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Presenting Bentham’s Panopticon as an epitome of modern, “disciplinary” governmentality, Michael Foucault singled out the École Militaire, founded in Paris in 1751, as a source of inspiration for this institution. As Foucault tells us, Jeremy Bentham believed that “it was while visiting the École Militaire that his brother first had the idea of the Panopticon.” Foucault devotes considerable attention to describing the concern of the school’s founder Joseph Pâris-Duverney with arranging the space so as to enable surveillance, crucial for producing “docile bodies”: “the very building of the École was to be apparatus of observation.” Among other things, “the rooms were distributed along a corridor like a series of small cells; at regular intervals, an officer’s quarters were situated, so that every ten pupils had an officer on each side,” and so forth. Foucault actually makes something of a sleight of hand here: due to the lack of fund, the school that was actually built (and visited by Samuel Bentham) differed somewhat from the design described in Pâris-Duverney’s memorandum for Gabriel, the architect, quoted above. And in fact, lately scholars have been inclined to stress a different version of the Panopticon’s genealogy, emphasizing instead that it has been conceived of by Samuel Bentham while in the employment of Prince Grigorii Potemkin, Catherine II’s favorite and minister. A number of theories have been set forth regarding the ways in which the Russian provenance might have shaped its design – and what does this connection mean for our understanding both of the Panopticon, and of state and power in early modern Russia.

However, it is actually the École Militaire that links the Panopticon most directly to Russia. As a matter of fact, while Pâris-Duverney was claiming in 1750 to have simply resurrected a project prepared back in 1725 by his late brother, he was also explicitly referring to the St Petersburg Cadet corps as an example to emulate! As he assured Louis XV, “among all the models that could be taken to form [the École Militaire], there could not be a better one than the Cadet School in Petersburg established in 1732 by the Field Marshal von Münnich.” Indeed, Pâris-Duverney had also penned for the king an extensive memorandum of over a dozen pages, describing in much detail the structure of the Russian school. While this memorandum does not dwell on the spatial arrangements at the Cadet Corps in Russia (or indeed, explain what was so wonderful about this model), it does refer to the need for “disciplining” the Russian subjects as a motivation for von Münnich in founding the school. Allegedly, upon assuming command of the Russian troops, von Münnich realized that it was only the “discipline” that they lacked. In order
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to discipline the Russian soldiers (described as “esclaves sans pouvoir jamais sortir de cet état”),
he needed to train the nobles first: “La noblesse les commande, et pour luy apprendre à
commander il falloit l’instruire elle même, dompter pour ainsy dire son caractère féroce, et la
former à un art dont la méthode et les règles font aujourd’hui tous les avantages et toute la
force.”

The discourse on “discipline” and “disciplining” occupies a central place in our thinking
about early modern state building. Most clearly, perhaps, this perspective has been articulated by
historical sociologist Philip Gorski, who fused the ideas of Michel Foucault, Max Weber,
Gerhard Oestreich, and Norbert Elias, to present a vision of what he calls a “disciplinary
revolution” in early modern Western Europe. According to Gorski, this “revolution,” or a
struggle to create a more disciplined polity, involved the emergence of a new “infrastructure of
governance” – a network of practices and institutions (“new mechanisms for the production of
social and political order”) designed for controlling behavior and shaping of subjectivity, or
Foucault’s “conduct of conduct.” The most important among them were the practices of
surveillance, as the “disciplinary revolution” was driven by a “key technology: the technology of
observation – self-observation, mutual observation, hierarchical observation. For it was
observation – surveillance – that made it possible to unleash the energies of the human soul…
and harness them for the purposes of political power and domination.” It is this shift from
physical coercion to non-coercive forms of control that helped to create “more obedient and
industrious subjects with less coercion and violence.” Schools – from the modest parish schools
to the École Militaire – were the crucially important cites for articulating this discourse
in Western Europe, and Foucault himself cites the school as one of the key disciplinary institutions
of modernity, alongside the army, the prison, and the church. In Russian context, the school was,
presumably central for the efforts to reshape the Russian elite under Peter and his successors.

5 Archives Nationales (Paris), Le carton des Rois, K 149.1. No.5.1, “Memoir: Collège académique,” April 22, 1750. The
description of St Petersburg Corps is in Ibid., No.8.1, “Memoir,” April 18, 1750. I am extremely grateful to Gemma Tidman of
Oxford University for sharing these documents with me and to Harold Guizar of York University for providing further advice
regarding their authorship.
6 Philip S. Gorski, The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe (Chicago:
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(see his Neostoicism and the Early Modern State (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982; 2008)), although its roots
could be traced to Max Weber. Highly pertinent, of course, is also Marc Raeff, The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and
Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983). For an
overview social disciplining in eighteenth-century Russia, see Lars Behrisch, “Social Discipline in Early Modern Russia,
Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries,” in Institutionen, Instrumente und Akteure sozialer Kontrolle und Disziplinierung im
frühneuzeitlichen Europa / Institutions, Instruments and Agents of Social Control and Discipline in Early Modern Europe, eds.
7 Gorski, The Disciplinary Revolution, xvi.
9 Marc Raeff’s article “Transfiguration and Modernization: The Paradoxes of Social Disciplining, Paedagogical Leadership, and
the Enlightenment in 18th Century Russia,” in Marc Raeff, Political Ideas and Institutions in Imperial Russia (Boulder, CO:
Westview Press, 1994), 334-47, esp. pp. 341-44. A different and, in our opinion, much more satisfying understanding of
transfiguration as built on the transformative power of the tsar’s mystical charisma is presented in Ernest A. Zitser, The
Transfigured Kingdom: Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority at the Court of Peter the Great (Ithaca, NY: Cornell
Taking the link – via the École Militaire – between the Noble Cadet Corps in St Petersburg and Foucault’s Panopticon as a cue, this article reflects on the emergence of discipline as a discourse and discipline as a set of pedagogic techniques in Russia in the first half of the eighteenth century, insofar as these were embodied in school and school building.  

Is there any place for “discipline” in or thinking about early modern Russia? On the one hand, there is a growing trend in the literature to apply the notions of “social disciplining” and disciplinary revolution to early modern Russian, even to the period before Peter’s reign. As noted by Paul Bushkovitch, beginning from the mid-seventeenth century, there appears in Muscovy an increasing concern with the conduct of the populace. As a part of this trend, the ecclesiastic and secular authorities emphasized sermons and sought, at least on rhetorical level, to police the morals of the clergy and the flock, a development that seems to be analogous to the process of confessionalization in Western Europe. Cathy J. Potter in particular has argued that the church intended to promote “a new understanding of the faith, ... one which demanded an informed and thoughtful belief.”  

As an extension of this trend, the late Professor V. M. Zhivov explicitly drew upon Gorski’s concept of “disciplinary revolution” to characterize the religious policies pursued by the Russian state in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including the fight against “superstitions.”

On the other hand, a long list of scholars, beginning with Max Weber, viewed disciplinary technologies in Western Europe, in particular, those of observation, as rooted in very specific theological sensibilities. In particular, Gorski, while admitting that disciplining efforts took place all over the continent, finds “subtle but important differences between confessions” in that regard. It was, allegedly, the peculiarly Calvinists understanding of disciplina that produced an especially intense focus on “voluntary” and “inward” obedience, on achieving “natural harmony between morality and desire,” and found its expression in the development of the panoptical techniques that formed the very essence of “disciplinary revolution.” In this sense, for Gorski disciplinary sensibilities seem not to be fully universal. And indeed, even as he found attempts to perform a “disciplinary revolution” in Muscovy, V. M. Zhivov conceded that the efforts of the Muscovite authorities were focused “not so much on moral perfection of the
society, as on correction of the ritual,” i.e. on the external conformity.  

In order to illuminate the process of articulation of disciplinary sensibilities and practices this article traces the genealogy of school building in Russia in the first half of the eighteenth century. By looking into the ways the school building was conceptualized, into its emergence as a special type of a building, I explore the notions of power and subjecthood in Russia – the political pedagogy, so to say – and the driving forces behind the evolution of these sensibilities. My narrative stresses the role of “administrative entrepreneurs,” especially of those with Pietist affiliations, in articulating the disciplinary discourse; as well as the ways in which the school building was subject to discursive appropriation and reinterpretation by diverse players. Focus on disciplinary sensibilities also leads to the reaffirmation of the divide between Peter’s reign and the subsequent era. Indeed, Catriona Kelly recently juxtaposed Peter’s enforcement of the requirements of “loyal service” by “twin means of punishment and reward,” by “savage penalties,” to Catherine II’s focus on achieving the interiorization of self-restraint by her elite; her discussion on vosptanie in Russia begins, for all the practical purposes, with Catherine’s reign. And Olga Kosheleva argues that until Catherine II’s reign, the Russian state “did not conceive of ways of manipulating its subjects through the school system.” This article maps the emergence of “discipline” in Russia as a prologue to Catherine’s embrace of vosptanie.

I.

In Western Europe, the great driving force behind the invention of disciplinary regimes was the church, or rather, the competing confessions that designed new methods of control over mind and body in the context of Reformation/Counterreformation, especially in the post-Westphalia era, and it is from the ecclesiastical institutions that these practices migrated to the military and to schools. By the end of the seventeenth century, some groups in Western Europe especially came to stress the need for an individual’s “thorough transformation,” for “true” conversion, or interiorization of belief; they developed new practices and refurbished the old ones – such as monastic regulation of daily prayers – for facilitating this process. This focus could actually span the confessional divides, linking Quietistic Catholicism of Fenelon with the Pietism of Francke, thus underpinning much of modern pedagogy. So, when the aristocratic
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15 Catriona Kelly, Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 11-12.
16 An excellent overview and systematization of existing literature is provided by O. E. Kosheleva, “Education as a problem in Seventeen Century Russia” (forthcoming), with whom this author is very much in agreement on this subject.
17 See, for example, Willem J. op ’t Hof, “Protestant Pietism and Medieval Monasticism,” in Confessionalism and Pietism: Religious Reform in Early Modern Europe, ed. Fred Van Lieburg (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2006), 31–50; Christoph Schmitt-
social reformers in France at the dawn of the eighteenth century sought to segregate young noble cadets from pernicious influences of the common soldiery by placing them in special cadet companies, contemporaries wasted no time in recognizing these seclusionary efforts as inspired by church practices: a diarist referred to these unit as “in reality, seminaries.”

Russian Orthodox Church did not have a similar tradition. As V. M. Zhivov points out, salvation in medieval Muscovy was not viewed as linked to human efforts, to the conduct of the individual faithful or of the Christian community at large; the transformation of this world into a Kingdom of God was to come not as a result of moral improvement of the flock, but rather as the gradual “expansion of the liturgical Cosmos.” The duty of the Christians was to maintain the continuity of worship and purity of the ritual. This approach, arguably, left little room for focusing on purposefully achieving individual moral transformation, much less for formulating “disciplinary” technique and procedures of such transformation. Russia’s monasteries, generally speaking, did not practice seclusion from the lay world; nor there was anything resembling Jesuit seminaries with their disciplinarian regime. Cathy Potter found a program of what she dubbed “Enlightenment” pursued by the church at the end of the century, most prominently, a new emphasis on sermons and preaching. Yet – at least, the way I read Porter’s findings – this campaign does not seem to have been underpinned by that obsession with “inwardness” – Innerlichkeit – and available texts to not dwell on articulating the gap between the external and the internal. “Morality,” as articulated in the context of Potter’s “Enlightenment,” seems to be poorly, if at all distinguishable from observing the rituals and the rules of external decorum, and in this sense, it is doubtful that the very notion of “interior” (as different from the “exterior”) had much meaning for the Russians of the era, save, perhaps, for a narrow circle of Ruthenian learned clerics. On the more instrumental level, while Potter points out that the deliberations of the 1681-1682 church council referred to enforcing stricter compliance with monastic rules, including an intention to regulate access into monasteries situated in the urban environment, she also acknowledges that these references did not make it into the final decisions of the council.

In that sense, the Orthodox Church does not appear to have been driving the “disciplinary” transformation of the school. While there was a marked and growing interest in “learning” in seventeenth-century Muscovy, teaching was understood as highly informal and personal, as a direct relationship with a tutor, senior relative, a master craftsman, or a wise
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A late Muscovite “school” was built around the “master”—teacher who gathered around him apprentices and students. This was a distinctly artisanal arrangement, and indeed, the teacher and his assistant were called master and podmasterʹe, just as any other artisans. Teaching space in this context was not differentiated from the master’s living quarters and/or his workshop. Students were not expected to lodge in “school,” but rather obtained accommodation in town as best they could; the teachers did not seek to control their behavior outside of school hours, or, at the very least, we don’t know of any administrative instruments employed to this end. Training of future clerks at the prikazy offices seems to have been conducted in a similar informal way.22 By the end of the century, a relatively spacious specially designated chamber (“palata shkolʹnogo ucheniia”) would sometimes be assigned for the leading teachers to work at. Thus, the “Typography” School (called so because it was attached to a printing press) was housed in 1681 in what used to be a “proofreader’ chamber.” That means that the teaching space was now differentiated from teachers’ living quarters; no provisions, however, were made for accommodating students, or for organizing the space within such chambers. Characteristically, the teaching equipment purchased for the school included also an “iron chain” for restraining the students.23 Probably the earliest school regulations in Russia, Silvestr Medvedev’s “Privilege” (1682) for the “academy” he was hoping to found with the Tsar Fedor’s support, turns to the issue of facilities for the future school in its very first paragraph: according to this proposal, the academy was to be housed at the Savior Monastery in Kitai-Gorod, by the Neglinnaia Gate. Yet, Medvedev’s focus here is solely on providing lodging for the rector (the role he most certainly reserved for himself) and teachers. The same paragraph also lists a number of other monasteries to be assigned to the academy, along with their landed estates. One of them, the Danilov Monastery, is earmarked specifically for “lodging newly arriving [to the academy] people.” There is nothing in the text, however, that might indicate an intention to confine students within the walls of the monastery, nor there is any talk of “supervising,” or “observing” them.24

The first purpose-build school facility in Russia was constructed in the 1687 for the so-called “Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy” established by Ioannikios (1633-1717) and Sofronios (1652-1730) Leichoudes in Moscow. In terms of its curriculum, the academy reproduced a
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22 See, for example, B. L. Fonkich, Greko-slavʹanske shkoly v Moskve v XVII veke (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskich kul’tur, 2009), passim; N.F. Demidova, “Prikaznye shkoly nachalʹnogo obrazovaniia v Moskve XVII v.,” in Torgovlia i predprinimatelʹstvo v feodalʹnoi Rossii (Moscow: Arkheograficheskii tsentr, 1994), 152-67.
24 On the “Privilege,” see Fonkich, Greko-slavianskie shkoly, 190-213. The text itself appears on pages 223-231. For a detailed summary of the “Privilege” in English, see Potter, “The Russian Church and the Politics of Reform”, 389-93.
proper Western European Jesuit college, familiar to the brothers from their own studies in Italy.\footnote{25}

Initially, the Russian authorities ordered two wooden huts (izby) built for the school at one of the Moscow monasteries, each of them about six meters in length. These were primarily meant to provide lodging to the teachers themselves: one of the huts was specifically intended for their servants “to cook, and bake bread, and to live.” Later, the patriarch ordered a wooden house constructed for them at another monastery: it is described as a traditional Russian “srub,” that functioned as their “cell” where the students were to “come” for study.\footnote{26} Soon, however, the brothers were moved into a much larger specially constructed stone building. A nineteenth-century history of the school describes it as a substantial brick structure of three floors, with an additional two-story wing joined to it by a tower with a staircase inside. As far as we understand, it provided classrooms, and also quarters for teachers, but not for students.\footnote{27} Yet, the sources used by the author of this study are not clear; quite likely, he described the building as it existed much later, in the eighteenth century. What we do know is that a French traveler, one Foy de la Neuville, did recognize it in 1689 as “an extremely magnificent stone college,”\footnote{28} while a 1718 document refers to “schools with stone passages” and “school yard,” indicating at least some complexity of architectural design.\footnote{29} In any case, however, the very fact that we don’t have any official records whatsoever reflecting the building’s outlook suggests that the authorities were not concerned with its configuration: if anything, its design reflected the experiences and sensibilities of the Italian-educated Leichoudes.

Neither do we find any attempts to shape the building so as to discipline students at the Moscow School of Mathematics and Navigation (1701), traditionally hailed as Peter I’s signature educational initiative with a secular, technology-oriented curriculum. In fact, when its founders did discuss school facilities, their concerns lay elsewhere. Initially the school was housed in a former workshop in the Kadashi district, across the Moscow River from the Kremlin; however, according to the teachers, that building was unsuitable for their purposes. The school’s Scottish professor, Andrei Danilovich (Henry) Farquharson (1675?–1739)\footnote{30} and his two British

\footnote{25} Most notably, S. K. Smirnov, Istoriia moskovskoi slaviano-greko-latinskoi akademii (Moscow: Tip. V. Got’e, 1855); M. Smenshtovskii, Brat’ia Likhudy. Opyt issledovaniia iz istorii tserkovnogo prosveshcheniia i tserkovnoi zhizni kontsa XVII i nachala XVIII vekov (St. Petersburg: Tipo-Litografiiia M. P. Frolovoi, 1899); Nikolaos Chrissidis, Academy at the Courts of the Tsars: Greek Scholars and Jesuit Education in Early Modern Russia (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2016).

\footnote{26} Cited in D. N. Ramazanova, “Brat’ia Likhudy i nachal’nyi etap istorii Slaviano-greko-latinskoi akademii (1685-1694 gg.)” (Candidate’s diss., Russian State University for Humanities, 2003), 190.

\footnote{27} Smirnov, Istoria Moskovskoi akademii, 40.

\footnote{28} Foy de la Neuville, A Curious and New Account of Muscovy in the Year 1689, ed. Lindsey Hughes (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1994), 54.

\footnote{29} Cited in Rodion (Larionov), “Slaviano-greko-latinskaiia akademiiz v istorii vyshego obrazovaniia Rossii (1700-1755)” (Candidate’s dissertation in theology, Moscow Theological Academy, 2009), 62. The “passages” in question are likely an arcade lining the building, onto which individual classrooms opened. This design was typical of the early modern Ukrainian colleges: see L. Iu. Posokhova, Na perekhresti kul’tur, tradytsii, epokh: Pravoslavni kolehiumy Ukraïny naprykintsi XVII-nu pochatku XIX st. (Kharkiv: Kharkivskyi national’nyi universitet imeni V.N. Karazina, 2011), color inserts between pages 305 and 306.

assistants argued that the horizon could not be seen from that location, making it impossible to train students in astronomical observation. Importantly, the teachers also resented the remoteness of the workshop from the usual royal routes, thus making a hoped-for visit to the school by Peter I or his son the Tsarevich rather unlikely. 31 What mattered for them was not the shape of the building, but its location, in particular, whether this location enhanced their access to royal patronage. The tutors’ appeals were only heard in July, when the school was relocated to the Sukharev Tower and the “various buildings and land attached to it.” 32 Immediately after the relocation, the Tower underwent significant construction and renovation work, which included building several new stone chambers. The cost of this work, around two thousand rubles, is comparable to the total sums that had two decades earlier allocated to the construction of the Leichoudes’ academy. 33 These chambers, however, were to house additional classes, so the construction works did not result in creation of an enclosed compound. Instead, students were provided with traditional daily stipends, or “feed money,” and rented lodging in town as best they could; the school did not seek to organize constant supervision over them.

While the Petrine government sporadically sought to monitor class attendance, especially as schools grew in size, confinement was meant to be limited to the class hours only: the key motive for organizing control of this kind over students in Peter’s time was making sure that no money was “wasted” on stipends for those who miss classes. General Admiral Apraksin – possibly repeating Peter’s own words – instructed the teachers at the Navigation School that “those students are not to leave the school yard during the classes on their own, and the soldiers on guard are not to let the students outside.” So, schools of Petrine era were typically housed in random buildings, often sharing them with military units of governmental bureaus. The Artillery School set up in 1701 was located at the “Artillery Yard”; another was attached to the Artillery Regiment, the pupils of the third school, set up in 1721, studied at the “Petersburg laboratory house.” An engineering school founded in 1719 was initially housed “in the antechamber of the Artillery Chancellery”; it was then moved to a “large hall at the Gunners’ Quarter,” and not until 1724 did it get a separate building. 34 Mikhail Danilov, who studied at Moscow Artillery School in 1737, reported later in his memoirs that he and his brother stayed with a relative of theirs at his house by the Stone Bridge, and had to walk every day “to the artillery regimental yard by the

31 Materialy dlia istorii russkogo flota, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg: Tipografia Morskogo ministerstva, 1866), 289–90. Requests to transfer the school to a different location were repeated by the teachers on March 15 and April 24, 1701. A. E. Viktorov, Opisanie zapisnykh knig i bumag starinnych dvortsovikh priказov. 1584-1725 g., vol. 2 (Moscow: Tipo-Litografiiia S. I. Arkhipova i Ko, 1883), 468.
33 Viktorov, Opisanie zapisnykh knig i bumag, 467–68, 471, 478–79; V. N. Benda, Deiatel’nost’ voenso-spetsial’nykh uchebnikh zavedenii po podgotovke artilleriiskikh i inzhenernykh kadrov v XVIII veke (St. Petersburg: GUAP, 2009), 18.
Sukharev Tower,” that is, nearly to the other end of town.35 Echoing the traditional “artisanal” understanding of schooling, both Peter and his associates throughout most of the reign viewed “school” as a workshop run by an individual teacher – thus, the Moscow Navigation School was normally referred to as “schools,” shkoly, in plural, since it had more than one teaching “master.” So, when Peter ordered to “teach arithmetic,” or some other subjects to “young lads,” as he would usually put it, he did not concerned himself with designing, or even with providing, space for such teaching.

More generally, while an active supporter and promoter of teaching and learning, Peter I very much shared baroque Muscovite anthropological sensibilities. Peter’s notions could be described as vaguely “Augustinian” in the sense that “truth” was believed by him to be manifest and obvious, while one’s refusal to see it was explained by wicked “stubbornness” and “passions,” an echo of the original sin.36 Thus, the tsar’s political pedagogy relied on explanation and demonstration, a focus so striking in his decrees seeking to present to his subjects the benefits of the measures proposed for the common good. Typical in this regard is his decree mandating the installation in every government office of two tablets reminding officials of their duty: the “true” ways, either in religion, or in secular affairs had to be made available for everyone to see.37 On the other hand, refusal to acknowledge and accept the “true” ways, manifest and “obvious” as they were, was conceptualized as “stubbornness.” In this case, it was the ruler’s duty to help his subjects to overcome their own “stubbornness” by applying coercion. Beyond Peter, this worldview, arguably, explains also the heavy (indeed, often exclusive) reliance on violence and torture by the seventeenth-century Russian prelates, even as they pursued policies that supposedly paralleled the confessionalization drive in Western Europe; that was also the case with one of the most active and most educated among them, Afanasii of Kholmogory.38 That is also why it was perfectly normal for Peter to order that the Muslim
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princes in the Volga region convert to Orthodoxy within half a year: conversion obtained in such a way was not seen by him as problematic or imperfect.  

This approach, arguably, goes a long way towards explaining the lack of interest on Peter’s part in developing and regulating the “disciplinary” pedagogical routines and methods. Indeed, seventeenth-century Muscovy, of which Peter was very much a part, did not articulate the notion of “discipline” as a “conduct of conduct.” The word itself does not appear in pre-Petrine texts. A trilingual Russian-Greek-Latin dictionary, published in 1704 by Fedor Polikarpov-Orlov, does not have an entry on “discipline” either. The word does appear, however, in the entry on “nakazanie,” which is rendered into Latin as “disciplina, admonition, præceptum.” Note, however, that “nakazanie” in the seventeenth-century meant not so much “punishment” (as it does in modern Russian), but primarily “instruction.” Describing in 1705 the ways in which well-born children are educated in France, A. A. Matveev directly juxtaposed “nakazanie” to corporal punishment: according to him, the noble youth there are “brought up through good and sharp verbal nakazanie (ot nakazania slovesnago), rather than through beating.”

The earliest use of the term “distsiplina” is registered in 1703: it is found in the Russian translation of a Saxon version of a proposed treaty between Peter and King August of Poland. According to that document, the Russian auxiliary force was to be under King August’s “obedience and discipline.” On the margins of the document, however, there is a translator’s addendum explaining that “discipline” means “instruction” (obuchenie). By itself, such reading is not incompatible with contemporary European usage: after all, the dictionary of the French Academy defined “discipline” as “institution, education,” and the verb “discipliner” as “instruire, regler, former.” One senses, however, a conceptual disjoint emerging here between the Russian officials and their Western European counterparts. It is doubtful that King Augustus was indeed planning on training the Russian infantry under his command: what he had in mind clearly had to do with obedience. And pointing to the understanding of discipline which was to become dominant in the eighteenth century, a French adventurer, the so-called Baron Joseph de Saint-Hillaire referred in his 1716 proposal to “police et discipline” to be established at the Naval Academy.
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39 PSZ, vol. 5, № 2734, 66-68.
41 F. P. Polikarpov-Orlov, Leksikon trezzychnyi sirech’ rechenii slavenskikh, ellinogrecheskikh i latinskikh sokrovishte iz razlichnykh drevnikh i novykh knig’ sobranoe i po slavenskomu alfavitu v chin razpolozeno (Moscow: V ego tsarstvi typ, 1704), no pagination.
43 Pisma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tipografia, 1889), 509, ft. 1.
45 RGADA, f. 370, op. 1, d. 7, l. 51.
Indeed, a curious note found among Peter’s papers, unsigned and undated, seeks to explain to the tsar the very meaning of the term:

The word DISCIPLINE (дисциплина) is of Latin origin, and it signifies НАКАЗАНИЕ. So, where the Slavonic translation of the Bible talks of наказание, there the Latin one has discipline. For example: Приимите наказание (Psalm 2[:12]); Вызнаведели еси наказание (Psalm 49[:17]) – in all these instances the Latin translation has the word DISCIPLINE.

Besides that, the word DISCIPLINE acquired also a meaning of its own in certain orders, especially so in the ecclesiastic and the military ones. And ecclesiastical discipline means not only наказание, but also supervision (надсмотрение) by pastors over the Christians entrusted to them, with the threat and application of ecclesiastical punishments (казнеи). And military discipline means diligent supervision over the warriors, whether they follow their regulations strictly, with the threat and application of established punishments.46

We might surmise that the tsar had to frequently deal with this notion as he was reading Western European military treatises and regulations, or interacted with foreign experts, but also that the notion of discipline had to be not only translated, but also explained and interpreted for him. Equally notable is the effort of the note’s author, only partially successful, to make a conceptual leap from instruction—“наказание” to “supervision” – that also goes hand-in-hand with punishment – as well as the explicit parallel he makes between the church and the army as two comparable disciplinary institutions.

II.

Arguably, the first time the idea of restricting students to an enclosed space in order specifically to shape their behavior appears in the writings of a “projector,” Peter I’s agent in England Fedor Saltykov (d. 1715). Saltykov felt that he failed to live up to the tsar’s expectations (in fact, Peter did order his arrest); so, he sought to regain the sovereign’s good graces by presenting to the monarch the “Proposals” (Propozitsii) and “Declarations for state profit” (Iziavleniia pribytochnye gosudarstvu), in 1713 and 1714, respectively. Typically for documents of that type and period, they were lists of seemingly unrelated suggestions on a variety of diverse matters, from ways of justifying Russia’s claims to Karelia, Finland, and Lifland, to methods of feeding paupers, horse-breeding, promotion of markets, “rules for writing history,” etc.47 Among other things, article VII in the Proposals called for establishing academies in each province,

46 RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, kn. 64, l. 244. In Latin, the phrases referred to by the author are “adprehendite disciplinam” and “tu vero odisti disciplinam.” In modern Russian translation “discipline” is rendered here as “respect” and “instruction,” respectively.
using for that end the building of local monasteries, which were to be vacated of their current occupants, the monks. The sons of nobles, merchants, and people of other ranks, to be drafted into these academies, were to stay there from age 6 to 23, fed and clothed by the government. Saltykov’s rationale for keeping students in confinement, away from their parents and estates for so long was that when those young children from their early years on are constantly gathered together among themselves, they will improve their nature through continuous socializing. In this case they will be much better off than those noble children who are currently brought up on their estates, growing up like a wild forest.\(^{48}\)

While Saltykov does not refer explicitly to establishing surveillance over students, the idea of reshaping them through confinement and seclusion from the harmful influences of their social environment is fully articulated here. The specific sources of his ideas are not clear, although it is reasonable to suggest that these proposal are based on his observations and reading in England; one is tempted to see Lockean overtones here. Peter I read Saltykov’s proposals, marking some of them on the margins and sending to his lieutenants for study, and this particular idea is found in his later documents. A note personally written by Peter in 1722 explicitly refers to establishing schools in monasteries cleared of their monks. He does not repeat, though, the pedagogical argument articulated by Saltykov, and unlike in the latter’s proposal, Peter’s schools were to be intended for orphans, a form of social welfare.\(^{49}\)

The first attempt to spell out and actually to implement a seclusionary model of school was made by baron de Saint-Hillaire, an international adventurer and impostor,\(^{50}\) who arrived to St Petersburg in January 1715. Having quickly established a foothold at court by getting engaged to a favorite lady-in-waiting to the Crown Princess Charlotte, Saint-Hillaire sought to gain Peter I’s attention by bombarding him with various proposals, including a project for establishment of a corps of gardes-marine and a naval academy to educate them.\(^{51}\) The initial project, presented to Peter I in February 1715, was, probably, the first detailed school regulation in Russia since Medvedev’s Propozitsii: in prescribed a daily curriculum, delineated the duties of various officials, set the examination procedures, and so forth. Among other things, the document called upon the tsar to “built a house of many grand chambers,” and explained that “it is imperative that this house was insofar as possible in the Arsenal or not far from it, and that every [teaching]
master had his own chamber for teaching the cadets.” It also instructed the officers at the Academy to put guards at the doors “so that nobody would leave without a permission, which should not be given without good reasons.” The enterprising Frenchman certainly did not put too much thinking into these provisions, as his text is actually a nearly verbatim translation of two chapters from the French naval regulation, *Ordonnance de Louis XIV pour les armées navales et arsenaux de marine* of April 15, 1689.52

This project did not provoke any explicit reaction from Peter I: we must assume that it met with his general approval, as few months later the baron drafted and submitted to Peter a contract (“capitulation”) naming him Director-General of the Academy.53 The contract, naturally, set his salary and enumerated various titles and perks due to him in this new capacity, but it also established that the tsar was to provide for construction of a new building for the academy, to be designed and built by Domenico Trezzini. Notably, the baron did not explain why a new building was necessary from a pedagogic point of view, although he did emphasize that he and his family would also receive quarters there. In practice, the tsar had neither the intention, nor the funds to build a new compound for the school; instead he assigned to the academy the former mansion of Aleksandr Kikin, a recently disgraced and exiled courtier. The baron’s new family was also duly installed in this *belle maison*, as it was described by the French naval agent.54

This evidently did not satisfy Saint-Hillaire, as in September 1715 he came up with still another proposal, once again insisting on the need for purpose-build facilities for the academy. Here, finally, he explicitly cited disciplinary considerations: new building was required in order to be able to house in it all the students, which was in turn necessary in order to maintain round-the-clock surveillance. According to the baron, “it is mandatory that all the young men are lodged and fed at the academy, which they would not leave except when necessary, and that they would stay there every day during the hours assigned for study, which would be impossible if they are housed elsewhere.” This disciplinary vision, however, had also very pragmatic implications. As it turns out, if this scheme were approved, the baron offered to take upon himself the maintenance of students “for the sake of saving from trouble Your Imperial Majesty and Your ministers, as well as the *gardes-marine* themselves.” In other words, since all the *gardes-marine* were to be housed in the same place, their stipends should not be paid out to them directly, as was the case at earlier schools, but rather accumulated in the hands of the director.

52 Ordonnance de Louis XIV. Pour les Armées navales et Arsenaux de Marine (Paris: E. Michallet, 1689). This document would later on be also extensively used by Peter I and his associates for drafting the tsar’s grand naval regulations. E. V. Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1997), 158; N. A. Voskresenskii, Petr Velikii kak zakonodatel’ (forthcoming).

53 RGADA, f. 370, op. 1, d. 7, ll. 30-31ob; published in Fedyukin, “Osnovanie Morskoi akademii,” 54-5.

54 Archives Nationale (Paris), Marine, B’ 28, ff. 163-163 verso.
who would spend the money as he saw fit on food and clothing. The baron’s intention to seclude was directly related to his attempts not only to secure better quarters for himself and his family, but also to establish control over cash flow at the academy.

The tsar’s reaction was predictably acerbic: in his notes on the margins of the proposal he cited budgetary constraints making it impossible to fund new construction, but also accused the baron of seeking to illegally profiteer and, generally, of putting forward “capricious demands,” suggesting that Saint-Hillaire either did his work as a director, or returned the salary already received and leave the country. It did not help, naturally, that the baron also proposed for the academy a new budget of over 57,000 rubles – an absolutely fantastic sum, especially since the old Navigation School cost Peter about 12,000 to 15,000 rubles a year, and even that put a heavy strain on the treasury. Nevertheless, Peter did approve the next document drafted by Saint-Hillaire, his “Instruction for the Naval Academy” of October 1, 1715, which demanded, among other things, that the students spent night in their own chambers (paragraphs 22 and 23) – apparently implying that they all should be accommodated at the academy. Having approved the document, Peter penned an addendum prescribing measures for “curtailing yelling and outrage”: assigning a retired guardsmen with a whip in his hand to every room in the academy. Yet the baron’s days at the school were numbered. Early in 1716 the tsar appointed Count Matveev as the academy’s “President” to supervise the Frenchman, and a year later Saint-Hillaire was finally fired.

What’s striking is that none of Saint-Hilaire’s documents received any input or comments and corrections either from Peter I, or from his lieutenants; specifically, his ideas leading towards confinement of and surveillance over students did not provoke any reaction from his Russian employers. Not surprisingly, after Saint-Hillaire left, his regulations (and the disciplinary practices they entailed) were abandoned. Even though his successors at the academy, Count Matveev, Grigorii Skorniakov-Pisarev, and the tsar’s young cousin Aleksandr Naryshkin were all familiar with the customs of the Western European schools (and Naryshkin actually spend a year and a half observing the French naval school in Brest), none of them

56 Veselago, Ocherki istorii morskogo kadetskogo korpusa, 39-40.
57 Materialy dlia istorii russkogo flota, vol. 3, 316; Saint-Hillaire's budget projections are in RGADA, f. 370, op. 1, d. 7, l. 42; published in Fedyukin, “Osnovanie Morskoi akademii,” 57.
59 On Skorniakov-Pisarev, see D. O. Serov, Administratsiia Petra I (Moscow: OGY, 2008), 70-71; D. O. Serov, Stroiteli imperii. Ocherki gosudarstvennoi i kriminal'noi deiatel'nosti spodvizhnikov Petra I (Novosibirsk: Izdatelstvo Novosibirskogo universiteta, 1996), 31-2, 40-4, 60-5, 81-8; on Naryshkins, see Serov, Administratsiia Petra I, 59-60.
specifically sought to confine the students within an enclosed compound. In fact, in February 1720 Skorniakov-Pisarev went so far as to cancel the relevant provisions of the October 1, 1715 “Instruction”: “insofar as the students have not been assigned chambers at the academy,” he reasoned in his letter to the Admiralty, “these articles were not to be implemented.” In another document, though, he implies that the “schoolboys” were lodged at the Academy itself, as they are prohibited from playing games of chance and causing “noise and outrages” in “their chambers.” The officers were also instructed to make sure that the young men spend nights in “their chambers” (except for the weekend, when the students could be allowed to stay with their relatives in town). The document does not offer, however, any explanation of the pedagogic importance of this norm; nor there are any mechanisms of monitoring or supervision other than checking each morning who had slept in “his chamber,” and who had not. Likewise, the “Reglament of the Admiralty,” written with Peter’s direct and personal participation, has a special chapter on the Naval Academy (chapter 1, article 59) that briefly listed the subjects to be taught and instructs the director to hire necessary teachers. Yet, nowhere in these passages are there any references to the need to confine students on campus, or to school facilities in general. If anything, the relevant section from the “Harbor Book” (the second part of the “Naval Ordonnance”) reproduces a passage from the very same Ordonnance de Louis XIV that has been previously used by Saint-Hillaire. According to that norm, the landlords of the gardes-marine should be periodically questioned regarding their behavior, thereby implying that the young man, in fact, are to rent accommodation in town on their own.

On the other hand, the principles of confinement and surveillance are emphasized in the “Ecclesiastical Regulation,” written in 1721 by Archbishop Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736) and outlining the new principles of governance for the Russian Orthodox Church after the abolition of patriarchy. Peter certainly supported the drafting of this document and kept track of Prokopovich’s work on it. Yet, in contrast to the naval regulations, he did not contribute to it personally: there are no drafts, or any meaningful marginalia in Peter’s handwriting. It was this document, however, that envisioned creating “Seminaria” in each diocese, including “construction of a school house modeled on a monastery, [so that] its overall size, the size of living quarters, and various supplies for feeding, clothing, and otherwise maintaining students would be proportionate to their numbers.” Such schools were to be built in quiet places, away

Italii neustanovlennogo litsa, 1716,” in Russian Public Library (St Petersburg), Manuscripts Division, f. 1000, op. 3, d. 339, 40ob.-41, 46, 77.
61 RGA VMF, f. 146, op. 1, d. 48, l. 88 ob.
62 RGA VMF, f. 146, op. 1, d. 48, l. 92-94.
63 PSZ, vol. 6, № 3937, chapter XIV, 633. Cf. the 1689 French Ordonnance, book 7, chapter 1, article XIV. On the process of drafting the regulation, see N.A. Voskresenskii, Petr Velikii kak zakonodatel’ (in print).
from towns, where nothing would distract the young men from their studies. Entering students would take up an obligation to stay at the school till the end of the course. For the first three years, pupils would not be permitted to “leave the Seminarium to go to the town or anywhere at all, even to visit their kin,” and later on, they would only be allowed to leave for no longer than one week at a time, twice a year. Even then, they would be allowed to venture outside only accompanied by an “honest person” for an “overseer,” and when their parents or kin come to visit, the meetings would likewise take place in the presence of a supervisor. Inside this “monastery” pupils would live in special “huts” (“izby,” pl.) under constant supervision of schoolmasters (or prefects), and they would not be allowed to leave their “hut” without asking for permission and telling where they are going. A detailed schedule would regulate their daily regime from morning to dusk; a “little bell” would tell them when to wake up, go to prayer, classes, etc., and they would follow it “like soldiers follow [the commands of] a drum”: the church and the army are again presented as two parallel disciplinary institutions. “Such a life for young people might seem sad and akin to captivity in prison, - the author admitted. - But once they get used to this life, even after a year, it will be quite agreeable.” Even though the “Ecclesiastical Regulation” has been approved by Peter, there are no signs that the tsar actually shared its educational vision. Certainly, he made no effort to implement this disciplinary regime. Rather, this focus on disciplinary aspects of education in the “Ecclesiastical Regulation” reflects the peculiar vision of Prokopovich, who not only had personal experience of Western European practices of ecclesiastical education (not to mention his familiarity with the relevant theoretical treatises) thanks to his studies at the Uniate schools and the College of St. Athanasius in Rome, but also maintained close links with August Hermann Francke, the leading Pietist in Halle.

III.

And indeed, the Pietist links and influences are notable at Noble Cadet Corps founded in St Petersburg in 1731, the first Russian school where we do find consistent efforts to implement the disciplinary practices focused on manipulating the school space. An early anonymous project

for this institution from the 1720 listed learning “discipline, or order” (“disziplina, ili poriadok”) as one among key three necessary for future warriors (alongside “military oeconomy” and “military action”).\(^67\) The 1731 charter of the Corps demanded that all the cadets of the said Corps live in one building, following the example of the Prussian, Danish, and other royal cadet establishments, so that they waste less time on walking around and inappropriate entertainment, but rather in all their studies and conduct there would be constant observation (\textit{nadziranie}) over them. And to this end, We assign the mansion of the former Prince Menshikov on Vasil’evskii Island [to this Corps].\(^68\)

The authorship of this document is not clear, but it was certainly composed in Empress Anna’s inner circle. Not only there are unmistakable traces of the Pietist intellectual influences in the document, but also both the Field-Marshall Burchard Christoph von Münnich (1683–1767), the founding Director-General of the Corps, and Count Heinrich Johann Friedrich (a.k.a. Andrei Ivanovich) Ostermann (1686-1747),\(^69\) a member of the Cabinet and a leading minister of the reign, are known for their Pietist connections. Von Münnich’s Pietists connections also align well with his fascination with Fénelon and his pedagogic ideas: common for them was the focus on inner transformation achieved through conscious “educational work,” so much so that, according to a recent study, “Francke’s concept of pedagogization relied mainly on Fénelon.”\(^70\)

Also telling in the regard the reference to the Berlin Cadet Corps, itself a pioneering educational institution formed under strong influence of the Halle Pietists; the officers and faculty members at the Corps in the 1730 were nearly exclusively German expatriate experts, some of them with personal experience of service in the school’s Berlin prototype.\(^71\)

---


\(^68\) PSZ, vol. 8, № 5881, 557-59.


And indeed, from its very foundation the Corps was located in the palace of Prince A.D. Menshikov, the exiled favorite of Peter the Great. Menshikov began construction of the palace in 1710, and by 1713 it was a four-storey mansion facing the river. Subsequently it was supplemented with two two-storey wings, and with the construction of one more, northern wing the palace formed an enclosed quadrangle with an internal courtyard and covered galleries running along its outer perimeter. With the addition of further wings and a gated wall, a second enclosed courtyard has been formed. By the 1720s the Menshikov palace was really the largest and, according to a foreign traveller, the most luxurious building in the new capital, surpassing even the imperial residence itself. Another foreigner believed that the palace had “as many rooms as there are days in a year.” On the northern edge of the palace there was a “large garden with a beautiful greenhouse and numerous service buildings”; it was also surrounded with a wall. The garden was sufficiently large that the cadets could subsequently entertain themselves by shooting birds there. The complex also included stables and warehouses. Later the Corps’ authorities built a large covered manège for equestrian practice and converted two halls into an in-house church and a hospital.

The Corps’ authorities certainly did their best to exploit the fact that the school was housed in an enclosed compound. All the enrolled cadets had to reside in the complex, and insofar as possible the authorities also sought to accommodate there the faculty and the officers of the Corps: here was an attempt to create a self-contained entity with limited (especially as far as the cadets were concerned) contact with the outside world. A foreign traveler reported that all the cadets “live in this house, and it has only one large gate.” Appropriately, the gates were guarded by sentinels, and special rules regulated the cadets’ access to the city, depending on the season and the time of the day. The principle of seclusion was closely related to that of surveillance. An Imperial decree explained that the earlier practice of sending young nobles to study in foreign countries did not produce the desired result precisely because the youngsters “did not have sufficient supervision” over them while abroad, and hence wasted time on various objectionable activities. So, while at the Corps cadets were to be kept under constant “supervision,” described as crucial for their improvement. The overseers at the Corps were to “diligently watch their mores, habits, and deeds, so that they behaved according to the demands

---

77 PSZ, vol. 8, № 5894, 569-70.
of virtue, politeness, due humility, and honor, while lies, unfaithfulness, and other vices inappropriate for nobility were rooted out from them early on.”

Seclusion and “supervision” meant that the cadets were to observe a set of rules that attempted to regulate nearly every detail of their daily life. Besides detailed schedule of the day, the authorities produced a number of strikingly detailed documents which sought to regulate various aspects of the cadets’ life. There were, for example, *Rules on how to act in the grand hall where the cadets dine* and a *Regulation* on how to behave in class (which prescribed the correct ways of leaving and entering the class, etc.).

The cadets themselves were also involved in “overseeing” each other: each room had to have a cadet “headman,” and the best among the cadets were promoted to NCOs with a mandate to “oversee” their detachments. The Corps authorities tried to establish their control over the cadets even when they were outside the schools’ compound. Already in July 1732, for example, it has been ordered that whenever cadets are given a leave to go into town, “two or three or more of them should go to the same place, and one of them is to have supervision over the rest so that they behave decently and go everywhere together and not alone.”

Taken together these documents and practices were designed to create a certain way of life, which emphasized discipline and order, cleanliness and self-control over one’s mind and body. Crucially, the authorities at the Corps moved to develop a menu of bureaucratic instruments for performing disciplinary control. Teachers were to submit monthly reports on the academic progress of each cadet. In addition, company officers were expected to produce similar reports on their behavior, and all of these served as a basis for conducting regular formalized examinations, another key element of the newly emergent disciplinary governamental.

An enclosed building, thus, created opportunities for deploying an arsenal of disciplinary measures. Yet, that such building was to be assigned to the Corps was not something

---
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predetermined. When the creation of the school was announced, the empress ordered the Senate to find appropriate facilities for it, and the senators considered Menshikov’s mansion in St Petersburg and the late Frantz Lefort’s mansion at the German Quarter in Moscow. So, rather than the Corps receiving a building that uniquely fit being used as an instrument of confinement and “overseeing,” the senators simply reached for the most economical and expedient solution - housing the school in one of the vacant mansions that the government currently had no better use for. Indeed, redistribution of spoils of court battles, such as the movable and immovable properties of disgraced officials, was standard practice in the period. Some of these properties, usually those that have not been, for some reason, claimed by ministers and dignitaries could be used as a storage for army supplies, or assigned to house government department – or schools. That was, after all, how the Naval Academy got the Kikin Mansion in 1715; in 1732 it moved into the mansion confiscated from Prince Aleksei Dolgorukov. In the early 1740s the Admiralty attempted to appropriate for the Academy the confiscated palaces of exiled dignitaries of Anna’s reign, and so forth.

IV.

Indeed, a school building could be read in a wide variety of alternative, though not necessarily mutually exclusive ways. In the case of the Corps, one such reading was offered by the government itself. While the Corps’ charter in November 1731 presented confinement of all the cadets in a single building as a prerequisite for proper “overseeing,” another decree in December of the same year offered a different story. Although referring to “overseeing,” it also sought to attract nobles to the Corps, and therefore emphasized the sovereign’s “most gracious care” towards young members of the elite, as well as the government’s intention to “avoid causing great costs to the students.” It is this desire to provide appropriate accommodation and to save the cadets ruinous expenses that, allegedly, was the motive behind placing them “in a spacious stone mansion of the former Prince Menshikov in St Petersburg,” where they would be also provided with “sufficient dining,” servants for cleaning and washing, and so forth. A disciplinary regime here is, thus, reinterpreted as a privilege.

A very different reading was implied by Vasilii Nikitich Tatishchev (1686-1750), an administrator, engineer, and amateur historian, who brought this very issue up in the context of his attempts to settle his scores with von Münnich. In his writings, Tatishchev lamented the dominance of the “Germans” at court in the 1730s: among other things, they allegedly

83 RGADA, f. 248, kn. 2018, ll. 10-12.
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85 PSZ, vol. 8, № 5894, 569-70.
engineered the disgrace and removal in the fall of 1731 of the Procurator-General Pavel Iaguzhinskii. It was Iaguzhinskii who, according to Tatischev first came up with the idea of creating the Cadet Corps – and having taken over the establishment, von Münich supposedly "perverted" his design, the key element of this “capricious” perversion being the excessive expenditures. So, in his proposals for reform of the Corps Tatischev suggested to “avoid excessiveness” and to “cut unnecessary expenditures” by making the wealthier cadets pay for their own maintenance. This, in turn, would allow the government to use the savings to educate a larger number of young nobles and to open new schools in the provinces, where the students could rent cheaper accommodation. As opposed to von Münich’s perversion of a cadet corps, these new provincials schools, according to Tatischev, would need no large buildings, “except for few chambers that could be built [for housing] the destitute ones.” In other words, in his politically-motivated critique of the Corps, Tatischev refused to see the school building as a disciplinary instrument: rather, he interpreted it as a form of charity for the poorest nobles.

The tension between different understandings of school building came to the fore in the 1730s-1740s in the discussions regarding new facilities for the Naval Academy. Even though it got a new building in the early 1730s (a former Dolgorukov mansion on the Vasil’evskii Island), it still had to share it with a government pharmacy and with the Admiralty’s own “Academic Chancellery” (a bureau in charge of all naval schools). The students continued to rent accommodation on their own as best they could, mostly at the outskirts of the city. In a proposal for reform of the Naval Academy dating from this period and found in the papers of Count Ostermann (likely commissioned, and most certainly edited by him) the issue of a building for the would-be institution is discussed already on the very first page. The focus here is on organization of space as central for monitoring behavior of students, and consequently, for their moral instruction in general – all of this, incidentally, combined with near total lack of concern with the technicalities of naval training as such.

According to this proposal, the Academy was to be housed in a separate, purpose-built compound; all the students, officers, and teachers were to live on the premises. According to the draft budget, 90 000 rubles were to be assigned for construction, since “to launch [the Academy] it is necessary to build two large special stone buildings with enclosed courtyards” (zur Auffrichtung werden gleich Anfangs zwey große besondere steinerne Gebaue mit geschloßenen

88 Veselago, Ocherk istorii morskogo kadetskogo korpusa, 82-5.
Höfen und seiten gebauen erfordert). A rough sketch on page 2 of the manuscript provides the author’s vision of such building: the concern here is solely with stressing the idea of an enclosed compound (SEE PICTURES IN THE APPENDIX). On the margin of page 1 of the document there is another drawing, this time of a layout for a model room. According to this sketch, each room was to house four students, and every two such rooms were to be joined by a room for an officer or a teacher in such a way that the students had to pass by their supervisor whenever they left or entered their chamber. This organization of space was to enable the supervisors to “listen and watch what are those [students] doing [making sure] that they do not waste their time.” The supervisors were also to observe students during their meals and prayer. All teachers and adjuncts had to monitor student behavior and record it in special “books of observation” (knigi obzervatsii); the results of this monitoring were to be examined by the director and discussed weekly at the faculty meetings. Unlike at the Petrine schools, but similarly to the Cadet Corps, the students were to be subjected to regular formalized examinations. The project, of course, included a detailed schedule of the day and elaborate procedures for requesting a permission to venture outside the academy or even to be absent from class. Leisure, or “permissible entertainment” was also strictly regulated and included, in the Franckean spirit, such useful pursuits as supervised excursions to workshops and factories; learning to work at the lathe and to make lenses; learning to play musical instruments; and making geometric figures and cases for books and instruments from cardboard. Finally, the students were to keep registers of their personal belongings and to update them weekly or monthly in order to learn to “lead well-ordered lives” (zhit’ reguliarno).

All these pedagogical methods and techniques were designed to go beyond mere outward compliance, to shape the feelings and aspirations of the students. These were expected to study “with joy and desire,” to be “diligent and obedient,” and furthermore, not simply to obey their teachers and commanders, but to “love them as their own parents.” It was imperative, therefore, that “both the teachers and the students were not burdened by incessant labors, but on the contrary, driven to study by their own desire.” Forcing the students and the teachers to work too hard was considered counterproductive, for they might “loose desire and start acting with less zeal.” Instead, examinations were calculated to have a motivational impact: their public character would push both the instructed and the instructors to work hard “avoiding shame and hoping for praise and award.” The system of awards and punishment was likewise meant to motivate.
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91 “Proekt k Morskoi akademii,” II. 2, 14, 5 ob.; 35-36; 24-25ob.; 26ob-27; 22.
Diligent students were to be seated higher at the table, publicly praised in the presence of the faculty and the Admiralty officials, and presented with useful prizes. The prescribed methods of punishment included, among other things, making transgressions visible by forcing deviant students to wear common sailor’s dress or eat at a “dishonorable” table. Students could be chained, locked up, or put on bread and water, but corporal punishment was not mentioned as an option. As the first step, however, officers and teachers had to try to “persuade [the offending student] exposing to him the inappropriateness of his behavior and its potential evil consequences.”

Throughout the first years of Anna’s reign Ostermann presided over the so-called Naval Commission charged with reforming the navy; in 1740, during the brief reign of the underage Ioann VI, he engineered his appointment to the office of the General-Admiral, a highest rank in the Empire equal to that of the Chancellor. The Admiralty, seeking to provide better facilities for the Naval Academy, submitted a plan for a new building for the school – yet, surprisingly, it was rejected by Ostermann. How exactly the building proposed by the admirals was to look like, we do not know, but the problem for Ostermann was that it did not fit his disciplinary vision. As he reasoned, “the chambers for student lodging are assigned [in the drawing provided by the Admiralty] all jointly, and so the students could congregate among themselves, and for that reason there would be inappropriate conduct on their part, yet there would be nobody to watch over them and prevent it.” So, echoing his earlier project, Ostermann demanded that the student chambers should be clustered around separate rooms for teachers and apprentices, which would allow the latter to provide “diligent overseeing” of students even outside class hours so that the young men “would be prevented by this overseeing from any inappropriate conduct and quarrels.” The building was also to include an apartment for the head professor and other faculty who were all expected to reside at the Academy, as well as sufficient facilities for storing food and other supplies. In short, Ostermann had in mind an enclosed compound where the students would be “maintained … as they are maintained at the Cadet Corps.” The Admiralty College ordered to redraw the plan according to these principles, yet before long a palace coup brought an end to Ostermann’s tenure as General Admiral, and the idea of reforming the Naval Academy lost its key supporter in the government.

V.

93 Minutes of the Admiralty board, Dec. 5, 1740. RGA VMF, f. 212, op. 6, d. 5, l. 109, 112-13.
With the departure of Pietist-inspired ministers of Anna’s reign, the disciplining rhetoric disappears from the documents. Yet, once founded, the Land Cadet Corps served as a template for other schools. Different players sought to employ this template for their own goals, ascribing in the process different meaning to the school and to school building. Apparently, a new design for the Naval Academy building has been presented by the Admiralty to the Senate in October 1741, yet the Senate declined to approve it and suggested to “wait until further consideration.” The Admiralty actually made an attempt to secure for the Academy the mansion confiscated from its former patron, Ostermann himself, yet this did not work out either – Empress Elizabeth preferred to use this and other buildings confiscated after her coup for rewarding her supporters. In the early 1740s the Admiralty again and again returned to this issue, petitioning the Senate for funding for better facilities for the Academy. The key argument the admirals were putting forward in their petitions had to do with class attendance. Allegedly, the students had to rent cheap lodging at the outskirts of the city, “and because of this remoteness [of their apartments], they can never be at the Academy at the appointed hours, and they spend most of their time away, and commit outrages, and all of this can result neither in good order, nor in rapid progress in studies.” In 1745, the admirals again appealed to the Senate, claiming that insufficient funding did not allow the Academy to recruit the necessary number of students, which could lead to problems with staffing the navy with junior officers.94

The solution proposed by the admirals was to finance the Academy at the same level as the Noble Cadet Corps – “in everything following the example of the Cadet Corps,” especially since the land cadets “are not engaged in such difficult sciences” as the naval once. Organization of the Land Cadet Corps is described in these submissions in terms of comfort and noble status, as the land cadets “are maintained in good satisfaction in everything… that is necessary for honest noble living.” And it is at this moment, while lobbying for additional resources for the Academy, that the Admiralty returns to Saint-Hillaire’s 1715 “Instruction”: it points out that “according to the academic articles signed by the Blessed and Eternally Glorious Late Emperor Peter the Great, the students are supposed to be housed at chambers at the Academy itself.” So, on the basis of this reference the Admiralty demanded that the Academy’s budget be doubled, and that “it should be ordered to assign such a building for the [Academy], where not only the classes, but also the generals, officers, teachers, and others masters could all be housed,” in addition to students.95 Thus, the document reproduced the principle of housing all the students in one building, yet the disciplinary connotations are hardly discernable here. The building is

94 Veselago, Ocherk istorii morskogo kadetskogo korpusa, 85, 91-2.
95 Minutes of the Admiralty, July 8, 1747. RGA VMF, f. 212, op. 7, d. 319, ll. 311-321, here ll. 319ob-320. An abridged version of the document is published in Materialy dlia istorii russkogo flota, vol. 9 (St. Petersburg: Tipografia Morskого ministerstva, 1882), 641-55.
presented not so much as an instrument of surveillance, but rather as a matter of comfort, of ensuring parity of the navy with the land forces, and of “honest noble living” – and the references for the necessity of housing all students in the Academy and to the example of the Cadet Corps are used as a rhetorical devise for securing additional funding.

An alternative project for reforming the Naval Academy composed at about the same time by Admiral V. Ia. Rimskii-Korsakov (himself a graduate of the French naval school) did not refer at all either to the need for a new, larger building, or to the principle of housing all students on campus. The author was, indeed, concerned with shaping the conduct of future officers, but that was to be achieved by allowing them to eat at the captain’s table, so that the young men “would be accustomed to socializing with honest men.” That, of course, required additional funding for the captain to keep an open table.96 At the end, the reform of the Naval Academy into a Naval Cadet Corps in 1752 was accompanied, by a grant of a new, larger building for the school, but discussion of the building bears no traces of disciplinary discourse.

Likewise, when the artillery and engineering schools were amalgamated into the Artillery and Engineering Cadet Corps in the late 1750s-early 1760s, Count P. I. Shuvalov’s proposal addressed to the empress included a request for a new building, and even a design for it (though the latter has not been found). A separate article in the proposal called for constructing a “stone building, to contain all the cadets, officers, and teachers, as well as the classes,” but otherwise neither elaborated on the meaning or purpose of such request, nor explained the building’s design. Another chapter insisted on “maintaining cadets in great restraint” and promised corporal punishments for transgressions, but did not specify any mechanisms, special or any other, for monitoring or control.97 Instead, such mechanisms, including internal regulations and the registers for recording transgressions were introduced by M. I. Mordvinov, the first director of the new school and himself a graduate of von Münnich’s Noble Land Cadet Corps.98

Thus, the schools of Elizabeth’s reign did not necessarily seek to achieve disciplining through confinement and total surveillance, in the vein of Ostermann’s 1730s project, yet having a building that could contain more or less all the students, faculty, and services, was increasingly viewed as necessary for a proper school. Increasingly, spatial confinement and segregation could also be understood as marking the boundaries between different classes. Indeed, P. I. Shuvalov

96 V. Ia. Rimskii-Korsakov, “Polozenie o morkikh kadetakh i nizhnikh shkolakh.” RGADA, f. 21, d. 55, ll. 2-9ob., here l. 7ob.
first organized an in-house hospital at his artillery and engineering school, so that the students would not have to be sent to the garrison hospital, and then organized separate hospital rooms for noble and non-noble boys. Thus, physical space was organized so as to the “noble” youth were from being morally “contaminated” by contact with lower classes. Eventually, this approach extended to include also the "medical" explanation for confining the students, as the later were also prohibited from eating outside the school.

This, in turn, prepared the ground for educational projects of Catherine II’s reign. where the disciplinary role of such building, the need to fence the students off from the surrounding world, and the need to shape accordingly the building itself was taken for granted. I. I. Betskoi, the key educational entrepreneur of her reign who thoroughly reformed the Cadet Corps after her accession to the throne, argued that an “army without discipline is what a body is without a soul,” and that the reformed Cadet Corps is being established as a “school for teaching obedience.” Yet, in his projects, a school building became a cite for implementing a different set of anthropologic principles. Central for his pedagogy was the notion of “innate emulation” (vrozhdennoe svoistvo podrazhaniia). From this followed that the tutors should “not only be skilled in sciences, but also could serve as an example” of correct behavior, that is, much stricter selection of those who would be entrusted to interact with the students. In his proposals, Betskoi demanded that the youngest pupils were to be “never allowed to have any interaction with the servants,” as these might serve as a source of pernicious influences for impressionable boys; and only the specially selected and trained servants could be allowed to have direct contact with the cadets. This approach did not require detailed regulation of interactions between these tutors and their charges, but it implied confinement within an enclosed space. Indeed, after Betskoi’s reform of the Noble Cadet Corps in the 1760s, pupils were admitted too school at the tender age of six, and their parents had to agree not to withdraw them until the boy complete the full course of study.

*   *   *

An oft-quoted anecdote describes Peter I trimming a human figure at the lathe in the company of his court mechanic, Andrei Nartov. “Happy that the work was going well, [Peter] asked of the mechanic Nartov: ‘How am I trimming?’ And when Nartov answered: ‘Good,’ then His Majesty said; ‘Just so, Andrei, I trim bones very well with a chisel, but I cannot shape up the

99 PSZ, vol. 17, № 12670, 802-3; № 12741, 959.
stubborn with a cudgel.”100 This is a striking image of Peter in his later years: a ruler burned out after a quarter-century reign, tired of his subjects’ intransigence, burdened by worries about his reforms’ survival after his death. Above all, it emphasizes the emperor’s own, if only unwilling, admission that his chief tool of governance has indeed been the infamous cudgel, and that the cudgel’s ability to effect change is limited. The big stick could, perhaps, break the bones, but “shaping up the stubborn” is something altogether different. This admission, arguably, goes to heart of the shift from spectacular application of coercion to increasing reliance on the “disciplinary” methods of manipulating subjects. Alas, the so-called Nartov’s stories, have been shown to be, in effect, a work of fiction, composed in the second part of the eighteenth century.101 Fittingly, Nartov-junior, the son of Peter I’s court mechanic, to whose writings we owe this anecdote about the tsar’s disillusionment with the transformative powers of the cudgel, was himself graduate of the St Petersburg Cadet Corps. The sensibilities this story relates likely reflect the authors’ own experiences at von Münnich’s school rather than anything Peter himself might have said.

Using concern with spatial arrangements in schools (or lack thereof) as a lens, I argue that the “disciplinary” sensibilities remained unarticulated in pre-Petrine and Petrine Russia. In that period, there are no traces of awareness that the school space should – or could – be arranged in a special way so as to facilitate control over students; school building remained “invisible” to policymakers. Indeed, one wonders if the very notion of “discipline,” with its focus on making students and subjects “interiorize” constraints and values, carried much meaning for Peter and his associates. By the time of Catherine II’s accession, however, school building was increasingly at the center of projects and proposals related to schooling. There was a notion that students should be confined, insofar as possible, to an enclosed compound so as to facilitate control over their movements, daily routine, and contacts with the outside world, and most importantly, to enable the round-the-clock surveillance over them. This surveillance – nadziranie – was, in turn, viewed as a central element of instruction, crucially important for internalization of prescribed models of behavior and thinking by students. This vision went hand-in-hand with increasing bureaucratization of school, as it acquired specialist officials and processes to administer both the buildings themselves and the procedures of “supervision” and control.

100 This story is quoted to illustrate Peter’s mentalité in, inter alia, such key works as E.V. Anisimov, The Reforms of Peter the Great: Progress Through Coercion in Russia (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1993), 39; Lindsey Hughes, Russia in the Age of Peter the Great (New Haven and London, 1998), xiv.
My narrative highlights the role of “projectors” or “administrative entrepreneurs,” as I call them – in driving this shift. The new, “disciplinary” instruments of power (new understanding of school building, in this case) were not adopted because the omnipresent and omniscient reforming monarch decreed them into being. Nor were they introduced because an abstract impersonal state “needed” them for modernizing its military forces in the context of the “military revolution.” If anything, Peter and his government appear to have been indifferent, if not hostile to these conceptual innovations. Rather, the new disciplinary instruments were promoted by specific entrepreneurial actors, who used these innovations to achieve their own career, financial, or ideational goals within the administrative domain.

In the regard, the story of invention of the Panopticon by Samuel Bentham, an inventive and entrepreneurial outsider employed by a royal favorite, appears not really unique or exceptional, but rather symbolic of the way institutional innovation operated in the early modern world. Many other instruments of modernity were similarly invented “from below” by such enterprising projectors; more often than not, the “state” was but a framework employed by them to pursue their own agendas. The “state” certainly did not “need” these instruments of modernity in any sort of pragmatic way. They were expensive (indeed, prohibitively so, in Russia, as in France) and difficult to implement; military practitioners – including the foreign-born and trained officers – never really advocated them on utilitarian grounds. It is not by chance that Pâris-Duverney, the founder of École Militare in Paris, was not a military either, but rather an enterprising financier, supported in his enterprise by Madam de Pompadour, whom he, in term, might have assisted in gaining her initial access to the king. Gorski likewise presents the “disciplinary revolution” as initially driven from below by Protestant clerics and reforming magistrates: as he observes, “it was only later that this revolution penetrated and reshaped royal bureaucracies and armies.”

More broadly, it appears that we probably strongly underappreciate the extent to which the absence in Russian Orthodoxy of anything similar to specific religious sensibilities, emerging in Western Europe in the context of Reformation/Counterreformation moment affected the trajectories of early modern state building in Russia. One the one hand, more attention should be

---

paid to the role of those actors in the eighteenth century Russia, whose relationship with modernity was based on their religious sensibilities, as was the case with Ostermann and many other German experts, as well as Feofan Prokopovich. In the case of schools, the introduction of disciplinary sensibilities (and techniques) directly and explicitly resulted from the efforts of Pietist-affiliated experts who copied Pietist-inspired educational models. On other hand, this article illustrates the ways in which these religiously-inspired techniques were domesticated and “secularized” in the Russian context by diverse players who reinterpreted the school building and ascribed a variety of different meanings to it. School building, as I demonstrate below, could be understood not only as an instrument of confinement and surveillance, but also as a resource, as a privilege, as a form of charity, or a marker of social boundaries. They were also used as a pawn in the game of court politics. These readings were not necessarily mutually exclusive; on the contrary, it was this very ambiguity of school building, its openness to reinterpretations that made it such a convenient instrument for competing players and helped to place it at the center of discourse on schooling.
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