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PREFACE

This dissertation is a descriptive and analytical study of the post-1863 works of the Russian historian Afanasii Prokofevich Shchapov (1831-1876). Shchapov was always preoccupied with the публика (people), but in 1863 he departed from his earlier concern with the Russian Orthodox schism (raskol) and regionalism (областность) to search for a scientific analysis of the nature of Russian society. Of all his works, the post-1863 studies are the least well-known. While there has been much classifying and labeling of these works, there has not been enough understanding of the full complexity of his theses. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to contribute to an understanding of Shchapov by providing a detailed description and analysis of his basic ideas after 1863.

Although biographical material is included in the INTRODUCTION Shchapov's entire life and works are definitely not the central concerns of this study. The corpus of Shchapov's post-1863 works is not,
regrettably, complete, since a number of his works have been lost. Enough remains, however, to form a consistent whole, capable of analysis and evaluation. The post-1863 works discussed below are not approached in a strict chronological order, and certain works, more crucial than others, have been emphasized to reveal important theses. Readers are warned that Shchapov's ideas were extremely complex and that Russians find his style of writing to be tiazholyi (ponderous or turbid). However, there is more of value and interest in the later works than is commonly realized--they are worth a struggle with the tiazholyi style. It is hoped that through this study and the continuing interest in Shchapov, symbolized by the recent republication of his works in England by Gregg International Publishers Ltd., a better understanding of the importance and the significance of his ideas will emerge.

I wish to express my gratitude to my adviser Professor Michael W. Curran for the long-term loan of his personal set of The Works of A. P. Shchapov (Sochinenia A. P. Shchapova) and for his advice and encouragement during several years of graduate work and
dissertation research at The Ohio State University, including an all too brief visit to the U. S. S. R. My thanks also to Professor Charles Morley for much valuable advice and to the History Department and Administration of The Ohio State University for their assistance in obtaining a N. D. E. A. Fellowship.
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INTRODUCTION

A. P. SHCHAPOV: SCHOLAR,
VOICE OF "THE PEOPLE;"
POLITICAL EXILE

Shchapov's life and entire career are not the central topics of this study, but a brief biographical sketch will serve to place the period of interest, 1863-1876, in perspective. Basically, Shchapov, from humble origins in Siberia, was advancing in a promising career as a historian, but in the early 1860's his ideas

and acquaintances were judged to be dangerous by the Tsar's administration. For the last twelve years of his life Shchapov was exiled, though not imprisoned, in his Siberian homeland.

Shchapov left a rich legacy to Russian history and intellectual life. For instance, the American scholars Michael Cherniavsky and J. H. Billington respectively described Shchapov as the leader of a new interpretation of the Russian Orthodox schism (raskol) and as one of the "most influential" of the Populist journalists in the 1870's. Furthermore, the great Russian author Maxim Gorky (1869-1936) advised fledgling writers to read Shchapov, while the Soviet historian M. N. Pokrovsky (1868-1932) saw in Shchapov's achievements the "most interesting phenomenon" of an era.

The descendant of a Russian peasant father and a Buriat (Siberian native) mother, Afanasii Prokofevich Shchapov was born in the province of Irkutsk in 1831.

---


3Gorky cited in Kabanov, p. 60; Pokrovsky cited in Astakhov, p. 376.
The Shchapovs were peasants, but due to the father's position as a sexton (diachok) in the Russian Orthodox Church Afanasii, and his brothers, had access to the ecclesiastical educational system in Siberia. Thus, in 1838 Shchapov, the future historian, entered an elementary school located in the city of Irkutsk.

An intelligent youth, Shchapov did well in his studies; by the early 1850's he had progressed through a Seminary and was admitted into the Ecclesiastical Academy at Kazan, an important center of studies for Siberian churchmen. While he had traveled a long way from Irkutsk, the young student never forgot his humble peasant origins. From his background and education, which included a significant amount of Russian history, Shchapov developed a conviction that he should become a historian of "the people," a student of the peasants and workers who had been long neglected by Russian historians.

At Kazan, Shchapov came in contact with scholars delving into the history of the raskól. In 1854, works from the Solovetsky Monastery, a former schismatic stronghold, arrived at the Academy. Shchapov was thus
on the threshold of a career as an innovative scholar. Utilizing the materials at Kazan, he produced one of his most important studies, *The Russian Schism of the Old Believers (Russkii raskol staroobriadstva)*, submitted first as a Magister's dissertation, or Master's thesis, and later published as a book. In this study Shchapov presented a new and significant interpretation of the raskol which stressed the social and political content of the movement instead of its religious aspect.

With his dissertation completed, the young scholar was then chosen to be a lecturer in Russian history at the Academy. The raskol was not Shchapov's only concern; he was also interested in social history and the importance of the various regions (oblasti) of Russia. Thus, in the late 1850's, Shchapov pursued his professional interest in several aspects of history. Again moving upward in his career, Shchapov advanced to the university level in 1860 when he was appointed to be a lecturer in Russian history at the University of Kazan.

---

1Shchapov's dissertation was revised and published in 1858 and 1859 under the title *The Russian Schism of the Old Believers, Examined in Connection with the Internal Condition of the Russian Church and Civic Life in the Seventeenth Century and in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century (Russkii raskol staroobriadstva, razsmatrivaemyi v sviazii s vnutrennim sostoyaniem russkoj tserkvi i grazhdanstvennosti v XVII veke i v pervoi polovine XVIII).*
The Kazan students must have been a hard audience to face—they were known to demand the ouster of unpopular professors. Shchapov succeeded with the skeptical students; his stress on the peasantry as more important than the State and the concept of regionalism (oblastnost) was enthusiastically received. With these concepts Shchapov became the "spokesman of a new Populist trend."\(^5\)

Kazan was one of the most volatile of the Russian universities: the students were politically conscious, radical sentiments abounded, violent demonstrations were frequent, and many from the university were in the Populist movement of the 1860's and 1870's. Shchapov did not remain in this environment very long. His fate was connected to the Emancipation Proclamation of February, 1861, which brought the end of serfdom.

Peasant dissatisfaction with the terms of emancipation led to many riots and demonstrations. Bezdna, near Kazan, was the scene of a terrible incident in which soldiers fired into a crowd, killing more than fifty, and wounding several hundred. Shchapov, the peasant scholar, gave a funeral oration for those

---

\(^5\)Venturi, p. 199.
slain at Bezdna. Praising the dead, the historian issued intemperate words concerning the peasants, liberty, and a constitution. An official telegram also reported that Shchapov spoke of the doctrine of Christ as democratic. Tsar Alexander II (1818-1881), the "liberal" emancipator, issued an order: arrest Shchapov! The oratory at Bezdna, for which Shchapov is still respected in the Soviet Union, inevitably resulted in arrest and removal to St. Petersburg in early May 1861.

By the early 1860's, Shchapov's work on the raskol, interest in oblastnost, advocacy of the importance of the peasants, and link with the Populist trend had shaped his career as scholar and spokesman of "the people." A deep concern for the education of the masses was obvious in a letter Shchapov wrote to Alexander II—the importance of educating all of the people was stressed. Apparently, Shchapov was also involved in the short-lived Sunday school movement, which J. H. Billington described as "the first of the large-scale penitential efforts of the urban intellectuals to take the fruits of learning to the ordinary people."\(^6\)

\(^6\) Billington, p. 391.
In the spring of 1861, Shchapov waited, first under arrest and later in a clinic due to poor health, while the authorities investigated the Bezdna affair. Release from physical confinement came in August, but then Shchapov was placed in a position within the Ministry of Internal Affairs, under P. A. Valuev (1814-1890). The official investigation continued. The affair took a dangerous turn—Shchapov was on the verge of being banished to a remote monastery. Radical journalists, notably N. G. Chernyshevsky (1829-1889), publicized the Shchapov case. It was argued that the health of the historian was such that he might perish in a remote location. In February 1862, on the first anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, Shchapov was pardoned by the Tsar.

Staying in St. Petersburg, Shchapov came into closer contact with the men and ideas forming the dissident intellectual climate of the 1860's and 1870's in Russia—the decades of Populism and Nihilism. N. G. Chernyshevsky and N. A. Dobroliubov (1836-1861) were the leading voices of Populism, while D. I. Pisarev (1840-1868) best expressed the Nihilist ideology.
Chernyshevsky’s ideas embraced philosophical materialism, revolution, and the belief that Russia needed a reformed economy. Inspired by Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), one of the most important materialist thinkers of the nineteenth century, Chernyshevsky came to see science and mastery of the physical environment as keys for human progress and the building of a better society. An important concept in Chernyshevsky's thought was the idea that mankind could shape its environment in addition to the environment acting on mankind.

Peasant revolution, led by an enlightened elite, became a vital part of Chernyshevsky's view after disappointment with the terms of the Emancipation of 1861. Putting much emphasis on the centrality of economics, the great Populist leader also surmised that capitalism could be bypassed in Russia through the use of communal principles and the avoidance of private ownership of property.

Chernyshevsky used a journal The Contemporary (Sovremennik) as a vehicle for his cause, and he is known for the influential novel What Is To Be Done? (Chto delat?).

Dobroliubov, an important staff member of The
Contemporary and Chernyshevsky's most valued assistant, was an intensely moralistic young materialist who used literary criticism to convey outrage over the conditions of humanity in Russia. Familiar with the ideas of thinkers such as Feuerbach, Rousseau (1712-1778), Proudhon (1809-1865) and Alexander Herzen (1812-1870), Dobroliubov clearly went beyond liberal and reformist trends to foresee a revolt by the peasantry looming in the future. Exhorting his young readers to act on their ideological beliefs, Dobroliubov became a major spokesman for his generation. According to Franco Venturi, Dobroliubov's thought occupied the middle ground between the positions of Chernyshevsky and Pisarev; thus, the writings of the short-lived critic reflected, "the transformations, both psychological and spiritual, which the intellectuals of the sixties underwent in their search for a road towards politics and the people."  

The Russian Nihilist movement was personified by D. I. Pisarev the iconoclastic young writer who placed his faith in the assumed goodness of humanity, if freed

---

Venturi, p. 195.
from the past, and the value of science. Publishing in the journal *The Russian Word* (*Russkoe slovo*), Pisarev stressed an extreme kind of personal freedom for both sexes along with an ultra-utilitarian viewpoint which threatened to dispose of everything not meeting a standard of usefulness. Religion, art, morals, historic institutions—nothing was to be spared the acid test of utility. A thing either improved man's material existence and contributed to freedom or it was disposable: in this view a pair of good boots might be kept instead of the works of Shakespeare.

It would be a mistake to think of Pisarev in only a negative sense; like most of the Nihilists, he was very much committed to certain concepts especially the worth of "thinking individuals" and the importance of using science, and scientific education, to improve the material existence of the masses. In essence, Pisarev wanted the thinking elite to "go to the people" with the gift of science and to provoke the revolution which others thought would occur because of prevailing circumstances. Due to his stress on activism and science, Pisarev exerted an important influence on the young
generation of the 1860's and 1870's which eventually went out to the countryside, "to the people."

Men such as Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, and Pisarev expressed the kind of thinking prevalent among the intelligentsia in the early 1860's when Shchapov was set free. In St. Petersburg, the young scholar continued to publish many works, including another book Zemstvo i raskol which reflected his regionalist viewpoint. At this time he saw the raskol as a democratic movement in opposition to Tsarist centralization. In contact with the radical intelligentsia Shchapov continued to be an advocate of reform brought about by a rebirth of historic institutions such as the Land Assembly (Zemskii Sobor) and the village commune (obshchina).

However, by 1863, Shchapov had obviously been influenced by the Populist-Nihilist stress on economics and science. From the late 1850's onward there were certain links between Shchapov and the leaders of the intelligentsia. For instance, Chernyshevsky is known to have had a long discussion with Shchapov, besides working to prevent his banishment. Dobroliubov reviewed
one of Shchapov's many articles—the review was not
totally receptive to Shchapov's view of the relationship
of the Orthodox Church to serfdom. The Contemporary was
initially critical of Shchapov, but this attitude
apparently changed. Official censorship prevented the
publication of an article by Shchapov in the pages of
The Contemporary. Shchapov dedicated one of his most
important articles, to be discussed later, to Pisarev
and all of the contributors to The Russian Word.

During the first part of 1863 an interesting
change was occurring within Shchapov's world view.
Luchinsky, one of Shchapov's biographers, termed this
a perelom (fracture, break or rupture) in his thought.
The historical situation in 1862 doubtlessly had an
effect on Shchapov—Chernyshevsky had been arrested,
Shchapov himself had been interrogated, and repression
of the intelligentsia was increased. These circum­
stances combined with intellectual elements from Populism
and Nihilism led Shchapov to reevaluate his former
interest in older institutions, like the Zemskii Sobor,
and the importance of the raskol. Essentially, Shchapov
was still interested in reform but he began to take a
different path to the objective.
Engaging in an ambitious reading program in 1863, Shchapov included studies on physiology, geography, ethnography, anatomy, anthropology, zoology, and statistics in a survey of the sciences. Contemporary favorites of the intelligentsia such as the English environmentalist-historian H. T. Buckle (1821-1862), and the German materialists Jacob Moleschott (1822-1893) and Ludwig Büchner (1824-1899) became known to Shchapov. The scientific approach to mankind dominated the works of these writers. In later works Shchapov also revealed a serious interest in the ideas of the great French physiologist Claude Bernard (1813-1878) and the Russian physiologist I. M. Sechenov (1829-1905). Thus, Shchapov became quite eclectic in his pursuit of scientific knowledge.

The best evidence of Shchapov's transformed worldview is found in his article "Natural Science and the National Economy" ("Estestvoznanie i narodnaia ekonomiia") in which he displayed a commitment to the centrality of economics and science.8 Not particularly

---

well organized, "Natural Science," the study dedicated to Pisarev et al., is often cited as the work which indicated a change, or perelom, in Shchapov's thinking. This article also contains a declaration of principles which forecast the direction of Shchapov's work until his death.

A negative view of Russia's past dominated "Natural Science"—the Empire was blighted by ignorance, slavery to the forces of nature, and neglect of the popular masses. The economy could not progress; Russians were simply too ignorant of their own lands. The provinces were seen as hopelessly backward; intellectual work in such places would be "hard labor" (katorga). Poverty for the masses and wealth for a privileged few were described as anomalies in the mental relationship of the people to the economy—veritable pathological phenomena in the development of mankind. Contained in the discussion of anomalies and pathological development was a view of history predicated upon the premise that ignorance and weakness led to intellectual, economic, and political domination of the weak by the strong. Ignorance and fear of natural phenomena were stressed in
Shchapov's later works as major causes of the intellectual backwardness of Russia.

In discussing the economic suppression of the masses, Shchapov viewed force as the source of wealth. He believed that the strong, the military men, had seized the best land, forests, and water resources. Thus, the working class was subjected to exploitation by those with wealth—the ignorant strong controlled the ignorant weak. Shchapov was not afraid to declare that Russian history had been dominated by the principle that the strong enriched themselves at the expense of the weak and that his principle was still at work. It was clear to Shchapov that the working class was the captive of many forces:

At all times and everywhere ignorance of nature has produced only slaves—slaves of nature itself, and slaves of all human forces—of the force of muscle, cunning and intelligence, of the force of deceit and charm, of wealth, power and despotism—in a word, slaves of political, military, economic, bourgeois and religious force, etc.  

In addition to problems of the masses, Shchapov also raised the "woman question" in "Natural Science."

---

9Ibid., p. 170. The passage cited above was previously used by Venturi, p. 203.
Believing that women possessed mental and physical strengths similar to men, it was argued that the innate abilities of women were less developed due to centuries of exploitation by males. The traditional family organization and the ancient Russian practice of excluding upper-class women in the terem were mentioned as barriers to the economic progress of women. Noblewomen in Russia were simply regarded as childbearers in the past. Shchapov had a special sympathy for peasant women doing physical labor as well as bearing children. He realized that economic progress for Russia had to be difficult if the capacities of women were wasted. Like Chernyshevsky, Shchapov was interested in the concept of associations for women workers.

Having indicated Russia's great problems, Shchapov discussed various ideas and schools of thought incapable of providing the needed solutions. The State or Juridical school of Russian historiography, which stressed the value of centralized government and measures such as administrative reform, did not have the solutions for a man who proclaimed "the people" as the motive force of the nation. Not sparing himself,
Shchapov repudiated his former idée fixe—the belief that institutions such as the Land Assembly could be revived to foster local initiative. By 1863, it was clear that the Imperial government was still powerful enough to prevent local autonomy.

Therefore, some of Shchapov's own concepts and a host of other traditions—English, French, German, even Roman theories were dismissed. Abstract and metaphysical views, satisfactory in the past, no longer met the needs of the future. Western thinking did not escape Shchapov's criticism: he made negative comments on the schools of economic thought linked to John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) and Thomas R. Malthus (1766-1834)—the former did not seem to provide a satisfactory social structure, while the latter, with its laws explaining the demise of the workers, was not acceptable to a historian of "the people." Where were the answers?

Solutions were found in certain aspects of economics and science. Shchapov came to see the importance of Chernyshevsky's interest in "economic theory"—the aim of social development was the economic well-being of all social classes. But even economics did not have
all of the answers: Shchapov was firmly committed to the idea that scientific knowledge was vital for understanding and solving Russia's dilemmas. Thus, he advocated "rational economic theory" supported by scientific foundations. With his new view Shchapov recognized that the acquisition of one's daily bread was the ultimate question:

Yes, we thought, in fact the question of bread is the question of life and consequently of thought, literature, and science. On the solution of it depends the solution of all other social questions.\(^\text{10}\)

Maintaining that "great realist scientists" knew this fundamental truth, Shchapov cited Baron Justus von Liebig (1803-1873), one of the leading chemists of the nineteenth century, to support an essentially materialist viewpoint:

State organization, says Liebig, social and family ties, trade, manufacturing, art, and science, in a word, everything by which man is distinguished at the present time is dependent on the fact that for the support of his daily existence man needs nourishment, that man has a stomach and is subordinated to a law of nature, by which it is necessary for him to bring nourishment from the ground by his labors and skill, because nature by itself does not give him, or gives in insufficient quantities the necessary nutritive substance.\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 160.  
\(^{11}\) Ibid.
The use of sources such as Liebig illustrates Shchapov's search for the vital interconnection between the laws of physical nature and the laws of human nature. Progress did not seem possible for the masses occupied with the question of acquiring their daily bread. Scientific management of the economy—not administrative reform or old institutions—was needed to combat hunger and poverty. This new preoccupation with science was essentially what Luchinsky saw as a perelom in Shchapov's worldview.

With economics and science the salvation of the brutally ignorant Russian people seemed possible. "Economic theory" was also viewed as the intellectual tool which exposed the problems of women. The "dark masses" waiting in the provinces could be brought to science and realism through "economic-utilitarianism"—an approach to education which Shchapov developed in later works. Basically, he believed that peasant resistance to new ideas had to be overcome by demonstrating that economic benefits could be derived from applied science. Backward, "hereditary" practices in the peasant economy had to be vanquished by new learning.
Shchapov had found new hope; he ended "Natural Science" by citing Liebig's ideas that human intelligence could triumph over the forces of nature—knowledge could defeat ignorance.

Based on the stand taken in "Natural Science" Shchapov wanted to approach Russia's problems from a new direction—that of rational economics and science. But not long after the article was published, the State again interfered in the historian's life: Shchapov was banished to Siberia early in 1864—he became another political exile, the first listed by George Kennan (1845–1924) in his Siberia and the Exile System under the category "University Professors." Thus, in retrospect, "Natural Science" marked a transition in Shchapov's thinking, and its publication was near to the time when the exile phase of his life began. The article also marked the beginning of the series of Shchapov's works which are the subject matter of this dissertation—the works published after 1863.

Shchapov continued to write and to publish while in Siberia. He was not in prison, although he was once

arrested and taken to Omsk due to police suspicions of a link to the Siberian separatist movement. The suspicions were not borne out, and the hapless suspect was released. Shchapov settled in Irkutsk; his life was not comfortable, but his research interests were furthered by participation in expeditions of the Russian Geographic Society to the Turukhansk, Balagansk, and Verkholensk regions. Shchapov's wife, Olga Ivanovna, was with him until her death in 1874. Consumption, or tuberculosis, brought Shchapov death on February 27, 1876 (O.S.) in Irkutsk.

The works of Shchapov published after 1863 are not as well-known as his studies from the late 1850's and early 1860's. Prior to his exile, he was known for research on the raskol, interest in "the people" and regionalism, Populist leanings, and the Bezdna affair. This study is devoted to an examination of the historical theses and ideas of Shchapov as expressed in the post-1863 works when he was searching for a scientific analysis of the nature of Russian society. Many topics touched upon in "Natural Science"—such as science, education, and the "woman question"—reappeared in later
works. Siberia was also of great interest to Shchapov due to his personal background and exile. Thus, the post-1863 works of A. P. Shchapov can be divided into three categories: intellectual development and education, the history of women in Russia, and studies on Siberia.
PART I

A. P. SHCHAPOV ON INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION
CHAPTER I

THE WORKINGS OF THE MIND

The key concepts in Shchapov's scientific analysis of the nature of Russian society were formulated in a series of works dealing with intellectual development and education. This series comprises a sequence, with two articles, "A General View on the History of Intellectual Development in Russia" ("Obschii vzgliad na istoriiu intellektualnago razvitiiia v Rossi") and "The Historical Conditions of Intellectual Development in Russia" ("Istoricheskiia usloviia intellektualnago razvitiiia v Rossii"), published in 1867 and 1868 respectively, serving as preliminary studies. Completing the series, Shchapov presented his studies. 

most comprehensive discussion of intellectual development with the publication, in 1870, of "The Natural-psychological Conditions of the Intellectual and Social Development of the Russian People" ("Estestvenno-psikhologicheskiia usloviia umstvennago i sotsialnago razvitii russkago naroda") and The Social-pedagogical Conditions of the Intellectual Development of the Russian People (Sotsialno-pedagogicheskie usloviia umstvennago razvitii russkago naroda), the former presenting a theoretical view of the workings of the "Russian mind" and the latter describing the history of learning and thought in Russia.2

"The Natural-psychological conditions" is a


complex study of the factors which combined to control, and to a great extent retarded intellectual development among the Russian people. Using concepts taken from Western sources which he regarded as scientifically authoritative—notably the works of John Stuart Mill, the writings of the French physiologist Claude Bernard, and the research of the German physiologist Hermann von Helmholtz—Shchapov sought to employ nineteenth-century physiology and psychology to explain Russian intellectual history. Merging science and history, Shchapov discussed...
several factors harmful to Russia, such as the cold climate, and theories which showed how and why the peculiarities of certain physiological and psychological attributes of the Russian people inevitably dictated that backwardness would be overcome through acceptance of Western influences.

The theory that two characteristics of the "nervous organization" (nervniia organizatsiia) [the nervous system, brain and mind] played a major role in determining the course of Russian intellectual and social history was the foundation of "The Natural-psychological Conditions." The first characteristic was a certain "mediocrity" or slowness in the "receptivity" (vospriimchivost) of the nervous system: a slow response of the nervous system to stimuli or sense impressions. The second characteristic was the propensity to react to only the strongest impressions on the nervous system. These two characteristics of the Russian nervous system were understandable to Shchapov in terms of laws of physiology and psychology extracted from the writings of Mill and

4 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 1-2.
Bernard. Mill and Bernard were also the authorities cited to support the assertion that the physical structure of the nervous system affected intellectual capabilities.

Shchapov was particularly influenced by Mill's discussion of the process by which various qualities of the human mind or "different types of mental character" (razlichnye tipy dushevnago kharaktera) were formed. In essence, Mill supplied Shchapov with a theory which linked different degrees of "receptivity" to ideas or stimuli of the senses to differences in the physical structures of individual persons. Shchapov also cited Mill as the authority for a theory which predicted the

---


Shchapov referred to Mill's chapter entitled "Zakony dushi" ("Laws of Mind") which discussed the existence of laws governing the mind and the possibility that these laws might ultimately be grounded in physiological factors.

Bernard was cited as an authority on the physical structure of cells in the nervous system. Bernard believed that experimental studies of human sense organs and cerebral functions were necessary and that racial or individual idiosyncrasies could be explained by science. Shchapov was most interested in the intellectual idiosyncracy of many Russians which led them to resist Western influences.

6 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 3-4.
type of mind a person would have depending upon the manner in which sense impressions or stimuli were received. According to this theory, if many impressions were received simultaneously, through a sensitive nervous system, the individual would come to possess a very perceptive mind with a propensity toward natural history, everything "beautiful or great," and a certain moral enthusiasm. But if the senses reacted in a rather mediocre or slow manner, the mind supposedly acquired ideas in a sequential order and the person would be characterized by a "love" for science and abstract truth along with a lack of good taste and enthusiasm. Thus, the "mental character" of individuals was in part determined by the physiology of the body.

Again revealing the influence of Mill, Shchapov argued that the principles which determined the "mental character" of individuals were also applicable to whole nations. Mill's concept of ethology, "the science which corresponds to the art of education; in the widest sense

---

7 According to Shchapov Russians possessed the slow pattern of reaction. However, Russians had special problems to overcome before reaching a love for science and abstract truth.

8 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 4-5.
of the term, including the formation of national character as well as individual" was used by Shchapov to establish that the Russian national character had been formed or educated under initially adverse conditions.\(^9\)

The impact of the cold northern climate of Russia on the intellectual progress of the nation was one of the most crucial factors discussed by Shchapov in his study of formative or "educational" conditions. Hermann von Helmholtz was cited as a scientific authority to substantiate the principle that the functions of the nervous system slowed in response to the cold.\(^10\) In a passage which brings to mind Bazarov, the archetypical Nihilist in Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*, Shchapov commented on the effects of low temperatures on frogs and other animals as part of the scientific framework of his "cold theory."\(^11\)

---


\(^11\) Helmholtz' research included work on frogs. He discovered that impulses traveled through the nervous tissue of frogs at a speed of 27 meters per second in comparison to a speed of 50-60 meters per second through human beings—a fact of importance in the science of physiology.

Shchapov also gave an incomplete reference to a book entitled *Physiology* (*Fiziologiiia*) when he discussed effects of the cold on animals.
The first hand observations of the Russian explorer F. N. Vrangel (1796-1870) were also used by Shchapov to add authority to the assertion that people living in the colder parts of the Empire were characterized by a perceptible slowness of the "intellectual processes."\(^{12}\)

Aware that most of the population had never lived in the extremely cold polar regions of the Empire, Shchapov was, nevertheless, convinced that the historic environment was cold enough to have had an effect on all of the Russian people. Centuries of exposure to the cold supposedly produced a slowness in the excitation of the nervous system which slowed the association of sensations and ideas in the Russian mind.\(^{13}\) In Shchapov's theory, all "psychic functions" from the most elementary workings of the mind to the highest processes of abstract thought were slowed and weakened due to the effect of the cold on the nervous system. Russian intellectual backwardness was thus linked directly to the cold climate.

But the cold was not the only factor at work in the past; Russian backwardness was a complex phenomenon.

---


\(^{13}\) Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 8-9.
which included ethnic history. The mixing of the Slavs with certain other peoples— notably Finns, Asians, and Greeks— was identified by Shchapov as another harmful factor in the course of Russian history. \(^{14}\) Shchapov theorized that "ethnic impressions," the influences of one group on another, acted in the same way that sense impressions affected the nervous system. \(^{15}\) Applying this theory to the Russians, Shchapov concluded that only the strongest "ethnic impressions" could stimulate a movement forward toward progress for a backward people. Finns and Asians were found guilty of exerting a gradual weakening influence, while the Greeks were charged with exerting, through their religion, an initially strong but ultimately harmful influence.

Shchapov was convinced that the population of Russia was characterized, to a great extent, by a centuries long process in which the Slavs had mixed with a wide variety of Finnish and Asian tribes including the infamous

\(^{14}\) Finnish influences were not discussed to the same extent as the Asian and Greek impact on the Russians.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 44. Shchapov's theory of "ethnic impressions" paralleled his theoretical view of the workings of the nervous system which was largely based on Mill's ideas.
Regional variations in physical appearance, language, and "intellectual type" were cited as evidence of widespread ethnic mixing. To Shchapov, it was axiomatic that the peoples who mixed with the Slavs, excluding the Greeks, were all marked by a low stage in the process of intellectual development. It is interesting that research on a tribe indigenous to the Moscow area, prior to the arrival of the Slavs, was cited to show that due to the shape of their skulls this tribe would have been incapable of stimulating intellectual activity among the Slavs.

Emphasizing the harmful effects of Asians on the Slavs, Shchapov included laziness, apathy, indifference to theoretical capacities, mental slowness, susceptibility to sorcery and shamanism, fatalism, and

---

16 See Ibid., pp. 44-49, for Shchapov's basic views on the mixing of Finns and Asians with Slavs.

17 Ibid., p. 47.

18 Ibid., p. 46, citing an article by a professor of anatomy, Bogdanov, entitled "The Mound Tribe of the Moscow Province" ("Kurgannoe plemia Moskovskoi gubernii"). Shchapov was inclined to assume that the shape of the skull was an indicator of intellectual capacity.
slovenliness in his analysis of Asian influences.  
Thus, Shchapov, at this point, concluded that Asians contributed several deficiencies, but no beneficial influences to the ethnically mixed Russian people.

The Greek "ethnic impression" was transmitted through the medium of Byzantine Orthodoxy. The theoretical explanation for the conversion of Russia centered on the concept that after the Russians grew accustomed to Asian influences, Greek Orthodoxy appeared as something new and unexpected which produced great impressions on the "nervous receptivity" of the Russians in Kiev.

Thus the acceptance of Greek Orthodoxy by Grand Prince Vladimir, in 988 A. D., was linked to the theory that the Russian nervous system had to react to strong stimulation of the senses. While Vladimir may well have had practical considerations in mind when he chose Greek Orthodoxy as a state religion, Shchapov's idea that Vladimir's choice had great import for the "psychic life" of the Russians is certainly defensible in view of the

19 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 49. At times Shchapov's discussion of Asian influences reads more like a list of racial insults than the scientific analysis he sought to achieve in his writings.

20 Ibid., pp. 50-51.
widely recognized religious, cultural, legal, and intellectual influence of the Greeks in Russia.\textsuperscript{21}

In Shchapov's distinctive combination of science and history the external features of Orthodoxy—such as religious architecture, art, and the splendor of Church rituals—exerted a captivating influence on the senses of the relatively "savage" Russians.\textsuperscript{22} The new religion was thus not a matter of Christian ideas, but basically a response to the external attractions of the Greek Church. To Shchapov the real ideas of Christianity were incomprehensible (neponiatnyi) to the ancient Russians, but the external facets of the religion, nevertheless exerted their influence, and this response to externals characterized all Russian Christians.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{21}There does not seem to be complete agreement among historians as to why Vladimir selected Christianity. For instance, two popular textbooks—Melvin Wren's The Course of Russian History (New York: MacMillan Co., 1960) and Michael T. Florinsky's Russia: A History and an Interpretation (New York: MacMillan Co., 1964) offer contrasting views with Wren citing geographic, economic, and political factors while Florinsky reached the conclusion that the reasons governing the choice of Christianity are not known today.

\textsuperscript{22}Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 51. In Shchapov's view the Greeks, unlike Finns or Asians, were undoubtedly more advanced than the Russians.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 53. See D. Likhachev, "Further Remarks on the Problem of Old Russian Culture," Slavic Review, XXII (March, 1963), 115-20, for another interpretation of the significance of the arts.
Concentrating on the negative aspects of Greek Orthodoxy, Shchapov was particularly critical of ascetic teachings and the monastic way of life which spread in Russia with the new religion. Keeping his analysis within a theory of the impact of Orthodoxy on the Russian "nervous system," Shchapov argued that monasticism became the highest moral aspiration and the dominating "psychological inclination" in pre-Petrine Russia. Statistics were cited to show that the numbers of monasteries and hermitages had increased from 150 in the sixteenth century to 220 in the seventeenth century, and 966 by 1762 with 240 of the total for women. Shchapov also criticized the idealistic appeal of monasticism to children as young as twelve years old which apparently led many of them to pursue an ascetic life. Furthermore, ascetic ideals were linked to the seclusion of young girls and women in special women's quarters (terems) which Shchapov described as "cells."  


25 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 53. See the next section of this study for a discussion of Shchapov's research on the history of women in Russia.
The impact of Byzantine thought on "family education" (semeinoe vospitanie)—relationships between husbands and wives, the teaching of morals, and the education and upbringing of children—was especially significant to Shchapov. "Byzantine ascetic pedagogy" (vizantiiskaia asketicheskaia pedagogiia) was criticized as a harmful influence in Russia. Focusing on the arrangement of domestic life in noble families, Shchapov included the ancient "Teaching Concerning Evil Women" ("Slovo o zlykh zhenakh") and the "Parable Concerning Women's Wickedness" ("Pritch a o zhenskoi zlobie") as examples of Greek teachings which contributed to the despotism of husbands over wives. Finding a great deal of ascetic fanaticism in the Greek pedagogy, Shchapov cited as one example the belief that it was sinful for young men to see feminine beauty.

Going beyond "family education" Shchapov formulated an interesting view of the overall content of the Greek thought which, to a significant degree, educated

---

26 Ibid., pp. 54-55. In Shchapov's view family life and the training of children were governed by ideas and behavior which resulted from the combination of Byzantine teachings with native practices.

27 Ibid., p. 55.
the Russian people. Stressing the idea that Byzantine thought was the source of intellectual influence in the past, just as French thought affected the eighteenth century, Shchapov emphasized that Greek religious texts were the only works translated into Russian. Citing the historian Vasili Tatishchev (1686-1750), Shchapov showed that some princes had more than 1,000 religious books in their libraries.28 Another interesting piece of evidence cited by Shchapov in his effort to illustrate a selective policy in the transmission of knowledge to Russia was the opinion of an eighteenth-century translator, identified only as Maksimovich, that it had been a strict practice of Church authorities to limit translations to religious texts.29 The great corpus of Greek science and philosophy—such as the works of Aristotle, Euclid, and Archimedes—which stimulated the rise of science in the West was not sent to Russia along with


29 Shchapov, *Sochineniia*, III, 60, citing Pekarskii *Nauka i literatura pri Peterie I* (*Science and Literature During the Reign of Peter I*), p. 193. See Billington, pp. 613 and 703-704, for information on P. Pekarskii's contributions to the study of the history of education and thought in Russia.
Orthodox teachings. Thus to Shchapov, Greek influence in Russia brought a superficial religiosity instead of the enlightening gifts of science and secular philosophy.

Having explained the acceptance of Greek Orthodoxy in terms of new impressions on the nervous system of the Russian people, Shchapov also theorized that the strength of Greek impressions gradually weakened as the centuries passed. New and more powerful impressions from the West began to challenge the influence of religion. By the seventeenth century, according to Shchapov, Russian Orthodoxy was basically a religion of ceremony for the people and a faith marked by absurd beliefs. The weakening ceremonial aspect of Orthodoxy found its outlet by degenerating in the schism (raskol).

30 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 60. See Vucinich, Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860, pp. 3-17, for a discussion of the Byzantine influence in Russia which supports Shchapov's basic assertion that Greek scientific thought was deliberately excluded from the works sent to Russia. Shchapov would have endorsed Vucinich's statement that, "the direct Byzantine influence on Russia was limited to a theological systemization of religious dogma and to moral-religious education." [p. 3]

31 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 57. Shchapov's description of the fading influence of Orthodoxy was fortified by a reference to a passage in Mill's Logic which commented that once vibrant religious teachings often became lifeless dogmas.

32 Ibid., p. 58. At this point in his writings Shchapov was not discussing the social and political significance of the schism.
Resistance to influences from the West was yet another facet of Shchapov's complex view of the problems which inhibited Russia's progress. Shchapov believed that Russia's betterment had been slowed in the past due to a stubborn reluctance, among certain elements of the population, to accept anything new from Western Europe. This reluctance was viewed as an "abnormal, pathological, and regressive" phenomenon—an idiosyncrasy of the Russian mind. The scientific explanation for this idiosyncrasy, especially among the common people, was that the rejection of Western influences was a remnant from a crude level of nervous-brain development when anything new produced an initial response of fear. This first impression of fear was frequently described by Shchapov as an "irrating impression" on the nerves of Russians. Thus, xenophobia among schismatics, polemical literature on "the old" versus "the new" in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and attempts to curtail Western influences after the French Revolution and the rise of the Napoleonic

Ibid., p. 113.

Ibid., pp. 113-14. In Shchapov's theoretical view, what was initially feared often became accepted with the passage of time. Thus, he was not contradicting himself when he discussed both fear and enthusiasm in response to the West.
threat were discussed by Shchapov as atavistic fears irritating the nervous system.  

The nervous organization of the Russian people was also linked, in theory, to the existence of a national need for powerful and dictatorial government. In essence, Shchapov argued that the Russian "national mind" was entirely too passive due to a lack of theoretical reasoning attributed to the weaknesses of the nervous system. Russians supposedly lacked "enterprising character, inventiveness, and initiative." Therefore, a distinguishing "obedient receptivity" (poslushnaia vosprinimchivost) to governmental dictatorship developed in the Russian people. 

35 Ibid., pp. 114-120. The value of Russia's turn to the West has long been a subject of intense debate. See N. M. Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia, trans. Richard Pipes (New York: Atheneum, 1969), pp. 120-26, for a brief, but penetrating analysis of the basic issue. Karamzin (1766-1826) was a major contributor to the conservative view of Russian history.

36 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 37-38.

37 Ibid., p. 38, citing a letter of Speranskii's published in the journal Messenger of Europe (Vestnik Evropy) as the source of the description of Russia's susceptibility to despotic government. Michael Speranskii (1772-1839) was an advisor to Alexander I and a proponent of wide sweeping reforms in the administration of the Empire.
his earlier Populist views of history, Shchapov main-
tained that throughout the centuries the powerful force
of the State had been necessary to direct and guide the
people; the "fundamental basic fact" of Russian history
was the leadership of the government, and the great
result of "1,000 years" of Russian history was the Empire
of the tsars. The Russians, according to Shchapov,
had to be aroused from their intellectual passivity by
a strong "push" (tolchok) from a despotic autocrat, while
in the West thinkers like Descartes and Bacon showed the
way to progress. Even dictatorship and despotism were
linked to a chain of cause and effect with the cold cli-
mate being one of the initial causes.

Thus it was obvious to Shchapov that pre-Petrine
Russia lacked the educational, formative, and stimulative
means to overcome a variety of problems. Using Mill,
Bernard, and Helmholtz as scientific authorities,
Shchapov constructed a theory, based on certain assumptions
concerning the cold climate and the workings of the mind,

---

38Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 38. When teaching
at the University of Kazan, Shchapov gained attention by
arguing that "the people," not the State, played the
leading role in Russian history.

39See Ibid., p. 12, for one of Shchapov's
summaries of Russia's problems.
which explained the failure of education and culture in old Russia. In addition to the alleged mental backwardness and doubtless physical misery of living in a cold climate, Shchapov included harmful "ethnic impressions" as obstacles to progress for a nation burdened with an idiosyncratic resistance to beneficial Western influences. Even a special inclination to submit to dictatorial government was traced to certain characteristics of the nervous system. Having discussed these problems within a complicated analysis of Russian history, Shchapov concluded that the "force of the brain" (sila mozga) by itself was not able to produce the necessary "social-pedagogical" and cultural conditions to overcome the effects of the climate. 40

However, Russia's plight was not hopeless, for "science" also revealed the solution to the terrible dilemma. All nations, not only Russia, had been affected by factors such as the climate and peculiarities of the nervous system. But, different conditions produced different types of people; the Italians supposedly possessed a very sensitive nervous system, while the

40 Ibid.
Germans were conditioned for theoretical pursuits, rational and abstract thought, and transcendental philosophy. Thus, while the "laws" of psychology, physiology, and ethology explained Russia's problems to Shchapov, they also explained how and why Russia must eventually advance along the path taken by the leading Western nations. Shchapov theorized that if the "social-pedagogical" conditions of life changed, the mental slowness of Russians could be overcome. The works of John Stuart Mill and Claude Bernard supplied much of the conceptual framework for a theory of Russian progress which included the emergence of new qualities in the specifically Russian type of mind and the gradual unfolding of a definite pattern of advancement in mental development.

Even the root cause of Russia's problems--a special slowness or mediocrity of the nervous system--could be turned into an advantage. Emphasizing the basic concept that mental changes were possible under different conditions, Shchapov suggested that if the social and educational environment were altered, the mental slowness of Russians could be overcome.

Ibid., p. 5. The ancient Greeks and Romans were also typed by Shchapov. The characteristics of the Greeks included aesthetic talents and civic activity. Roman characteristics included courage, practicality, and materialism.

Ibid., p. 11.
conditions of life, Shchapov again cited Mill to show that people with slow "receptivity" (vospriimchivost) who received facts in sequential order, the Russian mental type, were inclined toward science, abstract truth, and the study of history. The fact that Russia was eventually capable of producing men like the mathematician M. V. Ostrogradskii (1801-1861), the social critic V. Belinskii (1811-1848), and the historians T. N. Granovskii (1813-1855) and P. N. Kudriavtsev (1816-1858) seemed, to Shchapov, to verify Mill's ideas on the intellectually slow type of nervous system.

Clearly revealing the influence of Mill, Shchapov

---

43 Ibid., p. 9, citing Mill, Logika, pp. 430 and 551-52.

44 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 10. For background information on these men cited as a few examples of rather highly developed Russians see:


"Kudriavtsev, P. N." Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, IX, 520-23.

"Ostrogradskii, M. V." Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, XII, 452-57.
predicted that if people with the slow type of nervous activity received a good scientific and moral education [lacking throughout most of Russian history] they would be rather calm, steady of character, given to deep thought, and persistent in intellectual and practical work. Violent feelings, wild enthusiasm in ideas and actions, and highly refined aesthetic tastes would be lacking in Shchapov's version of transformed humanity. Furthermore, these "slow" people would be inclined toward collective action in solving problems of common interest. The underlying concept in Shchapov's thoughts on collective action was that organically "slow" people concentrated their strength to overcome problems of life. Thus, old Russian institutions—such as the commune (obshchina) and Land Assembly (Zemskii Sobor) were organizations of weak people formed for collective struggle against a variety of problems. The old institutions, in theory, were incapable of stimulating real social progress because they lacked the necessary means to overcome the deficiencies in the nervous organization of the Russian people. In essence, Shchapov saw social

45 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 10.
46 Ibid., p. 11.
progress coming, through collective organizations, after a period of mental transformation.

A transitional phase in nervous receptivity was at the core of Shchapov's theoretical explanation of the process of mental change in Russia: as the Greek impressions weakened, a small, but significant, number of Russians began to respond to more powerful impressions from Western Europe. With the turn to the West, Shchapov found a beneficial quality, xenomania" (ksenomaniia), in an "ethnic generation" which was the result of mixed marriages between Europeans and Russians. The impressions made by Europeans were so strong, according to Shchapov, that the nervous receptivity of Russians actually increased. By the seventeenth century this increased receptivity became a "new, special intellectual quality" which was transmitted from generation to generation like an inherited characteristic.  

Shchapov borrowed the term "xenomania" from Iuri Krizhanich (1617-1683) to describe the new quality

---

which distinguished a new "ethnic generation." 48

Shchapov's description of the rise of a mixed Russian-European generation is one of the most interesting elements in his analysis of the past. Western foreigners in Russia, described as representatives of the European physical and intellectual type, supposedly made such a strong impression that a significant number of families married their daughters to these amazing Europeans. Comparing these marriages to previous examples of ethnic mixing—such as Russians marrying Finns and Asians—Shchapov argued that a new European

---

48 Ibid., pp. 66-67. Krizhanich was a Croatian Roman Catholic priest who went to Russia in the mid-seventeenth century. An advocate of modernizing Western-type reforms, Krizhanich believed that Russia had to overcome its intellectual and economic backwardness prior to assuming leadership in the Slavic world. The selective borrowing of science, but not all facets of European culture, was one of Krizhanich's basic ideas. A. Vucinich noted that Krizhanich was the author of some thirty books, including The Russian State in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century (Russkoe gosudarstvo v polovine XVII veka), and that the Croatian priest was, in his day, the "most highly educated person in Russia." See A. Vucinich Science in Russian Culture, pp. 21-23, 40-43, and J. H. Billington, The Icon and the Axe, pp. 168-71, for information on Krizhanich.
Some interesting statistics were cited to fortify the concept of a new ethnic mix in seventeenth-century Russia: 285 noble (dvorianstvo) families had an "Indo-Germanic" ethnic background with 152 linked to German Prussian, Danish or Swedish ancestry; 19 linked to Italian, Hungarian, or English predecessors; and 114 linked to a Polish background. In contrast to this "Indo-Germanic" group, a figure of 235 noble families with a Russian-Asian background was cited. Shchapov also pointed out that marriages between Europeans and Russians were not officially sanctioned until 1721 when the Holy Synod

49 See Ibid., pp. 66-67, for Shchapov's rather unique view of the significance of marriages between Russians and Westerners. Shchapov regarded religious considerations as an obstacle to marriage with a non-Orthodox spouse. The term "Russian-German" (Russko-nemetskiia) was also used to describe the generation of mixed ethnic origin.

50 Ibid., p. 67. Shchapov indicated in a footnote that the source of the statistics was a late seventeenth century Genealogical Book (Rodoslovaia kniga), but the author of the book and the date of publication were not included in the reference. Shchapov's Russian-European generation represented a small percentage of the Russian nobility. In his Lord and Peasant in Russia (New York: Atheneum, 1966), p. 349, Jerome Blum noted that there were 2,985 noble families in the Russian nobility near the end of the seventeenth century.
found more than 1,600 Russians married to foreigners. Thus, to Shchapov "xenomania" and mixed marriages were signs of the new Russian receptivity to Western impressions.

"Xenomania," in Shchapov's analysis, was a powerful intellectual force at work in Russia prior to the birth of Peter I. Therefore, Peter, the greatest of all Westernizers, was himself the product of Western impressions on the Russian nervous system. The scientific framework of Shchapov's thoughts of Peter I may be more interesting than valuable, but Shchapov's appreciation of what happened before Peter's reign reveals a sound sense of history.

Shchapov theorized that "xenomania" became a quality in the minds of "leading people" and Romanov family in the generations preceding Peter I.

---

51 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 68.

52 V. Kliuchevskii (1841-1911), often regarded as the greatest Russian historian in the nineteenth century, was also interested in advocates of Western-type reforms prior to Peter I. See Kliuchevskii's Kurs russkoi istorii, III, also available in a new translation as A Course in Russian History: The Seventeenth Century, trans. N. Duddington (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968).

53 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 69. "Leading people" were those inclined to accept Western innovations and ideas.
Members of the ruling family, especially the princes, were exposed to Western influences through contact with individual foreigners and the presence of the foreign colony of advisors and skilled craftsmen brought into Muscovite Russia to improve the power of the State.\(^{54}\)

Describing these Western influences as the "European education" of the princes, Shchapov explained the nature of Peter I amidst a complicated theoretical framework.

In the late seventeenth century Shchapov saw "xenomania" in the royal family and "leading people" contesting against an unreasonable fear of new Western influences, often exemplified by reference to the schismatics. This was, in Shchapov's terms, a "fateful hour" of history in which "national-ethnological" (natsionalno-etnologicheskii) and "natural-psychological" (estestvenno-psikhologicheskii) questions were posed, with the answers determining whether Russia would be educated and civilized by merging with the Western nations or remain under the domination of Byzantine education and Asian intellectual passivity.\(^{55}\) At this fateful hour Peter I was born possessing intense "xenomania" due to

\(^{54}\) Ibid.  
\(^{55}\) Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 70.
"natural selection" and the exposure of the Romanovs to Western influences.

Shchapov claimed to understand the "nervous-brain organization" of Peter I. Peter's receptivity to new influences, or impressions, from the West was theoretically a superior stage in the development of the quality of "receptivity" which all Russians possessed to some degree. In low stages of human development this receptivity usually produced a fear of new things, but in higher stages of progress receptivity to the West produced the genius of Peter I. Thus, Peter's reign gave Russia a powerful push toward the West, and the generations after Peter continued to inherit receptivity in the same way children inherited certain characteristics from their parents.

Shchapov's approach to Russia's salvation included the discussion of specific factors, such as the character of Peter I, and a general theory that sequential progress in the development of the human mind had to occur. In the area of broad theories Shchapov was influenced by

56 Ibid., p. 78.
57 Ibid., p. 79. In the series of articles on intellectual development Shchapov frequently discussed the achievements and failures of each generation after Peter I.
Claude Bernard's belief in definite stages in the matura-

58 tion of the thinking process. Bernard's works, like Mill's, seemed to reveal laws of the mind, and Shchapov was familiar with the French physiologist's theory that the mind went through periods of "feeling" and "reason" (philosophy) prior to arriving at the "experimental" stage which reveals the truth about the world in which man lives. In Bernard's view "feeling" resulted in the creation of religious truths and theology, while "reason" led to scholasticism. The experimental phase, the most advanced, revealed scientific truths beyond "feeling" or "reason."

Shchapov, in "The Natural-psychological Conditions" viewed Russian history in terms of four basic periods of mental development, sometimes described as "worldview" (mirosozertsanie), which reached a peak in an "experimental" phase.59 The first phase in Russian mental development covered all of history up to the reign of Peter I and was designated as the "theological-pantophobic" (teologo-pantofobicheskii) period. This phase was characterized

58 See Ibid., p. 85, for a long quote from Bernard's An Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine (Introduction a l'etude de la Medicine Experimentale).
59 Shchapov, Sochineniiia, III, 100-102, 109-12.
by fear of the forces of nature and the possessors of physical force, a submission to "fate," and a theocratic view of the organization of society and the State. The second phase covered the eighteenth century, after Peter I, and was given a very strange title--the "nature-favmatological" (natur-favmatologicheskii) period. In this phase, under Western influences, fear of the natural world was displaced by a certain amazement at "the wonders of nature," and great deeds of the rulers, notably Peter I and Catherine II, aroused enthusiasm among subjects of the Empire. The first half of the nineteenth century was covered in Shchapov's third phase which he designated as the "nature-philosophic or metaphysical-empirical" (natur-filosofskii ili metafiziko-empiricheskii) period. This third phase was marked by a struggle between idealistic philosophies, such as Schelling's nature-philosophy, and a weak, but growing, appreciation of a scientifically oriented empiricism. Shchapov, again citing Claude Bernard as an authority, theorized that after three preceding phases Russia would go on to the use of the experimental method in an "experimental-positive" (eksperimentalno-positivnii) phase. 60

60 Ibid., p. 102, citing Bernard, pp. 376-77. The ideas of the German philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854) exerted strong influence on many Russians in the period after 1820.
Thus, in the conclusion to "The Natural-psychological Conditions" Shchapov argued that the course of Russian history had been set along the path of Western influences. Explaining this process in terms of the nervous receptivity of the Russian people to impressions of the greatest intensity, Shchapov emphasized that since the time of Peter I receptivity to Western influences gained a victory over receptivity to backward local, Asian, and Byzantine influences. Theoretically, the Western influences were beneficial for "personal, familial, and public education, formation, development, and well-being" in Russia. Therefore, "natural-psychological" processes in the mind were linked to changing "social-pedagogical" conditions of life. In Shchapov's interpretation, Russia's collective intellectual response to the West was understandable as a psychological phenomenon.

---

61 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 120.

62 Shchapov's terminology was very cumbersome when he summarized his theories, but the essential concept involved above is that Western ideas and practices were beneficial for individuals, families, and society as a whole.
CHAPTER II

INTELLECTUAL AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Shchapov's book The Social-pedagogical Conditions contains his most comprehensive statement on the history of learning and thought in Russia.\(^1\) The book differs from "The Natural-psychological Conditions" in that the former is basically devoted to an examination of the slow and difficult process of the education of the nation, after the reign of Peter I, while the latter is fundamentally a theoretical treatise on the functioning of the "Russian mind." In The Social-pedagogical Conditions Shchapov presented a simpler theoretical analysis, but the future solution to Russia's problems, as in "The Natural-psychological Conditions," also centered on the

\(^1\)The Social-pedagogical Conditions attracted considerable attention when it was first published. N. Ia. Aristov's biographical study Afanasii Prokefevich Shchapov (St. Petersburg, 1883), p. 124, lists some fourteen articles and reviews on Shchapov's book. It is also interesting that early in the twentieth century a short book by N. Belozerskii Af. P. Shchapov kak pedagog (A. P. Shchapov as Pedagogue) (St. Petersburg, 1905) revived the theses formulated in The Social-pedagogical Conditions.
experimental method and the sciences. Considered together, the book and the article show different aspects of Shchapov's approach to the problems of intellectual development.

One of the basic theses of *The Social-pedagogical Conditions* was the charge that, over the centuries, Church and State in Russia failed to create a thinking class and to educate the masses. The Russian Orthodox Church was especially criticized for not disseminating the ancient Greek scientific thought which stimulated the rise of learning in the West. Shchapov was well aware that the State stimulated the spread of learning. But small groups of learned men did not constitute a thinking class. State efforts in education from 1700 to 1815 were, nevertheless, marked by a redeeming feature—interest in the practical training of the European *realschule* (real school) tradition. However, to Shchapov, the period from 1815 to the 1850's was marred by efforts to control education and social thought for the purpose of preserving stability within the Empire. The crucial assumption that

---

2 Shchapov began *The Social-pedagogical Conditions* with a review of his ideas on Russian backwardness prior to the late seventeenth century. However, the book is fundamentally devoted to Russian intellectual and educational history from approximately 1700 to the 1860's.
the "Russian mind" was characterized by "sensory knowledge" was fundamental to all of Shchapov's discussion of educational progress, or the lack of it, and his plan for intellectual reformation.³

Shchapov's emphasis on "sensory knowledge" should be understandable in view of the theoretical explanation of the workings of the mind given in the previous discussion of "The Natural-psychological Conditions."⁴ The theory of "sensory knowledge" elaborated in The Social-pedagogical Conditions centered on the concept that Russians used their external senses, such as hearing and sight, and their memories in mental processes. The major failing of this system of knowledge was the inability to progress to the highest level of thought: theoretical speculation. Shchapov believed that "sensory knowledge" was evident in the historical dominance of ignorant workers, practical labor, and the external

³The term "sensory knowledge" is being used to refer to Shchapov's term "sensualism" (sensualizm) which might be misleading. See Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 123 and 130-31, for two of several references to "sensualism," i.e., "sensory knowledge."

⁴See Ibid., p. 219, for an explanation of "sensory knowledge" which is very similar to the theories discussed in "The Natural-psychological Conditions."
senses over thinkers, theoretical thought, and reason in Russia. In Shchapov's terms, Russia was always weak in the processes of abstraction, comparison, induction, and the generalization of "elementary concrete facts" received through the "immediate-natural talent of observation" and the workings of the external senses. 5

"Sensory knowledge" was directly linked to problems in educating the relatively advanced segments of society. 6 For instance, Shchapov argued that it was difficult to teach complex theories to young Russian students who were used to superficial knowledge gained through the senses without much cerebration. Similarly, there was a degree of futility in the practice of learned men setting up scientific displays for the public, because the people employed the sense of sight to look at zoological or botanical exhibits without being interested in the scientific lessons illustrated before their eyes, but not understood by their minds. In the social and economic spheres of life, Shchapov saw "sensory knowledge" in the inability to search for

5 Ibid., p. 123.
6 See Ibid., pp. 211-12, for additional commentary on the negative aspects of "sensory knowledge."
rational solutions to problems after becoming aware that serious shortcomings existed in many facets of Russian life.

Despite the great emphasis on the negative aspect of "sensory knowledge" it is crucial to an understanding of Shchapov's ideas to realize that he also found a positive aspect to the phenomenon which seemed to control the minds of Russians. Shchapov theorized that due to the climate and the environment the people were oriented by "nature" toward practical interests of physical labor and economic activity involving use of the senses and the memory. Thus, while "sensory knowledge" prevented the people from grasping abstract scientific theories, it was also the utilitarian means by which the people struggled to make a living. The problem for Shchapov became one of joining the practical side of the "Russian mind" with the powerful forces of abstract theory and science to improve the lives of the masses.

In "The Social-pedagogical Conditions" Shchapov examined the history of the great task: the education of

---

*Ibid.*, p. 306. The conclusion that Russians were conditioned for practical pursuits was a major element in Shchapov's solution for all of Russia's ills.
the Russian people. Educational progress was analyzed within the context of the advances and failures of succeeding generations after the great pioneering efforts of Peter I to import Western learning. The chronological span of each generation was not delineated with great precision, but from the text it is apparent that the period of the first generation was from about 1725 to 1755; the second generation from 1755 to approximately 1815; the third generation from 1815 to the beginning of the 1850's; the fourth generation covering the 1850's and the 1860's.

In discussing the first post-Petrine generation Shchapov came to the harsh conclusion that the period and most of the population were characterized by "stupidity."  

---

8 The organization of The Social-pedagogical Conditions is very complicated; basic problems, such as "sensory knowledge" and the lack of theoretical thought were analyzed in addition to the history of the generations. I have chosen to stress the generational scheme in order to clarify Shchapov's ideas.

9 See Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 199 and 272 for highly critical views on the first generation. The generation of Peter I was also regarded as being very backward. It was typical of Shchapov to describe an era as "stupid" and then point to the existence of a small group of advanced persons such as the scientist Michael Lomonosov and the "Learned Guard" of Peter I: V. Tatishchev (1686-1750), F. Prokopovich (1681-1736), and A. Kantimir (1708-1744).
The first half of the eighteenth century was viewed as being clearly under the domination of the external senses and the memory instead of reason. Shchepov stressed that the people simply did not understand what they saw, heard, touched, or perceived. Thus, many of the new things brought into the Empire by the modernization drive of Peter I were beyond the understanding of most Russians.

According to Shchepov, the first generation specifically lacked a capacity for mathematics and scientific thought due to the long centuries of "sensory knowledge." This specific weakness was obviously related to some of the general problems Shchepov saw in the first generation: an inability to exploit the natural wealth of the country; the lack of an understanding of the usefulness of learning; the lingering influence of religion and superstition in the old worldview marked by "psychopathic sensual hallucination" and incompatible with science; the difficulty in understanding concepts such as the Copernican universe; and the apparently popular opinion that learned Westerners were magicians.¹⁰

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 246-47. Shchepov was particularly interested in destroying the "hallucinatory" worldview which he linked with mysticism and unreasoning fear of nature.
Shchapov's negative estimation of the level of learning in the first generation included members of the academic community as well as the general public. Citing the opinions of a German author, V. F. Brandt, Shchapov observed that a superficial view dominated scientific thought even in the minds of some of the staff of the Academy of Sciences. Apparently, the zoological collection of the Academy was regarded as a mere display of interesting rarities of nature. Thus, in this case, Shchapov was critical of the lack of a scientific approach to the study of zoology. The gathering of objects as mere curiosities was regarded as a form of "sensory knowledge." In Shchapov's view it was never enough to look at something without trying to understand the object scientifically.

While the first generation was thoroughly criticized, Shchapov also viewed it as the era when learning made a weak start in Russia. Michael Lomonosov was praised as the "first publicist or propagandist" to work for the spread of knowledge about the natural

---

sciences and as an individual who tried to expose the weaknesses of the traditional worldview.\footnote{Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 241. Lomonosov, the most famous Russian scientist of the eighteenth century, was a figure of great interest to Shchapov. The Works of Lomonosov, and P. Peakarskii's Science and Literature During the Reign of Peter I, were frequently cited among the many secondary sources Shchapov used to document his interpretation of Russian intellectual progress in the eighteenth century.}\footnote{Ibid., p. 248.} Indicative of the times, Shchapov noted that Lomonosov was trying to convince the nation that science was useful and not to be feared.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 252-53.}

Shchapov also offered an interesting analysis of the thought of one of the true geniuses of the eighteenth century.\footnote{Ibid., p. 253.} Lomonosov supposedly showed signs of "scholasticism" and, in reference to a general view of nature, his thought fell into Shchapov's "nature-philosophical" category. Idealism was detected in Lomonosov's poetry in contrast to the scientist's view on subjects such as chemistry which were realistic enough for Shchapov. In a footnote Shchapov commented that Lomonosov did not subscribe to Voltaire's skeptical-critical rationalism.\footnote{Ibid., p. 253.}
Besides the towering individual genius of Lomonosov, Shchapov pointed to State sponsored explorations of Siberia and the realschule tradition in subjects such as mathematics and navigation as positive aspects of the first generation. But the explorations, according to Shchapov, had little impact until later in the century, and there was no significant effort to extend education to the masses, through the realschule or any other tradition in the eighteenth century. Thus, the first generation was judged as a period of very modest beginnings with most of the nation still blighted by "stupidity."

Turning to the second generation (1755-1815) Shchapov found limited progress—the educated segment of

---

16 The expeditions, sent in the 1720's, 1730's, and 1740's, are discussed in greater detail in connection with the second post-Petrine generation.

The Moscow School of Navigation and Mathematics, founded in 1701, is a clear example of education in the "realschule" tradition. In Russia, and many European countries, the proper nature of education was a very controversial topic from the mid-nineteenth century to World War I. The "realschule" method of practical education was pitted against the classical curriculum. Shchapov valued the "realschule" approach. Thus, he was interested in the history of practical education in Russia. For a recent analysis of the "real" versus "classical" battle in Russia see Patrick L. Alston Education and the State in Tsarist Russia (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), especially pp. 65-74.
the population had moved from the "stupidity" of the first generation to a position of "partial-understanding" (poluponimanie) and rather cynical indifference to Western science. The uneducated masses continued their labors in virtual isolation from the world of learning while "sensory knowledge" remained a constant factor in the Russian mentality. Achievements in the sciences and arts by small groups were overshadowed by several weaknesses of the mind, notably an "intellectual schism" brought on by a misplaced search for morality which led to the rise of mysticism.

The "partial-understanding" attributed to the second generation was the result of an improvement in "rational capacity" (razsydochnaia sposobnost) or "theoretical reflection" (teoreticheskaia myslitelnost). The improvement was linked by Shchapov to a growing interest in Western thought and philosophy. This was the age of the great influence of the French philosophes and

17 See Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 271-72, for comments on the general characteristics of the second generation.
18 Ibid., p. 201.
encyclopedists. Shchapov commented that the works of great thinkers, notably Voltaire, were translated into Russian in the form of extracts from the original writings with titles such as The Spirit of Voltaire (Dukh Voltera). Public lectures given by Russian naturalists in an effort to popularize new ideas were regarded as another aspect of the spread of Western knowledge.

Not content with general statements on any specific generation, Shchapov also identified individuals, or movement, thought to be relatively progressive. Certain professors, in this instance all Russians, from Moscow University such as A. A. Barsov (1730-1791), M. I. Afonin (1739-1810), A. M. Karamyshev (b.?-1791), and S. G. Zybelin (1735-1802) were praised by Shchapov.

19 The impact of the Enlightenment in Russia is a major question in Russian intellectual history. See J. H. Billington's The Icon and the Axe, pp. 207-68, for a chapter entitled "The Century of Aristocratic Culture" which interprets the Russian adaptation of French thought.


21 Ibid. For additional background information on these men see:
From the ranks of the Academy of Sciences Shchapov designated men such as the explorer-scientists I. I. Lepekhin (1740-1802), N. P. Rychkov (1746-1784), and N. Ia. Ozertskovskii (1750-1827) as particularly worthy. More well-known figures like I. V. Boltin (1735-1792), M. M. Shcherbatov (1733-1790), I. I. Betskoi (1704-1795), D. I. Fonvizin (1745-1792), N. I, Novikov (1744-1818) [considered to be progressive for part of his career], and A. N. Radishchev (1749-1802) were regarded as noteworthy historians and men of letters.

In the literature of the era Shchapov saw the start of satirical criticism aimed at the shortcomings in Russian social, intellectual and moral life. Novikov's journal The Painter (Zhivopisets) is an example of this type of literature and was frequently cited by Shchapov to illustrate attitudes toward various aspects of life.

---

22 See the following articles for biographical data:
"Ozertskovskii, N. Ia." Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, XII, 181-84.

23 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 202. Shchapov cited A. Afanasev's Russian Satirical Journals, 1769-1774 (Russkie satiricheskie zhurnaly 1769-1774), published in 1859, one of the sources he used to study the eighteenth century.
The impact of State sponsored scientific expeditions on the second and third generations was very important in Shchapov's opinion. The expeditions were carried on throughout the eighteenth century. In the 1720's Peter I dispatched D. G. Messerschmidt (1685-1735) on an exploratory journey to Siberia which took seven years. This adventure was followed by the Great Northern Expedition, carried out in three sections between 1733 and 1743. Shchapov was particularly interested in the section of the expedition led by Vitus Bering (1680-1741) discoverer of the Bering Straits who traveled to Alaska. Lesser-known participants in the expedition like G. W. Steller (1709-1755), S. P. Krasheninnikov (1713-1755),

24 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 259-63. See A. Vucinich Science in Russian Culture for background information on the fascinating story of the expeditions and some of the major participants. For additional information on individuals of interest to Shchapov see:

"Bering, V." Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, II, 740-42.
"Steller, B. W." Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, XIX, 370-76.
and J. Gmelin (1709-1755) also drew Shchapov's attention. In addition to these earlier explorations, another expedition, from 1768 to 1774, led by P. S. Pallas (1741-1811) was of great import to Shchapov.

The expeditions were doubly significant: they contributed to knowledge of Russia and served as a stimulus for the advancement of the sciences. Shchapov placed a high value on the well-known discoveries of Bering and many contributions made by members of the expeditions to the study of geography, natural history, medicine, ethnography, philology, mineralogy, history, and the study of wildlife and vegetation. The difficult feat of mapping the north coast of Siberia was regarded by Shchapov as one of the greatest achievements of geographic research. But it seemed to take a few decades before Russian responded to the knowledge acquired by the explorers. Thus, Shchapov saw a great deal of the significance of the expeditions in the interest of the second and third generations in the further study of the sciences.

Pallas' expedition, in particular, was credited

---

26 Ibid.
with stimulating a "spirit" of scientific research.\footnote{Ibid., p. 263.} To illustrate this point Shchapov cited frequent public lectures by the professors of Moscow University, around 1800, on natural history as being linked to the interest in learning sparked by the expeditions.

However enthusiastic Shchapov was over the expeditions, he still maintained a rather negative view of the achievements of the second generation.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 265-66.} The "partial-understanding" of the generation and the plight of the serfs was not overcome by the progress made by small groups of scholars and naturalists attached to the universities and the Academy of Sciences. Even these men of science were regarded as "children" when compared to the intellectual leaders of the West. The scientific community, in Shchapov's opinion, was handicapped by the lack of truly outstanding naturalists, access to great quantities of Western scientific works, equipment and facilities such as observatories, and a thorough understanding of Western thought. Shchapov might have been content with limited progress in science, if the second generation had not been plagued with problems which finally
resulted in a veritable schism of the "Russian mind."

From his discussion of the second generation's problems it is obvious that Shchapov was convinced that society, in general, possessed little rational, theoretical thought. The thought of this generation was sometimes characterized as "immature" or "deformed."

Shchapov agreed with satirists such as Fonvizin that the basic concepts involved in fashionable modes of thought, such as Voltarianism, were not fully understood by Russians. 29

To Shchapov the second generation was also compromised by a confused mixture of scientific thought and religious views. For instance, he was critical of a certain mathematics professor, Anichkov, whose thinking apparently became marred by attempts to conform with a "religious-moral" outlook on learning. 30 Citing S. P. Shevyrev's History of Moscow University (Istoriia moskovskogo universiteta), a frequently used source, Shchapov noted that speeches by several mathematicians and naturalists were permeated with "mystical-religious."

29 Ibid., p. 203. The Adolescent (Nedorosl) and The Brigadier (Brigadir) are two of Fonvizin's best known works. Soviet scholars published Fonvizin's Collected Works (Sobranie sochinenii) in 1959.

30 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 267.
"physical-theological," or "spiritualist" concepts.\(^{31}\)

In addition to religious complications, the second generation was also criticized for its "crude-materialist, physical-epicurean indifference" toward the study of the natural sciences. Shchapov theorized that Western influences broke down the old religious denial of scientific thought, but the result, for many Russians was an indifference to science while the pursuit of sensual pleasures continued. To illustrate the disregard for learning Shchapov, again drawing on Novikov's The Painter, cited the protestations of a Russian nobleman against the value of science.\(^{32}\)

The literature and journalism of the second generation, despite the rise of satire, was found wanting. To Shchapov, Russian literature had few authors, like Radishchev, concerned with a better future for Russia, while there were too many, such as Shcherbatov and Boltin, looking backward toward the imagined simplicity and purity of Muscovite Russia.\(^{33}\)

---

\(^{31}\)Ibid. The study by Shevyrev (1806-1864) is usually cited as Istoriia imperatorskogo moskovskogo universiteta. There is a rather long entry for Shevyrev in Russki biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, XXIII, 19-28. The history of the university has been continued in Istoriia moskovskogo universiteta (Moscow, 1959).

\(^{32}\)Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 271-72.

\(^{33}\)Ibid., pp. 205-207.
However, the major failure of the second generation involved a problem more serious than a wistful yearning for the past. Shchapov was convinced that many half-educated Russians, who had achieved a false skepticism and an imperfect understanding of Western thought, drifted into an "intellectual schism" (umstvennii raskol) characterized by an enthusiasm for mysticism, instead of pure science, and described as a "sad, pathological phenomenon" (pechalnoe, patologicheskoe iavlenie) in Russian intellectual history. Novikov and the Masons were Shchapov's prime example of the turn to mysticism.

Focusing on Novikov, Shchapov sought to illustrate that many Russians of the era were not capable of accepting all of the latest scientific thought from the West in fields such as physics, chemistry, and astronomy. A letter from Novikov to Karamzin was cited to show the

---

34 See Ibid., pp. 204-358, for Shchapov's comments on the downfall of the second generation.

35 Ibid., pp. 273-75 and 358-63. Novikov is justly known for his role as a publisher and disseminator of knowledge—a role praised by Shchapov. However, two authoritative studies, J. H. Billington's The Icon and the Axe and A. Vucinich's Science in Russian Culture can be cited, in addition to Shchapov's works, to illustrate that Novikov and the Masonic movement embraced occult mysticism as well as moral, philanthropic, and educational interests. See Vucinich, pp. 176-79 and Billington pp. 242-59. Vucinich noted that, "most observers see two Novikovs: one dedicated to science and the other to mysticism." [p.179]. Billington found that Novikov's philosophic and occult interests have been "minimized and at times even suppressed in Soviet treatments. . . ." [p. 711].
fall of one of the second generation's great men into a medieval type of mysticism which repudiated new advances in learning.

With the permission of our famous astronomers— he [Novikov] wrote in 1814 to Karamzin—they rave, finding more than seven planets, finding and seeing nonmoving stars and calling them suns. There are neither more nor less than seven planets, since God created only seven and filled them each with proper forces. There cannot be nonmoving stars, for the indisputable truth is that which does not have movement is dead, for life is motion. They call the sun itself the laziest, inactive planet, for what does not have movement, does not have action. . . . Present day physicists, not being satisfied with four elements, God created only four and not more, completely remove those [four] from the elements, for according to their high science that which is able to be divided is not an element. What blindness and what wretched understanding about elements. However, they bestow on us almost one hundred elements. Chemists threw away everything previous and endowed us with certain gases, i.e., empty words, which have neither meaning nor strength. And who is able to enumerate all of their stupidities? Not by letters, but perhaps by folio-volumes can one really describe them.36

Shchapov was impressed that Novikov scoffed at astronomers and believed in the existence of just seven planets and four elements. Using the letter as part of his interpretation, Shchapov argued that Novikov did not accept

36 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 273, citing Pervoi pismo k Karamzinu, 1814 (First Letter to Karamzin, 1814). Beyond stating that the letter was from Novikov, Shchapov did not identify the source of the correspondence.
Newton's Mathematical Principles, Kepler's "Laws" of planetary motion, or Laplace's Celestial Mechanics—all basic contributions to the advancement of knowledge. 37

Furthermore, Novikov was charged with not accepting scientific advances made by pioneers in chemistry such as Robert Boyle (1627-1691), Henry Cavendish (1731-1810), Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), and James Watt (1736-1819). 38

Shchapov explained the rise of mysticism in Russia as a mistake which arose from the pursuit of morality at a time when science and rational philosophy should have been the main concerns of society. The subsequent intellectual schism, exemplified by Novikov and the Masons, was linked to the reactionary obscurantism which gripped Russia after the traumatic tumult of the

Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 361. Pierre Simon de Laplace (1749-1827) is not as well known as Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) or Johannes Kepler (1751-1830), but the French mathematician is an important figure in the history of science due to his contributions to gravitational astronomy. See W. C. Dampier A History of Science and Its Relation to Philosophy and Religion (4th.ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), for information on virtually all of the important men in the history of science.

Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 361. Boyle and the other figures cited above are important in the history of chemistry. Watt is also known for his work with steam.
Napoleonic Wars. Thus, the second generation, troubled by several problems, bequeathed an intellectual heritage of doubtful value to its successor.

To Shchapov the third generation was characterized by superficial knowledge, "partial-understanding" mental laziness, and a distinct antipathy toward the intellectual effort needed for mastery of the sciences. The turn to mysticism in the second generation was followed by reactionary obscurantism which found a rather easy conquest in the third generation. Shchapov saw the domination of the memory instead of the thinking processes in the historical interests of the era symbolized by the Archeographic Commission. Thus, the third generation brought limited progress toward rational thought in the sciences and the world of letters. However, the betterment of the nation was retarded by State sponsored obscurantism, in addition to archeologism, classicism, metaphysical philosophy, aestheticism, and an intellectually enervating false skepticism.

Shchapov's interpretation of the third generation was not entirely negative. The achievements of Russian

39 Those aware of Billington's concept of the "Anti-Enlightenment" will find many familiar ideas in Shchapov's discussion of Russia after the "intellectual schism."
scholars and men of science continued to fascinate him, although he still saw Russia under Western intellectual leadership. To Shchapov figures such as the mathematicians T. F. Osipovskii (1766-1832), D. M. Perevoshchikov (1788-1880), M. V. Ostrogradskii and I. I. Somov (1815-1876) were significant in the third generation. Osipovskii particularly impressed Shchapov as one of the few who protested against philosophical idealism and the domination of memory and the imagination in learning.

Among historians Shchapov found a few individuals such as T. N. Granovskii and P. N. Kudriavtsev with appealing ideas. In literature some progress toward rational thought was detected in the works of A. S. Pushkin (1799-1837) and A. S. Griboiedov (1795-1829). Shchapov was interested in Pushkin's efforts to describe national

---

40 Ibid., p. 207. For further information on these scholars see:
41 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 343-45.
42 Granovskii and Kudriavtsev, like Ostrogradskii, were also mentioned in "The Natural-psychological Conditions."
character and Griboiedov's comparisons of educated Russians and Westerners. As might be expected Vissarion Belinskii won high praise for his "real-critical skepticism." Shchapov saw the salvation of Russian literature with the advent of Belinskii.

Willing to acknowledge positive factors, Shchapov was, nevertheless, much more concerned with negative aspects of Russian intellectual and educational progress during the third generation. History furnished Shchapov with a chain of unfortunate events well-known to students of the reigns of Alexander I (1801-1825) and Nicholas I (1825-1855). Shchapov found much to attack in the story of Alexander's turn toward mysticism and conservatism after the soul searing events of the struggle with Napoleon, the Restoration in Europe, and the conclusion of the Holy Alliance. Reactionary and obscurantist policies in education, continued under Nicholas I, designed to produce a populace imbued with religiosity.

Belinskii, a literary critic, was a leading member of the circle of intellectuals known as the Westernizers. See Marc Raeff, Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966), p. 252, for a brief but precise statement of Belinskii's significance in Russian intellectual history.
and blind obedience to the tsar were natural targets for Shchapov. 44

Interpreting the damage done to Russia by obscurantist policies, Shchapov saw true learning restricted and perverted by the heavy handed policy of government censorship. The censorship, in combination with mysticism, was blamed for retarding the progress of Russian social thought for forty or fifty years. 45 Shchapov emphasized that the major concern of Church and State, from 1815 to the 1850's, was the struggle against Western materialism. This conflict was described as particularly harmful to the natural sciences because men of learning were forced to bow to pressures to include "mystical-idealistic" concepts in their teachings.

Shchapov found the old idea that science was "Godless" still existing in the nineteenth century and

44 The details of all of the changes in educational policy need not be repeated. The history of the regulation and suppression of education in the first half of the nineteenth century has long since made its way into monographs and textbooks. For instance, Nicholas Hans' book The History of Russian Educational Policy: 1701-1917 (New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1964); Hugh Seton-Watson's The Russian Empire 1801-1917 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967); and recently Patrick Alston's Education and the State in Tsarist Russia (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969) all narrate the same general account of intellectual suppression given by Shchapov.

45 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 173-74.
that scholars, like Lomonosov in the previous century, had to show that scientific knowledge was useful and did not subvert religion. The efforts of Professor Nikolskii, a mathematician at the University of Kazan, to show that the study of scientific laws did not lead to a denial of the powers of God were cited as examples of the pressures on the teaching profession to conform to official policies. Another example of interference with the world of learning was the firing of the mathematician Osipovskii because he expressed the idea that it would be better to think of God as existing rather than living. According to Shchapov, Osipovskii was an exponent of realism, while the superior who dismissed him was tainted by mysticism. Thus, Shchapov attributed the inclusion of "mystical-theological" concepts in the lectures of many university professors partially to an inclination toward "mystical-idealism," partially to fear of Runich and Magnitsky, and partially fear of being thought of as materialists.

Ibid., pp. 299-300.  
Ibid., p. 300.  

D. Runich and M. Magnitsky were two of the most notorious obscurantists to plague the Russian universities. Runich, unfortunately, obtained a post as the curator of St. Petersburg University, while the University of Kazan was subjected to harsh treatment under Magnitsky.
In addition to State sponsored obscurantism, Shchapov also identified archeologism and classicism as detrimental to real progress.\textsuperscript{49} The term "archeologism" was used to denote the rather energetic movement for research in history, and related disciplines, which sprang up in the first half of the nineteenth century and was dominated by the activities of the Archeographic Expedition and Archeographic Commission.\textsuperscript{50} "Classicism," to Shchapov, meant the nearly valueless study of "dead languages"—Latin and Greek—and ancient literature.\textsuperscript{51} Thus, in the third generation Shchapov saw the triumph of archeologism and classicism over the development of the natural sciences.\textsuperscript{52}

Curricular changes, in 1819 and 1828, which strengthened the teaching of Greek and Latin, at the

\textsuperscript{49}See \textit{Ibid.}, p. 302, for one of several references to the terms "archeologism" (\textit{arkheologizm}) and "classicism" (\textit{klassitsizm}).


\textsuperscript{51}Shchapov, \textit{Sochinenija}, III, 332-33.

\textsuperscript{52}Shchapov was also dismayed over the prominence of the study of jurisprudence in the first half of the century.
secondary school or gymnasium level, were stressed by Shchapov as part of his effort to illustrate the rise of archeologism and classicism. 53 Similarly, the number of students at the University of Moscow, between 1825 and 1836, who completed the historical-philological curriculum (783) was contrasted to the number of students who completed the physical-mathematics curriculum (119) to demonstrate the academic trend of the times. The defeat of the sciences was also evident to Shchapov in the literature of the era: he noted that of some 323 articles published in the journal Notes of the Fatherland, between 1818 and 1825, only 8 were devoted to the natural sciences.

Seeking to discover the reason for the rise of archeologism and classicism, Shchapov speculated that Russia's weakness in theoretical thought, combined with a shortage of scientific equipment made it difficult to pursue the sciences. Thus, it was easier for a nation with the heritage of "sensory knowledge" and the use of rote learning to employ the external senses to study history and antiquity through disciplines such as

53 See Ibid., pp. 301-303, for some of the facts and figures used to substantiate Shchapov's discussion of education and literature.
philology, numismatics, and archeology.\textsuperscript{54}

Although Shchapov's view of archeologism was essentially negative, he also found a positive, though less significant, aspect to the great research projects of the first half of the century. Archeologism was looked upon favorably for its role in changing the Russian worldview; the historical-archeological viewpoint was definitely preferable to the Byzantine chronographic worldview with its attendant mystical theology.\textsuperscript{55}

As a professional historian Shchapov could not be totally negative in his evaluation of the half-century of archeological "monomania." In fact, publications of the Archeographic Expedition and Commission were frequently cited by Shchapov in his research on various facets of history. As a scholar, Shchapov was more than willing to admit that the era of archeologism was valuable for its "historical-archeological and philological-bibliographical" research.\textsuperscript{56} The massive research into the Russian past was even once labeled as the "first beneficial result" of the Petrine reforms; Russia was beginning to unearth its past in a serious fashion.

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., pp. 300-301.
\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., p. 320.
\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., p. 326.
This historical research was thought to be necessary, just as the expeditions of Messerschmidt and Pallas were vital for the advancement of the natural sciences.

The negative aspects of classicism and archeologism, however, were more important to Shchapov than their positive features. He found archeologism largely irrelevant and classicism incapable of supplying the kind of knowledge needed by society. To Shchapov the classical tradition in education was simply too far removed from the daily interests of the Russian people. Classicism was also viewed as detrimental to an active interest in the abstract sciences. Archeologism, more than classicism, was subjected to a complex analysis, involving a number of negative factors, designed to show the limitations or undesirable features of an obsolete tradition of historical research.

According to Shchapov, archeologism developed a type of "slavery" to the memory of the past without a concomitant rational examination of history. Development of the memory, without a sharpening of the thought processes, was always opposed by Shchapov. The

---

57 Ibid., pp. 332-33.
58 Ibid., pp. 329-30.
"ultra-archeological" education given to the third generation was criticized for turning young minds from the study of the sciences toward the dead past. Shchapov was not opposed to an examination of the past, but he felt that archeologism did not reveal the vital connections between the past and the present. Thus, the whole tradition was capable of producing a "onesided" and harmful "almost psychopathic mental monomania." 59

Shchapov also opposed archeologism on the grounds of methodology; he believed that truly vital knowledge could be obtained only through a discipline grounded in the sciences. 60 Thus, he saw historical-archeological research as inadequate for the future study of sociology and ethnology which were thought to require a scientific foundation. The research of the first half of the nineteenth century was also found to be lacking in the study of disciplines such as craniology, ethnology, anthropology, natural history, geography, botany, zoology, and geology.

In addition to lacking a scientific foundation, archeologism was described as a tradition which prevented, and even destroyed, the growth of a scientific

59 Ibid., p. 327.
60 Ibid., pp. 327-28.
worldview. Shchapov saw a great deal of intellectual stagnation and the waste of mental powers in the education of the era which turned young people away from the sciences. Thus, the epic of archeologism was, on the whole, interpreted by Shchapov as not being very beneficial for the intellectual development of a society beset with backwardness.

German philosophy was another source of confusion for the third generation. Shchapov, without devoting a great deal of space to the topic, presented both positive and negative aspects of the foreign thought. The ideas of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Friedrich von Schelling (1775-1854) were valued for their "abstract-theoretical" content and logic which, according to Shchapov, contributed to the development of theoretical thought in Russia.

However, as with his treatment of archeologism,

61 Ibid., p. 329.
62 See Ibid., p. 335, for some of Shchapov's general statements on German philosophy. Kant is known for his role in the development of critical philosophy. Schelling often described as an idealist or romantic philosopher, was a major influence in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century. It is somewhat surprising that Shchapov did not discuss Georg Hegel's ideas at great length. Hegel (1770-1831) exercised a great influence in Russia during the time of Shchapov's third generation.
Shchapov placed greater emphasis on the negative influence of German philosophical ideas. Shchapov believed that due to the weak state of the Russian mind, especially in philosophy, the introduction of German thought with its metaphysical and transcendental content resulted in "scholastic-idealistic" thought among many young Russians.\textsuperscript{63} To Shchapov, concepts such as Schelling's view that nature was the realization or physical expression of the thoughts of a divine being and the contents of works such as Kant's Metaphysik der Natur were harmful because they delayed the development of "inductive logical" thought and diverted Russia from more valuable scientific thought possessed by men such as physiologists, chemists, or mathematicians.\textsuperscript{64} Shchapov also believed that Russians, imbued with Byzantine scholasticism, incorrectly used German philosophy as a sort of mental "prop" (opor) during the period of reaction against science in the early nineteenth century. It was axiomatic to Shchapov that Russian professors and students could not fully understand German philosophy.

Shchapov's utilitarian mind also held little regard

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., p. 340.  
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., pp. 335 and 340.
for another aspect of Russian culture during the third generation—training in aesthetics. Professors of aesthetics were accused, by Shchapov, of diverting Russian thought from the pursuit of "realism." Shchapov thought that aesthetics dealt too much with the imagination and resulted in a "fantastic" and "idealistic" frame of mind harmful to the pursuit of scientific learning. Opposed to teaching of the fine arts in universities, Shchapov complained about courses such as Poetics and the Theory of Poetry which were offered at the University of Moscow from 1813 to 1830. Similarly, the educational institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church were criticized for their extensive program of aesthetics.

Interest in the arts was not the final problem perceived in the third generation; the era was especially marked by a quality of false skepticism. According to Shchapov, Russian minds were too weak to reach the intense stage of "doubt and negation" found in the thought of Western thinkers such as Descartes and Voltaire. Contacts with the West during the Napoleonic era and constant exposure to foreign influences through

---

65 Ibid., pp. 333-35.
66 Ibid., p. 363.
literature were credited with influencing young officers and students toward attitudes of skepticism and disenchantment with Russia. The abortive Decembrist Revolt in 1825 is usually linked with such attitudes. However, Shchapov viewed Russian skepticism as essentially shallow and weak—the skeptics were not advanced enough in logic and scientific thought to develop a satisfactory critique of Russia's problems.

In analyzing "false skepticism" Shchapov described the rise of a superficial spirit of doubt and negation in a generation which was under a variety of influences including the presence of French immigrants and tutors, the ideas of thinkers such as Georg Hegel, David Strauss, Ludwig Feuerbach, and the concepts of European liberalism. To Shchapov's critical eye, the Hegelians and the liberals of the first half of the nineteenth century appeared to be as intellectually immature as the Russian Voltairians of the late eighteenth century.

---

67 Ibid., pp. 363-64. Martin Malia, author of Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1965) described Strauss as a Left Hegelian whose ideas communicated the notion that heaven could be realized on earth. Feuerbach was an advocate of atheism and materialism.

68 Ibid., p. 364.
Pursuing the theme of superficiality through the 1830's and 1840's, Shchapov offered an interesting interpretation of the "circles" of university students who gathered together to discuss philosophy. Describing the best student "circles," those not completely cynical, as being occupied with the ideas of men such as Alexander Herzen (1812-1870) and Belinskii as well as Hegel, Strauss, and Feuerbach, Shchapov, nevertheless, maintained that even these students did not possess ideas of sufficient strength to plunge ahead toward the necessary reordering of society.  

Linking literature with false skepticism, Shchapov concluded that immature Russian minds were not able to fully understand the truly cosmopolitan skepticism contained in the works of Lord Byron (1788-1824) and symbolized by the figure of Childe Harold ("Chailde Garoldovskii kosmopoliticheskii skeptitsizm Bairona").

69 Ibid., p. 365. Herzen was one of the most important founders of the Populist tradition in Russian thought. Malia's study of Herzen has become one of the standard works on the nineteenth century and is useful for its discussion of the student "circles."

70 Ibid., p. 123. Byron's Childe Harold was but one of the great poet's many works. Byron's influence in Russia is discussed in D. S. Mirsky's A History of Russian Literature From Its Beginnings to 1900 (New York: Vintage Books, 1958).
To Shchapov, fictional characters such as Pushkin's Eugene Onegin and Lermontov's Pechorin failed to convey the pure spirit of skepticism found in the writings of Byron. Thus, even the perceptive minds of Russia's great literary men were thought to be incapable of a true understanding of Western ideas. Russian literature was saved, however, by the appearance of Belinskii who possessed enough critical skepticism to impress Shchapov.

The journalism of the era was also dissected by Shchapov in his search for realism. Journals such as The Northern Bee (Sievernaia pchela) and The Son of the Fatherland (Syn otechestva) were attacked for their oriental complacency, self-deception, and ultra-patriotism. However, Shchapov conceded the fact that government censorship was a constant threat to the world of letters.

Unlike his elaborate analysis of the third

71 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 367-68. Eugene Onegin is one of the central characters in Pushkin's celebrated "novel in verse" Eugene Onegin (Evgenii Onegin). M. Lermontov (1814-1841), though not so well-known as Pushkin, is also an important figure in Russian poetry and literature. Pechorin is the central character in Lermontov's novel A Hero of Our Times (Geroi nashego vremen).  

72 Ibid., pp. 365-66.
generation, Shchapov's treatment of the fourth generation, his own, was brief. But there is no doubt as to his estimation of Russian progress in the third quarter of the nineteenth century: society, as a whole, was still weak in rational thought. However, a few bright beacons from the world of science and literature were trying to illuminate the sea of intellectual darkness.

Among the small corps of extremely talented scientists and scholars produced in tsarist Russia, Shchapov pointed to men such as the chemist A. M. Butlerov (1838-1886), the chemist D. I. Mendeleev (1834-1907), the physiologist I. M. Sechenov (1829-1905), and the mathematician P. L. Chebyshev (1821-1894) as examples of successful figures in the fourth generation.

---

73 See Ibid., p. 208, for a general statement on the fourth generation.

74 Ibid., p. 207. For background information on these scholars consult the following sources:


P. T. Belov, Materializm I. M. Sechenova (Moscow, 1963).

Kh. S. Koshtoians, I. M. Sechenov (Moscow, 1950).

Nevertheless, in Shchapov's view, the Russian scientific community was still under the influence of Western leadership—intellectual independence had not been reached.

In literature the appearance of N. G. Chernyshevsky was regarded as a clear sign of progress. Either Shchapov found it expedient, as a political exile, not to write much about Chernyshevsky, himself a political prisoner, or the censors removed additional material on the great Populist leader. Whatever the case, Shchapov even by mentioning Chernyshevsky made it quite clear where his loyalties were in the matter of literature.

Thus, by the time of his fourth generation Shchapov's chronological survey revealed slow progress in the world of learning. Beginning with the "stupidity" of the first generation early in the eighteenth century, Russia, at least in its educated segment, reached a position of "partial-understanding" in the nineteenth century. Small groups of progressive scientists and literary figures were forging ahead in intellectual development, but the ignorance of the masses lay like a blight over the land.

75 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 207.
Russian thought, in general, was attacked by Shchapov for its lack of rational doubt and the ability to criticize and analyze. Instead of questioning the worldview taught in a variety of religious and State educational institutions, too many Russians passively accepted the doctrines learned in their youth—doctrines which formed their intellectual and moral character. Russian society, therefore, appeared to be dominated by a harmful devotion to routine, superstition, obscurantism, and tradition. The inclination to pursue science was often crushed in such an environment. To Shchapov virtually all of these patterns perceived within society and pedagogy were in dire need of great changes.

Shchapov's solution for Russia's ills centered upon the need to change the worldview of both the educated elite and the uneducated masses. The argument that philosophic doubt and the experimental method of reasoning, induction, had to be inculcated in Russia as general principles was an integral part of Shchapov's plan for intellectual reform. The a priori method of thinking

See Ibid., pp. 371-90, for the long summation which ends The Social-pedagogical Conditions. The summation contains much of Shchapov's solution for the problem of educating Russia.
inherent in all of the old traditions had to be replaced by a posteriori thought conducive to rational control of all aspects of life. Russia's unique "sensory" learning was to be utilized, with special techniques of instruction, to ensure that the masses became educated and triumphed over nature through science oriented communes.

In dealing with the general principles of thought necessary for Russia, Shchapov became convinced that the experimental method of arriving at ideas a posteriori as the result of experimentation was needed to develop "critical philosophical doubt." Significantly, Claude Bernard was cited as the authority for the concept that doubt was the fundamental principle in the experimental method which was opposed to scholasticism. 77

The capacity to doubt and to experiment with the sciences and all facets of life, such as the economy, was deemed necessary in order to counter the a priori metaphysics visible to Shchapov in customs and traditions which retarded progress—everyone in Russia should become an "experimenter" in order to break the shackles of the past.

77 Ibid., pp. 373-74.
Russia, like Europe, supposedly possessed two conflicting intellectual classes—the experimenters and the Scholastics, i.e., the traditional authorities. As Shchapov saw contemporary Russia, the scholastics were dominant and the nation was plagued with dogmatic metaphysical ideas of a priori reasoning in everything from religion to economics. Russia was therefore dominated by "scholastic metaphysical absolutism" which was tragic for the social system. Thus, philosophic doubt was needed, and it was hoped that progress would result from the spread of a "spirit of criticism, analysis, and rational doubt."  

Shchapov wanted to employ the new system of thought in order to end anomalies and "pathological deficiencies" which encumbered all facets of life—legal relations, popular morality, economic institutions, even public health. For instance, the traditional view that smallpox and fever were the "will of God" was attacked as an anomaly in the "social-physiological" life of the nation. Class antagonisms were blamed for hindering the intellectual and economic development of the lower classes, and the clergy, capitalists, and merchants were

---

78 Ibid., p. 371.
criticized for not contributing to intellectual progress. Similarly, the peasants, in Shchapov's view paid too much to the government in comparison to the demands on merchants and nobles. Another feature of traditional Russia disagreeable to Shchapov was the prevalence of the crime of theft which apparently accounted for half of all crimes in some provinces. Thus, Shchapov was dismayed that so many aspects of existence, including the all-important distribution of property, were not subject to rational examination.

When illustrating "pathological deficiencies," Shchapov pointed to "metaphysical dogmatism" in religion which plunged the masses into ignorance and superstition. Attacking what he termed the "mystical-scholastic" worldview of Orthodoxy for not giving practical knowledge to the masses, Shchapov made it clear that he would have had the Church give the people mastery of subjects such as meteorology and medicine instead of burdening the popular mind with religious metaphysics.

While anomalies and mental deficiencies absorbed Shchapov's attention as general problems he saw mastery of the natural economy as the great specific task for the masses. History revealed to Shchapov that the people
had always been slaves in the economy. The masses had
worked the land, but they never approached it with an
investigative type of mentality. Shchapov also argued that
all of the historical mistakes in the economy and national
worldview were basically linked to ignorance of the
nature of the Russian land. According to the "experimental
factual logic" which he perceived in Russian history,
Shchapov believed that the point had been reached at
which the question of the introduction of men of science--
chemists, physicists, botanists, zoologists, mineralogists,
agronomists, technicians, and even mechanics--into the
economy was posed. Thus, in Shchapov's analysis, the
vital "key" to mastery of the economy, and to intellectual
reform, was the study of the natural sciences. 79

Clearly revealing his Populist sentiments,
Shchapov pointed to the young educated people as having an
obligation to become "intelligent, rational, economic
workers"--virtual creators of a scientifically based
economy--and the "leaders and enlighteners" of the
millions toiling in ignorance. 80 The young were to study
natural sciences of all types and apply their knowledge

79 Ibid., p. 381.
80 Ibid., p. 380.
to the economy, especially in the sphere of labor where the working people toiled. Wherever the masses worked--in any type of agriculture or industry, the learned were to educate them to the value of scientific knowledge through displays and experiments which demonstrated the practical benefits to be gained from the utilization of science in work such as farming. Working class children were to attend a system of schools organized around practical scientific training. Shchapov theorized that scientific principles could be taught if the practical interests of the workers were aroused through demonstrations which allowed the workers to learn by using their external senses.

However, the type of education given to young people was the great problem which confronted Russia. The schools and universities, according to Shchapov, were not training the young to go forth, with the experimental mind, and to build a new science oriented economy for the masses. Too many lawyers, philologists, classicists, and theologians were being trained to suit the Populist reformer. Shchapov concentrated his attack on the tradition of classical education with its devotion to Greek

---

81 Ibid., pp. 312-13.
and Latin. Recalling the history of the struggle to settle the Empire in the face of a harsh environment and climate, Shchapov criticized the traditional idée fixe that classical education, or non-scientific education, was somehow necessary in the "cold, harsh, northern countries" of Russia and Siberia. It was obvious to Shchapov that "real," "polytechnical" education for the masses was required to rectify centuries of ignorance and injustice. 82

Shchapov was convinced that his type of scientific education would succeed because of the special "sensory" nature of the "Russian mind"; he perceived an extremely important positive aspect in the "sensory" phenomenon—Russians were inherently conditioned to possess a "sensory-realistic" type of mentality. 83 Basically, Russian "sensory-realism" was seen as an orientation toward the practical, non-theoretical, facets of life, such as survival and earning a living, dictated by the interaction of the external senses and the harsh environment.

82 Ibid., p. 389. Shchapov did not give an elaborate plan for the type of education he wanted, but he was adamant in supporting mass, polytechnical training geared to instruction through "sensory" techniques.

83 Ibid., pp. 304-14. As stated previously, the word "sensory" is being used in place of Shchapov's original word "sensual."
The inclination toward practical affairs was visible in the activities of the educated elite and the unlettered masses. The educated were somewhat closer to theoretical knowledge, but Shchapov, as we have seen, was very critical of the level of theoretical learning in Russia. The *realschule* tradition of practical technology institutionalized by Peter I, the Free Economic Society, the continuing interest in the development of the economy and technology displayed by the State and its universities, and the resurgence of the sciences in the 1850's and 1860's were among the evidence cited by Shchapov to demonstrate the inclination toward "realism" or practical utilitarianism among the learned.\(^8^4\) Thus, Shchapov came to the viewpoint that "realism," though it had been repressed, was never totally eliminated despite all of the obscurantism, idealism, archeologism, and classicism in Russia.

In dealing with the education of the masses, Shchapov believed that he had found the technique to bridge the gap between their crude "sensory" learning and advanced scientific thought.\(^8^5\) It was axiomatic to Shchapov that

\(^{8^4}\) The Free Economic Society was started in 1765, during the reign of Catherine II, for the advancement of knowledge in farming and agriculture.

the masses were deprived of theoretical pursuits due to
their primary interest in the physical labor and economic
activity necessary for life itself. But, Russians, in
general, were seen as a people marked by "sensory
receptivity" and a "talent for observation." Such a
people, Shchapov believed, could be convinced of the
utilitarian value of science by visual and palpable, hence
"sensory" proof of the benefits to be gained from the
natural sciences.

The basic principle Shchapov relied upon was the
concept that science at work would impress the masses.
He reasoned that if Russians came to understand the
usefulness of applied science, they would pursue the new
knowledge as something necessary for their practical
economic interests. Theoretical knowledge could be
developed, through schools and demonstrations, after the
senses had been used to interest the workers. Shchapov
also theorized that Russia would eventually have to
follow the path toward a new science oriented system of
"public" (vserodnyi) education.

The theory that Russians could be educated through
the senses was a key link in Shchapov's ideas on education.

---

86 Ibid., p. 309.
87 Ibid., p. 313.
In one of his preliminary studies, the article "The Historical Conditions" published in 1868, Shchapov cited a few sources to fortify the basic sense theory which he later used in The Social-pedagogical Conditions. These sources reveal much about the genesis of Shchapov's ideas concerning education through the external senses.

In the summary which ended "The Historical Conditions" Shchapov cited Russian translations of Baron von Humboldt's Cosmos: A Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe; The Works of Dugald Stewart; and an essay by John Tyndall, a British scientist. Tyndall's essay "On the Importance of the Study of Physics" was in a book edited by E. L. Youmans and originally entitled The Culture Demanded by Modern Life; A series of Addresses and Arguments on the Claims of Scientific Education.

Youman's book which includes essays by T. H. Huxley, 88

88. Shchapov, Sochineniiia, II, 616-20. Baron von Humboldt (1769-1859) a geographer and naturalist, was an extremely prominent member of the European scientific community during his lifetime. Dugald Stewart (1753-1828) was a well-known proponent of the Scottish "common sense" philosophy. John Tyndall (1820-1893) was a British natural philosopher renowned for his studies of light, air, and radiant heat.

89. E. L. Youmans (1821-1887) was an American devotee of Herbert Spencer's thought. The Culture Demanded by Modern Life was published in New York in 1867.
M. Faraday, and von Liebig was used by Shchapov as a source for Western thought and knowledge of physiology.  

Some of the material which Shchapov cited from Stewart and Tyndall is striking. For instance, Shchapov's quotation from Stewart contains the following lines:

Practical knowledge of physical laws is inscribed by the hand of nature in the organs of the external senses. . . . In the operations of manufacturing and the arts lies an astonishing number of scientific principles. . . .

From Tyndall, who was interested in the rehabilitation of factory workers, Shchapov drew a long quotation which included a somewhat fascinating passage:

Besides, our factories and mills present a wide field for observation, and if those who work in them, became able, by previous education, to appreciate that which they see, then science would be enriched by innumerable gains. Who can say what Samsons of the intellectual world are working at the present moment with closed eyes in our Manchester and Birmingham forges and mills. Give these Samsons visions, grant them some knowledge of physics, and you increase the chances of discovery and with this you widen the field of future national well-being.

What else but a blind and bound Samson did Shchapov see in his beloved Russian peasant? It was indeed in the factories, and all places of work, that Shchapov saw the

---

90 T. H. Huxley (1825-1895) was the well-known biologist, educator, and advocate of Darwinian thought. Michael Faraday (1791-1867) gained fame as a physicist and chemist. Justus von Liebig (1803-1873) was significant for his research in chemistry.

91 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 617.

92 Ibid., p. 618.
means to pierce the mental darkness of the masses.

In *The Social-pedagogical Conditions* Shchapov did not limit himself strictly to questions of intellectual development. The question of social organization was also linked to the plan for a better future. Shchapov argued that the working people, through colonization, had expanded across Russia and established communal organizations—notably the "commune" (obshchina). It was time, Shchapov believed, to reconstruct the nation; a young scientifically oriented generation should give a rational scientific basis to the previously established communal organizations. In essence, Shchapov wanted to apply science to the economy and to retain Russia's communal heritage.

Shchapov concluded *The Social-pedagogical Conditions* with a reminder that Russians, in general, did not understand that a radical transformation of the national worldview, through science, was necessary. Old ideas and traditions were still strong, and Shchapov, echoing materialist concepts, noted that only intelligent people understood the impact of the Russian land on the

93 At this point in his writings Shchapov did not stress the role of the State in colonization or the role played by force and violence in the formation of communes.  
stomach, brain, life, and mind. The public, according to Shchapov, did not understand that the common people should master the natural sciences in order to gain mastery over the forces of nature which dominated their lives and work. That every rural laborer should become an "agriculturalist-experimenter" or a "farmer-naturalist" was clear to Shchapov, but he also believed that Russia was clinging to the idea that the common people need not be educated for, besides being unnecessary and harmful, education was not in keeping with their proper station in life. Thus, Shchapov presented an educational plan which was essentially abstract in character—a basic policy was recommended, but all of the details of an educational system were not included.

Conclusions—Part I

In general, Shchapov's views on pedagogy are clearly consistent with the Populist tradition of education formulated by N. G. Chernyshevsky, N. A. Dobroliubov,
and D. I. Pisarev. The necessity of a scientific approach to the world, the commitment "to go to the people" with education, the attack on a priori reasoning, the belief that men and women should be trained for a useful role in society, and the interest in technological education were major elements in the Populist tradition shared by Shchapov.

While he was familiar with all of the ideas of Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, and Pisarev, Shchapov's intense belief in the value of the sciences links him especially with Pisarev. Often regarded as a Nihilist, Pisarev was an important influence on the Populist movement of the 1860's. Pisarev is especially known for his stress on the need to spread scientific knowledge. In matters of education Pisarev was opposed to reliance upon the memory, the contemporary method of teaching history, and the study of Greek and Latin. He was committed to

---

95 See N. Hans The Russian Tradition in Education (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), pp. 107-29, for a chapter entitled "Socialists and Populists: The Materialistic Trend," which discusses the pedagogical views of the Populist leaders. Dobroliubov was Chernyshevsky's brilliant collaborator on The Contemporary. Dobroliubov's Collected Works (Sobranie sochinenii), 9 volumes, were published in Leningrad between 1961 and 1964. Pisarev, a journalist, was feared by the State as a Nihilist. Pisarev's Works (Sochinenia), 4 volumes, were published in Moscow in 1955 and 1956.
the study of nature, the utilitarian value of the natural sciences, and the "necessity of natural science as the basis of a rationally organized general education."  

Considered within the spectrum of Russian thought from the 1850's to 1917, Shchapov's ideas on pedagogy place him in the ranks of the liberals, Populists, and revolutionaries who were hostile to the direction Russian education took under the State, especially with the "Tolstoy system" instituted between 1871 and 1874. The system established by Count Dmitri Tolstoy (1823-1889), Oberprocurator of the Holy Synod and Minister of Public Education, stressed government regulation of the secondary schools, realschule training for local needs and practical education, the classical curriculum as preparation for university careers and government employment, and tightly centralized supervision of education by the State.  

Until the revolutions of the early twentieth century, the "Tolstoy system" remained the core of the State's apparatus for directing and controlling social change. 

At a time when there were sentiments for more public control of education, the bureaucratic grip on

96 Hans, p. 124.
97 Alston, p. 86.
schooling symbolized by the "Tolstoy system" became a target for the student intelligentsia and a variety of educated Russians. Wide opposition to "the system" was united in distaste for the study of Greek and Latin. However, there was more to the conflict:

But for all the pedagogical arguments for or against, the two language requirements [Greek and Latin] were only the pretext of the underlying contest between the bureaucracy and the public for control of education and through it of the future of Russian politics.

Similarly, Nicholas Hans concluded that the split between the attackers and the defenders of classical training corresponded to the split between the advocates of reform and reaction. Hans also noted that the intelligentsia, including radicals and liberals, advocated scientific education. Lenin, who supported polytechnical education, and the Bolsheviks settled the dispute by giving Soviet education a "scientific-utilitarian basis." Thus, Shchapov's faith that Russia had to turn to science was vindicated by history.

The two major features of Shchapov's analysis of the "Russian mind" and intellectual progress were his conviction that Russians had to respond to Western

---

98 Hans, p. 156.
99 Alston, p. 134.
influences and the belief that intellectual and educational progress, though it was slow and difficult, could be stimulated through the utilization of "sensory" learning for instruction in the sciences. Shchapov's writings contain a challenging mixture of extremely theoretical theses and a knowledgeable acquaintance with most of the important movements and thinkers in Russian and Western European intellectual history.

When discussing the workings of the "Russian mind" notably in the "Natural-psychological Conditions," Shchapov drew on the feeling that his countrymen were, to some degree, mentally backward and the ideas of prominent European such as John Stuart Mill, Claude Bernard, and von Helmholtz to theorize that the nervous organization of Russians could be understood and was conditioned by the cold climate and a long history of ethnic influences from non-Slavic peoples. Mill's "ethology" which dealt with the formation of national character, was particularly important to Shchapov. The "laws" of psychology, physiology, and "ethology" also furnished an explanation of the processes by which Russia could extract itself from the morass. The nervous system had to react to new and powerful "impressions" from the West.
In the seventeenth century Shchapov saw the development of "xenomania" in a new Russian-European ethnic generation. Thus, Western influences were contesting with local, Asian, and Byzantine influences for control of the "Russian mind." The reign of Peter I supplied the decisive force for the historic turn to the West.

The way to a better future was to follow the path of Western ideas. Shchapov found hope for Russia in the concept that people with inadequately developed "receptivity" were innately suited for certain types of learning including study of the sciences. The need to receive a proper scientific and moral education was a corollary to the innate capacity concept.

To support his overview of intellectual progress Shchapov cited Claude Bernard's ideas on definite stages in the development of the mind. The ultimate stage of development, according to both authors, was characterized by use of the experimental method. Thus, to Shchapov the "Russian mind" was understandable, and he assumed that Western influences were fundamental in bringing about needed intellectual progress— the "natural-
psychological" processes acted to bring about "social-pedagogical" changes.

Shchapov's book The Social-pedagogical Conditions was the vehicle for his most ambitious discussion of intellectual and educational reform. Difficulties in educating the nation and changing the popular worldview were stressed in this book, thus it provided a balance to the positive, aggressive theorizing which distinguished "The Natural-psychological Conditions." The book and the article also differ somewhat in the phases assigned to intellectual growth. However, both works led to the same conclusion: Russia must progress to the experimental method of thought. The Social-pedagogical Conditions was structured around the premise that while Church and State failed to create a thinking class, the unique "sensory" learning inherent in Russians could be used, in combination with polytechnical education to bring about an intellectual reformation embracing the long-neglected peasant masses.

The achievements and failures of four post-Petrine generations were analyzed. The career of Lomonosov, expeditions sponsored by the State, and an interest in realschule education were the most positive features of
the first generation. However, learning was still weak in Russia and the generation, in general, was marked by "stupidity." Shchapov ascribed a rather modest advance in intellectual development to the second generation (1755-1815). Limited progress in science and literature were the most attractive aspects of a generation characterized by many failures including "partial-understanding" indifference to learning, and, most significantly, a "schism" in the mind.

Using Novikov and the Masons as his prime example, Shchapov described a drift into mysticism which he attributed to weaknesses in intellectual development and a somewhat confused pursuit of morality. Interpreting any propensity to equivocate with science as a mental "schism," Shchapov perceived a link between mysticism and the unfortunate obscurantism which reached a peak under Nicholas I in the third generation (1815-1850's).

When describing the third generation, Shchapov again depicted a degree of progress by a small group of scholars and literary men. Furthermore, archeologism and German philosophy made positive contributions to the era. But the negative aspects of the generation which included mysticism and obscurantism, as well as censorship,
irrelevant or useless scholarship in classicism and
archeologism, false skepticism, and the pursuit of the
non-scientific German philosophy were more significant
to Shchapov. The fourth generation was not discussed in
detail, but it was also criticized for too little pro­
gress toward the creation of a rational society.

Shchapov's answer to Russia's problems centered
upon the need to instill philosophic doubt and experi­
mental thought in the "Russian mind." The older, a priori
method of thinking had to be overthrown in order to rid
the nation of anomalies and mental deficiencies. How­
ever, the communal social system was to be retained.
The masses, through the study of science, were to conquer
the harsh Russian land and the natural economy. Educated
people were to train the workers to appreciate scientific
knowledge. Preliminary studies by Shchapov, utilizing
the ideas of figures such as Baron von Humboldt, John
Tyndall, and Dugald Stewart, laid the foundation for the
theory that "sensory" learning was the vital technique
for training of the workers. With his advocacy of mass,
polytechnical education, Shchapov was calling for revolu­
tionary changes in pedagogical practices which would
act on the national worldview.
PART II

A. P. SHCHAPOV ON THE HISTORY OF

WOMEN IN RUSSIA
CHAPTER III

RUSSIAN WOMEN FROM THE Earliest TIMES TO

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The "Woman Question"

A. P. Shchapov devoted a significant portion of
his scholarly work, after 1863, to the "woman question."
The term "woman question" is generally used in reference
to problems of change in the familial, sexual, social,
legal, political, or educational status of women in the
nineteenth century. 1 Tsarist laws and customs clearly

1 Various aspects of the "woman question" may be
familiar to students of Russian history from authoritative
secondary sources such as Martin Malia's Alexander Herzen
and Venturi's Roots of Revolution. Chernyshevsky's What
Is To Be Done? has long been known as an influential novel
in the history of the "woman question" in Russia. A
Soviet publication, Liubov liudei shestidesiatykh godov
(1929), is frequently cited in scholarly discussions of
Chernyshevsky's ideas. Fannina Halle's Women in Soviet
Russia, available in English since 1933, contains a survey
of the history of Russian women from pre-Christian times
to 1917. An unpublished doctoral dissertation by Richard
Stites "The Question of the Emancipation of Women in
Nineteenth Century Russia" emphasized the period from 1855
to 1881 and is an extremely useful source of information.
I wish to express my thanks to Richard Stites for allowing
me to read his dissertation.
delineated the restrictions on women. Marriage of a young woman was not allowed without parental consent, and the restrictions of the Russian Orthodox Church made divorce difficult to obtain. Wives were required by explicit laws to obey their husbands, accompany them on journeys, and to reside with them. Freedom of movement for women was further restricted by passport regulations which allowed parents and husbands to control travel by daughters and wives. A wife could not seek the limited employment allowed to women without permission of her husband, and university education for women was difficult to obtain prior to the 1870's. In Russia, the restrictions placed on women led virtually every important thinker of the nineteenth century to concern himself, to a greater or lesser degree, with the problems of women.

Martin Malia has outlined Alexander Herzen's ideological approach to questions of love and marriage. Herzen felt that he had resolved the dichotomy between

---


3 See Martin Malia, Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1965), pp. 257-77, for an interesting chapter entitled "Realism in Love: George Sand."
egoism and love in a new morality of "rational egoism."

Life-long fidelity in love was scorned by Herzen. But, as Malia noted, this was an ideological position, and Herzen never brought himself to abandon his wife, even under severe emotional stress.  

What is most fascinating, in regard to Herzen, is Malia's contention that questions related to love and women played a more direct role in bringing Herzen to a socialist viewpoint than did matters related to economics. Malia used a quotation from Herzen's diary in pointing out that "the first practical question" herzen asked was:

> Why is it that in general woman is rarely able to give herself to living, social interests, but instead leads a purely private life? Why is it she torments herself with personal questions and can be happy only through personal life? What changes will socialism bring in this respect?®

In discussing radical thought during Herzen's generation, Malia concluded that feminism was a "paramount concern" and that questions related to the role of women" . . . play a surprisingly large role in radical

---

5 Malia, p. 274.
6 Ibid., citing Herzen, Dnevnik (Diary), 26 May, 1843.
thinking of the day." Freedom for the individual was
total to Herzen and his contemporaries, therefore, as
Malia concluded, women as individuals were to share in
the emancipation from the shackles of the past.

Vissarion Belinskii, truly a seminal figure in
Russian radical thought, may also be cited as another
example of the growing concern about the position of
women in Russian society. Malia used the following quo­
tations from Belinskii:

What is it to me that the state is founded on
abstract marriage? It is also founded on the
hangman with a knout in his hands.

When people become human and Christian, when
society has at last attained its ideal develop­
ment, then there will be no more marriages.
Away with these frightful bonds. Give us life,
freedom!

In his masterful study Roots of Revolution Franco
Venturi stated that the radical group known as "Young
Russia" made it a point to condemn contemporary family
relationships. Venturi also narrated how M. L.
Mikhailov (1826-1865), a contributor to the Sovremennik,
inaugurated an intense debate on the "woman question" in

\[\text{Malia, p. 266.}\]

\[\text{Ibid., p. 259, citing Belinskii, Pisma (Letters), II, 188 and 220.}\]

\[\text{Venturi, p. 292.}\]
the 1860's through articles which discussed Pierre Proudhon's antifeminist views.\textsuperscript{10}

D. I. Pisarev, the spokesman of the Nihilist generation, was still another important radical with a view on the "woman question." Pisarev wrote:

It is impossible to regard woman as an instrument to be employed in family life and useful in bringing up children; it must not be forgotten that a woman is an independent individual, with her own spiritual needs and with a right to her independent development.\textsuperscript{11}

It was not Pisarev, however, but N. G. Chernyshevsky who put forth the most important radical statement on the question of women, morals, and marriage.

Chernyshevsky's novel \textit{What Is To Be Done?} was written in 1863 as a contribution to the polemical debate over the status of women and the organization of family life. F. L. Barghoorn found three basic themes in this novel--male-female relationships and marital questions; the economic position of females; and the question of

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., pp. 244-45.

poverty. Chernyshevsky was described as an advocate of freedom for women, trial marriages, and "harmony of the partners" as the only criteria for a marriage.

However, a Soviet publication of the late 1920's provided a more detailed explanation of Chernyshevsky's thought and the whole question of the status of women and the organization of the family. Loves of the People of the Sixties (Liubov liudei shestidesiatykh godov) described the search for the "forms and norms" of personal and social relationships. The radical intelligentsia is described as dominated by ideals of utopian communism, a philosophy of materialism, and the conviction that reason could be used to solve all problems. Social life, according to a radical worldview, should be arranged


13 Tatiana A. Bogdanovich, Liubov liudei shestidesiatykh godov (Leningrad, 1929). T. A. Bogdanovich wrote Part I (pp. 1-64) which described radical thought on the "woman question," marriage, and matters related to sex and morals. Part II (pp. 65-438) is a compilation of primary source materials which described the personal views of N. G. Chernyshevsky, N. V. Shelgunov, I. M. Sechenov, and P. I. Bokov on matters related to the "new morals" of the 1860's.

14 Ibid., p. 9.
in a logical pattern. The basic cell (iacheika) of society was the family; however, family relationships were regarded as perverted by tradition and custom. Reconstructing the family on a rational basis became a major concern of the intelligentsia.

The "new family" was to be centered upon conjugal love, but this love was to differ from the conventional ideas of society. The radicals were calling for a change in the nature of the feelings which bound people together. According to Loves of the People of the Sixties, conventional feelings of love were thought to be unreasonable and led to suffering, exploitation, and misery, especially for women. Therefore, reason should be applied to love, and in accord with a theory of "rational egoism" the ideals of freedom and equality would form the basis of a new type of family life. Wives and children were to be freed from the "despotism and tyranny" of husbands and fathers. At this time idealistic young men helped to free girls from their parents by the so-called "fictitious marriage"—a ruse which used legal marriage as a device to allow the girl to leave her parents' home.

---

15 Ibid., p. 12.
Mikhailov's series of articles in the Sovremennik were stressed as "sensational" journalism which brought forth an "earthquake" response in the Russian press concerning the "woman question." Loves of the People of the Sixties related the story of a raging debate which included every segment of the political spectrum. The Slavophiles were apparently brought into the debate, and a women's journal Daybreak (Rassvet), was also involved. The "woman question" was one of the first issues which led to the "furious quarrel" between the radicals of the 1860's and their conservative protagonists.

Radical ideas on female emancipation were attacked as signaling the destruction of family life and the coming of an age of depravity. Nihilists and radical publicists, notably Chernyshevsky, were ridiculed in many stories and novels such as The Mirage (Marevo). Opponents of the new thought on women linked the "woman question" with Nihilism.

It was at this time of polemical debate that Chernyshevsky wrote What Is To Be Done?. Tatiana

---

16 Ibid., pp. 14-15. Bogdanovich described the various factions drawn into the debate.

17 Ibid., p. 16.
Bogdanovich made the interesting observation that Chernyshevsky "took virtually no part in the theoretical discussion of the woman question," but that his novel made up for any previous lack of involvement in the issue. Opponents of Chernyshevsky argued that the book was "abominable dirt" and the "most disgraceful production of Russian literature." What Is To Be Done? became a classic of Russian radical literature. Venturi wrote that the novel "became a blueprint of life for the young intelligentsia." Chernyshevsky's book was by no means restricted to a discussion of the "woman question," but the female character Vera Pavlovna obviously reflected concern for the status of women in society. Bogdanovich described Chernyshevsky as recognizing the right of women to equality and freedom in love and marriage.

Chernyshevsky was not regarded as the originator of these ideas; he was discussed as a writer who reflected some generally held concepts among radicals.

18 Ibid., p. 17.
19 Ibid.
20 Venturi, p. 179.
21 Bogdanovich, p. VI.
However, it does appear that Chernyshevsky was the originator of the idea that women had to be granted superiority in personal relationships in order to compensate for the centuries of domination by males.\textsuperscript{22} As discussed in \textit{Loves of the People of the Sixties}, women were to be granted superiority so that they might make the transition from an inferior status to equality with men more rapidly. A husband was to place his wife higher than himself, temporarily, to redress the inequities of society. Bogdanovich maintained that the idea of a superior status for women became an important part of the radical ideology of the 1860's.\textsuperscript{23}

The radicals apparently saw true socialism in Chernyshevsky's discussion of a new morality and a new family organization based on freedom and equality of partners. New people would be formed in a new society due to the reorganization of the family—the basic cell of society. Women would be free to marry if, and only if, they desired.

In the decades after the 1860's the "woman

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 15. See also Adam B. Ulam, \textit{The Bolsheviks} (New York: Collier Books, 1968), pp. 56-57, for additional discussion of Chernyshevsky's willingness to grant freedom to women.

\textsuperscript{23} Bogdanovich, p. 15.
question" became part of the radical program for revolutionary change, and it was taken for granted that after revolution occurred, specifically female goals would be reached. This basic position was evident in the manifesto To Women, From Russian Revolutionary Society (Ot russkogo revoliutsionnogo obshchestva k zhenshchinam):

Together with the working classes you must destroy the empire of the gentry. And with it you must destroy all its laws which stifle the people. Only then will the field be open for women to work freely. . . . Only by doing away with private property can one do away with the legal family.

In the 1870's, the great decade of Populism, polemical writings by revolutionaries concerning the "woman question" decreased, while radical women participated in a myriad of revolutionary organizations. Two of the most famous groups of the late 1870's Zemlia i Volia and Narodnaia Volia devoted little literary effort to the "woman question." However, female terrorists

24 Stites, p. 327. See also Lydia Nadejena, "The Great Transformation in Russia," Woman's Coming of Age, ed. Samuel D. Schmalhausen and V. F. Calvertion (New York: Horace Liveright Inc., 1931), pp. 519-20, for a discussion of the merging of the women's movement with the drive toward socialist revolution in Russia.

25 Venturi, p. 382.

26 Stites, pp. 389-93.
of Narodnaia Volia played an important part in the assassination of Alexander II in 1881.

As radical women were subordinating their goals to the revolutionary movement, moderate women worked for reform within the tsarist system. A clear division in the ranks of female reformers had occurred in 1865-66 after Karakazov's attempted assassination of Alexander II. Moderate women did not wish to be linked with radical women who were tagged with the pejorative term "Nihilist." Moderate leaders emphasized legal reforms in areas such as education, employment, and redemption of prostitutes, but the moderates drastically differed from the so-called Nihilists in not emphasizing sexual freedom for women. The triumph of the moderates came in the 1870's when women students were allowed to study in all of the tsarist universities. With these educational reforms, Russia was in advance of Western Europe in the field of education for women.

Thus, this brief introduction to the "woman question" is intended to demonstrate that revolutionaries and reformers were very concerned about the issue. The

\[27\text{See Ibid., pp. 173-90, for more discussion of moderate and "Nihilist" women.}\]
"woman question" was one of the problems discussed in the "thick journals" of the intelligentsia. Radicals and moderates differed in their approach to the solutions of problems facing women. Revolutionary groups admitted women into their ranks, and the State granted significant reforms in university education for women. This was the historical situation in which A. P. Shchapov contributed to the literature on the "woman question" through a series of articles dealing with the history of women in Russia.

Women from Antiquity to the Reign of Peter I

In order to explain the distant origins of the suppression of women in pre-Christian Russia, Shchapov wrote "The Influence of the Worldview of Society on the Social Position of Women in Russia" ("Vliianie obshchestvennogo mirosozertsaniia na sotsialnoe polozhenie zhenshchiny v Rossii"). This article discussed two

related topics—the place of women in the past and factors within the worldview of the ancient Slavs, before and after the Varangian influx, which contributed to the suppression of women. Analyzing sources such as Old Russian Poems (Drevniia russkiia stikhovneniiia) and Monuments of Old Russian Literature (Pamiatniki starinnoi russkoi literature) Shchapov came to the conclusion that in the far distant past Slavic women physically resisted male domination. A "primitive sexual struggle" had taken place; women fought with men as the old tales revealed:

29 Old Russian Poems first appeared in 1804, and since then the collection has had a complicated publishing history with several editions produced, including a Soviet edition in 1938. The original title is cited above. Shchapov did not give the date of the edition he was using. N. K. Gudzy, a Soviet authority on Slavic literature, regarded Old Russian Poems as an important collection of genuine folk culture. See N. K. Gudzy, History of Early Russian Literature, translated by S. W. Jones (New York: MacMillan Co., 1949), p. 12.

Gudzy also briefly discusses Count Kushelev-Bezborodko's Monuments of Old Russian Literature a serial publication cited frequently by Shchapov. See Gudzy, p. 17. A. N. Pypin (1833-1904), a prominent scholar in the fields of history, literature, and ethnography and N. I. Kostomarov (1817-1885), a specialist in Ukrainian history, ethnography, and the study of the lives of the "common people" were among the contributors to Monuments of Old Russian Literature.
She tore the arm from the shoulder of
the first fighter,
And she broke the leg of the second,
the third she beat across the back,
she wounded him in the middle of the
courtyard.\textsuperscript{30}

Shchapov concluded, partly from old poetry, that physical
strength was the "first basis of marriage."\textsuperscript{31} He also
believed that through hunting and warfare the physical
prowess of men increased, and that pregnancy, childbirth,
and the care of children increased the dependency of
women upon men.

Women, according to Shchapov, carried the sexual
struggle into sorcery and witchcraft in an effort to
resist male domination. Defeated physically, women
were described as using magic and sorcery in a struggle
for "liberty and equality."\textsuperscript{32} This is a good example of
the highly interpretive nature of Shchapov's approach to
the history of women. The fact that there were legends
about beautiful goddesses was understood to mean that
women were trying to use their beauty in the struggle

\textsuperscript{30}Shchapov, Sochinenia, II, 61, citing Old Russian Poems. Shchapov was not the only author to be
interested in the physical prowess of Slavic women. For
a brief discussion of Slavic women warriors in combat
against the Byzantine Greeks see Lydia Nadejena, "The Great
Transformation in Russia" Woman's Coming of Age, ed. S. D.
Schmalhausen and D. Calverton (New York: Horace Liveright,

\textsuperscript{31}Shchapov, Sochinenia, II, 61.

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., pp. 62-63.
against men. But the crude muscular force of men was credited with overcoming inhibitions concerning feminine beauty as a magic force and the possession of evil powers by witches. Shchapov made it clear that the strength and violence of males led to the brutal subjugation of women in ancient Slavic society. The warrior, the bogatyr, emerged victorious in the war of the sexes.\(^{33}\)

Ancient customs of marriage were also discussed as evidence of the suppression of women.\(^{34}\) Shchapov described three types of marriage—incestuous marriage or consanguineous union; marriage through ravishment or by violent seizure of women; and marriages arranged by the families of the bride and groom.\(^{35}\) Incestuous marriage and union by ravishment were condemned by Shchapov as "zoological" practices of ancient Slavic tribes such as

---

\(^{33}\) See Gudzy, p. 204, for a description of the bogatyr as "a legendary man of extraordinary strength and success; a hero of byliny [epic tales], a kindly Russian giant." Shchapov would have endorsed this description with an emphasis on the strength of the bogatyr as the major identifying characteristic.

\(^{34}\) See Gudzy, pp. 127-38, for a discussion of marriage customs similar to Shchapov's description. Gudzy also discussed some legends about the Avars, Poles, and Hungarians harnessing women to plows. See also Maxim Kovalesky, Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia (London: Nutt Co., 1891), pp. 6-13, for additional commentary upon incest, morality, and forced marriages among the ancient Russians.

\(^{35}\) Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 73.
the Derevlians, Severians, Radimichians, and Viatchians.

Citing several sources, including S. M. Solovev, N. M. Karamzin, and Ancient Russian Poems, Shchapov presented the ancient Slavs as a lewd and shameless people given to incest and the practice of marriage between close relatives or members of the same tribe. Progress occurred gradually when customs of endogamous marriage declined in favor of the practice of taking wives from "foreign" (chuzhoi) tribes or from families not closely related. Shchapov cited Charles Darwin (1809-1882) on the beneficial results of exogamy—the offspring of non-related parents were stronger.

The practice of seizing and ravishing women from other tribes or villages was yet another phase in the subjugation of women. Shchapov noted that the seizure of

---

36 Ibid., p. 65. S. M. Solovev (1820-1879) was a major contributor to the development of historical scholarship in Russia. His works include the twenty-nine volume study History of Russia from the Earliest Times (Istoriia Rossii s drevnieishikh vremen). N. M. Karamzin (1766-1826) is best known for his defense of the autocratic state, the nobility, and the institution of serfdom, Karamzin's works include The History of the Russian State (Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago).

37 Ibid., p. 66. Shchapov's reference cited Priruchennia zhivotnyia i vozdelannyia rasteniia by Charles Darwin which suggests a translated version of Darwin's The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication.
women was often a cause of war between the ancient tribes. Compensation for the loss of women was often sought, and Shchapov commented that traces of this practice were still observable among the "common people" in the custom of prospective suitors haggling over a payment to the family of the bride.  

Marriages arranged between families were interpreted as another phase in the suppression of women. The arranged marriage was linked to the rise of city living, especially around Kiev in the area of the Polianian tribe. Shchapov, again citing Solovev, outlined the concept that in the cities tribal identity broke down and people considered themselves increasingly as members of families. In the close quarters of urban living the older custom of seizing women declined, and families developed the custom of arranging marriages. The arranged marriage was often used to solidify relationships between families, but even in this case the bride was subjected to the "despotic" will of her family.

There was another interesting aspect of this third form of marriage. In Shchapov's view the arranged

---

38 Ibid., p. 68.
39 Ibid., p. 71.
union held some hopes for the happiness of the partners, and he believed that with this form of marriage people first began to feel real emotions of love. However, in line with his belief that the ancient Slavs were dominated by a great fear of "secret forces" which interfered in human destiny, Shchapov presented the interesting idea that the "spirit" or "essence" of love was regarded as an evil force—a demonic supernatural power which tormented helpless humans. The worship of Lada, the pagan Slavic love-goddess, was linked by Shchapov to fears and apprehensions related to beauty, love and marriage.

In order to illustrate the legal status of women Shchapov cited the ancient law code known as Russian

40 Ibid., pp. 74-76. It is interesting to note that Gudzy, when describing literature of the Kievan period, wrote, "Human behavior, like historical events, was ascribed for the most part to the interference of an outside force, good or evil." (Gudzy, p. 181). Shchapov would have subscribed to this statement with a stress on evil forces.

51 Shchapov also knew of Lada as the goddess of fecundity—a rather generous and benevolent figure. It was typical of Shchapov to stress the aspect of fear in his commentary on Lada.
Justice (Russkaia Pravda). In a brief summary of the provisions of the law which limited the rights of women, he noted that unmarried women were not allowed to be independent members of a commune (obshchina), or independent members of a family (rod); sisters were not allowed to receive an inheritance from deceased brothers, and widows were to be deprived of an inheritance if they remarried. To further illustrate the status of women, Shchapov cited the system of fines or compensation (wergeld) in Russian Justice. A fine of 40 grivna (the ancient monetary unit) was levied for the murder of a male commoner, but the fine for the murder of a woman was only 20 grivna. Shchapov's summary did not include every article of Russian Justice which referred to women, but it is clear from that document that women did not have

---

42 The Russian Justice was the first law code compiled in Russia. The so-called Short Version of the code was compiled in the eleventh century. In the twelfth century an Expanded Version of the code was finished. See Medieval Russian Laws, translated by George Vernadsky (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947) for a discussion of Russian Justice and copies of both versions.

43 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 80.
equal rights with men. \textsuperscript{44}

Shchapov's thesis on the suppression of women seems to be refuted by the well-established fact that Princess Olga (regent 945-964) was one of the most renowned leaders in early Russian history. Shchapov admitted that in a very few cases the familial or social positions of some women were above the normally depressed level he described. After citing a passage from Solovev's \textit{History of Russia} which mentioned the tradition of Olga as the wisest person of her times, Shchapov concluded that infrequent exceptions to the general practice of the suppression of women did not invalidate his thesis that women had been discriminated against in a male dominated society. \textsuperscript{45}

In addition to laws and customs pertaining

\textsuperscript{44} Shchapov, imbued with nineteenth century concepts of social justice, stressed the negative aspects of the past. Thus the limitations on the rights of women in \textit{Russian Justice} were more important to Shchapov than some of the provisions which provided for the welfare of women. For instance, in the \textit{Russian Justice (Expanded Version)}, Article 93 reads:

If the wife survives her husband, she receives a portion [of the estate in usufruct]; and whatever her husband gives her [by a special settlement], she owns that, but she does not inherit the estate (p. 51, \textit{Medieval Russian Laws}). Shchapov interpreted this kind of evidence to emphasize what the law took from women, not the protection given to women.

\textsuperscript{45} Shchapov, \textit{Sochineniiia}, II, 70.
directly to women, Shchapov put great emphasis on trying
to characterize the general nature of Slavic society.
The defeat of women, as explained by Shchapov, becomes
more understandable if we keep in mind his hypothesis
that not only women, but the majority of the population
were subject to rule by the physically strong. From his
interest in anthropology and physiology it was axiomatic
to Shchapov that fear and physical force dominated the
worldview of the ancient Slavs and were determining
factors in shaping the social structure of the Kievan
period.

One of the fundamental concepts on which Shchapov
based his analysis of the past was that fear of "secret
forces of human and external nature" dominated the
worldview of the ancient Slavs. The commitment to a
scientific explanation of human conduct was obvious when
Shchapov stated that the Slavs were acting according to
the "general law of primitive psychic development of all
peoples." Thus, the Slavs were said to be in the "first
phase of mental development" in which fear dominated all

---

Shchapov was not alone in analyzing literature by discussing the "psychic" attributes of people in the past. See Gudzy, p. 20, for comments on the "anthropological" school of literary analysis in the nineteenth century which focused on, "the psychic attributes of human beings at fixed stages of cultural development."
other feelings. Fear was the "dominating motif" of psychic development and the major source of "external manifestations of mental activity."

Shchapov explained that the ancients had no scientific understanding of their environment and that they lacked a system of rational speculation concerning man and nature—anything that was not understood was feared. Thus, any strange or unexplained phenomena—Shchapov mentioned a meteor as one example—produced fear in the minds of men. In the primitive phase of intellectual development the reflexes of fear were alleged to be more developed than the processes of rational speculation. Citing the physiologist Sechenov, Shchapov digressed into an explanation of how stimuli affect the brain and nervous system to produce a quick muscular response. Through stimulation of the nervous system it was believed that fear became instinctive and dominated the response of man to his environment. Having cited a scientific authority on human behavior, Shchapov concluded, "The whole worldview of the people and the social system necessarily had to develop pre-eminently from the

47 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 81.
feelings of fear of unknown, secret forces of human and external nature, and it was motivated by the instinct of self-preservation." Thus, physiology seemed to explain a large part of mental development.

Shchapov combined his physiological explanation of human conduct with his knowledge of folklore and old literature to discuss the theogony of ancient Slavic gods. From a variety of sources, including the works of Afanasev, Buslaev, and Kostomarov, Shchapov gleaned information about the myths, legends, and customs of the past. He felt that the pantheon of old gods was linked to things which produced instinctive fear in man. Thus, he linked the ancient gods with phenomena seen, heard, or felt by man, but not understood--Perun, the god of thunder; Stribog, the god of the winds; and Dashbog or Khors, the sun god, were cited as examples of the personification of natural phenomena. To further demonstrate

48 Ibid., p. 83.
49 A. N. Afanasev (1826-1871) was a scholar in the field of folk literature. His publications include The Poetical Views of the Slavs of Nature (Poeticheskiiia vozziensniiia slavian na prirodu). F. I. Buslaev (1818-1897) was the author of numerous works on Slavic literature, and he is regarded by Gudzy as one of Russia's most important literary historians.
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the ignorance and fears of the ancient Slavs, Shchapov described the great terror produced by an eclipse of the sun, the practice of the divination of human fate through the interpretation of natural phenomena, the belief in witchcraft and sorcery, and the superstitious belief in the "evil eye." 51

According to Shchapov, physical power instilled the greatest fear in the ancients. Fear of physical power was considered to be a typical characteristic of the "primitive period" of human development which he described as, "the period of special utilization of crude muscular strength." 52 This was described as a phase of the past in which warfare, hunting, pillaging, robbery, and debauchery prevailed. The deeds of warriors were glorified, and the fear of physical power dominated all men caught up in a vicious struggle for survival.

In Shchapov's view of the "primitive period" muscular, reflexive actions were more highly developed than the rational, thinking processes of the mind. Human feelings or emotions, were expressed in violent physical


52 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 96.
actions; the killing of one's enemies and the ravishment of women are but two examples of human conduct unchecked by rational thought in the "primitive period."

The apotheosis of the legendary Russian warrior was cited by Shchapov as confirmation of the thesis that physical strength instilled the greatest fear and wonder in the ancient Slavs. He maintained that fear of physical power resulted in the practice of praying to the gods for the strength to kill one's enemies. In conjunction with his stress on the role of muscular force, Shchapov also believed that the possession of physical strength was the primitive ideal of human perfection.

Shchapov developed a theory of the bifurcation of Slavic society. He maintained that under the fear of force and the "rule of the strongest" strength was the determining factor which divided the Slavs into "strong men and weak peasant people" (silnykh muzhei i malomozhnykh smerdv-lijudinov). Together with the division by

---

53 As an attempt to condense the history of early Slavic social organization with the impact of the Varangians, Shchapov's description of a bifurcated society will be regarded by some readers as a distortion of the past. However, it should be pointed out that in Shchapov's terms all other social groups were "weak" when compared to the warrior-rulers.

54 Ibid., p. 98.
strength, Shchapov perceived a division between "working" and "non-working" (ruling) people. He placed great emphasis upon the use of the word "strong" (silnyi) in sources such as *Monuments of Old Russian Literature* to illustrate that the strength of warriors was a prominent feature in the tales of the past. Shchapov pointed out that older warriors often possessed the most developed strength and they were able to force younger men into submission. Force was the solution to all disputes over who ruled and who served. The strongest men became the princes and boyars— the weaker functioned as servants, slaves, or members of the military retinue (druzhina). The patrimonial system among the Slavs was mentioned as another example of the rule by the oldest and strongest. Force, according to Shchapov, came to be acknowledged as the source of power and authority, while weakness became the source of slavery and servitude.

The coming of the Varangians was also depicted as another example of the rule of force. Touching on the Norman theory, Shchapov observed that at first the Varangians answered a call from the Slavs, but then the Varangians resorted to the "rule of the strongest,"
conquered the Russian lands, and instilled fear in the Greeks. Apparently the Varangians perfected the process of the division of society by strength which had started earlier. Shchapov was of the opinion that the order imposed by the Varangians resulted in a "two-class population"—a ruling class of the strong and a working class of the weak. Although Shchapov was aware of the variety of terms used to indicate the status of individuals—such as peasant farmer (smerd), slave (rab), indentured peasant (zakup)—he included everyone except princes and boyars in the "weak" or "working class."

Shchapov touched on another controversial topic in Russian history when he theorized that fear of physical force was a basic cause in the formation of communes (obshchiny). Describing the Slavs as a people terorized by murderers, thieves, robbers, and "strong men," Shchapov viewed the formation of communes as an attempt

---


57 Ibid., pp. 102-104.
by oppressed people to band together to fight for self-preservation. Colonization of the forest zones of northeastern Europe was also linked to the factor of fear. Flight to escape from violence was stressed as the motive which led the Slavs to settle in the forests.

However, even in the communal form of organization, Shchapov saw signs that force and muscular reactions were still more developed than the thinking processes of the brain. In murder and fighting Shchapov perceived the muscular expression of passion and feelings. Violence and "zoological" conduct were still rampant in the communes formed for self-protection. The people suffered from violence within the communes and from the oppression of outsiders. Thus, Shchapov concluded that in order to escape from incessant violence, quarreling, robbery, and murder the communes eventually found it necessary to submit to the more orderly rule of the Varangian-Russian princes. 58

In Shchapov's view the princes participated in the struggle against violence. 59 The law code of Kiev

58 Ibid., p. 103.
59 Ibid., pp. 103-104, for Shchapov's summary of his views on the nature of ancient Slavic society.
Russia, Russian Justice, was cited as evidence of an attempt to curb the use of crude physical force and to protect the communes from violence.

Thus in "The Influence of the Worldview of Society" Shchapov presented the suppression of women within an historical interpretation of the pre-Christian era based on the primacy of fear, force, and violence as factors governing history. Describing a "sexual struggle" in the past, Shchapov depicted the defeat of women by physically stronger males. The process of the battle between the sexes paralleled the bifurcation of society into "the strong" and "the weak." Shchapov assumed that the triumph of strength was typical of the "primitive phase" of human development. The "law of the strongest" and a pathetic fear of "the secret forces of human and external nature" were described as the foundations of ancient morality. Violence and the "savage, animal-like manifestation of sexual passion" characterized the earliest period of the history of women in Russia. 60

Shchapov's "The Position of Women in Russia According to the Pre-Petrine View" ("Polozhenie

50 Ibid., p. 104.)
continued the historical narrative of women's history from the Christianization of Russia to the first half of the eighteenth century.\(^{61}\) Monuments of Old Russian Literature was continually cited as a source which revealed attitudes toward women. Various law codes, including the Ulozhenie of 1649, were mentioned to illustrate the juridical status of women as the centuries progressed. The suppression of women was often revealed by references to the Domostroi (Household Ordinance).\(^{63}\) The impact of Byzantine asceticism, the limited property

---


\(^{62}\) The Ulozhenie law code was compiled during the reign of Tsar Alexis (1645-1676), and it remained the basic law code of Russia until the nineteenth century. The bondage of serfs to landowners was legalized by the Ulozhenie.

\(^{63}\) The Domostroi dates from the sixteenth century and is usually attributed to the priest Sylvester. Gudzy characterized the Domostroi as a blueprint, "which provided down to the last detail a positive religious, moral and practical life pattern to aid the family, under the headship of the master of the house, the father and husband, in orienting itself by the rules of monastic communities ...." See Gudzy, pp. 377-48, for additional commentary on the Domostroi.
rights of women, and the history of attitudes toward marriage were important parts of Shchapov's narrative.

Fear of God and women impressed Shchapov as basic ingredients of the Byzantine Christianity selected by Prince Vladimir (978-1015) in 988 as the state religion. Russian Orthodoxy was described as a religion of fear by Shchapov; he did not stress the kenotic aspect of Orthodoxy so well described by George P. Fedotov in his Kievan Christianity. 64 Willing to admit that Christianity had in some ways helped women—for example by attacking polygamy and incestuous marriage—Shchapov, nonetheless, saw Byzantine asceticism as a powerful force working against Russian women. Believing that male domination was a fundamental part of the Byzantine heritage, Shchapov perceived a maturation of the Slavic society under Byzantine influence which had considerable significance in determining the pattern of women's lives.

Fear of God was described by Shchapov as the "first precept of married and family life" according to the Orthodox religion. 65 To illustrate this concept he

---
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cited several sources including the *Domostroi*:

I bless, I teach, I instruct, and I
explain to my son and his wife to
affirm themselves in every fear of God
[Shchapov's italics] and in the law of
the home. 66

Shchapov maintained that through fear of the Christian
God all customs and practices related to marriage were
permeated with strict teachings of the Church.

Women apparently became convinced that marriage
was sacred and the bonds which submitted them to their
husbands had divine sanctions. To support this view
Shchapov cited a tale from the works of F. I. Buslaev
in which a married noble woman wished to enter a monastery
to pursue a holy life. 67 The good woman gave up her
wish and remained at home when her husband cited Church
teachings concerning the indissoluble nature of a
Christian marriage. Strict religious instruction con­
cerning the bonds of marriage were also credited with
creating a reluctance among widows to remarry. 68 However,
if marriage for women was as bad as Shchapov describes,
the widows may have been exercising good judgment.

was cited as a second source of the story of the obedient wife.
Shchapov identified Byzantine ascetism as the factor which created the belief that "woman's nature is extremely evil." Thus, the old pagan fears concerning love and women were replaced or strengthened by Christian teachings. Shchapov placed great emphasis on the "evil women" theme in the old literature. He cited "The Teaching of John Chrysostom" ("Slovo Ioanna Zlatousta"), Chrysostom's "Teaching Concerning Cunning Women" ("Slovo o lukavykh zhenakh") and the "Parable Concerning Women's Wickedness" ("Pritcha o zhenskoi zlobe") among examples of literature which illustrated the Byzantine ascetic fear of women. Monuments of Old Russian Literature, the works of F. I. Buslaev, and the works of N. I. Kostomarov were also used to show that in a variety of anecdotes and tales women were characterized as "evil," "wicked," "diabolical," and "satanic" in accordance with Byzantine thought.

Ibid. Byzantine ascetic teachings and the "evil women" theme in Russian literature are discussed in the following authoritative works: N. I. Gudzy's History of Early Russian Literature (for example pp. 412 and 439); Dmitrij Cizevskij's History of Russian Literature (for example pp. 98-289); and G. P. Fedotov's The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity (for example pp. 231 and 238).

The belief that women were mentally inferior to men was also attributed to the Greek religion. The **Tales of Solomon's Wisdom (Povesti o premudrosti Solomona)** were cited as giving a "sarcastic-derogatory" view of the intellectual powers of women. **71** Monuments of Old Russian Literature provided Shchapov with another observation on the relative mental powers of the sexes:

> I found one intelligent man in a thousand people, but I did not find one intelligent woman in the whole world.**72**

Having identified Byzantine asceticism as the source of pernicious doctrines which spread the "evil women" concept, Shchapov also wanted to show that all of the laws and customs relating to women were permeated with a "religious-social worldview" which reinforced the supremacy of males.

Shchapov began his summary of legal practices by starting with the **Regulations of Church Courts (Ustav o tserkovnykh sudakh)** which dates from the reign of Vladimir I (978–1015). **73** According to Shchapov, this ancient document instructed the clergy to preserve the hegemony of

---


**72** *Ibid.*

husbands and wives. Having cited a document from the Kievan period, Shchapov then turned to the Muscovite era. His general interpretation of the period prior to the coming of Peter I was that husbands were superior to wives in all "moral-juridical" relationships. Shchapov saw a Muscovite custom of making wives share the penalties for crimes committed by husbands as part of an unjust system of relationships between the sexes. To support this generalization Shchapov cited from Solovev's History of Russia in which the story was told of a prince who acknowledged forfeiture of his spouse's life as well as his own if he should fail the Tsar.\textsuperscript{74} Shchapov also found it cruel that prior to 1637 pregnant women guilty of serious crimes could be executed. After 1637 a woman could not be executed until six weeks after the birth of her child.\textsuperscript{75} The Ulozhenie law code instructed wives to fear their husbands, and, according to Shchapov, was silent in regard to the murder of a wife by her husband, but stipulated the death penalty for the murder of a husband by his wife.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p. 111.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., citing Chapter 22 of the Ulozhenie.
The practice of forcing wives to enter monasteries was also discussed as part of a grossly unfair suppression of women. Shchapov had no sympathy for Muscovite customs which allowed infertile women, wives who produced no male heirs, or wives guilty of adultery to be forced to live in religious communities. No doubt Shchapov's pessimistic view of the past was strengthened by evidence which showed that husbands could remarry after disposing of infertile wives.

The monastery was not always a place of doom: Shchapov credited the clergy with saving some women from the horrible penalty of being buried alive as punishment for killing their husbands. From Shchapov's description the women were buried in a way which allowed them to survive for at least one day, apparently to suffocate slowly. He praised the clergy for saving a peasant woman, Zhukova, who was buried alive in the market square at Vladimir in 1677 and two women buried at Moscow in 1682. The women were "dug up" and allowed to live in monasteries.

---

77 Shchapov, Sochinenia, II, 122-23.
78 Ibid., p. 123. Shchapov cited Historical Documents (Akty istoricheskoe) as the source for the story of the women being "buried." Historical Documents was used previously by Shchapov in his study of the schism. See Charles Morley, Guide to Research in Russian History (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1951) for information on the activities of the Archeographic Commission, the agency which published Historical Documents and other large archival collections.
The question of property rights of women in the Muscovite period was introduced by Shchapov to further illuminate harmful Byzantine influences. In the pre-Christian era it was the "law of the strongest" which led to the limitations on the rights of women, but in the "Position of Women" Shchapov linked the practice of not entrusting widows with the property of their husbands to Byzantine teachings which denigrated women as evil and untrustworthy. Sources such as The Sermon of Holy Father Vasilii Kesariiskii (Poucheniia sviatago otsa Vasiliiia Kesariiskago) and the Church Nomocanons (Kormchye knigy) were cited as sources of ideas which limited the property rights of widows.

Wills left by husbands and the law codes of the tsars were used by Shchapov to illustrate male prejudices. Widows were often willed property in the form of a "life-estate" (pozhizhennoe vladenie) which provided for their livelihood without giving them personal ownership of

79 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 123.

80 Ibid., p. 124. The Nomocanons were the documents of the Canon Law of the Russian Orthodox Church. See Fedotov, pp. 179-80 for an authoritative discussion of the influence of Greek Orthodox religious law in Russia.
estates. Shchapov placed emphasis on the practice of husbands stipulating that their widows should be deprived of any inheritance if they remarried. Thus, even in death the husbands exercised a form of control over the actions of their wives.

The State was also discussed as a force which acted to limit the property rights of women. Shchapov rather succinctly summarized his view of the relationship between the Muscovite State and Russian women when he stated, "Since women did not have the right or the obligation to personally serve the state, they did not have the right to possess service lands and patrimonial estates. . . ." All of the major law codes "from the Sudebniks to the Ulozhenie" were described by Shchapov as excluding women from possession of estates. He also pointed out that upon the death of landowners, their estates often fell into the hands of the tsar on the grounds that he was the "heir" entitled to possession.

81Ibid., p. 125. Shchapov was aware of the complexity of the various laws dealing with different types of property. For instance, he mentioned inherited property, property gained by service to the tsar, purchased property, and property given as a dowry. His emphasis has placed on the limited rights of women to own or inherit property, especially the landed estates which were often a bone of contention between the tsars and nobles.

82Ibid.

83Ibid., pp. 125-26. The law codes of Ivan III (1462-1505) and Ivan IV (1547-1584) were both entitled Sudebnik. Shchapov discussed both codes.
rather than surviving spouses. In this case a portion of the estate was allotted to the wife of the deceased for her support. Shchapov interpreted this practice as a clear example of the restriction of women's rights.

To illustrate the domestic situation of noble women in the Muscovite era Shchapov discussed the worldview of that age which he referred to as the "Domostroi view."\textsuperscript{84} Seclusion of wives and daughters in the women's quarter (terem) was an integral part of the way of life fostered by the "Domostroi view." Shchapov saw the terem as one more manifestation of the general low regard for women. To further demonstrate the outlook on women Shchapov mentioned that special purifying prayers by priests were required because women were thought to be "unclean" as well as evil.

Ideally, noble women were to be isolated in the terem in the company of children and other women with little to do but embroider. There was no possibility for an active social life and the women of the household were presented to visitors only on special occasions. The one outside activity allowed for women was charity "inspired

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., p. 122.
by the feeling of the fear of God."\textsuperscript{85}

The isolation of women was credited by Shchapov with preventing them for acquiring the means to provide for their own economic security. Women, in addition to being barred from owning much property, were not allowed to acquire any training for "free and rational labor."\textsuperscript{86} Husbands apparently were successful in preventing women from engaging in trade, manufacturing, or the affairs of state which brought economic gains to men.

However, the terem was not found to be effective in achieving the complete isolation of women.\textsuperscript{87} Shchapov described the immorality which resulted from secret meetings between women supposedly in seclusion and their lovers who disregarded all of the teachings warning them to stay away from "evil women." In Shchapov's view the adultery, deception, and secrecy necessary to circumvent the terem and the advice of the Domostroi prevented the rise of genuine feelings of love.

The management of noble households was, according to Shchapov, influenced by the Domostroi to the extent

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid., p. 113.
\textsuperscript{86}Ibid., p. 129.
\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., p. 117.
that women were not entrusted with supervision of domestic matters. Apparently the belief that women were less intelligent than men, untrustworthy, and not capable of independent thought lead to the assumption that males should supervise women in everything relating to the home. Shchapov's reference to "fear of the whip" as a measure to ensure the obedience of wives is well borne out by the following:

. . . If a wife refuses to obey, and pays no attention to what her husband . . . tells . . . her . . . it is advisable . . . to beat her with a whip according to the measure of her guilt; but not in the presence of others, rather alone . . . And do not strike her straight in the face or on the ear, be careful how you strike her with your fist in the region of the heart . . . and do not use a rod of wood or iron. For he who allows himself to be carried away to such actions by anger may have much unpleasantness; if, for instance, she loses her hearing or goes blind or breaks a bone in her hand or foot or elsewhere. . . . Keep to the whip . . . and choose carefully where to strike: the whip is painful and effective, deterrent and salutary. . . .

In carrying the "Domostroi view" forward in his historical narrative Shchapov included in "The Position of Women" a discussion of attitudes toward marriage after the Church schism (raskol) of 1667. Shchapov found that the

89Ibid., pp. 130-34.
"Domostroi view" of women and sexual morality had a continuing impact on both the schismatics and the Orthodox faithful.

Briefly tracing the history of sex and marriage among the schismatics, Shchapov attributed the desire for celibacy, and in extreme cases castration, to Byzantine ascetic doctrines which encouraged an aversion to sexual intercourse:

Fear of devilish seduction induced many to despise the beauty of women, to crush sexual love by fasts, to mortify the flesh and to prefer monkish life in a monastery to married life. Shchapov regarded the practice of castration as "anti-physiological" and the desire for sexual purity as a "fanatical wish." Monuments of Old Russian Literature was again utilized to describe the practice of celibate marriage and the desire for monastic seclusion.

The works of Ivan Filippov (d. 1744) and I. F. Nilskii, a nineteenth-century writer, were cited by Shchapov in his discussion of the evolution of schismatic

90 Ibid., p. 130.
views on sex and marriage. The teachings of the Denisov brothers, prominent schismatic leaders, were known to Shchapov and he used their ideas to illustrate the desire for chastity. The concern with purity led to the segregation of the sexes in the schismatic communes under the control of the Denisovs. However, the penalties for sexual violations—forty days of fasting, bowing to the ground up to 18,250 times a year, or expulsion from the community—cited by Shchapov show that the flesh was not always mortified.

Certain schimatic communities persisted in advocacy of chastity even into the nineteenth century. Shchapov's short discussion of two rather bizarre sects

91 Shchapov included Filippov's History of the Vyg Hermitage (Istoriia Vygovskoi pustyni) and Nilskii's Family Life in the Russian Schism (Semeinaia zhizn v russkom raskolie) in his discussion of the schism in relation to women and marriage. Filippov was the leader of the Vyg community of schismatics from 1740 to 1744. See R. O. Crumney, The Old Believers & The World of Antichrist (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), for additional information on Filippov, Nilskii, and the schism.

92 The works of Semon Denisov (1683-1740) and Andrei Denisov (1674-1735) were utilized by Shchapov in his previous studies of the schism. See Serge A. Zenkovsky, "The Ideological World of the Denisov Brothers," Harvard Slavic Studies, III, 48-66, for an authoritative analysis of schismatic doctrines.

of the 1840's and 1850's revealed the continuous force of the old ideas. In the 1840's a sect existed that attacked marriage and the bearing of children. This sect taught that since 1667, the beginning of the reign of Antichrist, the conception and birth of children were acts of the Devil. Mothers were thus considered to be filthy and sacrilegious by this sect which Shchapov described as "ascetic maniacs." A sect of women active near Moscow in 1850 which demanded from its members an oath signed in blood testifying to a hatred of marriage was also mentioned as an extreme example of conduct produced by tensions related to sex and marriage.

However, it was the eighteenth century which Shchapov concentrated upon to show the strength of the "Domostroi view" of the sacredness of marriage. Shchapov stressed that schismatic leaders, especially the Denisov brothers, did not deny the sacrament of marriage per se; it was doubt concerning the validity of marriage performed under the Nikonian reforms which gave strength to

---

94 Ibid., p. 132. Shchapov cited Nilskii as the source of his information on these sects.
the movement for celibacy. The Denisovs also taught that celibacy was a higher state than marriage—a position which did not repudiate the sacrament of marriage. Shchapov was of the opinion that the attempt to live in celibacy inevitably resulted in immorality.

Celibacy proved to be beyond the strength of some schismatics who either engaged in "sinful" sexual relations or lived in "secret marriage" (tainyi brak) which appears to have been common-law marriage. However, among the schismatics were leaders, notably Ivan Alekseev who approved of "secret marriage" and argued against the necessity of chastity. Citing Alekseev's ideas, Shchapov emphasized that the defense of "secret marriage" was based on the old Church teachings concerning the sacredness and necessity of matrimony which he often referred to as the "Domostroi view." To Shchapov the eventual recognition by many of the "priestless" schismatics of marriages performed by the clergy of the

---

95 Nikon was the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church from 1652 to 1667. Under Nikon, Russian church books and religious services were corrected to conform to the texts and rites of Greek Orthodoxy. Controversy over these reforms resulted in the outbreak of the schism (raskol).
96 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 133.
97 Ibid., p. 134.
Orthodox Church was an indication of the strength of the old teachings.  

While leaders of the schism quarreled among themselves on the necessity of chastity, the Orthodox clergy taught the faithful that marriage was a necessary requirement for salvation. The message given by the clergy was that the worst marriage was better than no marriage at all. Shchapov saw in this doctrine teachings which inhibited any kind of free and natural relations between men and women. Thus to Shchapov chastity was a prelude to immorality and Orthodox marriage was a denial of freedom.

In his brief discussion of attitudes toward marriage after the schism, Shchapov pointed to three basic positions—chastity as taught by the Denisovs, marriage as seen by Ivan Alekseev and "priestless" schismatics, and marriage as taught by the Orthodox

---

98 The "priestless" schismatics were those who believed that the death of the last priest consecrated before the reforms of Nikon meant that the faithful were without validly ordained clergy. The acceptance of priests consecrated after the reforms required the "priestless" to compromise the purity of their original desire to break all contacts with the supposedly heretical Orthodox Church.

99 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 133.
Church. All of these positions were regarded by their advocates as based on the true teachings of the Church which meant the "Domostroi view" to Shchapov. The doctrine of chastity was interpreted as the result of the Byzantine "evil women" concept which worked to suppress women in Russian society. Marriage in the Orthodox Church was also interpreted by Shchapov as an institution working for male hegemony. Thus all of the attitudes toward marriage were permeated by ideas which fostered the subjugation of women.

Shchapov devoted "The Position of Women" to the period between the Christianization of Russia (988) and the reign of Peter I (1682-1725). Although Christianity was credited with some civilizing influence, the Slavs were still regarded by Shchapov as a people living in ignorance. Monotheism had displaced the old pagan pantheon, but a worldview which saw nature controlled by one God still lacked the scientific outlook so highly valued by Shchapov. Fear of the Christian God and Byzantine asceticism placed new chains on women already defeated in the distant past when the "rule of the strongest" prevailed. Coming to the reign of Peter I,
Shchapov saw the beginnings of significant changes for women.

**Women in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries**

Without going into great detail on Peter the Great's reign, Shchapov used one section of his article "Worldview, Thought, Work, and Woman in the History of Russian Society" ("Mirosozertsanie, mysl, trud, i zhenshchina v istorii russkago obshchestva") to describe Western influences accelerated by Peter I as a major factor in ending the "Domostroi view" of women. Knowledge of the physical nature of the human body gained from Western scientific treatises and the study of anatomy were regarded by Shchapov as being very significant in breaking down the old superstitious fear of females. The relative social freedom of Western women was an example which led to the end of seclusion in the terem. The wives of Russian nobles began to appear more in public wearing the Western clothing urged by the Peter I. Shchapov placed great emphasis on these changes.

---

signaling a transition from the old idea that "the nature of woman is extremely evil" to a new eighteenth-century view of woman as "a wonderful creation of nature" (chudesnoe proizvedenie prirody).  

101

Literature and poetry were the sources used by Shchapov in his analysis of a changing Russian outlook on women. In an effort to demonstrate that "leading people" had broken away from the old ideas a variety of sources were cited including The Works of Lomonosov (Sochinenia Lomonosova) and The Works of Derzhavin (Sochinenia Derzhavina). Michael Lomonosov, the important scientist, historian, and linguist, was indeed one of the leading figures of the eighteenth century. Shchapov cited Lomonosov's works to contrast the new view of women as goddesses and heroines with the older idea of women as evil creatures.  

102: It was Gabriel Derzhavin (1743-1816), even more than Lomonosov, who

---

101 Ibid., p. 585. Shchapov cited the use of the terminology "wonderful creature of nature" in N. I. Novikov's journal The Painter (Zhivopisets). Novikov (1744-1818) is well known for the large output of his publishing firm, his activities as a Mason, and the fact that he was persecuted by Catherine the Great.

102 See Ibid., pp. 585-86, for one of several references to the poetry of Lomonosov.
held Shchapov's interest as a man of letters imbued with the new concepts. An enthusiastic appreciation of the physical beauty of women was evident in the titles of some of Derzhavin's poems which Shchapov listed—for instance, "To the Graceful" ("K gratsiiam"), "The Victory of Beauty" ("Pobeda krasoty"), and "The Birth of Beauty" ("Rozhdenie krasoty"). It was also very important to Shchapov that Derzhavin recognized the "psychic" beauty of women.

Tenderness was seen by Shchapov as the most admired quality of the new Russian women emerging in the eighteenth century. Perhaps the romantic enthusiasm for gracious women was best illustrated by Shchapov's reference to the poetry which celebrated the first appearance in the famous Summer Garden by a group of young ladies from the Novodevichi Monastery (a school for girls) on May 20, 1773.  

In an example of his complex approach to history

---

103 Derzhavin was a poet who also had a career as a government administrator. See Jessie V. Clardy, G. R. Derzhavin (The Hague: Mouton, 1967), for a recent study of Derzhavin's career.

104 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 587.

105 Ibid., p. 588, citing The Painter and The Works of Derzhavin.
Shchapov presented a scientific explanation of the changes evident in poetry. He theorized that in primitive times the capacity for self-control was not highly developed. The sex drive was manifested then only in reflexive action—"the animal satisfaction of sexual desire." Violent conquests by warriors were celebrated in the literature of the past. However, progress had occurred, and by the eighteenth century the capacity for self-control was able to detain the reflexes. Love of women came to be regarded as a "wonderful force of nature," and sexual passion was no longer manifested as an irresistible primitive reflex. Romantic poetry such as Derzhavin's was thus regarded by Shchapov as evidence of a more sentimental and moral expression of love.

Shchapov perceived some results from the viewpoint which romanticized women as "wonderful creatures of nature." He found an increasing moral status for women in public opinion and a growing compasion for the personal and social misfortunes of women. N. M. Karamzin's Poor Liza (Bednaia Liza), A. Izmailov's Poor 106

---

106 Ibid., p. 594.
Masha (Bednaia Masha) were appropriately titled examples of literature cited by Shchapov to illustrate sympathy for women in Russian society. Shchapov's discussion of women merges with his general view of changing attitudes within Russia since he viewed the early nineteenth century as permeated by a "sentimental-philanthropic" understanding of human nature.

Shchapov also described a growing recognition of women's intellectual, aesthetic, and social rights. A few individuals and publications were discussed to illustrate changing attitudes in Russia.

Michael Speranskii (1772-1839), the talented Russian statesman and legal reformer, was used as an example of a man inclined to dispute the overly romantic view of women. The point which interested Shchapov was that Speranskii, in letters to his daughter, argued against the idea that women were more cowardly or faint-hearted than men. In one letter Speranskii offered the idea that Russian men were vacuous due to the nature of their early education and an inclination toward the

---

military, not because of the influence of women. Ivan Betskoi (1703-1793) was also mentioned as an individual concerned with the intellectual and social rights of women. Betskoi was especially praised for a protest against the "egoistic inclination" of men to prevent women from fully developing intellectually.

Briefly digressing into journalism, Shchapov found advocacy of greater rights for women, notably in the areas of education and intellectual activity, in publications such as "The Moscow Mercury (Moskovskii merkurii), The Ladies Journal (Damskii zhurnal), and The Journal for the Gracious (Zhurnal dlia milykh). Perhaps the thoughts of many inclined toward greater rights for women were expressed at the beginning of a speech cited by Shchapov—"Horace said there is nothing impossible for mortals; we say there is nothing impossible for women."  

108 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 589-90, citing a letter written by Speranskii while he was in Siberia.
109 Ibid. Betskoi served Catherine the Great as an advisor on educational policy. He played an important role in the development of the Smolny school for women in St. Petersburg. Betskoi also served as the President of the Russian Academy of Arts.
110 Ibid., pp. 590-91.
111 Ibid., p. 591, citing Galakhov History of Russian Literature (Istoriia russkoi literatury), T.II, 131-33. The author of the speech was not fully identified.
However, Shchapov believed that the brave words and progressive thoughts of a few interested in women's rights did not fully express the dominant feelings of a society enmeshed in romantic sentimentality. In his view, progress for women was definitely limited in the first half of the nineteenth century. The prevalent concept of the era, according to Shchapov, that women were "wonderful creatures" intended for love and domestic happiness was also something of a trap which placed restrictions on the role which women were allowed to play in society. In addition to societal restrictions, Shchapov found Russian women to be their own worst enemies due to their susceptibility to romantic notions of themselves as wonderful and beautiful creatures.112

Shchapov argued that women were so overcome by a "monomania" for passionate love that they came to value themselves only for their physical charms. Russian women became so "confused and blinded" by the apotheosis of beauty and love that they no longer recognized their own intellectual and moral qualities. Scoffing at the women who substituted physical perfection for what he

112 Shchapov, Sochinenia, III, 598.
considered the real ideal in life—intellectual development, Shchapov cited from Novikov's *The Painter* (Zhivopisets) to illustrate that some women were so insensitive to intellectual and moral development that they ridiculed those who sought knowledge:

> How stupid are those people who waste the most precious years in learning. How ridiculous are learned men, but our sisters, learned women—Oh! they are complete fools. Without example, they are ridiculous. Nature did not give us a beautiful face for geography; a witty and sharp understanding was not given to us for mathematics; a tender heart was not put into us for history. . . .

Shchapov also observed that many women wanted to read only love stories and beyond that they did not want to know anything else.

> It was obvious to Shchapov that the education of Russian women was deficient. Training for young ladies in the "fine arts," such as dancing, music, and French was not considered to be useful by Shchapov who valued science above all other disciplines. The wrong type of education was seen as a "new misfortune" for women.

Thus, Shchapov described the plight of Russian women—praised as goddesses, educated for charm and graciousness,

and raised for a life of sentimental love and marriage. It is clear that he was not dealing with peasant women in this article.

The tragedy of this situation, according to Shchapov, was that women became blind to their own best interests—intellectual and moral development. Success or failure in love and marriage was described, and disapproved of, as the greatest interest in the lives of women. To Shchapov the romantic monomania was so strong that disappointment in love frequently drove women to give up the world for life in a monastery. The facade was fully stripped away when Shchapov concluded that the worst result of the excessive exaltation of romance was the phenomenon of insanity among women which results from "nervous shocks" related to love.

However, in the late 1830's and 1840's Shchapov found evidence that Russian women had begun to understand the situation which exalted them as goddesses while confining them to a role as lovers and wives. Russia was described as then being "on the eve" of the "woman question." Women were suffering due to the monomania of

---

115 Ibid., p. 602.
love, and in the midst of this torment Shchapov described the emergence of the "thinking woman" (думайущчая zhenshchina) who questioned her place in society with a disbelieving skepticism. It is interesting that in the letters of Speranskii's daughter to her famous father Shchapov saw traces of the thinking individual beginning to speculate about the injustices of the past and the bright future ahead for women.

Turning again to poetry and literature, Shchapov emphasized the works of two women—Julia Zhadovskaia (1824-1883) and Zeneida R . . . va [pseudonym of Elena Hahn (1814-1843)]--as important examples of "thinking women" active in the first half of the nineteenth

Shchapov cited Zhadovskaia's poetry, published in the 1840's as the work of a woman sadly conscious of her restricted role in life. A particular poem of Zhadovskaia's entitled "Two Sisters" ("Dve sestry") was used by Shchapov to illustrate that one of the sisters represented the "thinking woman" who doubted the world around her, while the other sister was satisfied with society and in Shchapov's opinion was "thoughtless."

Material from Zeneida R ... va's story entitled The Ideal (Ideal) was used to conclude the article and the

---

Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 604-605. As a poetess Zhadovskaia was known for her observations on the social position of women. Though not a political revolutionary, Soviet commentary on Zhadovskaia describes her as being influenced by radical social ideas circulating in the 1860's. Some of her poems were set to music by M. I. Glinka and other composers. See the entries on Zhadovskaia in Bolshaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 2d. ed., 1952, XV, 579 and Russkii biograficheskii slovar, Kraus Reprint Corp., 1962, VII, 1-5.

quotation selected reveals the skeptical irony so highly valued by Shchapov:

What evil genius so distorted the destiny of women? Now she is born only to please, to charm, to make the leisure moments of men enjoyable, to dress up, to dance, to reign in public, but in reality to be a paper ruler, whom the clown greets in the presence of onlookers . . .

Truly sometimes it seems as if God's world was created only for men, to them the universe is opened with all of its mysteries, for them there are glory and the arts and knowledge; for them there is freedom and all of the joys of life . . . 118

In "Worldview, Thought, Work, and Women," Shchapov brought his narrative of women's history up to the nineteenth century. Poetry and literature were analyzed to demonstrate the change from the old "evil women" concept to the more enlightened idea of women as "wonderful creatures." Shchapov viewed the change in ideas concerning women as limited progress because the position of women in the first half of the nineteenth century was still circumscribed by the mores of a tradition bound society. The emergence of "thinking women" in the 1830's and 1840's was the most important development to Shchapov. His commentary on Zhadovskaia and Hahn is interesting

118 Ibid., p. 605.
because it focuses attention on women beginning to come
to grips with the "woman question"--a topic which is
often discussed in terms of men who publicized the issue.

**A New Role for Women**

Most of Shchapov's discussion of women's history
was intended to show that women had been callously sub-
jugated since losing a "sexual struggle" in the pre-
Christian era. As vanquished creatures, women were
excluded from any role in life besides being lovers and
wives. Shchapov basically relied upon historical sources
such as laws and literature in describing the poor
treatment of women in Russia. Scientific concepts, such
as Sechenov's explanation of the effect of fear on the
nervous system, were utilized to describe the dominance
of ignorance and superstition in the past.

Shchapov's works, however, also contain two
interesting articles which reveal the beginnings of a
revised approach to the history of women: "The
Significance of the Nation's Women in the Anthropological
and Social Development of the Russian People" ("Znachenie
narodnoi zhenshchiny v antropologicheskom i sotsialnom
razvitii russkoi narodnosti") and "Physical and
Anthropological Worldview and the Social Development of Russian Society" ("Fizicheskoe i antropologicheskoe mirosozertsanie i sotsialnoe rasvitie russkago obshchestva"). In these articles science was the tool used to show a more positive aspect of women's history and to predict a great role for women in the future.

The key to Shchapov's "The Significance of the Nation's Women" is the concept that although women had been excluded from a direct role in history they nevertheless exerted an important influence on the path of humanity toward progress. Shchapov believed that Charles Darwin, and a few lesser known scientists, had proved that women were the major source of "social sympathy" (an ameliorative civilizing quality) and feelings of

altruism in the primitive past on mankind. Furthermore, Shchapov argued that it had been proved that women were one of the basic forces in the rise of "socialness" (sotsialnost) and the creation of primitive communities. Women, in this view, had been a civilizing force in the development of mankind. Shchapov found a clear expression of the role of women in a lecture delivered in France in 1845 by a Professor Serr who remarked that, "the roots of human improvement of savage tribes are in the female organism, the cause of the wildness of these tribes is the humble position of women. . . ." 121

Shchapov went on to theorize that in certain great transitory epochs of "anthropological-social" progress women inspired the development of "new human-social ideas" and influenced new generations of mankind to progress in intellectual, moral, and social development. 122 Departing from complicated generalities Shchapov gave some examples of the epochs of progress he was describing—classical

Greece, the Renaissance, eighteenth-century France, and

120 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 31-32. A translation of Darwin's The Descent of Man (O proiskhozhd cheloveka) was cited on p. 32.
121 Ibid., p. 32, citing Notes of the Fatherland (Otechestvenye zapiski), XLII, 1845.
122 Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 32.
the reign of Catherine the Great in Russia. Having established a scientific and historical background for the role of women in history, Shchapov turned to examine the significance of peasant women in Russia.

Asserting that women played a great role in the "physiological-psychic" development of mankind, Shchapov examined the mixing of the Slavic population with the numerous other ethnic groups in Russia—for instance Finns, Mongolians, and Siberian natives. He described the mixing of ethnic elements as the "anthropological and ethnological history of colonization." In the mixing process, which he interpreted as anthropological and ethnic change for the non-Slavic element, Shchapov saw the ascendancy of the Slavs and the assimilation of various ethnic groups into the Slavic-Russian population. Slavic-Russian women were credited with a great role in the improvement of non-Slavic tribes. Shchapov conceptualized Slavic women as a regenerative force which improved virtually all aspects of existence—from physical strength to social organization—of the tribes merging with the Slavs. To illustrate the regenerative influence

---

123 Ibid., pp. 34-35.
of Slavic women Shchapov cited his research among the Buriat tribe in Siberia.\textsuperscript{124}

Contrasting the situation among the Buriats with the level of civilization found in mixed communities of Buriat men and Slavic-Russian women, Shchapov produced some interesting evidence. He maintained that the Buriats were degenerating because of a decline in the number of women in the tribe.\textsuperscript{125} Extreme oppression of women was cited by Shchapov as the reason why Buriat women frequently fled from their husbands or simply died out in greater numbers than men. The Buriats were thus losing their regenerative source—women—and slipping into degeneracy. However, Shchapov also observed communities composed of mixed Slavic-Buriat stock (the Buriat men were apparently baptized as Orthodox Christians) and found different conditions. In these mixed communities women outnumbered men and the regenerative force of Slavic women, according to Shchapov, led to a higher state of civilization.

\textsuperscript{124}Ibid., p. 36, Shchapov was of mixed ethnic background—his mother was a Buriat and his father was Russian. While living in exile, Shchapov participated in field expeditions of the Siberian Section of the Russian Geographic Society. Thus he had firsthand knowledge of the Buriats and data gathered on expeditions.

\textsuperscript{125}See Ibid., pp. 36-40, for Shchapov's discussion of the status of Buriat women and the numerical data which he analyzed.
Shchapov's commentary on the relative numbers of men and women in the two types of communities were accompanied by statistical data gathered in Siberia. In one area over a seven year period (1867-1873) Buriats averaged 6,129 men and 5,466 women compared to an average of 150 men and 180 women for the mixed Slavic-Buriat population.

Shchapov observed that the ethnically mixed population was superior to the Buriats.\textsuperscript{126} A marked increase in the number of physically deformed or mentally defective children born to Buriat parents as compared to the offspring of Slavic mothers was linked by Shchapov to the practice of consanguineous marriages among the Buriats. The progeny of Slavic mothers were found to be physically stronger than the Buriats—evidence to Shchapov that the regenerative force of Slavic women was producing an improved type of human being in Siberia.\textsuperscript{127} It was also very crucial to Shchapov that Slavic women improved the living standards, work habits, and social organization of the Buriats. From his personal observations in Siberian villages, Shchapov credited women with the possession of the quality of "sociability" (obshchitelnost) and a

\textsuperscript{126}Ibid., pp. 40-42.
\textsuperscript{127}Ibid., p. 46.
greater propensity than men toward mutual aid.  

Darwin's "social sympathy" seemed to be verified in Siberia. However, most important to Shchapov was his conclusion that Slavic women played a major role in the introduction of Russian communal organization among the Buriats. Thus, women, in Shchapov's case study of the Buriats, appeared to be bearers of that controversial Russian institution—the village commune.  

Shchapov concluded this article by arguing that the role of women and the lower classes of society must be recognized in the "anthropological and social development" of the nation—it was not enough to see all developments as the result of the State and great individuals. Women and the common people, workers and peasants, were considered by Shchapov to be among the forces for progress which had the potential to bring about beneficial changes for Russia. Society, it was argued, could be made more humane, cooperative, and civilized by utilization of women's instinct for "social sympathy." The scientists, notably Darwin, supplied

---

Shchapov with a concept which he used to predict the future role of women in Russian society.

The use of science to explain women's history reached a peak in Shchapov's "Physical and Anthropological Worldview"—an article which virtually bristles with scientific explanations of human behavior. Shchapov first sketched a general description of the intellectual progress of the Western world away from a primitive unthinking reflexive fear of the unknown toward abstract thought about man and his environment characteristic of an advanced stage of civilization. The speculations of men such as Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, Karl Vogt, and Henry Maudsley concerning the increasing size of the human brain and skull in relation to intellectual progress were woven into Shchapov's narrative along with frequent references to G. H. Lewes' *History of Philosophy.*

The ideas of Henry T. Buckle, Laplace and Claude Bernard were also used to add authoritative sanction to the description of the gradual path of intellectual

---

130 Karl Vogt (1817-1895) was a German materialist philosopher whose ideas were popular with many of the Nihilists in the 1860's. Henry Maudsley (1835-1918) was an English psychiatrist and materialist frequently cited by Shchapov. G. H. Lewes (1817-1878) was another of the English thinkers used by Shchapov. Lewes was active in a variety of disciplines including journalism, science and philosophy.
Demonstrating that progress had occurred, Shchapov then asked if the "nervous system," which governed intellectual development of women had developed equally with the "nervous system" of men. The answer was no.

Shchapov theorized that women had fallen behind men in mental development. Centuries of deliberate exclusion from "higher nervous activity" in male dominated societies was cited as the reason for the uneven development of the sexes. By the term "nervous activity" Shchapov meant the external senses, desires, thoughts, and ideals. Higher nervous activity was what we in the twentieth century would call intellectual development.

The position of women was not hopeless, however, for the

131 H. T. Buckle (1821-1862) was an English historian who influenced Shchapov and many of the radical intelligentsia. Buckle's best known work was History of Civilization in England. P. S. Laplace (1749-1827) was an important French mathematician and astronomer, Claude Bernard (1813-1878), a Frenchman, was one of the leading physiologists and scientists of the nineteenth century.

132 Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 402-404. Shchapov also discussed the intellectual development of the lower classes. Women were discussed as a separate group within society.

133 Ibid., p. 404.
underlying theme in "Physical and Anthropological Worldview" is that conditions for women were slowly evolving toward a higher stage of anthropological progress.

Describing the primitive phase of human development, Shchapov stressed the lack of any feelings of moral love for women, the domination of society by males, and women's position as a "beast of burden." In such conditions Shchapov saw the inhibition of women's intellectual development, moral feelings, and aesthetic talents. The mental progress of women was said to be "almost absolutely impossible" due to male domination. Under these conditions there was no chance for women to equal the intellectual achievement of men.

Turning to Greece and Rome, Shchapov described a degree of limited progress for women. The apothegms of female beauty expressed in some of the ideas of classical Greece was seen as a step forward in anthropological development. Some of Plato's ideas were regarded as evidence that in Greece women were certainly progressing beyond the state of "beasts of burden." Shchapov also found that in Greece and Rome sexual depravity sometimes

---

Ibid., pp. 405-406.
acquired religious sanctions.\textsuperscript{136} Thus, while it does not seem completely logical, religious erotic orgies were viewed as detrimental to the intellectual and moral progress of women. It was typical of Shchapov to find limited progress for women in the classical world and to feel that the intellectual and moral progress of women was also "paralyzed" with a resulting delay in the perfection of the "nervous" capacities of women.\textsuperscript{137}

The Middle Ages in Western Europe was seen by Shchapov as a period in which contempt for the mental powers of women was evident. Shchapov described a belief in female inferiority as the reason why women were almost "unheard of" in serious pursuits related to the regulation of society, the development of higher learning, and the fine arts.\textsuperscript{138} When Western man began to lose his fear of nature and to rejoice in the talents of human beings, the view of women as inferior, and often evil, creatures, began to decline. Thus, the Renaissance period appeared to Shchapov as an era marked by the rise of love and respect for women and a growing consciousness of women's intellectual and moral rights.

\textsuperscript{136}Ibid., pp. 407-408.  
\textsuperscript{137}Ibid., p. 407.  
\textsuperscript{138}Ibid., pp. 408-409.
Limited progress in Russia was condensed to emphasize the evils which Shchapov always attributed to the Byzantine ascetic doctrines—the view of women as evil creatures and the denial of the intellectual capacity of women. Reforms under the reign of Peter I and the apotheosis of women as "wonderful creatures of nature" were regarded an anthropological progress and signs of the development of the human intellect. The alleged increasing tendency toward morality in the treatment of women indicated that men were becoming more civilized, thus Shchapov linked attitudes toward women with progress in civilization and mental development.

Having brought this narrative of women's history up to the nineteenth century, Shchapov faced the problem of the "monomania" for romantic love which was seen as yet another barrier to the intellectual progress of all women. In dealing with nineteenth-century conditions Shchapov made great use of the works of Henry Maudsley, the English psychiatrist and materialist philosopher.\(^{139}\)

It is the use of figures such as Maudsley that so clearly

\(^{139}\)See Ibid., pp. 410-12, for several references to a Russian translation of Maudsley's *The Physiology and Pathology of Mind.*
reveals Shchapov's attempt to place women's history within a scientific analysis of the nature of Russian society. That Shchapov was influenced by the English psychiatrist is obvious from the following quotation:

Given an ill-constituted or imperfectly developed brain at the time when the sexual appetite makes its appearance, and what is the result? None other than that which happens with the lower animal, where love is naked lust, and the sight of the female excites a desire that immediately issues in uncontrollable efforts for its gratification. Given, on the other hand, a well constituted and naturally developed brain, the sexual desire undergoes a complex development in consciousness; from its basis are evolved all those delicate, exalted and beautiful feelings of love that constitute the story of the poet, and play so great a part in human happiness and in human sorrow.\(^\text{140}\)

Shchapov utilized Maudsley's *The Physiology and Pathology of Mind* to attack nineteenth century attitudes which viewed women as creatures intended exclusively for love and marriage. Influenced by Maudsley, Shchapov argued that the harmonious development of the intellectual and moral strength of the female nervous system was paralyzed by conventions of romantic love which led women into domestic situations dominated by males who had

infinitely greater opportunities to develop their mental abilities.\textsuperscript{141} Women, therefore, still suffered from inhibited intellectual development. It was inevitable to Shchapov that women were fully estranged from "higher spheres" of social, intellectual and physical work. Lacking skills and talents to become self-sufficient economically, women were dependent upon husbands for the material necessities of life.

Having shown "scientifically" why the intellectual progress of women was "paralyzed" by male domination, Shchapov also used a scientific explanation to show why women must eventually progress in mental ability. He maintained that there was a physiological law of "correlative and harmonious development of all parts and functions of human nature."\textsuperscript{142} According to this law of physiology all of the "nervous capabilities" of women must also develop with the general progress of humanity. It was, therefore, inevitable that intellectual progress for women must take place.

Shchapov fortified his arguments in behalf of women by introducing the idea that "such serious thinkers"

\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., pp. 411-12.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p. 412.
as John Stuart Mill and Henry T. Buckle believed that women possessed great powers of deductive thought and that this mental ability could eventually benefit all humanity. Freed from "medieval conditions" of subordination women would use their deductive powers to "illuminate the world" with new thoughts and to double the creative forces of humanity. The worldview of humanity was to be enlarged by female contributions to virtually all aspects of existence. The organization of work, the teaching of future generations, the exploration of the natural sciences, and the science of sociology were regarded as fields where women could make special contributions.

The Darwinian concept that women possessed special talents for social cooperativeness was cited again by Shchapov to give authority to predictions concerning the future conditions of labor. As Shchapov saw the future, science and technology could be applied to work in order

\[143\] *Ibid.*, p. 415. Shchapov did not give references to specific works by Mill and Buckle to support his discussion of the deductive powers of women. However, Mill's *The Subjection of Women* and Buckle's "The Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge" had been translated into Russian in the 1860's.

\[144\] See *Ibid.*, pp. 415-19, for Shchapov's enthusiastic predictions of the benefits liberated women could bring to the world.
to end the back breaking toil which brutalized the Russian working class. Women were to enter virtually all fields of endeavor to escape from "nervous afflictions" resulting from a life of isolation in domestic affairs. Thus, in the future the conditions of work would be more humane, and women would play a great role in the development of new conditions of labor characterized by "higher human feelings" of social cooperation, reciprocity, and sympathy for one's fellow workers.

Progress for women appeared to Shchapov to be inevitable and desirable. He cited the works of Kingdon Clifford (1845-1879), an English mathematician and philosopher, to demonstrate that the conditions for the advancement of the human mind were known to mankind. Clifford, also using Darwin, theorized that progress could be stimulated by constant exercise of the creative powers of the mind. Thus, virtually every factor in Shchapov's discussion of the problems and progress of women was based upon some scientific authority.

Conclusions - Part II

Shchapov's articles on the history of women in Russia are obviously not the polished works of a professional historian writing with a complete body of reference material on hand for a sufficient period of time. For instance, Shchapov's effort to portray women as suppressed creatures capable of exerting a beneficial influence on society was not fully explained in these articles. The scientific descriptions of human behavior given by Shchapov are characterized by a nineteenth-century desire for a total understanding of history no longer shared by most scholars. Despite these shortcomings, Shchapov's articles show him to be an early contributor to the relatively unexplored field of the history of women in Russia. Furthermore, Shchapov's research may be of some value to a women's historian as secondary source material.

To illustrate the potential value of these articles it may be recalled that Shchapov's concern with the fighting capacity of women in the past may have seemed rather far-fetched at first glance. However, Shchapov's account of women fighting with men becomes more
interesting in view of Article 119 of the "Charter of Pskov":

And a duel may be ordered between two women but neither may hire a substitute. 146

This provision of the Charter might be good evidence of some rather unique customs relating to the history of women. Thus a reading of Shchapov's articles, even if we do not always agree with him, can suggest facets of Russian history which may be of value to investigate.

Similarly, the Byzantine "evil women" concept stressed by Shchapov should be of interest to a women's historian. The influence of Byzantine thought in Russia is widely recognized. Shchapov was certainly not the only writer to discuss Byzantine asceticism and Russian women, but his training as a historian may have given him the perspective to see links between ideas concerning women and the ownership of property not so apparent to others.

In examining the law codes of the tsars Shchapov stressed the limitations on women's rights. The fact that women had any rights at all did not prevent Shchapov from using his nineteenth-century reformist viewpoint to

146 Verdnadsky, p. 82.
criticize Muscovite Russia. Even if Shchapov's interpretation of the law codes is challenged, his comments on legal practices concerning women contain the interesting details and anecdotes often sought by historians to portray attitudes toward certain aspects of life. Following Shchapov's analysis the Ulozhenie law code might be researched for provisions which depict the legal status of women.

Schismatic doctrines concerning asceticism, women, and marriage surely constitute a rich source of material for a women's historian. Shchapov's reputation as the acknowledged founder of a revisionist school of historiography on the schism lends authority to his discussion of schismatic teachings. A historian of Russia's women could gain some insights into ideas on marriage by comparing Shchapov's comments on "secret marriage" with the ideas of R. O. Crummey the most recent author to write on the schism.

When Shchapov described changes in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries he frequently cited literature and poetry. Since many of the sources cited by Shchapov, such as the writings of Lomonosov and Derzhavin, are
easily accessible a study of attitudes toward women in Russian literature might well utilize some of Shchapov's ideas. Of course, Shchapov's scientific explanations of the changes in literature and poetry probably would find few, if any, advocates today. The women authors discussed by Shchapov in connection with the rise of "thinking women," notably Zhadovskaia and Hahn, should be of interest to a women's historian since there were relatively few female authors of any consequence active in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century.

While the use of thinkers such as Spencer, Darwin, Maudsley, Buckle, Mill, and Vogt in a discussion of women's history may at times appear to confuse the issue, Shchapov's utilization of Western sources is also an interesting piece of historical evidence. In Shchapov's articles the variety of Western works relative to the "woman question" and translated into Russian, is testimony to the intense, and often overlooked, interest in the status of Russian women in the nineteenth century. Shchapov's references to Darwin's ideas on the civilizing influence of women could be of note to historians trying to gauge the impact of Western science in Russia.
Though highly interpretive and permeated by out­dated scientific concepts Shchapov's articles on women reveal an aspect of his career given scant attention by Western and Soviet historiographers. Shchapov's view of the history of women in Russia may appear as overly pessimistic. But much of the evidence introduced by Shchapov might well lead another scholar to valuable information on Russia's women. Shchapov's skills as an historian were not wasted in Siberia even when he attempted to blend a commitment to science with his first research on women's history.
PART III

A. P. SHCHAPOV ON SIBERIA
CHAPTER IV

THE POPULATION SERIES

Research on the Empire's population and Siberia comprises a third category of Shchapov's works. This category encompasses both general works of a demographic and ethnographic nature, hereafter discussed as the "population series," and studies devoted to specific aspects of life and history in Siberia. Given the development of the Empire, eastward migration dictated that much, but not all, of the "population series" was devoted to the experience of the Russian Slavs moving east across the Urals. Thus, this third category of Shchapov's writings is unified by a concern with Siberia.

The "population series" was published in 1864 and 1865. Three works—"The Historical-geographical Distribution of the Russian Population" ("Istoriko-geograficheskoe, raspredelenie russkago narodonaseleniia"), "The Ethnographical Organization of the Russian Population" ("Ethnograficheskaia organizatsiia russkago narodonaseleniia")

1The word demography was not used by Shchapov, but it best describes his interest in population distribution.


concentration on two basic topics—demography and ethnography. In these articles there is the search for the patterns, and determining factors of the geographic distribution of the population. Shchapov was also searching for an understanding of ethnic mixing and cross-breeding in the human race. Slavic racial superiority was axiomatic in these articles, but it is important to realize that Shchapov saw a mixing process in which the resultant Russian "nationality" bore traces of its non-Slavic elements. Thus, the Slavic-Buriat scholar constructed a kind of ethnographical dialectical ideology.

The most interesting, and the longest, work in the "population series" is "The Historical-geographical Distribution." Arguing that the population carried out the epic process of colonizing the vast empire without any sort of scientific approach to life and labor, Shchapov theorized that multiple factors dictated the locations and kinds of settlements established within the so-called three kingdoms of nature—the animal, vegetable, and mineral realms. Therefore, Shchapov saw the pattern of population distribution as a process in

---

See Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 264, for an example of his interest in the three realms of nature.
which people were placed in locations and occupations by natural forces beyond the comprehension of their simple minds.

The multiplicity of factors cited as relevant to population distribution reveals the intensity of Shchapov's interest in demography. For example, the need for food grains—expressed as a "natural, chemical-physiological instinct and law" or more simply as dictates of the stomach—was regarded as a primary factor which drove people to seek agricultural lands, even in Siberia.\(^4\)

Never content with simple explanations, Shchapov went on to explore the relationship of factors like seasonal temperature patterns, chemical properties of soils, and plant physiology to "agricultural" (zemledelcheskii) settlements. Thus, with data such as temperature charts the historian-turned-scientist illustrated the "physical-geographic, meteorological, and chemical laws of agriculture."\(^5\)

---

\(^4\)See Ibid., pp. 191-201, for Shchapov's treatment of the link between the need for food grains and population movements. References to the works of men such as the chemist Liebig and Moleschott, the physiologist and materialist thinker, were used to support the scientific approach Shchapov sought for all of his ideas.

The lesson being taught was that factors such as climate and soil chemistry determined where certain plants grew—barley and rye in northern regions and crops such as grapes in south Russia. \(^6\) Thus, the possibility of agricultural settlements was ultimately dependent upon phenomena like soil chemistry which the people did not understand. Shchapov was pointing out the obvious in a complicated manner; the chemistry of the stomach drove mankind to seek food wherever nature allowed it to grow. Agricultural settlements were located where nature, not man, deigned to produce nourishment.

The enormous size of the Empire and the fact that much of it was originally forest land also impressed Shchapov as factors which influenced the character of agricultural settlements. \(^7\) The expanse of the land had negative aspects. For instance, the strength of the people was consumed in dealing with such a vast country. Shchapov also believed that the expansion of the Empire was disproportionate to the growth of the population. \(^8\)

\(^{6}\) Ibid., p. 214.
\(^{7}\) Ibid., pp. 232-41.
\(^{8}\) Ibid., p. 233, citing figures from the year 1462 to 1860.
Most importantly, he argued that settlements developed extensively instead of intensively with rational development. The result was "mental stagnation" for the people spreading through the Empire to the Pacific. Thus, he theorized that the extensive nature of expanding settlements was inversely related to mental progress.

Shchapov also found significance in the concept that many settlements were first clearings hewn out of sprawling forests. It was these settlements with simple forest-related activities, not larger cities of the European type with advanced thinking and manufacturing activities, which dominated the pattern of colonization in Russia. Russian cities were seen by Shchapov as historically linked to administrative-financial, or military tasks. Thus, when the population spread into the forests and founded a myriad of small settlements, the way was prepared for the historical dominance of

---

9 Ibid., p. 233. Shchapov saw obstacles to the advancement of civilization in the "half-nomadic" character of many settlements.

10 Ibid., p. 235. At this point, Shchapov had not formulated his theory on the effect of the cold climate on nerves and mental development.

11 Ibid., pp. 236-39.
villages over cities in Russia. Shchapov assumed that
cities of the European type would have been beneficial,
but he stressed that villages, with simple occupations
and ideas, dominated in Russia due to the early pattern
of clearings in forests.

The village populations, or colonists as Shchapov
sometimes described them, were regarded as performing
their historic task without rational plans—their geo­
graphic distribution was dictated by natural forces.
They seemingly went off into Siberia "at random" (na avos)
with no real knowledge of their destination. Lamenting
that these brave souls had no institutions, like French
and English colonial organizations, Shchapov also pointed
out that peasants had no popularized scientific litera­
ture on factors such as climates and soils.12 Thus, it
was obvious to the historian that many settlements were
located irrationally and suffered needlessly from pheno­
mena such as infertile soils or floods.

The recurring theme of an ignorant, poverty
stricken people existing in a state of slavery to nature
was emphasized in the "The Historical-geographical

12 Ibid., p. 244. The source of information on
the French and English colonies was not cited.
Distribution." The peasants went wherever their axes, scythes, and plows could produce sustenance amidst the soil, climate, and topography of the Russian lands. Shchapov linked the agricultural settlements to a general intellectual backwardness which in turn was linked to the social, economic, and political spheres of life—the ignorant, agricultural peasants were enserfed.

Convinced that natural forces dominated the establishment of settlements, Shchapov also attempted to discern the relationship between various locations and the health of the population—"medical-geography" in his terms.\(^\text{13}\) Somewhat predictably, he reached the conclusion that in matters of health the settlements were also at the mercy of nature and did not possess the medical resources to combat natural menaces such as regional endemic diseases.\(^\text{14}\) The methodology employed in discussing "medical-geography" is rather striking and illustrates Shchapov's desire to employ quantitative data in approaching historical problems. For example, birth rates, mortality rates, causes

\[^{13}\text{Ibid., p. 251.}\]
\[^{14}\text{Ibid., pp. 261-62. Many Russians, notably the zemstvo groups, were interested in the improvement of public health in the second half of the nineteenth century.}\]
of death, and numbers of marriages were often cited in tabular form. Shchapov's data and footnoted references could be of value to a scholar seeking quantitative sources for the tsarist period.

From his studies Shchapov came to see that in Russia the fertility rate was higher in cities than in the rural settlements, but that, in general, agrarian settlements were lower in mortality than industrial cities. He also observed that natural factors, such as the climate, apparently altered figures like the mortality rates of cities and villages. In essence, he was demonstrating that vital statistics varied with factors such as the climate. Thus, the location of settlements, and even the type of settlement, had a relationship to the health of the population.

The data revealed that certain areas of the Empire had problems with high death rates or endemic

---

15 See Ibid., pp. 258-61, for examples of quantitative data taken from a variety of sources. Similarly, in his discussion of agriculture, Shchapov used tables showing the chemical content of soils.

16 Data from the tsarist period may not be precise, but the sources cited, such as a study on the health of Russian soldiers, may be of historical interest.
fever, goiter, and cretinism. Shchapov used this kind of information to point out the importance of "medical-geography." Thus, he depicted the agrarian settlements as distributed by impersonal natural forces, and doubtlessly some villages, without medical resources, were located irrationally in unhealthy locations.

Shchapov realized that all settlements were not of the same type--the population was distributed by factors beyond the fundamental need for agriculture. Some villages were historically linked to the animal and mineral kingdoms.  

Focusing on the pre-Petrine period, Shchapov emphasized that people were also dispersed "along zoological-geographical paths" (po zoologo-geograficheskim putiam) especially in the so-called "beast-industry settlements" (zveropromyshlenniya poseleniia) of the fur trade. Shchapov was searching for links between the animal kingdom, the movements of people, and the establishment of settlements.

Perceiving a partially zoological basis for

17. The mineral kingdom was not discussed at great length. Shchapov stressed that prior to the seventeenth century, Russia had not developed its mineral resources.

18. Ibid., pp. 284-86.

19. See Ibid., pp. 264-317, for the unusual analysis of the relationship between animals and people in Russian history.
Russian history, Shchapov discussed the relationship
between the "beasts"—such as beavers, sables, fish, birds,
even bees—and the pattern of colonization, or settlement,
of the Empire. In essence, he recounted how the pursuit
of fur-bearing animals led people to the north of the
Empire and as far east as North America. Certain settle­
ments were thus linked to the fur trade. The catching
of fish in great rivers and bodies of water similarly
resulted in the development of other regions. Examining
ornithology in old Russia, Shchapov pointed out that
princes and tsars had special settlements for the purpose
of raising hunting birds like falcons. Thus, some
villages were historically linked to birds of prey.
Apiculture was the basis of "bee villages" (bortnyia ili
bortnichi sela i derevni). 20

Logically, the pursuit of fur-bearing animals
was stressed by Shchapov. 21 Similar to the treatment of

20 Ibid., p. 302.
21 Most Russian historians recognize the fur trade
as a basic element in the traditional economy. For example,
see a recent book by John A. Harrison, The Founding of the
Russian Empire in Asia and America (Coral Gables: University
of Miami Press, 1971), p. 93, for the opinion that the drive
to the Pacific was, "set in motion by the hunt for furs and
the depredations from the steppe, the push eastward was a
boon for the fur trade it furnished to the impoverished
Russian state."
"medical-geography" the discussion of the fur trade is interesting due to the quantitative data and footnoted references utilized. Among sources cited were works by the explorers P. S. Pallas and J. Gmelin, and Baron von Herberstein (1486-1566) an ambassador to Russia from the Holy Roman Empire. Shchapov regarded valuable animals, such as sable, the "gold" of ancient Russia, as irresistible lures which pulled the population eastward thus providing a "zoological-geographical" connection between European Russia and Siberia. Novgorod was recognized as the "parent state" of the animal-related settlements in the northeast.

However, Siberia was of greatest concern to Shchapov. He concluded that the winter camping places and crude shelters of the fur trade were the first "clearings" (pochinki) in the process of colonizing Siberia. The first settlements, and also the major colonies of southeast Siberia, were thus related to the hypothetical zoological basis of the past.

---

22 Pallas and Gmelin were discussed previously in the section of this dissertation on intellectual development. Herberstein's Notes Upon Russia is a frequently cited source for the ambassador's personal observations on sixteenth century Russia.

23 Shchapov, Sochinenia, II, 290.
expansion did not stop at Kamchatka: the pursuit of fur-bearing animals led to the establishment of colonies across the Bering Sea. Thus, the "zoological-geographical" path led from European Russia to North America.

Shchapov's analysis of the characteristics of human life in the zoological sphere was largely negative. It was theorized that the cultural and intellectual level of animal-related settlements reflected their "savage" (dikoi) and uncivilized surroundings--economic activity had a link to the general level of culture. Bringing the contemporary passion for ecology to mind, Shchapov noted that Russian hunters, trappers, farmers, and fishermen simply plundered the natural gifts of the land.

Similar to his view on agriculture, Shchapov held that the animal-related economy was not fully exploited due to the lack of rational thought among the generally poverty stricken population. There was wealth in the fur trade, but the tsars were the "ultimate masters"

---

24 The Russian-American Company, which enjoyed the protection of the tsar, dominated the overseas colonies after 1799.
26 Ibid., p. 317.
of the zoological aspect of the economy. With his unique perspective on history Shchapov saw the riches of the tsars as a manifestation of the zoological settlements. The derivation of great wealth from the fur trade was seen as a negative influence. It was assumed that the Western type of manufacturing activity, which presupposes a certain level of social, cultural, and economic development, would have brought more intellectual progress.

However, Shchapov made it clear that Russia eventually moved forward toward a new economy in which the importance of the older zoological foundation was lessened. This process started in the sixteenth century and was accelerated in the seventeenth century. While agriculture remained a basic element, livestock raising, manufacturing, and the exploitation of mineral resources were the new characteristics of a changing economy.

It was argued that many of the older villages, first linked to wild animals, took on a more settled way

---

27 See Harrison, p. 71, for an estimate that the Siberian fur trade provided approximately one-fourth of Russia's total revenue.

28 See Shchapov, Sochineniia, II, 317-47, for his ideas on the changing economic foundations of the Empire.
of life with different occupations. In general, Shchapov wrote of a process of metamorphosis in which settlements based on occupations such as manufacturing and mining developed. Thus, once again the population was subjected to economic forces which dominated its distribution. However, this new phase, movement away from the so-called animal and vegetable realms of the economy, was not discussed in great detail. Like other works by Shchapov "The Historical-geographical Distribution" ended with an emphasis on the need for the spread of scientific knowledge to the masses toiling in the various spheres of the Russian economy. 29

Movement of the population, due to numerous factors, brought the Slavic Russians into contact with other peoples. Shchapov was interested in combining demography with ethnography for the purpose of understanding the development of the Russian "nationality" (natsionalnost). 30 The titles of two studies "The Ethnographical Organization" and "The Historical-ethnographical Organization" accurately reflect the author's complicated view of the ethnic mixing process. The former study is much shorter than the latter

---

29 Ibid., pp. 363-64.
30 See Ibid., p. 480, for one example of the use of the word "nationality."
and many of the same topics—e.g., ethnic mixing, Slavic superiority, effects of the local environment—are found in both works. An analysis of the longer study will suffice to convey Shchapov's thinking on ethnography in the mid-1860's.

It is in "The Historical-ethnographical Organization" that we find one of Shchapov's most important theoretical studies on the broad topic of racial cross-breeding. The basic thesis expounded was that the Russian "nationality" was evolving with new ethnic additions. In this process, it was argued, the population showed distinct regional variations. But Shchapov firmly believed that "cross-breeding" (metizatsiia) or "mixing" (smeshnie) resulted in a general Slavic physiological "superiority" (pereves). The superiority of the Slavs did not mean that other ethnic influences were totally eliminated. It was theorized that the population was developing into "one Russian people" from the Slavic "root" (koren). Thus, the "root" had ethnic branches

---

31 Ibid.
32 See Ibid., p. 425 for an example of the usage of the word metizatsiia, p. 436 for smeshenie, and p. 437 for pereves.
33 Ibid., p. 438.
which revealed the diverse regional character of the multitude of peoples mixed with the Slavs in Siberia and elsewhere.

Shchapov's thesis on ethnic or racial superiority was typically complex. Essentially, he held that Slavic-Russians possessed physical, mental, cultural, and socio-economic dominance over the Siberian natives. More pragmatically, it was noted that the Russians had firearms to use against the Siberian tribes and leaders comparable to Cortez and Pizarro who conquered the New World. Shchapov might well have reflected upon the difference between conquest by force and the peaceful spreading of civilizing influences: superior force does not imply a higher level of civilization.

Utilizing the ideas of Charles Darwin and the lesser known French zoologist and anthropologist Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages de Breau (1810-1892), Shchapov stressed that physiological laws of inheritance governed

\[34\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 409.\]
the cross-breeding of races and species. Therefore, what happened in Siberia was scientifically understandable. In theory, the Slavs possessed the quality of racial "stability" (ustoichivost). Thus, if the Slavs mixed with different races and predominated in the process, Slavic characteristics would be transmitted biologically to non-Slavic elements in an assimilative process. With the passage of time the physiological dominance of the superior race was thought to increase. Using Darwin as an authority, Shchapov stressed that when certain species mixed there was an atavistic tendency for the offspring to return to the form of the dominant element. To Shchapov, therefore, it was clear that by scientific laws the Slavic race had to triumph in mixing with Siberian tribes. The process might be long and have regional variations, but Slavic superiority was ensured in a kind of physiological dialectical process by which

35 See Ibid., pp. 436-37, for a relatively concise statement of Shchapov's concept of cross-breeding.

Quatrefages de Breau was a member of the Academie des Sciences of Paris, a professor of zoology, and held the chair of Anthropology and Ethnography in the Museum of Natural History in Paris. See "Katrfazh de Breo, Zhan Lui Arman" Bolshaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 2d. ed., 1952, XX, 385, for further information.
the cross-bred population revealed, in varying degrees, the characteristics of both progenitors. Shchapov also perceived intellectual, moral, and linguistic "cross-breeding" in Siberia.

Shchapov was obviously interested in demonstrating the superiority claimed for the Slavs. To accomplish this he used a variety of sources, such as the ideas of the explorer Pallas, which gave the impression that the Siberian natives were physically weaker than Slavic-Russians. Convinced that the tribes were also less fertile, thus weaker in another way, Shchapov again revealed a penchant for using quantitative data. His ideas on this topic are conveniently condensed into the following figures:

1) marriages between Siberian natives produced 3-4 children
2) marriages between Russian peasants yielded 10-12 children
3) marriages between Russians in Siberia exceeded 10-12 children with some truly amazing Russian

\[36\] Ibid., pp. 414-15.
women giving birth to 20–25 children. Shchapov's interest in the historical role of women has been discussed above, and it is not surprising that his ethnographic research led him to compare the fertility rates of Slavic and non-Slavic women.

Since he was interested in evaluating peoples, the methodology of comparative physiology and anthropology was rather fascinating to Shchapov. In "The Historical-ethnographical Organization" he discussed nineteenth-century research on craniology which used cubic centimeter measurements of skulls and measurements of physical strength by dynamometers to compare groups of human beings. A French approach to the study of man through statistics stimulated Shchapov to discuss data, which he gleaned from various sources, like the median height in different regions—approximately 5'2" in Kazan and 6'2" or more in part of Siberia.

37 Ibid., p. 418. Without citing specific sources, Shchapov credited Haxthausen with item B) above and Pallas with item C). Baron August von Haxthausen (1792–1866) was a prominent authority on the Russian peasantry.

38 Ibid., pp. 412–13. A dynamometer is a device which can measure the muscular strength of human beings or the power of motors.

39 Ibid., p. 452. The figures above are converted from Russian units—the arshin (2.33 feet) and the vershok (1.75 inches).
Having buttressed the concept of Slavic superiority with scientific authorities and a variety of opinions about Siberia, Shchapov also argued that the native tribes must be helped. Thus, Darwin, but not social Darwinism, is present in these studies. It is not surprising that education, including the university level, was recommended as the best remedy for the numerous tribal weaknesses. Thus, mental progress was reaffirmed as the basic answer for both Russian and Siberian advancement.

The "population series" reveals Shchapov's interest in demography and ethnography. He pursued these two topics in order to fully understand the Russian "nationality." Utilizing his own Siberian background, the works of other writers on Siberia such as Pallas, and scientific concepts taken from authorities like Darwin and Quatrefages de Breau, Shchapov explored many facets of population distribution and race mixing. The "population series" thus demonstrates Shchapov's unique theoretical approach to Russian and Siberian history. Furthermore, the Soviet author Astakhov found in the series evidence that Shchapov

---

40 Ibid., pp. 461-65.
was something of a pioneer due to the thoroughness with which he studied the peoples of the Empire. Race mixing was obviously important to Shchapov, and Siberia was the major arena for the meeting of peoples as the Slavs moved eastward. When Shchapov was sent eastward into exile, he continued to write, producing a second series of works on Siberian topics, with one exception published in the 1870's.

\footnote{Astakhov, p. 370. There is a complete reference to Astakhov's book at the beginning of the "Introduction" to this dissertation.}
CHAPTER V

SIBERIAN STUDIES PUBLISHED IN THE 1870'S

The many articles published in the 1870's reflected Shchapov's interest in a multitude of topics—including a revised theory on ethnography, the Buriat tribe, theories on instincts and egoism, communal institutions, the laboring masses, the impact of Siberia on Russia, education, problems of drinking and prostitution, American philanthropy, and the ideas of Karl Marx—most of which were linked to Siberia. Many of these articles, some quite short, are not individually crucial for an understanding of Shchapov; however, in their totality the works of the 1870's complete the picture of Shchapov's ideas, opinions, and conclusions. Field research with the Siberian Section of the Russian Geographic Society increased Shchapov's knowledge of his homeland, and, due to the materials which he preserved in these studies, the Populist ideologue earned praise for his contribution to Siberian history. Scholarship, Populism, and science
all entered Shchapov's search for a way to understand and, above all else, to improve Siberia.

The study entitled "Historical-geographical and Ethnological Notes on the Siberian Population" ("Istoriko-geograficheskie i ethnologicheskie zametki o sibirskom naselenii") was devoted to a familiar theme—the question of changes in the Slavic-Russian population as a result of moving eastward.¹ However, in this study, the concept of reversion to the dominant racial element had less importance, and the idea of a Slavic triumph was explained in a different manner. Shchapov now stressed Darwin's concept that cross-breeding, in some circumstances, could produce a unique, homogeneous people not bearing equally the characteristics of two dissimilar progenitors.²


²Ibid., p. 86, citing a Russian translation of Darwin's works entitled The Descent of Man and Sexual Selection (Proiskhodzenie cheloveka i polovoi podbor) published in Siberia in 1871.
The premise that the Slavic-Russians had dominated in transmitting their characteristics to the mixed Russian-Siberian population was not completely abandoned. But in Siberia the "national or tribal type" of the Slavic-Russians seemed to be susceptible to certain variations. Thus, a unique, homogeneous population was being produced. Shchapov was not reluctant to admit that "at present" the indigenous tribes exerted an influence on the Slavs, and the cross-breeding process was in a state of chaos. Therefore, by the 1870's, the Russian-Siberian "national type" did not exist in its final form; Shchapov did not indicate when the final form would be achieved. However, the present relates to the future, and Shchapov also clearly stated that the superiority of Russian culture and civilization would be a great force for change as time went on. The belief in Slavic superiority was thus retained in a modified fashion.

In "The Buriat Village-Family Commune" ("Buriatskaia ulusnorodovaia obshchina") Shchapov blended knowledge of a specific tribe with theories about mankind.

---

3 See Shchapov, Sochinenia, Dopolnitelynyi Tom, p. 87 and pp. 129-30 for the key concepts of his revised view of ethnography.
4 Ibid., p. 87.
to yield an interesting synthesis. The Buriat village communes were seen as the result of innate instincts, especially a "primitive purely consanguineous . . . social sympathy." Living proof of the genesis of human community was thus found in Siberia, for Shchapov saw these villages as new confirmation of the idea that communal organization was the foundation of human society. Equally important was the concept that the existence of innate social instincts, originally dominant over egoistic instincts within a small group, was also validated by the Buriat way of life.

The relatively uncivilized Buriats were of great interest to Shchapov because he believed that the answer

---


6 Ibid., p. 200.

7 Communal instincts were seen as the antitheses of egoistic instincts. Shchapov was very concerned about the strength of egoism, and, according to his usage, egoism was a term which embraced phenomena as diverse as simple theft and unequal property distribution.
to what was natural and instinctive for human beings was to be found among primitive peoples. Shchapov sought ideas different from liberal-bourgeois thought which dealt with the naturalness of what he regarded as "artificially created" concepts of social, economic, and political organization. For example, he argued that Buriat communal habits disproved the bourgeois idea that some kind of "commercial principle" was innate in mankind.

To support the notion of social instincts among a Siberian tribe, several Buriat characteristics were identified. The extension of aid to poverty stricken Siberians, in this case neither local Buriats nor ethnic Russians, for the formation of a commune was impressive to Shchapov. Similarly, he believed that the Buriats, even more than Russians in Siberia, had a great tendency to unite for mutual labor. An aversion for commercial exploitation of their comrades was another positive sign of social instincts among the Buriats. Russian influence was seen as a force which weakened some of the highly-valued social instincts.

The antithesis between opposing instincts was

Ibid., pp. 203-204.
theoretically resolved in "Egoistic Instincts in the Lena People's Commune" ("Egoisticheskie instinkty v Lenskoi narodnoi obshchine") which described different types of villages among the indigenous Siberians and Russian settlers in the Lena River region.  

Egoistic instincts were recognized as the major barriers to equality and communal development. To illustrate an uneven distribution of the means of livelihood, a kind of egoism, Shchapov cited statistical data such as comparative numbers of horses, livestock, and areas of tillable land. Shchapov tried to resolve the contradiction between social and egoistic instincts; he theorized that the two forces existed in a harmonious relationship. Therefore, in the Lena region and in all of humanity egoistic instincts eventually led to communal "reconciliation" (primirenie).

---


10 See Ibid., pp. 236-37. and 242-45 for examples of numerical data cited.
Abuses of egoism appeared to be followed by the rise of ameliorative social instincts.

Shchapov illustrated the reconciliation concept in Siberia by noting that diverse peoples, Buriats and Russians, on the Lena overcame their differences and tended to draw together in a regional communal movement.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, to Shchapov, Siberia revealed new proof that social instincts were at least as strong as the opposing force of egoism.

The positive aspects of the Siberian settlements were further explored in "The Rural Settled-Native and Russian-Peasant Commune in the Kuda Region" ("Selskaia osedlo-inorodcheskaia i russkokrestianskaia obshchina v Kudinskom krae").\textsuperscript{12} As a Populist, Shchapov viewed these institutions, the Buriat ulus (village), and working people—both rural and urban laborers—as possessing greater possibilities than larger cities and the bourgeoisie.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 256.

for the development of the kind of cooperative society he desired. Communal land ownership in the countryside was particularly praised because it kept people from becoming "landless proletarians."\(^{13}\) The relative impoverishment of the people was thought to be proportional to egoistic individualism, competition, and unequal distribution of property.

For the pursuit of social cooperation the communal village and the workers represented the greatest hope. The villages, more than cities, supposedly held greater potential for the rise of social instincts. The eradication of the "bourgeois spirit of exploitation," competition, and monopolistic practices was also more likely outside the city. Inclined to praise working people, Shchapov was quite harsh on the bourgeoisie; on an awkward, yet expressive praise they were accused of being so greedy that they revealed "psychiatric manifestations of stinginess."\(^{14}\) Previously stressing the value of European-type cities in history, Shchapov found social

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 260.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 275.
instincts threatened in large centers such as Irkutsk where he lived.  

Communal institutions—like schools, libraries, and financial organizations—were things which the people needed. In Shchapov's view "bourgeois-capitalist" abuse of the workers or the quest for luxury were expendable. The problem was in satisfying the assumed needs. According to theory and observation, village communality seemed to be a barrier to egoistic abuses. Therefore, in the villages Shchapov saw a excellent possibility for the development of social-cooperation obviously based on the communal institutions desirable for society in general.  

Thus, the humble villages of Siberia had something to offer—communality. 

The final group of Shchapov's Siberian writings to be considered was devoted to the importance of the discovery of the area in the seventeenth century, the situation before and after the governorship of Speranskii in the early nineteenth century, and, most importantly, ideas on reforms needed in Siberia. Shchapov's occasional

---

15 Essentially, Shchapov wanted the cultural and intellectual advancement historically linked to cities without the alienation of individuals also possible in an urban environment.

16 Ibid., p. 303.
references to Karl Marx will also be discussed in conjunction with ideas on the working class. Thus, near his death in 1876, Shchapov was still writing about his native region.

Seeking to emphasize the impact on Russia of the opening of Siberia, Shchapov wrote "Historical-geographical Notes on Siberia" ("Istoriko-geograficheskie zametki o Sibiri"). This rather brief article stressed that even in the seventeenth century the new lands to the east played a role in stimulating the formation of a new Russian worldview not dominated by ancient fears of nature. In retrospect, the "new world" of Siberia with its alien lands and peoples, unknown animals, plants, and minerals was a great catalyst for inquisitive minds in Muscovite Russia.

Seventeenth-century explorers and adventurers were credited with increasing Russia's knowledge of geography, nature, and ethnography. Discussing these


18 Ibid., p. 174.
early heroes, Shchapov correctly pointed out that a "simple Irkutsk cossack" Semen Dezhnev, an explorer in the 1640's and 1650's, sailed through the Bering Straits long before Vitus Bering's well-known explorations in the eighteenth century. In the writings of Erofei Khabarov, another seventeenth-century adventurer, Shchapov found something of a "historical-ethnographical" novel. Written accounts from the east appeared to be a new addition to Russian letters--a Siberian type of "travel literature."

On a more pragmatic level, the expeditions of the seventeenth century provided a base for later research. In fact, Shchapov felt that the eighteenth century revealed the most important results of the previous century's labors. He reasoned that Siberia excited the quest for knowledge while simultaneously revealing Russian intellectual weaknesses--new resources could not be fully

\[19\] Ibid., pp. 177-78. See Harrison, p. 73, for a description of Dezhnev's feat as, "the most remarkable small boat voyage in maritime history."


\[21\] See Douglas Botting, One Chilly Siberian Morning (New York: MacMillan, 1965), and Farley Mowat, The Siberians (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1971) for two recent accounts of travels through Siberia which are informative though not scholarly.
exploited without Western learning. Shchapov noted that Peter the Great's interest in Siberia led the ruler to dispatch European scientists into the hinterland of the realm. Thus, the importation of Western learning was also linked to the seventeenth-century interest in Siberia.  

Another aspect of Shchapov's research was revealed in his article "Siberian Society Before Speranskii" ("Sibirskoe obshestvo do Speranskago"). Essentially, this study was devoted to the thesis that Siberian society had been dominated by two opposing classes—the merchant-bourgeoisie and the government's administrators (chinovniki). Shchapov believed that historically both classes had been "wrong and harmful" for proper social development; neither the selfish capitalism of the merchants nor the despotism of the administrators was beneficial for Siberia. However, the administrative class held more hope for the remolding of society.

22 Shchapov, Sochineniia, Dopolnitelnyi Tom, p. 196.
24 Ibid., pp. 643-44 and 653.
The activities of Michael Speranskii, one of Russia’s greatest administrators, who was made Governor-General of Siberia in 1819 were indeed linked to reforms. Speranskii plunged into revisions in administration, government, education, and commerce. Tsar Alexander I allowed legislation in 1822 which gave most of Speranskii’s acts the sanction of law. While he was very sympathetic to Speranskii’s efforts, Shchapov, nevertheless, was of the opinion that the intellectual, moral, and social development of Siberia had not undergone substantially beneficial change. Thus, it is not surprising that the subject of reform was a basic theme in Shchapov’s works of the 1870’s.

The question of educational changes led to the publication of an article entitled "What Faculties are Necessary in a Siberian University?" ("Kakie fakultety neobkhodimy v sibirskom universitete?").

See the works of Marc Raeff, Michael Speransky, Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839 (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1957) and Siberia and the Reforms of 1822 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1956) on the Governor-General and his reforms.

Shchapov, Sochineniia, III, 716-17.

believed that a particular kind of higher educational institution was needed to meet regional needs. In Siberia the tasks of advancing the "social humanization" of the diverse population and stimulating the progress of a chaotic society required something beyond practical learning such as medical knowledge or understanding of the law. Thus, Shchapov recommended a Siberian university with four faculties: medicine, law, natural science, and history-philology.\(^{28}\)

The four faculties theoretically satisfied the "social-cultural" and "social-moral" needs of Siberia. Special emphasis was placed upon the scope of the history-philology faculty which was not to be limited to general studies or Russian literature and philology. This faculty was to include study of the native languages of Siberia and the dialects of Russian-Siberians. Russian history would be basic, but areas such as Siberian history, archeology, anthropology, ethnography, economics, and social ethics would be included. Similarly, the study of the natural sciences would have a special emphasis on areas such as local meteorology, mineralogy, and zoology.

\(^{28}\)Ibid., p. 308.
Shchapov went to some length to explain why his particular type of university was needed.\textsuperscript{29} Essentially, he saw the need for a civic-minded intelligentsia trained for regional necessities. For instance, it was hoped that more teachers and educators would be produced in the university. Thus, with these pedagogues, Siberians would become aware of the need for more lower and middle-level education. Reform from above was clearly envisaged in education.

Yet the university's improving role was not limited to the schools; the life of society, as a whole, also needed advancement. According to Shchapov, there was a vital need to increase the number of well-educated, honest public leaders in city and village government.\textsuperscript{30} The university was to satisfy this important requirement of public life. There was also a role for the educated on a more elevated plane in what Shchapov saw as higher matters of intellectual and social life.

Siberians apparently exhibited a very negative attitude toward these higher matters and were criticized for a general lack of interest in the sort of literature

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 309.
\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 311.
and ideas which meant everything to the Russian intelligentsia. Focusing on the youth of Siberia, Shchapov saw in them the potential for the type of person he valued. But, due to the educational situation the youth did not develop in a favorable manner. Most of the young people were judged to be indifferent and apathetic to matters of social progress. Shchapov not only criticized their reading habits, he thought their lives were wasted in drinking, gambling, and pursuit of pleasures of the flesh.31

Thus, the need for university graduates trained in practical knowledge and imbued with the highest social ideas was great. Progress for society was held back by the pervasive force of egoism. Siberia, much more than European Russia, was thought to be under the dominance of "crude, brutally-egoistic, narrowly-selfseeking interests" instead of beneficial social instincts and interests.32

Shchapov concluded his argument for the university by calling the attention of his readers to North America where egoism was also strong.33 Noting that Siberians

31Ibid., p. 312.
32Ibid., p. 313.
33Ibid., p. 314. Shchapov did not cite the source of his information on the United States.
sometimes compared themselves to Americans, Shchapov emphasized that among the "Yankees" (iariki) social aspirations developed in such a way that vast sums of capital were given to institutions of higher learning. Siberian capitalists were advised not to forget that American capitalists like Ezra Cornell (1807-1874) had founded institutions such as Cornell University in Ithaca, New York.

In two other works Shchapov also discussed education in Siberia. The study entitled "On the Development of Higher Human Senses" ("O razvitii vysshikh chelovecheskich chuvstv") stressed the need for intellectual improvement in Siberia to overcome problems such as egoism. Interest in the United States is also evident in this article. Shchapov showed an awareness of American support for education in the states of Indiana and Illinois and early school policy in the colony of Massachusetts.

The long essay "Siberian National Children and


Their Education" ("Sibirskie narodnye deti i ikh vospitanie"), first published in 1938, was basically devoted to the lower levels of education, and, in effect, complements Shchapov's writing on the importance of the university. Essentially, Shchapov discussed the type of child produced in Siberian schools. Each school was to perform two basic tasks: educate students with a scientific orientation and contribute to the "social-moral humanization" of the population. For the latter task the schools were to produce students imbued with qualities such as social sympathy, humanity, justice, and the all-important characteristic of socially-cooperative "solidarity."

To develop such children, Shchapov enthusiastically advocated the adoption of the educational concepts of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827). The humanitarian

---


37 Ibid., pp. 57-61. Pestalozzi was a Swiss humanitarian reformer and pedagogue who advocated using "sense impressions" in the education of children. Pestalozzi's school was well known in the early nineteenth century. Prussia was the area most clearly influenced by Pestalozzi. His method was also used somewhat in the United States. For further information see "Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich" Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVII (1970), 726, and Kate Siber, Pestalozzi (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960).
The pedagogy of Pestalozzi appealed to Shchapov's conviction that the human senses and social instincts had to be developed, especially in Siberia, through schools. Shchapov was so enthusiastic with Pestalozzi's "practical-humanitarian" approach that it was recommended for all of Russia, not just Siberia. However, it must be kept in mind that Shchapov's major published studies did not explicitly stress the ideas of Pestalozzi as was done briefly in the pages of "Siberian National Children and Their Education."

The schools were only part of the problems which seemed to plague Siberia. On a broad scale, Shchapov sought to change the attitudes and ideas of society. Always concerned with the masses, Shchapov exhorted his readers to look with new interest upon the workers in the article "What of the Working People in Siberia[?]" ("Chto takoe rabochii narod v Sibiri[?]"). Essentially, questions were raised about the workers and suggestions were made for further study of their humble existence.

---

38 A. P. Shchapov v Irkutske, pp. 58-61.
Shchapov believed that the role of the workers, some 95 percent of the population, in the hard struggle to exploit the natural riches of Siberia was not fully appreciated. Moreover, in Shchapov's view the epic toil of the workers, throughout Siberian history, was not for their own benefit, but for the satisfaction of "capitalist souls" (kapitalisticheskie dushi)—a term which he attributed to Karl Marx.

It is interesting that Shchapov was apparently the first writer in Siberia to publically cite Das Kapital. While a reference to Marx in an article about the workers seems most appropriate, there are also scattered references to Marx in other works by Shchapov. The most startling mention of the great German philosopher is in the article "Olga Ivanovna Shchapova" where such "giants" of human progress as Christ, Rousseau, St. Simon, Fourier, Owen,

---

40 Ibid., p. 315.
41 Ibid., p. 316. Shchapov gave a brief reference to a Russian translation of Marx's Das Kapital which was cited as Kapital, T. I (Volume I).
42 Ocherki istorii istoricheskoi nauki v SSSR (Essays on The History of Historical Science in the USSR) (Moscow, 1955-1966), II, 835.
Comte, Lassalle, Proudhon, Marx, Mill, and Mazzini were mentioned. 43

The Siberian workers, not Karl Marx, were Shchapov's most immediate concern in the article under discussion. A number of questions and topics were raised concerning the class sometimes designated as the proletarians. 44 Shchapov obviously believed that more workers were needed, but he also pursued the idea that if the workers, the largest element of the population, were so necessary, then why was local government not more concerned with working class interests. In a logical manner the concept of the relative importance of cities and villages was raised. It was observed that most of the working population did not live in cities. Thus, Shchapov focused on the issue of the importance of the advancement of village life and industry as opposed to the development of cities.

43 See Shchapov, Sochinenia, II, 11, for the reference to the founder of Christianity and some of the most important socialist thinkers of the nineteenth century. The reference for the article is: A. P. Shchapov, "Olga Ivanovna Shchapova" Sochinenia A. P. Shchapova ("Olga Ivanovna Shchapova" in The Works of A. P. Shchapov), II (St. Petersburg, 1906-1908), 1-30. The article was written after the death of Olga Shchapova in 1874.

44 Shchapov, Sochinenia, Dopolnitelyyi Tom, pp. 318-23.
Virtually all aspects of the workers' existence, from the organization of labor to domestic life, seemed to need more attention. Shchapov thought cooperative labor of the artel type was particularly necessary because of the Siberian environment. On a more personal level, he called attention to the prevalence of drinking by the workers. Women were not forgotten; the place of women amidst the workers and the causes of prostitution were also matters of concern. Basically, Shchapov argued that the working class in Siberia had been neglected and had not been sufficiently studied.

However, Shchapov did not wait long for more research before formulating a general concept of social transformation in the very brief article "The Social Needs of Siberia on the Eve of Reforms" ("Sotsialnye potrebnosti Sibiri nakanye reform") which was published in 1876, the year of his death. Convinced that reforms

---

45 Ibid., p. 319. The artel was a collective association of workers. The artel of the nineteenth century was different from the Soviet artel.

could not actually succeed unless a different view of life and society was adopted by all who lived in Siberia, Shchapov stressed the need to create a population which would independently seek collective goals. The problems and solutions involved in creating a "spirit of community" (dukh obshchestvennosti) led to a theory which explained how reform could occur in Siberia.  

Most of the difficulties preventing the emergence of the desired "spirit of community" were linked to the familiar evil of egoism. Shchapov was very critical of Siberian society where the relationship between individuals might be merely commercial contact in trading and selling. Egoism, not true social unity, was seen in the market place. Thus, to Shchapov the cities, commercial centers, appeared to be "socially-unconnected" (obshchestvenno-bessviaznyi) conglomerates of family units not linked together for social interests. Egoism and ethnic differences were also perceived as disruptive forces in the villages.

According to Shchapov, Siberians suffered from being peculiarly separated from each other and

\[\text{(Ibid., pp. 325-36.)}\]

\[\text{(Ibid., p. 326.)}\]
overly-committed to material well-being. The qualities of "social sympathy" and "social altruism" seemed to be restricted to family relationships; communality was a potential solution not yet existing throughout society. Siberian patriotism existed, but it did not give true unity because of its apparent lack of social consciousness. In public life and civic affairs, personal advantage seemed to always dominate over the public interest. Despite these problems, Shchapov still saw a way to create a new society with different attitudes.

The theoretical solution for Siberia's problems was based on the concept that the masses would respond to reform only if new institutions clearly improved each person's material existence thus satisfying egoistic instincts. Shchapov believed that reform keyed to general concepts like improving the wealth of the nation would be met with indifference if personal economic improvement was not perceived. A two-part process was envisaged in which governmental social reforms were enacted while the masses were awakened for independent collective reform through the agency of institutions.

49 Ibid., p. 327.
50 Ibid., pp. 329-30.
which satisfied basic popular needs.

In theory, a self-sustaining reform process could be initiated if the people saw that life was improved by collective "sociality" (sotsialnost'). If life was made better by new institutions, then according to Shchapov, the masses would be stimulated to move forward to higher social development of a more independent nature: new institutions would lead to people with different attitudes concerning improvement of their own lives. Much of this theorizing was obviously based upon the efficacy of certain institutions. Descending from general theory to specific recommendations, Shchapov gave his readers a view of institutions capable of overcoming the passive inertia of Siberian society. A commitment to the artel type of organization and an appreciation of monetary needs was clear in the discussion of financial institutions, manufacturing artels, agricultural associations, communal lands, cooperative markets, and the use of the artel in contracts.  

It was emphasized that government could play a crucial role in the establishment of the necessary institutions.  

---

51 Ibid., p. 331.  
52 Ibid., p. 332. While Shchapov was famous as an historian of "the people," he was not blind to the fact that government could play a role in the reform process.
Focusing on the *artel* and financial organs, Shchapov gave an enthusiastic opinion of what an organization devoted to these two institutions could do for Siberia. He believed that the economy might be changed to benefit all of the people and that egoism and exploitation could be replaced by collective action as the foundation of social and economic development. Furthermore, social, intellectual, and moral "self-education" (*samovospitanie*) could be advanced while the population was stimulated to act on its own for the improvement of society. Siberia could indeed be transformed if the attitudes of Siberians were changed by a new understanding of the benefits of the "spirit of community."

Conclusions - Part III

Shchapov's studies on the population and Siberia were devoted to three basic topics: demographic patterns, racial mixing, and reform. Throughout these works a Populist viewpoint is evident. Thus, Shchapov's works continued to reflect important ideas of his era, Populism and the quest for scientific knowledge, and, to some extent, he developed and advanced these concerns through

---

his Siberian research which has retained a measure of significance into the 1970's.

The "population series" of the 1860's has a very modern tone due to its attempt at understanding the way in which several aspects of the environment predetermined where human beings would live. Shchapov tried to establish a relationship between the pattern of settlements and factors such as the need for food, soil chemistry, the size and nature of the land, health factors, and even the animal kingdom. In these studies the obvious desire to use quantitative data also contributed to the impression of modernity.

Shchapov's penchant for scientific explanations and theories make his works both fascinating and difficult to understand. This is no less true of his theories on racial mixing than as it was of previously discussed studies on brain development and women. In a sense, Shchapov was a racist; yet, he was convinced that the superior race, the Russian-Slavs, was influenced by the presumably inferior Siberian tribes and that the Russians should help the tribes advance to a more civilized condition. The vicious aspects of social Darwinism were alien
to his mind. Shchapov was not totally consistent in his view of the races; he revised his approach without repudiating the commitment to Slavic superiority. Initially, in the 1860's, he put more emphasis on an assimilative process with an atavistic tendency in the cross-bred population to revert toward the dominant Slavic element. Then, in works published in the 1870's, Slavic superiority was reaffirmed, but the Siberia before Shchapov's eyes seemed to be in a state of biological chaos; the cross-breeding process was still going on, and the Slavic superiority would be more visible as time passed.

The mixing of peoples in Siberia was only one aspect of Shchapov's interests. The conviction that life could be made better for "the people" constantly led him to consider various reforms of a specific and general nature. Educational reform was advocated through a university with four departments and, in a volume published in 1938, Shchapov urged the utilization of Pestalozzi's ideas. In Shchapov's view, villages and workers held more hope for reform than cities and the bourgeoisie. Social classes had unequal value. Committed to the
workers, both rural and urban, Shchapov was obviously interested in the ideas of Karl Marx. While he was not a disciple of Marx, Shchapov was the kind of thinker who might have become a Marxist had he lived through the 1880's and 1890's when Marxism was made more relevant to Russia. Shchapov was not reluctant to embrace new ideologies, and the Marxist claim to scientific validity might have made him a convert to the new faith of a significant number of the intelligentsia.

While Part III above has been focused on Shchapov's Siberian studies, we should keep in mind that he was fundamentally a Populist. In retrospect, these works revealed a Populist examination of a specific region. Despite the peculiarities of the area, Shchapov still saw its salvation in a Populist light: "the people," not the bourgeoisie or the government held the key to reform; communal institutions such as the native villages or the artel, not private enterprise or an alienated industrial proletariat were the desired agents of change. Exile to Siberia and discovery of Marx did not divert Shchapov from his basic type of social criticism: narodnichestvo.
Shchapov's studies on the population and Siberia did not have the same great impact that some of his earlier works produced, but his later studies were being published, and since "Shchapov" was still a name of great significance in Populist circles of the 1870's, it seems logical that his later works would have attracted some attention from the intelligentsia. Beyond the Populist aspect, Shchapov's Siberian studies of the 1870's have additional significance as source materials. In this context we are not concerned with Shchapov's theories, but with the factual content of his works: personal observations, conversations with Siberians, archival evidence, materials from local family records, and especially historical materials from the Eastern-Siberian Geographic Society which were lost in a fire of 1879. As of 1937, Shchapov's works were regarded as the only available source for certain materials on Siberia in the nineteenth century. It was indeed a tribute when a Soviet writer commented, "For a long time to come Siberian

---

historians will use the historical material collected by Shchapov.\footnote{Ibid.} This positive evaluation of Shchapov's Siberian research has been continued in more recent works by Soviet historiographers which are discussed below in Part IV.
PART IV

CONCLUDING INTERPRETATION
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The preceding parts have been mainly descriptive in order to provide an easily accessible source devoted to Shchapov's post-1863 works. I have tried to describe these writings, as their author might have, by identifying basic topics and ideas. To some degree, I wanted to let Shchapov speak for himself, since others have spoken somewhat superficially for him. Obviously, any description is a form of analysis, and Parts I, II, and III contained interpretive comments for their respective topics. However, now in Part IV, it is appropriate to present a concluding interpretation of the corpus of the post-1863 works structured around four points: 1) Shchapov continued to make a contribution to Populist thought and historical scholarship, but this contribution and the wide scope of his writings have not been fully explained in previously published works, 2) the theoretical aspect of these works is their most distinctive and difficult feature, 3) Shchapov's theories now appear to be rather
extravagant and reveal certain intellectual weaknesses, 4) examination of the later studies places the perelom concept in clearer focus as a significant transformation within Shchapov's thought, but not a total change of his essentially Populist worldview.

Shchapov's contribution to Populism and historical scholarship did not cease when he was exiled to Siberia, yet much of the literature on Shchapov fails to provide a comprehensive view of his writings during the twelve years from 1864 to 1876. Having researched the post-1863 works, previously published commentary appears to be like descriptions of a complicated building which focused on one or two parts of the structure without adequately depicting the whole edifice; it is as if writers attempted to portray The Cathedral of St. Basil, in Moscow—which has a central church and eight surrounding chapels—by discussing a few of the chapels, but not all eight nor the center. Shchapov's works, like St. Basil's, cannot be appreciated without knowledge of the whole structure.

Russian Populism has been the object of a great deal of study, and Shchapov, primarily for his ideas before 1863, has been acknowledged as a very important
Populist thinker. The post-1863 writings were also a contribution to the Populist movement, but the scholarly attention to these works has been disproportionate to their interesting and challenging content. Viewed from a Populist perspective, Shchapov provided a critical interpretation of the history of Russian education and science, the history of women, and a view of Siberia supported by his background and research. This later contribution was not as crucial to Populism as Shchapov's earlier theses. However, the post-1863 studies by no means deserve the almost cursory treatment often accorded to them in the past. If Shchapov is going to be identified as an important Populist thinker, then the full range of his thoughts should be indicated.

Viewed from another perspective, the post-1863 works also comprise a contribution to historical scholarship which has not been fully portrayed. It may be that Shchapov's unique combination of professional skills and social interests resulted in writings which could have a long delayed impact, of limited but nonetheless real importance, in Russian studies and related fields. Here again, it would be intemperate to overemphasize the
importance of his works, but on the other hand, Shchapov's research on the history of education and science has, within the last decade, been utilized by Alexander Vucinich the author of two books on Russian science which are discussed below. Other scholars might also profit by acquainting themselves with Shchapov's research.

Consider additional aspects of his post-1863 writings such as the "woman question" and Siberia. Research on the history of women is of great interest to us in the 1970's. As suggested previously, scholars in this area might do well to consult the works of Shchapov for his interpretation and research concerning the place of women in Russian history. Previous studies contained hardly a word on the "woman question" in Shchapov's works. With regard to his Siberian studies, Shchapov's legacy may yet prove to be more valuable than commonly realized. Soviet commentators on Shchapov have praised him for preserving historical data on Siberia. Thus, his research could be valuable for a number of disciplines such as anthropology, ethnic studies, or perhaps economic history. While the comments made above may appear to be overly optimistic concerning Shchapov's later works, it is my
conviction that they are valuable works which comprise a contribution to the world of learning that has been somewhat slighted.

Other scholars, often dealing with much broader topics, have not fully explained the value and complexity of the post-1863 works. Shchapov wrote of so many things that one is liable to be misled by rather brief descriptions of his works. Soviet authors have shown a fair amount of interest in the later works, but even they have been somewhat remiss in the thoroughness with which the works have been described. Both Western and Soviet sources would be improved if they presented a more inclusive treatment of Shchapov's works.

Anatole Mazour, author of Modern Russian Historiography, described Shchapov as "the pioneer populist historian of nineteenth-century Russia" whose ideas embraced "the current populist philosophy of the 'seventies.'"\(^1\) Emphasizing Shchapov's regionalism, research on the raskol, and interest in "the people," Mazour depicted Shchapov as an opponent of the State-centered, "juridical" school of Russian historiography.

\(^1\)Mazour, p. 150. Consult Mazour's comments on Shchapov between pp. 146-51.
Other topics, such as the essays on geography and Shchapov's concern for universal education, were mentioned in a few sparse words. Thus, while Mazour's book is undeniably valuable for placing Shchapov within the broad topic of Russian historiography, the nature of Shchapov's research after 1863 was not adequately revealed.

Alexander Vucinich's two books Science in Russian Culture: A History to 1860 and Science in Russian Culture 1861-1917 illustrate the value of Shchapov's research and the problem of fully explaining the nature of his works. In Vucinich's approach Shchapov's scholarship was utilized, but the abstruse theoretical framework surrounding that scholarship was not fully described. Shchapov was praised as, "the historian and sociologist of science," who also deserved the following evaluation, "Not only are his essays a rich source of information on the development of scientific thought and the scientific attitude in Russia, but in their wide scope and generally high quality they are an impressive summation of the scientific achievements in Russia until the early 1850's." Thus, Shchapov emerges as a highly valued scholar, yet his

---

history and sociology of science were interconnected parts of a larger structure which also included complex scientific theories interpreting the history of science and even the workings of the Russian mind. Vucinich, dealing with the broad topic of Russian science, did not indicate the great dimensions of Shchapov's views on the topic.

Franco Venturi’s masterful *Roots of Revolution* differs from the studies of Mazour and Vucinich in the author's approach to Shchapov. In a chapter entitled "The Intellectual Movement of the 'Sixties': Dobrolyubov and Shchapov" Venturi presented a brief biography of Shchapov which emphasized the importance of "the people" throughout the historian's life and his early contributions to Populist theory. Venturi displayed an incisive understanding of the post-perelom phase of Shchapov's works: "Science would give the intelligentsia a tool to reach the popular masses, where the attempt to revive Russia's past had failed." Yet Venturi devoted just two pages to the period 1863-1876. Thus, the full variety, depth, and complexity of Shchapov's works were given a capsule treatment in *Roots of Revolution*, an outstanding

---

3 Venturi, pp. 187-203.
4 Ibid., p. 203.
source on Russian Populism.

Soviet sources exhibit a greater appreciation of the full scope of Shchapov's works. Yet, the works were so complex that only detailed description communicates the many facets of Shchapov's studies. In the multivolume *Essays on the History of Historical Science in the USSR* Shchapov was linked to "revolutionary-democrats"—leaders such as Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, and Pisarev. A section of the *Essays* devoted to Shchapov was dominated by the concept that he was the only successful "democratic" historian of his era who interpreted history from the perspective of "the people." The *Essays* contain biographical material which covers the whole of Shchapov's life, his contributions to research on the *raskol*, his significance as a Populist theoretician, the *perelom* of 1863, and the subsequent works of the 1860's and 1870's. The most interesting aspect of the *Essays* is the interpretation of Shchapov's ultra-scientific worldview.

From a Soviet viewpoint, Shchapov substituted

---

5 Complete references to the Soviet sources used above were given at the beginning of the "Introduction" to this study.

6 See *Essays*, II, 3, 66-80, 270-71 and 825-35 on A. P. Shchapov.

natural science for Marxist theory as the foundation of economics, and he did not understand that the study of human society could not be mastered by nineteenth-century techniques borrowed from the sciences. The Essays also raised the problem of Shchapov as materialist or idealist; the historian was described as an "advocate" (storonnik) of materialism whose worldview was not totally free of idealism. Shchapov's materialist-environmentalism was interpreted as too mechanical and deficient because he did not realize that the environment acted on mankind through Marxist "relations of production." Idealism was detected in Shchapov's concept that razum (reason or intelligence) and science could overcome the influence of the environment.

The Essays also called attention to Shchapov's studies of his homeland by stating that they "occupy a distinguished place" within research on Siberia. Furthermore, it was noted that, "the well-known historian, ethnographer, and publicist A. P. Shchapov played a significant role in the Siberian branch of the Russian Geographic Society. Shchapov was credited with valuable

---

8Ibid., pp. 826-35, contain a discussion of Shchapov's Siberian studies.
research on the movement of Russians into Siberia and their relations with the indigenous population. The factual content of Shchapov's studies was highly valued along with his emphasis on the need for serious research in Siberia.

Criticism of Shchapov's Siberian studies pointed to a contradictory treatment of the Buriat communes which seemed to possess both social cooperation and material inequalities due to egoism. Shchapov made an attempt to resolve this contradiction by his theses on the reconciliation of opposing instincts. Even though he began to study Marx in Siberia it was clear, in the Essays, that Shchapov never reached the heights of historical materialism. Shchapov wrote on the workers of Siberia, but his understanding of the toilers was not precise, from a Soviet view, because he regarded all who worked—from peasants to industrial laborers—as "working people"; Shchapov did not understand the special nature of the industrial proletariat in Marxist theory.9

Thus, in the Essays Shchapov was endorsed as an important "democratic" historian who searched for a materialist explanation of history with a worldview

9Ibid., p. 835.
hampered by idealism. However, even in this authoritative Soviet source on historiography the "woman question" was not explored, and the extreme complexity of Shchapov's theories on topics such as physiology, race-mixing, and education was not adequately indicated.

A short book by P. Kabanov *The Social-political and Historical Views of A. P. Shchapov* compensated somewhat for the deficiencies of the *Essays*. Writing to publicize the whole of Shchapov's life and works, Kabanov proceeded with the thesis that while great attention has been given to prominent "revolutionary-democrats"—such as Chernyshevsky and Dobroliubov—lesser known, but still important members of the movement, like Shchapov, deserve more study. Kabanov's willingness to discuss some of Shchapov's more abstruse scientific theories, which other authors often negelected is a particularly noteworthy feature of the book.

Kabanov showed how materialist scientific concepts and the ideas of A. P. Shchapov related to the movement of the "revolutionary-democrats" or "enlighteners" of the 1860's. From Kabanov's viewpoint, the most outstanding of the "enlighteners" were only able to

---

10 Kabanov, pp. 61-66.
approach dialectical materialism. However, the "enlighteners" were credited with the "most progressive worldview before Marxism." Thus, Kabanov placed Shchapov's ideas, of the 1860's and 1870's, within a highly valued, yet always insufficient, tradition of pre-Marxist materialist thought.

The true nature of the later works was at least indicated when Kabanov discussed Shchapov's theories on topics such as physiology, the human brain, the thinking process, intellectual development and its retardation, the importance of geographic environment, population distribution, the development of physical strength, the interaction of peoples, and the influence of individuals like Peter I on history. Kabanov let his readers know that Shchapov was concerned with concepts such as "the law of the anatomical-physiological progress of the human nervous system."\(^\text{11}\)

Shchapov's theories were criticized as well as described; for example, Kabanov found that he did not understand the role of the proletariat and that he was rather naive in his treatment of concepts such as the slow

\(^{11}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 66.$
receptivity of the Russian "nervous-brain" system. 12 Similarly, Kabanov held Shchapov to be in error concerning environmental influence: Shchapov saw geography as too direct in its impact upon mankind, and he did not recognize the Marxist "mode of production" as a determining influence. Like other "enlighteners" Shchapov's materialism was also tainted by an idealist stress upon the power of "thought" to affect human society. Kabanov saw many of Shchapov's mistakes as the result of trying to use theories from disciplines such as physiology to explain historical laws and social development.

Despite his criticism, Kabanov concluded that Shchapov's works had undoubted significance in the crucial struggle against the forces of reaction, autocracy, and serfdom. In the hands of Shchapov history became a weapon used against the tsarist system. Tribute was also given to Shchapov as an important historian of "the people" whose works, before and after 1863, contained "original and progressive thoughts" and "valuable factual data."

Thus, while Kabanov is a perceptive scholar, his presentation of the life and works of Shchapov within a slim book, of necessity, involved much condensation of

12 See Ibid., pp. 38, 63 and 78, for Kabanov's critical comments.
material with an inevitable loss of crucial details. Even Kabanov did not reveal the more fantastic aspects of Shchapov's theories, or his concern with women, but to his credit Kabanov did more than others to communicate the content of the post-1863 works.

In 1965, V. I. Astakhov published his *Course of Lectures on Russian History* with the nineteenth lecture entitled "The First Russian Professional Historian-Democrat: A. P. Shchapov." Much of Astakhov's description, analysis and evaluation of Shchapov's works is similar to the approach found in Kabanov's book and the *Essays*. However, Astakhov's twenty-nine-page lecture on Shchapov is interesting for two reasons—the evaluation of certain post-1863 works and a convenient commentary on the evolution of Soviet opinion on Shchapov.

Astakhov expressed the idea that before Shchapov no one had been so diligent in the study of the peoples of the Empire. Referring to Shchapov's Siberian studies, Astakhov made it clear that he agreed with another Soviet writer, N. P. Boltukhin, that some of the ideas in the studies are still significant and for a nineteenth

---

13 Astakhov, pp. 347-76.
14 Ibid., pp. 370-71.
16 Astakhov, pp. 372-75.
17 Until the 1930's Pokrovsky was a leader in Soviet historiography.
18 Rubenstein was the official voice of Soviet historiography during the 1940's until one of the ideological changes of the Stalin era led to his decline.

sixteenth century figure Shchapov was rather progressive.15

While it is not exhaustive, Astakhov's commentary on past interpretations of Shchapov sheds light on the origins of the concept of Shchapov as "revolutionary-democrat."16 None other than G. B. Plekhanov was cited as the first to analyze Shchapov from a Marxist viewpoint. Astakhov noted that Plekhanov placed a high value on Shchapov as an historian of "the people" and an opponent of autocracy and serfdom. M. N. Pokrovsky (1868-1932) was apparently the originator of the view of Shchapov as the first professional historian to speak of the masses.17 Further understanding of Shchapov's historical views was credited to N. L. Rubenstein (1910-1952), but Rubenstein's scholarship was also criticized as being inconsistent and contradictory.18 Astakhov found Shchapov first designated as a "revolutionary-democrat" in The

— Astakhov, pp. 372-75.
— Until the 1930's Pokrovsky was a leader in Soviet historiography.
— Rubenstein was the official voice of Soviet historiography during the 1940's until one of the ideological changes of the Stalin era led to his decline.
History of the USSR, published in 1949 and edited by M. V. Nechkina. Since 1949, other Soviet scholars, especially P. Kabanov, have used the same ideological designation; the multi-volume Essays, with M. V. Nechkina as editor-in-chief, again linked Shchapov to the camp of the "revolutionary-democrats." Astakhov's view is that while complete unanimity of opinion has not been achieved, the concept of Shchapov as "revolutionary-democrat" is the most valid interpretation. Thus, while sharing the common deficiency of brevity, Astakhov's lecture is quite useful for its evaluation and commentary on Soviet historiography.

The second point made in conclusion is that the theoretical aspect of these works is their most distinctive and difficult feature. Shchapov's writings are a blend of scientific theories and historical research. The scholarship is valuable, but in some discussions of Shchapov's works the scientific theories surrounding and intermingled with his more conventional scholarship have almost been reduced to insignificance. Yet, to Shchapov the theories were far from insignificant, and he devoted a large portion of his writings to scientific concepts.
Those interested in intellectual history will find Shchapov's theories to be an intriguing example of the fascinating kind of thinking which became prevalent on the nineteenth century—the search for a total explanation of human behavior through scientific knowledge. Shchapov's concern with science as the answer to the problems of "the people" was pursued with such enthusiasm that the theoretical aspect became the most distinctive, even dominant, characteristic of the post-1863 works.

Scientific theories also cause the greatest difficulty in the evaluation of Shchapov's works. In explaining the research value of the post-1863 writings, one must not lose sight of the theoretical aspect; in presenting the theories, care must be taken not to slight the worth of the research. To dismiss the works of Shchapov because of the theories would be unfair and wasteful. Because it is hard to focus on one aspect of Shchapov's writings without distorting another, it becomes very difficult to keep the whole structure in its true perspective as the creation of a thinker who wanted to be an "historian-scientist", yet never equalled in science what he was capable of in history.
Beyond the problem of perspective which the theories present, they also appear to be rather extravagant and reveal intellectual weaknesses. Shchapov should not be criticized for not having known what we know about the sciences, but he can be fairly criticized on the grounds that his theories are now outmoded, exceedingly hard to unravel, at times inconsistent, and not totally in accord with the scientific logic of his own era. Shchapov possessed the passion for theoretical knowledge which makes nineteenth-century thinkers so interesting, but he also reflected the embryonic stage of many of the sciences in the 1800's. While I endorse the ideas that the post-1863 works can be a valuable source on several topics and that the theoretical aspect must be understood, it is also obvious that Shchapov cannot be viewed as an entirely reliable scientific theorist.

Throughout his studies Shchapov delved into a wide range of disciplines including early, and now outdated, forms of anthropology, anatomy, chemistry, demography, ethnography, economics, geography, genetics, linguistics, meteorology, pedagogy, physiology, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, zoology, and nearly forgotten
disciplines such as craniology and J. S. Mill's ethology. Many had toiled to create this pyramid of the sciences: Bernard, Buckle, Darwin, Helmholtz, Liebig, Marx, Maudsley, Quatrefages de Breau, Sechenov, Stewart, Tyndall, and others supplied Shchapov with concepts which he utilized in constructing theories which now have an extravagant tone, but in all fairness, are very understandable as products of the age of mechanical materialism.

In essence, Shchapov combined a crude type of materialism with the belief that men could overcome the past by working in the present to build a scientifically oriented future. In his works on intellectual development and education the extravagant nature of his theories is well-illustrated by reference to the "cold theory," the typology of peoples, and view of Peter I, and the concept of "sensory knowledge."

The cold northern climate allegedly retarded the workings of the Russian mind; surely, Shchapov's countrymen would not like to see this theory revived! While Russians suffered from their environment, Germans were supposedly conditioned by nature for rationality and transcendental philosophy. The German contribution
to philosophy is undeniable, but the modern explanation for this contribution does not substantiate Shchapov's type of determinism.

With his interpretation of Peter I, Shchapov challenged imagination; the Tsar supposedly possessed the quality of "xenomania" at birth and his "nervous-brain organization" was linked to a higher stage of human development. Shchapov's approach to Peter I would be more acceptable if it were restricted to a psychological interpretation of the Tsar's ideas and decisions. However, Shchapov presented a partially physiological interpretation of Peter's actions which is virtually a biological view of the Tsar as an organism born with an instinctive reflex to reform.

The senses held Russia back intellectually, but "sensory knowledge" also led to a theory of progress in Shchapov's convoluted worldview: through special techniques of instruction, using the basic senses, Russians had to advance to abstract knowledge and scientific thought. The most glaring weakness in Shchapov's theory of learning is that the psychological and physiological bases of the concept were formulated long ago and were
permeated with an outdated, mechanistic outlook constructed prior to many important advances in the sciences and pedagogy.

When he turned to the "woman question" Shchapov also utilized a theoretical approach based on his understanding of nineteenth-century science. The fundamental weakness of his approach was in the unproved assumption that while women suffered from retardation of the nervous system and intellect, females were also destined to advance intellectually due to a low of physiology. Shchapov's knowledge of links between the nervous system and the mind was at best rudimentary in the 1860's and 1870's. I think most would agree that progress for women is inevitable, but that advancement is more likely to come from moral, social, or legal concepts than from a physiological law.

Theories of racial cross-breeding, primarily in Siberia, similarly illustrate the weakness of Shchapov's scientific approach. Fundamentally, Shchapov's view was predicated upon the assumption that Russian Slavs were generally superior to other peoples of the Empire—this was an assumption because, despite some research,
he never studied all of the mixed population. Shchapov's theoretical explanations of race-mixing were not consistent: at one point he described a process in which the races mixed, Slavic characteristics were transmitted to non-Slavs, and then an atavistic process occurred and the mixed population tended to revert to the form of the dominant Slavic element. Reversion to the dominant element played less of a role in another study in which Shchapov still endorsed Slavic superiority, but weakened the atavistic concept. Recognizing that cross-breeding was chaotic in Siberia, Shchapov simply predicted that Slavic superiority would continue to be a great force in the future.

On scientific grounds the race-mixing theories are suspect because Shchapov relied upon assumption and prediction, not the method of deduction which requires observation of a completed process before making conclusions. In the nineteenth century, great reliance was placed upon the experimental method, but Shchapov was not totally in accord with the scientific logic of his own era because he was not willing to postpone conclusions with the finality of a laboratory experiment, Shchapov's
desire for scientific certainty seems to be unattainable.

The fourth point made in conclusion is that examination of the later studies places the perelom concept in clearer focus as a significant transformation within Shchapov's thought, but not a total change of his essentially Populist worldview. Commitment to "the people" provides a definite unity to Shchapov's works, but after 1863 he saw a different way to fulfill his obligation to the masses. Shchapov's early works can be viewed as "historical Populism," while his later studies can be interpreted as "scientific Populism." The difference between the two types of works being that he first found solutions to the problems of the masses through the revival of historic institutions, such as the Land Assembly, but later stressed science as the key to future reforms, not that he ever abandoned all elements of the past or history as a method of portraying the dilemmas of "the people."

The concept that "the people's" needs were not served by the tsarist State was the ideological, and emotional, core of Russian Populism. Individual Populists did not agree on all aspects of ideology, but enough men
and women were devoted to the Russian masses in the same way to be recognized as a distinctive movement.

Populists, in general, wanted neither the backward agrarian-based society of nineteenth-century Russia, nor an industrialized society dominated by a middle class, nor the Marxist "dictatorship of the proletariat."

Essentially, Populists wanted the best of two worlds: they sought the social cohesiveness symbolized by ideals of communal life and the improvement of human existence which education, science, and technology seemed to offer.

Shchapov's post-perelom works are clearly within the Populist tradition, even if they are somewhat different from his earlier studies; thus, his thinking changed, but this was change within a worldview, not a complete change of worldview. The narrative description of Shchapov's works given above revealed his commitment to "the people" as opposed to the State, communal traditions, education, science, technology, economics, the workers, and the "woman question." The content and tone of these works make it clear that Shchapov stayed within the Populist camp. The perelom was a break or fracture, but it did not destroy the organic unity of Shchapov's thought.
Since narodnichestvo (Populism), even in its etymology, was so obviously linked to "the people," Shchapov has to be regarded as a member of the movement before and after 1863. From his earlier days as a lecturer and throughout the 1860's and 1870's Shchapov generally presented a negative view of Russia under the tsarist State: Church and State failed to create a thinking class, the State fostered obscurantism, and virtually all aspects of life in Russia needed reform. As a scholar, Shchapov contributed to the Populist attitude that the State was the symbol of an unjust system which mistreated its most numerous class, the toiling masses.

According to Populist tradition, it was the humble villages, not the State leviathan, which offered the best hope for a reformed society in the future. Village communes seemed to be the nuclei around which a better world could be constructed. Throughout many of his later studies, including The Social-pedagogical Conditions, "The Natural-psychological Conditions," and works on Siberia, Shchapov demonstrated his convictions that communal organization was basic for human society and should be retained in the future.
Posterity, in the Populist view, was also to be educated. Populists were concerned with universal schooling of the masses in Russia. Traditionally, with few exceptions, education played a small role in the lives of the peasants and industrial workers. Surely, no one was more convinced than Shchapov that the masses had to be educated, and as noted in the "Conclusions" to the first part of this study, his ideas on pedagogy were consistent with the Populist approach to education. While Shchapov is usually not viewed as an original formulator of Populist educational theories, there is no doubt that he sought to spread basic ideas such as scientifically oriented education for "the people."

Related, but not restricted to education was another of Shchapov's most important desiderata--the increased use of science and technology throughout many aspects of Russian life. Populists generally favored the use of science and technology to improve human existence, but they also wished to avoid the negative aspects of the industrial revolution in the West. Most Populists shared the conviction of Chernyshevsky that science could play a critical role in human existence. Shchapov became a
convinced advocate for science, and as previously emphasized, saw science as the key to many reforms in Russia including the attainment of a rational economy.

In his general treatment of economics and the related question of the workers Shchapov was again within the Populist tradition which recognized the centrality of economics, problems of economic development, and the obvious difficulties of all of those who toiled, whether it be in agriculture or industry. Like most Populists, Shchapov tended to view both agricultural and industrial laborers as members of the working class. During the 1860's and 1870's Shchapov's writings, from "Natural Science" to the studies on Siberia, stressed the need to remedy the economic backwardness of Russia, the concept of force as the source of wealth, the need to help the workers, and opposition to capitalism.

During Shchapov's lifetime the "woman question" became a bitterly argued issue in Russia. Populists, notably Chernyshevsky, extended their ideology to include concepts which we might now view as the liberation of women from many social, legal, economic, and political restrictions. Shchapov's post-1863 studies contained works
which were obviously intended to contribute to the Populist understanding of the "woman question"; concern with this issue is a good example of how Shchapov's works are linked to the ideological content of Russian Populism. Thus, throughout his post-1863 works Shchapov demonstrated that his thought had undergone a transformation, he had found new solutions to old problems and certainly recognized some new problems, but that he did not experience a complete change of worldview—whether he looked to history or to science for solutions, he was basically a narodnik, a man of "the people."

I believe that those who have read this study will now agree with a point first made in the "Preface"—the post-1863 works of Shchapov do contain more of interest and value than commonly realized. Shchapov has left us a legacy of ideas and scholarship which is worth a struggle with his tiazholyi style. It is my obvious conviction that the post-1863 works should be better known by the scholarly community. Our knowledge of Russian history can only be enriched through a wider appreciation of what Shchapov attempted to accomplish
during the exile period. It is hoped that this study will contribute to a more precise understanding of Shchapov's search for a scientific analysis of the nature of Russian society.
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