Введение. Актуальность статьи объясняется 200-летием со дня рождения Константина Дмитриевича Ушинского (1823-1870 гг.), и тем, что работа великого русского педагога в качестве редактора главного педагогического журнала России не находила отражения в публикациях российских историков педагогики и образования. Цель статьи состоит в характеристике его деятельности в должности редактора «Журнала Министерства народного просвещения».

Материалы и методы. В качестве методов исследования автором используются: анализ историко-педагогической и мемуарной литературы, биографический, исторический и сравнительный методы, а также аксиологический (ценностный) подход к исследованию историко-педагогического материала.

Результаты. Содержание журнала до К. Д. Ушинского не отвечало требованиям времени и запросам педагогов, прежде всего, учителей начальной школы как самого массового типа школ в России. Содержащиеся на страницах журнала материалы не давали исчерпывающего ответа на те актуальные вопросы, которые так волновали передовое педагогическое общество в конце 1850-х годов. Редактор К. Д. Ушинский ввел в журнале четыре раздела: педагогика и дидактика; вспомогательные науки; критика и библиография; новости и "смесь". Он обеспечил своевременный выход журнала, тогда как раньше номера задерживались на полгода и более, а также привлек в авторский коллектив талантливых ученых.

Обсуждение. В итоге, настойчивые усилия К. Д. Ушинского по преобразованию "Журнала министерства народного просвещения" принесли свои позитивные результаты. Журнал, ранее представлявший собой сугубо официальный сборник приказов и распоряжений министерства, а также случайную подборку специфических, обычно далеких от педагогики статей, превратился в издание, ставшее печатным центром, объединявшим прогрессивные педагогические силы в России. Журнал чутко отзывался на передовые образовательные тенденции и текущие события в области воспитания, стремился направлять общественное мнение в том направлении, которое соответствовало взглядам самого Ушинского. Всё это позволило журналу занять видное место среди российских периодических изданий.

Заключение. Деятельность К. Д. Ушинского в качестве редактора журнала оставила яркий след в истории российского образования, и имела позитивные последствия для развития прогрессивной российской педагогической печати. Имеется необходимость дальнейшего исследования данного темы, в частности, не исследованным в российской истории педагогики остается вопрос о деятельности коллег К. Д. Ушинского по журналу.
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Ссылка для цитирования:
K. D. Ushinsky's activity as editor of the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education" (to the 200th anniversary of his birth)

Introduction. The relevance of this publication is explained by the 200th anniversary of the birth of Konstantin Dmitrievich Ushinsky (1823-1870), and the fact that the work of the great Russian teacher as editor of the main pedagogical journal of Russia wasn’t reflected in the publications of Russian historians of pedagogy and education. The purpose of the article is to characterize his activities as editor of the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education".

Materials and methods. The author uses as research methods: analysis of historical-pedagogical and memoir literature, biographical, historical and comparative methods, as well as axiological (value) approach to the study of historical-pedagogical material.

Results. The article shows that before K. D. Ushinsky, the content of the journal didn’t meet the requirements of the time and the needs of teachers, primarily primary school teachers as the most popular type of schools in Russia. The content of the materials published on the pages of the journal didn’t provide an exhaustive answer to those topical pedagogical questions that so worried the advanced pedagogical public opinion at the end of the 1850s. Editor K. D. Ushinsky introduced four sections in the journal: pedagogy and didactics; auxiliary sciences; criticism and bibliography; news and "mixture". He ensured the timely release of the journal, whereas earlier issues were delayed for six months or more. Talented authors were attracted to work in the journal. As a result, K. D. Ushinsky’s persistent efforts to transform the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education" brought positive results.

Discussion of the results. The journal, which had previously been a purely official collection of orders of the ministry, as well as a random selection of special articles, usually far from pedagogy, turned into a publication that became a printing center that united progressive pedagogical forces in Russia. The journal responded sensitively to advanced educational trends and current events in the field of education, sought to direct public opinion in the direction that corresponded to the views of Ushinsky himself. All this allowed the journal to take a prominent place among Russian periodicals. The article reveals the relationship of K. D. Ushinsky with the Ministers of Public Education E. P. Kovalevsky and A. V. Golovnin, with some authors, for example, with I. S. Bellyustin.

Conclusion. Despite the short period of time, K. D. Ushinsky’s activity as an editor of a pedagogical journal left a bright mark in the history of Russian education, and had positive consequences for the development of the progressive Russian pedagogical press. Nevertheless, there is a need for further research on this topic. In particular, the question of the activities of K. D. Ushinsky’s colleagues in the journal remains completely unexplored in the Russian history of pedagogy.
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The urgency of the problem

February 19 (March 3), 2023 marks the 200th anniversary of the birth of Konstantin Dmitrievich Ushinsky (1823-1870). For more than one hundred and fifty years after the death of the great Russian teacher, his scientific, theoretical and methodological work has repeatedly become the subject of careful study by Russian historians of pedagogy. However, K. D. Ushinsky's editorial activity was practically not reflected in publications, and if it was mentioned, it was only casually and very briefly. All the more reason, in the jubilee year for K. D. Ushinsky, to present a detailed article about his work as editor of the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education", which in the first half of the 1860s could with good reason be considered the main Russian pedagogical periodical.

Materials and methods

The leading research methods are the analysis of scientific and memoir literature, biographical and historical methods, axiological approach, which makes it possible to identify all the most valuable things in the subject of research, specifically in this publication, – in the editorial work of K. D. Ushinsky in the interests of the development of domestic pedagogical literature and periodicals.

As the objectives of the study, the author identifies the following: to describe the efforts of K. D. Ushinsky as editor of the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education"; to evaluate the editorial work of K. D. Ushinsky; to study the memories of K. D. Ushinsky's associates on joint pedagogical activity with him. As theoretical sources, publications of different years are taken, both by K. D. Ushinsky himself, and his colleagues and researchers of his legacy (M. L. Peskovsky, A. V. Starchevsky, V. Ya. Struminsky). The author used the materials of a number of pedagogical periodicals of domestic and foreign origin, including "Pedagogy", "Perspectives of science and education", "Primary school", "Espacio, Tiempo y Educación", "The History of Education & Children’s Literature", "Ricerche di Pedagogia e Didattica – Journal of Theories and Research in Education", etc, and the works of Russian and foreign researchers of historical and pedagogical science; among them L. G. Guseva, S. Ph. Egorov, C. Caracchini, B. Comella-Gutiérrez, W. Grandi, R. Hofstetter, A. Lisiecka, S. Maddalena, J. Meda, C. Meta, etc. The practical significance of the work lies in the possibility of using the factual material contained in the article in the process of subsequent historical and pedagogical research.

Results

The theoretical and methodological heritage of outstanding teachers of the past invariably becomes the subject of study of modern historians of pedagogy and education. Leading pedagogical journals regularly publish materials that reveal the essence of the pedagogical views of outstanding figures of education and the largest scientists and teachers of the past.
Researchers are always interested in the legacy of Celestin Freinet [1]. His methodological findings serve as an example of a creative approach to the education and training of children and adolescents [2]. This circumstance makes the methodology of the outstanding French teacher in demand in today's educational conditions [3]. The ideas of the prominent German teacher of the first half of the twentieth century, P. Petersen, are still relevant and actively used in educational practice, especially in his homeland, Germany [4]. V. Dilthey's ideas serve as a source of development of modern knowledge in the field of pedagogical psychology [5]. The method of projects, put forward and tested at the time by W. H. Kilpatrick, receives a second life today [6]. The interest of researchers in the legacy of D. Dewey does not weaken [7]. There are many supporters of the education system put forward by M. Montessori [8]. The ideas of M. Montessori were interpreted by E. Kay taking into account the national characteristics of education [9]. Researchers find similarities in the views and practices of these first women scientists in the field of pedagogy with the views of R. Steiner [10].

In recent years, the efforts of researchers have been aimed, among other things, at expanding the area of research by revealing the scientific heritage of scientists whose work, for example, the German teacher Karl Kerbach, had not previously been reflected on the pages of the scientific press [11].

Researcher Alicja Lisiecka introduces the scientific community to the works in the field of aesthetic education of Yanina Mortkovitsova [12]. Another rediscovered name in the history of European pedagogy, Johann Funger, became known thanks to the publications of Beatrice Comella–Gutierrez [13].

The legacy of the best Soviet teachers of the first half of the twentieth century is of interest to modern scientists [14]. The best practices of the second half of the twentieth century are carefully studied [15]. At the same time, some attention is paid to the best teachers of the pre-Soviet period. Among them, of course, a special place belongs to K. D. Ushinsky [16]. The ideas put forward by him in the middle of the XIX century still remain among the fundamental ones and determine the main directions of the development of Russian pedagogy [17].

However, the editorial activity of the great Russian teacher K. D. Ushinsky has not attracted the attention of Russian authors until now. The proposed publication is intended to fill this gap in research on K. D. Ushinsky. In his younger years, Ushinsky was fond of writing articles for periodicals. They were mainly ethnographic in nature. He also collaborated with journals as a translator of novels by foreign authors. He wrote a lot for the progressive journal «Sovremennik», which was headed by the famous poet N. A. Nekrasov. Ushinsky's essay "A Trip for the Volkhov" was praised by the famous writer I. S. Turgenev. Over time, he began to think about publishing his own journal.

In the publication of the pedagogical journal, K. D. Ushinsky saw an opportunity to unite around himself a group of like-minded teachers, not only from the capital's educational institutions, but also from the province. All this could be achieved only with the publication of a periodical journal of pedagogical orientation. In addition, in the early 1860s Ushinsky was theoretically prepared to implement his plan to form the foundations of Russian pedagogy on the basis of mastering his extensive knowledge in the field of philosophy, psychology, literary studies, natural sciences and a number of other sciences. In 1859-1862,
K. D. Ushinsky held the position of inspector of classes at the Smolny Institute of noble maidens, in other words, he was in charge of the educational part of this institution, in which about seven hundred girls of noble and petty-bourgeois origin studied under the personal patronage of Empress Maria Alexandrovna, the wife of Emperor Alexander II.

The Smolny period, it would seem, wasn’t the most suitable time to head the journal; the reformer of women’s education was too busy with pressing, practical matters. On the other hand, every day of work in Smolny gave him new ideas and thoughts, with which Konstantin Dmitrievich wanted to immediately share with the entire Russian teaching staff. On one of the first days after his assumption of the post of inspector of classes of the Smolny Institute, namely on March 4, 1859, Ushinsky appealed to the Minister of Public Education Yevgraf Petrovich Kovalevsky (1790-1867) with a request to give him permission to publish a "critical-philosophical, pedagogical and psychological" journal called "Persuasion". Needless to say: the name is the most "appropriate" in order to tease even the most accommodating and liberal censor. Ushinsky, of course, counted on his popularity in the teaching environment, on the growing scientific and pedagogical authority in the academic environment, which was provided to him by his first successful pedagogical articles.

E. P. Kovalevsky went down in history as a fairly progressive pedagogical figure, however, due to his relatively short existence as a minister (1858-1861), he managed to do, in general, little. Having received a statement from Ushinsky, Kovalevsky asked the Council of the Smolny Institute and the Imperial Chancellery about this, whether there were any obstacles on their part to the publication of the journal by K. D. Ushinsky. The responses were positive, i.e. there were no objections from these institutions. During a meeting with the minister, when all administrative obstacles were removed, Ushinsky, who was largely naive and not quite practical in everyday life, finally asked himself the question, and with what funds he would publish his own journal. The Minister invited him to take up the editing of the ministerial journal. It’s clear that K. D. Ushinsky couldn’t fail to take into account those advantages, primarily financial and censorship, which he will be able to use as an editor of a ready-made, well-established periodical published since 1834. And the fact that its content lagged behind the requirements of the time, here the positions of Ushinsky and E. P. Kovalevsky completely coincided, as well as the goal set by the minister, – to transform the journal into a "truly pedagogical" one. Moreover, Ushinsky was allowed to use for this purpose the work program he had previously developed for the journal "Persuasion", which never saw the light. March 1, 1860 Ushinsky was confirmed as editor.

For 26 years of publication, journal had only two editors. Konstantin Stepanovich Serbinovich (1796-1874) led it from the very beginning. In 1856 he was replaced by Academician Alexander Vasilievich Nikitenko (1805-1877). They were thinking people, but they weren’t teachers, and they happened to be "at the editorial helm" by accident. Literary critic and censor Nikitenko was a remarkable figure in the Russian literature in the mid-XIX century.

Suffice it to say that, being a censor, it was he who allowed the publication of N. V. Gogol’s "Dead Souls". This fact alone is enough to make his name forever inscribed in golden letters in the history of the Russian literature. After all, another censor would certainly have banned the publication of this "dangerous" book, and its impulsive author could well have sent his creation to the oven, as he did with the remaining unpublished volume of this work.
First of all, having assumed the post of editor of the journal, Ushinsky conducted an analysis of the materials published in it in recent years. It turned out that attempts were made to improve the quality of the content of the journal; in particular, articles by D. D. Semenov, V. I. Vodovozov and other advanced teachers occasionally began to be published in it. But their materials dealt exclusively with private issues. In general, the content of the journal didn’t meet the requirements of the day and, in particular, the demands of the most popular – elementary school. The content of the materials published on its pages didn’t provide a thorough answer to those topical pedagogical questions that so worried public opinion in the late 1850s. The journal couldn’t compete with the emerging private pedagogical journals, which relied on interesting, relevant materials that corresponded to the title and the proclaimed subject of the publication. It is no accident that Kovalevsky noted that the journal doesn’t occupy a worthy place in Russian literature [18, p. 45].

Until 1849, the journal received an annual subsidy of 10,000 rubles, which provided its employees with good material well-being. Later, the journal existed solely on subscription income. The Ministry of Public Education has identified the so-called mandatory and optional subscribers. The first numbered up to six hundred. They included provincial administrative bodies of the field of education, large libraries, universities, gymnasiums. They were required to write out at least one copy of the journal. Optional subscribers were those who were only recommended to subscribe to journal. These were smaller educational institutions, as well as heads of educational institutions, major officials.

A significant improvement in the quality of published materials, a variety of topics, relevance and compliance with the requirements of the day, – all this became conditions for attracting non-mandatory subscribers and increasing their number. Ushinsky rightly believed that in order to solve this problem, the journal should publish articles that would raise the most important problems of modern education. He referred to such problems as the ideas of the national education, the beneficial influence of labor on the individual, the training of pedagogical personnel, the creation of national pedagogical literature. Nationality and reasonable Europeanization, – through the prism of these two criteria that determined his pedagogical worldview, he evaluated all the materials that came to him as an editor. The restructuring that he carried out could be called the pedagogization of the journal.

In the March book of the journal, a new program of its work was printed on the cover, but the content up to the second half of the year mainly included articles selected by the previous editorial board; K. D. Ushinsky was forced to print previously prepared materials. Only starting from the July issue, the journal can be fully considered to meet the fundamental requirement that Ushinsky put forward as the fundamental basis of pedagogy, namely: the indissoluble connection of the actual needs of society in the education of the younger generation and the conclusions of pedagogical science. In the work program of the journal "in a new way", Ushinsky included a condition that the articles printed by the journal should have a purely pedagogical orientation. These could be theoretical discussions on the topics of education, practical experience of teachers, biographies and autobiographies of pedagogical figures, a review and critical "analysis" of relevant, including children's, literature. Articles from the field of history, physiology, philosophy and psychology were allowed only those that could directly contribute to solving the problems of education. According to Ushinsky, the journal should have four sections: pedagogy and didactics; auxiliary sciences; criticism...
and bibliography; news and "mixture". He adhered to this program with all his characteristic pedantry during the term of editorship allotted to him by fate (1860-1861). Being a punctual person, Ushinsky paid considerable attention to organizational issues in the work of the editorial office. He ensured the timely release of the journal, while earlier issues were delayed for six months or more.

Ushinsky's biographer M. L. Peskovsky (1893) rightly wrote: "Since the middle of 1860, this journal, which was previously a dry, official collection of government orders and occasional special articles on subjects of no interest to anyone, has completely transformed, taking a prominent place as a sensitive, responsive pedagogical journal that guides public opinion on all the next issues and current events in the field of education. The press began to take into account the opinions of an obscure, previously impersonal journal. Society began to listen to him. For direct figures in the Ministry of Education, the journal was an indispensable interpreter of the next issues, tasks, goals and means to implement them" [19, p. 62].

Discussion of the results

Researchers of Ushinsky's creativity note that most of the materials published in the journal under K. D. Ushinsky were devoted to the problems of the Russian school and, in particular, its reform being prepared at that time [19, p. 70]. In order to show how much the content of the journal changed under Ushinsky, we will name only a few articles published at the end of 1860 and in 1861. True to his idea of using advanced foreign experience, Konstantin Dmitrievich published an article by Yu. S. Rechnevsky "An essay on the history of public schools in Germany", material by V. Ignatovich "The History of English Universities", his colleague in Smolny L. N. Modzalevsky "On teaching the national language in Germany", V. Nadler "Lingard and Gertrude Pestalozzi", head of a private a boarding house in the German town of Waltershausen K. Ker about the work experience of his educational institution ("The main grounds for teaching numeracy").

An article by the first major German historian of pedagogy, Karl Schmidt, "Letters to a mother about the physical and spiritual upbringing of her children" and other interesting and important materials were also published.

This is already indicated by the titles of articles: D. Dashkov (1864) "A few words about the draft charter of lower and secondary schools"; N. Mizko (1864) "A look at the draft charter of secondary and lower schools, which are in the department of the Ministry of Public Education"; G. Kosman (1864) "Thoughts on education in general and education youth in Russia"; N. Lavovsky (1864) "On pedagogical conversations in county schools (Opinion submitted to the trustee of the Kharkiv educational District)"; K. Petrov (1864) "The current state of teaching literature"; F. Toll (1864) "Something about the upbringing of feelings in children"; A. Filonov (1864) "About reading in libraries" [20, p. 190].

Some articles were published without specifying the names of their authors: "About some transformations at universities", "Thoughts about life. Girls-teachers (From travel notes)", "Pedagogical gymnastics. Historical view", "Pedagogical Seminar of Professor K. F. Stoy in Jena". As a rule, such articles were written by Ushinsky himself, but he didn't indicate his last name, so as not to receive accusations of, so to speak, "using official position" when choosing materials for publication. Two articles were published in the journal ("Two last
words about public education" and "Parish teachers", the author of which was the priest of the Tver diocese Ivan Stepanovich Bellyustin (1819-1890). Ushinsky and Bellustin had known each other since the late 1850s, and since 1860 they had been in active correspondence, including after Ushinsky left the journal.

The content of the great teacher's letters shows how difficult it was for him to defend his position with the ministerial "curators"; after all, every issue of the journal was thoroughly censored. In an effort to somehow hold the censor, Ushinsky printed Bellustin's articles under the pseudonyms "Vessky" and "B". Strange as it may seem, pseudonyms didn’t cause objections in the censorship committee: firstly, it was then quite common in the Russian press, and secondly, it was enough for the censor not to have a censored surname or a prohibited pseudonym at the end of the text. In his desire to somehow help Bellyustin, Ushinsky tried to transfer him to the capital and get him into his journal or some other publication; but these attempts were unsuccessful. I. S. Bellyustin wasn’t only an active associate of Konstantin Dmitrievich as editor, but also his closest friend. It was I. S. Bellustin who was the first person with whom K. D. Ushinsky shared his creative idea, namely the idea of writing "Children's World". Ushinsky also needed Bellustin because even in the editorial office Konstantin Dmitrievich didn’t meet with full support, not to mention the editorial offices of other journals.

Of course, the articles of K. D. Ushinsky himself, published in the journal, became a particularly significant event. They attracted the attention of the pedagogical community by their relevance. As a rule, each article was accompanied by a lengthy journal polemic. Thus, Ushinsky defended the need to introduce schools for young workers in the article "Sunday Schools".

The genius of K. D. Ushinsky consisted, first of all, in the fact that he, in the conditions of his time, posed such topical issues to himself and society, which are still relevant now, a century and a half after his death, and urgently require worthy resolution. With particular force, his talent as a polemicist was expressed in the article "Work in its mental and educational significance" [21]. The relevance of this work was that in those years, young loafers appeared in Russian society, who lived carelessly at the expense of the capital earned by their parents. All this is very reminiscent of the current situation in the modern Russian society.

In the article "On the moral element in Russian education", the teacher wondered why we don’t have real people [22]. He saw the answer in poor-quality education. Teachers, he believed, were concerned, as a rule, with one thing – to impart as much knowledge as possible. But "intelligence and knowledge alone aren’t enough to strengthen in us that moral sense, that social cement that ... binds people into an honest, friendly society." The teacher brought to the fore "moral influence", which, in his opinion, "constitutes the main task of education, much more important than the development of the mind in general, filling the head with knowledge and explaining to everyone his personal interests" [22, p. 50].

Another important article by K. D. Ushinsky, published in the journal, is "The Teachers' Seminary Project" [23]. In it, for the first time before the Russian educated society, he raised the question of the need to establish these special educational institutions. Ushinsky cited the example of advanced foreign teachers' schools. He was acquainted with them in absentia, but soon he had the opportunity to personally visit a number of specialized
professional seminaries abroad, and he had the opportunity to personally verify the effectiveness of their work. In the meantime, he tried to convince his opponents that a retired soldier or an illiterate sexton couldn’t be a teacher. A candidate for a teaching position, K. D. Ushinsky believed, shouldn’t only undergo in-depth professional training, but also have the opportunity to constantly replenish their knowledge. And for this we need permanent teachers’ provincial and county courses, pedagogical journals.

In the March book for 1862, K. D. Ushinsky placed an article "Pedagogical works of N. I. Pirogov" [24]. He was enthusiastic not only about the personality of Pirogov himself, but also about his pedagogical views, and Nikolai Ivanovich's article "Questions of Life" (1856) considered almost the pinnacle of pedagogical thought in Russian pedagogy. The humanist N. I. Pirogov opposed the idea of early professionalization of children, which prevailed at that time in Russian pedagogical circles, to the detriment of their overall development. His opponents referred to material difficulties, the lack of funds among the common people, and similar really objective reasons that forced the poor to rent their children to some poor artisan, – shoemaker or blacksmith, sometimes for the sake of one livelihood. Pirogov himself grew up in complete poverty, without a father, in a family where he was the thirteenth child. Nevertheless, he proposed nothing less than "to give an opportunity to develop the inner man" [25 p. 37], i.e. to create the necessary and equal social conditions for the full development of the inclinations inherent in nature in every child.

K. D. Ushinsky, however, strongly differed with N. I. Pirogov on the issue of the importance of classical languages in the education of Russian youth. Ushinsky proceeded from the fact that it was his native Russian language that should be the basis of education and this is the best means of his spiritual, moral and patriotic education. At the same time, N. I. Pirogov was an ardent adherent of the Greek and especially Latin languages. Ushinsky delicately but persistently made it clear to him that Nikolai Ivanovich judges the significance of the classical antiquities he protects from the position of a university professor of medicine; naturally, a future doctor needs knowledge of Latin. But after all, we live in such a time, Ushinsky convinced readers, when, as scientific knowledge develops, natural sciences become more and more important, more necessary and applicable to real life, – industrial, scientific and domestic. The teacher carried out this idea in a number of his articles, and the article "Native Word" published in the journal was completely devoted to this issue [26].

K. D. Ushinsky was very worried about the fact that the so-called "recognized writers" didn’t consider him "their own". Indeed, for the radicals (A. I. Herzen, N. G. Chernyshevsky, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, D. I. Pisarev), he was too close to the "powers" and "far from the people". For law-abiding writers (I. S. Aksakov, K. S. Aksakov, V. I. Askochensky, I. I. Lazhechnikov, A. F. Pisemsky), the very name "Ushinsky" was synonymous with anxiety, change and reform.

The restrained social position maintained by Ushinsky allowed him to occupy a fairly prominent, weighty position in the then Russian pedagogical community, which opened up the opportunity for him to put his ideas and plans into practice, but, at the same time, actually isolated him from the leading writers of his time.

Meanwhile, any Russian child during his lifetime among his favorite stories would definitely name "Four Wishes", "How the shirt grew in the field", "Bishka" and other works written by Ushinsky.
In fact, since the middle of the nineteenth century and up to the present, Konstantin Dmitrievich has been one of the most beloved children’s writers.

At the beginning of 1861, K. D. Ushinsky felt carping towards himself as an editor. He was reproached for the fact that the journal doesn’t increase the number of subscribers and, accordingly, doesn’t bring income. In addition, the editor-in-chief was blamed for the fact that the journal doesn’t publish articles that would expose anarchist and materialistic views, including those disseminated in the field of education. Meanwhile, this "harmful fad", i.e. materialism, was becoming more and more widespread on the pages of other publications, and the ministry’s journal had to take on a kind of mission of fighting against materialism. To this Ushinsky stated that, indeed, some publications are engaged in publishing critical, or even slanderous materials, as well as articles capable of arousing anarchic and other illegal sentiments in the minds of readers. This, of course, attracts the attention of an additional number of readers and, accordingly, increases the number of subscribers. Konstantin Dmitrievich also left the opposition to the materialistic worldview to the share of those publications that deliberately fill their pages with such materials. The official body of the Ministry of Public Education, according to Ushinsky, is designed to cover the issues of education of the people and shouldn’t descend to the level of journal bickering; that’s why it publishes articles exclusively of positive contents [27, p. 305].

Despite such a prudent position, the editors of other pedagogical publications treated Ushinsky – the editor very coldly. In his memoirs, journalist Albert Vikentievich Starchevsky (1818-1901) [28, p. 59] noted that, despite all the efforts of Ushinsky, as an editor, he didn’t meet with sympathy in the journals and newspapers of that time. For a year and a half, attacks not only on the beliefs of the new editor, but also attacks directly against his personality didn’t stop.

K. D. Ushinsky could not help but understand that his editorship was unlikely to continue after the resignation of the Minister of Public Education who favored him, so he feverishly sought to do as much as possible in this post.

When he took up the post of editor, he most likely understood that some difficulties awaited him, but, in all probability, as evidenced by his correspondence with friends, he reassured himself that these difficulties were completely surmountable, and most importantly, he was encouraged by the opportunity to address directly to the teaching community with a conversation about public education through a printed word from the pages of a once "completely characterless" journal, and now a "special" journal.

The liberal Minister of Public Education, E. P. Kovalevsky, was dismissed, and Count Evfimiy Vasilyevich Putyatin (1803-1883) was appointed in his place from June 20 (July 2), 1861. E. V. Putyatin demanded from Ushinsky a sharp change in the course of the journal he led. According to him, the journal was supposed to become a kind of scientific collection on all branches of sciences, so to speak, the "pantheon of all sciences", like the French "Journal de savants" ("Journal for scientists"). In all likelihood, such journals are really needed, but in this case, the pedagogical component of this printing body was reduced to zero.

K. D. Ushinsky categorically opposed such an instruction and preferred to abandon the editorship.
At first, K. D. Ushinsky was not going to give up. He wrote a memorandum addressed to the director of the Department of Public Education Ivan Davydovich Delyanov (1818-1898). In it, he tried to briefly characterize his journal as corresponding to the goals of the ministry's activities, namely, the education of the people, the dissemination of useful information on the cause of education.

In October 1861, the note was in the hands of E. V. Putyatin and Delyanov, and, as a result, a resolution of the latter appeared on it, stating that since 1862 the journal should be published on the same terms, i.e. become what it was before Ushinsky came to the post of editor. It was difficult to expect anything else from Delyanov, who two decades later, in 1882, became the Minister of Public Education, and on June 18, 1887, – the author of the infamous "circular on cook's children" – a law that, until October 1917, closed the very possibility of obtaining even secondary education to the overwhelming majority of the population of the Russian Empire [29, p. 29-30]. On November 17, 1861, K. D. Ushinsky sent a letter of resignation to the Minister.

The November issue of the journal for 1861 was the last book signed by K. D. Ushinsky as editor. If he had such qualities as diplomacy in relations with his superiors, flexibility in expressing his thoughts and the ability to adapt to circumstances, he would most likely have been able to maintain both the previous course of the journal he developed and the post of editor and thereby bring many more benefits to Russian education as the head of this most important print editions.

Literally one month passed, and on December 25, 1861 (January 6, 1862) the Minister of Public Education E. V. Putyatin resigned, and one of the most prominent figures of the era of Alexander II, Alexander Vasilyevich Golovnin (1821-1886), was appointed in his place. A. V. Golovnin raised the importance of the Ministry of Public Education, which before him was considered as secondary; he doubled its budget, and reduced unproductive expenses, mainly administrative. A new charter of gymnasiums (1864) and a university charter (1863) were issued. The funds of university libraries were expanded; Novorossiysk University was founded in Odessa (1864). In order to replenish the number of professors at universities, he restored the practice of sending talented young people to study abroad, and entrusted their leadership to N. I. Pirogov.

A.V. Golovnin’s activity evoked the most positive assessments from the progressive part of the pedagogical community. His first impulse was to restore Ushinsky to the post of editor. However, Ushinsky refused; it seemed to him that the new minister was no better than the previous one. In 1864, Golovnin made Konstantin Dmitrievich an offer to publish a private pedagogical journal at the expense of the ministry. But by that time Ushinsky already had other priorities, – he urgently needed to finish his main works that immortalized his name.

The editorship after the resignation of K. D. Ushinsky passed to the writer Yulij Semenovich Rechnevsky (1824-1887), who led the magazine in 1861-1867. He managed to keep the main section in the journal, – "Pedagogy and Didactics", and had to abandon the rest. Rechnevsky and Ushinsky had known each other while studying at the university, and subsequently communicated and corresponded a lot. After the death of a friend, Rechnevsky gave a large essay "Konstantin Dmitrievich Ushinsky" in the "Bulletin of Europe" [30], in which he highlighted some little-known events in his friend's biography.
Conclusions

We believe that K. D. Ushinsky's pedagogical legacy isn't limited at all to his wonderful books and articles. The contents of the eighteen volumes of the Journal of the Ministry of Public Education, published under the direct supervision of Konstantin Dmitrievich as an editor, represented at one time an essential theoretical and practical basis for creating the foundations of Russian pedagogy [31, p. 45]. Currently, the materials published in these issues act as a valuable historical and pedagogical source. Thus, the purpose of the study, which consisted in characterizing the activities of K. D. Ushinsky as the editor of the "Journal of the Ministry of Public Education", has been achieved. The conducted research shows that the theoretical and methodological legacy of the great Russian teacher K. D. Ushinsky, his practical pedagogical and editorial work deserve further study. There is also a need for further research of the activities of Ushinsky's colleagues in the journal remains completely unexplored in the Russian history of pedagogy.
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