



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Kira Ilina*

**ACADEMIC LUCK:  
GENERAL AND SPECIFIC  
SCENARIOS OF ACADEMIC  
ATTESTATION IN RUSSIA IN THE  
1830S**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES  
WP BRP 81/HUM/2014

*Kira Ilina*<sup>1</sup>

**ACADEMIC LUCK:  
GENERAL AND SPECIFIC SCENARIOS OF ACADEMIC  
ATTESTATION IN RUSSIA IN THE 1830S<sup>2</sup>**

The article presents an analysis of the practice of awarding degrees in Russia in the 1830s. The author considered legal and regulatory acts, memoirs and archival documents and studied the ways of climbing the academic or bureaucratic ladders, which were open to graduates. The article describes some typical and atypical cases of degree awards. The analysis revealed the turbulent way that the state regulated this sphere, and the existence of alternative ways of acquiring an academic degree, which made it possible for a Minister of Education to interfere in the procedures for academic attestation.

JEL Classification: Z.

*Keywords:* academic attestation, Russian Empire, 1830s, legislature, Universities, Ministry of Education

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Poletaev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities (IGITI). Senior research fellow; E-mail: [glukist@mail.ru](mailto:glukist@mail.ru).

<sup>2</sup> The results of the project «Academic Attestation and Degree Awards at European Universities in the Modern Era», carried out in the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2014, are presented in this work. I wish to thank Elena Vishlenkova for her support and constructive criticism.

### *Historiographical debates*

Studies by Russian historians on academic degrees have one thing in common; their sources are limited to laws and personal texts, such as biographies, letters and memoirs<sup>3</sup>. Because of this self-limitation, scholars were obliged to focus on the reconstruction of legal manipulations of academic attestations, or to be precise, on the logic of creating a normative act and its contents, such as the scope of the degree examinations, disputations, or the degree confirmation. Given this, memoirs and even some fragmentarily used documents from university archives serve as an illustration, which demonstrates the (in)efficiency of legal acts. For example, all studies on degree awarding in early 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia cover the following grounds: they usually gave an account of the university charter of 1804; discuss the preparation of the ‘Regulations of the academic degree awarding’ of 1819 and its articles, as well as the charter of 1835 and the regulations of academic degree awarding from 1837 and 1844. When addressing the period of mid-1820s to mid-1830s, historians of science and education analyze the state programs for the training of professors, including the foundation of the Professorial Institute at the University of Dorpat, and the training of law students at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Imperial Chancellery. To demonstrate the impact of these programs, information about the numbers and social status of students, memoirs about their daily life, and biographical information about the graduates’ academic careers is provided<sup>4</sup>.

Historians tend to refer to the procedure of academic attestation, which the characters of historical narratives had undergone, as established general ‘rules of the game’. At the same time, evidence from archival sources caused me doubt this and suggested that in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, academic attestation took place within a poorly defined legal field. University administrators had a contradictory set of regulations, decrees and circular letters. These were initiated not only by the bureaucrats but also by university professors. It seems that active legal work was initiated by the universities crisis in the late 1820s, and the resultant staff reform of the late 1820s – early 1830s. If my hypothesis is correct, the results of academic attestation were unpredictable in these circumstances. There were no universal rules and requirements for applicants and university experts were examiners. Everything was situational and depended on

---

<sup>3</sup> See: Uchenye stepeni v Rossiiskikh universitetakh // Universitet v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII – pervoi poloviny XIX veka / pod. obsch. red. A.Yu. Andreeva, S.I. Posokhova. M.: ROSSPEN, 2012. P. 326-388; Ivanov A.E. Uchenye stepeni v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII v. – 1917 g. M.: AO “Chertanovskaya tipografiya”, 1994; Petrov F.A. Rossiiskie universitety v pervoi polovine XIX veka. Formirovanie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniya. Kn. 3. Universitetskaya professura i podgotovka ustava 1835 goda. M.: Polteks, 2000. P. 364-376; Yakushev A.N. Organizatsionno-pravovoi analiz podgotovki nauchnykh kadrov i prisuzhdeniya uchenykh stepenei v universitetakh i akademiakh Rossii, 1747-1918 gg.: Istoriya i opyt realizatsii: dis. ... kand. yurid. nauk. SPb., 1998. 510 p.

<sup>4</sup> See: Ivanov A.E. Op. cit. P. 71-77; Petrov F.A. Formirovanie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniya v Rossii. T. 4, ch. 1. Rossiiskie universitety i lyudi 1840-kh godov. P. 23-44, 141-233; Tamul V.E. Professorskii institut i mezhdunarodnye nauchnye svyazi Tartuskogo universiteta v pervoi polovine XIX veka: avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk. Tartu, 1988; Kostina T.V. Vospitanniki Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta v Derptskom professorskom institute // Peterburgskie issledovaniya: sb. nauch. st. Vyp. 3. SPb., 2011. P. 219-228; Andreev A.Yu. Berlinskii universitet i podgotovka rossiiskoi professury // Idem. Russkie studenty v nemetskikh universitetakh XVIII – pervoi poloviny XIX veka. M.: Znak, 2005. P. 287-317.

certain circumstances, determined by the opinions of the members of a particular faculty board, the personal engagement and activity of some officials, and even on the speed of personal communications. A combination of these variables determined an applicant's luck.

In this article, I reveal various legal ways and loopholes of acquiring an academic degree in the Russian universities of the early 1830s. This time was the apogee of Nicholas I's rule and a period immediately after Sergey Uvarov had been appointed Minister of National Education.

### *Legal web*

A study of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century legal acts on to academic attestation demonstrated the existence of a number of options available to those who applied for academic degrees. More options emerged in the late 1820s and the mid 1830s.

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the local foundation charters and the charters of 1803 – 1804 were in place. These charters set out the general procedures of attestation and established three degrees, for a candidate, a master, and a doctor, as introduced by the decree 'On the structure of High schools'<sup>5</sup> on 24 January 1803. The regulations on academic degree awarding of 1819 allowed the procedure of academic attestation to be universal for the entire Russian Empire. This introduced an additional degree (of an actual student) and established a succession of degrees and the order of academic attestation. The text contained the criteria of the expert knowledge that applicants were expected to meet. Moreover, the regulations distributed the 'disciplines' between faculties. A degree could be awarded at any of the four faculties of theology, law, medicine and philosophy, where the latter consisted of two departments; physics and mathematics, and ethics and philology<sup>6</sup>. However, this division did not correspond to the actual structure of imperial universities, which did not only deviate from those described by the regulations, but were also unique to each university<sup>7</sup>.

The staff crisis that occurred at universities in the late 1820s stimulated the emergence of two projects for professorial training, by Georg Friedrich Parrot and Mikhail Speransky. Parrot, a member of the Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg, a restorer of the University of Dorpat and its first rector, addressed the government and pointed out that although the universities of Moscow, Kharkov and Kazan' had been in existence for a quarter of a century and 10 millions of rubles had been spent on them, they 'did not produce what is necessary for the fruitful existence

---

<sup>5</sup> Ob ustroistve uchilisch, 24.01.1803 // Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya. T. 1. SPb., 1864. № 6. Cols. 17.

<sup>6</sup> O proizvodstve v uchenye stepeni na osnovanii polozheniya o sem, 20.01.1819 // Ibid. № 340. Cols. 1135.

<sup>7</sup> See: Ustav i obschie postanovleniya imperatorskogo Vilenskogo universiteta, 18.05.1803 // Ibid. № 15. Cols. 45-46; Ustav imperatorskogo Derptskogo universiteta, 12.09.1803 // Ibid. № 24. Cols.137-138; Ustav imperatorskogo Derptskogo universiteta, 4.06.1820 // Ibid. № 389. Cols. 1264-1265; Ustavy imperatorskikh Moskovskogo, Kharkovskogo i Kazanskogo universitetov, 5.11.1804 // Ibid. № 46. Cols. 268-269; Obrazovanie Glavnogo Pedagogicheskogo instituta, 23.12.1816 // Ibid. № 264. Cols. 835; Ob uchrezhdenii universiteta v S. Peterburge, 8.02.1819 № 264. № 344. Cols. 1155.

of these universities – namely, a class of native Russian professors worthy of the name of scholar<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, he suggested that an institute for professorial training should be established at the University of Dorpat, with 15 students who had graduated from Russian universities. Within in seven years, after five years of studies at the Dorpat, a master's dissertation and a two-year course at a university in Europe, they were to replace all professors (except rectors). The then Minister Alexandr Shishkov and some members of the Committee for the Establishment of Schools were against the project. The rest offered to amend the document. As a result, the project and opinions of it were presented to Nicholas I. The Emperor ordered 20 students to be selected and trained for professorship, and maintained that the training period be reduced to four years (two years at the Dorpat and two at a university in Europe)<sup>9</sup>.

After five months, the Emperor approved the plan to train law students. This project was devised by Mikhail Balugyansky and Mikhail Speransky. It was decided that students would attend lectures on Roman law and Classics at the University of St Petersburg, and practice with experienced officials at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Imperial Chancellery<sup>10</sup>. Speransky had selected the six best graduates of the Theological Academies of Moscow and St Petersburg for this, who had experienced the thorough overhaul of the curriculum where students were taught Latin as well as Canon law.

These programmes created a system of professorial training for the Empire's universities. However, in the context of personal rule, high officials of state were often tempted to receive preferential treatment, or to adjust the system to suit 'their' people. Therefore, on 12 September 1830, Baron Matthew von der Palen, a curator of the Dorpat educational district, reported to Karl Lieven, the Minister of National Education, that the students of the Professorial Institute held various degrees; there were students, candidates, physicians and even one doctor among them. The curator supported the rector's request from the University of Dorpat, and the director of the Professorial Institute, to allow the university board to award degrees to graduates who passed the examinations not according to seniority of degree, but according to the graduates' successes and knowledge. In this case, they referred to the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Law, since by that time the University of Dorpat already had the right to award the degree of Doctor of Medicine. This was certainly applied to the medics, who were graduates of the Professorial Institute. This initiative was approved by the Committee of Ministers and by the Emperor on 11 November 1830<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Po delu o prigotovlenii professorov, 14.10.1827 // Dopolnenie k Sborniku postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya, 1803-1864. SPb., 1867. Cols. 256.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. Cols. 251-257.

<sup>10</sup> Ob obrazovanii pri S. Peterburgskom universitete kandidatov pravovedeniya, 24.01.1828 // Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya. T. 2, otd. 1. SPb., 1864. № 45. Cols. 89-91. See also: Korf M. Zhizn Grafa Speranskogo. Spb., 1861. T. 1. P. 329.

<sup>11</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 56, file 668, fol. 24-24 v., 29.

On 30 January 1831, Baron von der Palen informed the Minister that the acting Director of the Professorial Institute, Johann Friedrich Erdmann, Professor of Pathology, Therapy and Clinical Medicine, had asked the university board to amend the exit procedure of degree examination. Otherwise, he thought, the graduates ‘would have to study disciplines that are far removed from their main disciplines’<sup>12</sup>, since the degree examination implied testing the graduates’ knowledge in all of a faculty’s disciplines. Other professors however, voted to preserve the existing rules<sup>13</sup>. Erdmann therefore did not succeed in removing the graduates of the Institute from the field where the regulations of 1819 applied.

Another of the university officials’ initiatives to change the rules of academic attestation emerged in February of 1831. Erdmann reported to the board that graduates who passed the examinations and were sent to study overseas should, according to the law, submit dissertations. However, in the professor’s opinion, the graduates did not have time to write ‘well-grounded discourses’, and Erdmann’s colleagues supported him. At a meeting of the University Council it was decided that after passing the degree examinations, the graduates of the Professorial Institute were to go and study abroad, where ‘on top of other things’ they were to write dissertations. These were to be defended upon the young scholars’ return to Russia, at the Dorpat or any other university in the Russian Empire. However, on 13 March 1831, Lieven challenged them, maintaining that the Institute’s graduates already had enough privileges and remarked that in his opinion, the young scholars had sufficient time to prepare and defend their dissertations<sup>14</sup>.

Other special rulings on the graduates of the Professorial Institute also emerged later. In July 1835, the first graduates of the Institute who did not hold doctoral degrees returned from Europe. There were three Masters’ students (economist Alexandr Chivilev, historian Mikhail Kutorga and physicist Vassily Lapshin), and two candidates (philologist Vladimir Pecherin and economist Victor Poroshin). The Minister had issued a new decree especially for them, which was published on 23 July 1835, three days before the publication of a new university charter. The decree stated the university’s desire to ‘reduce’ multi-staged forms of tests, so that young scholars could be quickly employed in university departments. It is interesting that while trying to achieve this, Uvarov referred to Speransky’s project and recommended that the rules created for law students be used to test the scholars<sup>15</sup>. The examinations were to take place at the University of St Petersburg.

At the same time, officials from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department demanded privileges for their own graduates. In 1833, the first group of young lawyers who had studied in Berlin returned, and the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., fol. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., fol. 1 v.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., fol. 4, 8-9.

<sup>15</sup> Ob ispytanii molodykh uchenykh, vozvrativshikhся iz chuzhikh kraev, 23.07.1835 // Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya. T. 2, otd. 1. № 361. Cols. 739. See also: TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 477, file 23, fol. 159 v.

question of their academic attestation arose. On 12 April 1833, acting upon the instigation of Mikhail Speransky, Balugyansky sent a long memorandum entitled; ‘On law students who came back from Berlin to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Imperial Chancellery’, to the Emperor. There, he explained that the students had studied in St Petersburg and Berlin, and focused on their academic successes and the sacrifices they had made in order to study, and not to further their careers. He first referred to the experiences of the Professorial Institute, and asked that the doctoral examinations of the returning students be held at the University of St Petersburg. Moreover, pointing out the variability and lack of uniform rules in academic attestations, Balugyansky suggested that a special programme to test law graduates was needed. The Emperor approved his plan the next day<sup>16</sup>. By mid-December, the rules had been prepared, and on 29 January 1834, the examinations begun<sup>17</sup>.

The curator of the St Petersburg educational district, Prince Mikhail Dondukov-Korsakov, wrote to the Department of Education in early January 1835 to describe the last stages in the preparations for the examinations of the first law students, Vassily Znamensky and Konstantin Nevolin. The curator reported that the Faculty of Philosophy and Law had established a ‘ritual of a public disputation’ the previous October, and the list of those invited to it, and chose the reviewers from the professors. The process was prolonged by the publication of dissertations that presented ‘a serious problem of proofreading’ because of ‘a great number of references and notes in Greek’<sup>18</sup>. In the end, the dates of examinations were set. However, Znamensky died a week before the debate, which was scheduled for January. On 8 February 1835, Nevolin triumphed in the defense of his dissertation entitled ‘On the philosophy of the law-making of the Ancients’ in three languages; Russian, Latin and German. In January of 1835, the faculty considered another dissertation, Speransky’s student Alexey Blagovetshensky<sup>19</sup>. The remaining students (Savva Bogoroditsky and Sergey Ornatsky) did not submit their completed dissertations.

In the meantime, Uvarov had asked Speransky to appoint his students as heads of three departments in the Faculty of Ethics and Politics at the University of Moscow, where there were vacancies. The ‘only problem’ was that the majority of the returning students had not yet passed their examinations and had not completed their dissertations. On 28 February 1835, Speransky informed the Minister of National Education that Balugyansky had presented him with a project ‘on the reduction of the examination of students’. Instead of completing and defending dissertation – since another year would be required for this – the state official suggested that the

---

<sup>16</sup> RGIA, f. 1251, inv. 1, file 118, fol. 22-31 v.

<sup>17</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 22, file 61, fol. 13-17 v., 32 v.-33 v.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., fol. 24 v.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., fol. 24 v., 28-28 v., 36.

graduates would publicly defend ‘from 30 to 40 and more theses from all legal disciplines’<sup>20</sup>. In this way, the graduates’ attestations would have been complete by May. Speransky intended to ask the Emperor’s permission to implement this project. On 13 May 1835, Balugyansky reported to Uvarov that the project to replace the dissertation by a public defense of theses was approved by the Emperor<sup>21</sup>. The graduates were required to write and submit dissertations after they were employed by universities in the Russian Empire.

Moreover, from August to September 1835, the new charter’s rules on academic attestation came to force (the charter as a whole had been in force since 1837). In general, these rules were specifying, and reflected the results of how attestation had been practiced until the 1830s, although there were some differences. For example, the degree of ‘student’ was abolished and three remained: candidate, master and doctor. The most important change was the requirement for those applying to a professorial position to hold a doctoral degree<sup>22</sup>. It should be noted that as far as the University of Dorpat was concerned, it had been a requirement for a contender for a professorial position to hold a doctoral degree as laid out in the charter of 1803, and again in the charter of 1820<sup>23</sup>. By 1835, this requirement had been in place for 15 years for all other universities. On 19 February 1820, Alexandr Golitsyn, the Minister of Religious Affairs and Public Education, sent a circular letter maintaining that all applicants for professorial positions should have doctoral degrees, and all applicants for the position of adjuncts should have master’s degrees<sup>24</sup>. However, this suggestion was a suggestion rather than an order (‘in cases that would arise, wherever possible’) and so was not carried out. It seems that, by 1835, professors had forgotten about it entirely, and so the presence of this requirement in the 1835 charter created panic among the university lecturers who did not hold these necessary degrees.

It seems that having realized the scale of catastrophe and wanting to maintain talented young lecturers without degrees at universities, Minister Uvarov initiated a special decree. According to his decree, university adjuncts could be awarded doctoral degrees without taking examinations, but they were required to write and defend dissertations publicly<sup>25</sup>. It is at this point that I disagree with Anatoly Ivanov, who claims that defending a dissertation without prior examination was first made legal in 1842, in the St Vladimir University of Kiev’s charter, and was intended for applicants taking up part-time associate professorial positions<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., fol. 41-42.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., fol. 45-45 v.

<sup>22</sup> Obschii ustav imperatorskikh rossiiskikh universitetov, 26.07.1835 // Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya. T. 2, otd. 1. № 363. Cols. 754.

<sup>23</sup> Ustav imperatorskogo Derptsogo universiteta, 12.09.1803. Cols. 140; Ustav imperatorskogo Derptsogo universiteta, 4.06.1820. Cols. 1265.

<sup>24</sup> Tsirkulyarnoe predlozhenie o tom, chtoby ischuschie professorskikh i adyunktских mest imeli stepeni doktorov i magistr, 19.02.1820 // Sbornik rasporyazhenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya. T. 1. SPb., 1866. № 184. P. 406-407.

<sup>25</sup> See: Vishlenkova E.A., Ilina K.A. Ob uchenyh stepenyakh i o tom, kak dissertatsiya v Rossii obretala nauchnyu i prakticheskuyu znachimost’ // Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 2013. № 4. P. 84-107.

<sup>26</sup> Ivanov. A.E. Op. cit. P. 139-140.



Therefore, by the late 1820s and early 1830s, the Russian Empire's legal field embraced at least nine official, but unconnected trajectories of academic attestation, on top of the specific legislative acts which regulated the awarding of ecclesiastical and medical degrees<sup>27</sup>:

- 1) Local university charters (1803, 1804 and 1820)
- 2) The 'regulations of academic degree awarding', 20 January 1819, which were applicable to all universities
- 3) The permission for graduates of the Professorial Institute to defend theses in their fields of knowledge, 11 November 1830
- 4) The permission for Speransky's students to be attested according to a special programme, 15 December 1833
- 5) The permission for Speransky's students to replace dissertations with publicly defending theses, 13 May 1835
- 6) The decree on a special programme for five graduates from the Professorial Institute at the University of Dorpat, 23 July 1835
- 7) 'The general charter of the universities of the Russian Empire' (for the Universities of Moscow, St Petersburg, Kazan' and Kharkov), 26 July 1835
- 8) A ministerial initiative to permit university adjuncts to defend doctoral dissertations without prior examinations, 31 December 1835
- 9) The 'Rule of examinations for academic degrees' (for the Universities of Moscow, St Petersburg, Kazan' and Kharkov), 28 April 1837

#### *Drawing of individual trajectories*

Within this polyphony of legal initiatives in the field of academic attestation, which did not often correspond to the structures of universities or to the specialists they had, each applicant rarely fitted into the ideal framework prescribed by the law. More often, a young scholar had to maneuver between various programmes and guess the rules established by the authorities while drawing their own individual trajectory to acquire a degree and building an academic career.

The fates of the graduates' academic attestation at the Professorial Institute are remarkable. Out of the original 20 selected students, two (Pavel Shklyarevsky and Poluekt Shramkov) died in Dorpat, and two more were sent to replace them (the Dorpat graduates Mikhail Lunin and Victor Poroshin). Another student (Alexandr Shumansky) chose to join the civil service. In late 1832 to early 1833, a number of public disputations took place, which resulted in 13 graduates awarded the degree of doctor; six became doctors of medicine (surgeons

---

<sup>27</sup> See e.g.: Suhova N. Yu. Sistema nauchno-bogoslovskoi attestatsii v Rossii v XIX – nachale XX vv. M.:Izd-vo PSTGU, 2009; Gatina Z.S., Vishlenkova E.A. Sistema nauchnoi attestatsii v meditsine (Rossiya, pervaya polovina XIX veka) // Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta kultury i iskusstv. 2014. № 1 (18). P 168-178.

Nikholay Pirogov and Feodor Inozemtsev, physiologist Alexey Filomafitsky, therapists Grigory Sokolsky and Nikanor Skadovsky, zoologist Stepan Kutorga), and six became doctors of philosophy (philologists Dmitry Kryukov and Alfons Walitsky, historian Mikhail Lunin, mathematician Petr Kotelnikov, botanists Petr Kornukh-Trotsky and Ivan Shikhovky, who was also awarded the degree of Doctor of Medicine at the University of Dorpat in 1829). One became a doctor of law (Ignaty Ivanosky), and three graduates were awarded the degree of Master of Philosophy (economist Alexandr Chivilev, physicist Vassily Lapshin and historian Mikhail Kutorga). Whilst abroad, they were joined by a candidate from the University of St Petersburg, philologist Vladimir Pecherin, who upon his return from Europe in the autumn of 1835 passed the examination through Speransky's students' programme at the University of Moscow<sup>28</sup>.

Speransky had a connection to Petr Redkin and Petr Kalmykov's academic careers, who both studied at the Professorial Institute at Dorpat. In 1828, they were sent to the Professorial Institute from the universities of Moscow and St Petersburg, but had to leave Dorpat after two years (in late 1830). At that point, the Law Faculty at the University of Dorpat was temporarily "disarranged," because Professor Friedrich Clossius spent a long time studying abroad; Professor Alexander Magnus Fromhold von Reutz was ill, and Professors Johann Philipp Gustav von Ewers and Christoph Christian von Dabelow died. All of this coincided with the death of one of Speransky's students (Alexandr Peshekhonov) in Berlin. Speransky informed the Emperor, and the Emperor requested that Kalmykov and Redkin were sent to the University of Berlin. On 24 November 1830, Speransky informed Lieven, the Minister of Education, about this, and the following day Lieven informed the University of Dorpat about the Emperor's decision<sup>29</sup>. Therefore, Redkin and Kalmykov joined Speransky's programme and were sent immediately to Berlin to study under the famous law historian Friedrich Carl von Savigny, who at that time taught the rest of the students from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Russian Imperial Chancellery.

Kalmykov and Redkin benefited from the law that had been instigated by Speransky in May 1835. Like the majority of the students from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department, they were both were awarded doctoral degrees in 1835, after they had defended theses in legal disciplines. Later, Kalmykov was employed by the University of St Petersburg, and Redkin was appointed to the University of Moscow. According to the law, they were obliged to submit dissertations in due course.

Obtaining dissertations from new doctors, who had been appointed professors at various universities of the Empire, proved to be the most difficult task for officials from the Ministry of education. Therefore, on 9 March 1838, Uvarov inquired of the university boards as to 'whether

---

<sup>28</sup> TsGAM, f. 418, inv. 477, file 23, fol. 156-156 v., 160-160 v., 177-178 v., 185-186, 191.

<sup>29</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 56, file 671, fol. 1, 2, 4.

the aforementioned graduates were obliged to compose dissertations, and which topic was selected by each of them'<sup>30</sup>. Soon after, the Minister learned that 'in 1835 no order had been given to that extent, but now the Faculty of Law was told to demand answers from students who were employed by the university as lecturers'<sup>31</sup>. In his suggestion on 10 July, addressed to the curators of the educational districts, Uvarov set a one year deadline for the defense of dissertations by Speransky's former students. In late October, the curator at the University of St Petersburg informed the Ministry about Yakov Barshev, Alexander Kranihfeld and Petr Kalmykov's dissertation themes and also wrote that Kalmykov, 'in place of the theme 'Historical description of the state institutes of civil administration in Russia' had instead chosen the topic 'The development of fundamental ideas of property and treaties, with an introduction to legal studies'<sup>32</sup>. In late December, the Minister received a letter from the curator of Moscow, Sergey Stroganov, to inform him about Redkin's enormous teaching load, which made it impossible for him to complete the dissertation in time. There were similar requests to prolong the preparation period for the dissertations, which were made in mid-summer of 1839, when the deadline for the dissertations' completion and submission, as set by Uvarov, was approaching. As a result, the Minister postponed the deadline for another year<sup>33</sup>.

However, the situation had hardly changed a year later. In response to a new inquiry by the Ministry, on 6 December 1840 the curator of Moscow maintained that Redkin had been working on rearranging his lectures about various subjects. When this had been done, the young professor 'was able to set some time, however short, for the publication of a work within a field of his department and was hoping to fulfill the authorities' requirement in May 1842'<sup>34</sup>. In January 1841, Kalmykov, sent the dean of his faculty a letter, in which he referred to the administrative duties performed by the director of the 1<sup>st</sup> Gymnasium, and promised to complete dissertation on the 'main foundations of property and civil treaties' during the 'winter break'. Nevertheless, the young professor's dissertation was submitted only in May 1842 and was discussed by the faculty. A review of Kalmykov's dissertation entitled 'On the symbolism of law in general and of Russian law in particular' survived; it was written on 30 November 1842 by a professor of the Faculty of Law Ignaty Ivanovsky, who was a graduate of the Professorial Institute,<sup>35</sup>.

The story of the economist Alexandr Chivilev's academic attestation was a quintessence of legal confusion and unpredictability. Chivilev graduated from the Faculty of Philosophy and

---

<sup>30</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 22, file 61, fol. 78.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., fol. 74-74 v.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., fol. 82, 83-85 v., 87-87 v.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., fol. JI. 87-87 v., 89, 90-91, 92, 93.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., fol. 102-102 v.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., fol. 103-103 v, 107, 115-116.

Law at the University of St Petersburg in 1827. In 1828 he was awarded the degree of Candidate of Laws and was appointed a student of the Professorial Institute at the Dorpat<sup>36</sup>. There, he chose to study political economy, which, together with cameral, financial and commercial disciplines and the technology, civil architecture and martial disciplines, made up the technological and economic class of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Dorpat<sup>37</sup>. In his autobiographical entry in the 'Biographical dictionary of professors and lecturers at the Imperial University of Moscow' Chivilev said that in early 1833 he defended a dissertation entitled 'On poor relief' for the degree of Master of Philosophy<sup>38</sup>. At the same time, the 'Review of the work of the Imperial University of Dorpat in memory of the years 1802 – 1865' compiled on the basis of letters and reports sent to the curator of the Dorpat educational district in 1866, said that in 1833 Chivilev 'acquired' the degree of Master of Political Economy<sup>39</sup>. This discrepancy is strange, because according to the law (the charter of 1804 and the regulations of 1819) the Master's degree was awarded in connection to the discipline, and the doctoral degree was awarded in connection to the faculty. Therefore, it remains to be seen how three graduates of the Professorial Institute (Chivilev, Mikhail Kutorga and Lapshin) managed to become Masters of Philosophy, a fact proven by the title pages of their dissertations.

In July 1833, soon after his dissertation defense, Chivilev like many other graduates of the Institute, went on to study in Berlin. After two years, he returned to St Petersburg, and after delivering a trial lecture on cameral disciplines at the Academy of Sciences, was appointed a lecturer at the University of Moscow. Since Chivilev did not have a doctoral degree he remained at the capital, in accordance with the decree of 23 July on the graduates' examinations from the Professorial Institute who were returning from abroad<sup>40</sup>. However, on 9 October 1835 Uvarov informed the curator that scholars who came back from abroad should be examined at the universities they were appointed to.

Chivilev was sent to the University of Moscow, where professors were supposed to organize his examinations and award him a doctoral degree before 1 January 1836. He could choose either the Regulation on awarding academic degrees from 1819, or the Charter of 1835, since the applicants themselves could choose the legal framework<sup>41</sup>. The choice offered to a Master's applicant is very important in context, because, according to the Regulations of 1819,

---

<sup>36</sup> *Biograficheskii slovar professorov i preredavatelei imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za istekayushee stoletie so dnya uchrezhdeniya yanvarya 12-go 1755 goda po den stoletnego yubileya yanvarya 12-go 1855 goda, sostavlennyyi trudami professorov i preredavatelei, zanimavshikh kafedry v 1854 godu, i raspolozhennyyi po azbuchnomu poryadku. Ch. 2. M., 1855. P. 554-555.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ustav imperatorskogo Derptsogo universiteta, 4.06.1820. Cols. 1268.*

<sup>38</sup> *Biograficheskii slovar... P. 555.*

<sup>39</sup> See: *Obzor deyatelnosti imperatorskogo Derptsogo universiteta na pamyat o 1802-1865 godakh: sostavlennyyi po otchetam i doneseniyam, predstavlenным popechitel'yu Derptsogo uchebnogo okruga. Derpt, 1866. P. 115.*

<sup>40</sup> *TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 477, file 23, fol. 123.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid., fol. 160.*

political economy was placed within the discipline of the Faculty of Law, and according to the charter of 1835, ‘political economy and statistics’ belonged to the First Department (of Fine Letters) of the Faculty of Philosophy<sup>42</sup>. The choice of a law determined the faculty where professors were to examine an applicant, as well as the number of disciplines that were to be passed as additional examinations. On 5 November 1835, Chivilev was invited to a meeting of the University Board and asked how he preferred to be examined for the doctoral degree. However, the young scholar replied that he could not be examined ‘since the University of Moscow did not have a department of cameral disciplines, which for the last seven years had been the subject of his studies’. Chivilev asked to be allowed to remain and adjunct at the Department of Political Economy and Statistics<sup>43</sup>, to which Uvarov finally agreed in late November 1835<sup>44</sup>.

The decree of 31 December 1835, which enabled university adjuncts to be awarded doctoral degrees without examinations, provoked a series of declarations of intent to write dissertations, and later, public defenses in Moscow. Chivilev proved no exception. The minutes of the First Department of the Faculty of Philosophy on 10 October 1836 mentioned that Chivilev presented the Department’s Board with two possible themes for his doctoral dissertation – ‘On national income’ or ‘On state loans’ – while retaining the right to choose one of these later. The themes were presented to the University Board<sup>45</sup>, and approved on 4 November. On 24 February, Kachenovsky, the Dean of Department, reported that the adjunct Chivilev had submitted a dissertation ‘On national income’ for the doctoral degree. He also reported that professors of the faculty decided to refer the dissertation to the Faculty of Law for review, and this was confirmed by the board’s decree on the same day. On 7 April Nikolay Vasilyev, the Dean of the Faculty of Law informed the University Board of the results of an expert review of the dissertation by the professors of law, and the work was ‘unanimously approved by members of the faculty’. Having received the letter of their colleagues from the Faculty of Law, the professors from the main board decided to publish the text of the dissertation<sup>46</sup>. On 26 May 1837, the Dean of Department presented Chivilev’s dissertation as ‘approved and printed’<sup>47</sup> by the university printing press, in order to award him with the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chivilev’s dissertation defense took place on 2 June 1837 at 11.00 am, at a meeting of the Faculty of Philosophy’s First Department Board. The curator and his assistant, the rector of the

---

<sup>42</sup> O proizvodstve v uchenye stepeni na osnovanii polozheniya o sem, 20.01.1819. Cols. 1136; Obschii ustav imperatorskikh rossiiskikh universitetov, 26.07.1835. Cols. 744.

<sup>43</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 30, file 185, fol. 32-32 v.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. Fol. 35.

<sup>45</sup> TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 477, file 24, fol. 110 v.-111, 139.

<sup>46</sup> TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 5, file 174, fol. 11, 12, 28, 29 v.

<sup>47</sup> TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 477, file 25, fol. 33. See the text of the dissertation: TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 5, file 174, fol. 33-63 v.

university, and deputies from the board were present. The professors concluded that Chivilev was worthy of the degree in question. After a few days, they prepared and sent all the documents necessary to the Minister through the curator, and expected a response to the curator of the district's report from the Minister, which would confirm Chivilev's degree<sup>48</sup>. It seemed that all formalities had been observed, and nothing suggested a storm was about to break.

On 16 July 1837, the Minister rejected the curator's request to confirm Chivilev as a Doctor of Philosophy. Uvarov explained to the curator (and through him to the professors) that the decree of 31 December 1835 applied only to those university adjuncts who had by then already held the title. Uvarov also reminded him of the special decree on graduates of the Professorial Institute at the Dorpat. The Minister accepted the defended dissertation, but to award the degree he needed to add the applicant's 'other forms of examinations' to it, according to the new regulations on academic degree awarding in 1837. On 21 August, the professors from the University of Moscow received the curator's letter about the refusal to confirm Chivilev's degree. Three days later, at a faculty meeting, the examinations took place in the presence of the rector and deputies from other faculties. Chivilev presented written responses to three questions on his main subject, statistics, and was recognized as 'certainly worthy of the degree of doctor'. This efficiency notwithstanding, Uvarov only confirmed Chivilev as a Doctor of Philosophy and a Professor Extraordinary at the Department of Political Economics and Statistics on 15 April 1838<sup>49</sup>.

Therefore, because the programmes had been implemented, the Imperial universities acquired young professors with doctoral degrees. According to data from the Ministry, over five years (1832 – 1837) Russia had 372 candidates, 19 Master's student and 20 doctoral students. Seven of these were at the University of Dorpat in 1833; 12 were from the University of St Petersburg in 1835, and one other was there in 1836. In the next five years (1837 – 1843) 29 doctoral students, 33 Master's students and 638 candidates were added to this<sup>50</sup>. This growth required that the procedure of academic attestation be developed further. In the process, the dissertation acquired the status of original scholarly research<sup>51</sup>, which needed to be evaluated, and a new generation of professors learned to be loyal servants of the state.

From the late 1820s to the mid 1830s, there was a redistribution of power between actors of academic attestation. It was entirely different from the 1810s and 1820s, where professors played the main role in awarding degrees and the Minister's intervention was minimal. In the early 1830s, young scholars knew from personal experience that many (if not all) academic

---

<sup>48</sup> TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 477, file 25, fol. 68; TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 5, file 174, fol. 64.

<sup>49</sup> TsGAM. f. 418, inv. 5, file 174, fol. 73-74, 75, 76, 79, 90.

<sup>50</sup> RGIA, f. 733, inv. 89, file 178, fol. 114.

<sup>51</sup> See: Wiszlenkova E., Ilina K. *On the Origin of Russian Academic Degrees (First Half of the Nineteenth Century)* // *Rozprawy z Dziejów Oświaty* / Red. J. Schiller. Warszawa, 2013. T. L. S. 81-99.

problems could be solved through the Ministry, through the patronage of an interested official. It seems that this was the basis of Sergey Uvarov's belief that he could manage university corporation at will, by changing its professional and expert decisions. Now that they were obligated to the Minister, new university professors became 'an instrument of government' to promote and support a new ideology of public education in Nicholas I's police state.

Kira A. Ilina

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Poletaev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities (IGITI). Senior research fellow.

E-mail: [glukist@mail.ru](mailto:glukist@mail.ru), Tel. +7 (495) 621-37-02

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Ilina, 2014