



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Kira Ilina*

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

The article presents an analysis of the practice of degree awarding in Russia in the 1830s. The author considered legal and regulatory acts, memoirs and archival documents and studied the ways to climb an academic or a bureaucratic ladder open to graduates. The article describes some typical and atypical cases of degree awards. The study of these revealed a turbulent character of the state regulation of this sphere, as well as the existence of alternative ways to acquire an academic degree that made it possible for a Minister of Education to interfere into the procedures of 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 within the framework of 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 any support and critical statements.

The publications by Russian historians of academic degrees have one thing in common: their sources are limited to laws and personal texts (biographies, letters, and memoirs)<sup>3</sup>. Because of this self-limitation, scholars had to focus on the reconstruction of legal manipulations of academic attestation, or, to be precise, on the logic of the creation of a normative act and its contents (the scope of the degree examinations, a disputation, and a confirmation of a degree). In this context, memoirs and even some fragmentarily used documents from university archives serve as an illustration, which demonstrates an (un)efficiency of legal acts. I will give an example. All studies of the degree awarding in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia cover the following grounds: they 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 the academic degree awarding of 1837 and 1844. When addressing the period of mid1820s – mid1830s, the historians of science and education render the state programmes of the training of professors (the foundation of the Professorial institute at the University of Dorpat, and the training of the law students at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Imperial Chancellery). To demonstrate the impact of these measures, information about numbers and social status of students, memoirs concerning their everyday 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 of the archival sources made 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 provoked by the crisis of the Universities in the late 1820s and the staff reform of the late 1820s – early 1830s, which resulted from it. If my hypothesis is correct, the results of academic attestation were unpredictable in such circumstances: there were no universal rules and requirements for applicants and University experts – examiners. All depended on particular

---

<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.

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

In this article, I reveal various legal ways and loopholes to acquire an academic degree in the Russian universities of early 1830s – the apogee of the rule of Nickolas I and a period immediately after Sergey Uvarov had been appointed the Minister of National Education.

### *Legal web*

A study of the early 19<sup>th</sup> century legal acts dedicated 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 – mid 1830s.

In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century the local foundation charters and the charters of 1803-04 were in place; these set general procedures of attestation and established three degrees (of a candidate, a master, and a doctor) introduced by a decree ‘On the structure of High schools’<sup>5</sup> of 24 January 1803. The Regulations of academic degree awarding of 1819 made the procedure of academic attestation universal for all the Empire. This introduced an additional degree (of a student) and established a succession of degrees and the order of academic attestation. The text contained the criteria of expert knowledge applicants were supposed to meet. Moreover, the Regulations distributed the ‘disciplines’ between faculties. It was possible to be awarded a degree at any of the four faculties: of theology, law, medicine and philosophy, the latter consisting of two departments: of physic and mathematics, and ethics and philology<sup>6</sup>. However, this division did not correspond to the real structure of Imperial universities (which did not just deviate from the one described by the Regulations but also were unique at each university)<sup>7</sup>.

The staff crisis that occurred at universities in the late 1820s stimulated the emergence of two projects of professorial training, that of Georg Friedrich Parrot and Mikhail Speransky. The former, a member of the Academy of Sciences at St Petersburg, the resorer 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 were spent on them, they ‘did not produce what is necessary for the fruitful existence of these universities – namely, a class of native Russian professors worthy of a

---

<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.

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, and in seven years (after five years of studies at Dorpat, a magisterial dissertation and a two-years 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 to choose 20 students to be trained for professorship and to reduce the training period to four years (two years at 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 planned 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>. For this Speransky had chosen six best graduates of the Theological Academies of Moscow and St Petersburg that had experienced a thorough overhaul of curriculum, and where students were taught Latin as well as Canon law.

These programmes created a system of professorial training for the universities of the Empire. However, in the context of personal rule high officials of state were often tempted to get preferment or to adjust the system to ‘their’ people. Thus, 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 request of the rector of the University of Dorpat and the director of the Professorial Institute to let the university board to award degrees to the graduates who passed the examinations not according to the seniority of degrees but according to the graduates’ successes and knowledge. In this case, they referred to the degrees of doctor of philosophy and doctor of law, because by that time the University of Dorpat had already had the right to award the degree of the doctor of medicine. This was certainly applied to the medics – 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 existing procedure of degree examination. Otherwise, he thought, the graduates ‘would have to study disciplines that are far remote from their main disciplines’<sup>12</sup>, because the degree examination implied testing the graduates’ knowledge in all disciplines of a faculty. Other professors, however, voted to preserve the existing rules<sup>13</sup>. Thus, Erdmann failed to take the graduates of the Institute out of field where the Regulations of 1819 applied.

Another initiative of university officials 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. But, in the professor’s opinions, the graduates did not have time to write ‘well-grounded discourses’. In this case, colleagues supported Erdmann. It was decided at a meeting of the university council 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 return of young scholars to Russia, at Dorpat or any other university of the Empire. However, on 13 March 1831 Lieven reminded them that the Institute graduates had enough privileges already and remarked that in his opinion, the young scholars had enough time to prepare and defend their dissertations<sup>14</sup>.

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 came back from Europe: three masters (an economist Alexandr Chivilev, a historian Mikhail Kutorga and a physicist Vassily Lapshin), and two candidates (a philologist Vladimir Pecherin and an economist Victor Poroshin). Especially for them the Minister initiated a new decree published on 23 July 1835, that is, three days before the publication of a new university charter. The decree stated the desire to ‘reduce’ multi-staged forms of tests so that young scholars could quickly be employed at university departments. It is interesting that while trying to achieve this, Uvarov referred to the project of Speransky and recommended to use the rules created for law students to test the scholars<sup>15</sup>. The examinations were to take place at the University of St Petersburg.

At the same time, the officials of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department demanded privileges for their graduates. In 1833, the first group of young lawyers who had studied at Berlin came back, and a question of their academic attestation arose. On 12 April 1833, acting upon the instigation of

---

<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.

Mikhail Speransky, Balugyansky sent a long memorial ‘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 at St Petersburg and Berlin, and focused on their academic successes and sacrifices they had made in order to study, and not to further their careers. At the end, he referred, first, to the experience of the Professorial Institute, and asked to hold the doctoral examinations of returning students at the University of St Petersburg. Moreover, pointing out the variability and the lack of uniform rules of academic attestation Balugyansky suggested that a special programme to test law graduates was needed. The Emperor approved his plan on the next day<sup>16</sup>. By mid-December the rules were ready, and on 29 January 1834, the examinations began<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 preparations to the examinations of the first law students, Vassily Znamensky and Konstantin Nevolin. The curator reported that already in previous October, the faculty of Philosophy and Law established a ‘ritual of a public disputation’ and the list of those invited to it, and chose the reviewers out of professors. The process was prolonged by the publication of dissertations that presented ‘a serious problem at proofreading’ because of ‘a great number of references and notes in Greek’<sup>18</sup>. At the end, the dates of examinations were set. However, Znamensky died a week before the disputation scheduled for January. On 8 February 1835, Nevolin triumphed at the defense of his dissertation ‘On the philosophy of law making of the Ancients’ in three languages: Russian, Latin and German. It is also known that in January 1835 the faculty considered a dissertation, that of another student of Speransky – Alexey Blagovetshensky<sup>19</sup>. The remaining students (Savva Bogoroditsky and Sergey Ornatsky) did not submitted completed dissertations.

Meanwhile Uvarov asked Speransky to appoint his students as heads of three departments of the faculty of Ethics and Politics of the University of Moscow where there were vacancies. The ‘only problem’ was that the majority of returning students had not yet passed their examinations and had not completed 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 dissertations (since another year would be required for this), the state official suggested that the graduates would defend publicly ‘from 30 to 40 and more theses from all legal disciplines’<sup>20</sup>. This way the attestation of the graduates would have been completed by May. Speransky

---

<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.

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

intended to ask the Emperor's permission to implement this project. On 13 May 1835, Balugyansky reported to Uvarov that the project of the replacement of 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 the universities of the Empire.

Moreover, from August – September 1835 the rules of academic attestation of the new charter came to force (the charter as a whole was in force since 1837). As a whole, these rules were qualifying, and reflected the results of the practice of attestation of the first three decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. At the same time, there were some differences. For example, a degree of a 'student' was abolished, and three remained: that of candidate, master and doctor. The most important change was the requirement for those applying for a professorial position to hold a degree of doctor<sup>22</sup>. It should be noted that as far as the University of Dorpat was concerned the requirement for a contender for a professorial position to hold a doctoral degree was set in the charter of 1803, and then – in the charter of 1820<sup>23</sup>. Moreover, 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 prescribing that all applicants for professorial positions should have doctoral degrees, and all applicants for the position of adjuncts – magisterial ones<sup>24</sup>. However, this suggestion was a prescription rather than an order ('in cases that would arise, wherever possible') and thus was not followed. It seems that by 1835 professors had managed to forget about it. Thus, the presence of this requirement in the charter of 1835 created panic among the university lecturers who did not hold the necessary degrees.

It seems that having realized the scale of catastrophe and desiring to keep talented young lecturers without degrees at universities, Minister Uvarov initiated a special decree. According to it, university adjuncts could be awarded doctoral degrees without examinations. They were required to write and defend dissertations publicly<sup>25</sup>. Here I would disagree with Anatoly Ivanov who thinks that defense of a dissertation without prior examination was first made legal in 1842 in the charter of the St Vladimir University of Kiev and was intended for applicants to part-time Associate professorial positions<sup>26</sup>.

---

<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.



Thus by late 1820s – early 1830s the legal field of the Russian Empire embraced, on top of specific legislative acts regulating the awarding of ecclesiastical and medical degrees<sup>27</sup>, at least nine official, but not connected trajectories of academic attestation:

- 1) Local university charters (1803, 1804 and 1820);
- 2) The ‘Regulations of academic degree awarding’, 20 January 1819, applicable to all universities;
- 3) The permission for the graduates of the Professorial Institute to defend theses in their fields of knowledge, 11 November 1830;
- 4) The permission for the students of Speransky to be attested according to a special programme, 15 December 1833;
- 5) The permission for the students of Speransky to replace dissertations with public defenses of theses, 13 May 1835;
- 6) The decree about a special programme for five graduates of 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 the 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 often did not correspond to the structures of universities and to what specialists they had, each applicant only rarely fitted into ideal framework prescribed by law. More often, a young scholar had to manoeuvre between various programmes and guess the rules established by the authorities while drawing one’s individual trajectory of acquiring a degree and building one’s academic career.

The fates of academic attestation of the graduates of 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), one (Alexandr Shumansky) chose civil service. In the late 1832 – early 1833 a number of public disputations took place. These resulted in 13 graduates

---

<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.

awarded degrees of doctor: six became doctors of medicine (surgeons Nikolay Pirogov and Feodor Inozemtsev, a physiologist Alexey Filomafitsky, therapists Grigory Sokolsky and Nikanor Skadovsky, a zoologist Stepan Kutorga), six – doctors of philosophy (philologists Dmitry Kryukov and Alfons Walitsky, a historian Mikhail Lunin, a mathematician Petr Kotelnikov, botanists Petr Kornukh-Trotsky and Ivan Shikhovky, the latter was also awarded the degree of the doctor of medicine at the University of Dorpat in 1829), and one – a doctor of law (Ignaty Ivanosky). Three graduates were awarded the degrees of the masters of philosophy (an economist Alexandr Chivilev, a physicist Vassily Lapshin and a historian Mikhail Kutorga). When abroad they were joined by a candidate of the University of St Petersburg, a philologist Vladimir Pecherin, who upon his return from Europe in the autumn of 1835 passed the examination according to the programme of the students of Speransky at the University of Moscow<sup>28</sup>.

Speransky had a connection to academic careers of Petr Redkin and Petr Kalmykov who studied at the Professorial Institute at Dorpat. In 1828, they were sent to the Professorial Institute from the Universities of Moscow and St Petersburg respectively, but after two years (in the late 1830) they had to leave Dorpat. At this point, a temporary ‘disarrangement’ of the law faculty of the University of Dorpat occurred. This happened because Professor Friedrich Clossius spent a long period studying abroad, Professor Alexander Magnus Fromhold von Reutz was ill, Professors Johann Philipp Gustav von Ewers and Christoph Christian von Dabelow died. All of this coincided with the death of one of the Speransky students (Alexandr Peshekhonov) in Berlin. Speransky informed the Emperor about it, and the latter had Kalmykov and Redkin send to the University of Berlin; on 24 November 1830, Speransky informed the Minister of education Lieven about this. Next day, Lieven let the University of Dorpat know of the Emperor's decision<sup>29</sup>. Thus, Redkin and Kalmykov joined the Speransky programme and were sent immediately to Berlin to study under the famous historian of law, Friedrich Carl von Savigny, who at the time taught the rest of the students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department of the Russian Imperial Chancellery.

Kalmykov and Redkin benefited from the law instigated by Speransky in May 1835; they both, like the majority of the students of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Department, 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 shortly.

---

<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.

What proved to be the most difficult task to be completed by the officials of the Ministry of education was to obtain dissertations from new doctors appointed professors at various universities of the Empire. Thus on 9 March 1838 Uvarov inquired of university boards ‘whether the above-mentioned graduates were obliged to compose dissertations, and what topic was selected by each of them’<sup>30</sup>. Soon the Minister learned that ‘in 1835 no order was 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 of 10 July addressed to the curators of educational districts Uvarov set a one year deadline for the defense of dissertations by the former Speransky students. In late October the curator of the University of St Petersburg informed the Ministry about the themes of dissertations of Yakov Barshev, Alexander Kranihfeld and Petr Kalmykov, and also wrote that the latter ‘in place of the theme ‘Historical description of state institutes of civil administration in Russia’ chosen the following 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 the letter from the curator of Moscow, Sergey Stroganov, who informed him about the massive teaching load of Redkin, which made it impossible for him to complete the dissertation in time. Similar requests to prolong the period for the preparation of dissertations were made in mid-summer of 1839 when the deadline for completion and submission of dissertations set by Uvarov was close. As a result, the Minister postponed the deadline for another year<sup>33</sup>.

However, the situation hardly changed a year later. In response to a new inquiry by the Ministry, the curator of Moscow answered on 6 December 1840 that Redkin had worked on rearrangement of his lectures on various subjects. When this was 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 requirement of the authorities in May 1842’<sup>34</sup>. As for Kalmykov, in January 1841 he sent the dean of his faculty a relation, in which he referred to administrative duties of the director of the 1<sup>st</sup> Gymnasium and promised to complete the dissertation on the ‘Main foundations of property and civil treaties’ during the ‘winter break’. Nevertheless, the dissertation by the young professor was submitted only in May 1842 and was discussed by the faculty. A review of the dissertation ‘On the symbolism of law in general and of Russian law in particular’ by Kalmykov survived; it was written on 30 November 1842 by a Professor of the faculty of law, a graduate of the Professorial Institute, Ignaty Ivanovsky<sup>35</sup>.

---

<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.

The story of the academic attestation of the economist Alexandr Chivilev was a quintessence of legal confusion and unpredictability. Chivilev graduated from the faculty of philosophy and law of the University of St Petersburg in 1827, and in 1828, he was awarded the degree of the candidate of laws and was appointed a student of the Professorial Institute at Dorpat<sup>36</sup>. There he chose to study political economy, which, together with cameral, financial and commercial disciplines, technology, civil architecture and martial disciplines, made up the technological and economical class of the faculty of philosophy of the University of Dorpat<sup>37</sup>. In his autobiographical entry in the 'Biographical dictionary of Professors and lecturers of the Imperial University of Moscow' Chivilev said that in early 1833 he defended a dissertation 'On poor relief' for the degree of the 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 relations and report send to the curator of the Dorpat educational district in 1866, said that in 1833 Chivilev 'acquired' a degree of the 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 degree of master was awarded in connection to the discipline, and that of doctor – in connection to the faculty. Thus, it remains to be discovered how three graduates of the Professorial Institute (Chivilev, Mikhail Kutorga and Lapshin) managed to become masters of philosophy (the fact is proven by the title pages of their dissertations).

Soon after the defense of the dissertation, in July 1833 Chivilev, like many other graduates of the Institute, went to study at 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, in accordance with the decree of 23 July about the examinations of the graduates of the Professorial Institute returning from abroad, remained at the capital<sup>40</sup>. However, on 9 October 1835 Uvarov informed the curator that scholars who came back from abroad should be examined at those universities they were appointed to.

Chivilev was send 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 of awarding of academic degrees of 1819, or the charter of 1835.

---

<sup>36</sup> Biograficheskii slovar professorov i prerodavatelei imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za istekayuschee stoletie so dnya uchrezhdeniya yanvarya 12-go 1755 goda po den stoletnego yubileya yanvarya 12-go 1855 goda, sostavlennyi trudami professorov i prerodavatelei, zanimavshikh kafedry v 1854 godu, i raspolozhennyi 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: sostavlen po otchetam i doneseniyam, predstavlenym popechitel'yu Derptsogo uchebnogo okruga. Derpt, 1866. P. 115.

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

The applicant himself could choose the legal framework<sup>41</sup>. This choice offered to a master is very important in the context, because according to the Regulations of 1819 political economy was placed within the disciplines 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 the 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 the 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>, and Uvarov finally agreed to this in late November 1835<sup>44</sup>.

The decree of 31 December 1835 that enabled university adjuncts to be awarded doctoral degrees without examinations provoked a series of declarations of intentions to write dissertations, and later – public defenses at Moscow. Chivilev proved no exception. The minutes of the First Department of the faculty of Philosophy of 10 October 1836 mentioned that Chivilev presented the Department's board with two possible themes of his doctoral dissertation 'On national income' and '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 the dean of the Department, Kachenovsky, reported that adjunct Chivilev submitted a dissertation 'On national income' for the degree of doctor. He also reported that professors of the faculty decided to refer the dissertation to the faculty of law for reviewing, 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 expert reviewing of the dissertation by the professors of law: the work was 'unanimously approved by members of the faculty'. Having received the relation of the colleagues from the faculty of law, the professors of the main board decided to publish the text of the dissertation<sup>46</sup>. On 26 May of 1837, the Dean of the Department presented the dissertation of the candidate of laws and the master of philosophy Chivilev, 'approved and printed'<sup>47</sup> by the University printing press, for awarding the degree of the doctor of philosophy.

---

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

<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.

The defense of the dissertation by Chivilev took place on 2 June 1837 at 11.00 in the morning at the meeting of the board of the First Department of the faculty of Philosophy; the curator and his assistant, the rector of the 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 necessary documents to the Minister via the curator, and expected the response to the report of the curator of the district to the Minister, which would confirm the Chivilev's degree<sup>48</sup>. It seemed that all formalities had been observed, and nothing forecasted a storm.

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 by then already held the title. Uvarov also reminded him about the special decree concerning the graduates of the Professorial Institute at Dorpat. The Minister accepted the defended dissertation, but to award the degree he required from the applicant to add 'other forms of examinations' to it, in accordance to the new Regulations of academic degree awarding of 1837. On 21 August. the professors of the University of Moscow received the relation of the curator of the district about the refusal to confirm Chivilev in his degree. Three days later, at the meeting of the faculty, the required 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 confirmed Chivilev as a doctor of philosophy and a professor extraordinary at the Department of political economics and statistics only on 15 April 1838<sup>49</sup>.

Thus, as a result of the implementations of the programmes, the Imperial universities acquired young professors who had doctoral degrees. According to the data from the Ministry, during five years (1832-1837) Russia got 372 candidates, 19 masters and 20 doctors (seven of these – at the University of Dorpat in 1833, 12 – at the University of St Petersburg in 1835, and another one – in 1836). In the next five years (1837-1843) 29 doctors, 33 masters and 638 candidates were added to this<sup>50</sup>. This growth required the development of the procedure of academic attestation. In the process dissertation acquired a status of an original scholarly research<sup>51</sup>, which needed an evaluation, and the new generation of professors learned to be loyal servants of the state.

---

<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.

During the late 1820s – mid 1830s there was a redistribution of power between actors of academic attestation. It was completely different from the 1810-1820s, when the main role in the awarding degrees played professors, and the intervention of the minister was minimal. In the early 1830s from personal experience young scholars knew that many (if not all) academic problems could be solved through the Ministry, through a 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, for example, by changing its professional and expert decisions. Being obliged to the minister new university professors became 'an instrument of government' to promote and support of the new ideology of public education in the frame of Nicholas I 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