практической подготовки учителя, на дублирование некоторой части материала и т.п. Неудовлетворенность состоянием преподавания этих двух дисциплин породила идею синтетического курса педагогики.

В начале 60-х годов в ряде педагогических институтов страны были разработаны и опробованы на практике курсы, объединяющие в единый предмет теорию и историю педагогики, т.к. при изучении разделов современной педагогики необходима опора на уже имеющиеся у студентов историко-педагогические знания (Шаров, 1962).

Опытный курс включал 4 основных раздела: 1. Историко-педагогическое введение. 2. Содержание коммунистического воспитания и образования в советской школе в период построения коммунизма. 3. Дидактика. 4. Основы методики воспитательной работы.

По мнению авторов проекта, знакомство студентов с историко-педагогическим материалом при рассмотрении теоретических проблем советской педагогики давало возможность сосредотачивать внимание на конкретных вопросах методики воспитания.

Общий итог проведенного эксперимента авторы оценили высоко. Эксперимент доказал преимущества предложенной системы изучения истории педагогики и педагогики. При такой последовательности историко-педагогический материал становится хорошей базой для изучения курса педагогики. Знания по педагогике вступают в связи со знаниями историко-педагогическими, обогащают их и в свою очередь обогащаются ими.

4-й период (конец 60-х – начало 90-х гг.)

Работа по совершенствованию программ в этот период была направлена на повышение научно-теоретического уровня курса и качество его преподавания.

В программе 1969 года ставится задача обеспечить высокий уровень теоретической подготовки учителей по педагогическим дисциплинам. В программе сделана попытка построить содержание курса в соответствии с достижениями науки, дополнить курс новыми теоретическими положениями и выводами. Высокий уровень теоретической подготовки рассматривается как необходимое условие овладения педагогическим мастерством, умениями и навыками педагогической деятельности. Содержание курса излагалось в 4-х разделах: общие основы педагогики, теория обучения, теория воспитания и школоведение (20).

С сентября 1970 года педагогические ВУЗы начали работать по новым учебным планам и программам. Система педагогических дисциплин включала: «Введение в педагогику» (1 семестр), «Историю педагогики» (2–3 семестры), и «Педагогику школы» (4–5 семестры).

Курс «Введение в педагогику» раскрывал сущность основных педагогических явлений; выяснял роль воспитания в развитии личности, рассматривал вопросы возникновения и развития воспитания и педагогической мысли в истории человечества, определял задачи, стоящие перед педагогической наукой. Большое внимание уделялось изучению цели и сущности коммунистического воспитания, системе народного образования в

СССР и критике буржуазной педагогики. «Педагогика школы» как основные разделы включала теорию воспитания, теорию образования и обучения, вопросы школоведения. Анализ программы показывает, что традиционно рассматриваемые в разделе общих основ педагогики темы, носящие теоретико-методологический характер, вынесены в курс «Введение в педагогику» и отделены не только временными рамками, но и логически от теории воспитания и теории обучения. Очень скоро курс «Введение в педагогику» выявил свою несостоятельность.

С 1975 года в учебные планы введен курс «Введение в учительскую специальность», призванный вооружить студентов первоначальными знаниями о сущности профессиональной деятельности, ознакомить со спецификой обучения в педагогическом ВУЗе, пробудить интерес к педагогической теории.

Учебные планы, вступившие в действие в 1983 году, кроме таких педагогических дисциплин как «Введение в специальность» и «Педагогика» введен курс «Методика воспитательной работы». В список спецкурсов внесены многие дисциплины: «Профессиональная ориентация школьников», «Учебно-воспитательная работа в ПТУ», «Теория и методика пионерской и комсомольской работы», «История ВЛКСМ и пионерской организации», «История международного юношеского движения», «Основы педагогического мастерства», «Методика работы воспитателя группы продленного дня и интернатных учреждений», «Теория и методика лекторского мастерства» и др.

Повышение значения теоретических исследований повлекло за собой и изменение акцента в изучении курса педагогики будущими учителями.

Курс «Педагогика» в общесоюзной программе 1987 года имеет своей целью вооружение будущих учителей знаниями теоретических основ современной педагогической науки, а также умениями, необходимыми для эффективной организации коммунистического воспитания учащихся. Обучение студентов направлено на усвоение науки и это определяет логику изложения материала (21).

В первом разделе программы, носящем теоретико-методологический характер, раскрываются социальное назначение педагогики и ее идейно-политическая направленность. Раздел теория воспитания излагает научные основы коммунистического воспитания, его сущность, принципы, содержание, формы и методы организации. В данном разделе излагаются лишь теоретические основы воспитания, а методика его осуществления изучается в курсе «Методика воспитательной работы».

Третий раздел посвящен раскрытию основ дидактики. В разделе 4 раскрываются основы управления советской школой.

Задачи всестороннего развития личности, всеобщего коммунистического воспитания продолжали оставаться ориентиром в деятельности государственной системы образования и воспитания. В реальной же практике положение все более ухудшалось. В конце 80-х начале 90-х гг. противоречия в области воспитания и образования резко обострились. Результаты воспитания молодежи все более не удовлетворяли общество. В этот период наиболее остро ощущался отрыв теории от практики воспитательной работы, произошло обесценивание самой идеи коммунистического воспитания, лежащей в основе социалистической педагогики.

Заключение

В рассматриваемый период фактически не прекращалась работа по совершенствованию учебных программ подготовки учителя. Осуществлялась эта работа не столько в связи с потребностями общеобразовательной школы, с новыми задачами и требованиями общественного развития, сколько в связи с установками партии и

советского государства. В 30-е годы методология марксизма становится методологией педагогики, осуществляется становление партийно-государственной советской педагогики. Победа государственной педагогики определила необходимость создания унифицированных типовых программ, контролируемых государственными органами. В следующем историческом периоде (40-е – конец 60-х гг.) основное внимание при разработке программ уделяется проблемам воспитания. Особое значение приобретают методики воспитания. Советскому государству необходим человек с определенным мировоззрением, определенными качествами и отношениями. В период 70-х - начала 90-х гг. усилия направлены на повышение научно-теоретического уровня курса педагогики. Эта работа привела к нарушению взаимосвязи теории и практики, вызвав у поколений студентов отношение к теории коммунистического воспитания как к очень далекой от проблем практики.

На протяжении всего советского периода наименее идеологизированной отраслью педагогических знаний была теория обучения.

В программах подготовки будущих учителей отражены все сложные процессы и противоречия, происходящие в развитии самой науки.

Литература

1. Алексинский, М. А. Ликвидируем «левацкое охвостье» в педобразовании. Педагогическое образование, 1933, № 1.
2. Архангельский, С. И. О программе и учебнике по педагогике для педвузов и педтехникумов. За педагогические кадры, 1931, № 3.
3. Анастасьева, Т. Н. О структуре курса педагогики в педагогических институтах. Советская педагогика, 1962, № 4.
4. Блонский, П. П. Гражданское или человеческое воспитание? Свободное воспитание и свободная школа, 1918, № 4–5. О воспитании в наши дни. Свободное воспитание и свободная школа, 1918, № 1–3.
5. Блонский, П. П. К вопросу о содержании курса педагогики. Педагогическое образование, 1935, № 2.
6. Блонский, П. П. Как обеспечить будущим учителям знание возрастных особенностей детей. Педагогическое образование, 1934, № 6.
7. Вентцель, К. Социализм и свободное воспитание. Свободное воспитание и свободная школа, 1918, № 6–7.
8. Всероссийское совещание заведующих кафедрами педагогики. Советская педагогика, 1960, № 2.
9. Дальневосточный университет. Педагогический факультет. Учебные программы на 1927/28 год. Хабаровск, 1928. Государственный Педагогический Институт им Герцена. Программы педагогического цикла на 1928/29 год. Ленинград, 1928 и др.
10. Комаровский, Б. Б. Диалектика развития научно-педагогической мысли, М., 1929.
11. Корнейчук, Т.Д. Проблема построения курса теоретической педагогики. Педагогическая квалификация, 1928, № 2–3.
12. На заседании ученого комитета по педагогическим наукам. Педагогическое образование, 1937, № 2–3; На первом всероссийском совещании по педагогическим наукам. Педагогическое образование, 1937, № 2–3.
13. На совещании заведующих кафедрами педагогики и преподавателей психологии в педвузах. Педагогическое образование, 1936, № 5
14. Огородников, И. Т. О задачах и системе курса педагогики в педагогических институтах. Советская педагогика, 1962, № 2.

15. О программе по педагогике для высших педагогических учебных заведений. Советская педагогика, 1937, № 2.
16. Проект программы по педагогике. Советская педагогика, 1938, № 10.
17. Программа по педагогике для педагогических и учительских институтов. Советская педагогика, 1940, № 9.
18. Программы педагогических институтов. Педагогика. М., 1961.
19. Программы учительских институтов. Педагогика. Учпедгиз, 1945.
20. Программа курса «Педагогика» для педагогических институтов и университетов. М., 1969.
21. Программы педагогических институтов. Педагогика. М., 1987.
22. Риндич, А. Замечания к программе по педагогике. Педагогическое образование, 1934, № 2.
23. Совещание по вопросам педагогики и психологии. Советская педагогика, 1941, № 4.
24. Тихонов, А. А. Улучшение педагогической подготовки студентов и программа по педагогике. Советская педагогика, 1963, № 1.
25. Учебно-методический сектор Наркомпроса. Программы педагогических институтов. Выпуск 4. Педагогика. Учпедгиз, 1933.
26. Фридман, С. М. К вопросу о квалификации педагога. Педагогическая квалификация, 1928, № 2–3.
27. Шаров, Ю.В. О системе педагогических наук в педагогическом институте. Советская педагогика, 1962, № 7.
28. Шацкий, С. Т. На путях к трудовой школе. Свободное воспитание и свободная трудовая школа, 1918, № 10–12.
29. Эпштейн, М. За марксистско-ленинскую программу по педагогике. За педагогические кадры, 1932, № 2.

Summary

The article considers the formation and development of pedagogy syllabuses in the period of Soviet education. The analysis of primary sources permits classification in four stages of this process. The coverage of the material comprises of the description of each stage in relation to the development of pedagogy syllabuses.

Keywords: teaching subject, pedagogy, pedagogy syllabus, course objectives, course content, topics of the course.

Kopsavilkums

Rakstā «Pedagoģijas kā studiju disciplīnas rašanās un attīstība padomju laika izglītībā: historigrāfiska analīze» izskatītas studiju kursa «Pedagoģija» attīstības problēmas. Padomju laika studiju programmu un pedagoģiskās literatūras analīze ļāvusi izdalīt četrus laika periodus, no kuriem katrs atspoguļo kursa attīstības specifiskās īpatnības.

Atslēgvārdi: studiju disciplīna, pedagoģija kā studiju priekšmets, pedagoģijas programma, kursa mērķis, tēmas, saturs.

**CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL AND EXCEPTIONAL NEEDS –
A SUBJECT IN THE TEACHER TRAINING CURRICULUM
(LATVIA, THE LATE 19TH CENTURY – 2004)**

**BĒRNI AR SPECIĀLĀM UN ĪPAŠĀM VAJADZĪBĀM – MĀCĪBU
PRIEKŠMETS SKOLOTĀJU IZGLĪTĪBAS PROGRAMMĀS
(LATVIJĀ 19. GS. BEIGĀS – 2004)**

Iveta Ķestere, Dita Nīmante

University of Latvia

Abstract

The article deals with the historical development of the issues related to children with special and exceptional needs included into the study programs of general teacher training. The problem was investigated using such sources as the study programs of teacher training institutions, the syllabuses of academic courses, text-books used at the teacher training institutions etc. Experience in teacher training was studied from the materials of teacher training seminaries and women's grammar schools (the 2nd half of the 19th century–1914), teacher training institutes, the University of Latvia (1919–1940), institutes of pedagogy, Latvian State University (1945–1991), the University of Latvia, Riga Teacher Training and Educational Management Academy, Latvian Academy of Sport Education, and Liepaja Academy of Pedagogy (the 1990s–2004). Studies of their history reveal some characteristic features of the teacher training curriculum: gaining information about the children with special needs (not developing special working skills) has been the dominating aim in teacher training curricula for general education; two models of education referring to children with special needs prevail – 1) separate themes included in the syllabi of particular courses, 2) teacher training curricula include a separate course of studies.

Keywords: children with special and exceptional needs; teacher training curriculum.

In 1894, Atis Ķeniņš, a graduate of a teacher training seminary, started working in a school for the deaf-and-dumb. In his memoirs, he writes that this job offer took him by surprise and even caused some embitterment (Ķeniņš, 1924). In 1983, Tālis Pumpuriņš, a graduate of the University of Latvia, was sent to work in a school for hard-of-hearing children. In an interview he admitted, “I was not too happy about the job”, and “I had not heard anything about children with special needs at the university.”¹ There is a time period of almost 100 years between both these statements... Therefore, the following questions seem topical for us today as well:

1. When were the issues related to children with special and exceptional needs included into the study programs for general education teacher training for the first time?
2. For what purpose did the teachers of general educational institutions acquire the knowledge about children with special needs?
3. What notions were used to describe the issue theoretically?

In order to answer the questions above, we used the following **sources**:

- the study programs of teacher training institutions,
- the syllabuses of academic courses,
- text-books used at teacher training institutions,
- interviews (structured and open).

¹ An interview with Tālis Pumpuriņš, 21 May 2007.

First of all, we tried to collect and study those sources that give a general insight into the treatment of the problem in a particular historical period. These include government regulations on teacher training, teacher training curricula for different levels of education, etc. We also studied most of the course syllabuses and text-books in pedagogy, hygiene, and psychology. At present, we are trying to identify more precisely the content of several courses and the activities of particular teacher training institutions.

Experience in teacher training was studied in:

- teacher training seminaries and women's grammar schools (the 2nd half of the 19th century – 1914),
- teacher training institutes and the University of Latvia (1919–1940),
- institutes of pedagogy and Latvian State University (1945–1991),
- the University of Latvia, Riga Teacher Training and Educational Management Academy, Latvian Academy of Sport Education, Liepāja Academy of Pedagogy (the 1990s–2004).

It should be pointed out that the sources analysed comprised only the materials referring to teacher training for general educational institutions;² the materials concerning special teacher education – specialists in defectology, teachers for specialized schools, speech therapists, and other teachers working with children having special needs were excluded.

There is an ongoing discussion in Latvia about the linguistic and pedagogical **meaning of two notions** – “children with special needs” and “children with exceptional needs”. Thereby we will use these two notions in parallel. Since 1996 the legal definition of the “children with special needs” in Latvian laws comprises 8 groups:

- children with impaired vision,
- children with impaired hearing,
- children with speech problems,
- children with impaired physical development,
- children with impaired mental development,
- children with somatic health problems,
- children with psychic-neurological health problems,
- children with impaired psychic development and learning difficulties (Speciālās pamatizglītības programmas, 2005).

In turn, the notion “children with exceptional needs” is more used to refer to either children with special needs, or the children who need to rely on a short- or long-time assistance in the learning process.

Naturally, both the volume of the materials and the selected time period are huge. Nevertheless, when starting the research, our initial **hypothetical assumption** was as follows: The teachers of general education were trained to work with “ideal” children who had to be protected from negative influences and diseases. If a child was affected by some disability, it was beyond the scope of an “ordinary” institution of general education.

However, it turned out in the process of the research, that the actual situation in Latvia had not been so grave: in separate cases, the would-be teachers were at least very well informed about the children with special needs.

² The teachers of preschool, primary school, elementary school, and secondary school.

The first professional teachers,³ however, were only warned that not all the children were ideal by separate themes included in the courses of pedagogy like “Reprimand”, “Punishment” (Lange, 1890, S. 58), “On Desires, Inclinations, and Passions” (Фальборк, Чарнолуцкий, 1901, с. 42).

We succeeded in finding **the first indication that future teachers were also taught about children with special needs** in the curriculum of a private women’s grammar school of 1913.⁴ In the hygiene lessons, girls studied the nervous system and also acquired such topics as “Deformities”, “Spiritual and Nervous Illnesses and Their Causes”; the theme of physiology included the topic “The Illnesses and the Hygiene of Sense Organs (eyes, ears, skin, etc.)” (Рижская женская ..., 1913, с. 54). These facts perfectly fit in the picture of the epoch: first, women as nurturing and patient individuals were considered to be particularly suitable for working with children having special needs, who need care more than intellectual achievements (Winzer, 1993, p. 234–243). The grammar school graduates – home teachers – were frequently hired to work in rich families and take care of their children with special needs. Second, in the second half of the 19th century, the hygienist movement was spreading throughout the world, and it was also known in Latvia. For this reason, the subject of “Hygiene” was included in the curricula of women’s grammar school. After World War I, the subjects “Hygiene” and “School Hygiene” were included in the study programs of teacher training institutions, and they kept a stable place there until the 1950s. In the course of hygiene in the 1930s, students acquired such themes as “Defective Children”, “Loss of Hearing”, “Language Disturbances”, etc. (Skolotāju institūtu ..., 1930, 143. lpp.) Judging from the text-book, in the late 1930s, eugenics was taught as part of hygiene (Fērmanis, 1937, 292–302. lpp.) After World War II, the course of hygiene focused on the prophylaxis of child and teenage illnesses, but did not touch upon the children with special needs any more.

The first text-book in General Pedagogy in the Latvian language was also written under a strong influence of the hygienists’ movement. In 1919, “A Handbook in Pedagogy” was published (Dēkens, 1919), whose author was a lecturer at a teacher training institute.⁵ In his book, he devoted considerable attention to children’s health and described both “subnormalities” appearing at an early childhood (epilepsy, cramps, rickets, infectious diseases, short-sightedness, hard hearing, nervousness, etc) and pupils’ “mental diseases” (psychopaths) at the school age. There are also given the characteristics of a healthy and unhealthy child (“the symptoms of a weakling”) at the start of the school age. According to the author, specialized educational institutions have to be set up for “underdeveloped” and “weakened” children, while those “lacking natural gifts” required special schools (Dēkens, 1919, 86.–97. lpp.). We are using the author’s descriptions referring to the children with special needs.⁶ In his book, he has also mentioned “an idiot”, “a total fool”, “hard head”, “the ungifted”.⁷

Even though we can look at author’s descriptions and his ideas about separate educational institutions with a critical eye from the contemporary standpoint, it was still an attempt not only to provide information, but also to develop teachers’ attitude to child’s health, which

³ The first teacher training seminary operated in the territory of Latvia from 1738 to 1743, but a larger-scale activity of teacher training seminaries started in the 1840s. Teacher training seminaries prepared teachers for rural primary schools. In the 19th century, the territory of Latvia was part of Russia; however, the German nobility and clergy played a significant role in setting up the seminaries.

⁴ Since 1870, women’s grammar schools were allowed to open the eighth (pedagogic) class, which trained home teachers and teachers for primary schools.

⁵ In 1918, Latvia became an independent state. There are 2–12 teacher training institutes prepared teachers for primary schools from 1920 till 1940.

⁶ These descriptions have been translated into Latvian from the German language. See, for instance, Berkholz, August. *Schularzt und Schulung Minderwertiger*. Riga, 1909, S.99 – 107; Keller, Ute. “Bildungsfähigkeit” von Kindern mit geistiger Behinderung. *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung* 6 (2000), S. 47–51.

⁷ These descriptions are used in the following sentences: “are “ungifted” or have “hard head””; “It is not difficult to recognize an idiot, a total fool”; “There are many stages from “hard head” to an idiot.”” (p. 96).

could be referred to as “supplying care” (Armstrong, 2002, p. 451) Unfortunately, it remained a single attempt in the field of general pedagogy in Latvia. The syllabus in pedagogy for teacher training institutes mentioned patho-pedagogy as a subbranch of pedagogy within the theme “The Theory of Upbringing”, while “The Schools for Ungifted and Defective Children” were included in the theme “The Institutions of Education and Upbringing” (Skolotāju institūtu ..., 1930, 134, 136. lpp.)

After World War I, psychology, experimental psychology in particular, started its “victorious march”. General and pedagogic psychology were integral parts of teacher training programs. These courses also provided knowledge on mental illnesses: the syllabus in psychology included the themes like “Illusions and Hallucinations” (Skolotāju institūtu ..., 131. lpp.) “Perversions”, “Neuroses”, “Psychoses”, etc. (Valsts centrālais ..., 1930, 143. lpp.)

In 1919, the **University of Latvia** was founded, where the training of grammar school teachers was started in Latvia for the first time.⁸ According to the study programs, the University provided comprehensive education in psychology. For the first time, the curricula included separate courses concerning children with special needs:⁹ The university provided courses “Child Psychology and Psychopathology” (Latvijas Universitātes ..., 1921, 23. lpp.), “Psychopathology” (Latvijas Universitātes ..., 1923, 26. lpp.), “Practical Work in Pathopsychology” (Latvijas Universitātes ..., 1926, 33. lpp.), “Difficult Children” (Latvijas Unive rsitātes ..., 1927, 33. lpp.) All these courses were taught by the Swiss psychologist Professor Ernst Schneider (1878–1957). After his dismissal from the University in 1928,¹⁰ these subjects were not taught any more.

In the course syllabus in pedagogy and in the lecture notes (Programma vispārīgā ..., Filoloģijas un ..., Dauge, 1932) we can find wonderful ideas about human upbringing, but not a real child ..

In 1944, the proposal of the Head of the Pedagogy Department at the University of Latvia and the long-term Director of the Teacher Training Institute to enable future teachers to observe several classes in the schools of “the defective and difficult” was published in the press (Pētersons, 1944, 130. lpp.). The supervision of students had to be entrusted to psychologists, and the students were supposed to familiarize themselves with this “peculiar type of schools” under the supervision of the specialists from the Institute of Psychology.¹¹ Unfortunately, the war and the change of the political regime put an end to this project.

After World War II, teacher training took place in Latvia within the framework of the educational system of the **Soviet Union**.¹² In the courses of pedagogy, struggle against various child and teenager vices was declared: “The Struggle with Child Stubbornness and Lack of Willpower”; “The Struggle with Child’s Caprices and Stubbornness”; “Child Falsity and the Ways of Its Overcoming”; “Laziness and Fight against It”; “The Struggle with an Inclination to Frequent Pleasures and the Habit of Idleness”; “The Eradication of Negative Habits”; “The Struggle against Gambling” (Pedagoģijas programma ..., 1948, 9, 10, 12, 13. lpp.) “An Active Struggle against Religious Ideology”; “The Struggle against the Effect of Bourgeois Morality upon the Youth”; “The Struggle against Revisionism, the Bourgeois Nationalism, Cosmopolitanism, and Racism”; “The Struggle against Greediness, Egotism, Cruelty, Boastfulness, Lying, and Self-Seeking” (Metodiskie ieteikumi ..., 1972, 14–16. lpp.)

⁸ Before the period of an independent state, grammar school teachers acquired education outside the territory of Latvia – mainly at the universities of Russia and Germany.

⁹ The courses mentioned below were not compulsory for obtaining teacher’s qualification.

¹⁰ The reason for E. Schneider’s dismissal was formulated as follows: “the faculty cannot accept his extreme direction in this [psychology] branch.”

¹¹ The Institute of Psychology existed in Latvia since 1923 and dealt with the diagnostics of children’s psychic diseases and the correction of speech disorders.

¹² In 1940, Latvia was occupied by the Soviet Union; the occupation continued after World War II.

Children with special needs were not mentioned in the course syllabuses of pedagogy and psychology. Still, the information concerning them was “coded” into separate themes. For instance, some syllabuses in psychology mention pathopsychology as one of the psychology branches (Psiholoģija ..., 1946, 3. lpp.; Metodiskie norādījumi ..., 1970, 4. lpp.; Metodiskie norādījumi ..., 1975, 4. lpp.; Vispārīgā psiholoģija ..., 1983, 4. lpp.). In pedagogy in the 1950s, the theme “The System of Pedagogic Sciences” included “surdo-, typhlo- and oligophreno-pedagogy, which study the upbringing and education of physically and mentally defective children – the deaf-and-dumb, the blind, and the mentally retarded” (Ogorodņikovs, Šimbirevs, 1952, 22. lpp.). Since the 1970s, these three branches were combined under one title “defectology”, while in the late 1970s there appeared the concept “special pedagogy” (Iļjina, 1971, 12–13. lpp.; Baranova, Voļikova, Slasteņins, 1979, 20. lpp.). In the 1970s, the syllabuses of pedagogic institutes and text-books in pedagogy contained a wider description of defectology (special pedagogy).

The second theme where students “encountered” children with special needs was “The System of Educational Establishments in the USSR”. Text-books in pedagogy mention special schools for “children having serious deficiencies or hearing, sight, or speech disorders, as well as the mentally retarded ones.” These schools are also referred to as “special schools” or schools for “anomalous” children. They are quite extensively covered in the text-book (Iļjina, 1971, 195–196. lpp.).

“The coding” of these themes of special pedagogy can be understood in two ways. The most optimistic interpretation might be attempts to integrate these themes in general pedagogy without any labelling. However, knowing the situation in the Soviet Union, a more realistic interpretation seems to be trying to ignore the group, “which might undermine the stability of the established social order” (Armstrong, 2002, p. 444).

In the 1980s, children with special needs “disappeared” from the text-books. It is just mentioned that “the structure of pedagogic sciences includes special pedagogy – typhlopedagogy, surdopedagogy, and oligophreno-pedagogy” (Бабанский, 1988, с. 10). In the course syllabuses of pedagogy, children have also “become considerably better”, but those who have failed to do so belong to the category of “unmanageable children” (Kļaveniece, 1983, 17. lpp.) or “those who resist upbringing” (Špona, Žogla, Koķe, 1987, 25. lpp.).

Naturally, it was interesting for us what caused the changes taking place in the 1980s. The reason could be the following: it was in the 1980s when special pedagogy experienced dramatic development in the Soviet Union (including Latvia). It became a separate branch of research, the specialists in which were trained in higher educational establishments. This positive development lead to a peculiar paradox: general pedagogy and special pedagogy isolated themselves in separate environments. Referring to the North America of the 1930s, Margaret Winzer depicted exactly the same situation: “Special education teachers and their exceptional pupils were isolated from the mainstream of education; special educators and regular classroom teachers lived in separate environments, each thinking the other used different methods and spoke different language” (Winzer, 1993, p. 370).

Let us return to **the example about two teachers** given at the beginning. The former started his work in the late 19th century when the training of teachers to work with children having special needs was not started yet; the latter – in the 1980s, when this theme was no longer included in the teacher training curricula. Still .. In 1897, Atis Ķeniņš, the 19th century teacher, published the book “The Deaf-Mute Child, His Upbringing and Elementary Education. Suggestions and Encouragement for Their Parents, Teachers, and Friends” (Ķeniņš, 1897). It is one of the first books in the Latvian language dealing with this issue. In addition, Tālis Pumpuriņš, the 20th century teacher, is currently developing tourism routes for people with special needs, intended not only for people in wheelchairs, but also for those with hearing and sight loss.

Nevertheless, nowadays it would be too thoughtless to rely on such a model of “learning by doing”. Therefore, it is important to clarify whether it is intended in Latvia, after regaining its independence in 1991, to include information concerning the children with special needs in teacher training curricula for general education.

After 1991, universities in Latvia gradually moved closer to the standards and requirements stated in Bologna process concerning higher educational institution processes and programmes in the system that is known all over the Western Europe. Although partial similarity was seen already before 1991 when the courses were called as obligatory and alternative ones, starting from 1991 all universities gradually offered the courses taught in three levels: obligatory basic courses (A), obligatory basic courses of specialization (B) and alternative courses (C). Therefore, while examining higher educational institution programmes several aspects were viewed. It was important to find out whether the course was included in the programme at all. The attention was paid also to level of the course and its accessibility for all students of the programme and prospective school teachers. Firstly, the question is: what courses for the children with special and exceptional needs were generally offered for the prospective pedagogues. Secondly, equally important is the question when was the exact moment when the course about the children with special and exceptional needs became as an obligatory component of the study programme. Was this course taught to all pedagogues and was there any guarantee that all students of teacher study programme would take a course?

Examining the period from 1991 up to 2004, similarly with the previous period, **firstly**, some **separate themes concerning children with special and exceptional needs were included in general subjects of Pedagogy and Psychology**. For instance, in the University of Latvia, students of professional comprehensive school teacher programmes had the course called “Child’s Development” where one lecture was spent on discussing the following theme: “Psychologically Pedagogically Pedagogical Evaluation and Disorders in Development of Adolescents”. The description of these two courses is attached to LUIS system and can be seen starting from the year 2004.¹³

The course “The Theory and Methodology of Upbringing” also provided one lecture, namely, “The Principles of Upbringing Problem Children”. The description of the course is attached to LUIS system and can be seen there starting from the year 2004.¹⁴ The course “Pedagogical Psychology” provided one lecture called “Pupils with Cognition Disorders”. The description of the course is attached to LUIS system and can be seen starting from the year 2004.¹⁵ The interview given by Viesturs Lāriņš, Dr. Med., Prof. of Latvian Academy of Sports Education,¹⁶ reveals that general courses included special themes concerning children with exceptional and special needs. For instance, the course “Remedial Gymnastics” included the theme – “Work with Special Medical Groups”. Until the year 1991 it had been governed by programmes ratified in Soviet Union, and this tradition was continued also after 1991.

Secondly, there were **courses that had been taught since 1991 and were designed with the aim to acquaint the prospective comprehensive school teachers with children with special and exceptional needs, to establish the basic conception and understanding of these children and their educational possibilities**. The first time the University of Latvia offered this kind of courses was in 1991. It was offered as alternative course (C) for students of professional comprehensive school teacher programmes and also for the students of Bachelor

¹³ LUIS system: <http://luis.lanet.lv/pls/pub/srep.stp?/=1&au=LU&str=LU204000000>, 24.04.07.

¹⁴ LUIS system: <http://luis.lanet.lv/pls/pub/srep.stp?/=1&au=LU&str=LU204000000>, 24.04.07.

¹⁵ LUIS system: <http://luis.lanet.lv/pls/pub/srep.stp?/=1&au=LU&str=LU204000000>, 24.04.07.

¹⁶ An interview with Prof. V. Lāriņš, 28 May 2007.

study programme. The title of the course was “Problem Child in School and Family”.¹⁷ Starting from the year of its foundation, in 1995, Riga Teacher Training and Educational Management Academy offered several subjects. Students of preschool and elementary school teacher training programmes were offered to choose such subjects as: “Introduction in Special Pedagogy” and “Speech Therapy”.¹⁸ The Professional and Bachelor programmes of the year 1998 were offered to choose the subject called “Introduction in Special Pedagogy” (Part-A). Whereas elementary school teachers had much wider offer of the course subjects: “Speech Therapy” (Part-A), “Gifted Child” (Part-B), “Children with Special Needs” (Part-B).¹⁹ The first time the Academy of Sports offered this kind of subject was in 2004. The title of it was “The Adaptive Physical Education” (Part-B).²⁰

However the most interesting findings were connected with Liepāja Pedagogical Academy (the previous name - Liepāja State Pedagogical Institute named after Vilis Lācis). The research revealed that the course named “The Basics of Defectology and Speech Therapy” was offered already in 1991.²¹ The course was taught to prospective preschool pedagogues. Futuremore prospective elementary school teachers had a course named “The Basics of Defectology”.²² The research revealed that Liepāja Pedagogical Academy continued the traditions which were present in Soviet Union times in Liepāja State Pedagogical Institute named after Vilis Lācis. These traditions determined the order the courses had to be taught. This fact is approved not only by the materials taken from the archive but also by the interview given by Mag. Paed. Baiba Trinite. In 1991 she started her work in Liepāja Pedagogical Academy. The first course she taught was “The Basics of Defectology”. She admitted: “..there was no discontinuity; we ensured the further continuation of the course taught previously”.²³ The authors of the research state that since 1985 the course named “The Basics of Defectology” was taught to prospective preschool teachers as an obligatory course.²⁴ In 1973 this course already was offered to primary school teachers as an alternative course.²⁵ The interview given by lecturer Lūcija Keire confirmed those facts provided by archive materials. She explained that she started to work in Liepāja State Pedagogical Institute named after Vilis Lācis in 1973 and the first course she taught to prospective secondary pedagogues students was “The Basics of Defectology”.²⁶

In 1970 the course named “Speech Therapy” was offered to methodologist and primary school pedagogue training programmes.²⁷ Jāzeps Kravalis, in his book “Special Schools in

¹⁷ LU Akadēmiskais departaments, Pedagoģijas bakalaura grāda iegūšanai, Svešvalodas mācību metodiskā apakšprogramma, apstiprināta 1991. gada 18. februārī Domes sēdē

¹⁸ An interview with Mag. paed. I.Miltina, 23 May 2007.

¹⁹ RPIVA Studiju daļa, Studiju plāni, 1998. 1999. gada studiju gada rudens, pavasaris.

²⁰ Kļaviņa, A. sast. *LSPA, Sporta medicīnas katedra. Adaptīvā fiziskā izglītība. Programma*. Rīga, 2004.

²¹ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 523F. 18.ap., 772. lieta LR Izglītības ministrija, LP institūts, Mācību darba plāni dienas nodaļai no 1985. līdz 1991. gadam.

²² *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 523 F., 18.ap., 772. lieta, LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību darba plāni dienas nodaļai no 1985. līdz 1991. gadam.

²³ An interview with Mag. paed. B.Trinite, 30 May 2007.

²⁴ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 523 F., 2ap., . 100., 527. lieta LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību plāni (latviešu valodas un literatūras fakultātes un pamatskolas skolotāju sagatavošanas fakultāte dienas nodaļai no 1985. līdz 1991. gadam.

²⁵ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 527. F., 2. apr., 100. lieta LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību plāni (latviešu valodas un literatūras fakultātes un pamatskolas skolotāja sagatavošanas fakultāte), 1973.

²⁶ An interview with Mag. paed. L.Keire, 3 July 2007.

²⁷ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 527. F., 2. apr., 99. lieta, LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību plāni (pamatskolas skolotāju sagatavošanas fakultāte un matemātikas fakultāte, 1970.

Latvia”, approves this fact by saying that those who wanted at the end of the 60s to acquire this speciality (Speech Therapy – D. N.) could study it as an optional subject.²⁸

Nothing proves the existence of any separate courses concerning this particular theme until 1970. The name of the course “Russian (native language) Language Methodology, Expressive Reading, Speech Therapy” proves that the themes were integrated in other courses which were offered to basic school teachers in 1964.²⁹

During the research another connection was found. Liepāja Pedagogical Higher Institution has borrowed not only the positive aspects, for instance, offering separate course about the children with special and exceptional needs to prospective comprehensive school teachers, but also some negative ones, for instance, the distinction between comprehensive school teachers who can and can not apply for this course. For example, the course named “The Basics of Defectology”, held in Liepāja Pedagogical Academy, changed its name to “The Basics of Special Pedagogy”.³⁰ For a long while this course was offered only to prospective elementary and primary school teachers. The students of this programme were offered to study the following specialization subjects: “Patopsychology”, “Psychology of Psychological Deviations”, “Psychocorrection” and “The Basics in Speech Therapy”.³¹

Throughout the years the prospective Math pedagogues did not have a chance to acquire the course named “Introduction to Special Pedagogy” because it was not introduced at all.³² At the same time the particular study programme offered the course named “Work with Gifted Children”.³³ This course was included in one of the study years.

Thirdly, all Latvian higher educational institutions had something in common. Initially all the courses offered by Latvian Universities, except Riga College of Pedagogy and Education which began their work only in 1995, were offered as alternative courses. Both the course “The Basics of Defectology”,³⁴ offered in 1973, and the course “Problem Child in School and Family”, offered by LU in 1973, were alternative courses.³⁵ Examining the programmes offered by Latvian Universities, the authors of the research concluded that starting from 1997 the course named “Introduction in Special Pedagogy” was gradually offered to all prospective teachers as an “obligatory course”.³⁶ Courses were put in section, namely “obligatory courses” or “obligatory specialization courses”. This adjustment helped to broaden the accessibility to those courses; many students had a chance to acquire them.

The study process offered and still offers various additional courses concerning these particular themes.

Fourthly, evaluating the offered aims of the courses, it was concluded that the majority of the courses **provided only conceptions about the children with special and exceptional needs.**

²⁸ Kravalis, Jāzeps. *Latvijas speciālās skolas. 1840-1996*. Rīga, 1996.

²⁹ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 527. F., 18. apr., 135. lieta, LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību plāni 1964, 1973, 1975, 1976. gads (neklātienas nodaļa).

³⁰ *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija*, Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, par 1994/ 95. st. g. Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Nr. 981.

³¹ *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija*, Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, par 1994/ 95. st. g. Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Nr. 981.

³² *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija*, Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, 2003./2004. st. g. Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Lieta Nr. 1217.

³³ *Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija*, Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, 1998./ 1999., Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Lieta Nr. 1024.

³⁴ *Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs* 527. F., 2. apr., 100. lieta LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, Mācību plāni (latviešu valodas un literatūras fakultātes un pamatskolas skolotāja sagatavošanas fakultāte), 1973.

³⁵ LU Akadēmiskais departaments, Pedagoģijas bakalaura grāda iegūšanai, Svešvalodas mācību metodiskā apakšprogramma, apstiprināta 1991. gada 18. februārī Domes sēdē.

³⁶ LU Akadēmiskais departaments, LU Pedagoģijas un psiholoģijas fakultātes pedagoģijas bakalaura programma, 1. sej. Apstiprināts 1997. gada 10 decembrī Domes sēdē.

This kind of goal was proposed by the first lector L. Keire in 1973³⁷ and still is set today for the programmes and courses offered to prospective teachers.

Courses did not propose to acquire the competences which are needed when working with different children in comprehensive schools. The study programmes were not focusing on developing necessary competences for the teachers when working with diverse children. Only one course, namely, “The Adaptive Physical Education” (Part-B)³⁸ offered by Latvian Academy of Sports Education included both theoretical and practical skills by providing special adaptive sports activities which are necessary when working with children who have special and exceptional needs.

Conclusions

◇ Teacher training curricula for general education include information referring to children with special needs in **two models**:

1. There are separate themes included in the syllabi of particular courses.

The children with special needs are first mentioned in the courses of hygiene. The mental problems and illnesses are dealt with in the course of psychology³⁹ and pedagogic psychology.⁴⁰ The sources in general pedagogy, on the other hand, provide information that children with special needs really exist, but general pedagogy dissociates itself from them as these issues are dealt with by other branches of science (pathopsychology, defectology, and special pedagogy).

In some cases, information concerning children with special needs is “coded” under general themes in the course syllabi of pedagogy.⁴¹ This requires more thorough research in the future.

As the course syllabi and text-books give a very narrow picture of the themes concerning special pedagogy, students’ knowledge studying according to this model actually depended on the goodwill and the competence of professors in pedagogy, psychology, hygiene.

2. Teacher training curricula include a separate course of studies.

The teachers of general education could acquire pathopsychology as the first course of this kind. This was due to the fashion for experimental psychology and psychoanalysis in the 1920s, as well as the personal enthusiasm of Professor E. Schneider. That these courses had an incidental nature can be proved by the fact that the next separate course concerning children with special needs was taught in Latvia only 50 years later.

According to the researched materials, it could be concluded that the first higher educational institution which offered separate course meant for comprehensive school pedagogues, when working with children with special and exceptional needs, was Liepāja State Pedagogical Institute named after Vilis Lācis. Already in 1973 the course “The Basics of Defectology” was offered as an alternative course. It was offered to primary school teachers. The fact that there was no evidence that proved the existence of any separate courses concerning this particular theme until 1970 led to the following conclusion; at that time there were no separate courses meant for comprehensive school

³⁷ An interview with Mag. paed. L. Keire, 3 July 2007.

³⁸ Kļvaina, A. sast. *LSPA, Sporta medicīnas katedra. Adaptīvā fiziskā izglītība. Programma*. Rīga, 2004.

³⁹ We first found the subject of psychology in the curriculum of a women’s grammar school of 1912.

⁴⁰ We first found pedagogic psychology in the curriculum of the University of Latvia of 1919.

⁴¹ For instance, further research is needed in order to clarify what was the content of such themes in general pedagogy as “The Life of Body and Soul”, “Immortality and Its Causes”, “Heredity”, “The Characteristics of Child Development Groups”, etc.

teachers when working with children with special and exceptional needs. Offering the course in one of the higher educational institutions did not guarantee that similar courses would also appear in other universities.

Improving general education teacher training programmes by adding the course “The Basics of Defectology” was stimulated by several factors. The first factor was the development of special education (Defectology) as a science. It entered the higher educational institutions of Latvia, namely, Liepāja State Pedagogical Institute named after Vilis Lācis. According to J. Kravalis,⁴² the department of correspondence courses in Defectology was opened in 1969. The first programme for special school teachers was offered exactly in this department. The second stimulating factor was involving the people who had acquired the knowledge, offered in this programme, in higher educational institutions.⁴³ Similar situation was seen also in the University of Latvia. Taking part in the formation of study programmes for the University of Latvia was V. Avotiņš, the former head of Laboratory of Pedagogical Psychology in the Pedagogical Research Institute of Ministry of Education of the former Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic (LSSR).⁴⁴

- ◇ The situation changed dramatically in the early 1990s after Latvia regained its independence: the individuality of each child was proclaimed as the main value contrary to the Soviet collectivism. Consequently, the children who were not ideal were also “noticed”. Interest in the children with special needs became more topical in the Latvian Society. Several generations of specialists in special pedagogy had been trained during the Soviet time, who, after dismantling “the iron curtain”, could professionally acquire the experience of democratic states in the field of inclusive education and pass on this experience to their colleagues, the teachers of general education.
- ◇ After 1991, traditions of borrowing the courses, including those which were offered to comprehensive school teachers when working with children with special and exceptional needs, had had an important role. According to these traditions it was denoted which of the pedagogue groups would mostly need to acquire the knowledge about the children with special and exceptional needs.
- ◇ Initially, all new courses about the particular theme were offered as alternative courses but afterwards as obligatory ones.
- ◇ The terminology which had been used in course descriptions and also in some other resources corresponded to the traditions set by the society of that time. In each historical period the use of terminology had been influenced by different processes, conceptions and the level of comprehension of the child with special and exceptional needs. After 1991 different kind of terminology and conceptions were used. For instance, the conception historically borrowed from Latvian first independence period was “problem child”. Whereas conception “defective child” was borrowed from Soviet Union. The terminology used after 1991 was equated with international terms, for instance, “child with special needs”. The search for different terms reveals the process of humanization in pedagogy and society itself. It strived to find new, inoffensive ways how to define these children, for example, unusual child, problem child, different child, etc.
- ◇ It should be pointed out that the modest goal – to inform students about the children with special needs (not to develop special skills when working with these children) has been the dominating one in teacher training curricula for general education. On the other hand,

⁴² Kravalis, Jāzeps. *Latvijas speciālās skolas. 1840-1996.*: Rīga, 1996.

⁴³ An interview with Mag. paed. I. Miltina, 23 May 2007.

⁴⁴ An interview with Dr. Psych. S. Liepina, 16 May, 2007.

it is not too little as information is the first step towards arousing interest. Therefore, nowadays there are various activities carried out not only to provide students with extensive information, but also to give them opportunities to apply their knowledge in everyday practice, where including education is becoming more and more widespread.

References

1. **Armstrong, F.** The historical development of special education: humanitarian rationality or wild profusion of entangled events? *History of Education*, 2002, No. 31, p. 437–456.
2. *Baltijas skolotāju seminārs. 1870–1919.* Rīga, 1940.
3. **Baranova, S., Voļikova, T., Slasteņins, V.** (red.) *Pedagoģija.* Rīga, 1979.
4. **Birkerts, P.** *Pedagoģiskā psiholoģija. Skolotāju semināriem un skolotājiem.* Rīga, 1923.
5. **Birkerts, P.** *Psicholoģija. Vidusskolām, skolotāju semināriem un pašmācībai.* Rīga, 1921.
6. **Dauge, A.** *Vispārīgā pedagogģija. Latvijas Universitātē lasāmo lekciju kurss.* Rokraksts, 1932.
7. **Dēkens, K.** *Rokas grāmata pedagogģijā.* Rīga, 1919.
8. *Deutsches Lehrerseminar zu Mitau. Bericht über das I Quadrennium (1907/8 – 1910/11).* Rīga, 1911.
9. **Fērmanis, E.** *Higiēna. Mācību grāmata studentiem, ārstiem un skolotājiem.* Rīga, 1937.
10. *Filoloģijas un filozofijas fakultātes programmas 1934 – 1935.* LVVA, F 7427, Apr. 6, L 63.
11. **Fricberga, S., Karpova, Ā.** (sast.) *Vispārīgā psiholoģija. Darba programma.* Rīga, 1983.
12. **Iļjina, T.** *Pedagoģija.* Rīga, 1971.
13. **Kļaveniece, E.** *Darba programma pedagogģijā.* Rīga, 1983.
14. **Kļaviņa, A.** (sast.) *Adaptīvā fiziskā izglītība. Programma. LSPA, Sporta medicīnas katedra.* Rīga, 2004.
15. **Korņilovs, K. N.** *Psicholoģija. Mācību grāmata pedagogģiskām skolām.* Rīga, 1947.
16. **Kravalis, J.** *Latvijas speciālās skolas. 1840–1996.* Rīga, 1996.
17. **Ķeniņš, A.** *Atziņas. Atziņas. II daļa.* Cēsis-Rīga, 1924, 125.–148.lpp.
18. **Ķeniņš, A.** *Kurlmēmais, viņa audzināšana un pirmmācība. Padomi un uzaicinājumi vecākiem, tautskolotājiem un kurlmēmo draugiem.* Jelgava, 1897.
19. **Lange, H.** *Das Erste Dorpatsche Lehrer-Seminar mit seinen Schülern und Lehrern von seiner Gründung 1828 bis zu seiner Schliessung 1889.* Dorpat, 1890.
20. *Latvijas Universitātes lekciju un praktisko darbu saraksti.* Rīga, 1921–1939.
21. *Lehrplan für das Parochiallehrer-Seminar zu Walk.* Riga den 7 Mai 1879.
22. *LU Pedagoģijas un psiholoģijas fakultātes pedagoģijas bakalaura programma, 1. sēj. Apstiprināts 1997. gada 10 decembrī Domes sēdē.* LU Akadēmiskais departaments.
23. **Ļubļinska, A.** *Bērna psiholoģija. Mācību līdzeklis pedagoģisko institūtu studentiem.* Rīga, 1979.
24. *Mācību darba plāni dienas nodaļai no 1985. līdz 1991. gadam. LR Izglītības ministrija, LP institūts.* Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs, F 523, Apr.18, L 772.
25. *Mācību plāni 1964, 1973, 1975, 1976. gads (neklātienes nodaļa). LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts.* Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs, F 527, Apr.18, L 135.
26. *Mācību plāni latviešu valodas un literatūras fakultātes un pamatskolas skolotāju sagatavošanas fakultāte dienas nodaļai no 1985. līdz 1991. gadam. LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts.* Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs, F 523, Apr.2, L 100, 527.

27. *Mācību plāni (latviešu valodas un literatūras fakultātes un pamatskolas skolotāja sagatavošanas fakultāte)*, LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, 1973. Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs, F 527, Apr. 2, L 100.
28. *Mācību plāni, lekciju un praktisko darbu saraksti, katedru atskaites*. LVVA, F 3297, Apr. 6, L 59.
29. *Mācību plāni (pamatskolas skolotāju sagatavošanas fakultāte un matemātikas fakultāte)*, LR Izglītības ministrija, Viļa Lāča Liepājas Valsts Pedagoģiskais institūts, 1970. Liepājas zinātniskais valsts arhīvs, F 527, Apr.2, L 99.
30. *Metodiskie ieteikumi pedagoģijas kursa studēšanai*. Rīga, 1970.
31. *Metodiskie ieteikumi pedagoģijas kursa studēšanai*. Rīga, 1972.
32. *Metodiskie ieteikumi pedagoģijas kursa studēšanai*. Rīga, 1975.
33. *Metodiski norādījumi neklātniekiem psiholoģijas kursa studēšanai*. Rīga, 1970.
34. *Metodiskie norādījumi pedagoģijas kursa studēšanai 1963/64.m.g*. Rīga, 1963.
35. *Metodiski norādījumi pedagoģijas kursa studēšanai*. Rīga, 1966.
36. **Ogorodņikovs, I., Šimbirevs P.** *Pedagoģija. Mācību grāmata skolotāju institūtiem*. Rīga, 1952.
37. **Ozoliņš, K.** *Valkas-Valmieras skolotāju seminārs. 1894–1919*. Rīga, 1936.
38. *Pedagoģijas programma Latvijas Valsts Universitātei un Latvijas Valsts Pedagoģiskajam institūtam*. Rīga, 1948.
39. **Peterson, E., Bach J., Inselberg, G.** *Das ritterschaftliche Parochiallehrer-Seminar in Walk, seine Lehrer und Zöglinge. 1839–1890*. Rīga, 1898.
40. **Pētersons, E.** *Paidagoģiskā pieredzes mācība (Izglītības un Kultūras ģenerāldirekcijas apstiprināts projekts)*. *Izglītības Mēnešraksts*, 1944, Nr. 6, 127.–131.lpp.
41. **Prindule, L., Avotiņš, V., Veličko L.** (sast.) *Laboratorijas un praktisko darbu krājums psiholoģijā. Mācību līdzeklis*. Liepāja, 1972.
42. **Prindule, L.** *Lekciju cikls bērnu psiholoģijā*. Liepāja, 1977.
43. **Prindule, L.** *Pedagoģiskā psiholoģija (lekciju cikls)*. Liepāja, 1978.
44. *Programma vispārīgā paidagoģijā 1927./28.m.g*. LVVA, F 3297, Apr.1, L 131.
45. *Psiholoģija. Programma un metodiski norādījumi neklātienēs studentiem*. Rīga, 1946.
46. *Reglament für die evangelisch-lutherrischen Land-Volks-schulen und Lehrer-Seminare in den Gouvernements Est- und Kurland*. Rīga, 1875.
47. *Rēzeknes Valsts skolotāju institūts. 1925–1944*. Rēzekne, 1998.
48. *Rīgas Skolotāju institūts*. Rīga, 1928.
49. *Skolotāju institūtu programmas*. Rīga, 1930.
50. *Skolu departamenta rikojumi*. *Izglītības Mēnešraksts*, 1942, Nr. 2, 63. lpp.
51. **Smirnova, A.** (galv.red.) *Psiholoģija. Mācību grāmata pedagoģiskajiem institūtiem*. Rīga, 1958.
52. **Sovetovs, S. E.** (red.) *Skolas higiēna*. Rīga, 1948.
53. **Students, J. A.** *Psiholoģija. Ģimnāzijām, skolotāju institūtiem un pašmācībai*. Rīga, 1930.
54. *Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, par 1994/95. st. g.* Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija, Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Nr. 981.
55. *Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, 1998./1999. st.g.* Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija, Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Lieta Nr. 1024.
56. *Studiju plāni, dienas nodaļa, 2003./2004. st. g.* Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmija, Apr. 18, Ind. 6-05, Lieta Nr. 1217.

57. *Studiju plāni, 1998., 1999. gada studiju gada rudens, pavasaris.* RPIVA Studiju daļa.
58. *Svešvalodas mācību metodiskā apakšprogramma pedagoģijas bakalaura grāda iegūšanai, apstiprināta 1991. gada 18. februārī Domes sēdē.* LU Akadēmiskais departaments.
59. **Špona, A., Žogla, I., Koķe, T.** *Darba programma pedagoģijā un audzināšanas darba metodikā.* Rīga, 1987.
60. *Valsts centrālais pēdagoģiskais institūts. 1925–1930.* Jelgava, 1930.
61. *Vispārīgā psiholoģija. Mācību līdzeklis pedagoģisko institūtu studentiem.* Rīga, 1978.
62. *Vispārīgā psiholoģija. Programma pedagoģiskajiem institūtiem.* Rīga, 1948.
63. **Zaporožecs, A. V.** *Psicholoģija. Mācību līdzeklis priekšskolas pedagoģiskajām skolām.* Rīga, 1955.
64. **Žukovs, L., Kopeloviča, A.** *Pedagoģiskā doma Latvijā.* Rīga, 1997.
65. **Žukovs, L., Kopeloviča, A.** *Skolotāju izglītība Latvijā 1940–2000.* Rīga, 2004.
66. **Winzer, M.** *History of Special Education. From Isolation to Integration.* Washington, D.C., 1993.
67. **Бабанский, Ю.** (ред.) *Педагогика.* Москва, 1988.
68. **Груздев, П. Н.** (ред.) *Педагогика.* Москва, 1940.
69. **Ивашенко, О.** (сост.) *Методические указания по педагогике.* Рига, 1978.
70. *Краткий отчет о состоянии Двинской женской гимназии за 1904 – 1905 учебный год.* Витебск, 1906.
71. *Краткие учебные программы предметов преподаваемых в частном женском училище I разряда А. И. Клаустынь.* Рига, 1914.
72. *Методические указания по педагогике для студентов университета.* Рига, 1974.
73. *Отчеты о состоянии Рижской женской Ломоносовской гимназии.* Рига, 1874, 1878, 1880, 1885.
74. *Программы Рижской женской гимназии П. А. Долгих.* Рига, 1912.
75. *Рижская женская гимназия В. П. Малдона. Краткая учебная программа.* Рига, 1913.
76. *Учебные программы предметов преподаваемых в Рижской женской гимназии Л. И. Тайловой.* Рига, 1904.
77. **Фальборк, Г., Чернолуский В.** (ред.) *Учительские семинарии и школы.* С-Петербург, 1901.
78. LUIS system: <http://luis.lanet.lv/pls/pub/srep.stp?/=1&au=LU&str=LU2040000000>, 24.04.07.
79. *Speciālās pamatizglītības programmas izglītojamajiem ar speciālām vajadzībām paraugs, 2005.* IZM mājaslapa: <http://web2.izm.gov.lv/default.aspx?tabID=3&lang=1&id=1373>

Kopsavilkums

Raksts iepazīstina ar tematikas par bērniem ar speciālajām un īpašajām vajadzībām vēsturisko attīstību vispārīgglītojošo skolu skolotāju sagatavošanas programmās. Par pētījuma avotiem tika izmantoti skolotāju sagatavošanas iestāžu studiju plāni, studiju priekšmetu programmas, mācību grāmatas skolotāju sagatavošanas iestādēm u. c. Skolotāju sagatavošana tika pētīta skolotāju semināros un sieviešu ģimnāzijās (19. gs. otrā puse – 1914), skolotāju institūtos un Latvijas Universitātē (1919–1940), pedagoģiskajos institūtos un Latvijas Valsts universitātē (1945–1991), Latvijas Universitātē, Rīgas Izglītības un vadības augstskolā, Latvijas Sporta akadēmijā, Liepājas Pedagoģijas akadēmijā (20. gs. 90. gadi – 2004). Jautājuma vēsturiskā izpēte atklāja vairākas skolotāju sagatavošanas programmu iezīmes: vispārīgglītojošo skolu

skolotāju sagatavošanā dominējošais mērķis ir informēt (nevis veidot prasmes) par bērniem ar speciālajām un īpašajām vajadzībām; vispārīzglītojošo skolu skolotāju izglītībā par bērniem ar īpašām vajadzībām raksturīgi divi modeļi – 1) atsevišķas tēmas studiju priekšmetu programmās, 2) atsevišķs studiju priekšmets.

Atslēgvārdi: bērni ar speciālām un īpašām vajadzībām, skolotāju sagatavošanas programmas.

The authors

Iveta Kestere – Dr. Paed., Associate Professor at the University of Latvia.

Dita Nīmante – Doctoral Student of the University of Latvia.

E-mail: dita.nimante@lu.

SCHOLACTISICM IN MEDIEVAL SCHOOLS SHOLASTICISMS VIDUSLAIKU SKOLĀS

Dalia Marija Stančienė, Juozas Žilionis

Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology of Vilnius Pedagogical University

Abstract

The early scholasticism developed a new mentality, changing the entire *Weltanschauung*, understanding of man and society. Medieval culture was formed in accordance with the model of the political, economical and religious life of the Carolingian Empire. That model was accepted by various ethnic groups and adjusted to their peculiar traditions, customs and ways of life. Intellectualism and objectivism enabled scholasticism to bring fundamental innovations into medieval culture.

In Northern Europe of the 11th century, one of the most significant schools was the School of Bec led by Benedictine monks, who continued the theological philosophy of the Carolingian School, elaborating dialectical, grammatical, and logical ideas of Aristotle and Boethius. The leaders of the school were convinced that the truths of Revelation could be explicated by means of logic. Relying on logical semantics, they widely employed active methods of teaching. They taught their pupils not only to have a logical mind but also to illustrate abstract ideas by attractive visual examples. The Benedictine monks were the first who attempted to combine logic, grammar, and dialectics in explaining the truth of faith.

In the 12th century, the School of Chartres was the centre of West European humanism. The school was famous for its liberal arts programme and the propagation of Ancient Greek science and philosophy, especially of Plato and his followers. It developed Platonic cosmology based on mathematical and aesthetic considerations which were not quite compatible with the cosmological claims of Christian theology. Teachers and students of the school did not limit themselves to scholastic and theological speculations, but paid attention to the empirical reality, striving for an understanding and explanation of it. The findings and humanistic ideas of the School of Chartres positively influenced the great medieval universities of Paris and Oxford.

Keywords: scholasticism, semantics, logic, dialog, humanism, School of Bec, School of Chartres.

Introduction

The article analyzes the dimensions of the scholastic philosophical school, which existed in Western Europe in the 11–12 c., explores the features characteristic of the schools of Carthres and Bec, presents the most famous scientists and teachers who belonged to these schools. The scholastic school of thought along with its teachers sought to shape a *Weltanschauung* based on theological concepts. The gnoseological function of this school was performed through its didactic theory, which, in turn, was based on a theory of syllogisms and proposition logic. This theory was interpreted with the help of didactic dialogues. Such dialogues encourages the students to be creative, independent and active, and required not only the ability to logically prove one's ideas but also to present them in a visual, metaphorical way.

The aim of our inquiry is to illustrate the role played by the scholastic school of thought within the cultural and educational context of Western Europe.

The aim is achieved by means of analytically-interpretative method.

The dimensions of scholastic education

In the 12th century, the Pope started to take active measures to establish schools run by monasteries, cathedrals and city churches, since the existing schools were no longer enough to satisfy the needs of city dwellers, whose numbers were on the rise. In 1179, during a Lateran

meeting, Pope Alexander III ordered for teachers to be sent to all the chapters of cathedral provosts in order to teach deprived students to read and write for free. In 1215, during another Lateran meeting, Pope Innocent III suggested that measures should be taken to reinforce the quality of teaching at schools, and also suggested that an additional theology teacher should be appointed to each of them. In those times most schools had a single teacher, therefore each school would specialize in accordance with the teacher's interests and penchants. In other words, every city and every school had its own academic community, and its own specialization. The seven liberal arts, which experienced a revival and flourished in the 12th century, were taught at schools. During that period, Paris was famous for its liberal arts, as well as for being a centre of theological thought; the school run by the Toledo Cathedral advocated translating works by Greek and Arab scientists; medicine flourished in Salerno and Montpellier, while law was developing in Bologna. Schools were continuing the tradition of ancient Roman times, which led to the rediscovery of classical authors, such as Cicero, Virgil, Horatio, Seneca, Catullus, Ovid, Terentius and others. It must be noted that practically nobody was familiar with the Greek language, and, as a result, the works of ancient Greek philosophers were known in their Latin translations. Of all works by Plato, only "*Timaeus*" (along with comments by the translator Chalcidius) had been translated. Several treatises by Aristotle, which were translated and commented on by Boetius, including "*On the Categories*", "*On Interpretation*" and "*The Prior Analytics*", were included in "*Logica vetus*". The latter collection of works was acknowledged as the main textbook on dialectics. Apart from works by Aristotle, it also included "*Isagoge*" by Porphyry, "*Topics*" by Cicero and treatises by Boethius himself, where he analysed dialectic and hypothetical syllogisms on the basis of Aristotle's logic. The rest of Aristotle's works became accessible in the middle of the 12th century, after Europe became familiar with their translations into Arabic and the corresponding comments.

Early scholastic thought was based on a strictly linear concept of time, where every reason is primary with regard to its consequence. The primary active reason of all being is God, while all other reasons are secondary. These reasons alter the form of existing entities, giving these new means of expression. Scholastic scholars drew a connection between causal relations and the law of non-contradiction, according to which it is impossible for the same object in the same place and at the same time to simultaneously belong and not to belong to another object, or to simultaneously exist and not exist. In the sphere of logic this law implied that two propositions which contradict each other cannot simultaneously be true. There are two separate aspects to the law of causality and the law of non-contradiction, namely, the logical and the ontological aspects. Representatives of the scholastic school maintained that the law of non-contradiction was a real law of being, since it is possible to perceive a non-contradictory form of being only when the law of non-contradiction is being observed. As Stanisław Kowalczyk put it, "The logical and gnoseological power of this law depends on its ontological value." (Kowalczyk, 2001, p. 70) It is thus that the law of non-contradiction turns out to be valid not only for our reasoning, but for reality itself. Since the law of non-contradiction is the basis of any reasoning, it allows us to perceive reality in an adequate way. Scholastic scholars described this law as the law which determines the existence of all being and the presence of rational thought (Kowalczyk, 2001, p. 70).

Having formulated the link between the law of non-contradiction and the law of causation, scholastic scholars were able to determine the logic governing Latin syntax. The linearity of thought, understood as a constant with relation to the cosmological concepts of the time, was established in grammar, where spoken and written logical constructs were connected by means of tense sequencing (*consecutio temporum*). Both grammar and logic served to explain the doctrine of Revelation, and enabled scholars to analyse language from the theological standpoint. Representatives of the scholastic school were convinced that grammar and logic could assist them in analysing God's names and features, and, consequently, could help them understand the Creator's nature. On the other hand, they asserted that not all faith is akin to

language, thus linguistic analysis does not necessarily lead to a complete understanding of faith. It was thus that theology became a speculative science.

It must be noted that, according to medieval theologians, Greek and Roman philosophy had one significant shortcoming: it did not deal with the Christian Revelation. Compared to the authentic Word of God, the classical *Weltanschauung* and wisdom were merely an expression of human weakness. Therefore, scholastic theologians believed that every word said by the Old Testament prophets was laden with deep meaning, while the treatises of ancient Greek and Roman philosophers were much more low-key in comparison. Monastery schools were often characterized by wariness or even open hostility towards classical philosophy, while church schools tended to be more tolerant in this respect.

As the social and economic situation changed, and as the arts and sciences kept developing, twelfth-century intellectuals started to form larger communities which centred around schools. Somewhat later the academic elite started to form guilds, just like the merchants and craftspeople did. The academic guild system became fully established in universities in the 13th century.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the active social, economic, political and cultural life in the period between the 11th and the 13th centuries had an impact on the further development of Western European civilization. Early scholastic sciences and arts helped draw connections between the past, the reality of the present, and the future, and in doing so helped change people's perception of the world's structure. Scholastic European culture defined the laws which governed mankind, and which in turn were regulated by the divine law. The thinkers who belonged to the Christian tradition were representatives of a relatively liberal outlook, and thus interpreted man's essence and the laws of nature and morality in a novel light. The cultural shaping of personal identity, which began in the middle ages with the acknowledgement of the diversity of beliefs and the differences between them, is helping our contemporaries to comprehend the essence of European cultural identity. In the contemporary Western European culture, this identity has experienced a transformation, enabling the culture to become oriented towards personal attainment of transcendence, and at the same time providing a basic background for social relationships to take place.

The characteristics of the School of Bec

One of the most famous Benedictine monastery schools in eleventh-century Europe was situated in Normandy, in the town of Bec. The Dukes of Normandy were greatly concerned with the upbringing and education of youth, and would invite scientists and teachers from other European countries. The School of Bec became famous throughout Europe in 1045, after the Lombardian monk Lanfranc – a famous teacher of dialectics and rhetoric, and one of the founding fathers of scholastic thought – was appointed as its head.

Lanfranc was born in 1010 in Italy, in the town of Pavia, in a lawyer's family. He studied grammar, rhetoric and dialectics, and later enrolled in the University of Bologna to study law. Upon graduation Lanfranc taught at the schools of Chartres and Tours (France). He became a famous public speaker, and, being a wonderful teacher as well, in 1039 he founded his own school in Normandy, in the town of Avranches. Young people from all over Europe came to this school to listen to Lanfranc's lectures.

Lanfranc's arrival at the Bec monastery is documented in its chronicle. The chronicle says that, while Lanfranc was travelling through the forest at night, he was attacked by robbers, who took all his belongings, undressed him and tied him naked to a tree. In his despair Lanfranc tried to pray, but it turned out that he did not know a single prayer by heart. This ordeal forced Lanfranc to reconsider his entire life. He realized that being familiar with many scientific subjects still essentially means nothing, since it does not guarantee that, during a critical

moment, one will be able to say even the shortest prayer, the sort that every peasant knows. In the morning, the peasants found Lanfranc and freed him. He thanked them and asked how he could find the poorest monastery in the neighbourhood. He was shown the way to the monastery of Bec.

The monastery of Bec was founded in 1031 by a knight named Herluin, who became its first abbot. Lanfranc arrived at the monastery in 1042 and was accepted by the abbot Herluin himself. That very year Lanfranc became a monk. The chronicle says that during his first three years at the monastery Lanfranc did not teach, and only learned to be humble, seeking to overcome his pride. In three years' time, when Lanfranc became the *scholasticist* at the monastery school, Pope Michael II delegated a large number of chaplains to the Bec monastery to study rhetoric and dialectics. Many famous dialecticians of the time, such as Guitmund from Aversa, Anselm from Bages and others, were Lanfranc's students. The future Pope Alexander II was also a student of Lanfranc's. Leon Karsavinas describes one incident with Pope Alexander II, which demonstrates the respect the latter felt towards his teacher. This incident took place when Lanfranc was the Archbishop of Canterbury. When the Pope saw Lanfranc, he stood up and said: "this honour is not for the Archbishop of Canterbury, but for the teacher at the School of Bec. I used to sit at his feet with the other students myself." (Karsavinas, 1994, p. 350)

Lanfranc was quite familiar with Aristotle's treatise "*On the Categories*", as well as with Boethius' works on the subject of logic. His knowledge of dialectics and grammar, both of which were based on Aristotle's and Boethius' ideas, allowed him to understand and explain the mysterious aspects of the Revelation. It was this that made the School of Bec famous. In his public speeches Lanfranc voiced the idea that logic helps explain the truths of the Revelation. Lanfranc's first move was to establish the traditional doctrine at his school. His views were radically different to those of the dialectician Berengar of Tours (~1000–1088), who was head of the Tours school. Berengar was developing the philosophical and theological concepts formulated by John Scotus Eriugena and taken up by the late Carolingian School. Some of these concepts did not coincide with the general doctrine of the Church. During their theological discussion Lanfranc accused Berengar of misinterpreting Aristotle's logic while trying to explain the mystery of the Eucharist. While defining the doctrine of transubstantiation, Berengar used the Aristotelian concepts of substance and accident. He believed that the physical form of bread and wine corresponds to accident, while Christ's mysterious presence in them corresponds to substance. According to Aristotle, accident cannot change until there is a change in substance (Aristotelis, 1990, p. 59). On the basis of this assertion, Berengar tried to prove that bread and wine do not become Christ's body and blood during the consecration. On the other hand, Lanfranc was trying to prove the opposite: namely, that a change in physical substance was not necessary for a shift in the reality of the Eucharist. As a result of this ongoing discussion, grammar and logic were introduced into theology for the first time in history; in other words, the laws of dialectics began to be used for explaining the truths of faith.

Humanist ideas in the School of Chartres

Trade and crafts flourished in Western Europe in the 12th century. This commercial revival caused towns to expand, which resulted in the formation of a new social class, the townspeople. This meant that the political and legal systems had to be reconsidered and reformulated, since the new class required personal freedom and freedom of trade. Besides, the ongoing social changes meant that the education system needed to be developed as well. As the towns kept growing, the schools run by monasteries or cathedrals could no longer satisfy the townspeople's needs, and secular, municipal schools began to be established. These schools cultivated the image of a new city intellectual, who, "like the town-dwelling merchant, travelled a great

deal in search of knowledge. The emerging city community put forth a model which relied on mobility as a necessary condition for education.” (Baldwin, 1996, p. 54)

It is acknowledged that the School of Chartres was a centre of humanist thought for the whole of twelfth-century Western Europe (Copleston, 1950, p. 190). This school became especially famous in 990, when Fulbert, the Bishop of Chartres (*lat.* Fulbertus Carnotensis, *fr.* Fulbert de Chartres, 960/970–1028), was appointed as its head. The Bishop had come to France from Italy, and was a scholar who was familiar with works by Arab scientists. He cultivated a love for the Hellenic tradition, which he had adopted from the Arab academic culture, and which was based on ideas of Plato, Aristotle, Proclus, Plotinus and other Eastern thinkers. The later chancellors also contributed to the school’s development. Among them are Bernard of Chartres (*lat.* Bernardus Carnotensis, *fr.* Bernard de Chartres, +1130), who was known as the greatest Platonic thinker and was the school’s chancellor from 1119 to 1126; his student Gilbert of Poree (*lat.* Gilbertus Porretanus, *fr.* Gilbert de la Porée, ~1080–1154) who was chancellor from 1126 to 1140, and later became the Bishop of Poitiers; Theodoric of Chartres (*lat.* Theodoricus Carnotensis, *fr.* Thierry de Chartres, +1170), the younger brother of Bernard of Chartres, who was chancellor from 1142 to 1150/55; Wilhelm of Conches (*lat.* Guillelmus Conchesius, *fr.* Guillaume de Conches 1080–1154), Bernard de Chartres’ student and teacher to John of Salisbury (*lat.* Joannes Saresberiensis, 1115/20–1180) (Libera, 1993, p. 314).

The School of Chartres was a famous centre of liberal arts, humanist and philological studies, platonic thought and natural philosophy. Under the influence of Greek and Roman culture, scientific experiments and rationalist thought, this church school transcended theological boundaries and became a philosophical school which was relatively independent from the Church, even though it was Christian theologians that taught there. At the time, censorship as a theological concept did not exist, and scientific theories could be developed and published freely without fear of persecution. From the 12th century onwards, the school became a center for specialists in the field of science. The school librarians would often search for rare or unknown scientific manuscripts in Greek, Arabic or other languages, and then translate those into Latin. Studies in the fields of astronomy, physiology and medicine, as well as an interest in Aristotle’s logic and universal philosophical problems, were the factors that determined the special position and role of this school. The School of Chartres became famous for its studies in the fields of natural science and the humanities, and later served as a prototype for the Oxford school.

The School of Chartres was based on Platonic philosophy. It was there that the *thymaeon* system of concepts was developed. This system was based on certain aesthetic and mathematical concepts originating from Boetius’ mathematics and Augustine’s principle. The latter proclaimed the idea that God will arrange every object according to a given order and number (*ordine et mensura*).

It must be noted that this principle corresponded to the set of ancient Greco-Roman cosmological concepts, where the divine was perceived as a soul, a form and a fate. Such a vision of God originated from Plato’s “*Timaeus*”. In this work the author speculated that, when God was about to create His most perfect and beautiful creation – the universe – He constructed the cosmos in such a way, that it united all living beings, as well as objects and events. “Based on this idea, he placed the mind inside the soul, and placed the soul inside the body, thus creating a Single Entity, so that his creation could be the most beautiful and perfect by its very nature.” (30 b) (Platonas, 1995, p. 67)

In the School of Chartres, God’s creation the author perceived “precisely the *cosmos*, an all-encompassing order, which is opposed to the primordial chaos.” (Eco, 1997, p. 53) A mediator through whom this order can be implemented is Nature, who possesses a magical ability to create like from like, i.e., who governs the appearance of objects and their becoming themselves.

In striving to perfect the world, Nature is concerned with making it more beautiful (*o oxornatio mundi*). In order to do this, Nature uses the organic unity found in causal links, creating beauty (*ornatus*) in the form of order and accumulating its creations (*collectio creaturarum*). Nature's creations become beautiful when matter starts to break down according to shape and number, so that its dimensions and contours become obvious, its proper shape and form are attained, and the full palette of its sounds and colours is used. Such an extended vision of cosmic harmony becomes "a metaphor for the organic perfection of each separate shape, or each organism created by nature or art." (Eco, 1997, p. 54)

The idea that the world is ruled by Nature's greatness, rather than by numbers, filled the strict mathematical logic and harmony of this concept with meaning. Such a concept of cosmos harmony solved many problems related, among other things, to the negative elements present in the world. Even for evil or ugliness there is a place in the world's harmonious structure, since they provide a necessary contrast: after all, beauty becomes obvious only upon contrasting it with something that is not beautiful; and evil itself becomes beautiful and good if we remember that goodness is born from it, and shines with its full colours beside it.

This concept helped the School of Chartres prepare humanist scholars, improve medieval academic culture and enhance the further development of scientific philosophy. The school did not limit itself to scholastic and theological studies; rather, it looked at the reality of life as a whole, which in turn allowed it to ascend to the heights of transcendence.

Thinkers and pedagogues of the School of Chartres

Bernard de Chartres, a chancellor of the School of Chartres, had a privileged status; none of his manuscripts survived until nowadays. We learn about his grammar lectures mostly from the works of his students and followers. John of Salisbury characterised Bernard de Chartres as a talented teacher of grammar who was successful in teaching others (Gilson, 1989, p. 620), the more so that at the beginning of the 12th century grammar was at the centre of *trivium* attention. According to John of Salisbury, apart from being an art to speak and write correctly, grammar is a starting point of the studies of liberal arts. It is a cradle of philosophy and of all the first studies of script. John of Salisbury emphasised that a task of a grammar teacher is not only to make students aware of grammar subtleties but also to develop their morals. Having realised this thought, Bernard de Chartres taught students grammar reading works by Roman writers and explaining them in terms of grammar. Moreover, similarly like Alcuin, Bernard de Chartres related grammar teaching with philosophy and logic. Developing students' arts knowledge, he continued Quintilian's teaching traditions. In his opinion, all derivatives first of all have the meaning of the root of the main word; however, the language approaches them in a specific way on the bases of the limits of concepts. Bernard de Chartres was fond of Cicero, Seneca and Boethius. At the beginning of the 12th century, trying to develop his students' mind and an ability to feel a text, Bernard de Chartres used a method of academic reading (*lectio*), although treated as inadequate and outworn by John of Salisbury. Having adopted the Platonic way of treating of ideas from Seneca's (Seneca, 2005, p. 150–158) letter 58 to Lucilius, Bernard de Chartres became Platonist. His teaching featured the Platonism of Pseudodionysius and Saint Maximus the Confessor (Gilson, 1989, p. 144). Analysing the Latin translation of Plato's "*Tymaeus*" (Maurer, 1965, p. 71) by Platonic Chalcidius in the fifth century and his comments, Bernard de Chartres gave universals the meaning of Platonic ideas, treating ideas as primordial examples. Talking about logic he interpreted that gender and kind are not in things but in ideas; by analogy, in grammar things cannot be defined by nouns as the latter are devoid of consistency that is present in ideas (Gilson, 1989, p. 619). Bernard de Chartres explained eternity referring to the teachings of St. Augustine and Stoics. He maintained that idea, like a primordial example, is eternal, and substance is created by God; however, the real eternity is three divine persons, i.e., the Holy Trinity. In this way, idea

cannot be equal with God at the same level, because in some sense being in God's mind its nature is secondary. Thus, Bernard de Chartres agrees that idea is eternal but being dependent on God, it cannot be equal with Him.

Following his teacher Bernard de Chartres, Gilbert of Poitiers aimed to make the School of Chartres an important centre of scientific studies and research. Those who wanted to simplify teaching programmes were offered by him to go and work in commerce business for a material welfare rather than to seek education. Gilbert, like Abelard, is one of the most intellectual scientists of the 12th century, but famous not as logician but as metaphysician. He studied Boethius, commented on him and in relation to Boethius's ideas he "advocated" Platonic realism and tried to make it compatible with Aristotle's convictions; in this way he encouraged thriving of Aristotelianism and scholastics in the 13th century." (Tatarkiewicz, 2001, p. 273)

Gilbert was the first medieval author to work up an original textbook *Book of Six Principles* (*Liber sex principiorum*) (Gilson, 1989, p. 140) – a metaphysical interpretation of Aristotle's "Categories". This textbook was included to the programme of the department of liberal arts until the very 15th century. In his teaching programme, Albert the Great commented on this book as well as on the works by Aristotle and Boethius. This treatise interprets equivalent categories distinguished in Aristotle's logic: substance, quantity, quality, proportion, state, possession, action and suffering. Gilbert divides them into two groups. According to him, Aristotle's categories are not acceptable in metaphysics because, for instance, substance is not equivalent to place or quality. Therefore, Gilbert attributes substance, quantity, quality and proportion to one group of categories, and the rest six categories to another group. As a proponent of the conception of a real existence of universals, Gilbert calls all these categories as *forms*. He defines the first group as *inner forms* and the second group as *secondary forms*. A subdivision of these categories became the basis of a further development of metaphysics. Inner forms are either the very substances or belonging to the essence of substance, independent from its relations to other substances. Therefore, proportion, as an inner form, becomes the essence of substance, and because of the fact that every substance can have some relations with others, independent from its inner proportion, Gilbert's theory of forms posed an unsolvable problem to the medieval ages: does proportion really exist or is it a mere construct of the mind.

Thierry of Chartres, the younger brother of Bernard, was famous as a scientist researcher and had his share in the development of a scientific theoretical trend of the school. Generalising his ideas he worked up a manual of seven liberal arts, *Heptateuchon*. It recommended necessary authorities for teaching every art: extracts from Priscian works and works of Roman prose and poetry; the priorities of logic and dialectic were Aristotle and Boethius; the representatives of rhetoric were Cicero and Quintilian. Each of *quadrivium* arts also had their own authorities: Boethius, Capella, Isidore of Seville, Columellus, Ptolemy and others for arithmetic, geometric, astronomy and music. According to Thierry of Chartres, the division of the programme into *trivium* and *quadrivium* reflects the difference between the mind and its presentation. *Trivium* embodies the goal of cognition and its clever expression, whereas *quadrivium* is related with the content of cognition. With reference to this thought, Thierry of Chartres drew a conclusion that "*Heptateuchon*" is the one and only instrument both of the seven liberal arts and of the philosophy, with the help of which a love for wisdom develops and wisdom itself becomes an absolute understanding of truth. Thierry of Chartres paid attention to cosmological problems too – the creation of the world according to the Bible he related physics. He was interested in two questions of this problem: the reasons of the universe formation and the process if it.

In 1134 Thierry of Chartres went to teach to Paris and after seven years came back to become a chancellor of the School of Chartres in 1142.

The bishop of Chartres John of Salisbury as one of the most outstanding representatives of the school was a student of Peter Abelard. Both these scientists were “on the edge of the new education era that was stirred up by enthusiasm, informality, improvisation and constant change.” (Baldwin, 1996, p. 64) John of Salisbury attended lectures of various teachers for 12 years in Paris. He became a refresher of the ancient culture and conservator of the world scientific thoughts; he was among the first of those who analysed the problems of the history of philosophy and political philosophy in the medieval ages.

His treatise addressed public affairs based on wide political and ethical views. Analysing the problems of the law and equality, John of Salisbury emphasised that a universality of equality is as if coded in itself as it “is a reconciliation of things; it equates everything rationally (*ratione*) and demands equal rights in all respects to equal things, gives everything what is necessary to give to everything. The law is an interpreter of equality.” (Solsberietis, 1980, p. 379) John of Salisbury especially requires equality and tolerance to everyone from the government men, who are decisive authorities when it comes to destiny of people, communities and states.

Written in 1159, the most important work *Metalogicon*, a peculiar treatise of Aristotle’s philosophy and logic, analyses the main postulates of the theories of gnoseology and logic, which were aimed at application of the philosophy of Aristotle to theology needs.

On the other hand, he sought to make theology a scientific study as well, the basis of which consisted of ancient literature heritage, history cognition, dialectic and philosophy. With eloquence defending the seven liberal arts in his treatise, John of Salisbury announced that “our generation is proud of the heritage from the ones before us. Very often we learn more not because of the power of others’ mind that we belong to and we govern the wealth from our ancestries. Bernard de Chartres used to compare us with small dwarves sitting comfortable on the shoulders of giants. Thus he emphasised that we can see more and further than our ancestries not because of the fact that we gaze penetratingly or sit high but because we are on the giants.” (Salisbury, 1955, p. 167).

With this metaphor John of Salisbury put emphasis on the achievements of the past minds that nurtured ideas, discussions and interpretations. John of Salisbury was opponent to verbalism that was used to analyse abstract ideas. In his opinion, people need matter-of-fact and detailed knowledge. Only ignorant people can have answers to all questions since they are aware of only one way of solving a problem. He understood philosophy not only as a way to a scientific cognition but also as a way of life connected with a cognition process and a current and change of historical events.

William of Conches was a student of the School of Chartres who is considered to be as one of the most honourable followers of the grammar of Bernard de Chartres. He was interested in the studies of astronomy, physiology and philosophy of nature. In the period of dogmatism, Conches was not afraid to say that his knowledge is limited and was sceptical about certain issues. He regarded himself a Christian not an academic; however, he admitted talking like an academic in the discussions of dialectic. Apart from dialectic, he also highlighted the importance of mathematics, astronomy and music to a harmonious cognition of the world and human being.

Adelard of Bath was also fond of the School of Chartres. He studied in France, visited Italy, Greece and Arab countries; he got an education of nature studies, mathematics and philosophy and translated Arabic mathematics works to Latin and Euclid’s works.

It must be emphasised that in the 12th century, humanistic arches of the School of Chartres inspired a deep scientific thought that was criticised or even condemned by opponents more than once. In the second half of the 12th century and in the 13th century the glory of the School of Chartres decreased. Chartres was unable to deal with the competition of Paris and Paris University; besides, Europe was beginning to be interested in other fields of science. Once

a famous school, it became a provincial educational institution for young people planning to study in Paris departments. The scientific ideas and attitude to studies established in Chartres did not melt in the air – nature and humanitarian studies were popular in England, Oxford University, in the 13th and 14th centuries and existed until “the 15th century when the whole scientific world established itself there surpassing a dominating philosophy.” (Tatarkiewicz, 2001, p. 276).

Conclusions

1. The 12–13th centuries with their dynamic socio-economic, political and cultural life influenced the further development of the civilization of Western Europe. Combining the past and reality, sciences and arts of the early Scholasticism changed the man’s attitude to the order of world. Scholastic European culture defined the laws of human life that were regulated by the divine order. As prophets of a relatively free thought, thinkers of the Christian tradition had a new view towards a human nature, nature laws, moral rules, attitude to the man and his development.
2. Teaching in the School of Bec was based on the principle of dialog. It formed a method of syllogism teaching, the essence of which was to find logical connections between the phenomena being analysed and to substantiate or reject them on the basis of certain arguments. Such kind of teaching formed the character of the future studies of the medieval universities of Western Europe.
3. The humanistic position of the School of Chartres on the basis of Aristotelianism and Neo-Platonism played an important role in the medieval history of science and culture. The expanded sciences of mathematics and nature studies were related to the promotion of the ideas of arts, humanitarian and philosophical thoughts. On the basis of these ideas, an objective to overcome the prevailing general theological and philosophical speculations was set.

Literature

1. Aristotelis. *Kategorijos*. // Aristotelis. *Rinktiniai raštai*. – Vilnius: Mintis, 1990.
2. Baldwin J. W. *Viduramžių kultūra*. – Vilnius: Aidai, 1996.
3. Copleston F. SJ. *A History of Philosophy*, vol. II, *Mediaeval Philosophy, part II, Albert the Great to Duns Scotus*. – New York: The Newman Press, 1950.
4. Eco U. *Menas ir grožis Viduramžių estetikoje*, Vilnius, Baltos lankos, 1997.
5. Gilson E. *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. – London: Sheed and Ward, 1989.
6. Karsavinas L. *Europos kultūros istorija*. T. 2. – Vilnius: Vaga, 1994.
7. Kowalczyk S. *Bendroji metafizika*. – Vilnius: Logos, 2001.
8. Libera A. *La philosophie médiévale*. – Paris: PUF, 1993.
9. Maurer A. A. *Medieval Philosophy*. – New York: Random House, 1965.
10. Platonas. *Timajas*. // Platonas. *Timajas. Kritijas*. – Vilnius: Aidai, 1995.
11. Salisbery J. *The Metalogion*. Transl. D. D. McGarry. – Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1955.
12. Seneka L. A. *Lai kai Lucilijui*. – Vilnius: Tyto alba, 2005.
13. Solsberietis J. *Polikratika*. // *Filosofijos istorijos chrestomatija: viduramžiai*. Edited by Bronius Genzelis. – Vilnius: Mintis, 1980.
14. Tatarkiewicz W. *Filosofijos istorija*, I t. – Vilnius: Alma littera, 2001.

Kopsavilkums

Agrīnais sholasticisms attīstīja jaunu mentalitāti, izmainot pasaules redzējumu (*Weltanschauung*) kopumā, izpratni par cilvēku un sabiedrību. Viduslaiku kultūra tika veidota saskaņā ar modeļi, ko veicināja Karolingu impērijas politiskā, ekonomiskā un reliģiskā dzīve. Šo modeļi pieņēma dažādas etniskās grupas un pielāgoja savām tradīcijām, paražām un dzīves veidam. Intelektualitāte un objektivitāte padarīja skolasticismu spējīgu ienest fundamentālus jauninājumus viduslaiku kultūrā.

Vienpadsmitā gadsimta Ziemeļeiropā viena no visnozīmīgākajām skolām attīstījās Bekas klosterī, ko nodibināja Benediktiāņu mūki, kuri turpināja Karolingu teoloģiskās filosofijas skolu, izkopjot Aristoteļa dialektikas, gramatikas un loģikas idejas. Šīs skolas vadošie pārstāvji bija pārliecināti, ka atklāsmes patiesību var paust ar loģikas palīdzību. Balstoties uz loģisko semantiku, viņi mācot plaši izmantoja aktivizējošas metodes. Viņi mācīja saviem skolēniem ne tikai attīstīt loģisko prātu, bet arī ilustrēt abstraktas idejas ar pievilcīgiem vizuāliem piemēriem. Benediktiāņu mūki bija pirmie, kas mēģināja savienot loģiku, gramatiku un dialektiku patiesības un likteņa izskaidrošanai.

Divpadsmitajā gadsimtā Šartras skola bija Rietumeiropas humānisma centrs. Skola bija slavēta tās liberālo mākslu programmas un antīkās Grieķijas zinātnes un filosofijas izplatīšanas dēļ, īpaši Platona un viņa sekotāju ideju turpināšanas dēļ. Tā attīstīja Platona kosmoloģiju, kas balstījās uz matemātiskiem un estētiskiem apsvērumiem, kuri savukārt nebija kristīgajai teoloģijai un tās kosmoloģiskajiem apgalvojumiem īpaši viegli pieņemami. Skolotāji un skolēni skolās neierobežoja sevi ar sholastiskām un teoloģiskām spekulācijām, bet gan pievērsa uzmanību empīriskajai realitātei, cenšoties to izprast un izskaidrot. Šartras skolas pieredze un humānistiskās idejas pozitīvi ietekmēja lielās viduslaiku Parīzes un Oksfordas universitātes.

Atslēgvārdi: sholasticisms, semantika, loģika, dialogs, humānisms, Bekas skola, Šartras skola.

About the authors

Dalia Marija Stančienė is Habilitated Doctor of humanities (philosophy), Associate Professor at the Department of Ethics of Vilnius Pedagogical University, Head of the Department of Ethics of the Culture, Philosophy and Arts Research Institute, Editor-in-chief of the *Logos* magazine. Scientific interests: the history of philosophy and ethics, metaphysics, the philosophy of education.

Address: Studentų St. 39-323, LT-08106, Vilnius, Lithuania

Phone: 85 2 75 49 30

E-mail: logos@post.omnitel.net

Juozas Žilionis is Habilitated Doctor of social sciences (education), Dean of the Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology at Vilnius Pedagogical University, Professor at the Department of Education. Scientific interests: the history of pedagogy, the philosophy of education, didactics.

Address: Studentų St. 39, LT-08106, Vilnius, Lithuania

Phone: 85 2 75 23 98

E-mail: ppf.dekanatas@vpu.lt

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE PRIVATE RUSSIAN TECHNICAL SCHOOL OF ENGINEER NIKOLAJ OKOLO-KULAK INŽENIERA NIKOLAJA OKOLO-KULAKA PRIVĀTĀ KRIEVU TEHNIKUMA DARBĪBA

Alīda Zigmunde

Institute of Humanities, Riga Technical University

Abstract

The history of the Private Russian Technical School of Engineer N. Okolo-Kulak shows the situation of technical education in Latvia at the time just after the end of the First World War and after the beginning of the first independence period of the Republic of Latvia. N. Okolo-Kulak was an experienced engineer; he became the founder and first director of the Technical School, he was able to get qualified teachers with practical experience, with an education in Technical Sciences and teaching experience. N. Okolo-Kulak had great ideas. He was not able to get the permission to found a Private Polytechnic Institute and after a 15-year experience, lack of students even for his Technical School was evident. In the years 1920 to 1936, this was a very good educational institution for those students which were not able to speak Latvian. The education the students obtained at his Technical School was good, the state acknowledged the exams of his School and the students enjoyed the same rights as those in the state schools.

Keywords: technical education, private schools.

Introduction

The Republic of Latvia, founded in 1918, imposed the Latvian language as the official language in the education process, but many students who had received their education in Russia understood the Latvian language badly or not at all. After the war of independence and after the independent Republic of Latvia came into existence, the former inhabitants of what was now Latvia who had been evacuated to Russia because of the First World War returned to Latvia. Among them were engineers N. Okolo-Kulak, M. Berlov, S. Schimansky and others. In this situation, N. Okolo-Kulak decided to found a Private Russian Technical School with the Russian language as the language of instruction.

Teachers and study process

The founder Nikolaj Okolo-Kulak (1867–1927) had finished in 1898 a technical school in Moscow (Studentu, p. 130) and had studied engineering at the Riga Polytechnic Institute for a short time (1900). Before the beginning of the First World War, he was Head of the work on the railroad Riga–Orl. During the First World War, the railroad was evacuated to Russia and the engineer N. Okolo-Kulak returned to Riga only after the end of the war. The only property he owned was two summerhouses in Rīgas Jūrmala (Beach of Riga). It was not easy to organize a technical school (H. A. Ололо, 1927). N. Okolo-Kulak succeeded. He became the owner of the Technical School, which was conducted by a director and a board of administrators.

Work started at the Technical School in the autumn of 1921. The teachers were: H. Luter, N. Bernardski, G. Knasew, S. Zitkow, V. Maschkin, A. Dekšins, S. Michailow and Professors M. Berlov, S. Schimansky. The teacher of drawing and calligraphy, R. Murasow, was his son in law. Nikolaj Okolo-Kulak was the owner, director and teacher for technical drawing at his school. His daughter Marija Murasova, who did some teaching, assisted him in his administrative and economic activities.

The owner had two very experienced pedagogues without whom this technical school hardly would have been imaginable. In 1921, two former professors of the Riga Polytechnic Institute came back from Russia – Michail Berlow (1867–1935) and Stepan Schimansky (1868–1931). Both had property in Riga (Mājas, 1921, p. 8) and in Rīgas Jūrmala, and they decided to come to Latvia. They were both born in Ukraine but worked before the First World War at the Riga Polytechnic Institute for a long time; they had their friends and acquaintances in Riga. M. Berlow had finished the Technological Institute in St. Petersburg and came to Riga in 1897. Professor Berlow was a specialist in machine building and had written some textbooks, which spread into different countries. His textbook “Детали машин” (Details of Machines) was known at different universities in France. His textbook was reprinted many times and had special versions for students at technical schools, for engineers and for mechanics.

S. Schimansky was the son of a very rich entrepreneur. He had studied chemical sciences in Riga. In 1897, he started his teaching carrier at the Riga Polytechnic Institute simultaneously as M. Berlow (Profesora, 1931).

It is important to note that with the start of the First World War, the Riga Polytechnic Institute was evacuated to Russia, and it kept running in Moscow until 1918. After the war, only a small part of its property had been brought back to Riga, which was used later in 1919, when the University of Latvia was founded. From parts of the property of the Riga Polytechnic Institute, which did not return to Latvia, the Polytechnic Institute of Iwanowo- Wosnesensk was founded. A good part of the teachers of this Institute of Higher Education were the former teachers of the Riga Polytechnic Institute. For instance, Michail Berlow was appointed the first Rector of the Polytechnic Institute in Ivanovo-Wosnesensk. S. Schimansky worked there as a professor (Augstākās, 2002, p. 95). When M. Berlow and S. Schimansky came to Riga in 1921, the University of Latvia did not need new teachers. Because of their knowledge and experience, the Technical School of Nikolaj Okolo-Kulak needed them very much.

The private Russian Technical School of the Engineer N. Okolo-Kulak was the first and the only private technical school at the time of the first independence of Latvia. The Engineer N. Okolo-Kulak tried to found a private polytechnic institute in Riga. He wanted the students who had finished his private Technical School to continue studying in a private Russian polytechnic institute, which he wanted to establish in Riga. In the Petition of N. Okolo-Kulak, written on December 27th 1921 to the administration of the Russian part of the Latvian Department of Education he explained that teaching at the Russian Polytechnic Institute should start in autumn 1922. The teaching process would correspond to the Curriculum and the plans of the University of Latvia. He even wanted to take teachers from the University of Latvia; this was possible because almost all of the teachers of the University of Latvia spoke Russian, with some rare exceptions, teachers from other European countries. He already had two professors at his Russian Technical School – M. Berlow and S. Schimansky. For the Russian Polytechnic Institute he had projected four departments – Mechanics, Sciences in Electrical Engineering, Traffic, Constructive Sciences (Architecture). But a private Technical Institute was not to be opened. The Ministry of Education gave its answer on August 4th 1922. They said that irregularities had already been found in his private Technical School and therefore they could not allow N. Okolo-Kulak to found a private Russian Polytechnic Institute (Dokumenti, 1922, p. 11).

Unfortunately, from the documents in the Latvian State Historical Archives (LVVA), it is not possible to find out what irregularities the director has made possible. Students generally were freed from military service. But in the papers concerning N. Okulo-Kulak’s Private Technical School it is mentioned that his students enrolled at his school to get free from military service, and that they did not go to the courses regularly; the administration was suspicious that the director was not strict enough. There has been a judicial enquiry conducted on that matter, but it was decided that it was not the fault of the director (Inženiera, 1923, p. 59).

In the documents of the Private Technical School of N. Okolo-Kulak you can find several petitions in which his school administration asks the permission to let Russian citizens be teachers at the Technical School. The legislation of that time did not allow employing a foreigner as a teacher, and it was necessary to get a working permit for him. Some teachers, for instance S. Schimansky, became citizens of Latvia some years later (Stepana, 1923, p. 8). It was interesting to take foreigners as teachers because they usually had a solid education. For instance, in 1922, the school wanted to have Pjotr Tokarew as a teacher for Physics and Electric Engineering. He had finished the Institute for Electric Engineering in St. Petersburg. In 1924, the school had only one foreigner as teacher; it was a railroad engineer Sergej Zitkow. In 1929, there were three foreign teachers at the school (Studentu, 1929, p. 31).

Courses were delivered in the Russian language. The Latvian language and foreign languages were also taught, so that the students were able to go on studying at universities abroad. Teachers worked very much “after hours” with their students (Pedagoģiskās, 1922, p. 42). Lessons were not only taught theoretically, the students also had excursions to electric engineering shops, foundries, and other production sites and companies. It was slightly more difficult to organize the period of practical training. In 1925, the Board of Railroads informed N. Okolo-Kulak that there were not enough places for practical training for state schools and therefore no places would be given for students of private schools; however, it was not so that the students stayed without practice. In 1923, for instance, they had places for 5 students: 2 in Riga, 2 in Vecgulbene, and 1 in Valmiera. The only condition was that the student understands and speaks Latvian and is at least 16 years old. Only those would get paid who were able to work on their own (Sarakste, 1923, p. 95).

In 1927, Nikolaj Okolo-Kulak, the owner of the Private Russian Technical School of Engineers, died. His wife and his daughter tried to continue to run the school. In the year 1933/1934, they informed that the Technical School had to be closed because of lack of funds.

The Association of Russian Engineers in Latvia tried to continue the studies at the school. On September 27th 1933, the new statutes of the Private Russian Technical School of the Association of Russian Engineers in Latvia had been accepted by the Latvian Secretary of Education (Latvijas, 1933, p. 2–4). The intention was not to leave students who had started their studies without final exams. In the Departments of Mechanics and Construction, teaching continued until autumn 1936. On October 1st 1936, the Technical School was closed because of lack of students (Ienākošie, 1936, p. ?). The Private Technical School had existed for 15 years.

Its directors were: Nikolaj Okolo-Kulak (1921–1927), Mihail Berlov (1927–1928), Stepan Schimansky (1928–1931), Nikolaj Feodorow (1931–1935), Alexander Kleinenberg (1935–1936). N. Okolo-Kulak tried to have the very best teachers available for working at his school. Both his professors were already quite old; nevertheless, after the death of the director S. Schimansky, the school had teachers of good quality. Almost all of the teachers of N. Okulo-Kulak’s school had to work at other schools too to make a living.

Table 1
Teachers and their level of formal education

Year	Teachers with higher education	Teachers without higher education	Female teachers	Total
1925	11	3	2	14
1926	12	3	2	15

Teachers of specific technical matters were alumni of institutions of higher technical education (among them also alumni of the Riga Polytechnic Institute) because it was one of the obligations

of these institutions to prepare teachers for technical schools, professional schools, trade schools (Gewerbeschulen), apprenticeship schools.

The Private Russian Technical School were located in different buildings: Marijas street 57, Aspazijas bulv. 11, Matīsa street 11/13, Valdemāra street 36, Ģertrūdes street 36, Brīvības street 40, Akas street 10. These addresses of the Private Russian Technical School of N. Okolo-Kulak very often were simultaneously the addresses of other private schools where the teachers who worked for N. Okolo-Kulak also worked. Thus, when a teacher quit a private school, the Private Russian Technical School of N. Okolo-Kulak had to leave, too, and had to find another location for its purpose.

Students of the Private Russian Technical School

The students had specific caps and wore special stickers. In the autumn of the first year (1921), around about 50 students enlisted in the school. During the course of the school year other students enrolled, at the end of the year 1921/1922, there were 156 students. After finishing this type of technical school, students could go on studying in an establishment of higher education. The school's students were of different nationalities, but almost all had Latvian citizenship.

Table 2

The number and the nationality of the students in different years

	1921/22	1922/23	1925	1926
Russians, Byelorussians	38	24	72	85
Latvians	19	19	32	17
Germans	13	13	5	5
Polish	12	9	6	3
Jews	71	13	15	22
Estonians	-	-	-	2
Lithuanians	3	-		
Without Latvian citizenship	-	6	-	-
Total	156	72	130	134

Students had to pay for their studies. Very poor students got financial aid from the Cultural Fund of Latvia. Only those students who studied well did not get enrolled in the army while they were studying. Teaching was organized in 4 classes (teaching year). The school began with 4 Departments – Mechanics, Construction Sciences, Traffic, Agriculture, from autumn 1924 – Commerce Department. In the first 5 years, 70 students got their final certificates (Фейгман, 2000, p. 298). Slowly the number of students decreased because there were enough public technical schools, and the number of students who were fluent in the Latvian language increased. Studying in a public technical school was without fee, whereas in a private school students had to pay a fee.

Not everybody finished the Technical School. For some it was very difficult to combine studying with practical work. If the knowledge of students was insufficient, they had the possibility to pass the exams the next year.

After finishing this Technical School, the alumni could go on studying at technical universities in France without further exams. There were two reasons for this: the alumni arrived with good knowledge, and Professor M. Berlow was known in France (Умер., 1935). His students were well prepared for further studies.

In autumn 1936, there were only 16 students who had to look for other technical schools for finishing their studies.

Conclusions

The Private Russian Technical School of Engineer N. Okolo-Kulak played an important role in the first years of the newly founded independent Republic of Latvia. For young people who did not understand or did not speak Latvian, it was almost the only possibility to get professional education. However, from 1930 on, there were enough public technical schools, and people had started learning the Latvian language. The school had served its purpose and it was closed after 15 years of activity (1921–1936) because of lack of students. The school was well equipped, there were laboratories and workshops, but it still had no main school building and changing the location of the school every two years did not facilitate the studying process.

References

1. Augstākās tehniskās izglītības vēsture Latvijā. Redkol. I. Knēts, J. Stradiņš, J. Briedis u. c. Rīga: RTU. I daļa. Rīgas Politehnikums, Rīgas Politehniskais institūts 1862–1919. 2002. 295 lpp.
2. Dokumenti par privātā Krievu Politehniskā institūta atvēršanu: 1921.–1922. g. LVVA 2125. f., 1. apr., 306. l.
3. Ienākošie raksti: 1933.–1936. g. LVVA 3264. f., 1. apr., 2. l.
4. Inženiera N. Okolo-Kulaka krievu privātā tehnikuma sarakste par mācību un audzināšanas darbu. LVVA 2125. f., 1. apr., 895. l.
5. Latvijas krievu inženieru biedrības privātā krievu tehnikuma dokumenti: 1933.–1936. g. LVVA 6648. f., 1. apr., 579. l.
6. Mājas grāmata – Stabu iela 93, Rīgā. LVVA 2942. f., 1. apr., 12 880. l.
7. Pedagoģiskās padomes protokolu gāmata: 1921.–1925. g. LVVA 3264. f., 1. apr., 4. l.
8. [B. a.] Profesora traģiskā nāve. In: Jaunākās ziņas, 1931, № 31.
9. Stepana Šimanska pavalstniecības lieta: 1923. g. LVVA 3234. f., 2. apr., 14 811. l.
10. Studentu saraksts 1900.–1901. g. Latvijas Valsts vēstures arhīvs (LVVA): 7175. f., 1. apr., 1906. l.
11. Sarakste par inženiera N. Okolo-Kulaka privātā krievu tehnikuma darbību. LVVA 3264. f., 1. apr., 1. l.
12. [Б. а.] Н. А. Около-Кулак. Сегодня, № 149, 1927.
13. [Б. а.] Умер профессор М. Н. Берлов. Сегодня, № 38, 1935.
14. Фейгман Татьяна. Русские в довоенной Латвии. Рига: Балтийский Русский институт, 2000. 384 с.

Kopsavilkums

Inženiera Nikolaja Okolo-Kulaka (1867–1927) privātā krievu tehnikuma darbība ir cieši saistīta ar arodizglītību Latvijā pēc Pirmā pasaules kara un Latvijas Republikas pastāvēšanas pirmajos gados. N. Okolo-Kulaks bija pieredzējis inženieris un privātā krievu tehnikuma dibinātājs, uzturētājs un direktors. Tehnikumā strādāja kvalificēti un pieredzējuši pedagogi, kuri bija ieguvuši gan pedagoģisko pieredzi, gan tehnisko izglītību. Par skolotājiem strādāja gan Rīgas Politehniskā institūta bijušie profesori M Berlovs un N. Šimanskis, gan absolventi. Tehnikuma dibinātājs vēlējās atvērt pat privātu Politehnisko institūtu, taču nedabāja atļauju. Tehnikums darbojās 15 gadus (1920–1936), un tajā labu, kvalitatīvu izglītību varēja iegūt tie, kuri neprata latviešu valodu. Pēc N. Okolo-Kulaka nāves 1927. gadā tehnikumu uzturēja viņa atraitne un meita, bet 1933. gadā tas nonāca Latvijas krievu inženieru biedrības pārziņā. Latvijas valsts atzina tehnikumā iegūto izglītību, un absolventiem bija tādas pašas tiesības

kā valsts tehnikumu beidzējiem. Nelielā audzēkņu skaita dēļ 1936. gadā tehnikums darbību pārtrauca.

Atslēgvārdi: arodizglītība, privātskolas.

About the author

Alīda Zigmunde – Dr. Paed, Senior researcher, Riga Technical University, Institute for Humanities. Research interests: history of pedagogy, private schools, higher education, influence of pedagogical ideas from Western Europe and Russia on Latvia.

Address: Āzenes iela 16, Rīga, LV-1048, Latvia

Phone: + 371 2 9869642

E-mail: azigmunde@web.de