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INTRODUCTION

Serious historical treatment of the Russian universities has not yet begun. There is not a single historical survey of Russian universities or university policies in any language. The only work approaching such a history, Universitetskoe obrazovanie v SSSR, published in Moscow in 1957 by A.S. Butiagin and Iu. A. Saltanov, is little more than an encyclopedic outline which interprets university development in the most simplistic ideological terms. Its factual content goes little beyond a repetitive summary of information provided in standard administrative and educational histories. Works published in the Soviet Union and the West since the nineteenth century dealing with Russian education explore university policy only superficially, and with reference primarily to the most readily accessible collections of government documents.¹

There are a few detailed descriptions of Russian universities and educational institutions in general at particular points in time,

¹See Patrick L. Alston, Education and the State in Tsarist Russia (Stanford, 1969); Nicholas Hans, History of Russian Educational Policy, 1701-1917 (London, 1931); William H.E. Johnson, Russian's Educational Heritage (Pittsburgh, 1950); Daniel B. Leary, Education and Autocracy in Russia (Buffalo, 1919); A.G. Nebol'sin, Istoriko-statisticheskii ocherk obshchago i spetsial'nago obrazovanie v Rossii (St. Petersburg [hereafter abbreviated SPB], 1883); and S.V. Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor deiatel'nosti ministerstva narodnago prosveshchennia, 1802-1902 (SPB, 1902)
such as Henry Barnard, Systems, Institutions of Public Instruction in Different Countries (New York, 1872); Thomas Darlington, Education in Russia (London, 1909); and a work published anonymously in Paris in 1900 entitled, *Aperçu de l'enseignement supérieur en Russie*. But their historical introductions are superficial in the extreme. Probably the most valuable introduction to tsarist university history is that of Professor Ikonnikov, "Russkie universitety v sviazi s khodom obshchestvennogo obrazovaniia," *Vestnik Evropy*, 1876, no. 9, pp. 161-207; no. 10, pp. 492-551; no. 11, pp. 73-133.

With these exceptions, the other relevant secondary works deal with (1) the universities in general during particular reigns, (2) individual universities over longer periods of time, and (3) important events or periods in Russian university history, such as the purge of St. Petersburg university in 1821 and the role of the universities in the revolutionary movements. Among works published in Russia and the Soviet Union, those falling into the first category are largely portions of general histories written by men who are not specialists in university history. Those falling into the second category -- with few exceptions -- were written under official sponsorship upon the occasion of universities' anniversaries and are pervaded more with the spirit of a celebration than the spirit of careful scholarship. In this respect there is little difference between works published in the tsarist and Soviet

---

2 See, for example, I.N. Borozdin, "Universiteta Rossii v pervoi polovinie XIX veka," *Istoriia Rossii v XIX vekie*, II (SPB, 1907-11), 349-379.
periods. Only those in the third category supplement official printed documents with extensive and intensive treatment of contemporary memoirs. The only in-depth treatment of university policies and their results during a single reign is a first-rate dissertation written in 1964 by James T. Flynn, entitled, *Universities in the Russia of Alexander I*.

Whatever the reason for the lack of first-rate work on the universities, the inaccessibility of documentary material is not one of them. As regards the tsarist period in particular, there is a wealth of printed material, including statistical tables, biographies of students, rectors, and other officials, student notebooks, rectors' reports on university progress, catalogues of university libraries and laboratories, and memoirs of individuals connected with the university in every conceivable capacity — all found by this author in libraries outside the Soviet Union and many cited in this study for the first time. Within the Soviet Union, there are manuscript sources that have never been tapped by university historians. In connection with the present study, practically every relevant document was found in one of four locations: The British Museum, the library of the London

---


In the case of St. Petersburg-Leningrad University there is a printed guide to these manuscripts giving their specific archival location within the USSR: S.N. Valk, ed., *Materialy po istorii Leningradskogo universiteta, 1819-1917: obzor arkhivnykh dokumentov* (Leningrad, 1961).
School of Slavonic and East European Studies, the New York City Public Library, and the Ohio State University Library.

This study is an administrative history. The dual purpose of this study is to define the university policies formulated by the Russian government and evaluate the development of a single institution served by these policies during the period of that institution's formation and early growth.

The University of St. Petersburg has been chosen because of its location in the Russian capital, where policies could be applied in relatively pure form without the delays and confusions involved in translating policies to the provinces. Because this is the first investigation of this sort on this subject, care has been taken to establish the chronology of events, ministries, and programs. The chapters dealing with policy formulation have been separated from those dealing with policy application and results, enabling the reader interested in only one of the two topics to concentrate on his particular interest.

In the chapters dealing with general policies and programs an attempt has been made to show the connections, under several educational ministries, between specific programs and the administrative and political circumstances which surrounded them. Such circumstances include the organizational structure of the Ministry of Public Instruction, the personalities and philosophical views of important administrators, and the general political goals and personal traits of the tsars. These chapters have been guided by the following questions: During each policy
making period: What ideas and attitudes inspired the tsars and those persons who had a direct influence on university policies? What were the main objectives of policy? What major problems were tackled? What major programs were inaugurated and revised? How did non-educational policies affect university policies? And, despite the personalities and ideologies which shaped the distinctiveness of each period, what degree of continuity existed for the entire period of the study? Which programs were most successful overall? Which were least successful?

Several criteria have been applied to evaluate the "growth" of St. Petersburg University during each period: the degree and rate of expansion of the student body, the quantitative growth of library and laboratory facilities, and changes in the quality of instruction and scholarship.

As an administrative history, this study is not a study in intellectual history. However, the European and Russian ideological context of policy-making has been drawn upon where it sheds light on the explanation of policies. This study is not a political history. But the general goals of the rulers have been outlined where these affect university policy. Although this is not a history of science, the conclusions of historians of science have been drawn upon in evaluating the development of St. Petersburg University. It is hoped that this investigation will shed light on the complex workings of Russian state policy, the goals of policy, and the degree to which the goals were reached with respect to one institution.

Most bibliographic abbreviations are self-explanatory: e.g. SPB
for St. Petersburg. The Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvieshcheniia has been abbreviated Zh.M.N.P.
CHAPTER I
THE BACKGROUND:

RUSSIAN UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES, 1726-1824

The Eighteenth Century

Prior to the eighteenth century, no university or comparable institution of higher education existed in Russia. It was not until the reign of Peter I (1682-1725) that the tsarist government took any real interest in the establishment of secular schools offering primary and secondary instruction. For Peter, the primary goal of state-financed education was the training of skilled military officers and civil administrators. But he also recognized a need for higher education in the arts and sciences.¹ Acting on advice solicited from Leibnitz and Christian Wolff, Peter devised a scheme for the establishment of an Academy of Sciences with a gymnasium and a university attached.²

Peter’s plan was carried out during the reign of his wife and successor, Catherine I (1725-1727). In 1726, at St. Petersburg, she founded the Academy of Sciences and financed it liberally. However, the lack of any tradition of secondary and higher education in Russia hampered


the development of the Academy's university from the very outset. Due to the lack of qualified Russian scholars, all seventeen university chairs were filled with scholars invited from abroad. All of the eight university students who matriculated in 1726 were also foreigners, who soon left the university to fill more lucrative positions in the state administration. Although the university was now devoid of students, the government demanded that classes be held, and the professors had no recourse but to attend each other's lectures. Within a few years, lectures were virtually abandoned.\(^3\)

During the remainder of the century a few improvements were made, at irregular intervals. In 1760, the scholar Lomonosov, rector of the university, divided the institution into faculties (medical, juridical, and philosophical) and insisted that lectures be regularly given. Russian scholars gradually made their way into university chairs. The government conscripted native scholars for the university from the Moscow Theological Academy, and offered monetary inducements to keep them there. Yet the quantity of students remained remarkably low, ranging between two and twenty.\(^4\) This fundamental deficiency kept the institution from having any significant effect on Russian society, and the efforts to keep it alive were abandoned before the close of the century.

The second attempt to establish an institution of higher learning in Russia was made by Empress Elizabeth (1741-1762), who founded the


\(^4\)Darlington, p. 15.
University of Moscow in 1755. It was hoped that the institution would train native scholars, thereby overcoming the necessity of importing professors. The university had three faculties. The philosophical faculty offered courses in logic, ethics, metaphysics, rhetoric, and history; the medical faculty taught anatomy, chemistry, and natural history; and the juridical faculty contained the chairs of politics, natural law, public law, and Russian jurisprudence. Theoretically, the university enjoyed a limited degree of autonomy from the autocratic state. Directly under the control of the Senate, the university was exempt from police supervision. It had its own tribunal with jurisdiction over faculty and students. The state, however, controlled university administration and finances. Supervision of instruction was shared by a council of professors and two government-appointed curators.

The University of Moscow had to face the same problems encountered by the university of the Academy of Sciences. Russian scholars were scarce. Therefore, foreign professors, who lectured only in Latin, had to fill most of the chairs. The use of Latin made higher education inaccessible to young Russians who were capable of comprehending lectures except for lack of fluency in Latin, thereby perpetuating the shortage

5 Ibid., p. 19.

6 Russia, Chancery of the Committee of Ministers, Statesman's Handbook for Russia (SPB, 1896), XI, 211-212.

7 At first, Russians occupied only two of ten chairs; E. Koutaissov, "The University of Moscow: An Historical Note," Universities Quarterly, IX (August, 1959), 325.
of Russian scholars. In spite of government inducements, the student enrollment remained very small until the reign of Catherine II (1762-1796). Catherine II made several attempts to overcome these problems. Thanks to her insistence, Russian became the predominant language of instruction. To overcome the shortage of native scholars, she sent large numbers of young Russian noblemen to European universities, including Jena, Leipzig, Göttingen, and Oxford. As a result, the proportion of Russian professors gradually increased. Karamzin later described the impact of Catherine's efforts on the progress of the university in the following terms: "The number of its youthful alumni increased with every year, and the benefits conferred by this temple of learning kept pace with the increase in numbers..." Karamzin, always prone to exaggerate the greatness of Catherine, was no doubt exaggerating here; nevertheless, the university's enrollment for the rest of the century remained significantly higher (averaging between 80 and 100) than that of the Academy's university, and the University of Moscow had some influence on late eighteenth-century Russian life.

The first effort to give Russian universities legal definition was made during the reign of Catherine. In 1786, the Empress ordered the

---

8These inducements included scholarships covering room, board and tuition, and promises of noble status and high rank to students who finished the university course. See Darlington, p. 20 and Borozdin, 350.

9Darlington, p. 20.

10Quoted in Darlington, pp. 29-30.

11Simkovich, p. 500.
Schools Commission, established four years earlier, to compose a project for a university statute which she hoped to apply to the University of Moscow and three new universities. The project, completed in 1787, was written by O.P. Kozodavlev. Kozodavlev depended on a work written by an Austrian professor, J. von Sonnenfels which relied heavily on the current practices of Austrian universities.  

The project stated that the purpose of Russian universities was to serve the state by training people for administrative positions which required preparation in higher sciences. It provided for division into the traditional three faculties. To qualify for admission, a student had to present a certificate of study from a public secondary school. Admission was to be open to all who could meet this requirement, regardless of class, and who "are men not having deranged minds." Professors could be invited from abroad until the lack of native scholars was overcome, but Russian was the required language of instruction. The universities would be under the direct control of the Schools Commission. Yet they were allowed a minimal degree of autonomy. The professors were annually to elect a rector and the deans of faculties. But the university curator would be subordinate to the local governor-general.

Catherine's project never became law, and no new universities were established during her reign. Still, it remained in the archives.  

---


and became one of the models for the legislation of Alexander I.

By 1800, university policy had not developed beyond a few vague ideas regarding the purpose, organization, and administration of institutions of higher learning. The rulers of the eighteenth century generally agreed that universities should directly serve the needs of the state administration, and that the state should finance and partially direct university education. A pattern of organizing universities according to models established at the older cultural centers of western and central Europe had emerged. Some concessions had been made to the principle of university autonomy, but how this was to be reconciled with state-financed, state-established institutions was never really decided. In fact, there is no evidence to show that the issue ever came up. In sum, before the opening of the nineteenth century, institutions of higher education had not really taken root in Russian society, and no clear lines of state policy toward them had been drawn.

Nevertheless, the educational activities of the eighteenth-century sovereigns mitigated for Alexander I (1801-1825) some of the major problems that thwarted university development before 1800. Secondary public education, begun in the seventeenth century, and expanded under Catherine II, enabled an increasing number of Russians to qualify for university education during Alexander's reign. Catherine's policy of sending Russians abroad for study provided native scholars who could fill a larger portion of the chairs in Alexander's five new universities. Catherine left Alexander a completed, although inoperative, university statute, on which he could and did base portions of his own university
Finally, seventy-five years of Russian experience with the problems of maintaining universities must have saved Alexander a few of the trials and errors involved in inaugurating a university system.

The Reign of Alexander I: The Policies of the Ministry of Public Instruction, 1802-1816

The reign of Alexander I is particularly important in the history of Russian university policy, for it was under this ruler that five new universities were opened, that the first comprehensive university statutes were promulgated, and that the first systematic programs were applied to the most serious obstacles to university development.

The policies of the first decade of Alexander's reign cannot be traced to a single, consistent set of governing principles. During the early years, two court circles competed for influence over the ruler, representing distinct orientations, capable of agreement on some points of policy, but differing radically on others. One of these circles consisted of the men who formed the "Unofficial Committee", which met regularly with the tsar between 1801 and 1803 to consider major proposals for political, social and cultural reform. The Committee consisted of four young aristocrats, enthusiastic liberals, who were exposed to Western life and committed to reforming Russian institutions according to the principles and practices of late eighteenth-century French rationalism: Nicholas Novosiltsev, Count Victor Kochubey, Count Paul A. Stroganov, and Prince Adam Czartoryski. The other circle was called the "Senatorial Party." These men were older by a generation and more conservative than the first group, exposed to the Enlightenment tradition and favorable to
Western institutions as models worthy of adaptation in Russia. Typical of this group were Prince A.A. Bezborodko, Count Alexander Stroganov (Paul's father), Count P.V. Zavadovskii, and Count Severin Potocki.\textsuperscript{14} Both groups were extremely influential. But neither ever gained permanent ascendancy over Alexander, who, although educated in the Enlightenment tradition and willing to give lip service to constitutional principles, jealously guarded his prerogatives as an absolute ruler.

It was during the first few years of Alexander's reign that these two circles were most influential, since it was during this period that Alexander took most seriously the role of "Enlightened" emperor. Little came of most of the reforms planned by the "Unofficial Committee", such as the plans for establishing a constitutional monarchy and abolishing serfdom. The major accomplishment of these early years was the inauguration of a thorough reform of the Russian school system, which followed closely the program which Condorcet presented to the French Legislative Assembly in April, 1792. Both circles were fully represented on those bodies which formulated and administered the new educational programs. The general principles of the reform were laid out by the "Unofficial Committee." These were put into practice by the old Schools Commission, of which Zavadovskii was president, and, after 1803, by the Central School Board of the new Ministry of Public Instruction. Three discernable groups composed the membership of this Board from 1803-1816,

a period during which the previous experience and the pedagogical and political views of the members remained constant. Novosiltsev, Czartoryski and Kochubey, members by virtue of their appointment as university curators, were instrumental in establishing the principles of Condorcet as a basis for the reform. Potocki was also a university curator, and Zavadovskii was the first Minister of Public Instruction. Most of the third group were experienced educators and educational administrators, similar in age and temperament to the "Senatorial Party". They were too practical to be ardent liberals, but they were firmly committed to the cause of educational progress in Russia. T.I. Yankovich de Miriëvo, P.S. Svistunov, N.I. Fus and N.Y. Ozeretskovskii had gained experience in the practical matters involved in the administration of Catherine's educational institutions. Fus compiled a list in 1802 of subjects to be considered in the organization of the new school system which showed the great thoroughness of his practical acquaintance with educational affairs.15 M.N. Muraviev, assistant minister and curator of Moscow University until his death in 1807, believed in the value of university autonomy and academic freedom, not because of any faith in the superiority of foreign models, but because he considered these principles essential to university progress. He considered such progress a prerequisite for Russian greatness. He called education "the main fundamental on which is built the prosperity of nations"; to his mind the freedom of scholarly

15 Russia, Ministry of Public Instruction, Sbornik materialov dlja prosvieshchennia v Rossii (St. Petersburg, 1897), II, 7-8. Hereafter cited as Sbornik materialov.
inquiry was "the necessary condition ... for the advancement of education." Although not energetic imitators of Western institutions, this group was not prone to allow any irrational sense of national pride impede the educational progress which they felt would make Russia worthy of praise.

In the school-system reform of 1803-1804, the orientation of the "Unofficial Committee" had the greatest influence. The ministerial reform of September 1802, included the founding of the Ministry of Public Instruction, and on January, 26, 1803, the tsar promulgated the "Preliminary Regulations of Public Instruction," outlining the new school system. The organization of the system followed closely the scheme of Condorcet. Four levels of public schools were provided for: parish schools, district schools, gymnasium, and universities. Each level of schooling was to prepare pupils for entrance to the next level. It was hoped that talent, rather than wealth or class background, would be the major criterion for advancement to higher levels. The realm was divided into six regions, each encompassing several provinces, and a university, possessing a considerable degree of autonomy, was to administer each region.

---

16 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 39.

17 See C.S. Steinger, "Condorcet's Report on Public Education," The Social Studies, Jan., 1970, pp. 20-25. Stroganov was tutored by Gilbert Romme, who championed Condorcet's scheme in the French Constitutional Convention in 1793. Stroganov brought up Condorcet's system during a discussion of educational policy at the "Unofficial Committee" meeting of December 28, 1801. The "Preliminary Regulations" were the outgrowth of a plan presented by Czartoryski to the Schools Commission on October 4, 1802, which relied heavily on Condorcet's plan as a model.
Universities were put into operation as quickly as possible and, by the end of 1804, five of the six administrative regions had universities at their centers. Emperor Paul (1796-1801) had already granted the nobility of the Baltic provinces permission to revive the old University of Dorpat, and Alexander granted it a charter in 1803. Then Alexander founded the universities of Vilno, Karkov, and Kazan, and granted a new charter to the University of Moscow. The Schools Commission began writing statutes (hereafter referred to as the "university statutes") for these universities in late 1802. The task was completed during 1803 and 1804 by the Central School Board, the council of the Ministry of Public Instruction. 18

The models and influences which inspired the university legislation were more varied than those which shaped the school-system reform. It was necessary to rely on foreign models. The statutes of 1802-04 followed closely the 1787 university project regarding admission requirements and the availability of university education to all classes. Like this project, the statutes gave the universities a primarily utilitarian purpose: the education of useful citizens and the training of civil servants for imperial administration. But the 1787 project itself was under the influence of Austrian university traditions.

The university traditions of Protestant Germany also influenced the Russian university reforms. The framers of the university statutes solicited advice from the German specialist Count d'Antreg and the German Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 56.
The university of Göttingen served as a specific model for the statutes' provisions regarding autonomy and freedom of teaching. Generally speaking, the universities of the Protestant German principalities supplied educated personnel to the state bureaucracies. They were state-financed institutions under the administrative jurisdiction of state ministries of education. Professors were salaried state officials. At the same time, the universities enjoyed certain rights of corporate autonomy. Typically, the university rector, annually elected by the ordinary professors from their own ranks, presided over an executive committee, composed of the deans of faculties and the university judge. Each faculty elected its dean, supervised instruction, administered examinations, and conferred degrees. Extraordinary professors did not participate in the university administration. The university had civil and criminal court jurisdiction over its members and their families and was guaranteed freedom of teaching and research. The Russian statutes of 1803-1804 incorporated all of these practices.

The Russian autocrats since Peter I had considered foremost the utilitarian value of public schools to the state administration. It is therefore not surprising that Alexander did the same, nor that his legislators found models in states where universities served this utilitarian

19 Borozdin, 353; Darlington, p. 42; Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 56-57.

function. What is surprising is that the Russian statutes granted the universities a greater degree of autonomy than most German universities enjoyed.\textsuperscript{21}

Like Condorcet's scheme, the university legislation made extensive provisions to guarantee the autonomy of the universities from bureaucratic authority, emphasized the natural sciences in university curriculum, and declared the universities open to graduates of public gymnasia regardless of class, religion, or nationality. Thus, in spite of reliance on other models, the impact of Condorcet's ideas and the young Russians who championed them cannot be minimized.

The university statutes announced the establishment of institutions of higher learning for the purpose of educating "useful citizens for ... state service.\textsuperscript{22} In particular the universities were to prepare their students for state positions in the foreign service, in domestic administration, in legal administration, in the school system, in commerce and finance, and in architecture and engineering; and for private occupations as doctors, midwives, writers and artists.\textsuperscript{23} The statutes divided each

\textsuperscript{21}The rector's independence from the state administration was more limited by German, than by Russian law. Russian professors were elected to chairs by the council of professors; German professors were appointed by the state. See Friedrich Paulsen, The German Universities and University Study (New York, 1906), pp. 3, 37, 46, 72, 78-79.

\textsuperscript{22}Russia, Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii, 1649-1919 (SPB, 1830-1919), XXVII, 525. Hereafter cited as PSZ.

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., 616.
university into faculties, defined the duties of faculty and administrative officials, established councils to govern each university and to administer the middle and lower schools of each university region, defined the rights and responsibilities of students, outlined the process of awarding academic degrees, and provided for the founding of affiliated institutions such as hospitals, libraries, and teacher-training institutions.

The framers of the statutes followed the Enlightenment tradition in their curricular emphasis on the natural sciences. Each university was divided into four departments: Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Moral and Political Sciences, Literary Sciences, and Medicine. This division and the distribution of chairs among the departments was almost an exact duplicate of that proposed by Condorcet, with the largest number of chairs going to the Department of Physical and Mathematical Sciences.  

The framers endeavored to make university teaching positions attractive to scholars of talent. The statutes placed on university payrolls the following categories of university members: ordinary professors, emeritus professors, extraordinary professors, assistant professors, and honorary members. Each ordinary professor would command an annual salary of 2,000 rubles, which "allowed one at that time to live comfortably and devote oneself entirely to study." He would occupy the seventh rank of the civil service table of ranks, which meant automatic membership in the nobility. All professors who retired after

24 Ibid., XXVIII, 609-610; Hans, p. 43.

twenty-five years of service would automatically receive a pension fully equivalent to their salaries. Widows and orphaned children of professors would receive pensions in proportion to their needs and the length of service of the provider.26

The statutes embodied the hope of making talent the only criterion for educational advance in admissions and scholarship policies. Any gymnasium graduate could qualify for university entrance if he held a certificate signed by the gymnasium director attesting to his deportment, diligence, and academic achievement. The normal undergraduate course lasted three years, and qualified graduates could then seek the degrees of Master and Doctor. While in attendance at the university, the conduct of each student had to comply with the "university regulations."27 The statutes provided that each university educate a number of "crown students" — students whose living expenses would be paid out of the state treasury. In the selection of such students, poorer boys, otherwise qualified for university entrance, would be given priority.28

The statutes made specific provision for the exposure of the new institutions to Western currents of thought. Honorary members, domestic and foreign, had the responsibility of corresponding with professors and keeping them abreast of the lastest advances in science and scholarship. Professors were instructed to "supplement their courses

26PSZ, XXVII, 395; XXVIII, 655.
27Ibid., XXVIII, 618-619.
28Ibid., 619.
with new discoveries perpetrated in other countries of Europe."  

The writers of the statutes expected each university to serve its school region by administering it and supplying it with teachers. They attached to each university a pedagogical institute for the purpose of training teachers for positions in district schools and gymnasium. Students at these institutes received full scholarships in return for the pledge to devote at least six years after graduation to teaching in the public school system. Every other year, each institute would send its two most accomplished students abroad, expenses paid, for advanced study.  

Each university was run by a series of officials and administrative bodies. The two most important officials were the curator and the rector. The curator of each institution, a ministerial official appointed by the tsar, served as a member of the Central School Board. His duties were to represent the university's interests to the central ministry, to ratify decisions and confirm appointments made by the university administration, and to receive reports on the university's progress. The curators were supposed to reside in St. Petersburg in order "not to impede local academic activity." The rector, elected annually by the ordinary professors, was to be the university's actual administrative head. An ordinary professor himself, the rector had the responsibility of presiding over

\[29\] Ibid., 611, 610.  


\[31\] Borozdin, 352.
all administrative committees, enforcing the university statutes, and maintaining the general good order of the university. 32

The statutes granted each university absolute jurisdiction over its internal affairs. The division of power between curator and rector was one method of guaranteeing the autonomy of officials elected by university members from appointees of the state bureaucracy. University autonomy was further guaranteed by the specific composition and function of each of the major administrative organs of the institution: the soviet, the faculties, the pravlenie, the tribunal, and the censorship committee.

The soviet or council of the university became the university's "highest authority." The soviet consisted of the ordinary professors of the university, meeting in monthly sessions. This body annually elected one of its members to serve as rector. It was intended to be self-perpetuating: it elected to office all ordinary professors, thus replenishing its own membership. The soviet also elected assistant professors, extraordinary professors, and honorary members of the university. From its own membership it chose the major officials of the university and the membership of other administrative committees. 33

The statutes reserved for the soviet the right "to discharge from duty all officials depending on its selection who prove to be negligent in duty, cause disorder by disobedience to authority, or ... [commit] ... some

32 PsZ, XXVII, 614; XXVIII, 622.

33 Ibid., XXVII, 611; XXVIII, 611-619.
The soviet was empowered to make major decisions regarding administrative policy, investigate means of perfecting teaching methods, establish the university's schedule of courses, and conduct annual examinations of student achievements. This body also heard appeals of decisions by the university tribunal. Most decisions were made by majority vote, the rector voting only in case of a tie.  

The ordinary professors of each department formed a university faculty. The soviet annually elected an ordinary professor from each faculty to serve as dean. Each faculty held monthly ordinary sessions and extraordinary sessions at the call of the dean. It passed decisions regarding the administration of its department according to majority vote. Among its functions were the preliminary examination of manuscripts submitted for publication to the university press, the review of the use of funds allocated to facilities connected with its department, the examination of candidates for academic degrees, and the annual scheduling of departmental courses. 

A third administrative organ was the pravlenie or executive committee, composed of the rector (its president), the four deans of faculties, and an ordinary professor appointed by the curator to serve as juror. The juror was the "closest assistant to the rector" in matters concerning university justice, the maintenance of law and order, and the
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35 Ibid., XXVII, 612; XXVIII, 611, 612, 615, 623.
36 Ibid., XXVIII, 610, 614.
The pravlenie met twice a week to handle the day-to-day administrative tasks of the university. It examined and passed upon the credentials of students applying for admission. It distributed funds according to the terms of the university budget, examined the accounts of students assigned special outlays, and supervised the distribution of funds left over from the annual budget according to the directions of the soviet. The statutes also charged the pravlenie with the dispensation of university justice and the drawing up of the university's written agreements. A chancery composed of a secretary, cashier, bookkeeper, endorser and clerk facilitated the work of the pravlenie. 37

The statutes provided each university with its own tribunal, independent of the state judiciary, with civil and partial criminal jurisdiction over university members and their families. This court decided cases of lawsuits involving members' persons, of claims of members' creditors, and of student violations of university regulations. It decided disputes involving the division of inherited real estate among university members, officials, and their families. 38 In criminal cases involving members of their families, the tribunal was empowered to conduct a preliminary investigation and then hand the accused together with its opinion regarding his innocence or guilt over to the regular courts. 39
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37Ibid., 608, 618, 620, 621.

38It did not, however, have jurisdiction over lawsuits involving real estate.

39PSZ, XXVII, 395; XXVIII, 623.
The members of the pravlenie plus the university sindic formed the tribunal. The rector served as judge and processed "all complaints and matters of injury regarding students." The entire body decided by majority vote matters involving members or serious student infractions. During the consideration of such matters, the syndic served as legal advisor by pointing out the provisions of state law relevant to each case. Defendants in cases involving fines of more than fifty rubles or sentences of more than fourteen days' confinement (in cases of student infractions) could appeal the tribunal's judgment to the soviet, which could reverse the tribunal's decision. Only the most serious cases could be appealed beyond the university, and only the Senate could reverse a soviet ruling.40

A law of June 9, 1804, placed the censorship of all books and theatrical performances in the hands of the university censorship committees.41 The university statutes provided that the censorship committee of each university consist of the four deans of faculties. This committee had jurisdiction over all works printed by the university press, published in the university region, ordered for the university library, and ordered from abroad by university members. Its jurisdiction did not extend to anything published by order of the soviet or pravlenie or printed under church auspices.42

40Ibid., XVIII, 622-623.

41Materialy dlia istorii prosviescheniia v Rossii, P.I. Koppen, ed. (SPB, 1819-1827), III, 6.

42PSZ, XXVIII, 625, 694.
A major purpose of the censorship committee was to prevent the publication of works "contrary to law, government, decency," or injurious to any individual's honor or good character. All manuscripts intended for publication had first to be examined by a professor, assistant professor, or student holding a master's degree. After this preliminary examination, the committee decided by majority vote whether to permit publication. Whenever the censorship committee could not reach a decision, the soviet took up the matter. A private writer or publisher could appeal a censorship committee decision to the Central School Board, but the latter had no jurisdiction whatsoever over works published by the university press.  

These statutory provisions clearly defined the universities as autonomous institutions. Although appointed civil servants of the Ministry of Public Instruction ratified and confirmed many decisions and appointments and drew up the university budgets, the statutes placed the administrative initiative in the hands of the ordinary professors. Other provisions further guaranteed autonomy. They forbade local police and military authorities from interference in the university community. They declared "all university buildings and dwellings of professors ... free from quartering and payment of quartering costs." The rector had the right to call in local police, whenever he considered it necessary, to maintain order at his university. Each university had the right to order from abroad any materials, including books, without hindrance or duty. Customs officials were forbidden to open or inspect any package addressed

\[43\text{Ibid.}, 625.\]
to a university.

The statutes also promised each university the freedom of debate in literary and scholarly matters. Every professor could teach by whatever method he thought best, as long as it conformed to the decrees of the soviet.

The new ministry dedicated the years 1804-1816 to implementing these statutes and attacking the three major problems that inhibited university growth during the eighteenth century: the lack of qualified students, the shortage of native professors, and the general indifference to higher education of the Russian nobility. University autonomy and academic freedom proved difficult to enforce. This was largely due to the peculiar historical development of the Russian monarchy. When the universities of western and most of central Europe began their existence, society was organized into corporate communities whose mutual rights and obligations were defined by custom. When centralized states emerged in the West and university communities came more and more to serve the needs of the crown, they retained a considerable degree of their corporate autonomy. Russia, however, had already developed a centralized state bureaucracy before her universities were established. Russian universities were state-supported institutions from the beginning. The university autonomy of the reign of Alexander sprang from laws decreed by an autocrat rather than from centuries-old traditions. Therefore, it would not be

\(^{44}\)Ibid., 609, 654.

\(^{45}\)Ibid., 611-612.
surprising to discover that the tsarist administration did not fully accept the statutory autonomy which was foreign to Russian tradition.

Nowhere were the provisions for autonomy and academic freedom more flagrantly violated than at the University of Kazan. During the first decade of its existence (1805-1814) the director of the Kazan gymnasium actually ruled the university. He allowed the soviet practically no initiative in the conduct of university affairs, and he would not permit that body to overrule his administrative decisions. He strictly supervised the pedagogical activities and the private lives of the professors. S.Y. Rumovskii, the aging curator of the Kazan region, reprimanded the soviet whenever it protested the director’s actions.\textsuperscript{46}

Although the other four universities did not suffer from Kazan’s peculiar form of organization, curators and other bureaucrats often surpassed their legal authority regarding internal university affairs. When professors at Dorpat protested the curator’s reversal of a soviet decision, they were brought before the provincial government. The local authorities warned the professors that they would be brought to trial if they continued their disobedience.\textsuperscript{47} This was a direct violation of the legal jurisdiction of the university tribunal over university members.

The tsar’s appointed officials, however, did not always disregard the statutory provisions. Except Kazan, all of the universities were quickly organized in conformity with the statutes.\textsuperscript{48} The administrative

\textsuperscript{46}Borozdin, 357.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., 359.

\textsuperscript{48}Kazan followed suit in 1814.
structure which was to insure autonomy and academic freedom was put into
effect without delay at the universities of Moscow, Karkov, Dorpat, and
Vilno. At these institutions, the curators did allow administrative
initiative to the professors. There is no indication that the infringe­
ments of autonomy which occurred were the result of conscientious minis­
terial policies. In fact, the curators and other members of the Central
School Board during this period were essentially the same men who drafted
the statutes. It would be absurd to think that they intentionally
violated the very provisions which they wrote into the statutes. It
would be more reasonable to attribute the violations that did occur to
the inexperience of the Russian administration in dealing with institutions
not strictly subordinated to its authority.

The complete control of censorship by the university censorship
committees, as prescribed by law, remained theoretical. In 1807 Alexander
revived the secret police that he had abolished at the beginning of his
reign. The new Ministry of Police began confiscating publications
previously approved by the universities' censorship machinery. After
1815, the Ministry of Public Instruction could not permit the publication
of any manuscript that had not received preliminary approval by police
censors. These new developments did not directly affect university
autonomy, since the censorship committees retained jurisdiction over
library books and works imported by the university. Although the revival
of the police and their control of censorship expressed the deeply­
rooted autocratic traditions, the retention by the universities of
censorship jurisdiction in their own affairs testified to the respect
for higher education on the part of most of the educational ministry.

The large proportion of foreign professors and consequent use of foreign languages in instruction remained a handicap to university growth. The Ministry of Public Instruction was well aware of this problem and tried to correct it. By 1808, the St. Petersburg Pedagogical Institute, established in 1803 in lieu of a university in the capital, had taken on the function of training professors. In that year, twelve students at the institute were sent abroad to improve their knowledge of their disciplines of specialization so that they could fill chairs in Russian universities. As a result of this program and the production of scholars by the universities themselves, a gradual shift occurred in the direction of a large proportion of native professors. Upon their return in 1811, seven of the twelve sent abroad received chairs at the Pedagogical Institute, which was reorganized as the University of St. Petersburg in 1819. At the university of Kharkov during the period 1804-1814, the proportion of Russian faculty members increased from less than one-third to exactly one-half. At Kazan in 1809 more than half of the courses offered were taught in Latin, French, or German. But of eleven new courses added in the next four years, ten were taught in Russian.

---

49 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 59-60.


51 Ikonnikov, "Russkie universitety v sviazi s khodom obschestvennago obrazovaniia," Vestnik Evropy, 1876, no. 10, p. 549.
The framers of the university statutes went to considerable effort to attract students to the new universities. They promised important privileges upon entry into the civil service to graduates and holders of university degrees. Outstanding graduates could enter the service in the twelfth rank, masters in the ninth, and doctors in the eighth. Their policies quickly brought results. By 1808, Russian university enrollment had gone far beyond its eighteenth-century maximum. In fact, the total enrollment had increased tenfold since the turn of the century.

But the Ministry of Public Instruction encountered difficulties in finding students who were fully qualified for university study. Many students lacked the general preparation and language knowledge to comprehend lectures. The ministry tried to correct this problem by a decree of 1811 which created special preparatory courses at the universities.

The major purpose of Alexander's university reform was to give university training to prospective administrators, particularly to members of the nobility, who traditionally occupied the higher reaches of the

52 PSZ. XVIII, 654-655.

53 There were 135 enrolled at Moscow, 525 at Vilno, 40 at Kazan, 82 at Kharkov, and 193 at Dorpat. Hans, p. 233.

54 According to Potocki, curator of Kharkov University, "If the university kept in a strict sense all regulations which must be followed in the admission of students, it would not now have one student." Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 62.
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military and civil service. Yet, a survey conducted by the university curators showed that the prevailing attitude of the nobility was one of indifference to the universities. Most of the gentry wanted to prepare their sons for military commissions and saw no reason to give them any education beyond a military training. Those who wanted to educate their sons did not want to send them to schools where they might mingle with commoners; they exhibited a preference for private tutors, private boarding schools, and foreign universities. The generous contributions of the Kharkov nobility to their new university might be taken as evidence that there were exceptions to the rule. But even they shared the general preoccupation with their military role. They demanded the creation of a faculty of military sciences, and the Kharkov statute of 1804 recognized this demand by establishing a chair of military sciences.

The ministry made some additional concessions in its attempt to overcome this aristocratic resistance. In 1806, it granted special exemptions to anyone entering the military service after completing a university education. At some of the universities, it opened special dormitories and boarding schools, open only to sons of the nobility.

The quality of education at the universities varied enormously during this period. Czartoryski felt that the universities of Kazan

---

56 Darlington, p. 15.
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and Moscow suffered a low level of instruction but that those of Dorpat, Kharkov and Vilno were making considerable progress. 59

Vilno and Kazan occupied the extremes. Czartoryski invited to Vilno Polish and foreign scholars of distinguished reputation and men exposed to advanced European thought, making no consideration for their nationality or religious affiliation. These appointments greatly furthered teaching and scholarship at that institution. Vilno, in fact, became a center for the promotion of Polish culture, since the universities of Cracow and Warsaw were in the hands of governments that were practicing cultural Germanization. 60 At Kazan, many of the native professors were gymnasium teachers elevated to fill faculty chairs, and a portion of the small student body consisted of gymnasium pupils enrolled as university students. Lectures seldom surpassed the gymnasium level. 61

At Kharkov, the local nobility, thanks to the constant prodding of their leader, Vasily N. Karazin, made large donations to the university. Karazin and Potocki, the curator, quickly put the university into functioning order. Most of the new professors were foreign scholars of excellent reputation. 62 At Dorpat, curator Klinger solicited large appropriations for the university and saw to it that buildings were reconstructed, that


60. Nicholas Hans, "Polish Schools in Russia, 1792-1830," Slavonic Review, XXXVIII (June, 1960), 405-408.

61. Ibid., p. 358.

62. Ibid., p. 359.
clinics and anatomical theatres were built. Signifying increased intellectual vitality, four academic societies were founded at the University of Moscow between 1805 and 1811. Even at Kazan University a certain esprit de corps developed among the student body, which formed salons and academic societies.

How far had the universities progressed during the first decade and one-half of the nineteenth century? Certainly the obstacles to educational progress that had existed in the eighteenth century remained in existence. However, the evidence does show that significant growth occurred. By 1814, all five universities were organized and administered according to their statutes. Student bodies expanded greatly in size. The quality of instruction varied, but the University of Vilno, which alone contained five times as many students as had existed in the entire realm at the close of the previous century, provided academic instruction of undisputed academic excellence. At most of the universities an environment of respect and enthusiasm for scientific and intellectual enterprise had begun to develop. The Ministry of Public Instruction and its Central School Board responded to those problems that did exist with practical, corrective measures; their members exhibited a commitment to educational growth which eclipsed any ideological, religious, or nationalist sentiment.

---
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The Reign of Alexander I: The Policies of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction, 1817-1824

The last decade of the reign of Alexander was characterized by policies conducted in a spirit of religious mysticism and political reaction. The shock of the invasion and repulsion of French troops during 1812 and the predominant international position in which the subsequent defeat of Napoleon thrust the Russian monarchy produced a change in the tsar's philosophical and political orientation. During these events of 1812-15, Alexander became convinced that Providence had personally charged him with the mission of applying the "essence of Christianity" to his domestic and foreign policies. He felt that a part of this mission was to oppose the rationalist, Western ideas upon which many of his early reforms had been based. He opposed their spread into Russia because he considered them un-Christian and subversive to the Russian autocracy. The revolutionary movements and university disorders which erupted in the West during the late 1810's and early 1820's only confirmed his suspicions of the threat of these ideas to the Russian political system. His newly acquired mysticism and xenophobia transcended all other considerations and profoundly affected the course of university development for the rest of his reign.

One of the first manifestations of the reaction in Russian domestic policies was the creation in 1817 of the combined Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction. The goal of this ministerial reorganization was to insure that "Christian devotion would always be the basis of true enlightenment." The new ministry consisted of the departments of
Religious Affairs (with jurisdiction over the Holy Synod, ecclesiastical schools, and other religious institutions) and of Public Instruction (which directed the same institutions as the former ministry). However, this formal separation did not prevent men who shared the ruler's reactionary mood from controlling the affairs of both departments.

The tsar's ideological "conversion" led to a change after 1816 in the personnel of the educational administration. The original members of the ministry and its Central School Board were gradually replaced by men with no previous experience as educators, who shared Alexander's new views, and who considered the new politico-religious ideology more sacred than educational progress. In 1816, the tsar appointed as minister Prince Alexander Golitsyn, the former head of the Russian Bible Society and procurator of the Holy Synod who had been instrumental in Alexander's conversion to mysticism. The previous professional experience of the new director of the Department of Public Instruction, V.M. Popov, was acquired in his position as secretary of the Bible Society. Three men came to play the predominant role in university affairs: A.S. Sturdza, D.P. Runich, and M.I. Magnitskii. Sturdza, who joined the Central School Board in 1818, was an outstanding critic of the freedom of the German universities, around which the German nationalist movement was centered in the 1810's. Describing the activities of these universities as subversive to the stability of Europe, he recommended the abolition of their autonomous privileges, close government supervision
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of instruction, and greater police jurisdiction in university affairs.\footnote[66]{Rozhdestvenskii, \textit{Istoricheskii obzor}, pp. 116-117.} Runich, who became a Board member in 1819 and St. Petersburg curator two years later, became known as the persecutor of professors at St. Petersburg University (established in 1819). He charged the professors with teaching history and philosophy "in a spirit contrary to Christianity" and with inculcating "in the minds of students ... ideas subversive to public order and prosperity."\footnote[67]{Ibid., 124.} Magnitskii, formerly a military governor, became Kazan curator in 1819. He insisted that professors of political economy defend the divine-right theory of monarchy and that geography courses strictly follow the chronology of the scriptures.\footnote[68]{Ibid., p. 124.} In a recent work, Alexander Vucinich masterfully summarized the ideological orientation of these men:

In a word, the Magnitskii group directed its heaviest ... pressure against the rationalistic and humanistic approaches to the study of social phenomena. Acting from the most extreme anti-rationalistic premises, they endeavored to suppress all theories that recognized the historical nature of the sacred institutions and ethical code of Russian autocracy. They denied the importance of man's rational search for positive knowledge and the intrinsic right of the individual and human collectivity to seek improvements in living conditions. They attacked the natural sciences for offering theoretical and methodological models which the humanists could emulate, and also for supporting conclusions which challenged the truth of the gospel.\footnote[69]{Vucinich, p. 236.}
They shared a negative more than a positive ideology, attacking the major
tenets of the enlightenment in the West. Their predecessors in the Central
School Board felt the more advanced scholarship of central and western
Europe could significantly foster educational progress in Russia, and
they made specific statutory provisions for the exposure of the universities
to western influences. The "Magnitskii group", more concerned with the
political threat of Western ideas to the stability of Christendom and
the Russian monarchy than with scientific progress, sought to quarantine
Russia from the West. The Germanic areas came under direct attack, because
the new Board greatly feared the spread of German student unrest to the
Russian universities. According to Magnitskii, "the whole mischief which
has been observed in our universities has been caused by the education,
the books, and the men we have imported from the German universities,"
where "the infection of unbelief and revolutionary principles which
started in England and gained additional strength in pre-revolutionary
France has been erected into a complete ... system."70 Russia, he
believed, must isolate herself from the "pernicious" influence of western
Europe.71 The new Board cancelled the earlier policy of sending young
Russians abroad for training to become professors. They even prohibited
Russian students from attending German universities and Russian universities
from hiring as professors anyone who had studied outside Russia.72

70 Darlington, p. 65.
71 Borozdin, 361.
72 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 118; Darlington, p. 60.
It was in 1819 that the new ministry's orientation began seriously to effect the course of university policy. In that year the *Burschen­schaften* movement of radical German students, founded in 1815, caused an international crisis. Climaxing a series of university disturbances, a student assassinated an ultra-conservative poet. In response the Carlsbad Conference, representing the German states, approved three decrees jointly proposed by Metternich and Frederick William III. They provided for the establishment of (1) rigid censorship regulations, (2) strong supervision over universities by appointed directors to weed out subversive students and faculty members, and (3) a central German investigative committee to deal with subversion. Due largely to the efforts of the three reactionaries mentioned above, the Central School Board translated the first two Carlsbad decrees into tenets of Russian university policy.

Minister Golitsyn added a School Committee to the ministry, consisting of several Central School, Board members, and charged them with censorship regulation. The Board and the Committee censored texts, professors' writings, and lectures. They amended some of the most innocent textbooks, including one reputed to have been written by Catherine II. Works on natural law came under especial attack. The treatment of Professor Kunitsyn's book, *Natural Law*, was typical. At a Board meeting in 1820, Runich condemned the book as a "collection of subversive sophistry ..., a sacrilegous attack on the divinity of Holy Revelation."75

73Vucinich, p. 231.
74Kornilov, I, 189, 193.
The Board thereupon decreed the confiscation of the book from all libraries and individuals who had already obtained copies of it. Later the Board ruled that all texts required for courses in natural law must be submitted to it for examination and approval. Most members of the School Committee agreed that it was the job of each curator to supervise lectures closely.\textsuperscript{76} The Board required that each professor present to the minister a detailed conspectus of courses, explaining the writings on which his lectures would be based, before he could begin his classes.\textsuperscript{77}

One of the most dramatic episodes of this period was Magnitskii's "purge" of Kazan University. Golitsyn appointed Magnitskii to the Central School Board in February in 1819, for the purpose of inspecting the University of Kazan. In April, Magnitskii reported to the emperor that the university was a seed-bed of atheistic and subversive thought and recommended that the institution be closed down. Alexander ordered Magnitskii to avoid such a drastic measure, but he appointed him Kazan curator and sent him back to the university "to take ... appropriate measures for bringing all parts of it into proper order."\textsuperscript{78} Magnitskii then introduced an arbitrary regime at Kazan from which it was not to recover until the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855).

Magnitskii appointed a director of morals to Kazan University (an official for which the 1802-04 laws made no provision) whom he called "the chief authority in the university."\textsuperscript{79} In January 1820 the ministry

\begin{footnotes}
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\end{footnotes}
approved Magnitskii's "Instructions" to the director, which explained the purposes and policies of the new regime. In the first two articles, the curator stated that the goal of Russian education was to train students to be "faithful sons of the Orthodox Church, loyal subjects of the sovereign, and good and useful citizens of the fatherland," and that "the heart of education ... is -- obedience." Magnitskii ordered the director to sit in on lectures, inspect student notebooks, and watch the casual activities of students to insure that no lectures contradicted Christian doctrines and that no subversive conversations took place. Magnitskii found Christian doctrine to be relevant to courses in all faculties but the medical. He insisted that professors of philosophy teach that all philosophical systems inconsistent with the truths of the Bible were false and illusory, that only theories consonant with the Scriptures were rationally sound. They were to teach that God gave monarchical power to the legitimate dynasties and that the legislation of tsars was the expression of divine will. Professors of law had to "point with repugnance to the rules of Hobbes and Machiavelli" and argue that the best society is consistent with the theories of Plato and Aristotle. The "Instructions" ordered professors of physics to teach that God's grace provided men with the senses and instruments to perceive the marvels of the universe, and commanded the professor of astronomy to argue that God planned the firmament and had already revealed to mankind all the laws governing the heavenly bodies. 80

Magnitskii removed all books from the university library which he felt contained "harmful trends" of thought. He dismissed eleven professors, more than half the teaching staff, and replaced them with amateurs in full agreement with his policies, who slavishly carried out his orders. The new professor of geometry for example, claimed that the triangle was the emblem of the Trinity and that the hypotenuse of a right triangle symbolized the unity between truth and peace, justice and love, God and man, heaven and earth. Students "were forced to march, to read and sing prayers in chorus; those who disobeyed were put in cells and wore plates with the inscription 'sinner', after which they had to do penance."

Magnitskii's policies soon spread to other universities. The 1821 application of the "Instructions" to St. Petersburg University will be discussed in Chapter III. In 1824, Kharkov curator Kamieev persuaded the Central School Board to apply the "Instructions" to Kharkov University. The Board permitted Kamieev to select rector and deans at his own discretion. The curator dismissed Professor Shad for setting forth new philosophies in his work on natural law and Professor Osipovskii, a mathematician, for reminding a student on an examination that it was more
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accurate to say that God "exists" than that He "lives." Karvieev forced professors to teach with seventeenth-century textbooks. The number of professors dwindled during his curatorship from twenty-eight to eight.

The University of Vilno presented a particular threat to tsarist authority because it became after 1815 a center of a Polish nationalist movement, which had gained inspiration from similar movements further west from students who had served the Polish national cause in Napoleon's armies. The students at Vilno formed secret patriotic societies which shared the goal of reuniting the Polish provinces of Russia to a revitalized independent Poland.85 Realizing that the Russian secret police had been quick to discover the existence of these societies, Curator Adam Czartoryski cautioned the students against foolhardy actions which he knew would only result in police interference. In 1823, Grand Duke Constantine, whom Alexander had put in charge of affairs in Russian Poland, sent Nicholas Novosiltsev (who had followed the tsar along the route from philosophé to reactionary) to inspect the situation at Vilno and take measures to wipe out "the spirit of unwise Polish nationality." There soon followed "mass arrests, interrogations, prosecutions of professors and pupils, and purges among the educational bodies."86 Police arrested twenty secret society leaders. Before the year was out, Novosiltsev had replaced Czartoryski as curator and curtailed whatever university

85 Borozdin, p. 367.

autonomy remained. This situation continued until May 1832, when the university was closed as a consequence of the 1830-31 Polish insurrection.

These policies were clearly contrary to the letter and spirit of the university statutes of 1802-04. More than the other universities, Moscow and Dorpat retained their former statutory rights. Curator K.A. Lieven of Dorpat, described by Rozhdestvenskii as a "sincere and zealous pietist," did dismiss three professors from the university, charging them with "rationalism." Nevertheless, Lieven secured a new statute for the university in 1820 which did not depart significantly from the university's original statute. The University of Moscow escaped the effects of the reaction, thanks to the protection of its curator, and underwent great expansion during this period. The enrollment rose from 215 in 1812, to 695 in 1822, to 876 in 1825.

Generally speaking, these policies dealt a severe blow to the quality of university education. Most of the Board members no longer considered pedagogical excellence the most important criterion for policy. Instead, "the sole test applied for every form of teaching was: is it in harmony with the truths of revealed religion [as interpreted by the ministry]?" At Kazan, according to Kluichevskii, the "Instructions" implementation definitely caused "scientific education to deteriorate."

---

87 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 125.
88 PSZ, XXXVII, 254-279.
89 Ikonnikov, No. 10, 546.
90 Darlington, p. 57.
91 V.O. Kliuchevskii, Kurs russkoj istorii (Moscow, 1937), V, 309.
Outright dismissals significantly depleted teaching staffs. In addition, the total disregard for statutory autonomy and the strict supervision of teaching caused many of the best professors to resign from their posts. Although Dorpat's statute reaffirmed its autonomy and Moscow escaped the purges, even these institutions suffered from the Board's rigorous censorship of lectures and textbooks and the sealing off of universities from Western contact. The oppressive atmosphere created by the purges and inspections, the effective curtailment of university autonomy, and the humiliating treatment of students at the other universities discouraged the intellectual spontaneity that had begun to develop between 1804 and 1816. There is no evidence of the formation of new student societies or salons during the reactionary period.

University progress suffered because the new educational administrators knew less about education and were less critical of their own policy than were their predecessors. Whatever practical corrective measures the new Board did take were occasional and far less effective than its repressive measures. A measure such as that requiring professors to hold higher degrees, designed by Golitsyn to raise teaching standards, could hardly compensate for the lack of qualified native professors augmented by the reversal of the former ministry's policy of sending prospective professors abroad for training.

The Reign of Alexander I: Conclusions

Two periods in the university history of 1801-1824 have been suggested, each with a characteristic spirit that guided policy and affected university growth. The first period began with the drafting
of the university statutes and ended around 1816, when Golitsyn was appointed Minister of Public Instruction. Throughout this period, university policy was conducted in a critical and empirical spirit. The old Schools Commission, composed of experienced educators, was intentionally given a major role in the drafting of the statutes. The Central School Board which supplanted this body exhibited a certain flexibility, a responsiveness to practical needs as they arose, and a willingness to adapt policies to these needs. The Board considered no principles more sacred than that of educational improvement. The spirit of the second period, 1816-1824, was fantically uncritical. The Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction showed no desire to temper ideology with experience; in the process it sacrificed educational advancement to ideological principles.
CHAPTER II
THE FOUNDING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. PETERSBURG,
1819-1821

Introduction: The Origins of the University

From the beginning, the University of St. Petersburg was an exception to the general pattern of university organization. It was not even in existence when the general university statutes of 1803-04 were promulgated. The estimated university budget of 1803 included an allotment for a university in St. Petersburg, but later in the same year the government decided to postpone its establishment. Instead, the government reorganized the capital's Teachers' Seminary renaming it the Teachers' Gymnasium. The Ministry reorganized it again in 1804 into the Pedagogical Institute and yet again in 1816 into the expanded Chief Pedagogical Institute. These predecessors of the University of St. Petersburg left their imprint on the university's organization and administration.

1Russia, Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosviesheniia, Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu Narodnogo Prosviesheniia (SPB, 1864-65), I, 33. Hereafter cited as Sbornik postanovlenii. It is not known why the plans were changed. V.V. Grigor'ev, the official historian of the university, suggests that the government feared the impossibility of finding good teachers for all positions if too many universities were founded at once, and that there was a greater need for universities in the provinces than in St. Petersburg, where there already existed several specialized institutions of higher learning. V.V. Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii S. Peterburgskii Universitet v techenie pervykh piatidesiat I let ego sushchestvovania (SPB, 1870). Insufficiency of funds for domestic expenditure after Russian involvement in the wars against Napoleon may have been the reason for continued postponement until 1819.
The Curatorship of S.S. Uvarov, 1810-1821

The 1804 decree establishing the Pedagogical Institute referred to the school as a section of the future University of St. Petersburg. Therefore it was given the same name as the pedagogical department of the other universities. But the goal of establishing a university was not energetically pursued by the first curator of the St. Petersburg school region, and it was soon lost sight of by the educational ministry. In 1811, the minister submitted to the Committee of Ministers a plan which would put off the founding of the university indefinitely. Preoccupied with the coming war with Napoleon, the Committee postponed consideration of this proposal. The fact that action was never taken on this proposal was due chiefly to the efforts of S.S. Uvarov. Uvarov, who served as curator from 1810-1821, was instrumental in holding the ministry to its original intention.

Sergei Semenovich Uvarov (1786-1855), born into a highly placed noble family, had begun a career in the diplomatic service. In 1801, he entered the employ of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in the course of the next decade served in the embassies at Vienna and Paris. He was a broadly educated man, well-versed in classical and modern European literature, a devotee of modern science, and a literary associate of Karamzin, Zhukovskii, and Bludov. He was fluent in French and German and published several treatises on the classics in both languages. His

2 Shornik postanovlenii, I, 233.
interests ranged over a wide field of learning, and he eventually gained membership in the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, the Göttingen Society of Sciences, the French Academy of Writings and Literature, and the Danish Royal Society of Sciences. He showed considerable tact and charm in his dealings with others, putting these gifts to good use in the several positions of authority he held.³

Although he later became an official conservative as Minister of Education during the reign of Nicholas I (1825-55), as curator he was an innovator. He experimented with gymnasium curricula in the St. Petersburg region, and his classics-based reforms were eventually extended to all the gymnasium in the country. He proved to be a man who understood the needs of science and scholarship, with a remarkable talent for judging the intellectual and moral capacities of professors.⁴ He took the initiative in expanding the Pedagogical Institute into the Chief Pedagogical Institute with the ultimate aim of transforming the latter into a university.

Uvarov's immediate goal was to make the Pedagogical Institute, essentially a training center for gymnasium teachers, into an institution of higher learning. The 1816 foundation of the Chief Pedagogical Institute was an enormous step in this direction. The statute of this school enlarged the curriculum to include many courses normally offered in a university. It expanded the course of studies from a three-year to a six-year term. Institute pupils, like university crown students, paid

³Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 220-226.
no tuition and received payment of living expenses in exchange for a pledge of six years' service as teachers. In 1817, 100 pupils were recruited, chiefly from seminaries. Each pupil was to take two years of preparatory courses, three years of advanced courses, and one of pedagogical courses. The advanced courses were equivalent to university classes, and the statute organized them into departments according to the pattern of the other universities. The arrangements made for pensions, salaries, and administrative rank equivalents for professors and officials closely resembled the corresponding provisions of the university statutes. Other privileges characteristic of the universities were granted: the right to award higher degrees, the right freely to import materials from abroad, a tribunal with jurisdiction over members and their families, and an official seal of its own. Yet, the institute enjoyed none of the universities' independence from bureaucratic tutelage, and its essential function remained the training of teachers. In 1817, a second section was added for the training of parish and district school teachers, as part of an attempt to overcome the shortage of teachers in those institutions.

---

5PSZ, no. 26,753, XXVIII, 1133-56.

6The decree establishing this section is reproduced in Sbornik postanovlenii, I, 1105-1108; see also Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 120-121, and P.A. Pletnev, Porvoe dvadtsatipiatiletie Imperatorskago Sanktpeterburgskago Universiteta (SPB, 1844), pp. 9-11, for discussion of the question of whether the institute constituted a de facto university.
Circumstances forced Uvarov to hurry through the next step of his plan. Seeing that the forces of the reactionary movement he was at odds with were rapidly gathering in the Central School Board, he pressed for the prompt founding of a university, even if this meant its premature establishment. On January 11, 1819, the tsar agreed to the university's establishment. Two days later, Uvarov presented to the minister a draft of a temporary decree, which amended and elaborated upon the statute of the Chief Pedagogical Institute. This decree, entitled the "Original Foundation of St. Petersburg University," received official confirmation on February 8, 1819. It was to remain in force until the drafting of a permanent statute, which was to be based on the recommendations of the faculty of the new university.

Just as the pursuit of his goal caused the institute to assimilate the traits of a university, the speed with which he reached it caused the university to retain many of the characteristics of the institute. The university inherited the institute's chairs and departments, which were organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical and Juridical Sciences:</th>
<th>Physical and Mathematical Sciences:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Divine Law</td>
<td>Chair of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Philosophy</td>
<td>Chair of Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Public Law</td>
<td>Chair of Chemistry and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Positive Law</td>
<td>Chair of Zoology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of Botany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of Mineralogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of Astronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 9-10.
A medical department was not established at St. Petersburg University in light of the existence in the capital of a Medical-Surgical Academy. The university could, according to need, add additional chairs and courses. A comparison with the departmental organization of Kazan University, typical of the other universities, is valuable at this point. Excluding the medical faculty, Kazan had twenty-one chairs, one less than St. Petersburg. The largest number of chairs at Kazan belonged to the Physical-Mathematical Sciences department, following the Enlightenment emphasis on the exact sciences; at St. Petersburg the emphasis was clearly on the humanities. Uvarov's love of classical, oriental, and modern European literature had clearly left its mark.

Although the "Original Foundation" affirmed in principle the privileges and autonomy of the 1803-04 statutes, it vested far more authority in the hands of state appointees and far less in those of the ordinary professors. Like the earlier statutes, it provided for a conference of professors, the election of the rector, professors and

---

9PSZ, no. 27,765, XXVI, 63.

10Ibid., no. 21,500, XXVIII, 614.
honorary members by this body, a pravlenie, faculties, and a censorship committee. But St. Petersburg University differed from the other universities in the authority of the curator, in the roles assigned to its administrative committees, and in the composition of the committee which had supreme authority. The university had a director, appointed by the crown, who served as first assistant to the curator and as the "main and closest" superintendent over "all internal affairs of the university." The competence of the conference of professors, presided over by the elected rector, did not extend beyond pure educational matters, and the supreme organ of the university was the pravlenie, which handled the government of the university and its region, university finance and justice, and had jurisdiction over the censorship committee. The composition of the pravlenie hardly resembled its counterpart at the other universities. Instead of elected university members (the rector, deans, and juror) this body consisted of four crown appointees (the curator, the director, the advisor, and the provincial school superintendent) and only one elected member (the rector). The curator, whom the early educators of Alexander's reign did not even want to be present at the university, presided over this organ; he had the right to call extraordinary sessions, to invite to sessions any outside individuals whose presence he deemed necessary, and to decide what matters regarding administration of the school region were within the pravlenie's jurisdiction. It is a testimony to the great statutory power given the

\[11\] Ibid., no. 27,675, XXXVI.
curator that DoP. Runich, the authoritarian successor of Uvarov, was the one to put into full force the provisions defining the composition and function of the pravlenie.

There were other reasons for the uniqueness of the university's pattern of organization and administration besides the use of its parent institution as a model. To get his project accepted by the Central School Board, Uvarov had to make concessions to the opinion of its majority, which definitely opposed the granting of genuine autonomy. The establishment of the post of director was such a concession although it was also the result of copying the example of Halle University. Uvarov himself sponsored the composition and dominant role of the pravlenie. To his mind, the experience of the past fifteen years had shown administration by the professors' council to be ineffectual and chaotic. In his opinion, the dispersal of power had led to conflicts of authority within the university, distracted the professors from their scholarly pursuits, and caused internal disorder. He hoped to serve educational purposes by simplifying internal administration and concentrating ultimate responsibility in the hands of a single authority.¹² It is more than likely that Uvarov felt this would prevent any disorder which the Central School Board could use as a pretext for wholesale and arbitrary intervention in university affairs (or for interference with

his own work as curator).

Uvarov's next task was to put the new university into operation. The university opened at a formal session of the professors' conference on February 14, 1819, where Uvarov announced the intention to improve the university's present condition, partly through the introduction of "basic, classical education."\(^{13}\) The election of deans of the departments occurred in March. It took the entire summer to elect a rector. In June, due to a tie vote, the conference cast lots for its choice. The matter was then reported through the curator and the minister of education to the Committee of Ministers. The latter demanded a new election, which, held in August, resulted in the choice of Professor Balug'ianskii.

The "internal" course of studies for crown students in the pedagogical department continued on the same pattern that was followed when the most recent class of students entered the institute in 1817. In August, the conference added an "external" course for regular (also called "self-supporting," "free," and "external") students. A three year course was prescribed for each faculty. Students enrolled in the philosophical-juridical department were to study philosophy the first year; natural law, political economy and finance the second; and positive laws the third. Students of science and mathematics would have to take three years of physics, botany, and zoology; two years of mathematics and chemistry; and one year of astronomy and mineralogy. Students of history and literature were required to take three years of language and literature study in Russian, Greek, and Latin; they were to spend their first year

\(^{13}\)Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatiljetie, pp. 11-13.
studying geography, history, and statistics, and their next two years learning German and French language and literature. In September the conference established the following requirements for the admission of regular students: possession of a satisfactory certificate of studies from a gymnasium or equivalent institution or the successful completion of an entrance examination in Latin, Russian, arithmetic, geography and history. When the "external" course opened in November 1819, the university was in full operation.  

From the beginning, St. Petersburg University experienced the same major problems that plagued its sister institutions. The shortage of qualified students was particularly acute at St. Petersburg. The enrollment figure of 95 students in November 1819, is misleading. Of this number, 71 were crown students of pedagogy who had entered the first division of the Chief Pedagogical Institute in 1817. Only twenty-four regular students entered in 1819, and only one of these possessed a gymnasium certificate. Of the twenty-three who took the entrance examinations, only eight passed with complete success, and six of these passed only after a second attempt. The remainder were very deficient in Latin, the language in which many teachers lectured due to the lack of native professors and the classics-orientation of Uvarov. The conference decided to allow entrance to the deficient students on condition that they show continued improvement in Latin at semi-annual examinations. The majority of these students proved unable to meet even

14 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 27-29; Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 16.
such relaxed requirements, and by 1822, only seven of the original entrants remained. Only four of them ever graduated. In spite of a fresh enrollment in late 1820, the total number of regular students did not exceed twenty. In January 1822 before Runich purged the student body, the total reached twenty-seven.

One of the methods employed by the ministry of education to deal with the student shortage and with the nobility's aversion to university education which contributed to that shortage, was the establishment of pensions — university-preparatory boarding schools exclusively for young noblemen. In 1817, the government established a pension at the Chief Pedagogical Institute, and it remained at the university when the latter was founded. It offered secondary instruction in divine law, state law, logic, moral philosophy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, political economy, and architecture, which were taught, on the advanced level, by university faculty members. It also offered subjects appropriate to the usual occupations and amusements of the nobility: military science, fencing, dancing, and singing.

The pension's impact on university enrollment was contrary to the ministry's intention. It was originally a separate institution from the university. Until 1826, its only administrative connection with the

---

15 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 6, 29-32, 100.
16 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 562-3.
17 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 31.
18 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, c-ci.
university was through the university inspector of students, whose assistant ran the pension; the university's administrative organs had no influence on its affairs. Contrary to the founders' intentions, pension pupils seldom used university facilities. More important, beyond its failure to supply students to the university, the pension actually distracted young noblemen from university attendance. It acted as a competitor with the university, rather than a support of it, because of the extensive service privileges granted to pension graduates. Most graduates could enter the civil and military service with privileges equivalent to those of university graduates. All were exempt from the 1809 law which required examinations or university degrees for entrance into the upper reaches of the civil service. Thus, the pension offered a route to privileged service positions to sons of noblemen who would otherwise have had to gain such positions by university attendance. Naturally, pension graduates entered the service directly, without further study. While regular university enrollment remained extremely small, the total number of self-supporting pupils in the pension reached eighty-seven in 1819 and ninety-one in 1820.

For this and other reasons, the pension became an irritant to the regime. It became a center of fervent literary and political debate, and the university disorders of 1821 began at the pension. Some of its

---
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21 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 551-552, 562-563.
pupils became Decembrists. In 1826 the government brought the pension under the university's direction; four years later the pensions at Moscow and St. Petersburg Universities were converted into ordinary gymnasia.

By the time of the conversion of the Chief Pedagogical Institute into the university, Uvarov and his predecessors had assembled a teaching staff of twenty-three. By 1820 three new professors had been added and two old ones had retired, resulting in a total of twenty-four. Of the twenty-two chairs provided for by the statute, only sixteen were filled by ordinary professors in 1820. Professors of lower rank occupied the chairs of zoology, physics and Latin; it proved necessary for a pension teacher to fill the chair of botany, and for the ordinary professor of history to fill the chair of German. Only a handful of ordinary professors had professors of lower rank to share their teaching duties. Yet as a result of the policies of ministers and curators, St. Petersburg did not suffer from the lack of native scholarly talent to the same degree as the other universities when they were in their infancy. In fact, thirteen of the professors were natives of Russia proper. Seven of these were former Pedagogical Institute pupils sent abroad for professorial training during 1808-1811. Of the eleven foreigners, three were Slavic, and could

---

22 Kosachevskaiia, I, 41.

23 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, c-ci.

24 This figure comprises the total of emeritus, ordinary, extraordinary, and assistant professors and excludes junior faculty members such as teachers, lecturers, and laboratory technicians.
lecture in Russian without difficulty in communication. Thus, the legislation and policies of the ministry of education showed important beneficial results upon the composition of the teaching staff at St. Petersburg.

Other general facts concerning the staff's composition are of interest. A full half of the professors belonged to the humanities department. The age of professors ranged from thirty-one to fifty-five years. Of the total, two thirds were under forty. Practically all of the Russian natives were members of the clerical class who began their education in Church seminaries and academies, and then attended the Pedagogical Institute. Four came from the Tver seminary alone. Eighteen of the total had been trained abroad. Of the natives sent abroad, the students of law and political economy attended Göttingen, Helmstadt, and Heidelberg; those of mathematics and natural sciences attended Berlin, Paris, Salzburg, and Vienna. The foreign professors represented the universities of Lvov, Vienna, Jena, Berlin, Halle, Göttingen, Paris, and Leipzig.

---

In 1803 Curator Novosiltsev, hoping to recruit talent which had the benefit of foreign university training without the disadvantage of unfamiliarity with Slavic tongues, hired three professors from Habsburg Ruthenia, of which two remained in 1820: ordinary professors P.D. Lodii and M.A. Balug‘ianskii. The former had received his doctorate from Lvov University, the latter from Vienna. Novosiltsev's agent, I. Orlai, a Ruthenian who had entered the Russian service in 1796, wrote to them of the liberal salaries, pensions, and administrative rank privileges for Russian professors, suggesting that their talents would be more fairly rewarded in Russia than under the Habsburgs. Kosachevskaia, I, 43.
The competence of professors and the quality of their lectures were extremely varied. Especially within the historical-literary and physical-mathematical departments, the latest European theories were taught in one chair, whereas from another chair came ideas that were half a century behind the times. Until Uvarov's position was severely weakened in early 1821, there were no significant restrictions on the content and form of university lectures. Professors Balug'ianskii (political economy), Plisov (political economy), Kunitsyn (public law), Raupach (history), Hermann (statistics), and Arsen'ev (geography and statistics) freely criticized the political and social institutions of Russia, including serfdom. The faculties of philosophical-juridical sciences and historical-literary sciences introduced into St. Petersburg many current European ideas, especially from Germany, which were alien to Russian tradition; for their chairs emanated the Enlightenment concepts of natural law, popular sovereignty, and inalienable rights, and the ideals of the rule of reason, freedom of labor, and equality before the law.

Almost to a man, the department of philosophy and law consisted of very talented and articulate lecturers, attuned to current trends in their fields in European universities, who made significant scholarly contributions and gained reputations beyond the borders of the Russian Empire. Except for the professor of theology, all had received their

26 Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatiletie, p. 18.

27 Kosachevskaia, I, 41.
advanced training at German or Austrian universities. The ideas of Schelling prevailed in the teaching of philosophy, and those of Adam Smith in political economy.28

The ordinary professor of political economy, M.A. Balug'ianskii, the university's first rector, was the department's leading light, and his superb lectures typified the high level of teaching offered by the department. Balug'ianskii was one of the Ruthenians invited to staff the new Pedagogical Institute in 1804. Before coming to the institute, he had received the doctorate of laws from the University of Vienna and had begun his teaching career at a Hungarian legal academy. During the first few years of his career in Russia, he published articles in the Statisticheskii Zhurnal, which showed him to be a truly independent thinker with views that were very progressive for the times.29 His article, entitled, "A Description of Various Economic Systems," established in Russian literature "the then still new terminology of political economy."30 His education had been encyclopedic, and he had gained fluency in classical and modern languages. His lectures, which he could deliver in Latin, German, French, or Russian, exhibited his "broad erudition, knowledge of the world and of the political life of the most advanced countries of Europe."31

28 Sukhomlinov, Izasedovaniia i stati, I, 255.

29 Kosachevskaia, I, 55, 49-50.


31 Kosachevskaia, I, 52.
In his course of lectures in political economy, he first described the major sixteenth and seventeenth century economic theories. Secondly, he surveyed the history of economic development since antiquity. Finally, he offered his own ideas, borrowing heavily from Adam Smith and the Physiocrats, and applied them to the conditions in contemporary Russia. He advocated the thorough reform of the Russian economy based on serf emancipation, peasant property ownership, freedom of labor, free circulation of capital, improved credit systems, restricted government participation in production, and government protection of the sanctity of person and property. He felt Russia's economic prosperity depended on such a reform. The influence of his ideas on other members of the teaching staff was considerable. The ordinary professor of public law, Kunitsyn, and extraordinary professor of political economy, Plisov, were his direct disciples. They studied under his personal guidance at the Pedagogical Institute. Professors Arsen'ev and Galich in philosophy had attended his lectures at the Pedagogical Institute.  

Not only was teaching of high quality offered in this department, students were least plagued by language barriers, since, in spite of foreign training, all of its teachers could lecture in Russian. The superiority of this department should not be surprising, since it offered training in those fields which were most relevant to the tasks of state administrators, whose training was the chief purpose given the universities. However, since such a small number of the university's students were free

---

32 Ibid., 45-50.
of the obligations connected with the teacher-training program (and thus unable to enroll as law students), the university, in its infancy, was clearly failing to fulfill its major purpose. It differed in few respects from the Chief Pedagogical Institute. Although it provided the highest level of education in St. Petersburg, the geographic center of the Russian bureaucracy, and although each faculty made significant contributions to scholarship, the administration could hardly benefit from the university's existence so long as the shortage of non-pedagogical students continued.

The Fall of Uvarov

Uvarov must have known that his days as curator were numbered. Minister Golitsyn regarded him as a personal enemy and accepted his proposal to found the university, principally because it meant the surrender of Uvarov's personal control of public schools in the region, and because the "Original Foundation", rejecting the principle of university autonomy, vested considerable authority in the hands of the minister's trusted lieutenant, Director K.A. Kavelin. Uvarov had never been sympathetic with the partisans of obscurantism who were gaining predominance in the ministry at the time of the university's establishment. His concern for high scholastic standards and classics-based education had no relevance for a group which felt moral training should be the sole basis for education at all levels. Uvarov's isolation

33Mavrodi, ed., Istoriia, p. 17.
within the ministry became increasingly apparent during 1819-1821. The friction between Uvarov and the Magnitskii group continued to grow as the result of controversies over university policy, and eventually forced Uvarov's resignation in May, 1821.

Uvarov's resignation was simply a confirmation of his inability to champion his own policies successfully in the face of the determined opposition of the Central School Board. The failure of his attempts to get through a statute project, to protect the pension from ministerial interference, and to defend Professor Kunitsyn's Natural Law against its censors, testifies to the weakness of Uvarov's position. After he submitted a draft of a university statute to the minister in May 1819, the majority of the School Board attacked it mercilessly. From their viewpoint his project failed to provide for proper supervision of student morals, placed too little emphasis on religious instruction and too much on the secular philosophies taught in Germany, and promised to establish the degree of autonomy which they considered the fundamental reason for disorder in German universities. In spite of a willingness to revise the statute in accordance with the wishes of his critics, he failed to produce the passage of any statute at all. In the spring of 1820 the ministry postponed the matter indefinitely.

---

34 The most comprehensive attack came from Magnitskii and is reproduced in Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 91-108.

35 Ibid., 88.
In January 1821, a disturbance broke out in the pension. The boys of the third class demanded the reinstatement of a teacher fired by the director for his political views, underscoring their demands with the building of barricades and the beating of a supervisor. Director Kavelin blamed the incident on a generally defiant mood of pupils, produced by atheistic teaching in philosophy, natural law, and political economy. In spite of Uvarov's objection that the disorder was of minor consequence and could be corrected by organizational reforms and the relaxation of supervision, the minister accepted Kavelin's interpretation. The ministry instructed Kavelin to use his own discretion in dismissing "unreliable" teachers, approved the director's proposal to see that the Old and New Testaments serve as the major sources for courses in natural law and political economy, and declared that teaching would henceforth come under the Central School Board's direct supervision.

The authority of Uvarov, as well as the privileges of the university, was entirely overlooked in the ministry's treatment of A.P. Kunitsyn, ordinary professor of public law and a product of the 1808 program of study abroad. A disciple of Baluz'ianskii, he studied at the universities of Göttingen and Heidelberg, and accepted the Philosophes' conception of natural law, adopting views which were close to those of Rousseau. In his lectures and his book, Natural Law, he asserted the peasant's right to life, liberty, and property, opposed the legal recognition of a

36 Kosechevakaia, I, 62.
privileged class, and claimed that political tyranny resulted from the Church's support of monarchial authority. He rejected violent revolution as a means of achieving change, but this did not protect him from attack by D.P. Runich. As a member of the School Committee, Runich condemned Kunitsyn's book for expressing the ideas of Rousseau and Marat and propagating views that undermined the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Such views, he felt, were clearly revolutionary, and the distance was short between the "chair of Kunitsyn" and the "shocks of Naples, Turin, Madrid, and Lisbon." The Central School Board agreed with Runich, declared the work un-Christian and subversive to state and family, and called for its confiscation. In March 1821, the minister dismissed Kunitsyn from his chair at the university. Uvarov resigned when the ministry completely ignored his advice regarding the settlement of the pension and Kunitsyn affairs.

38 Ibid.
39 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 35; Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatiletie, p. 25.
CHAPTER III

THE APPLICATION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN REACTION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. PETERSBURG: THE CURATORSHIP OF RUNICH, 1821-1826

Curator D.P. Runich

Uvarov's resignation in May 1821 cleared the way for the appointment of D.P. Runich (1778-1860) as curator and the direct application of the prevailing ministerial policy to St. Petersburg University. Runich was born into a high-placed family although one of relatively recent immigration into Russia. His grandfather came from Hungary during the reign of Elizabeth (1741-62), and his father became a Senator during the early years of Alexander's reign. Before his appointment to the Central School Board in March 1819, he had enjoyed a successful career in the civil service, having been decorated twice for meritorious performance of duties and having reached the rank of actual state councilor after eighteen years of service. He served in the College of Foreign Affairs as a translator at Vienna and Berlin (1790-1800), in the provincial governments of Vladimir and Viatka (1800-1805), and in the Moscow Postal Department, first as assistant director and then as director (1805-1816). Like most of the new members of the Board, he converted to evangelical mysticism around 1812 and became actively associated with the Bible
Society movement. Before becoming a censor himself, he wrote works in a mystical vein which got him into a measure of trouble with the censorship.1

It is difficult to find trustworthy information on Runich's personal character. All writers of a later period have nothing to say in his favor, and most contemporary observers, outside of his associates in the ministry, condemn him in the most unsparing terms. Even the reactionary publicist, N.I. Grech, a paid agent of Nicholas I's Third Division and a constant apologist for arbitrary government, considered Runich a "zealot, imitator and caricature of Magnitskii," a "cunning and circumspect rogue," who played on the weaknesses of people for his own profit, a "fool braggart, gossip."2 Runich's behavior during the faculty "purge" at St. Petersburg indicates that he came well-prepared to the role of grand inquisitor.

Runich was in complete agreement with the views of Magnitskii, and he fully shared the new orientation of the ministry. This orientation was not an ideology in the strictest sense of that term; that is, it did not consist of a carefully worked out, coherent set of principles. When translated into educational policy, it consisted of a number of vague yet rigidly-held assumptions which inspired an uncritical, missionary zeal. From the viewpoint of the Magnitskii group, the goal of education

1Russski biograficheskii slovar' (SPB, 1896-1918), XVII, 592-601.

2V.V. Mavrodi, ed., Leningradski Universitet v vospominaniakh sovremenikov (Lenigrad, 1963), I, 17. Hereafter cited as Leningradskii Universitet. Mavrodi states that, while not completely accurate, Grech's comments are "fairly objective." Ibid., editor's commentary, 243.
was the development of the character traits of humility and submissiveness to constituted authority. Such traits could best be instilled by the moral inspiration offered by the holy writings. All education must be grounded in these writings. Their central assumption was that any secular, rationalistic philosophy, especially those sprouting on foreign soil, undermined the authority of scripture and thereby produced attitudes and actions hostile to the social and political order. They assumed that any departure from the pattern of submissiveness was conclusive proof of the influence of such philosophies. Thus, Kavelin and Golitsyn regarded the acts of defiance at the pension as ipso facto proof of the teaching of rationalism and the undermining of scriptural truths, which, properly taught, could only inspire submissiveness. Golitsyn felt no need to receive all the facts involved before concluding that more religious instruction was necessary. In the other direction, they assumed that the teaching of Enlightenment rationalism would, of necessity, produce defiant and revolutionary behavior. Thus, in reviewing Kunitsyn’s book, Runich equated Rousseau with Marat, and automatically took a sympathetic treatment of Enlightenment principles as proof of the author’s revolutionary intentions. It was an air-tight system of assumptions considered so self-evident by its adherents that they saw little need for the careful weighing of evidence to prove a connection between teaching and subversion in each given case.³ Applying these assumptions directly.

³Golitsyn’s report to the Committee of Ministers in 1822 provides a good summary of the ministry’s orientation. He reported that the tranquility of Europe was being disturbed by systems which, denying scripture and Christianity, were at the basis of sedition and revolution. "The
to his policies as curator, Runich showed great impatience with established procedures and legal requirements, considering them little more than impediments to the reaching of obvious conclusions. The Golitsyn ministry approved of the establishment of dictatorial regimes at the universities, in spite of statutory precedent, because they were less concerned with the search for truth than with the most immediate translation of self-evident truths into decisive actions — the rooting out of rationalist teaching, the elimination of German ideas from the environment, stricter supervision over student morals, and the grounding of all subjects in scriptural truth.

Runich's Purge of the Teaching Staff, 1821-22

Runich was quick to introduce at St. Petersburg a regime patterned after Magnitskii's policies at Kazan. A major purge of the teaching staff was inevitable in light of the large number of professors who taught according to Enlightenment principles, who were of German birth, or who had studied in German universities. Given Runich's assumptions, this clearly spelled danger. He hinted that he considered conditions at the university unsatisfactory at the start of his term as curator, while rumors began circulating in university circles that changes were going to

pernicious idea ... which attributes the foundation of legitimate authorities not to God, but to popular consent, springs from the same source as faithlessness and free-thinking." This illusion has become the "general creed of scholars and the basis of almost all sciences." Sciences which substitute "human fictions" for divine revelation "overthrow all ties of obedience, undermine social unity, eradicate alters, topple thrones and turn the entire order — of society into stormy chaos." Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 262-264.
be made in the near future. On August 29, 1821, Runich appeared before the university conference and demanded from it various items, including reports on students' moral standards and degree of success in religious instruction, a library catalogue, a list of texts used in teaching, and professors' lecture notes. A week later, before receiving the requested information from the conference, Runich claimed to have definite proof that professors Hermann, Raupach, Galich, and 'rsen'ev were teaching "philosophical and historical sciences ... in a spirit contrary to "Christianity," thereby inculcating in the minds of students ... ideas subversive to public order and well-being." This proof consisted of excerpts from the accused professors' books and from student notebooks confiscated by the director and I.V. Tolmachev, professor of Russian. The ministry responded with full support for Runich's activities. The Central School Board authorized him to suspend the four professors. They were suspended on September 19, 1821. The minister granted Runich unfettered control over university affairs on October 1, and on October 21 the

---


5. Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 142-145.


7. Leningradskii Universitet, p. 17; Ibid., editor's commentary, I, 244; N.G. Ustrialov, "Vospominaniia o moei zhizni," Drevniaia i novii Rossiiia, 1880, II, 609. Typical of the excerpts from the notebooks are the following from those of students of Hermann's course in statistics: "Public opinion is the tsar of tears ..."; "The general will is the primary basis of every society." Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 271-272.
Board approved his proposal to put Magnitskii's "Instructions" into effect until a new university statute could be drawn up. The Board, after examining the confiscated notebooks, issued a protocol in support of Runich's accusations. The protocol concluded that the professors' lectures attacked government decrees and the authenticity of scripture, poisoning young minds with the atheistic and seditious principles that had already shaken the foundations of other states. The Board decided to require answers from the accused to questions regarding their harmful and erroneous teaching. A list of questions, written by four members of the Board including Magnitskii and Runich, was sent to the university for written responses, which, together with the opinions of the conference, were to be returned to the Board for further consideration.

Rector Balug'ianskii showed courage in defending the innocence of the professors of the charges and their competence as teachers. When he saw that his words were reaching deaf ears and that there was no hope of preventing the persecution of his colleagues, he offered his resignation as rector and professor on October 24. A resolution of the tsar's retained him as professor until a decision could be reached regarding "the matter concerning the teaching of history, statistics, and philosophy." But his resignation from the rectorship was accepted, and he was replaced

---

8 Sbornik postanovlenii, I, 1601-1602.
9 Sukhomlinov, Izdelovaniia i stati, I, 258-260.
10 Quoted in Mavrodin, ed., Istoriiia, p. 30.
by professor of Geography E.F. Ziablovskii, a man willing to cooperate with the designs of Runich.

The university conference met on November 3 and 4 for Runich's presentation of and the professors' response to the questions drawn up by the Central School Board, and on November 7 for the composition of a report on the investigation. Runich, with the assistance of Kavelin, violated established procedures in directing the meetings, acting as both prosecutor and judge. The written questions themselves did not deal with the issue of the professors' innocence or guilt, but, assuming the latter, inquired into their motives. The following is typical of the accusatory tone of the interrogation. Raupach was asked: "With what intentions do you ... bring into your instruction ideas which lead to materialism and atheism?" Runich punctuated the questioning with threats and insults. Before sending Galich into another room to write his answers, Runich turned to him and said, "You clearly prefer paganism to Christianity, blasphemous philosophy to the purity of the Christian church, Godless Kant to Christ, and Schelling to the Holy Ghost." Runich poured scorn on the accused, demanded full confessions, threatened criminal action, and refused to allow them to defend themselves. When they asked for time to answer the accusations, Kavelin went into a rage and threatened to call the police. Even the Committee of Ministers,

---

11 Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 260.
12 Ibid., 352.
13 Nikitenko, Galich, p. 53.
14 Ibid., p. 51.
which later upheld Runich's accusations, found the procedure followed by Runich at the conference meetings to be in full violation of existing decrees. 15

Three of the accused professors resisted Runich's demands for recantation and confession and refused to give direct answers to the questions, which also would have been tantamount to admission of guilt. Raupach refused to answer them and abruptly denied that he preached atheism and materialism. Hermann wrote detailed denials of his guilt and requested that experts in political sciences be invited to determine the degree to which the student notebooks were reliable indications of lecture content. Arsen'ev categorically denied the validity of the charges against him. Only Galich proved unable to withstand the pressure applied by Runich and Kavelin. He confessed to the irrefutability of the accusations and begged "not to be remembered by the errors of youth and ignorance." 16 The confession made Runich ecstatic. He embraced

---

15 Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 265-66.

16 Ibid., 353. The questions indicate the specific charges against each professor. They accused Raupach of teaching history according to an arbitrary philosophical system, of denying the authority of Holy Scripture, and of preaching atheism and materialism; Hermann of planting harmful political and religious ideas in the minds of students, of teaching statistics as a political science instead of as a pure science, and of condemning the Church and the very state which employed him; Arsen'ev of teaching principles antagonistic to the social order, and of reviling the existing "government,... laws, and forms of civil and ecclesiastical administration; and Galich of defending the views of Schelling and attacking the "faith and authorities instituted by God." The full text of the questions, containing the professors' written responses, is contained in Ibid., 346-358. The irony is that the accusations against Galich were the most preposterous. In his History of Philosophical Systems he called the ideas of Schelling "not for us", and contended that no philosophy could
Galich and informed the conference that they had observed a miracle of God's grace, that the great shepherd had just led one of his sheep to the land of Israel.\(^{17}\)

Runich found the responses of Hermann, Raupach and Arsen'ev "unsatisfactory." Golitsyn had expected a report on the conference's opinions of the accusations and the professors' responses to them, but Runich stopped soliciting opinions when he encountered criticism of the investigation. Some professors considered the evidence unsubstantial. Balug'ianskii, Plisov, Solov'ev, and Grefe questioned the legality of the investigation. Others objected to his line of questioning. Charmoy, Demange, Wisznewski, and Grefe submitted written minority opinions after the interrogation of Hermann and Raupach. Regarding these expressions of dissent a so much unnecessary "verbiage", Runich put an end to discussion and proposed various questions to a general vote. The results were far from conclusive. A bare majority of eleven, which included the director, the rector, and the most cooperative professor, Tolmachev, supported Runich's contention that the responses of the accused were "unsatisfactory." Five considered them "insufficient", and the remaining four completely disagreed with Runich. Only seven of the twenty voters favored Runich's motion to condemn the three who were unrepentant and to

\[^{17}\text{Nikitenko, Galich, pp. 53-54.}\]
recommend their removal. The remainder either acknowledged them guilty only if the student notes could be shown to be accurate representations of their teaching, or refused to give an opinion because of the irregularity of the interrogation. Runich completely failed to assemble a majority vote in approval of his official report of the meetings. Balug'ianskii, Plisov, Chizhov, and Grefe submitted their own accounts to Runich, who submitted only his own to the ministry. In fact, Runich was able to give Golitsyn the impression that the conference admitted to the harmfulness of the professors' lectures, except for several members who showed themselves to be infected with the same erroneous principles.  

Runich's account of the meetings was the only one to reach the Central School Board.  

On November 24, the Board ruled that the teaching of the accused was un-Christian and politically subversive, dismissed them from teaching at the university, and prohibited their writings from use anywhere in the ministry. Golitsyn then conducted his own inquest and brought the matter before the Committee of Ministers, which considered

---


19To no avail did ex-curator Uvarov intervene directly with Alexander, to whom he wrote about the November meetings. "The conference, although dominated by terror, exhibited almost entirely an honorable conduct." Its members underwent "a veritable moral torture," meeting day and night, suffering insults, threats, "the most insidious questions, [and] the most unspeakable outrages." Seven professors (Balug'ianskii, Grefe, Soloviev, Chizhov, Demange, Charmoy, and Plisov), "the flower of the university, ... have protested in writing against this procedure." Uvarov begged the tsar to give the accused a chance to defend themselves, and to grant reparations if a fair investigation should show them innocent. Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 382.
the matter during January and February, 1822. Golitsyn reported that the systems taught by the four were "pernicious and harmful." He recommended that Hermann and Raupach be deported, that Arsen'ev be prohibited from teaching anywhere but be allowed to choose another kind of occupation in the civil service, that Galich be permitted to remain at the university in a non-teaching capacity, and that Runich be confirmed as curator and rewarded for his "discovery." The Committee received from Golitsyn, in addition to these recommendations, excerpts from the notebooks and the professors' books accompanied by the minister's observation that these clearly demonstrated that the professors repudiated Revelation and legitimate political authority. The Committee also examined the minutes of the Board meeting of November 24. The Committee found the excerpts harmful and approved the dismissals, but it declared Runich's handling of the matter illegal. Rather than accept Golitsyn's suggestion for additional punishment of Hermann, Raupach, and Arsen'ev, it decided to turn the case over to the regular courts, where they would be completely free to defend themselves. The Committee appointed a committee of three of its own members and two members of the Board to supervise the continuation of the case. But no new trial was held, and in February 1827 Nicholas I declared the matter closed. The accused were never reinstated at the university.20

The policies of Runich caused a depletion of eleven men from the professorial ranks of St. Petersburg University, if we include the

20Ibid., I, 262-266.
dismissal of Kunitsyn. Some of those who defended their colleagues at the conference meetings came to share their fate. Runich and Golitsyn both believed that their acts of defense indicated that these men shared the guilt of the accused. At the meeting of November 24, the Central School Board dismissed Cham moy, Demange, Balugianskii, and Plisov. Finding themselves unable to work under the new regime in good conscience, Pansner and Radlov retired from their posts in July 1822.

The immediate effect of the purge was disastrous to the three-year-old institution. The physics-mathematics department was hardly affected, losing only one member. But the faculties of philosophy-law and history-literature lost two-thirds and one-half of their professors, respectively. In these departments, the quality of teaching declined immediately, as did the proportion of qualified professors. By and large, the ten men who left these departments fitted Uvarov's description as the "flower" of the teaching body. Nine of them had received advanced training abroad, comprising three veterans of the 1808-1811 professor-training program, and six foreigners. The majority had published works of recognized scholarly merit. The excellence of Balugianskii had already been pointed out; it reflected itself in the competence of his students, Kunitsyn and Plisov. Galich enjoyed a full career of publishing in philosophy and esthetics, before and after the events of 1821. Raupach,

21 Flynn, p. 313.

22 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 39.

23 A later rector listed Balugianskii, Hermann, Kunitsyn, Arsen'ev, Raupach, Demange, and Cham moy as the institution's chief assets. Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatiletie, pp. 23-5.
although handicapped by difficulties in speaking Russian and a lecturing voice that was all but inaudible, was an erudite student of ancient history, a Halle University Ph.D., who taught history "completely scientifically and critically," according to the rationalist school predominant at his alma mater. He left Russia for Germany in 1822, where he subsequently enjoyed a successful career as a playwright. Hermann had been a student of Shletser at Gottingen, and proved to be a "wise and scholarly", although somewhat frivolous and lazy, teacher. He had written several works on statistics in Russian and German, which like his lectures, were considered competent. Arsen'ev, a student of Hermann, had published two competent works in statistics and geography and had impressed students with the accuracy, extent, and comprehensiveness of his knowledge. These men served well the university's purpose of preparing knowledgeable entrants to the civil service. While some were critical of Russian institutions, and although some of their pension pupils joined the Decembrist movement, none represented any threat to the established order.

---

24 Grigor'ev, p. 15.
25 Leningradskii Universitet, p. 18.
26 Ibid., I, 17.
27 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 17.
28 According to Grech, Raupach was "in no way either a revolutionary or an atheist." Hermann was a kind man incapable of planning mischief, which "requires effort and work, and he loved comfort and idleness." Arsen'ev was a "noble, honest, and gentle" man whose chief act of defiance was his refusal to marry the niece of Rector Ziablovskii. Leningradskii Universitet, I, 17-19.
The professors departing from these two departments left behind colleagues of noticeably less competence. Not counting Professor Pavskii of Theology, there were seven men left in these departments, five of whom had voted for Runich’s proposal to condemn and dismiss the accused professors. Three had no formal university training: Popov (classics), Ziablovskii (geography), and Toltmachov (Russian literature). Of the remaining four, three were competent teachers, but only one, Greffe (classics), was an outstanding scholar, and his value was limited because of his inability to lecture in Russian. Greffe, Lodii, Butyrskii, and Dugour had all received university training abroad, but only Butyrskii was completely fluent in Russian. Lodii had some fluency, but he had not kept abreast of developments in his own field (philosophy), his publications showing no acquaintance with Kantian philosophy or with systems more recent than that of Kant. Dugour (French) had been blessed with an outstanding classical education in France, had a vast knowledge of history and literature and a bibliography of ten works, but he had to lecture in Latin. 29

By 1825, Runich had brought the total of professors up to twenty-two by hiring seven new men from outside the university and promoting two others to professorial rank. The faculty of physics-mathematics was considerably strengthened by the addition of two men and the promotion of one. Professor Bongard, who began teaching botany in 1823, was an

29Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, 10-11, 17-22; Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatilietie, pp. 54-55.
outstanding scholar in his field. 30 Professor Sokolov, who replaced Pansner in the chair of mineralogy, eventually made important contributions to the study of geology in Russia, although it was not until after 1840 that he even became acquainted with the contemporary advances being made in European geology. 31

The addition of five and the promotion of one had no immediate beneficial effect on the other two departments. With one exception the new men were as yet unproven as scholars and teachers, without publications or reputations in the learned world. 32 By 1825, the history-literature faculty had only reached two-thirds of its original size, and it was necessary for two professors of literature to divide their time between teaching courses in this department and that of philosophy-law. According to one student, I. Panaev, teaching was of a generally poor quality, lectures were out of date, and students studied only to pass examinations, considering their teachers "stupid and vulgar." 33 In spite of the partial replenishing of vacancies, those departments remained in a state of decline during the entire course of Runich's curatorship, and the story of their recovery belongs to the following period.

30 Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatilitie, p. 37.
31 Vucinich, p. 345.
32 Grigor'ev, pp. 42-45.
33 Kosachevskaia, I, 64-65.
The Policies of Runich and Their Results, 1822-1826

In two reports submitted to the minister in March, 1822, Runich justified his policies and outlined his plans for further reforms at the university. He was not satisfied by the purge of the teaching staff as an answer to the problem of university disorders. He felt a major cause of disorder lay in the existing legislation governing the university, and he condemned it for the degree to which it provided for a division of powers among governing authorities which was not based on a clear chain of command. The assumption of dictatorial powers had already been one means of reforming this condition. Runich had also put into effect the provisions of the "Original Foundation" which established a pravlenie of appointees, headed by the curator, as the chief administrative organ of the university. The student body, he felt, was still a potential source of danger. He reported that as a result of the harmful teaching most of the student body remained infected by "destructive theories which, unhappily, strike strong roots in the hearts and minds of the young in those years of our life during which passions hear neither the voice of conscience, nor the warnings of experience, ... [nor] the instructions of an unpretentious, healthy intellect." He found student morals to be of a low order, partly as a result of the recruitment of crown students from ecclesiastical seminaries, which he considered breeding grounds of crude manners and depraved habits, and partly "due to poor supervision over

34 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 286-7.
students and the unlimited freedom which they were allowed to enjoy."

He proposed the weeding out of students who were morally or academically unfit to be administrators or teachers and the establishment of a new basis for the recruitment of students. He also found building facilities inadequate for housing students and staff, the rooms unsuitable for lecture halls, libraries, laboratories and museums, and proposed the construction of a new university building.35

Runich quickly received permission and funds for the execution of these proposals. By late March, he had temporarily suspended enrollment, effected a new system for the recruitment of crown students, and inaugurated a major purge of the student body. He weeded out students according to their "capacities and morality." Performance on lengthy examinations served as a basis for determining the academic capacities of the students, and the director and inspector of students reported on the morals of each student. The result was the expulsion of twenty-nine of the fifty-nine students then enrolled at the university. Five of them had been found deficient in both academic performance and morals and were divested of their service rank privileges. Twenty-four were considered academically competent but lacking in morals; they were admitted to the twelfth rank of the civil service but forbidden to serve as teachers. Runich allowed to remain at the university only those whom he considered morally and intellectually equipped to serve as professors or school teachers.36

35Sbornik postanovlenii, I, 1627-1638.
36Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 387-388.
Golitsyn confirmed these expulsions and restrictions in July, 1822. Runich did not show great care in the investigations. In spite of the inspector's closer contact with students, whenever he (the inspector) declared a student to be of acceptable morals and Director Kavelin disagreed, Runich accepted the latter's conclusions. During the next reign the complaints of several of the victims about the conduct of the purge reached the ear of the new Minister of Education, who found the purge unjustified and persuaded Nicholas I (in 1827) to restore the service privileges of several of the expelled students.

The St. Petersburg Gymnasium replaced the ecclesiastical seminaries as the source for the recruitment of crown students. According to the new system, every two years thirty crown pupils who graduated from the gymnasium would enter the university as crown students, with the same scholarships and obligations as the crown students of the former Chief Pedagogical Institute. The gymnasium's state pupils would, in turn, come from the Imperial Humanitarian Society's school for poor children, children of teachers in the school region, and children of propertyless officials. Eventually, there would be sixty such students in the university at any given time. Of those who eventually graduated from the university, the most competent would stay to earn higher degrees and enter university teaching, the less capable would become gymnasium

---

37 Sbornik postanovlenii, I, 1672-1673.
38 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 337-341.
teachers, and the least capable would enter the teaching staff of lower schools. Runich brought St. Petersburg into line with the other universities by abolishing the distinctions between internal and external, preparatory and advanced courses. All students took the same course and fell into the categories of crown or regular students, the former distinguished by their obligation to teach for six years after graduation.

The immediate result of the imposition of the new recruitment system was a sharp curtailment of the number of crown students, due to the lack of willing and qualified gymnasium graduates. In spite of a rise during the years following the purge in the number of regular students, the pre-purge enrollment total was not exceeded until the final year of Runich's curatorship:

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1822a</th>
<th>1822b</th>
<th>1823</th>
<th>1824</th>
<th>1825</th>
<th>1826</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown students</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = before purge    b = after purge

39Ibid., 392-393; Sbornik postanovlenii, I, 1633-1638.

Runich's administrative talents proved to be of a considerably lower order than his capacities as a grand inquisitor. Runich and his chancery officials showed up at work irregularly, and when a new pravlenie took over in 1826, it found the chancery's paper work totally disorganized and university finances in complete disorder. Runich made no significant progress toward the practical goals, laid out in 1822, of improving building, library and laboratory facilities, in spite of his receipt of a government allotment of 1,300,000 rubles for such improvements. Runich's report to the new minister, Admiral Shishkov, on January 31, 1826, greatly exaggerated his own accomplishments, judging from the marginal comments of a ministerial official, Shirinskii-Shikhmatov. Runich reported great improvements in the condition of the library, which, when he took over the curatorship, was in disorder and had no catalogue or booklist. The marginal note reads, "and now? Not even a list." Runich reported great inadequacies in the libraries and museums when he took over. Of the seven purchases totalling 36,100 rubles made by Runich, Shirinskii-Shikhmatov noted that four purchases amounted to "25,600 rubles worth of unnecessary things." Apparently, 10,500 rubles were spent on important acquisitions of books, manuscripts, and medals, but the expenditures for insects, fish, and shells were a waste of money; they hardly justified Runich's claim that these collections were the most famous in Europe (Shirinskii-Shikhmatov's note: "!!!").

41 Rector Dugour's report of 1826, Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 607-608.

42 Runich's report to Shishkov, January 31, 1826, Ibid., 390-391.
Rector Dugour reported that whereas Moscow, Dorpat, Vilno, and Kharkov had adequate library and laboratory facilities, those at St. Petersburg were "inadequate in all respects." Runich proposed to use the remainder of the government allotment for the construction of a new university building to replace the building of the Twelve Colleges which Peter I had built in Vasilevskii Island to house his collegiate administration. Runich objected to the use of this building, which he felt was inadequate for teaching and research purposes and conducive to unofficial student absences from their quarters because of its excessive number of exits. Runich allowed the residences of professors to remain on Vasilevskii Island, but he moved the university and student residences into the pension building on the edge of town, opposite the barracks of the Semenovskii regiment. This made extra-curricular contact between students and professors almost impossible. Runich's proposed new building never materialized, and Dugour complained in 1826 that the university was spread all over the city. What became of the bulk of the 1,300,000 ruble allotment? The dismissal of Runich in June 1826 followed closely on the heels of the discovery that the curator had used the funds to furnish his own apartments and meet other personal expenses.

---

43 Dugour's report of 1826, Ibid., 614.

44 Ibid., 596-597, 614.
CHAPTER IV

THE MINISTRIES OF SHISHKOV AND LIEVEN, 1824-1833

Introduction: Nicholas I, 1825-1855

Despite the detrimental effect the Golitsyn ministry had upon the quality of education and upon the rate of growth of student enrollment, Nicholas I inherited from Alexander I a university tradition and a university structure for which only a bare foundation had been laid before 1801. The Russian student body had increased over tenfold between 1801 and 1825. Nicholas did not have to face the degree of aristocratic resistance to higher education with which Alexander's ministries had to contend. Alexander left Nicholas a far more comprehensive statutory framework and more developed university system than Catherine had left him. Alexander's improvements of Catherine's system of secondary education meant that students during the following reign would be better prepared for the rigors of university training. Perhaps most important, Alexander left Nicholas six universities, five of his own regime's creation, which, although in a state of decline, were not beyond rehabilitation.

In any authoritarian state, the character of the ruler usually leaves a profound imprint on the traits of government institutions and official policies. It is certainly true that Alexander's ideological
orientations (first as a student of the Enlightenment, later as a convert to evangelical mysticism) directly affected the formulation of cultural policy. It is even more true of Nicholas, whose administration was more tightly centralized, and who, unlike Alexander, frequently intervened personally in the formulation of educational policy.

Alexander was greatly preoccupied with the discussion of general governmental reforms during the early part of his reign and with foreign policy during the latter part. He and his advisers established general outlines of policies, but he left detailed implementation in the hands of the ministerial personnel. This meant that not only his intimates and chief ministers, but also lesser officials, such as university curators, were allowed the latitude to initiate and to influence significantly the course of events. Any discussion of policy therefore necessitated an examination of the court circles that influenced the tsar and of the changing membership of the Central School Board, who gave full vent to their personal inclinations in the execution of policy, and whose personalities (e.g. Uvarov, Magnitskii, Runich) definitely stood out. Not so with Nicholas, who ran his realm alternately as a personal fief and a military camp. According to Riasanovsky, Nicholas surrounded himself with obedient executors of the Imperial will rather than advisors of independent judgment.¹ The only significant creative role played by his subordinates was that of fashioning ideological

¹ Nicholas Riasanovsky, Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855, Berkeley, 1959, pp. 36-37.
justifications for policies which emanated from the ruler's instincts as a drill master and military engineer. He relied more often on personal emissaries, hand-picked special committees, and the mushrooming staff of His Majesty's Own Chancery for the execution of his orders than on the regular channels of the ministerial bureaucracy. In the case of educational affairs, the Committee for the Organization of Educational Institutions, established in May, 1826, played the predominant role in drafting legislation and making policy, eclipsing the Central School Board.

The four successive Ministers of Public Instruction served as chairmen of this committee, and each ran his ministry like a military hierarchy, with a clear chain of command, each official executing the orders of his superior rather than suggesting lines of policy based on his understanding of local conditions or his personal pedagogical goals in the manner of Uvarov during the preceding reign. It is therefore the views of the ministers, which either directly reflected or elaborated upon the intentions of Nicholas, which will be emphasized here, rather than the views of university curators and other Central School Board personnel.

The basic outline of state goals and policies regarding public education had not changed since secular schools were first established by Peter I, and they were not to undergo any drastic alteration during the reign of Nicholas. But, within these general outlines, the particular ideological orientation and political goals of each ruler affected the particular way schools were organized and administered and affected such policies as admission requirements, curriculum content, and the
degree of university autonomy and academic freedom. During the reign of Nicholas, the universities remained state-financed institutions organized in a pattern similar to Central European universities. The primary goal of university education remained the production of state officials trained as lawyers, doctors, engineers, teachers, economists, surveyors, and so forth.

Alexander firmly established the principle that the universities were to serve the interests of the state, and various secondary goals were formulated for achieving this purpose. As his ideology and his interpretation of state needs changed, these secondary goals were altered and amended, often interfering with each other. Well-trained officials could be produced only if institutions of higher learning achieved high standards of academic excellence. The needs of the Imperial service could be satisfied only if sufficient numbers of properly-prepared young men attended and graduated from such institutions. Therefore, policy makers attempted to attract talented faculty members by creating academic conditions favorable to the normal pursuits, proclivities, and material well-being of scholars. This meant providing liberal salaries, university autonomy, academic freedom, contact with contemporary European scholarship and science, and unencumbered access to the latest scholarly publications. The desire to prepare and lure to the universities men from the class which normally supplied state servants called for the expansion and improvement of secondary education, and for attempts to overcome the aristocracy's resistance to higher education, such as the creation of segregated pensions. The desire to attract talent from all
quarters led to the creation of a school system which provided an educational ladder that, theoretically, could be climbed from the village to the university. This direction of policy, characteristic of the early reign of Alexander, was partly the result of the fascination of the tsar and his associates with the French Enlightenment in general and Condorcet's project for a modern school system in particular. The invasion and defeat of the French, accompanied by alliances with the German states, the tsar's conversion to mysticism resulting in the coming of new men to the educational ministry, and the news of student rebellions and nationalist revolutions brought a shift in state priorities and ideological orientations during the middle and latter part of Alexander's reign. These events inspired a sense of Russian national virtue, and corresponding anti-French, anti-European, sentiment, combined with a fear that rationalism, secular science, and Western influence threatened the stability of the Russian state. The new educational administrators felt the original direction of policy, intended to improve the state bureaucracy, interfered with another interest of the state—stability. In the interest of stability, they added a new purpose to state education—the teaching of morality and innoculating of young minds against the germs of European ideas: toward the goal of inspiring obedient and submissive behavior. The policies formulated in pursuit of this purpose, however, proved to be detrimental to the quality of education and hence was at cross-purposes with the original intent of providing the bureaucracy with enlightened personnel.
The energy and personal traits of Nicholas certainly left the tsar's peculiar stamp on the details of university policy, but without changing the essential goals, problems, and paradoxes which emerged during the reign of Alexander. The central problem with which he grappled was that of how to serve the needs of modernizing the state administration without threatening the stability of the Russian social and political system. Trained as a military engineer, Nicholas sought to fortify Russia for the preservation of the social and political status quo against its enemies, real and imaginary, material and philosophical, domestic and foreign. While his armies fought insurrections at home and revolutions abroad, his secret police rooted out insubordination and dissent among authors, teachers, students, officials and aristocrats. Physical opposition to revolution was accompanied by ideological assaults on the ideas which he felt lay behind political and social unrest. The relationship between central political policies and cultural and educational policies was immediate and direct. It is no accident that the author of the watchwords of Nicholas' official ideology, "Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality", was a Minister of Public Instruction. In general policies, Nicholas' characteristic reaction to threats to stability was regimentation. Following this pattern, he imposed uniformity and centralization on the educational administration, legalized the de facto control by appointed officials over university government ushered in by the Golitsyn ministry, put students in uniform, made university autonomy a dead letter, and conducted personal spot inspections at schools in
all parts of his realm. His desire to protect the social system was reflected in the measures taken to keep peasants out of district schools, and non-gentry out of gymnasium and universities, so that each subject's education would be appropriate to his inherited calling. Even more specific policies found their direct reflection in university administration. Russification of the Western borderlands was accompanied by the closing of the University of Vilno, a center of Polish nationalism, and the subsequent establishment of the University of St. Vladimir at Kiev. The new emphasis on Eastern Studies during the ministry of Uvarov, including the establishment of a special section of Eastern Studies at St. Petersubrg University, reflected the tsar's growing military and diplomatic involvement in the Near East. His disapproval of the revolutionary regime of Louis Philippe was reflected in the elimination of Paris as a possible location for professorial training.

The ultimate concern for stability, the regimentation of the universities, the distrust of academic freedom, the watchful censorship of writings and lectures -- all represented a continuation of the policies of the Golitsyn ministry. So did the tsar's conviction that education must be infused with moral instruction. On the occasion of the appointment of a new Minister of Public Instruction in January, 1850, the tsar proclaimed: "God's law is the single firm basis of any complete course of studies." Addressing a group of Moscow University professors on the one-hundredth anniversary of that institution (1855), he said,

I will tell you how I understand matters of education in our time. I respect and place high instruction and learning, but I place morality still higher. Without it instruction and learning are not only useless, but can even be dangerous,
and the basis for morality is holy faith.
It is necessary to cultivate religious sentiment together with instruction.²

But notably absent from the Nicholaian university policies were the fanaticism, the mysticism, and the disrespect for the worth of science and scholarship. Without returning to the liberalism of the young Alexander, Nicholas shared with his predecessor a desire to promote the advance of academic study and the excellence of university training. He felt this could be done within the authoritian structure he was building and without endangering the survival of the Russian throne. He saw nothing incompatible between true education and social stability:

It is not to education, but to indolence of mind, ... it is to lack of solid educational attainments that we must attribute that self-willed habit of thought which is the source of violent passions, that disastrous excess of half-assimilated knowledge, and that impulse towards extreme visionary theories, of which the beginning is moral deterioration and the end is ruin.³

In his view, then, a complete academic training was not only compatible with the moral development of individuals that is necessary to preserve general stability, but it was positively a bastion against "moral deterioration." Within a few years after Nicholas took the throne, the Golitsyns, Runichs, and Magnitskis had lost their positions in the

²Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 226-227. This speech concludes with characteristic authoritarian remarks: "That is my view on education. The ministry has submitted to me. That is what I expect from you.... My will is known to you: I am confident that you will fulfill it."

³Quoted from the manifesto announcing the sentences meted out to the Decembrists in Darlington, p. 64. Italics are my own.
ministry, and the intensity of their fanaticism did not return to the ministry until the 1848 revolutions frightened Nicholas into increased repression. During the intervening years, the universities not only recovered their former momentum; they even prospered. There was a return to the pragmatic approach to dealing with the problems of student and teacher shortage, aristocratic resistance, and inadequate library and laboratory facilities. Large sums were spent on modernizing libraries and laboratories, adding buildings, and increasing professors' salaries. The quantity of qualified Russian professors, students, and course offerings increased. There is evidence that the overall quality of university education and scholarship greatly improved. In spite of Nicholas' curricular emphasis on the humanities, rejecting the Enlightenment worship of mathematics and natural science, it was during his reign and under university auspices, that Russian geometry, chemistry, and anatomy came into their own. Russian chemistry professors adopted the modern orientation toward atomic theory, synthesized new forms of matter, and trained students whose accomplishments gained them entrance into the laboratories of leading European chemists. This was the era of Lobachevskii's non-Euclidian geometry.\(^4\) According to one historian of Russian science,

\begin{quote}

The Russian professor ceased to be a rarity. The antiquarian professor of the 1820's, whose scientific ideas were those of the eighteenth century, was supplanted in the 1840's by the modern professor who, though chiefly dedicated to
\end{quote}

\footnote{Vucinich, 331-335, 346.}
the spread of knowledge, was likely to be alert to the most modern scientific developments in Western Europe.\(^5\)

The reign of Nicholas, as far as the universities were concerned, was truly an age of ironies. In spite of the most comprehensive and restrictive censorship and violations of academic freedom, Moscow university became the center of philosophical discussion in Russia, and Kazan and St. Petersburg witnessed the birth of modern Russian chemistry and geometry. In an age when every aspect of student behavior and appearance was rigidly controlled down to the details of dress and length of hair, and when students were sentenced to long terms of military service for writing harmless poems, student circles initiated the seminal Slavophile-Westernist debate.\(^6\) In an age when the tsar sought at all costs to quarantine Russia intellectually from the contagion of foreign ideas and institutions, university professors and students found their way to the capitals and cultural centers of Europe and the Near East.

The Ministries of Shishkov and Lieven, May 1824 - March 1833

The ascendancy of the Bible Society mystics was undermined during the last year of Alexander's reign. Arakcheev, a confidant of Alexander's who gathered enormous powers into his hands near the end of the reign, skillfully guided an intrigue against Golitsyn, whom he considered a rival for access to the tsar's ear. The participants in this conspiracy

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 348.

\(^6\)S.S. Svatikov, Russkoe studentchestvo prazhde i teper' (Moscow, 1915), pp. 1-9.
used the same methods of denunciation against Golitsyn that the mystics in the ministry had used against their enemies, accusing the minister of actually promoting the spread of atheistic ideas. The intrigue, representing an assault on the part of the official Church against the Bible Society and its evangelism as well as reflecting the personal ambitions of Arakcheev, successfully discredited Golitsyn and led to his resignation. In May 1824 the tsar re-established a separate Ministry of Public Instruction and appointed a new minister, Admiral A.S. Shishkov, who retained his position until the third year of Nicholas' reign (April, 1828), when he was relieved of his duties because of "old age and impaired health."^8

The period of the ministries of Shishkov and his immediate successor, Karl Lieven (1828-32), represented an impasse between the more systematic ministerial policies of Golitsyn and Uvarov (1833-48). Although characterized by ad hoc measures rather than systematic policies, this period witnessed the fall of the remaining mystics from the preceding administration, the emergence of a general orientation, and the preliminary preparation of legislation, which set the stage for the more coherent system of Uvarov.^9

Alexander Shishkov (1754-1841) had had no university training or experience in educational administration before he became minister in

---


^8Rozhdestvenskii, Istoriicheskii obzor, p. 168.

^9Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, xxix.
his seventieth year. Shishkov, born into the Russian gentry class and educated at the Naval Cadet Corps, entered a career in the navy and rose to high rank during the reigns of Catherine II and Paul I. He had also developed considerable literary talent and interest. He wrote plays, translations, and works of criticism, and showed an especial admiration for the styles of Lomonosov and Derzhavin. He became an active member of the Russian Academy, and during the reign of Alexander he became the founder of the Academy's journal, Sochinenia i Perevody (Writings and Translations), and co-founder of the Assembly of Lovers of the Russian Word. His literary views were those of a conservative and Russian patriot. A precursor of Slavophilism, he opposed Karamzin's attempt to develop literary Russian in imitation of French, considering it of importance to base modern Russian on native Slavonic roots. His fervent patriotism caught the attention on Alexander, who, perceiving the usefulness in the impending struggle with France of "a skillful writer-patriot, who can by burning word act upon the national mass," gave Shishkov a position of prominence near the throne. In April 1819 after the fall of Speransky, Shishkov took over some of the latter's duties. During the war he wrote patriotic ukases, rescripts, and manifestoes, for which he was awarded entrance into the State Council.

The evolution of Shishkov's political philosophy closely followed the changing fashions of the aristocracy and the government. Originally,


\[\text{11Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 164.}\]
he belonged to the circle that admired Catherine II's Enlightenment orientation and hoped Alexander would continue her policies. But he soon became a critic of Alexander's early reforms, considering the liberal policy-makers to be permeated with "a new way of thinking, new notions arising from the chaos of the French revolution." He felt Russian society itself should be guarded from the infection of French and Western contact, just as the native language should be protected from French influence. By the time of his appointment as minister he firmly believed in the isolation of Russia from the West and opposed liberal trends within Russia. At the time Nicholas took the throne, Shishkov, combining his sense of national pride with a belief in the value of politico-social regimentation and indoctrination in official Church morality, shared the general philosophical orientation of the tsar which would later be articulated in Uvarov's doctrine of "Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality."

Shishkov's political-philosophical orientation bore directly upon his educational views and policy recommendations. A sampling of these views will clearly illustrate this statement. Shishkov personally favored the nationality principle of the later Uvarovian triad. In a speech before the Central School Board in December, 1824, he listed eight principles on which he felt educational policy should be based, four of which were related to his embryonic Slavophilism and anti-

12 Ibid., p. 163.
13 Bunnett, p. 239.
Westernism:

1. Public education in our entire Empire, in spite of the variety of faiths and languages, must be Russian. 3. Russian youth of all faiths must study our language and know it. They must pre-eminently study our history and law. 6. Slavonic language and classical Russian literature must be universally introduced and encouraged. 7. Greek language must everywhere have pre-eminence over Latin.14

But the tsar allowed little initiative to his ministers, and Shishkov was not able to win support for all of his personal views among people of high position. His sympathy for the Russian past and attempts to retain Slavonic elements in Russian literature and language led to only a few actual measures.15 His desire to isolate Russia from Western culture failed to prevent the establishment of programs for sending Russian students abroad for study.

It must be pointed out that Shishkov's brand of conservative patriotism, like Nicholas', was not identical with the orientation of the Golitsyn ministry which he helped to overthrow. After he became minister he condemned the policies of Magnitskii and Runich, stating that "blindness under the holy names of piety and philanthropy can creep into hearts and poison them."16 He characterised their ideas as "superstition clothed ... in authority." He considered Golitsyn's mysticism

14Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 177.

15E.V. Petukhov, Imperatorskii Turevskii, byvshii Derotskii, universitet (Turev, 1902), I, 346.

16Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 82.
a brand of cosmopolitanism connected, through freemasonry, to the French revolution, and preferred the tradition and theology of the Orthodox Church. But he shared the mystics' hostility to liberalism, moral emphasis, and desire to preserve the social and political status quo. Here, he was in complete agreement with Nicholas.

Shishkov's military background suited him well for the Nicholaian tendency toward regimentation. Anticipating the Uvarovian principle of autocracy, he opposed the importing of foreign concepts of academic freedom and university self-government, incorporated into the 1803-1804 university statutes. In February 1822, during the purge of St. Petersburg University, Shishkov connected an excess of academic freedom with "the inflammation of minds and the spread of errors." He blamed the crisis on policies which allowed teachers "to think and write about everything freely, or, better to say, to reason and philosophize insolently." He felt the resulting ideological infection had become too widespread for the punishing of a few individuals to be able to contain it. He felt the solution lay in watchful censorship, neither too weak nor too strict, discerning enough to distinguish "permissible from unpermissible freedom of thinking." As minister, "his first measures were to render the censorship more severe, and to place the universities and higher academies under strict surveillance." The censorship

17Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 387.
18Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 88.
19Sukhomlinov, Izledovaniia i stati, I, 389.
20Bunnett, p. 239.
statutes of 1826 and 1828, the former written by Shishkov himself, incorporated the minister's views.

In June 1826 Shishkov blamed the university crisis on the liberal principles of the 1803-1804 university statutes and on the lack of proper surveillance over the institutions. He recommended that the curators be given more control over the appointment of professors, that the rector be turned from an elected officer into a state-appointed official, and that the professors' councils turn over their administrative responsibilities to pravlenii (executive councils) composed of outside officials.\(^\text{21}\)

Two of Shishkov's concepts remained a permanent part of educational policy throughout the reign of Nicholas: the idea that learning must be combined with Orthodox ethics and the belief that the education of each social class should be appropriate to its fixed station in society, with higher education being reserved to the upper classes:

> To teach the whole people or a disproportionate number of them to read and write would do more harm than good. To instruct a farmer's son in rhetoric would be to make of him a bad and worthless, if not a positively dangerous citizen. But instruction in the rules of conduct and in Christian virtues and good morals is necessary to everybody...\(^\text{22}\)

> The superfluous quantity and great variety of school studies must be reasonably limited ...

---

\(^\text{21}\)Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. k80-181.

\(^\text{22}\)Quoted in Darlington, p. 63.
according to the occupations to which students are destined.23

Shishkov's military background, conservative patriotism, traditional religious faith, and love of regimentation blended in well with the political orientation of Nicholas and the spirit of his reign. But his successor, Prince Karl Lieven, (1767-1844), was an anomaly. Like Shishkov, he was originally a military officer. The son of a general of artillery, he entered the army during the reign of Catherine, fought in the wars against Sweden and Poland, rising to the rank of general of infantry, and served as a military governor of Archangel before retiring from the service in 1801. But unlike his predecessor, he was a Lutheran, and possessed "a gentle character disinclined to severity and injustice."24 Like Golitsyn, he joined the Russian Bible Society during the war against Napoleon, and he entered the Golitsyn ministry as curator of Dorpat region in 1817, in which capacity he remained until he succeeded Shishkov. Yet under the administrations of Golitsyn and Shishkov, his voice was that of a dissenting critic. As curator, he opposed Magnitskii's proposal to suppress the teaching of philosophy and considered it dangerous to increase curators' authority, opposing the idea of granting curators the power to dismiss "free-thinking" professors. He was responsible for guiding through the revised Dorpat university statute of 1820 without diluting the liberal principles of the original statute. Under Shishkov, he defended the principle that higher education should be open to all

23Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 177.

classes and the virtues of university self-government. Yet as minister, he executed policies consistent with the Nicholaian spirit and which continued in the direction established by Shishkov. For example, during a discussion of principles for reform of university legislation, he recommended a system similar to that inaugurated at St. Petersburg University be applied to all universities; he suggested that university administration be taken out of the hands of the soviet and placed under the jurisdiction of a pravlenie composed of outside officials and headed by the curator. Thus, the policies of Shishkov and Lieven, in spite of differences in personal leanings, can be considered as a single entity.

Nicholas I's reign began with a dramatic attempt to overthrow the traditional political and social system, and from the first day the new tsar took office he determined to protect this system against real and imaginary enemies. He personally supervised the interrogation of the Decembrists and determined the details of their punishment, appointed secret committees to investigate actual social and economic conditions, and created a vast network of police spies to seek out the sources of subversion at home and abroad. In a manifesto of December 19, 1825, five days after the Decembrist uprising in St. Petersburg, Nicholas connected political turmoil and the "infection of ideas imported from abroad" with the educational system. Considering "pernicious trends

25See Vucinich, p. 243, who quotes a statement of Lieven's explaining his opposition to the idea of accommodating education to the needs of particular classes.

26Darlington, p. 64.
of thought" the main problem, he turned a great deal of attention in
his quest for stability to the reform of educational and cultural policy.27
As with any area of policy he considered of central concern, he relied
on special committees of trusted subordinates, and he often initiated
and prodded along specific legislative measures and decrees.

The Committee for the Organization of Educational Institutions
(henceforth referred to as the Organization Committee), the first of
the special committees which characterized Nicholas' system, was organized
on May 14, 1826. At that time, Nicholas commissioned it to review all
educational statutes, textbooks, and courses of study, to standardize
statutes and regulations for the entire Empire, (allowing for the cultural
peculiarities of Vilno and Dorpat regions), and to prohibit "any arbitrary
teaching according to arbitrary books and notebooks."28 Between 1826
and 1833 all important matters of public education passed through this
committee.

Nicholas was a reformer to the extent that he aimed at making
his administration more rational and efficient, and several efforts
were made at reorganizing the Ministry of Public Instruction toward this
goal during the administrations of Shishkov and Lieven. In 1826 the
ministry inaugurated a more efficient system of handling money accounts.
In 1830, the number of clerks in the Chancery, which the Ministry shared
with the Main Administration of the Spiritual Affairs of Foreign Confessions,

27Butiagin and Saltanov, p. 20.

28Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 179.
was reduced: two years later, this chancellery began to handle educational affairs exclusively. In 1831, certain structural changes were introduced to simplify the organization of the ministry. For example, the Central School Board lost some of its subsidiary bodies, such as the School Committee. In the same year the State Council established new procedures to expedite business in all ministries. During this period, two new school regions were established, White Russia and Odessa, without universities at their centers.

Despite these efforts at administrative reorganization, during this period the ministry failed to recover the independence and authority it had enjoyed before the creation of the combined ministry. It had to share the power of enforcement of educational decrees with the Ministry of Interior. The Central School Board declined as a governing body because its members (unlike Stroganov, Novosiltsev, and Czartoryski during Alexander's reign) were not close to the tsar, and because Nicholas relied on the Organization Committee, which, although some of its members were ministerial officials, was technically independent of the ministry. 29

The major legislative accomplishments of Shishkov and Lieven were the statutes of censorship, the Main Pedagogical Institute, and the secondary and primary schools, promulgated in April, September, and December 1828, respectively. The new censorship regulations, passed in April 1828, had clear implications for the fate of academic freedom in the Russian universities. According to one ministerial official,

29 Ibid., pp. 171-178.
A. Krusenstern, this law satisfied the pressing need to unify and centralize censorship procedures. It was also intended to protect autocracy and orthodoxy from unsettling ideas. The censorship of all books published in Russia and imported from abroad came under the general supervision of a General Administration of Censorship, located at the Ministry of Public Instruction and consisting of both ministerial officials and outsiders: the minister and assistant minister, the presidents of the Academy of Sciences, the Academy of Fine Arts, and the Russian Academy, and representatives of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Interior. The only publications beyond its jurisdiction were religious works and official acts promulgated by government agencies. 30

Day-to-day censorship was entrusted to the university committees of censorship (now placed under the presidency of the curator) and directors of secondary schools in non-university towns, while the General Administration saw that regulations were enforced, issued general instructions to and heard appeals from the local censorship authorities. The new law prohibited the importation or publication of (1) works derogatory toward the rites, traditions, and doctrines of the Orthodox Church or toward Christianity in general, (2) writings critical of autocratic power, the fundamental laws of Russia, or disrespectful toward the royal family, (3) literary productions contrary to morality, and (4) slanderous or indecent writings regarding family life. Censors of

30 A. Krusenstern, Précis du système, des progres et de l'état de l'instruction publique en Russie (Warsaw, 1837), pp. 171, 174-175.
Russian publications were instructed to determine the author's aim on the basis of the obvious meaning of phrases, not to take words out of context, to distinguish between valuable theses and pernicious doctrines which are "contrary to morality," and to reject historical and political works which contain anything prejudicial to the Russian government or its allies. Jurisdiction over imported books belonged to the censorship committees at Moscow and St. Petersburg Universities and the local censors at Riga, Vilno, and Odessa. They received similar instructions.\(^{31}\)

In July 1827 the Organization Committee began work on a new statute for the reform of the primary and secondary schools. In September, the tsar demanded "that matters go more hastily," and by the beginning of 1828 the committee had completed a statute project. The minister submitted the project to the State Council in April, and the tsar ratified the new law the following December.\(^{32}\) The major change effected by this law was the conversion of the school system from a hierarchy of stages, in which each level prepared students for the next level, into a class-based system, in which each type of school gave a complete education appropriate to the social and occupational status of its pupils. Parish schools would be open exclusively to the children of peasants, district schools to the offspring of the mercantile classes, and the gymnasium would be the exclusive province of children of nobles and government officials. Each type of school would teach only those

\(^{31}\)Ibid., pp. 171-175.

\(^{32}\)Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 182.
subjects of use to the pupils in the traditional occupations of their parents. Only the gymnasium would prepare pupils for university attendance.

Aside from the statute of the Chief Pedagogical Institute, which will be discussed in the following chapter, no comprehensive legislation dealing with the universities was passed until the ministry of Uvarov. However, the ad hoc ministerial decrees and Imperial ukases of the Shishkov-Lieven period set in motion the general trends of policy which would be incorporated in the general university statute of 1835. Signifying the end of the Magnitskii-Golitsyn period, the office of director at the universities of St. Petersburg and Kazan was abolished in 1826. However, later decrees indicated that there would be no return to the earlier respect for university self-government. In July 1826, in response to the discovery of secret student societies at Vilno University, Curator Novosiltsev persuaded the ministry to make the office of rector at that institution dependent on government appointment. In the following month, the minister permitted the Kharkov curator to take it upon himself to hire new professors. This followed the curator's report to the minister, which blamed the shortage of professors on the soviets' right to elect professors and on its willingness to grant leaves of absence to large numbers. In 1827, as a result of disorders and conflicts between students and police at Moscow University, the tsar altered the freedom from the jurisdiction of regular courts and from regulation

33Sbornik postanovlenii, II, (part 1), 23.
by any law enforcement agency other than the university's own police force. Nicholas found it necessary to place self-supporting students under the surveillance of the city police. Magnitskii's policy of close ministerial supervision over the content of lectures was also continued. In a circular of 1828, the minister gave the curators the job of reviewing and approving lecture conspecti, warning that "if the curators find anything perplexing, then they can bring it to the attention of the minister."34

The 1830-31 revolutions in Poland, France, and Belgium, and Nicholas' desire to protect Russia from revolutionary contagion, led to an imperial ukase of February 1831 which limited study abroad. According to the tsar, "... young people sometimes return to Russia with the falsest notions about her. Not knowing her true needs, laws, customs, ... and often her language, they are aliens in the midst of the ... fatherland."35 The ukase required all subjects between the ages of ten and eighteen years to be educated only in Russia, except with the tsar's special permission. The penalty for disobedience to the order would be the loss of the right to enter state service. The ukase remained in effect until 1833. The Polish revolution had an additional, specific, educational consequence: the permanent closing of Vilno University on May 1, 1832.

34Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 186.

35Ibid., p. 188.
This period also marked a return to considerations of improving the quality of education by dealing with the problems that had plagued the universities from the very beginning, particularly the problems of attracting competent teachers, exposure to advanced European academic discipline, and increasing the proportion of Russian-speaking faculty members. Teachers' salaries virtually tripled during the first decade of Nicholas' reign. And the ministry inaugurated two programs for training native professors, which included study abroad, that continued into the next decade.

During the early 1820's, a Dorpat law professor, Dabelov, proposed without success to establish at his university a professor-training institute. This idea was revived in 1827 by Speransky and Professor Parrot of Dorpat. In September, 1827, the tsar ordered the presentation to the Organization Committee of a memoir written by Parrot, which proposed a seven year training program, to include five years at Dorpat and two additional years abroad. Parrot suggested that 156 students be selected for the program, from which the best 90 would be chosen to become professors, and the remainder would become directors and teachers in gymnasium. The students in the seven year plan would

---

36. Krusenstern, p. 424. Krusenstern claimed that the salary increases plus the pension privileges brought "undoubtedly a great number of distinguished men" to take on the tasks of pedagogy. He adds that the authorities were careful to choose professors who could join "solid instruction" with moral strength, to which one could never attach too great attention.

37. Pletnev, Pervoe dvadstipiatilietie, pp. 69-70.
specialize in medicine, ancient languages, law, mathematics, and astronomy. Those specializing in Russian literature would be trained according to a different plan, which provided for two years of study at the Russian Academy after preparatory training at their own universities. 38

The plan then underwent considerable alteration. In October, the tsar intervened by reducing the number of trainees to twenty and citing Paris and Berlin as the locations for the training abroad. At the same time, the Organization Committee turned the matter over to the Central School Board, which worked out a more detailed plan for the program, adding its own alterations. The term of the training was reduced to five years: three at Dorpat, where a special Professors' Institute would be established, and two abroad. In November, Nicholas accepted the Board's recommendations on the condition that all trainees be native Russians. In February, 1828, the tsar approved the Board's plan to have the trainees preliminarily examined at St. Petersburg University, to pay a salary supplement of 1200 rubles to the director of the institute and a 3000 ruble allowance to the participants. In June, the examination was held, and by the beginning of the autumn term, twenty-two trainees entered the Professors' Institute. 39 Of these, sixteen completed the entire program. 40

38 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 85-86; Petukhov, Imperatorskii, I, 485-487.

39 The contributions of individual universities were as follows: Kharkov-4, Dorpat-1, St. Petersburg-6, Moscow-6, Kazan-2, Vilno-3.

40 Petukhov, Imperatorskii, I, 487-496.
The tsar's reaction to the 1830-31 revolutions further altered the program after it began. As a result of the 1831-33 ban on study abroad, the trainees spent a total of five years at Dorpat, followed by one to two years in the West. Also, Paris was removed as a site of the advanced training. At the end of 1832, the students were again examined, and three received their master's degrees, thirteen their doctorates. In January, 1834, fifteen of them left for Vienna or Berlin, and one began a scholarly journey within Russia. In March 1833, Nicholas approved Lieven's request to continue the program. Between 1833 and 1838, six students studied at Dorpat, but instead of going abroad they immediately assumed teaching posts in 1838, when the institute was finally closed.

The second training program was intended to improve the discipline in which most prospective state administrators would be trained -- law. Under this program, established in January, 1828, six students were chosen from the ecclesiastical academies of Moscow and St. Petersburg, to be trained as law professors at St. Petersburg and Berlin Universities. Between February and July, 1828, the six studied at St. Petersburg, under the supervision of former professor Balug'ianskii, now an important official in the II Department of His Majesty's Own Chancery. In 1829

---

41. Russia, Ministry of Public Instruction, O litsakh, komandirovannykh Ministerstvom Narodnago Prosvieshcheniia za granitsu dlia pro-gotovlenia k zvanii professorov i preodavatelei s 1808 po 1860 (SPB, 1864), pp. 6-7. Hereafter cited as O litsakh komandirovannykh.

42. Petukhov, Imperatorskii, I, 496-497; O litsakh komandirovannykh, pp. 7-8.
five of these, by Speransky's recommendation, went to Berlin to complete their education, where they were joined by another student, from Dorpat University. The program was repeated in 1830 with six more academy students. Many eventually occupied law chairs at Russian universities and made important contributions to the study of Russian jurisprudence.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{43} O litsakh kommandirovannykh, pp. 4-5; Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 27-38. Among the graduates of this program was E.G. Nevolin, whose History of Russian Civil Law proved to be of lasting value.
CHAPTER V

ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY: YEARS OF RECOVERY, 1826-33

The Curatorship of Borozdin, 1826-1833

One of the first tasks of the Shishkov ministry was to terminate the regime that had been established by the "Magnitkii group." With respect to St. Petersburg University this meant the removal of Runich and the "normalization" of the institution — that is, the abolition of the dictatorship that the curator had erected. In attempting to accomplish this, Shishkov ran into as much resistance from Runich as Golitsyn had from Uvarov the last time a new ministry tried to reverse the policies of its predecessor. On January 4, 1824, Alexander issued an Imperial Rescript which abolished the statute of the Chief Pedagogical Institute and the Original Establishment of St. Petersburg University, authorized the continuance of Magnitkii "Instructions" only with regard to moral and police matters, and ordered the government of the university to be organized according to the terms of the 1804 Moscow University Statute. Runich made continuous efforts to obstruct and delay the implementation of this rescript for the remaining two and one-half years of his curatorship.

In February, 1824, Runich called a joint meeting of the conference and pravlenie, where he read parts of the Moscow statute and announced that he could not yet fully implement its provisions. Runich
insisted on keeping the pravlenie on its former basis, i.e. with all members but one appointed with himself as president, and with the conference subordinate to the pravlenie (whereas the Moscow statute provided for the exact opposite relationship). The only change he made at this meeting was changing the name of the conference to the soviet. As a consequence of the recent memories of his inquisitorial purges, "no one dared oppose these arrangements." It was not until the following year that word reached Shishkov that the Moscow statute was not being put into operation. In May 1825 the minister ordered Runich to fully implement the statute and proceed with the election of rector and deans. Runich managed to delay the elections until August. In September the first official soviet meeting was held, and in the same month Shishkov ordered the curator to install the rector, which Runich managed to put off until the beginning of 1826. Finally, in January 1826 Runich reported the election of the rector and deans and the organization of the soviet and pravlenie in accordance with the Moscow statute. In April Shishkov again pressed Runich to complete the statute's implementation. Runich's resistance was expressed in a letter to Shishkov almost two months later in which he opposed the latter's order to reorganize the pension according to Moscow University's example. In June the Central School Board expressed great surprise that the statute was still not fully operative two years and five months after the January 1824 rescript was issued.

---

1 Rector Dugour's report of 1826, Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 606-607.

2 Ibid., I, 607, 435-455.
By now it became clear to Shishkov that the removal of Runich was a necessary precondition to the carrying out of the ministry's policies. The friction and hostility that had developed between Runich and Shishkov's ministerial personnel are apparent from the caustic marginal notes made by two ministerial officials, Iazykov and Shirinskii-Shikhmatov, on Runich's progress report of 1826. Shishkov ordered these officials to make their own report on the university and had the Central School Board's Financial Committee investigate the part of Runich's report dealing with the allotment of building funds. The major result of the investigation was the discovery of gross errors in Runich's financial administration. When the Committee found Runich guilty of financial mismanagement, the tsar removed him from the curatorship and from membership in the Central School Board (June, 1826). In August 1826 K.M. Borozdin became curator, and by the autumn the Moscow statute was in full operation.3

The dismissal of Runich came as a relief to the members of the university. In July the soviet dispatched a letter to Shishkov thanking him for eliminating the impediments to the organization of the university according to Moscow statute. The soviet, in expressing its gratitude, assured the minister that it "will strictly observe all decrees given to it and will vigilantly defend the university against any disorders." The university had every reason to be satisfied with the appointment of K.M. Borozdin, whose curatorship lasted from August 1826 until March 1833.

---

3Ibid., I, 380, 389; Grigor'ev, p. 46; Leningradskii Universitet, I, 20. Grech said Runich spent the rest of his life ranting, complaining, and walking streets brandishing his St. Vladimir medal.

4Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatilietie, pp. 66-68.
Shishkov's choice as curator was highly qualified for this position. Borozdin was well read and well traveled. As a youth he had taken a three-year journey around Russia conducting research in Russian history and antiquity. The son of Senator M.K. Borozdin, and later a senator himself, he was an educated man and an author of several famous biographies. His patriotism reflected that of the minister who appointed him. In a letter of 1828 to the trainees of the Professors' Institute at Dorpat, he said,

Pursue untiringly that great aim to which providence and the Ruler have appointed you. Enrich your minds with new information, bring it back with you to our fatherland; but return also with pure hearts, return as zealous sons of the Greko-Russian Church, with unhesitating loyalty to the Ruler, with passionate love for the fatherland, in short -- return as Russians. 

According to V.V. Grigor'ev, who attended the university during this period, Borozdin was trustworthy, respected and hardworking. He was passionately involved in education and inspired the activity of his colleagues. From the moment of his appointment, the university soviet began to enjoy its statutory privileges.

Together with the accession of a new minister and a new curator came the election of a new rector, the ordinary professor of French, A.A. Dugour, who held office from 1825 until 1836. Dugour, a Frenchman, stood clearly on the side of educational progress and the rights of the university. In his annual report of 1826 he blamed the lack of academic progress

---

5 Petukhov, I, 491.

6 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 47.
and the internal disorders on the failure of the Original Establishment of 1819 to insure St. Petersburg the same rights granted the other universities. He clearly rejected the Golitsyn-Magnitskii-Runich view that education bred revolutionary upheavals: "Our fate depends on knowledge -- its benefit is undoubted! The small powers of Germany and Prussia would suffer revolution if it were true that superfluous knowledge" was politically dangerous.?

Soon after Borozdin took over as curator, the organizational changes implied by the application of the Moscow statute were implemented. Although the chairs remained divided into three faculties as before, five new chairs were added. In the ethics-politics (formerly philosophy-law) department, a chair of diplomatics was added, and the chair of public laws was replaced by two chairs: that of Russian legal procedure and that of the laws of outstanding ancient and modern nations. In the department of historical and literary sciences, three chairs were added: theory of fine arts; Russian history, statistics and geography; and Russian rhetoric, poetry and language. The ordinary professors formed the soviet which, under the rector's presidency, ran educational, school region, and financial affairs. The soviet annually elected the rector and deans until 1825, when the university authorities received permission from the ministry to elect these officials every three years. 8 Matters

7Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 603, 612, Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 60.

8Before the 1831 election, the soviet received approval of a further request to hold no new elections until the university statute, then being drafted, was promulgated.
concerning the school region were now handled by a school committee, composed of six soviet-chosen ordinary professors. Director Kavelin was dismissed and the office of director was abolished. Klement, who had been appointed inspector of students, was dismissed, and the soviet chose an ordinary professor to replace him and chose two junior staff members to serve as assistants. From 1826 on, internal and external students enrolled in the same course. Now, every student who attended three years and passed every annual examination would receive the degree of Candidate or Actual Student, depending on the degree of his success. The number of scholarship students was reduced and thereby brought into line with the other universities.  

Shortly after the university shed the remnants of the traits it had inherited from the Chief Pedagogical Institute and approximated the statutory autonomy and administrative organization of the other universities, the regime decided to establish a new, separate Chief Pedagogical Institute in St. Petersburg. In the summer of 1826, in response to an increased demand for teachers created by the impending gymnasium re-organization, the Committee on Educational Institutions began considering a project for a statute for the new Institute. At the third session of the Committee one of its members, Count Sivers, expressed dissatisfaction with training future teachers at the universities. He felt they would best be trained at an institution completely separate from the university which was completely subordinate to the ministerial authorities.

---

9Pletnev, Pervoe dvadtsatipiatilietie, pp. 31-38.
and which recruited its pupils entirely from seminaries. Uvarov agreed with the principle of separating the Institute from the University of St. Petersburg. The tsar backed Uvarov, commenting that "I entirely share the opinion of Privy Councilor Uvarov" that the Institute should be directly under the authority of the minister or his deputy. Sivers also felt that teacher-training should emphasize "practical preparation" in the rules and techniques of teaching. The tsar's agreement with Sivers was qualified only by his statement that he did not understand why only seminarians should be admitted to the Institute. Nicholas, in October, 1826, pressed the Organization Committee to get busy without delay on the Institute's establishment.  

The project was composed under the supervision of Uvarov and then approved by the Committee. The tsar confirmed the statute on September 30, 1828. The new statute essentially resembled that of the old Chief Pedagogical Institute, with these exceptions: the director was to be appointed by the central authorities, the teaching of oriental languages and astronomy was dropped, and the right to grant scholarly degrees was abolished. The question of recruitment was not completely resolved until 1832. At first preference was shown for seminary students who had completed their studies in philosophy. At the Institute they took a two year preparatory course, a three year definitive course, and a one-year pedagogical course. During the final year, to accustom the pupils to their future tasks, they presented practice lessons in various disciplines.

Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 193-194.
under their professors' direction and in their colleagues' presence. In April, 1832, a nine-year course was opened to gymnasium graduates. The most distinguished students in both courses could complete their studies abroad, return for examinations for university degrees, and then occupy teaching chairs in the universities. By the mid-1830's, there were 146 pupils in attendance at the Institute.11

University Progress: Faculty, Students, Laboratories and Libraries

While the number of chairs increased from 22 to 27, the number of professors increased more than 50% (from 21 to 32) during the Borozdin curatorship. The following chart shows the increase within each professorial rank:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Professor</th>
<th>1827</th>
<th>1828</th>
<th>1829</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary and Emeritus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11Ibid., pp. 194, 266-267; Krusenstern, pp. 121-122.

12Material gathered from Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 637 and annual rector's report for 1833, Zh.M.N.F., (March, 1834), 47.
Apparently, the increase was the result of the expansion of the number of younger men who held the rank of assistant professor. Of the total number, the proportion of natives of the Russian empire increased to over two thirds by 1833. Twenty-three were natives of the Russian Empire (one was from Poland and one from Livonia), and the majority of each department was Russian. Of the nine foreigners, seven were from German states, one from France, and one from Persia. By 1833, only four remained who had participated in the 1808-1811 program of professorial training in the West. Of the 27 chairs, 16 were occupied by ordinary or emeritus professors, and 11 chairs were occupied by more than one professor; several professors taught in more than one chair, and one taught in more than one department. Seven professors lectured in morals-politics, 11 in physics-mathematics, and 14 in history-philology.

Two-thirds of the 1833 total were newcomers, that is, had come to St. Petersburg or been promoted to professorial rank from within the institution after the departure of Runich. Of these, two-thirds were natives of the Empire, and one-fifth were graduates of the university itself. The entire moral-political sciences department was composed of newcomers, as was three-fifths of the history-philology department and just over half of the physics-mathematics department.

Regarding the new professors, they were generally of a higher caliber than the Runich appointees, but of less competence than the victims of the purge of 1821. A selection of the best of the newcomers will be illustrative.

In the department of moral-political sciences, Father Bazhanov replaced Pavskii as ordinary professor of theology in 1827. In 1826
ordinary professor M.A. Pal'min came from Kazan University to teach practical philosophy and the history of philosophy. Upon the death of Professor Lodii, Assistant Professor Elpat'evskii who held a master's degree, entered the chair of natural, political, and public law. S. Bogoliubov replaced Kukol'nik as ordinary professor of Russian law. His practical experience as a member of the Commission for the Composition of Laws compensated for his lack of speaking ability and academic training. V.V. Schneider, a former teacher at the Moscow University pension, became Extraordinary Professor of Roman Law. Assistant Professor A.A. Fisher, educated at the University of Vienna, taught psychology, logic, metaphysics, and ethics. He lectured according to his own notes, which he lithographed for his students' benefit and constantly brought up to date. Baron Wrangel became assistant professor in the new chair of Russian civil law. After a formal education at the Universities of Jena, Wittenberg, and Wurtzburg, he had served in the Imperial service and taught at Tsarskoe Selo Lycee, Kazan University, and the new Chief Pedagogical Institute. Among his works the most influential was his A History of Russian Law.

In the chair of Botany, Z.I. Zembnitskii, promoted to extraordinary professor, taught the history of botany, the physiology of plants, practical botany, and economic botany. Assistant Professor Postel's, a graduate of the university, entered the chair of mineralogy and attained fame throughout Europe for his published description of a

\[13\] Pletnev, Pervoe dvadstipiatiletie, 38-42, 76-78.
voyage around the world with the famous navigator, Litke. Heinrich F.E. Lenz became Assistant Professor of Physics in 1832 and published many original experiments which earned him a place among the most important European scholars. According to Vucinich, he “became ... one of the world’s leading experts on electromagnetism.”

Eight new professors entered the department of historical-philological sciences during this period. At the beginning of the 1830’s Ordinary Professor P.A. Pletnev and Assistant Professors A.V. Nikitenko and N. Ustrialov began contributing to the newly expanded Russian studies curriculum. Nikitenko, who taught the theoretical aspects of Russian literature, explained the Russian mind and the Russian language as aspects of the eternal spirit of mankind and related these forces to literature. One student, F.N. Fortunatov who sat in on Nikitenko’s first lecture in 1833 in an overflowing auditorium, described Nikitenko as a “talented and eloquent” teacher, capable of improvisation. Ustrialov, who like Nikitenko graduated from St. Petersburg University in the mid-1820’s, entered the chair of Russian history as a lecturer in 1828 and as an assistant professor in 1831. In addition to several scholarly publications, he wrote a textbook in Russian history which showed his acquaintance with the most recent literature in his field. Pletnev, who would serve as rector during the 1840’s and 1850’s, began teaching Russian literature in 1832. According to Fortunatov, he read his lectures so slowly, “dwelling on every word,” that he was easy to take notes from.

---

14Vucinich, p. 242; Pletnev, Pervoe dvadsatipiatilist, pp. 42-51, 53-54, 79.
According to another student, E.A. Matisen, who took his courses in the mid-1830's, Pletnev's lectures enjoyed great success, attracted students from all faculties, and were so crowded that it became necessary to move into a larger auditorium. One of Pletnev's most famous students, Ivan Turgenev, described him as a teacher not distinguished by great learning, but as one who loved his subject, "spoke plainly, clearly and without warmth," and knew how to stimulate his students' interest without creating exaggerated feelings. In eastern studies, the newcomers were I.O. Senkovskii, Ordinary Professor of Arabic, and M.D. Tobchibashev, Assistant Professor of Persian. They trained many young orientalists who later served as diplomatic representatives and teachers in the Oriental Institute of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Assistant Professors Sokolov, Brut, and Krylov brought new blood to the study of Roman and Greek antiquity. In 1833, Assistant Professor Shul'gin, educated at the old Pedagogical Institute, was invited from Tsarskoe Selo Lyceee to teach history. The revised edition of his modern history text won the Academy of Sciences' Demidov prize.

Whereas enrollment remained relatively steady during the latter part of the Runich period, the period 1826-33 witnessed a rapid expansion
of the student population, as the following chart indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apparently the problem of attracting self-supporting students was well on the way to being overcome. Of the enrollment increase of 122, the number of self-supporting students increased by 99. At the same time the university enrollment practically tripled, the pension enrollment increased approximately 50% between 1827 and 1829. However, this was largely the result of an increase in the number of scholarship pupils. The distribution of students among departments remained relatively steady between 1823 and 1828 as the following table shows:

17 Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet o sostioanii Imperatorskago S. Peterburgskago Universiteta s 1836 po 1840 (SPB, 1841), pp. 26, 31. See also Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 637, 652, 707; Krusenstern, p. 76.

18 Rozhdestvenskii, Materialy, I, 639, 654.

19 Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, pp. 26, 31.
Thus, while the enrollment in morals-politics and history-philology quadrupled over the decade, enrollment in physics-mathematics only doubled. Those enrolled in the exact sciences represented a fifth of the enrollment in 1823 and only a seventh a decade later.

The number of annual graduates remained relatively steady between 1824 and 1826, but increased five-fold during the Borozdin period. The proportion of entering students who eventually graduated remained steady, at about 50%. The distribution of graduates according to departments reflected the distribution of the enrollment:20

---

20 Grigor’ev, Imperatorskii, pp. lxvii-ci, 83-84, 104.
TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Morals-Politics</th>
<th>Physics-Mathematics</th>
<th>History-Philology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1833, St. Petersburg ranked third among the five Russian universities, if we exclude the graduates in the medical faculties of the other universities. ²¹

TABLE 6

NON-MEDICAL GRADUATES IN 1833

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuarton</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazan</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorpat</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²¹ Zh. M. N. P., 1834.
Library and laboratory facilities at the university did not improve their rate of growth significantly during this period. Grigor'ev, who studied at the university during the 1820's, claimed these facilities remained inadequate. Only a tiny annual sum, 6000 rubles, was allotted for the purchase of materials for these facilities. The main university library increased from 10,845 volumes in 1827 to 21,356 in 1833. But the latter figure, even when combined with the 2,844 volumes in the Chief Pedagogical Institute library, was the smallest of all five universities. It is necessary to add, however, that many other library facilities were available in St. Petersburg that were not available in other university cities. The Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy, the Imperial Public Library, and Rumiantsev Museum, the Hermitage Library, and the Institute of Oriental Languages, the Admiralty, and the Ministries all had important collections of books and documents. Between them, the academies, the Public Library, and the Rumiantsev Museum contained 382,823 volumes in 1833 -- more than the other universities combined. However, Fortunatov notes that students were allowed to use only the Rumiantsev museum, which specialized in historical documents. The combined resources of the university library and the museum totaled 53,558, which exceeded the contents of every other university library except that of Dorpat (57,828). The library at the university remained

---

22Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 77.
24Leningradskii Universitat, I, 25.
in the same disorganized, badly administered state in which Runich had left it.  

The other facilities consisted of the botanical, zoological, medals, physics, mineralogy, and mechanics kabinets, and the chemistry laboratory. During the Runich period only 200 rubles were spent on equipment and experiments in the physics kabinet and chemistry laboratory, testifying to the complete dearth of experimental activity in these fields. There was no change in this situation under Borozdin. According to Grigor'ev, the chemistry laboratory continued to exist, but hardly anyone visited it except the professor in charge of the facility. In 1827, Professor Shcheglov reported that most of the instruments in the physics kabinet were in such bad repair that no research could be done with them. He estimated that only an expenditure of 15,000 rubles could put the kabinet in a condition appropriate to an institution of higher learning.  

There is no evidence that anything approaching this sum was spent during the Borozdin period. The botanical collection remained inadequate, being completely lacking in plants from Africa and America, and in some species from Siberia and the Caucasus. The botanical, zoological and mineralogical kabinets, in terms of quantity of contents, compared favorably with the older universities, while the chemistry laboratory was

26 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 78.

27 Ibid., p. 81.
dwarfed beside the Moscow laboratory, for example. Aside from the budgetary problem, the major cause of the inadequate library and laboratory facilities was the cramped quarters in which the university was housed. The solution to the facilities problem would come only in a solution to the building problem, which was not solved until the mid-1830's.

Once again it is appropriate to mention other facilities available in St. Petersburg, particularly those at the Academy of Sciences. The Academy's Asiatic museum, Egyptian museum, ethnographic museum, medals collection, zoological museum, zoological and mineralogical collections, physics and chemistry laboratories could have been of some use to university students and faculty in the history-philology and physics-mathematics departments. The Academy's observatories were more useful to the other universities, since they were located at Dorpat, Helsingfors, Moscow, Kiev, and Kazan. However, St. Petersburg's astronomy students were allowed to make use of the observatory of the Naval Cadet Corps.

The Quality of Instruction

The amount of information on the quality of instruction during

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity of Contents in 1834:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. P. Un.</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow Un.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Krusenstern, pp. 148-154; Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, p. 56.
this period is quite limited. Professor Pletnev's account is rather vague and general, but that of V.V. Grigor'ev, a student in the history-philology faculty, is more precise. Therefore, the latter's account has been relied upon here.

Up until 1832 the academic year followed the service year, that is, it began in January and ended in December, with a mid-course vacation. Beginning in 1832, the academic year began in August and ended in June. The annual examinations were held each June. Lectures were held each morning from 8:00 - 12:00 and each afternoon from 2:00 - 6:00. The lectures were scheduled for two hours each. However, most professors began their lectures half an hour late and concluded them half an hour early. As a result, students attended approximately four one-hour lectures daily.

According to Grigor'ev, although there were several "intelligent, talented, industrious" teachers at St. Petersburg, many were unprepared for their calling and never made up in the course of time for their unpreparedness. For every three or four fully qualified teachers there were twenty or thirty who had not studied their subject in depth and who had no love of learning and no desire to stimulate it in others. Grigor'ev found it difficult to say which was worse -- university lectures or the education most students had before entering the university. Some teachers lectured from their own notes, others from published textbooks, which

---

30 Lenineradskii Universitet, I, 37, 22.
students were required to memorize. In discussions, most students were expected to reproduce the lectures or textbooks verbatim. Few professors were satisfied with answers from students in their own words. One professor was horrified that a student mentioned something not included in his lecture notes. In order to excell in his Greek history course, Grigor'ev claims to have memorized a two-volume textbook. Even this was exceptional, for the study of a subject seldom went beyond learning the professors' lecture notes. Only a few professors, such as Ustrialov and Fisher, expected students to become acquainted with standard works in the subjects taught. Professors kept their sources from their students and frowned upon student attempts to get at them. Students who paraphrased (rather than quoted verbatim) from the texts during examinations were considered freethinkers. Grigor'ev attributes the traits of the majority of the faculty to lack of preparation, laziness, and the fearful memory of the purge of 1821. There was little in the way of specialization, and many professors taught a wide variety of subjects.\footnote{Leningradskii Universitet, I, 38-9, 67-68.}

Grigor'ev admitted that the university did not graduate many accomplished students during this period, compared with Vilno and Dorpat. Apparently, state students did better than self-supporting students, as the latter were more indifferent and were frequently expelled from school for failure to attend lectures. Only in Eastern studies did the university receive transfer students from other universities. Usually, the opposite
direction was taken. Few St. Petersburg students graduated with much information or the capacity for creative thought. Students left the university knowing little beyond the content of professors lectures, facts memorized for examinations, most of which "evaporated" after the conclusion of each examination. Students of this period graduated with little factual foundation or equipment for continuing scholarly endeavors.32 Even Granovskii, the future historian, graduated from the law faculty without having developed a fondness for a single subject on that faculty. He had done little work in the field that was to become his speciality. 33 Thus, St. Petersburg University deserves little credit for contributing to his future greatness as a scholar.

Grigor'ev's conclusions are confirmed by Fortunatov and by the Russian historian of universities, Professor Ikonnikov. Ikonnikov describes the "pitiful state" of instruction in the historical-philological faculty. Professors used obsolete texts and gave summary information.34 According to Grigor'ev, in history there were no interpretive lectures, but rather a dry rendering of facts from outdated texts. Only Bugour and Ustrialov were even capable of interpretation. When Ustrialov began his course in Russian history by enumerating and evaluating the sources, he opened up to Grigor'ev and his fellow students an unknown world, since

32Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 104-105; Leningradskii Universitet, I, 40.

33Leningradskii Universitet, I, 37.

34Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 84.
most professors led students to believe their lectures contained all there was to know about a subject. Geography Professor Brut was conscientious, but he lectured in a monotone. Classical philology was in as poor a state as history. Grene was the only mainstay of the teaching of classical languages, but even he did not have his students read the original sources. And he did not introduce relevant historical information; rather, he limited his discussion of authors to grammar and esthetics. The history of Russian literature was limited to praise of Lomonosov and other eighteenth-century authors and condemnation of romantic writers. Professors failed to keep students abreast of important contemporary developments in German linguistics. Eastern studies were taught on a much higher level than most other subjects in this department. Professor Senkovskii was gifted with a remarkable memory and quick intellectual grasp. He was well-educated, diverse in interests, and fluent in the major European and Asian languages. He integrated the study of language and literature with that of Oriental ideas, customs, history and geography. Unlike most professors, he provided bibliographical information, supervised the work of his students carefully, and inspired independent study. He forced students to study sources rather than authorities. Unfortunately, his students were few. Undoubtedly, Grigor'ev's personal experience as a student in this faculty colored his adverse opinion of instruction in general at the university. According to Ikonnikov, "pompousness and amusements with empty trifles" distinguished historical-philological

---

35Grigor'ev, Imperatorski, pp. 72-77; Leningradskii Universitet, I, 39.
lectures from the "better teaching and serious work" in physical-mathematical sciences. 

In physics-mathematics teachers were generally competent and students well-prepared. Thanks to the efforts of talented men like Chizhov and Tikhomirov, the teaching of mathematics at St. Petersburg matched the progress being made during this period at Moscow, Kharkov and Kazan Universities. The shining light of the faculty during this period was Shcheglov, professor of physics, who kept up with foreign developments, showed great versatility, and lectured articulately and energetically. Sokolov propagated new theories and discoveries in geology and mineralogy, introducing the first lectures in geognosy to the university. Professor Bongard's value was limited by his reliance on Latin in his lectures, and Professor Solov'ev was so burdened by his teaching load that he had insufficient time to properly prepare his lectures. While Rzhevskii, weakened by palsy, did little of anything, his assistant read verbatim from the text. He never used animals for illustration, even though he was in charge of the university's zoological museum.

Teaching in the law faculty, apparently, sank to a lower level than that of either of the other two. Pal'mins lectures were extremely dull, and those of Elpat'evskii were equally lifeless. Professor Bogoliubov, who taught Russian law, gave lectures that were dull and

---

36Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 84.

37Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 71-72.
Butyrskii, who was not a specialist in this field, at least was a careful teacher. The exception to the rule was Professor of Roman Law Schneider, but, although he was very devoted to his subject, he left no published work. Although the regime did not allow the pre-1821 freedom of teaching to this faculty, the instructor of natural law did teach theories of national wealth according to the principles of Adam Smith.\(^{38}\)

In conclusion, although the level of teaching at St. Petersburg was undistinguished throughout this period, the university can be said to have recovered its position before the purges. The enrollment was steadily expanding, as was the teaching staff. But the quality of instruction remained low, although higher than that during the Runich period. Several factors impeded qualitative progress: traditional problems such as the indifference and poor preparation of students, and the backwardness of native professors; and more recent problems, such as the lack of space for adequate library and laboratory facilities. But essentially, the quality resembled that of the first years of the university. The university had one competent faculty, which unfortunately, attracted the smallest student population. The law faculty, the one which the government depended on for training administrators, greatly expanded its enrollment beyond the 1821 level, but at the same time the quality of instruction greatly diminished.\(^{39}\)

\(^{38}\)Ibid., p. 69.

\(^{39}\)Surprisingly, the university library’s holdings in books related to subjects in the moral-political sciences (law) department was by far the smallest. In 1827 there were 1615 volumes in these subjects, 3096 in the natural sciences, and 4559 in historical–philological sciences. Ibid., p. 78.
CHAPTER VI
THE MINISTRY OF UVAROV, 1833-1849

Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality

In the course of the 1830's the policies of Nicholas became even more systematic. They came to be stated in the terms of a coherent ideology of "official nationality." In April 1833 S.S. Uvarov, in his first circular as Minister of Public Instruction, declared that educational policy should be conducted "in the joint spirit of orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality." Official ideologists, poets, novelists, professors, and journalists echoed and elaborated upon this doctrine during the remainder of the reign. Nicholas Riasanovsky has written a succinct account of the origins and significance of these three inter-related concepts which will be summarized here.

According to Riasanovsky, the doctrine of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality" was a verbatim Russian translation of the European
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intellectual reaction to the French revolution and Napoleon. The intellectual counterpart of the anti-Napoleonic coalitions assumed the attitudes of hostility to rationalism and glorification of traditional institutions as bastions against revolution. Uvarov was a perfect example of the lack of originality and reliance on European trends in thought that characterized the official ideologists. The minister was fluent in French and German and followed closely the current trends in European romantic literature and philosophy. He and his ideological cohorts copied their ideas from Schelling, Carlyle, Fichte, Michelet, Louis Blanc and others. Generally speaking, the romantic nationalism of early nineteenth century Europe, especially Germany, became the ideological backdrop for the state policies of Nicholas.

The official ideologists borrowed from Orthodoxy the Church's essential pessimism about humanity. Most shared the concept that life is a mystery fathomable only by God rather than a problem soluble by human reason. They felt that revolutionaries, materialists and atheists alike committed the error of belief that science can be applied to social improvement. Like the tsar, they believed that truly religious behavior meant blind obedience to the will of the landlord, the officer, and the ruler. Uvarov insisted that families and schools inculcate this type of submissiveness and, toward this end, provide only the knowledge necessary to the fulfillment of one's inherited socio-economic calling. The concept of Orthodoxy had religious, philosophical, and historical aspects. The ideologists believed that Russian autocracy was sanctioned by God and justified by human nature. Man's natural wickedness created
the need for strong institutional control over his behavior. The historical justifications were infected with romanticism; they generally ran as follows: (1) All history shows that states and empires crumble when they lack authoritarian guidance by hereditary monarchs. Thus, Russia's strength and unity is tied up with her autocratic form of government.

(2) Russian historical peculiarities justify the existence of autocracy. This form of government best utilizes her tremendous size, population, and abundant resources. The Russian patriarchal family tradition makes people peculiarly suited for one-man rule. The tsar and the people form a unity similar to the father-son relationship, which is infinitely better for the people than a formal, legal, or constitutional relationship, which is foreign to Russia. Thus, Western institutions, while they may be best for their respective countries, are not transplantable in Russia.

The latter historical justification for autocracy is connected to the official or dynastic concept of nationality, as expressed by Pogodin, Shevrev, Tyuchev, Grech, Bulgarin and the government mouthpiece, the Northern Bee. The dynastic nationalists shared the main tenet of Russian distinctiveness. To their minds, Russia, unlike the West, was free from internal discords, revolutions, and class struggles. This harmony was a product of distinct geographic and spiritual characteristics. Russia's flat land was cited as a cause of social equality. Orthodoxy, unlike Catholicism, never waged secular wars. It was in the moral nature of the Russian people to passively submit to the Church and the tsar.

3 They were supported generally by court nobles, high officials, and the nobility of the Baltic Provinces; their geographic center was St. Petersburg.
Because of the uniquely Russian phenomenon of paternal unity, the tsar instinctively ruled in the people's interest. Any interference with this unity in the form of constitutionalism or legalism could be disastrous. Shevrev was particularly ingenious (as well as Romantic) in the notion that language expressed nationality. He postulated that the weak development of the conditional mood in Russian expressed the people's dislike of legalism and contractual agreements.

The Translation of Official Nationalism into Educational Policy

After his resignation as St. Petersburg curator, Uvarov entered the Ministry of Finances, where he reached the rank of privy councilor in 1824 and became a senator two years later. While still employed by the Finance Ministry he was appointed to the Organization Committee at the latter's inception. His work on this committee prepared his re-entry into the Ministry of Public Instruction in April 1832 as assistant minister. He was appointed acting minister after Lieven's resignation in March 1833 and minister in April 1834. As minister he proclaimed the trinity of Official Nationality and endeavored to translate it into practical policies.4

During the Uvarov period the Ministry of Public Instruction retained much of the organizational structure of 1811. After a new reorganization in May 1835, the ministry consisted of the Central School

4Among the many sources of biographical data on Uvarov are Rozhdestvenski, Istoriicheski obzor, pp. 220-226; Petukhov, Imperatorski, I, 350-351; Darlington, p. 49.
Board, the Chancery, the Central Administration of Censorship, and the Department of Public Instruction. However, besides the traditional subjects under the ministry's jurisdiction (public schools, censorship, and teacher training), there were added private and domestic education, private and public libraries, the Imperial Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy, and other scholarly societies.

The Chancery of the ministry employed a director, three secretaries, and two aides. It received all matters addressed to the minister, including letters, reports, and memoranda; handled confidential correspondence; and directed the protocol of the Central School Board. The Department of Public Instruction directed all the educational and scientific institutions in Russia and published the Zhurnal of the Ministry, "whose aim is to publish all the measures and dispositions which concern this Ministry and to render accounts of the state of the various establishments which depend on it." The Department had its own chancery, whose three section heads formed an executive board for the expedition of day-to-day business. The Central School Board was composed of the minister (who served as its chairman), the director of the Chancery (who served as secretary), the university curators, and other appointees of the minister. It deliberated about such matters as changes in the organization of schools, enforcement of ministerial regulations, the establishment of new schools, the choosing of textbooks, the examination of reports from school inspectors, and the determination of financial policy.

---

5 Krusenstern, p. 42.
6 Ibid., pp. 41-44.
Uvarov tied the School Board closely to the Department, usually submitting matters to the Department for preliminary review before taking them to the School Board for its consideration. When School Board members disagreed among themselves over a matter of business, the minister decided the question. When the Board as a whole disagreed with the minister, the issue was decided by the tsar himself. The eclipsing of the Board by the Organization Committee in the area of preparation of major legislation continued during the Uvarov period. The Board met more and more rarely: once or twice a year in the 1830's and less often during the 1840's. In university policies, the major legislative measures -- the 1833 statute of Kiev University and the 1835 General University Statute -- were formulated by the Organization Committee, which itself declined in importance during the 1840's.\(^7\)

By the mid-1830's, the organization of the public schools into regions had reached the form it would retain during the entire reign. The provinces of European Russia (excluding Finland, and the Kingdom of Poland) were divided into the regions of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kharkov, Kazan, Dorpat, Kiev, White Russia, and Odessa.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\)In fact, its last session was held on May 24, 1842. Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, pp. 231, 235.

\(^8\)The distribution of provinces ran as follows. St. Petersburg region: Pskov, St. Petersburg, Novgorod, Vologda, Olonets, Archangel; Moscow region: Moscow, Vladimir, Kaluga, Kazan, Smolensk, Tver, Tula, Taraslavl, Kostroma; Dorpat: Livonia, Estonia, Courland; Kazan region: Kazan, Simbirsk, Orenburg, Nizhni-Novgorod, Penza, Astrakhan, Saratov, Perm, Viatka; Kharkov region: Kharkov, Kursk, Poltava, Voronezh, Orel, Tambov, the Caucasian provinces, and the lands of the Don Cossacks; White Russian region: Minsk, Vilno, Grodno, Belostok, Mogilev, Vitebsk; Odessa: Ekaterinoslav, Kherson, Taurida, Bessarabia, Taganrog, Odessa; Kiev region:
Before the passage of the university statute of 1835, those regions with universities at their centers were governed by the university administration, the others by the curators. After 1835, in accordance with the doctrine of autocracy, the ministry's appointees directly administered the middle and lower schools. In each region the curator, his assistant, and a crown inspector of schools visited the schools and reported directly to the ministry. A regional council, consisting of the curator as chairman, the assistant curator, the university rector, the Crown inspector, and two gymnasium directors handled organizational changes, the opening of new schools, annual reports on the state of public instruction in the region, and all police, administrative, and financial affairs. Only purely academic matters, such as the adoption of teaching methods and textbooks, could be turned over to the university council by the curator, and this only at the latter's discretion.9

The revision of university legislation had been under consideration ever since the Golitsyn ministry violated the letter and spirit of the 1803-04 statutes. In December, 1824, Shishkov appointed a subcommittee of the Central School Board to consider university reforms. This subcommittee began meeting in January 1825 to consider a general project presented by Magnitskii and a draft for a new St. Petersburg university statute written by former rector Balugianskii, but it stopped meeting

---

Kiev, Volhynia, Podolia, Chernigov. The Siberian provinces (Irkutsk, Tobolsk, Tomsk, and Yenisseisk) were administered separately. Krusenstern, pp. 186-189.

9See Krusenstern, pp. 45-47, for a first-hand observation of the effect of the 1835 statute on the government of the school regions.
in May 1826 because of the formation of the Organization Committee, which took over the study of legislative reform. After the Organization Committee completed its work on the 1828 statute for elementary and secondary schools, Lieven charged it with the preparation of a general statute for the Universities of Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kharkov and Kazan. During 1828-29, the Organization Committee conducted a general review of Balug'ianskii's draft, a project for a Moscow statute written by the Moscow curator in 1826, proposed changes in the Kazan University statute considered by the State Council in 1820, a letter of December 3, 1828, written by Lieven outlining the general basis for the reform, and the written opinions of several professors and academicians.

In March, 1829, the committee turned from the consideration of bases for the reform to the writing of a statute project for the four universities. The committee's work moved rapidly until July, 1830, when the tsar stepped in unexpectedly as the final draft was in preparation. Nicholas demanded that the law change the rectorship from an elective to an appointive position, and the committee complied by inserting a provision that the soviet choose three candidates and report their names to the curator, whose choice would be confirmed by the minister and reconfirmed by the tsar. In the spring of 1831 Lieven persuaded the committee to retract this provision and instead turn over the university government to a pravlenie composed of outside officials under the

10 The tsar cooperated with the Committee's work, receiving detailed accounts of its deliberations and determining the direction in which the deliberations went. Ibid., p. 65.
chairmanship of the curator, and Nicholas approved this change. At this time the committee also agreed to take the administration of gymnasia and lower schools out of the hands of the university. 11

In May 1832 the committee was informed of the tsar's approval of its draft, and in August the committee affixed its signature. At the time Uvarov became minister the project was undergoing review and revision by the Department of Laws, and in May 1833 Nicholas granted Uvarov's request to halt further consideration of the law until he examined it. Uvarov then demanded so many changes in the statute that it soon became clear that it would be a long time before the revised law could be completed. 12

In light of the impending delay it was decided to promulgate the Kiev University statute in December 1833 without waiting for the general statute. Lieven's project of 1832, the Kiev statute, and the suggestions of university soviets and curators as well of those of Uvarov became the primary ingredients in the general statute. Finally, after a preliminary review by Speransky, the Organization Committee gave the general law its

---

11 A minority disagreed with this decision. Storkh was one. Krusenstern had some reservations. Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 192.

12 Uvarov demanded a long list of "improvements suggested by experience": He wanted "university court jurisdiction over its members abolished; the authority of the curator and the influence of the minister defined in clear boundaries; the financial aspect separated from the academic; fixed examinations established for all who are admitted to university lectures; juridical sciences distributed according to the code of laws; the university course divided into four years;" and an outside official in charge of university police; quoted in Rozhdestvenskii Istoricheskii obzor, p. 243.
final form in July, 1835. On July 25, the tsar confirmed the "General Statute of Imperial Russian Universities."\(^{13}\)

The doctrines of autocracy and nationality clearly predominated in the provisions of the new statute. University autonomy was definitely inconsistent with the principle of autocracy, and the statute tried to correct this anomalous situation. Some of the trappings of the former autonomy were retained while the universities were stripped of actual independent power. The university was granted its own press, theoretical self-government, freedom from taxes on its mail, and censorship -- albeit within the provisions of the 1828 statute -- over theses and professors' publications. The composition and function of the soviet remained the same except for the inclusion of Extraordinary Professors in its ranks and the elimination of its authority over elementary and secondary schools in the school region. The composition of the pravlenie was not altered, despite provisions to the contrary in the 1832 statute draft. The election of the rector also remained unaltered. However, the curator was now

---

\(^{13}\)On July 15, 1835, during the committee session which completed the final draft, an argument broke out over article 78, which gave the minister the right to appoint professors at his own discretion, while retaining the soviet's right of election as well. Uvarov, Speransky, Balug'ianski, and Count Stroganov argued that this would destroy the soviet's right of election and it would be better to have the minister suggest candidates to the soviet. But Count Pratasov defended the minister's right to appoint, claiming that the university had no right of exemption from the rules that apply to all other parts of the civil service. In fact, he said, here more than anywhere else, it was necessary to have leaders with decisive authority who are free "from the spirit of parties and intrigues which so often agitate academic communities." The minister's right to appoint professors would be an effective counterweight to the trends of government on the part of the universities, so easily "attracted by the pernicious theories of the century and ... exposed to the contagion of foreign examples." Nicholas' resolution solved the conflict: "Entirely agreed with Count Pratasov." Quoted in Ibid., p. 244.
required to set up permanent residence in the university town, the university inspector was to be chosen by the curator and serve directly under him. The inspector and his assistants were to conduct the "closest supervision over the morality of all students." The inspector had a vote in the pravlenie under certain circumstances and was to be present during the examination of students. He was required to conform with the regulations of "local authorities" and the curator.\textsuperscript{14} While the 1832 project actually purported to strengthen the university's judicial autonomy, the 1835 statute virtually annihilated it. It provided that the rector, as president of the pravlenie, could initially examine a matter arising from the university corporation, but anything beyond this was to be handled in the regular courts.\textsuperscript{15}

The nationality principle was directly reflected in the new organization of faculties and chairs. The new law followed the Austrian and German example of division into the faculties of medicine, law, and philosophy. The chair of natural law was eliminated and the chairs of

\textsuperscript{14}No mention was made of rules of the soviet or the pravlenie having any restrictive authority over the inspector. Apparently, his responsibility was only to the bureaucracy and "local authorities."

\textsuperscript{15}Sbornik postanovlenii, II, (part 1), 970, 974-978, 979-980, 987-988. Scholarly interpretation of the statute's significance differ. Ikonnikov considered the new law a reversal of the reaction started by Golitsyn: Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 92. Soviet historians Butiagin and Saltanov claimed it introduced to the universities "the order of military service and strict observance of established forms": Universitetskoe Obrazovanie, p. 20. Among a variety of contemporary commentators, Professor Vladinirskii-Bludanov lamented, "The university is no longer a scholarly community, ... the sessions of the soviet are no longer ... sessions of the scholarly community for ... debates:" quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 245.
philosophy and political economy were removed from the law faculty to
the Philosophy Faculty. Here the example of the Austrian universities
was followed, where the government considered legal studies purely as a
training ground for civil service positions and wanted to expose law
students to practical knowledge, but not to the new theories of political
organization encountered in the chairs of natural law, political economy,
and philosophy. Six of the seven chairs in the new law faculty con­s­
isted of subjects in positive Russian law. This was surely one method
of protecting future state administrators from exposure to Western
theories and institutions. Three new chairs were added to the his­
torical-philological division of the Philosophy Faculty which reflect
the regime's new diplomatic involvement in the Balkans and the Near East:
the chairs of the history and literature of Slavonic dialects; Arabic,
Persian, and Turkish; and Mongolian and Tartar. Alterations in the
medical and physical-mathematical division of the Philosophy Faculty
were relatively minor.

16Ustroistvo iuridicheskikh fakul'tetov v raznykh inostrannykh
universitetakh i v osobennosti v Germanii," Zh.M.N.P., III (August, 1834),
330-334.

17The following table indicates the changes made from predominantly
theoretical to predominantly practical training in law:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1804 Statute</th>
<th>1835 Statute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs of Department of Moral-</td>
<td>Chairs of Law Faculty:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sciences:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Russian State Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scriptural Interpretation</td>
<td>Civil Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Church History</td>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Laws of Public Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Law</td>
<td>Financial and Tax Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Law</td>
<td>Jurisprudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient and Modern Law</td>
<td>Roman Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only provision illustrative of the Orthodoxy principle was the removal of theology courses from the jurisdiction of a single department and requiring them of students in all faculties. The principle of Orthodoxy, with its major emphasis on the duty of the faithful to serve in the calling appropriate to their inherited estate, served to bolster the Russian class system. In this sense, Orthodoxy was clearly antagonistic to the principle of the 1804 statute that inferior social status should be no barrier to university entrance. It was not Uvarov who introduced class restrictions into the university system. The first formal limitation came in 1827 when an Imperial Rescript barred serfs from university attendance. And the school system statute of 1828 indirectly affected the "all-class" principle regarding the universities by barring the mercantile and artisan classes from the gymnasium, in as much as a gymnasium education was a requirement for university entrance.

But it was under Uvarov that a consistent policy was established. On December 31, 1840, in a secret circular issued to the curators, Uvarov stated, "If on the one hand, the open development of intellectual talent is of undoubted value, then, on the other, this development ought to be proportioned according to the future calling in life of the citizen." Although a "decisive limit" or "hard rules" need not be established, he felt care should be taken to keep an "excessive aspiration for higher

See PSZ, XXVIII, 609-610; Sbornik postanovlenii, II (Part 1), 970-971.

18 Sbornik postanovlenii, II (Part 1), 971

19 Children of merchants and artisans could enter gymnasium only if they obtained special certificates.
subjects of study" from harming the social order as a result of the implanting of pompous learning in the minds of individuals who, because of lower class origins, would not meet with success in its practical application. The availability of higher education to such individuals could only "disappoint the hopes of insufficient parents and the dreamy expectations of youth." He asked the curators to suggest appropriate measures. In response, the curators of Dorpat, Odessa, and Kharkov regions thoroughly agreed with the minister on the need for class limitations without formal prohibitions. They proposed indirect restrictive measures such as denying fellowships and service rank privileges to members of the taxable classes, opening special professional schools for non-aristocrats, raising tuition, and demanding certification of material security from university entrants. The Kazan curator felt such restrictions were unnecessary because middle and lower class university graduates were using their training for occupations (as teachers and doctors) that were appropriate to their social origins anyway. Only Count Stroganov, the Moscow curator, opposed any limitations whatsoever. 20

The establishment of high tuition fees was first proposed by the Committee of Ministers in 1839. In June, 1845, after consulting the curators, Uvarov "having in view that to higher and middle institutions there is evidently increasing the rush of young people, in part born in the lower orders of society for whom education is valueless," proposed to the tsar that high tuitions be established for gymnasia

20Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 254.
and universities. On June 15 the tsar approved the establishment of tuitions of 40 rubles for Moscow and St. Petersburg universities and 20 rubles for the provincial universities. On December 31, 1848, in the reaction that followed the Western revolutions, he raised the fees to 50 and 40 rubles respectively. The only other important formal measure was the 1845 circular which barred freedmen from university entrance.

Riasanovsky comments that the concept of autocracy when applied to military matters emphasized external discipline and orderliness more than actual efficiency. Nicholas was as upset by an improperly buttoned uniform as he was by a poorly conceived military campaign. In the decrees concerning student discipline Nicholas showed a similar concern with the appearance of order and uniformity, but also with internal discipline. Rozhdestvenskii contends that Uvarov considered the strict supervision of students for the sake of molding their morals and external behavior to be an important means of avoiding the spread of social and political ideals antagonistic to the existing order.

The reorganization of the ways and means of supervision began at St. Petersburg in 1833 and was extended to the other universities both

---

21 The first university tuitions were established in 1817: 28.57 rubles in St. Petersburg and Moscow and 14.28 rubles in the provinces. In 1839 the Committee of Ministers had proposed raises to 100 and 50 rubles, respectively. In 1845, Uvarov proposed 40 and 20 rubles, which Nicholas wanted to hike to 50 and 40. Uvarov managed to persuade the tsar to agree to the lower figures for a three-year trial period. See Sbornik postonavlenii, II (Part 2), p. 624; Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 106; and Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 256.

22 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 257.
by separate and general measures. In a circular of May 27, 1833, to the curators, Uvarov noted "that internal discipline among ... students constitutes the main guarantee of the good order of the university, and that the authorities are obliged to take unremittingly all measures prescribed by law for the maintenance of this discipline." Upon Uvarov's recommendation, on December 5, 1833, the Committee of Ministers decided in favor of "the establishment in ... [St. Petersburg] university of unremitting, vigilant and at the same time judicious, moral and police supervision." They established a post for an inspector, either a civil or military official with no teaching responsibilities, who could continuously observe "the activities of students, their ways of thinking, which would be ... the heart of all their stirrings ..." The same position was established at Moscow University, and the following year instructions were issued to the Moscow inspector to serve as a model for similar orders to this official at the other universities. The 1835 statute incorporated these instructions, put the inspectors directly under the curators' authority, and charged the curators with writing more detailed instructions.23

Uvarov considered "external education" an essential ingredient in the moral training of students. The tsar himself looked after the students' proper observance of dress and personally punished students for minor uniform infractions, and then reprimanded the university authorities for negligence. In 1837, upon the tsar's order, the ministry

23 Ibid., pp. 258-259.
composed regulations regarding student uniforms. The minister maintained that as a result of wearing uniforms properly, "Students, sharply differing ... from pupils of middle schools and considering themselves as being in the service, would have a new stimulation to refrain from behavior which does not conform to the rules of good breeding and decorum."²⁴

If a stable society was the primary goal of the Orthodoxy and autocracy principles, a culturally and linguistically integrated society was the aim of the nationality tenet. Leaving aside Asiatic Russia, the Polish Kingdom, and Finland, the major obstacles to cultural integration in the early nineteenth century were the Polish provinces comprising the Vilno school region and the Baltic provinces comprising the Dorpat region. The Polish separatist movement was effectively suppressed by the punitive expedition sent by Nicholas in response to the 1830 revolution. The military suppression was followed, during the Lieven ministry, by the closing of Vilno university and the absorption of the Polish provinces into the White Russian school region. The

²⁴Quoted in Ibid., p. 259. The student uniform originally consisted of a blue coat with a red collar and blue cap with a pink band. The wearing of swords and three-cornered hats was prohibited except at Dorpat. In 1831 dark green replaced the blue of the coat, and in 1834 dark blue trim replaced the red. Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 103. I.A. Belov, a student at St. Petersburg during the late 1840's attests to the great importance attached to the rules of dress. His university inspector went to public festivals almost every evening searching for students in improper dress. Those he caught were often interned in the karster (school prison). Belov recalls watching the Imperial carriage go by at the Peterhof festival and being commanded by the tsar himself to button his collar: I.A. Belov, "Razskaz ob Nikolae Pavloviche," Istoricheskii Vestnik, XX (May, 1885), 485-486.
establishment of the University of Kiev in 1833 to take the place of Vilno University was only a continuation of the policy of Russifying Polish youth. The Kiev University statute was essentially similar to that passed for the four Great Russian universities in 1835. Only Dorpat University remained statutorily distinct.

Dorpat University retained many of the privileges granted all the universities in 1803-04, particularly juridical and censorship autonomy. It retained the exclusive right of the soviet to choose professors. Its uniqueness was also the result of the privileged position and exemption from Russification enjoyed by the German nobility of the Baltic states from the time Peter I conquered them. The Baltic Germans were allowed to speak their native tongue without interference, and the language of instruction at Dorpat was German and Protestant. Theology was taught exclusively. Unlike the other universities, Dorpat University was in a flourishing condition during the first decade and one-half of Nicholas' reign. Professors Escholtz (zoology), Engelhardt (mineralogy), Struve (astronomy), and Tatke (natural history) achieved outstanding reputations extending beyond the boundaries of Russia. The superior quality of instruction at Dorpat was recognized by the government, which chose that institution as the appropriate location for the professors' institute.

---


The existence of an educational institution which taught Lutheran
Theology, used the German language and escaped the regimentation of the
general university statute was clearly antagonistic to the principles
of Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality. In January 1837 measures
were taken to rectify this situation. First, the university was deprived
of control over the Dorpat school region. A decree of January 20 dissolved
the university's regional schools commission and replaced it with a
council composed of the curator (as chairman), the assistant curator,
the rector, the crown inspector of schools, and the director of Dorpat
Gymnasium. A second decree of January 22 proclaimed that after the
expiration of a three-year term, no native of the Baltic provinces could
be appointed a gymnasium teacher outside the Dorpat region without
demonstrating the ability to lecture in Russian. After the expiration
of five years, no one could be accepted as a student without passing a
severe examination demonstrating his profound knowledge of the Russian
language. This, however, was the extent of Uvarov's revision of the
university's status. He brought it in line with the statutory pro-
visions of the other universities, but he did not invoke the Orthodoxy
principle. He left Dorpat's Theology Faculty alone.27

Nicholas and Uvarov tempered the nationality principle with the
goal of advancing the academic quality of the universities. Uvarov
realized the Russian universities could benefit from the intellectual

27Uvarov was careful to maintain a satisfactory personal relation-
ship with Dorpat University. His visits to the institution in 1833 and
1848 produced a very favorable impression. See Petukhov, Imperatorskii,
I, 351-353.
resources of Western Europe. He was therefore willing to violate the intellectual quarantine in persuasion of the benefits the West had to offer. Vucinich says Uvarov justified this with the contention "that it was the sacred duty of Russian scholars to blend universal learning with the Russian spirit."\(^{28}\) Even the \textit{Zhurnal Mjnisterstva Narodnago Prosvieshceniia}, the Ministry's magazine, contained regular news articles about the West. For example, the March, 1834 issue contained sections entitled, "News About Foreign Educational Institutes," "On Periodical Publications in France," "New Foreign Books," and "The Contemporary State of Philosophy in France." The "News about Foreign Educational Institutions" section became a regular feature of the journal, containing items about the condition of such institutions and government policies taken to improve them. Another regular section beginning in 1835 featured historical articles on education in various countries. Although the Professors Institute at Dorpat was closed in 1838, the government sent sixty-four students and professors of various ranks abroad for study. Among the locations of study abroad were Berlin, Bonn, Paris, London, Konigsberg, Munich, Vienna, Warsaw, Gottingen, Dresden, Braunsweig, Turkey, Persia, Syria, and Egypt. The most important dispatches of students were those of eleven Chief Pedagogical Institute students of rural economy to the West in 1841, nine Pedagogical Institute students to Berlin in 1842, eleven students and teachers to Berlin in

\(^{28}\)Vucinich, p. 261.
1843 to prepare for chairs at Kiev University. To facilitate study abroad, in 1844 the Senate established a policy of granting free passports to students sent abroad, and in 1846 the tsar confirmed an opinion of the State Council that such students may count the time spent abroad as time in the civil service. According to Uvarov:

The scholarly travels of young people serve the uninterrupted union between fatherland and civilization ... and constantly maintain the Russian scholarly class and the Russian universities at the level of learning of nations which formerly outstripped us on the path of education.

One purpose of the dispatching of students abroad was the training of professors in the hope of eradicating the shortage of native professors which plagued the regime since 1800. St. Petersburg, Kharkov and Kazan suffered most from the shortage, often per force hiring unqualified teachers. Another means of dealing with this problem was the establishment in 1843 of the position of dotsemt or professor-in-training at the universities. The teacher shortage continued through the 1840's, but not in the dimensions of the previous reign.

29 O litsakh komandirovannykh, pp. 9-16.

30 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 251; Vucinich, p. 262.

31 Uvarov, Desiatilietie, p. 27.

32 This is the opinion of Rozhdestvenskii: Istoricheskii obzor, p. 252.
measures harnessed the universities more tightly in service to the state and society. Uvarov regarded one purpose of the universities to be "resolving questions about the adaptation of scientific first-principles to the technological demands of mechanical, manufacturing and agricultural industry." He saw to it that chairs of agronomy were established at every university and introduced public lectures at St. Petersburg and Moscow in rural economy, forestry, commercial accounting, technical chemistry, descriptive geometry, and machine building.

The Fall of Uvarov

When the French revolution of February 1848 broke out, the critics of the Russian universities gained importance and Uvarov lost prestige and independence of decision. The minister made a last-ditch effort to save the universities from severe repression. In March 1848 he circulated a letter to the curators asking them to assess the impact of the revolutionary events in their regions. They reported that there was nothing dangerous in the students' state of mind. In the autumn of 1848 Uvarov personally inspected Moscow University and reported:

I venture to say that not only does there happen not to be anything scandalous, but also that according to my observation and the opinion of many reliable observers ... the fermentation of minds has diminished in view of the European events. This reversal of ideas shows up more or less in all classes of society. It

---

33 Uvarov, Desiatilietie, p. 20.

34 Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 249.
seems that minds fixed on foreign horrors more dearly esteem national principles and institutions.\(^{35}\)

He concluded that, "It is possible to call universal the aversion for the sad phenomenon in Western Europe." He recommended relatively mild measures such as preventing students from publicly expressing their general ideas, condensing the program of instruction in political and juridical sciences, making entrance examinations stricter to reduce the number of students, and putting more emphasis on the quality of their moral and academic training. In March 1849 an article giving statistical and historical data in defense of the universities against their critics appeared anonymously in the journal, Sovremennik. This brought Uvarov a royal reprimand in April, after which he admitted the article was written by the director of the Chief Pedagogical Institute, I.I. Davydov, with his (Uvarov's) complete approval. There followed the tsar's order of April 21 prohibiting the publication of articles defending or criticizing the universities.\(^{36}\)

Essentially a tool of the tsar's impulses, Uvarov carried out the measures ordered by the ruler, including the prohibition of travel abroad for study, the requirement that professors deliver signed lithographs of their lectures to the public library, the intensifying of censorship. Uvarov justified this unwilling compliance with the emperor's orders as sacrifices which would redeem the main as a sailor throws

\(^{35}\)Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 261.

\(^{36}\)Ibid., pp. 261-262.
expensive cargo overboard to save the ship. Such measures, however, were "only the beginning of those exclusive measures which during the time of the following minister paralyzed the normal working of the statute of 1835." 38

Uvarov himself was paralyzed by a stroke in September 1849 and in October the minister resigned. He continued to hold on to his positions as a member of the State Council and president of the Academy of Sciences.

38 Ibid., p. 262.
Contemporary descriptions of the St. Petersburg curators of this period (Prince A.M. Dondukov-Korsakov [1832-42], Prince G.P. Volkonsky [1842-45], and Senator Musin-Pushkin [1845-56] are fragmentary and incomplete. However it may be assumed that they and the inspectors who served under them fit Bunnett's description as the "most tested supporters" of the official system.¹ Reflecting Nicholas' concern with external discipline, the infrequent visits which the curators made to the university were mainly to inspect student dress and review marching exercises.

The rectors of the period had no authority in important matters of policy, but Rectors Shul'gin (1835-39) and Pletnev (1840-56) put their rhetorical eloquence at the service of the tsar and his ideology. In an address to the students of March 1838, Shul'gin admonished them to avoid the pitfalls of "education of the mind without education of the heart, purity of taste without purity of morals, ... visionary fits of

¹Bunnett, Distinguished Persons, pp. 251-252.
fantasy without the mature activity of the intellect ..." 2 In his report upon leaving the rectorship, echoing the Uvarovian triad, he defined the university's purpose as sending into society young people with love for the fatherland, firm Orthodox convictions, and "the most respectful devotion to the throne." 3

The name of Rector P.A. Pletnev is associated with this period of the university's history in the same sense that Curator Borozdin is connected with the preceding period — as the single official whose period in office almost coincides with the term of the minister himself. Pletnev, the literary executor of Alexander Pushkin, enjoyed less actual authority than the curator or the chief inspector of students and was seldom consulted by either in important questions. 4

The following quotations and paraphrases from his annual speeches to the general assembly of the university demonstrate Pletnev's ability to echo and elaborate upon the doctrines of Orthodoxy, autocracy, and nationality: Chateaubriand, the greatest nineteenth-century thinker, respected "truth, legitimacy and faith." "In such a sense the university understands scholarship and in such a spirit it transmits it to the young

2 I.P. Shul'gin, O nachalie, p. 30.

3 Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, p. 82.

4 Semenov-Tian-Shanskii, a St. Petersburg student from 1845 until 1848, noted that Pletnev was liked and respected by students. This may be a reliable reflection of student opinion, but Semenov-Tian-Shanskii is certainly exaggerating when he describes Pletnev's "great authority with the government." Leningradskii Universitet, I, 44.
generation. In studying philosophy, law, politics, history and natural science, we are guided by sacred Revelation, the indications of sovereign Authority and the experience of centuries. Here Scholarship is the light of wisdom, the founder of the social order, and the guardian of belief, devotion to the Monarch and love for the Fatherland." Pletnev eloquently expounded upon each tenet: Orthodoxy: Christian faith strengthens science and gives it direction and purpose. "Warm and constant love" of a subject and firm, yet "humble" judgment serve scholarship, whereas "cold sophism" and the "spirit of negation" corrupt it. It is not science which causes "enmity between classes" and "enflames passions and agitates society." "These are the fruits of false doctrine, the corruption of ideas, the neglect of duty, and hardness of conscience." Moral education is as much a university's task as intellectual development. Moral and religious feeling must be at the basis of education. Autocracy: The needs of the state and society should inspire the teaching of philosophy, history, law, and natural science. "... the central aim of higher education" is to inculcate "a clear understanding of civil obligations and a preference of the general good over personal good." In addition to developing intellects, the university serves to develop the traits of loyalty, obedience, and faithfulness which are essential in state servants. Nationality: The university's spirit reflects the spirit of the nation. The enlightened mind becomes sensitive to the hopes and aspirations of the nation to which it belongs. The patriotic spirit stimulates intellectual elevation. Society is strengthened by rules which arise "naturally" from its history, character, needs and
individuality. 5

It is difficult to distinguish between Pletnev's subservience to higher authority and his personal educational views. His contention that the "university is a central place for the higher education of all classes" and should be open to all Russian subjects with the necessary educational background is not necessarily a contradiction of official policy, which favored class restrictions behind a window-dressing of the rhetorical justification of the Petrine concept of careers open to talent. 6 In the annual address of 1849 he was careful to note that the university serves to educate students for a future appropriate to their station in life. 7 It was no contradiction of Uvarovian policy to state that the university must keep abreast of the "contemporary state of science." 8 If the views of Pletnev ever come to the surface it is in his advocacy of encyclopedic education at a time when the mushrooming Imperial bureaucracy demanded specialists. He praised universities in general for joining together the study of man in his physical, moral, and spiritual environment with that of the fates of civilizations, laws of nations, and Divine revelation. To his mind, an education which was too specialized could only restrict and deaden the mind. 9


6Ibid., 1843, p. 5; 1842, p. 14.

7Ibid., 1849, p. 9.

8Ibid., 1843, p. 5.

9Ibid., 1842, p. 9.
Rector Shul'gin reported in 1840 that by the beginning of the academic year, 1836-37, the 1835 university statute had been implemented. Both Shul'gin and Pletnev have left first-hand accounts of the change in the area of competence of the university soviet, stripped of its authority over the school region and of actual governing power over the university outside of purely academic affairs. During Shul'gin's rectorship, the soviet, meeting as a whole or separately as faculties or special committees, dealt with the evaluation of writings presented to it by the curator, the composition of procedures for annual examinations and the earning of academic degrees, the examination of university applicants, the implementation of article #103 of the 1835 statute regarding the "annual tasks" of students, the examination and certification of domestic tutors, and the composition of the annual schedule of courses and examinations. The major decisions in these matters were presented to the curator for approval. Pletnev's annual reports of the 1840's present a clear picture of the functioning of the soviet and the faculty sessions, demonstrating that the provisions of the 1835 statutes were fully enforced. By his account, the soviet, consisting only of professors who held the doctorate, during its regular fortnightly sessions made decisions regarding the application of existing rules only. The consideration of rules changes was delegated to special committees appointed by the soviet. These committees also planned such programs as public lectures. Problems demanding specialized investigation were usually

10 Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, pp. 6-9.
11 Ibid., pp. 37-42.
assigned to individual professors. All final decisions were decided by majority vote of the soviet as a whole. The soviet examined works competing for the Academy of Science's Demidov Prize and meet with non-voting faculty members in a "weekly committee" which examined applicants for certification as public school teachers and domestic tutors. The preparation of course schedules, published at the beginning of each academic year, was done by the individual faculties before approval by the soviet. Apparently, major decisions were submitted to the curator, and often the minister, for approval. For example, a new set of rules for entrance and final examinations written by the soviet did not go into effect until approved by Uvarov, whereas such matters as the establishment of required courses and prerequisites were entirely the soviet's concern. The faculties, which met fortnightly, handled such matters as the examination of candidates for higher degrees and the evaluation of books sent to them by the ministerial office.12

Although the universities were harnessed to the service of the state more tightly than during any previous period of history, St. Petersburg University, Chteniia po torzhestvennom aktie Imperatorskago S. Peterburinskago Universiteta (SPE, 1841), pp. 60-62, 64, 67; Akty, 1842, pp. 29-31; 1843, pp. 37-38. The following is a paraphrase of a typical annual Rector's report on soviet activities. The soviet delegated to committees (for preliminary consideration) three matters submitted to it by the ministry. (1) New rules regarding public lectures were drawn up, confirmed by the ministry, and put into effect, allowing certain classes of people (e.g. writers, professors, and members of the Academy of Sciences) to deliver courses of public lectures without preliminary examination by the university. (2) Another committee worked out a completed project for the reorganization of the distribution of courses, which have been submitted to the ministry for coordination with the projects of other universities. (3) A third committee is examining the rules of other universities concerning professors' duties with respect to pedagogical students. Akty, 1842, pp. 27-29.
Petersburg University at least gave lip-service to the tradition of encyclopaedic education. All students were required to take a minimum number of courses outside their faculty of specialization. By law, theology was required of all students. And, in a series of rules passed during 1836-37, the St. Petersburg soviet required a course in administrative law of all Philosophy Faculty students; Russian literature, philosophy, and one modern language of physics-mathematics students; principles of international law for history students, history of Roman law for ancient philology students; and Roman literature, medieval and modern history, Russian history, political economy, and statistics of law students.13

But primarily, the curricular policies of the university were geared to meet the needs of the state administration. This was particularly true of the development of programs in Eastern studies, technical sciences, financial sciences, and Pedagogy. After the 1835 statute was promulgated Kazan University became the center for Oriental studies in Russia. However, as specific governmental needs arose, St. Petersburg University was increasingly asked to answer them. In 1839, to correct the lack of Rumanian-speaking officials in the Foreign Ministry's Asian Department, the university established a chair of Moldavo-Wallachian in the Oriental Studies section of the history-philology department of the Philosophy Faculty. In 1844, to meet the need for educated administrators in the Transcausus region, three Transcaucasian languages

13Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, pp. 6-9.
were added to the curriculum: Tatar, Georgian, and Armenian.\textsuperscript{14} After the 1845 transfer of the Kazan curator, Musin-Pushkin, to St. Petersburg, Kazan University declined as a center for Oriental studies and St. Petersburg rose proportionately in importance.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1843 the Law Faculty combined several of its courses with courses offered previously by both departments of the Philosophy Faculty and opened a Department of Financial Studies, composed of the following chairs: Law of European States, Russian State Law, Financial Law, Political Economy and Statistics, Natural History, Technology, Agronomy, and Architecture.\textsuperscript{16} Students of this department were required to take

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14}By 1849, the enrollment of students in the Transcausian languages curriculum reached twenty. Shul'gin, \textit{Kratkii otchet}, p. 13; \textit{Akty}, 1850, p. 12; Grigor'ev, \textit{Imperatorskii}, pp. 117-118, 123.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15}The efforts of Musin-Pushkin to develop St. Petersburg University into an Eastern studies center was brought to fruition during the 1850's. In 1851, to meet the Justice Ministry's need for court and prison interpreters in Bessarabia, the government sent three pupils from Kishinev gymnasium to study at St. Petersburg. A Ukase of October 22, 1854 established a third Faculty at St. Petersburg, the Faculty of Oriental Languages, and ordered the transfer of the Eastern Studies facilities to St. Petersburg from Kazan and the Richilieu Lycee in Odessa. The new Faculty, opened in 1855, offered Arabic, Persian, Turko-Tatar, Mongol-Kalmuk, Chinese, Hebrew, Armenian, Georgian, and Manchurian and employed twelve professors and three lecturers. \textit{Materialy dlia istorii fakul'teta vostochnykh iazykov} (SPB, 1905-09) provides four volumes of documentary material on the Faculty of Oriental Languages.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{16}The chair of Technology, which had been vacant up to that time, now went to Professor Voskresenskii. The Chair of Architecture remained vacant until 1851, when it was occupied by Lieutenant-Colonel Krasovskii of the Communication Corps. The name of the section was changed to the Department of Administrative Sciences in 1860. Grigor'ev, \textit{Imperatorskii}, pp. 119-120.
\end{flushright}
the following outside courses: Russian civil and criminal law, Russian history, universal history,done modern language, and, of course, theology. In 1843 six students, whose education was paid for by the Ministry of Finances, completed a special course at St. Petersburg University for the training of teachers of technical sciences. Beyond normal university subjects, they took courses in applied mechanics, technical and analytical chemistry, architecture, machine design, and drafting. The Minister, who saw a permanent need for such teachers, proposed the establishment of a permanent program. The program was reopened in 1849 and six students were selected from the physics-mathematics department of the Philosophy Faculty. The students received scholarships in return for their written promise to spend six years after graduation teaching technical sciences. Professors Chebyshev and Il' enkov taught them technical chemistry and technology, and two officers from the Corps of Communications came to teach drawing, machine design, architecture, and construction.17

Changes were made in the offerings at the Chief Pedagogical Institute to ensure that it would more efficiently meet the needs of Russian public education. In December 1838 the Institute opened a second division of thirty pupils in training to become district school teachers. Originally a four year experimental program, the ministry obtained the tsar's permission for renewal in 1842. The purpose of the program was to make up for the lack of training in advanced teaching

17 Akty, 1850, pp. 12-13; Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 116-117.
methods of district teachers, who were recruited directly from gymnasium. In 1847, the division was closed because "district schools are sufficiently supplied with teachers from gymnasium and those pupils of the preparatory courses of the Chief Pedagogical Institute who do not have the ... talents to become distinguished ... teachers of gymnasium." In 1847 a ukase limited the Institute to two faculties — physics-mathematics and history-philology — because its Law Faculty proved to be too expensive and useless since these disciplines were not taught in gymnasium. In 1849, in light of the ability of improved gymnasium to fully prepare students for the Institute's regular program, the Institute's preliminary course was abolished.

In 1836, St. Petersburg University became a center for the training of native Poles for teaching and administrative positions in the Kingdom of Poland. Those in training to become teachers took a regular university course, but after 1845 they were required to take Old Church Slavonic. For the law students two new chairs were established: Polish jurisprudence, and Polish criminal and administrative law. In accordance with the nationality principle, in 1845 a special teacher of Russian was appointed to instruct the Polish students. Alexandrov University sent Finnish students to St. Petersburg to perfect their Russian. In 1845, Russian language became compulsory for all foreign students attending...

18 Quoted in Rozhdestvenskii, Istoricheskii obzor, p. 267.
19 Ibid., p. 266.
20 Akty, 1846, pp. 23-26, 1848, p. 31; Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 118-119.
the university. 21

Several practical measures were taken in the 1840's to improve financial aid to students and make more selective the process of admitting students and hiring new teachers. The curator gained the authority to make funds available for students who for financial reasons find it difficult to continue their education. In 1847, the category of private auditors was abolished and all civil servants and members of the free classes who wished to attend university lectures in fields related to their careers had to have the rector's permission (after presenting to him documents evidencing their social origins) and, if civil servants, the permission of their superiors. In the same year, applicants for the position of lecturer were required to take an examination showing their proficiency in the subject they wanted to teach, defend a dissertation, deliver a sample lecture, and in cases of equal performance of these tasks, demonstrate proficiency in classical languages. 22

University Progress:
Faculty, Students, Laboratories, and Libraries

The expansion of the professorial ranks did not keep up with the pace of the earlier period. The number of professors increased by 11 (from 21 to 32) during the nine years of the preceding period, but only by five (from 32 to 37) during the 16 years of the Uvarov period. The proportion of Russian professors in 1848 remained approximately the same

21Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, p. 120.

22Akty, 1847, p. 49; 1848, pp. 29-31.
as that of 1833 -- two-thirds. Of the 37 professors in 1848, 25 were natives of Russia, two of the Kingdom of Poland, one of Persia, one of Egypt, and nine of Germany. Distribution according to faculty hardly changed at all. The Law Faculty employed 10 professors, the physics-mathematics department of the Philosophy Faculty employed 11 and the history-philology department employed 15. Fifteen of the total were products of government-sponsored study-abroad programs: six came from the Professors Institute at Dorpat, three from the law program of the II Division of His Majesty's Own Chancery begun in 1827, and six from special programs established during the Uvarov period. Three-fourths of the total were newcomers, that is, they were hired or promoted to professorial rank during the Uvarov period; all but one were newcomers in both the law and science faculties, and two-thirds of the history-philology faculty were new. Two-thirds of the total were products of the Russian university system.23

Of the nine new professors in the Law Faculty, five were products of the programs for advanced study abroad established in 1828. K. I. Devolin, Ordinary Professor of Civil Law, came to St. Petersburg in 1844. The son of a poor priest in Viatka province, he studied at a local seminary before entering the Moscow Theological Academy. From there he was drafted into the 1828 program at St. Petersburg for training law

professors. After training at St. Petersburg he studied at the University of Berlin from 1829-1832, where he received the doctorate. Upon his return he taught at Kiev University until his transfer to the Law Faculty at St. Petersburg, at which time he had fifteen publications to his credit — primarily historical works on Russian law between the reigns of Ivan III and Catherine II. The man who entered the Chair of Jurisprudence in 1836, Ordinary Professor Ivanovskii, received his first degree from Vilno University, then entered the Professors Institute at Dorpat, where he earned the doctorate before going abroad for additional study. The other products of the study-abroad programs were Dr. Kolmykov, Ordinary Professor of Russian State Law; Dr. Barshev, Ordinary Professor of Criminal Law; and Dr. Kranichfeld, Ordinary Professor of Financial Law; all of whom joined the teaching staff in 1836. The two chairs of Polish Law, established in 1840, were occupied by two graduates of the University of Warsaw. Professor Zabrowski earned his Master's degree at Warsaw before serving on Speransky's codification commission; he was able to combine his academic training with his practical experience in his teaching. Professor Gube studied law at universities in Germany before earning the doctorate at Warsaw. Before leaving the Speransky commission to join the St. Petersburg faculty, he had publications in both Polish and Latin to his credit.

---

24 Akty, 1856, p. 23.

The Russian, Slavonic, and Eastern studies curriculum employed 10 of the history-philology department's 15 professors. Five of the professors in this curriculum were newcomers, of which two were products of study-abroad programs. Two of these programs were created specifically to train occupants of the newly-created chairs of Slavonic and Turko-Tatar. In 1839, Kharkov University sent Assistant Professor I.I. Sreznevskii on a three-year tour abroad on a stipend of 4,000 paper rubles per year to train as a professor of Slavonic. Sreznevskii visited Austria, Italy, Germany, Poland, and Turkey before returning to Kharkov in 1842 to earn the doctorate while teaching Slavonic. In 1847, he came to the Chair of Slavonic at St. Petersburg as an assistant professor, replacing Professor I.N. Preis, who himself had studied on a three year tour of Slavonic countries before occupying the chair in 1842. Preis, in turn, had replaced Professor Kastorskii, professor of Slavonic from 1838 to 1839, who had graduated from the Chief Pedagogical Institute and made a study trip to Berlin. Professor I.O. Mukhlinskii, who taught Turkish from 1836-1846, had graduated from Vilno University and the Professors' Institute. He went from the Institute to St. Petersburg University and then to the Near East for three years to study Oriental languages. Upon his death in 1846, his classes in Turkish were taken over by Extraordinary Professor Wilhelm Dittel, a product of Eastern studies at Kazan University and a three-year tour of Turkey, Asia Minor, Persia, Syria, and Egypt. The man who taught Persian, I.V. Petrashevskii, studied at Vilno, the Professors Institute, and the Foreign Ministry's
Oriental Institute. After a study tour in Constantinople he served in several Near Eastern consulates before joining the St. Petersburg staff in 1842. The other two newcomers came to the university directly from the Foreign Ministry's Asiatic Department. Professor I.A. D. Ginkulov, who came to teach Moldavo-Wallachian in 1840, had published a Rumanian grammar and a selection of readings from Rumanian prose and poetry.

Extraordinary Professor Tantavi, an Egyptian scholar who entered the Foreign Ministry in 1847, began teaching Arabic in 1847.26 Clearly, the entire staff of this curriculum combined a rich background of specialized training, professional experience, and contact with the cultures of Slavdom and the Near East.

Of the four new professors in the general studies curriculum of the history-philology department, three were graduates of Russian Universities. Professor M.S. Kutorga, who taught ancient and medieval history graduated from St. Petersburg in 1835 and immediately began teaching. He became a corresponding member of the academy of Sciences and was promoted to professor's rank at the university in 1838. Extraordinary Professor of Political Economy and Statistics from 1835-1847 was V.S. Poroshin, another St. Petersburg graduate who attended the Professors' Institute and studied at Berlin from 1832 until 1835. Between 1839 and 1843 he made another trip abroad to conduct research in Germany, Switzerland, France, Spain, England, and Belgium.27


27 Poroshin resigned in 1847 and was replaced by Ordinary Professor
I.B. Steinman was promoted to assistant professor of antiquity and archeology in 1847. He had entered the university after graduating from it and conducting advanced study abroad. Professor F.K. Freitag came to St. Petersburg from the teaching staff of the Richilieu Lycee in Odessa, where he achieved a scholarly reputation by his publications on the classics.28

Ten new professors joined the mathematics-science department of the Philosophy Faculty. All were at least as competent as the men they replaced, and many were more so. The one carry-over from the preceding era was that period's most outstanding faculty member, Prof. of Physics Heinrich F.E. Lenz. In 1840 Professor Shikhovskii of the Imperial Moscow Medical-Surgical Academy filled the vacancy in the Chair of Botany created by the death of Professor Bongard. He was a product of Moscow University, the Professors Institute, and the University of Vienna.

I.I. Gorlov, who graduated from Moscow, received his doctorate from Dorpat in 1838 after attending the Professors Institute, and served as extra-ordinary professor of Statistics and Political Economy at Kazan from 1838 until 1847. He had conducted statistical research in the West and conducted statistical surveys in the provinces of Perm, Orenburg, Astrakhan, Tambov, and Nizhnii-Novgorod.

28 Pletnev, Pervoe Dwadtsatipiatilietie, pp. 86-87, Akty, 1848, pp. 18-21. For the comments of those who attended the lectures of the most famous temporary professor who taught at the university during this period (from 1834-35) N. Gogol, see Leningradskii Universitet, pp. 83-86, and Brodskii, ed., Gogol v vosposminaniakh sovremennikov, pp. 598-599. According to one student, Gogol's lectures in world history were "very tedious." Apparently Gogol was as bored as his students, for the same student noticed the professor's "sleepy eyes." Another student had this comment after attending Gogol's last lecture: The professor looked like a "poor, oppressed official from whom was demanded work beyond his natural abilities." At his second lecture on medieval history, Gogol arrived "sufficiently late" and began boring his listeners by describing the great Asian migrations "slowly, lifelessly, and obscurely.... The entire lecture lasted twenty minutes."
When Professor Sokolov of Mineralogy retired in 1845, he was replaced by a Colonel of Mining Engineers and Ordinary Professor at Kiev, E.K. Hoffman. Dotsent P.A. Chebyshev, who held a master's degree from Moscow, was promoted to Assistant Professor of Mathematics in 1847. Vucinich ranks Chebyshev along with Ostrogradskii and Lobachevskii among those who "towered over their Russian peers by the originality and impact of their achievements in varied fields of mathematics." His first works on the theory of numbers achieved immediate recognition in Europe as valuable contributions. His work was facilitated by "the accelerated growth of mathematics in St. Petersburg University and elsewhere in the 1830's and 1840's." When he entered the university, the mathematics department "already enjoyed high prestige because of the scholarly achievements of two of its most illustrious professors — Victor Buniakowskii and O.I. Somov." The latter represented a new trend of impoverished nobility seeking occupations in the liberal professions and scholarship. Somov joined the faculty in 1841 to teach applied mathematics and algebra. In 1847 he received his doctorate and was promoted to extraordinary professor. According to Ostrogradskii, Somov's Foundations of the Theory of Elliptical Functions was "the first full and systematic study in Russian of one of the most important and most difficult branches of integral calculus." In the mid-1840's, Somov took over the duties of

29 Vucinich, pp. 309, 327.

30 Quoted in Ibid., p. 327.
Assistant Professor A.J. Chizhov, a student of higher mathematics who worked under Ostrogradskii and became well-known for his *Steam Engines, A Biography of John Watt, and A Deliberation about the General Theory of Equilibrium.* Assistant Professor of Agronomy Usov began teaching in 1836 after having graduated from St. Petersburg University, worked in industry, joined the Free Agricultural Society, and edited the *Agricultural Gazette.* Ordinary Professor of Astronomy A.N. Savich graduated from Moscow University and studied for the doctorate at the Professors Institute under the famous astronomer Struve. In 1836, he joined an expedition studying the problem of the different levels of the Black and Caspian Seas. Then he returned to Dorpat to serve as observer of the University observatory before joining the St. Petersburg faculty in 1839. The chairs of technology and chemistry were occupied by Ordinary Professor A.A. Voskresenskii and Assistant Professor Il'enkov. Voskresenskii was one of the Chief Pedagogical Institute pupils sent abroad by the government. He studied at the University of Berlin under Rose, Magnus, and Mitscherlich and at Giessen under Liebge, which constituted, in Vucinich's words, an "impressive" background. His pioneer work at St. Petersburg University earned him the title, "grandfather

---

31 The most accessible treatment of Somov is contained in N.N. Poliakhov, "Razvitie Kafedry Mekhaniki v Peterburgskom-Leningradskom Universitete," *Ocherki,* 1, 21-23.


33 Vucinich, pp. 334-335.
of Russian chemistry." Il'enkov was another product of government-sponsored study in Germany, France, Italy, and Switzerland. Professor S.S. Kutorga, another Professors Institute graduate, joined the Chair of Zoology in 1837 and became one of the most "talented and interesting" professors on the faculty. The newcomers represented a definite improvement over the already outstanding faculty of the Borozdin period.

Student enrollment, which had tripled during 1823-33, again doubled during the first decade of the Uvarov period, as the following chart indicates:

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Self-Supporting</th>
<th>Crown Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total enrollment increased to 731 in 1848. While St. Petersburg

---

34 Leningradskii Universitet, I, 41.

enrollment increased by over 400% during the Uvarov period, enrollment for the university system as a whole increased by only 100%. Only Kiev University, whose enrollment increased by 300%, even approached St. Petersburg's rate of expansion. During the Uvarov period, the average yearly increase for St. Petersburg was approximately 37%, as compared with 13% during the previous period. Since the number of state students remained relatively steady, this expansion can be attributed to the increasing numbers of gymnasium students qualified for and interested in university attendance. The following table shows the number of applicants for admission and the proportion of those who passed the entrance examination during the years of greatest expansion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined for Entrance</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number accepted</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What proportion of students who entered the university ever graduated? The following chart will illustrate the changes over both the Borozdin

---

36 Based on statistics contained in Ikonnikov, no. 11, p. 102.

37 Aktv. 1845, p. 27; 1847, p. 48; 1849, p. 31.
and the Uvarov periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly the number of graduates increased along with the number of entrants. Of those who entered the university during the Borozdin period, approximately 50% graduated. Under Uvarov the proportion reached nearly 60%. Since there is no evidence of annual or final examinations having become any more lenient during the latter period, it may be assumed that students who entered the university were better prepared for university training than during the proceeding period.\(^\text{38}\)

In comparison with the other universities, St. Petersburg ranked second to last in quantity of graduates in 1832 and rose to first by 1849, as the following comparative table indicates.\(^\text{39}\)

---

\(^{38}\)Ibid., Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 83-84, 104; Shul'gin, Kratkii otchet, p. 49.

\(^{39}\)Comparative lists, Zh.M., 1834-56. The figures for the other universities do not include medical graduates.
TABLE 10
NUMBER OF UNIVERSITY NON-MEDICAL GRADUATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below shows the shift from a relative equilibrium in enrollment between the law and history-philology departments of the preceding
period to the predominance of the Law Faculty in the period of the application of the 1835 statute:

TABLE II
NUMBER OF GRADUATES FROM ST, PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Physics-Mathematics</th>
<th>History-Philology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 Grigor'ev, Imperatorskii, appendix, pp. lxvii-ci.
The period of tremendous expansion in graduates produced by the law Faculty, 1847-52, was partly the result of the establishment of the Financial Sciences curriculum, which graduated 6 in 1845, 12 in 1846, 31 in 1847, 29 in 1848, 36 in 1849, 50 in 1850, 38 in 1851, and 52 (over half the Law Faculty graduates) in 1852. Of the 197 history-philology graduates from 1839 to 1852, 79 were graduated from the Oriental studies curriculum. 41

It seems clear from these statistics that the government was successful in tapping talent into the programs prescribed to answer its most pressing personnel needs. Uvarov achieved only partial success, however, in keeping that talent uncontaminated with non-gentry social origins. The table below indicates that during the Uvarov period peasant students were virtually non-existent at St. Petersburg University, gentlemen's sons predominated, and the middle classes were represented by about one-third of the student body. These proportions were not significantly altered during the entire period. 42

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gentry</th>
<th>Raznochintsy</th>
<th>Peasantry</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th>Merchants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 *Leningradskii Universitet*, I, 7.
The moving of the university into the more spacious Twelve Colleges building in August 1837, and the expenditure of considerable sums facilitated the expansion of the library and laboratory facilities, as appendix tables 13-20 indicate.43

The St. Petersburg University Library increased by a rate of approximately 1,000 volumes per year, which is slower than that of the preceding period. It remained by far the smallest of the university libraries. But if the numbers of volumes in 1849 of the Chief Pedagogical Institute and the Rumiantsev Museum are added to the university library total, the combined figure is 86,307, which ranks second only to the Kiev University figure for that year of 87,374. Thus, the library facilities open to St. Petersburg students kept pace with the rapid expansion of the other university libraries, whose contents generally doubled during the Uvarov period. The size of the physics kabinet doubled between 1835 and 1850, but still ranked below those of Kharkov, Kazan, and Dorpat. The zoology kabinet expanded only slightly, and was outdistanced by those at all the other universities. The Mineralogical kabinet doubled in size and retained its rank of third among six universities. Despite the tenfold increase of the medals kabinet, this

43 The move to the Twelve Colleges Building is detailed in M.V. Iogansen, "Istoriia zdaniia 12 kollegii vo vtoroi polovinie XVIII veka i pervoi polovine XIX veka," Ocherki, XXX, I, 184-199; Chtoniia, p. 65; Grigor’ev, Imperatorskii, pp. 82-83, 114-115; Pletnev, Pervoe dvadsati-pistilietie, p. 71. The tables included in the appendix are compiled from statistics taken primarily from Krusenstern, pp. 164-165; Shul’gin, Kratkii otchet, pp. 65-68, M.N. Tikhominov, ed., Istoriia Moskovskogo Universiteta (Moscow, 1955), I, 126-128; and Zh.M.N.P., 1834-1850.
facility ranked far behind the other universities. The most obvious growth occurred in the chemistry laboratory, which rose from fifth in size among the other universities to by far the largest.

The Quality of Instruction

As a center for original research and the training of future scholars and scientists, the St. Petersburg's mathematics-natural science department was unexcelled in Russia. Several important schools of chemistry and mathematics, contributing to Russian and European scholarship in those fields, have their origins in the work of this faculty during the Pletnev rectorship. By training several important scholars of the future, Professor Chebyshev and Buniakovskii laid the groundwork for the "St. Petersburg school of mathematics." Significantly, Chebyshev's first introduction to mathematics occurred on native soil — at the University of Moscow in the late 1830's -- and his doctorate was earned at the University of St. Petersburg in 1849. His lectures in analytical mechanics and probability theory combined profundity of content with lucidity of expression. His course in probability was one of the best of its time.\footnote{This is the opinion of V.V. Mavrodin, the soviet historian of Leningrad University and the writer of the most recent history of that institution. The evaluation of the quality of instruction offered here relies heavily on the opinions of Mavrodin and the first hand-observations of Semenov-Tian-Shanskii, a student whose views are expressed critically and judiciously.} The combined efforts of Chebyshev and Somov led to the thorough and intensive development of "mechanics, both in its
theoretical and practical aspects."\(^{45}\) Somov's work in the field of mechanics earned him the Demidov book prize of the Academy of Sciences.\(^{46}\)

Professor Voskresenskii earned the nickname, "grandfather of Russian chemistry," for his qualities as a teacher, rather than a scientist. Testifying to the prosperity of Russian university training as well as the profitability of the government's study-abroad programs, Voskresenskii was a product of the Chief Pedagogical Institute and advanced study in Berlin. He published original studies on the composition of acids and alkaloids, but "his real contribution was as a teacher, for which he was justifiably praised, particularly for his diligent effort to keep his students informed of the mass of new chemical ideas. He expanded upon the contributions of Liebig and Berzelius by "absorbing the provocative suggestions of ... the representatives of the French school' in chemistry."\(^{47}\) Semenov-Tian-Shanskii, who heard his lectures in organic chemistry, received Voskresenskii's personal guidance in the chemistry laboratory. He confirms Vucinich's observation that Voskresenskii was a respected teacher.

Semenov-Tian-Shanskii, a student in the late forties, who does not hesitate to criticize the unfavorable characteristics of his teachers,


\(^{46}\)Regarding the significance of this award, Vucinich testifies that the members of the Academy were by 1860 a "true scientific elite." Thus, a work undoubtedly had to meet high scientific standards to earn the prize. See Vucinich, p. 360.

\(^{47}\)Ibid., 334-335; See also Leningradskii universitet, I, 41-2.
however petty, found only two weak links in the department, and they were not a result of academic incompetence. In his view, Professor Savich of astronomy was a "talented astronomer" as well as a kind and compassionate man, but his lectures were inadequate because, due to his absent-mindedness, he often repeated material discussed in past lectures or, contrariwise, left significant gaps. When he wrote illustrations on the blackboard, he frequently blocked the students' view so that they could not see what he was trying to explain. Nevertheless, he was a good guide for students capable of independent work.  

Professor Hoffman of mineralogy and geology, famous for his research with the Mining Engineers in the Urals, knew his subject well, but his poor knowledge of Russian often evoked laughter from his listeners. Most students found it possible to comprehend his lectures in crystallography because he used models but his mineralogy lectures were, in Semenov-Tian-Shanskii's words, "simply incredible": he explained minerals in broken Russian without demonstrating them or showing examples, thanks to the poor state of the mineralogical collection. He attended to new acquisitions diligently, but this didn't benefit his generation of students. His geology lectures were well written but poorly translated into Russian.

But the study of geology at St. Petersburg was greatly advanced by the zoology professor, S.S. Kutorga. He was the first Russian to

48 Savich often spent the night in the observatory, taking his own pillow with him, and showed up at classes the next day with pillow-stuffing on his head. Leningradskii universitet, I, 42-43.
become a follower of Murchison, the well-known Scottish geologist who made the first accurate geological survey of Russia, and he truly revolutionized Russian geology. According to Vucinich, Kutorga was both a "pioneer in geological field work and a master in the popularization of the new scientific point of view; he conducted a series of highly popular geological trips to various localities in the St. Petersburg province." Kutorga's popularizing efforts contributed with equal value to the study of zoology. According to Mavrodin, he was the first Russian scholar to turn his students to the study of Darwin's theories, which he gave a "judicious, objective appraisal." According to Vucinich, Kutorga "lectured on such broad and varied subjects as zootomy, zoology, paleontology, and anatomy" and "was widely acclaimed as a public lecturer and writer of popular scientific articles and monographs." According to Senenov-Tian-Shanski, he was "the most talented and interesting" and one of the most popular professors on the faculty. He made the

---

49 Vucinich, p. 345. According to Vucinich, Russian geology underwent an important stage of popularization, but no truly first-rate geologists were produced. Part of the problem was government censorship, which repressed Charles Lyell's modern geological writings because they attributed the earth's historical development solely to forces.

50 Leningradskii Universitet, I, 252. Kutorga was another product of undergraduate study at St. Petersburg and graduate work at the Professors Institute.

51 Vucinich, p. 331.

52 Leningradskii universitet, I, 41.
 zoology kabinet into an adequate research tool, added several courses to the curriculum which expanded the limits of university study in his field, and generally supplemented his lectures with practical exercises such as microscopic observations. Professor Shikhovskii was not particularly gifted as a botanist, but he was devoted to his subject, knew it well, and impressed Semenov-Tian-Shanskii as an "unusually humane and approachable" person. He gave great latitude to students in the use of the herbarium, the university library, and his own personal library. He was an "ideal guide of the independent studies of students." His assistant, Dotsent L.S. Cenkowski, a pioneer in bacteriology, presented "excellent and interesting" lectures.

In two senses, the excellence of this department can be attributed to government policy. First, in a negative sense, government censorship left the fields of mathematics and non-biological sciences alone. These were fields which presented no conflict between Nicholas' search for stability and his desire for scientific progress and well-trained specialists to serve the bureaucracy. Academic and teaching excellence could serve the latter goal without in any way interfering with the former. Secondly, the Professors Institute and other study-abroad programs were responsible for the training of three of the four professors who combined outstanding scholarship with effective teaching methods:

54 Leningradskii universitet, I, 42.
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Voskresenskii, Shikhovskii, and Kutorga. The humanities were another matter. Here the conflict was most relevant. In those fields which had no immediate use for the government — the classics and Russian and world history — the tsar and his policy-makers were less concerned with promoting competence in scholarship and teaching than with adherence to official ideology. Only one of the professors in these fields enjoyed the benefits of study-abroad programs, and few of them compared in competence to the professors in the fields of political economy and statistics, Slavonic, and Oriental studies, but one of whom studied abroad or were natives of the Orient.

Ustrialov, for example, in his Russian history lectures, consistently supported Uvarov's ideology. His major work, *A History of the Reign of Peter the Great*, adhered to official nationalism's romantic glorification of Peter's autocratic instincts at the expense of scholarship. And most of the other professors in these fields started their teaching careers at the end of the preceding period, which was characterized by rote learning and other antiquated methods.

The chairs of Oriental literature, political economy and statistics, and Slavonic, were an entirely different story. Of the seven professors who occupied those chairs, one had studied in the Dorpat program, three had made three-year tours of the Orient and Slavonic countries. Two of the other three were natives of Persia and Egypt, and the third was a Rumanian expert who came to the university from the Ministry of Foreign

---

56 Vucinich, p. 272.
Affairs. A combination of specialized training, contact with foreign cultures, and richness of working experience brought these subjects to a level of excellence which surpassed that of the preceding period, already prospering in the area of Eastern studies. Since these involved, primarily, non-theoretical training in languages or statistics, of great use to a government increasingly involved in the affairs of Slavdom and the Middle East, the government was more concerned with competent training than rigid ideological adherence.

There is little in the way of memoirs left by students or professors in the Law Faculty or of reliable evaluations by secondary sources. There is no question that the quality of instruction offered there was on a level equivalent to that of the history-philology department. Of the seven new professors in the Russian law chairs the ones of most importance to the preparation of administrators, six had earned the doctorate of laws, five in conjunction with the study-abroad programs inaugurated in 1828, which included study at some of the finest law schools in Europe. All but one were native Russians who received their original education at Russian schools. A typical example was K.A. Nevolin, who, according to Mavrodin wrote several "valuable studies on the history of Russian law," one of which earned the Demidov prize. Semenov-Tian-Shanskii who took his course in the history of Russian legislation, which was required of all students, found Nevolin's lectures

---
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very interesting and "based on independent historical investigations."  

A measure of discretion on the part of both appointed and elected officials tempered the harshness of Nicholas' concern for external discipline. Semenov-Tian-Shanskii testifies that Inspector Fittstum and his assistants followed the demands of the curator regarding the inspection of uniforms and hairstyles but made the reprimands with delicacy. Because of his tact, there were few conflicts between inspectors and students. When conflicts occurred between students and town police, and these were relatively rare, the university authorities "always rescued the students." Not only did a certain *esprit de corps* develop among the students, but their relations with townspeople were characterized by general cordiality and cooperation. Since many St. Petersburg students had transferred there from Dorpat, where student life "began to develop according to the example of German universities" and students were accustomed to considerable independence, the spirit of Dorpat rubbed off on St. Petersburg. Whereas the variety of social origins of students prevented the intimate unity of student life of the small German towns, there was a spirit of pride and a sense of the unity of common scholastic aspirations. Students wore their uniforms proudly everywhere — in theatres and high society. The wealthier students frequently engaged

---
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60 This is based on the testimony of another student of the period, E. A. Matisen, in "Vospominaniia iz dal'nykh let," Russkaia Starina, XXXI (May, 1881), 155-156.
in revelry and merry-making, but by agreement between students and innkeepers, bottles were thrown at windows facing the back rather than the street. This was one of the factors which kept student-police conflicts to a minimum. By the rector’s account, the students, who were free to choose their faculty of specialization, studied with vigor and “amazing self-denial.” Such was their diligence and capacity for independent work, that the rooms of the crown students during their free hours were like a “deserted hall.” Matisen refers to the “diligent attendance at lectures.”

The 1840’s found St. Petersburg University in a generally prosperous condition. Experimental and research facilities combined with the talents and training of professors to produce a general level of instructional quality surpassed by the other universities and far above that of the preceding period in its own history. Half of the professors earned the Demidov prize for their publications — a third earned this distinction between the years 1836 and 1840 alone. All of the ordinary professors had the doctorate. Most made regular contributions to Russian and European scholarly publications and devoted their spare time to scholarly societies in St. Petersburg. Instruction and research particularly excelled in those fields of value to the needs of the government for administrators and scientific progress: applied mathematics,
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chemistry, technology, statistics, and Slavonic and Eastern studies, for it was in these areas that the government devoted funds for the improvement of research and laboratory facilities and the training of professors in their specialities. Specialists replaced generalists in most of the chairs. The professor with poor teaching abilities and methods became the exception rather than the rule. And since most of the professors were products of native universities, the German professor who lectured in broken Russian became enough of a rarity to evoke laughter among his students. Most important, the great majority of students graduated from those curricula which were intended to produce able administrators, and these very curricula, law and Eastern studies, were among the best the university had to offer in terms of instructional quality. The major problems which originally plagued the university - poorly-prepared professors, the lack of Russian lecturers, the lack of qualified students, the aristocratic resistance to university education and inadequate research facilities - had been solved.
From the beginning, the Russian universities were intended to serve the Russian state as centers for the training of state officials for the higher echelons of the civil service and for the training of public school teachers. This purpose was stated in the original charter of the University of Moscow and reiterated in the statute projects of Catherine II and the university statutes of Alexander I. Accordingly, the general policy objectives of the rulers were the most powerful forces affecting university policies. Many specific university policies, such as the nurturing of Eastern studies under Nicholas, can only be understood in the context of the ruler’s major domestic and foreign policies. Major changes in university policies formulated in the central ministerial offices are directly related to transitions from one tsar to the next and, in the case of Alexander I, to the tsar’s conversion from one ideology to the next.

The personality and concepts of rulership of the tsars affected the application of policy with equal profundity. Alexander delegated far more authority to his ministers than did Nicholas. Alexander was one to set the general tone for policy-makers and then let his subordinates tidy up the details. He was more tolerant of local cultural variations
at Vilno and Dorpat and granted more authority to university adminis-
trators — the rectors — who were on the scene, so to speak, and thus
more likely to take the peculiar needs of the institution into consideration
when applying the policies that were formulated. Thus, under Alexander,
far more than under Nicholas, rectors (and in the case of St. Petersburg,
curators) could significantly modify general policies of the ministry.
Thus, even after the Golitsyn-Magnitskii group had been in control of
the ministry for three years, Uvarov was able to set up the University
of St. Petersburg in spite of the hostility to his educational views
on the part of the majority of the Central School Board. Although St.
Petersburg was organized on a more authoritarian pattern than the other
universities at their inception, Uvarov was able to protect the university,
at least for a time, from subjection to an absolute dictatorship like
that of Magnitskii at Kazan.

The modifying influence that curators and on-the-scene univer-
sity administrators and professors could have in the way policy was
applied was reduced to a minimum under Nicholas. Nicholas tightened up
the chain-of-command within the ministry and kept a close eye on his
subordinates, often intervening in university affairs either personally
or through trusted individuals and special committees of confidants.
He brought five universities under a single set of regulations and
significantly curbed the uniqueness of Dorpat. Thus, the policy that
was formulated by the ministry was applied to the universities in
purer form than was the case under his predecessor. The needs of the
state, in other words, were only slightly affected by the local needs
Given these differences and excepting the anomaly of the Golitsyn years, university policies under Alexander and Nicholas showed a surprising degree of continuity. In spite of varying attitudes toward the West, policy-makers consistently viewed contact with the West as valuable to the universities. Alexander and Nicholas used the academic and scientific resources of Western institutions for the training of professors, although both tsars were quick to try to cut off contact with the West when they felt threatened by disorder abroad, particularly in Germany. In normal times, however, the West was seen as a classroom which contained valuable lessons for Russians to learn. Both tsars saw the value of establishing and maintaining high academic standards at the universities, albeit out of concern for the state rather than concern for academic growth as such. Both tried to make academic chairs as lucrative, prestigious, and generally as attractive as possible. Both attempted to improve gymnasium education in order to increase the pool of talent available to the universities. Only the Golitsyn ministry

1 This contrast between Alexander and Nicholas needs qualification. It was almost a decade before Nicholas completely tightened up the reigns of the bureaucracy. Runich was able to frustrate the goals of Shishkov for as long a period as Uvarov was able to impede the objectives of Golitsyn. Even after the Nicholaian regime took its classic form, there was a measure of local effect on the application of policy. The soviet at St. Petersburg, for example, modified the regime's demand for specialized training in accordance with the faculty's value of more generalized enlightenment. The exceptions to the rule of Nicholaian authoritarianism merit study in other fields besides educational policy.
sacrificed these concerns for the sake of ideological purity. Many of the policies under Nicholas were continuations and refinements of policies begun under Alexander, primarily because the problems (of establishing functioning universities with competent native professors, qualified students and attractions for the class that traditionally supplied the civil service) spanned both reigns.

The application of policies to St. Petersburg university have been divided into four definable periods, each associated with the name of a curator or rector: The Uvarov period, the Runich period, the Borozdin period, and the Pletnev period. Uvarov took the Pedagogical Institute and made good the regime's intention to turn that institution into a university, in spite of the ministry's indifference before 1816 and outright hostility afterwards. He hired the staff, expanded the curriculum, established libraries and laboratories, and won privileges for what became the University of St. Petersburg in 1819. By the time he resigned in 1821, the institution was on as sound a footing as most of the other universities were within two years after their establishment early in Alexander's reign. There was considerable freedom of teaching and institutional autonomy, if we take into consideration the mood of the regime around 1820. However, most of the students were former Chief Pedagogical Institute pupils finishing their courses and the university retained the organizational pattern of the Institute at the time it was legally transformed into a university, the library was poorly organized and catalogued, and the one faculty that met high academic standards contained only a handful of students. The university
was beset with the problems that were plaguing the other universities: the lack of qualified students, the lack of competent faculty who could lecture in Russian, and the unwillingness of noblemen to send their children there. Nonetheless, the size of the student body and faculty had considerably expanded since the formation of the Pedagogical Institute, and so had the variety of the curriculum. Since it resembled a university more than a teacher's gymnasium in terms of curriculum content, the quality of instruction offered by the law faculty, and the rights and privileges granted it by statute — it can be said that significant growth occurred.

During the Runich period the size of the student body grew slightly, as did the proportion of regular (non-scholarship or non-pedagogical) students. The disorganization of library and laboratory facilities was not remedied, the size of the faculty was slightly reduced and the level of instructional quality was profoundly plunged. Few new programs were launched or old ones corrected (such as the failure of the pension to attract regular students to the university) for the sake of dealing with the three problems mentioned above.

It took the flexibility of ministers Shishkov and Lieven to permit the university to recover its footing between Runich's departure and the appointment of Uvarov as minister. Most of the programs and legislative proposals initiated during this period did not bring measurable results immediately, but their fruit was reaped during the Uvarov period, especially with respect to the reinstatement of study-abroad programs and the elimination of the pensions. The student body, the faculty,
and the research facilities grew rapidly in size, but whereas the law faculty in 1833 was producing far more graduates than it was in 1820, the quality of instruction there was far lower than its 1820 level. Teaching methods were antiquated and professors generally failed to keep up with current developments abroad in their specialities.

The most startling growth of the university occurred during the Uvarov period. It is impossible to measure how much of this is to the credit of policies begun by Shishkov and Lieven and how much is the result of refinements and innovations made under Uvarov. Regardless of who deserves the credit, research facilities, faculty specialization, student preparedness, teaching methods, the size of the student body, and the proportion of regular students in the law faculty -- all achieved high levels. Most important, the institution ranked with the best Russian universities, and achieved a European reputation in mathematics and chemistry. For the first time it became an institution to which students from other universities were sent for advanced training, particularly in law and Eastern languages. Significantly, those subjects which the tsar considered most useful -- finance, law, Eastern studies, industrially-applicable mathematics and natural sciences -- showed the greatest improvement.

The policies which were most successful were those which all ministries but that of Golitsyn promoted: the improvement of gymnasium education; the offering of liberal salaries, rank privileges, and pensions to professors; and the sending of prospective professors abroad for advanced, specialized study. Two policies stood out for their lack of
success: the establishment of pensions to attract noblemen to the university, and the attempts, especially under Uvarov, to limit the student body to the administrative classes.

This study has brought some lessons home to the student of Russian administrative history. First, one's approach to the documents must go beyond the study of legislation and decrees. The contrast between the liberal legislation of Alexander and the conservative measures of Nicholas fails to give a true picture of the continuity of policy during the course of five decades. The effect of policies on institutions can be significantly altered by efforts on the part of subordinate officials and the institutions themselves. Thus, the personalities and views of these officials and the institution's administrators must be grasped. Second, the historian who wants to prove that "liberal" policies necessarily benefit institutions associated with liberal traditions and "conservative" or authoritarian policies retard their growth (or vice-versa) is destined to be disappointed. The success of failure of particular policies in the case of St. Petersburg University had little to do with the ideological orientation that inspired them. The evidence does not suggest that it was either the extensive institutional autonomy granted the universities under Alexander or the strict subordination of the university to the bureaucracy under Nicholas that affected university growth. This author must conclude that the degree to which the University of St. Petersburg experienced significant growth had little to do with the content or source of the ideological inspiration of policy. But the institution grew and eventually prospered only during those periods when ideology was tempered with practical policies geared toward specific ends.
## APPENDIX:

### CONTENTS OF LIBRARIES AND LABORATORIES AT ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY, 1833-1850

**TABLE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>21356</td>
<td>46039</td>
<td>24129</td>
<td>26143</td>
<td>57828</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>21751</td>
<td>44881</td>
<td>24210</td>
<td>28501</td>
<td>58936</td>
<td>34754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>21894</td>
<td>50712</td>
<td>31435</td>
<td>29834</td>
<td>60473</td>
<td>44474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>23182</td>
<td>58165</td>
<td>30639</td>
<td>31882</td>
<td>61384</td>
<td>45632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>24145</td>
<td>62652</td>
<td>33297</td>
<td>33186</td>
<td>62042</td>
<td>46588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>27494</td>
<td>64669</td>
<td>35105</td>
<td>31579</td>
<td>63614</td>
<td>51129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>27975</td>
<td>65927</td>
<td>36682</td>
<td>34748</td>
<td>64776</td>
<td>52157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>28188</td>
<td>67413</td>
<td>37982</td>
<td>35353</td>
<td>67344</td>
<td>54116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>28880</td>
<td>69410</td>
<td>39784</td>
<td>36102</td>
<td>68426</td>
<td>56367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>29327</td>
<td>70486</td>
<td>40856</td>
<td>38190</td>
<td>69373</td>
<td>65324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>32263</td>
<td>73975</td>
<td>41245</td>
<td>40252</td>
<td>70885</td>
<td>77065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>33144</td>
<td>75329</td>
<td>43095</td>
<td>41169</td>
<td>77356</td>
<td>79388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>34096</td>
<td>80195</td>
<td>47650</td>
<td>41820</td>
<td>79006</td>
<td>80755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>34829</td>
<td>80906</td>
<td>48572</td>
<td>42406</td>
<td>80079</td>
<td>82350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>37133</td>
<td>81947</td>
<td>49232</td>
<td>43328</td>
<td>80960</td>
<td>84033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>37961</td>
<td>82651</td>
<td>48954</td>
<td>44470</td>
<td>81848</td>
<td>86092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>38767</td>
<td>83655</td>
<td>48709</td>
<td>45703</td>
<td>82777</td>
<td>87374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from Statistical tables in Zh.M.N.P., 1834-1850.
### Table 14

**Libraries in St. Petersburg: No. of Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chief Ped. Inst.</th>
<th>Academy of Sciences</th>
<th>Russian Academy</th>
<th>Imperial Public Library</th>
<th>Rumiantsev Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>2844</td>
<td>89104</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>187,659</td>
<td>32202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>6938</td>
<td>93331</td>
<td>4599</td>
<td>441,591</td>
<td>32347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>8841</td>
<td>100,475</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>434,567</td>
<td>32750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>11429</td>
<td>115,136</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>462,584</td>
<td>33139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>14317</td>
<td>91,094</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>472,221</td>
<td>33223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15

**Physics Kabinets: Number of Instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>Moscow</th>
<th>Kharkov</th>
<th>Kazan</th>
<th>Kiev</th>
<th>Dorpat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16

**ZOOLOGY KABINETS: NUMBER OF SPECIMENS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>9100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6462</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>15,162</td>
<td>5867</td>
<td>15,354</td>
<td>7015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>62,027</td>
<td>15,770</td>
<td>5773</td>
<td>36,667</td>
<td>8178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>65,421</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>35,550</td>
<td>9679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 17

**MINERALOGICAL KABINET: NUMBER OF MINERALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>7,857</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>14,139</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>11,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>7,191</td>
<td>11,293</td>
<td>8,253</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>14,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>14,144</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>8,365</td>
<td>14,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>13,610</td>
<td>12,970</td>
<td>11,834</td>
<td>19,913</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>14,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 18

**ARCHEOLOGY (MEDALS) KABINET: NO. OF COINS AND MEDALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>19,957</td>
<td>8,845</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>10,519</td>
<td>10,996</td>
<td>24,042</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>14,207</td>
<td>21,847</td>
<td>11,546</td>
<td>24,292</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>14,213</td>
<td>21,869</td>
<td>14,653</td>
<td>24,541</td>
<td>5,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19

**CHEMISTRY LABORATORY: NUMBER OF ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>MOSCOW</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>*1,420</td>
<td>*559</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>1,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some of the contents were removed to a separate Pharmaceutical Laboratory at Kharkov and Kazan in 1848.
**TABLE 20**

**TECHNOLOGY KABINET: NO. OF MODELS AND MACHINES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPB</th>
<th>KHARKOV</th>
<th>KAZAN</th>
<th>KIEV</th>
<th>DORPAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*6,757</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*1,543</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*1,601</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kiev's Technology and Applied Mathematics Kabinets were combined.
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