

## ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННАЯ ИСТОРИЯ

### ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ ИСТОРИЯ РОССИЙСКИХ УНИВЕРСИТЕТОВ

UDC 94(47) (082.2)

*A. Iu. Andreev*

#### THE ELECTION OF RECTORS IN THE FIRST DECADES OF UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY IN RUSSIA

The article discusses the practices for election of the head of a university corporation in Russian universities at the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is shown that the concept of the “rector position”, transferred from European, mostly German, universities, acquired in Russia new features and characteristics. It acquired a complex content: a rector should become at the same time a “patriarchal” head of the scholars and a senior official in the bureaucratic milieu of the educational department. University curators influenced greatly on the election of a rector, which led to the progressive “bureaucratisation” of its position, the rector changing from ‘*primus ante pares*’ to the chief above the professors. The different perception of this position, its functions and powers, by several groups among the professors and ministry officials resulted in many inner conflicts. Meanwhile a new portrait of a rector, proper to the ‘classical’ university — a rector as a respectable scientist and personification of the university’s dignity with regard to the wider society — did not develop in Russia until the late decades of 19<sup>th</sup> century. Refs 31.

*Keywords:* Russian universities, rector, corporation, election, curator, autonomy, history of higher education.

*A. Ю. Андреев*

#### ИЗБРАНИЕ РЕКТОРА В ПЕРВЫЕ ДЕСЯТИЛЕТИЯ АВТОНОМИИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТОВ В РОССИИ

Статья посвящена анализу выборных практик при избрании ректоров в российских университетах первой половины XIX в. В статье показано, что сама должность ректора, перенесенная в Россию из европейских, преимущественно немецких университетов, в ходе последующего усвоения приобретала иные черты и характеристики. Ее природа оказывалась многосоставной: ректор должен был выступать и как «патриархальный» глава корпорации, и как старший чиновник, встроенный в бюрократическую вертикаль учебного ведомства. На выборы ректора значительное влияние оказывали попечители университетов, что постепенно вело к «бюро-

---

*Andreev Andrei Yurievich* — Doctor in History, Professor, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 27, corp. 4, Lomonosovskii pr., Moscow, 119991, Russian Federation; andrv@hist.msu.ru

*Андреев Андрей Юрьевич* — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова, Российская Федерация, 119991, Москва, Ломоносовский пр., 27, корп. 4; andrv@hist.msu.ru

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2016

кратизации» ректорских полномочий, превращению ректора из «первого среди равных» в начальника над профессорской корпорацией. Различное восприятие ректорской должности, ее функций и полномочий у разных группировок профессуры, а также министерских чиновников приводило к многочисленным университетским конфликтам. При этом в рассматриваемый период еще не сложилась ипостась ректора, свойственная «классическому» университету, — его восприятие как авторитетного ученого, воплощающего в глазах общества ученое достоинство университета. Библиогр. 31 назв.

*Ключевые слова:* Российские университеты, ректор, корпорация, выборы, попечитель, автономия, история высшего образования.

The rector's position as an elected head of the university corporation first appeared in the Russian Empire in Derpt (contemporary Tartu) University according to its "Act of Resolution" on January 12, 1802, and then was adopted for all Russian universities by "The Preliminary Rules of Public Enlightenment" on January 24, 1803, whose standards regarding elected university positions were worked out in detail by the Statute of 1804 [Akt postanovleniia dlia Imperatorskogo Universiteta v Derpte. December 12, 1802; p. 394–395; Ob ustrojstve uchilishh. January 24, 1803, p. 437–438; Vysochajshe utverzhdennyi Ustav Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta. November 5, 1804, p. 570–589].

These legislative acts established free rectoral elections by the means of "balloting", i. e. secret voting without any interference from the authorities. The first elected rector in the Russian empire was the person who may largely be called "guilty" of transferring the very idea of "university autonomy" to Russia, namely the Derpt professor G. F. Parrot [Andreev 2006]. After he returned from St. Petersburg, triumphantly bringing the text of "The Act of Resolution" of Derpt University signed by Alexander I, Parrot spurred a spate of activity to reform his university on new terms, and on December 22, 1802, he was solemnly elected the rector of Derpt University according to the new statute [Martinson 1954, p. 62].

The first elections in Moscow University took place in 1803 (i. e. before the new Statute of the university was approved) and its first rector became H. A. Chebotaryov. The rector's elections in Kharkov University took place in 1805 after the Statute had been enacted, and here I. S. Rizhskii was elected rector. In Kazan University, the first elected rector appeared only in 1814, while the first attempt of voting here failed. Electing the first rector in 1819 was no less difficult at St. Petersburg University, which we will discuss further. Overall, it can be stated that the practice of elections for administrative positions was slow to take root in Russian universities. The current study aims at analyzing this process as part of incorporating elective practices into the bureaucratic system of governing educational institutions by the department of people's enlightenment.

Speaking of the difficulties in the adaptation of the rector's position in Russia, it is above all necessary to compare the functions of the elective rector by the Russian Statute of 1804 with those traditional in German universities, as the latter usually served as a model for organizing internal university life in Russia<sup>1</sup>.

The rector's position has always been among the most prestigious in the university corporation and the elections have been most solemn, complex and ceremonial. It stems from the fact that in the Middle Ages the rector did not only have to preside over corporate

<sup>1</sup> The multifaceted process of the European idea of the university as transferred and adapted to Russia has been analyzed in detail in a recent *opus magnum* [Andreev, Posohov, 2012].

meetings but had a number of political (legal among them) rights, the so called “*corpus politicum*”. Therefore an appropriate candidacy for exercising the rector’s functions was not necessary to possess academic merits (they, on the contrary, were not of importance) but always represented a social and institutional agreement [Schwinges 1992, S. 9–10].

Overall, in the 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> centuries the rector’s position evolved from a “guiding authority” to a “reigning authority”. This had to do with the different models of rector elections, in which all the corporate members took part (sometimes through electors). The younger the university was, the more complex (and therefore less “direct” and “democratic”) the electoral procedure and the stronger the institutional pressure became, in order to limit the right to make electoral decisions to a small circle, and sometimes even to usurp them.

As early as in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the rector was titled as “*princeps, monarch*” in the newly established universities of the German (Holy Roman) empire to the north of the Alps. It was the rectors who on behalf of the entire university took the oath of loyalty to ruling princes, who in turn issued the charters (ger. *Stiftungsbriefe*) and demanded universities’ submission to the rectors. A medieval rector thus belonged to the noble circles, being equaled to aristocracy, and it was not accidental that soon the rector was granted the palatine’s rights for the term of office. Therefore, in the Late Middle Ages, the rector’s title was given to the members of a clearly defined social strata — doctors of law and theology, who came from the nobility and upper clergy and thus had the social ties that could benefit the corporate interests of the university [Schwinges 1992, S. 11–14, 27]. The next step in this direction would be granting the rector’s rank to a member of a princely house with a title *Rector Magnificus (Magnificentissimus)*.

Thus, at the developed stage of “pre-classical” (i. e. medieval, corporate) university, the rector’s elections were determined not by academic but by social factors such as background, family ties, connections to the government, connections within the social networks of the city.

At the same time, in the “modernized” university of the Enlightenment, whose social needs were met by passing the rector’s title to the ruling prince, there was established a prorector’s position with far more modest functions and a simple elections procedure of merely passing the office [Füssel 2006, S. 54–55]. Thus, in the universities of Halle and Göttingen, the prorector’s elections took place every year, according to the faculties’ priority (i. e. first the professor of theology, then law, then medicine, then philosophy became the head of the corporation and so on around a circle). Within each faculty, the office was passed in order of seniority [see p. 9 of the general statute (General-Statut) of Göttingen University: Die Privilegien und ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität 1961, S. 42].

It is characteristic that no professor wanted to perform the prorector’s functions, which seemed cumbersome to them: on p. 8 of the Göttingen Statute it was emphasized that the *kurfurst* had the right to deliver the professor from the prorectorship on his request, and then the position passed to the next in line at the same faculty. For example, the correspondence of Christian Wolf of Halle bears witness of how exhausting it seemed to him and how he waited for his term to end. Curiously, the first elected Russian rector G. F. Parrot felt almost the same: he wrote to V. N. Karazin in 1803 that he “could hardly wait until the coming July to give up his rector’s duties” [V. N. Karazin 1875, p. 77].

Indeed, there was quite a noticeable shift in the statutes of the “modernized” universities from fixing the former rector’s rights to listing his *responsibilities*. Thus, in Göttingen,

the rector's responsibilities included presiding over the Senate and the university court, signing all public university acts (including certificates for academic degrees), keeping students' matriculas, inspection of the pharmacy, wine cellar and typography, conducting the trial of the first instance "in accordance with the law", and altogether the prorector was "a guardian of the discipline and all the laws and, so to say, the father of a big family" [*Die Privilegien und ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität* 1961, p. 46]. In other respects, the power of the elected rector (prorector) in the "modernized" university of the Enlightenment was of a symbolic character: he was rather a representative of the whole university at different acts (hence the rector's regalia, emphasizing the autonomous status of the corporation) and was the "first among peers" in the collegium of professors. It is characteristic that the prorector was not paid any special fee for this, although some of his other functions rendered additional income possible: for instance, the prorector received money donations for he had the right to legitimize children born out of wedlock (which was always a vital problem for a university town) [*Die preussischen Universitäten* 1839, p. 130–132].

The statute of Berlin University (1816) shows us the next stage of this position's evolution: only the functions directly connected to organizing the academic process remain in the rector's hands, while all the other corporate rights and responsibilities recede entirely into the past. There still were elections for this position (unlike in Göttingen, in Berlin they were held by secret ballot, in which all professors ordinarily took part), but the rector's responsibilities consisted solely in controlling the order of lectures which was composed by the deans, in accounting the total number of the audience (however, at each faculty the students' admission and graduation, as well as assessment for an academic degree, were maintained by the deans), presiding over the Senate and the student disciplinary court [*Die preussischen Universitäten* 1839, p. 46–50]. As a whole, the role of the rector's academic qualification and his scholarly authority among professors was evidently increasing.

Thus, the main trend in changing the rector's functions from the "pre-classical", or medieval, to the "classical" university of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was the transition from the mainly social role to an academic one as the universities transformed from social units, built into the network of various connections within the estate society, into unions of scientists, aiming at sustaining their high authority in a society of "equal citizens". Initially, the social functions of the rector prevailed, which led to usurping this position by the higher university stratum, but gradually the major part of those social functions withered, leaving only administrative duties, which allowed for truly free elections and even for all corporate members to take their turn to assume the office. Finally, in the "classical" university era, the rector's functions narrowed purely to regulating education and research, and now the position was taken by scientists with a serious reputation, respected both at the university and beyond.

Hence, a question rises of how the nature of the rector's position was interpreted in Russia. Analyzing the 'Statute of Russian Universities of 1804', we may hypothesize that the adaptation of European university concepts to Russia affected the rector's position in an ambiguous manner. On the one hand, the system of "university autonomy" was based on the idea of a "pre-classical" university, and consequently the rector's position was to acquire the same social meaning it had in the Middle Ages, i. e. a medium between the outside world and the corporation advocating for the rights and interests of the latter.

From this point of view, what mattered was the rector's participation in the local social networks, which was achieved in Russia through his direct contacts with the trustee and local nobility. On the other hand, there can be traced an apparent influence of the concepts of the "modernized" university on the Statute of 1804: an elected rector actually becomes an executive within the bureaucratic system (it is especially representative of Moscow University as here the rector replaced the bureaucratic position of director that had existed in the 18<sup>th</sup> century). So, he acquired a broad executive and economic power at the university and even in education districts in general. The rector did not only preside over the Council and the Board of the university but actually managed its finances, coming from the fisc or from the incomes of the university typography: he managed the purchase of wood, candles, paper and other inventory that the university required, hired staff, etc. At the same time the rector had the responsibilities of managing the education process: he had to be present at the examinations and sign the diplomas for academic degrees, which seems similar to German universities, but with that substantial difference that in Russia from 1803 onwards receipt of an academic degree conferred the right of social rank in the Table of Ranks, which made them increasingly attractive and resulted in greater chances of abuse<sup>2</sup>. Finally, the elected rector's powers were even broader than those of the former director of Moscow university because according to the Statute of 1804 the university had the leading position in the education district with gymnasia and uyezd colleges subject to it, and it was the rector who appointed teachers and designated inspectors out of university professors for regular college inspections.

Let us illustrate this with examples from the history of Moscow University in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Its first rector, H. A. Chebotaryov, elected in 1803, was, on the one hand, merely the oldest in years and in service among the professors (yet, not having authored any considerable academic works), therefore his election can be compared to the transition of the rector's position by seniority as, for example, in Goettingen University. On the other hand, Chebotaryov immediately appreciated the charms of his newly gained power and demonstrated his own understanding of administration and management. He moved into the former director's apartment (which occupied the entire left wing of the Main university building constructed by M. F. Kazakov) and seemed to see himself as his successor. The preserved memoirs speak of Chebotaryov's somewhat "extravagant" behavior towards the students and his fellow professors, whom he started regarding as his subjects [Andreev 2000, p.106–107].

The next rector, elected in 1805, was professor of physics P. I. Strakhov — an experimental scientist, brilliant lecturer, science popularizer, respected at Moscow University as well as among the public at large. It must be said to his credit that did not take after Chebotaryov's behavior: he refused the director's lodgings and passed them on for educational ends, and lived in a house in the university yard, that was later called "rector's". Strakhov had been in the office for two years, enjoying full confidence of the trustee M. N. Muravyov when he decided that "he wanted to dedicate himself entirely to his research", and after the election of 1807 he did not accept the rector's office for the third time. The position was taken over by professor F. G. Bause, who received the second highest number of votes. In 1808, he was replaced by yet another German professor, I. A. Geim. This was the beginning of a tradition of the annual rotation of the rector, typical of German univer-

---

<sup>2</sup> It was the rectors who were in the centre of bribery scandals around issuing doctoral degrees, which led to a revision of academic certification in the 1810s Russia [Petrov 2002, p. 482–483].

sities [Andreev 2000, p.287; also see the case “Ob opredelenii v Moskovskii universitet rektorov...” 1805–1817].

However, the new trustee of Moscow University, count A. K. Razumovskii sent a request to the Ministry, suggesting to make the rectorship permanent or at least to prolong the rector’s term of office to three years. In the official report he wrote that “this position requires incessant care, handling numerous details, strict supervising and reprimanding of those teaching and taught, all the officials of the economic section, which is only possible to be achieved by experience, while with the frequent replacements of the rector it is his time to leave, hardly has he managed to get a proper insight into his duties... Being afraid to insult the one who is to soon replace him he would prefer to acquire indulgence by being as indulgent. Finally, the long-term habit of the subordinates to the same person in charge increases respect and obedience to him” [Ob izbranii Rektora v Moskovskom universitete, cherez kazhdye tri goda. September 18, 1809, p.1153–1154].

As the archive sources show, the true reasons for this initiative lay in the conflict within the university. The first request of count A. K. Razumovskii was made on April 15, 1808, and in a year, April 19, 1809, he described extraordinary (in his opinion) circumstances at the university, which compelled him to postpone the rector’s ordinary election until the final decision on his request. “I would give this case an ordinary run if I were not sure that the assembly of Professors would elect another rector; and because of that, instead of further success in the laboriously restored order, I would find myself in the same position as the year before as the approval of the rector’s three year term would arrive here after the new rector’s election: in such case I would have to struggle with disorder for another three years when such disruptive work would be too much for my age. Moreover, I can assure you that among the current professors no one possesses so many abilities for this position as the current rector, professor Geim. In such an unfortunate situation I decided to suspend the election in hope that you, my lord, will not delay to provide me with the much needed and craved relief for the benefit of learnedness here which has been about to collapse completely” [O rassmotrenii predlozhenij popechitelja uchebnogo okruga grafa A. K. Razumovskogo, 1808–1809, p. 4].

The matter thus concerned “restoring the order” at the university — a trend well-known by the 18<sup>th</sup> century, where the rector (as well as the previous rector) should serve not only as the head of the corporation but as an efficient and reliable assistant to the trustee, possessing a certain social (but not scientific!) reputation. Professor I. A. Geim perfectly fit this role — he was engaged by count A. K. Razumovskii in compiling a catalogue of his home library and thus entered the trusted circle of the grandee. It is not surprising that it was him that the trustee wanted to deal with at the university, and it meant that the rotation of rectors, characteristic German universities, did not actually suit him. A permanent or long-term rector would return the way of governing the university to the bureaucratic practice of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, i. e. would become a complete “counterpart” of the rector. This is why on June 17, 1809 (the next day after the election won by Geim) Razumovskii addressed the Ministry again, asking to prolong the term of rectorship, speaking of “special circumstances” at Moscow university and even threatening to “pass the position of the trustee over to someone else” [O rassmotrenii predlozhenij popechitelja uchebnogo okruga grafa A. K. Razumovskogo, 1808–1809, p. 6]. The suggested measure would apparently contradict the Statute of 1804 that prescribed following the practices of German universities, yet it reflected how those practices were adapted to the Russian situ-

ation. This eventually led to the minister accepting the request and to the issuing of the Emperor's decree on September 16, 1809<sup>3</sup>.

The above is proved by the fact that after two years the rector of Kharkov University, A. I. Stoykovich, strengthened his power in the same manner. Being aware that his position was not very stable, Stoykovich sent a confidential letter to the minister of People's Enlightenment. The latter presented a report to the Czar, after which on May 26, 1811, the three year rectorship was extended to Kharkov and Kazan Universities [Bagalei, Sumtsov, Buzeskul 1906, p. 28]. Moreover, after this resolution at Moscow University I. A. Geim remained in his office for another ten years! And it would be unfair to say that the professors' corporation did not try to elect another rector: on the contrary, there was such an attempt in the spring of 1811, which was motivated by the fact that Geim had been in his office for three years by then. But count A. K. Razumovskii, who had become the minister of People's Enlightenment, cancelled the election's results at Moscow University, ordering to calculate Geim's term not from 1808 but from 1809 as the year of his last election [Ob utverzhdenii rektorom universiteta professora I. A. Geima 1808–1811, p. 17].

Thus, the higher board of the university consciously tried to secure the maximal term of office for the professor of their choice, making this position increasingly less "academic" and more "bureaucratic". As the list of Moscow University rectors before the 1835 Statute shows, each remained in office for at least two decades. After the approval of this Statute, the rectorship was prolonged to four years with the possibility of a re-election, and A. A. Alfonskii, who had been in office from 1842 to 1863 (with a short gap between 1848 and 1850), i. e. nineteen years altogether, held an absolute record of the time.

As a result of the "autonomy", proclaimed in the Statute of 1804, the trustee and the ministry could formally influence the elections' results only indirectly. In reality, however, professors knew that for the university to thrive the rector should not be in opposition to the superior authorities. Therefore, although the elections were conducted independently, their outcome could be predicted and was discussed in advance with the trustee from the perspective of accepting or not accepting certain candidates. This phenomenon is most vividly seen in the words of professor F. K. Bronner of Kazan University in his letter to the trustee S. Y. Rumovskii dated September 5, 1811, and full of deliberations on the rector's election in Kazan University (where fractions of "foreign" and national professors were in a strong confrontation): "Wise and excellent trustee, deliver us from the burden which might lead to suffering and peril — electing the one who you do not desire! Point to the subject from your people who all the electors would approve of" [Naguyevskii 1902, p. 224].

The position of the trustee of Kharkov University, S. O. Pototskii is quite illustrative. When during the balloting for the rector's position in 1807 professors A. I. Stoykovich and P. M. Shumlyanskii received the same number of votes, the trustee reported to the minister as follows: "I for my part would prefer this position to be taken by a Russian as the one who knows the language and customs of the country. However, being of the Karpato-Russians, prof. Stoykovich has easily learnt and succeeded in the Russian language and has had enough time to know the customs of this country: he might be considered almost Russian.

---

<sup>3</sup> Minister count P. V. Zavadovskii complained to Razumovskii, "I shall not explain the difficulties of annulling the provisions of a statute issued, so to say, just yesterday. You might have believed them. But, finally, after much a discussion it has been decided to elect the rector at Moscow University for three years (sic!)" [Vasilchikov 1880, p. 230].

[...] Moreover, various gossip among the foreign professors that might occur were the rector's position held solely by Russians would be prevented" [Bagalei 1894, p. 302].

It is noteworthy that the similar choice between two candidates representing two "national fractions" of professors — the Germans and the Carpatho-Russians — at St. Petersburg university triggered a conflict with the ministry that ended in the resignation of the trustee, S. S. Uvarov. On June 6, 1819, the first election was held, with the votes split equally between M. A. Balug'yanskii (of Ruthenian descent from the Hungarian kingdom, who had a broad experience of service in the institutes of higher education, first in Hungary, then from 1803 in the Pedagogic, then in the Main Pedagogical Institute in St. Petersburg) [Andreev, Feofanov, 2011, p. 26–28] and E. Raupach (a younger scientist from Prussia, graduate of Halle University, who was invited by Uvarov and taught also at the Main Pedagogical Institute from 1816 and later transferred to St. Petersburg University [*ibid.*, 2011, p. 126–129]. The votes being even, the trustee ordered to draw lots, which fell upon Raupach (interestingly, the exactly same election procedure with a possibility of drawing lots was stipulated in the Statute of Berlin University of 1816 [*Die preussischen Universitäten* 1839, p. 46]).

Following the election, Uvarov recommended Raupach for inauguration, considering him "completely worthy" of the rank [Rozhdestvenskii, Maiakovkij, Nikolaev 1919, p. 116–117]. However, the minister, prince A. N. Golitsyn refused to support Uvarov's recommendation and transferred the case to the Ministers' Committee, pointing that Raupach was formally not a Russian subject (although that was not required by law). The Committee of Ministers considered drawing lots entirely "incompatible with the established order" (meaning the appointing to a position and not the corporate election!); i. e. they questioned the procedure established by the trustee Uvarov. By the Committee's decision, the results were annulled, and it was resolved to hold a new election [Seredonin 1902, p. 581], and on August 19 M. A. Balug'yanskii was elected. In T. N. Zhukovskaia's opinion, the ministry thus signaled their own arbitrary interpretation of the declared principle of electivity of the university administration [Zhukovskaia 2009, p. 77–78].

The cases when the rectors were directly appointed or deposed against the Statutes became especially common in the 1820s. It was caused by the practice of the trustees appointed by the "double ministry" of Golitsyn. Thus, in St. Petersburg, after the first rector Balug'yanskii resigned in October, 1821, to express his disagreement with the new trustee, D. P. Runich, who accused professors of being "atheists", Runich by his will appointed professor E. F. Zyablovskii to "fulfill the rector's duties", and the latter stayed in office without elections for four years, until 1825.

After the "rout" of Kazan University that he produced in 1819, M. L. Magnitskii usurped the right to approve the elected rector "for a year to test his abilities" with a possible prolongation of his term to three years. In this manner the trustee consequently dismissed the rector G. I. Solntsev (who did not meet Magnitskii's expectations whatsoever), then G. B. Nikolskii, until finally in 1823 it was K. F. Fuchs, whose election, according to the trustee, "was completely justified" [Ob osvobozhdenii Rektora Kazanskogo Universiteta ot zasedaniia v hozhajstvennom Pravlenii Universiteta. January 12, 1825, p. 6–7].

In Kharkov University, rector T. F. Osipovskii who was in high favor with the first trustee, S. O. Pototskii, tried to "zealously maintain his rector's dignity regarding the newly appointed trustee", Z. Ya. Karneev, for which there was a price to pay: on November 1, 1820, he was dismissed from his position by the trustee. For that, the trustee convened



an extraordinary session of the Council “late in the evening, as if secretly, to which Osipovskii, as the rector, was not invited”, and there on Karneev’s request a new rector was elected — V. Ya. Dzhunkovskii [Bagalei 904, p. 98, 106, 112]. At the end of 1823, the latter was outvoted, but the two new candidates received (as in St. Petersburg in 1819) an equal number of votes among the Council members, and even a repeated balloting did not reveal the majority. This situation again allowed the trustee to decide on his own. The trustee now was E. V. Karneev (who had replaced his uncle in his position); he ignored the election results and convinced the minister to prolong Dzhunkovskii’s rectorship for three years more [Ob uvol’nenii rektora Khar’kovskogo universiteta prof. T. F. Osipovskogo 1820–1835, p. 49–50 rev.]. However, in 1826 the new trustee A. A. Perovskii did not agree to bear with Dzhunkovskii, in whom he did not see the necessary qualities, i. e. “energy, attention, reason and force of character”, so without any elections he by his will appointed professor I. Ya. Kroneberg rector, and Emperor Nicholas I approved this appointment as termless, “until the new statute for the universities is issued” [Bagalei 1904, p. 153–155].

A clear resonance of these events was that even the remote Vilno (now Vilnius) University with its own ways was deprived of the right to elect its rector in 1826. N. N. Novosiltsev, who had become its trustee, used his power to appoint professor E. V. Pelikan to this position. He sent a note to Emperor Nicholas I where he explained his decision by saying that “the current staff of the Universities, established after the old German ones, and their republican governing turns out to be inconvenient and contrary to the goal for which the Universities had been established”. Therefore “the direct effect of the Government on the Universities and the successful supervision by the former over the people’s enlightenment cannot be established in any other way than through appointing to the rector’s position by the Government itself those learned and loyal to the Government” [Ob opredelenii rektorov Vilenskogo universiteta po naznacheniiu pravitel’sтва 1826]. Novosiltsev’s note is a typical example of how an ambassador of people’s enlightenment, who belonged to the first, “liberal” generation of trustees and contributed to the university reform in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, started to express completely opposite views in the new political environment a quarter century later.

Finally, even Moscow University that had been less affected by the measures of Golitsyn’s “double ministry”, changed its rector in October, 1826, after Nicholas I acceded to the throne. A. A. Prokopovich-Antonskii, who was rector as well as director of the Assembly of Nobles, was dismissed after a university inspection initiated as a result of Nicholas’ discontent with the Assembly, whose many graduates were among the Decembrists [Petrov 2002, p. 44, 575–576]. In 1836 — following the well-known “Chaadaev case” — the minister dismissed Moscow University rector professor A. V. Boldyrev, the first one elected for four years according to the new 1835 Statute. While this Statute diminished the direct interference of the trustees into the rector’s elections, Nicholas I still desired to eliminate the principle of “university board electiveness”. It finally happened in 1849: the candidates were now determined by the minister regardless of the will of the University Councils, and the minister also had the right to dismiss rectors and deans at any time [Ob izmene-nii porjadka naznachenii rektorov i dekanov v universitety: S.-Pereburgskii, Moskovskii, Sv. Vladimira i Kazanskii. October 11, 1849].

While the practice of appointing rectors regardless of the Councils’ opinion developed further, it should be noted that it brought about changes in the scope of rectors’ competence. Initially being the “first among peers” elected by their fellow colleagues, the

rectors wished to be simply the “first” at the university. Thus, the rector of Kazan University, K. F. Fuchs admitted to “lobbying” the Council: when he needed a “convenient” secretary of the Council, an extraordinary professor P. S. Sergeev was elected, but since the secretary had to be an ordinary professor according to the Statute, the rector suggested to the Council to promote Sergeev [Zagoskin 1904, p. 318].

Energetic and active, the rector of Kharkov University, I. Ya. Kroneberg showed, according to historian D. I. Bagalei, “the features of autocracy and despotism towards the University Collegium”, he wanted “strong rector’s power, independent of the Council, like the trustee” [Bagalei 1904, p. 106, 162]. Because of that, however, Kroneberg had to submit his resignation in 1829 since he found no support in the Council. As he had earlier revealed his view of the rector’s prerogatives in a letter to the trustee Perovskii: “If a rector possesses no power or liberty and cannot make any orders without exposing himself to the insults by the Council or the Board, how can he be considered head of a university?” [Bagalei 1904, p. 159].

Not surprisingly, there were true battles for the rector’s post, with professors forming factions to supporting certain candidates (which probably resulted in the frequent equal distribution of votes). Contrived schemes that involved the ministry were designed before elections or to depose rectors. Thus, in Kazan university professor I. M. Simonov, craving to occupy the rector’s chair, persuaded the minister to appoint N. I. Lobachevskii’s assistant of the trustee of Kazan educational district, to make his dismissal in 1845 seem a promotion. Professor N. P. Wagner recalled: “Maybe, by this appointment the ministry wished to promote Lobachevskii, but what was done was actually a crucial blow that deprived the genial geometer of all that was dear to him at Kazan University. Moreover, with his new appointment he lost in his income. Without his professor’s salary, he only had a pathetic pension of 1142 rubles with additional 800 rubles allowance. Having been rector for nearly 20 years, Lobachevsky did not receive any remuneration for this labor; he served the university quite unselfishly. His successor, the new rector of Kazan University, I. M. Simonov received an allowance of 1000 rubles in addition to his professor’s salary as soon as he was appointed to his position” [Wagner 1894, p. 27–28]. Thus, with this false promotion Simonov was able to remove Lobachevskii and concentrate power in his own hands.

Finally, let us view some examples demonstrating the “inner climate”, i. e. the attitudes inside the university corporation. They show that in many conflicts the rector failed as a “father of a big family” — on the contrary, he acted as an interested party stirred by partisan motives. Thus, the university judicial case, which resulted in the dismissal of the Kharkov University rector, A. I. Stoykovich, and was published by N. A. Lavrovskii and analyzed by D. I. Bagalei in detail, is full of comments on the rector’s power. As professor I. G. Shad emotionally wrote in his special report on this case, the rector “revealed his malicious designs, [...] for what can be more insane than to be the judge of his own case and the President of the court as well? Such is unthought of even in barbaric countries, and he would like to do that in the Russian Empire, where celebrated and highly cultured establishments have flourished since the olden days, and even more so since Peter I. [...] Let him seek support of his friends and patrons, let him menace not only the Board, which is investigating his horrid crime, but the Council itself! Our University does have honest and courageous members who protect our common well-being. Their voice against the few patrons of this man in this shameful matter will be heard by the minister and will reach our wise and fair Emperor” [Lavrovskii 1873, p. 33–34].

This example also shows how contradictory the adaptation of rectorship in Russia turned out to be, where it was simultaneously prescribed two roles. On the one hand, the rector acted as the head and protector of the “patriarchal” corporate institutions through possessing the necessary social ties, and, on the other hand, he was a strict authority figure and medium of the ministry’s policy and emperor’ will (Shad exploits this contradiction urging the minister to interfere in the university conflict).

Overall, the history of rectorship in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Russia provides much more striking and characteristic examples that reveal its complex nature than the same period in the history of German universities. With the establishing of the elected rector’s position in the Russian universities, as well as of other corporate attributes, it was necessary to deal with a rapid adaptation both of its early social functions dating back to the Middle Ages (rector as a medium and protector of the corporation) and of the newer administrative functions of the “modernized” university (rector as an “academic head”) incorporated into the government bureaucracy through the Ministry of People’s Enlightenment. Such a “compressed” adaptation entailed numerous conflicts, whose typical examples were given above. It can be added that the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century did not yet see the third role of the rector as a remarkable scientist, whose power was acknowledged owing to his academic authority, which in turn encouraged the rise of university’s social significance and prestige. Such rectors of the “classical” university period appeared in Germany in the 1830s, but in Russia they were to come only much later (S. M. Solovyev or S. N. Trubetskoi, to name a few [Andreev, Cygankov 2010, p. 677–680, 727–728]).

## References

- Akt postanovleniia dlia Imperatorskogo Universiteta v Derpte. 12 dekabria 1802 g. [Emperor Derpt university statute. 12<sup>th</sup> of December 1802]. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZRI)* [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire (PSZRI)]. St. Petersburg, Tipogr. II Otdeleniia S. E. I. V. Kantseliarii [Print. House of the II Department of His Imperial Majesty’s Own Chancery], 1830, vol. XX-VII, no. 20551, pp. 394–395. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. Imperator Aleksandr I i professor G. F. Parrot: k istorii vozniknoveniia “universitetskoi avtonomii” v Rossii [The emperor Alexander I and the professor G. F. Parrot: to the arising of the “university autonomy” in Russia]. *Otechestvennaia istoriia* [Native History], 2006, no. 6, pp. 19–30. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. *Moskovskii universitet v obshchestvennoi i kul’turnoi zhizni Rossii nachala XIX v.* [Moscow University in the social and cultural life of Russia at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> c.]. Moscow, Iazyki russkoi kul’tury Publ., 2000, 312 p. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. *Rossiiskie universitety XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoi istorii Evropy* [Russian universities at the 18<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the context of university history in Europe]. Moscow, Znack Publ., 2009, 640 p. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu., Cygankov D. A. (eds) *Imperatorskii Moskovskii universitet 1755–1917: Entsiklopedicheskii slovar’* [Moscow Imperial University 1755–1917: Encyclopedical dictionary]. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 2010, 894 p. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. (gen. ed.); Feofanov A. M. (ed.) *Inostrannye professora rossiiskikh universitetov (vtoraia polovina XVIII — pervaiia tret’ XIX v.): Biograficheskii slovar’* [The foreign professors of Russian universities (second half of 18<sup>th</sup> c. — first third of 19<sup>th</sup> c.): Biographical dictionary]. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 2011, 207 p. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu., Posohov S. I. (gen. eds) *Universitet v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka* [A University in the Russian Empire at the 18<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> c.]. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 2012, 671 p. (In Russian)
- Bagalei D. I. *Opyt istorii Khar’kovskogo universiteta (po neizdannym materialam)* [Essay on the history of Kharkov university (on the unpublished materials)]. Vol. 1 (1802–1815). Kharkov, M. Zilberberg and Sons Print., 1894, 1152 p. (In Russian)

- Bagalei D. I. *Opyt istorii Khar'kovskogo universiteta (po neizdannym materialam)* [Essay of a history of Kharkov university (on the unpublished materials)]. Vol. 2 (1815–1835). Kharkov, M. Zilberberg and Sons Print., 1904, 1004 p. (In Russian)
- Bagalei D. I., Sumcov N. F., Buzeskul V. P. *Kratkii ocherk istorii Khar'kovskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego sushchestvovaniia (1805–1905)* [The general outline of a history of Kharkov university for the first hundred years of its existence]. Kharkov, M. Zilberberg and Sons Print., 1906, XIV+329 p. (In Russian)
- Füssel M. *Gelehrtenkultur als symbolische Praxis: Rang, Ritual und Konflikt an der Universität der Frühen Neuzeit* [Scholarly culture as a symbolic practice: rank, ritual and conflict at the University of the Early Modern Period]. Darmstadt, WBG Publ., 2006. 556 p. (In German)
- Karazin V. N. — osnovatel' Khar'kovskogo universiteta [V. N. Karazin — the founder of Kharkov University]. *Russkaia starina* [Russian antiquity], 1875, vol. XIII, no. 5, pp. 61–80. (In Russian)
- Lavrovskii N. A. *Episod iz istorii Khar'kovskogo universiteta* [Case from the history of Kharkov University]. *Chteniia v O IDR* [Lectures in the Society of History and Russian Antiquities], 1873, vol. 2, part V, pp. 1–37. (In Russian)
- Martinson E. E. *Istoriia osnovaniia Tartuskogo (byvshego Derpstskogo-Iur'evskogo) universiteta* [History of the foundation of Tartu (former Dorpat-Iur'ev) University]. Leningrad, Leningrad University Press, 1954, 192 p. (In Russian)
- Nagudevskii D. I. *Professor Franz Ksaverii Bronner, ego dnevniki i perepiska (1758–1850)* [Professor Franz Xavier Bronner, his diary and correspondence]. Kazan', Tipogr. Imp. Kazanskogo universiteta [Print. House of Imperial Kazan' University], 1902, 504 p. (In Russian)
- Ob izbranii Rektora v Moskovskom universitete, chrez kazhdye tri goda. 18 sentiabria 1809 g. [About three times a year elections of Moscow university rector]. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZ RI)* [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire] (PSZ RI). St. Petersburg, Tipogr. II Otdeleniia S. E. I. V. Kantseliarii [Print. House of the II Department of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancery], 1830, vol. XXX, no. 23841, pp. 1153–1154. (In Russian)
- Ob izmenenii poriadka naznacheniiia rektorov i dekanov v universitety: S.-Peterburgskii, Moskovskii, Sv.Vladimira i Kazanskii. 11 oktiabria 1849 g. [Changing of procedure for the designation of rectors and dean of the universities: St. Petersburg, Moscow, St.Vladimir and Kazan'. 11 October 1849]. *Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvesceniia* [Collection of resolutions for the Ministry of Education], St. Petersburg, V. S. Balashev Print., 1864, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 915–916. (In Russian)
- Ob opredelenii v Moskovskii universitet rektorov, professorov i prochih prepodavatelei [Designation of rectors, professors and other teachers to Moscow University]. *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA)* [Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)], f. 732, op. 1, d. 305 (1805–1817). (In Russian, unpublished)
- Ob opredelenii rektorov Vilenskogo universiteta po naznacheniiu pravitel'stva. 28 iulia 1826 [Designation of rectors to Wilna University by governmental orders. 28 July 1826]. *Sbornik postanovlenii po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosveshcheniia* [Collection of resolutions for the Ministry of Education]. St. Petersburg, V. S. Balashev Print., 1875, vol. 2, part 1, pp. 31–33. (In Russian)
- Ob osvobozhdenii Rektora Kazanskogo Universiteta ot zasedaniia v hoziaistvennom Pravlenii Universiteta. 12 ianvaria 1826 [On the release of the Kazan University Rector of the meeting at the economic University Board. January 12, 1825]. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZRI)* [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire (PSZRI)]. St. Petersburg, Tipogr. II Otdeleniia S. E. I. V. Kantseliarii [Print. House of the II Department of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancery], 1830, vol. XL, no. 30192, pp. 6–7. (In Russian)
- O rassmotrenii predlozhenii popechitelia uchebnogo okruga grafa A. K. Razumovskogo o merah po uluchsheniiu sostoiianiia universiteta, v tom chisle ob izbranii rektora ne ezhegodno, a na bolee dlitel'nye sroki [Examination of the proposals of count A. K. Razoumovskii, curator of the educational district, to the improvement of the state of the university, among them for the elections of a rector non-yearly but for a longer period]. *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA)* [Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)], f. 733, op. 28, d. 70 (1808–1809). (In Russian, unpublished)
- Ob ustroistve uchilishch. 24 ianvaria 1803 g. [About specialized school organization. 24<sup>th</sup> of January]. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZRI)* [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire (PSZRI)]. St. Petersburg, Tipogr. II Otdeleniia S. E. I. V. Kantseliarii [Print. House of the II Department of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancery], 1830, vol. XXVII, no. 20597, pp. 437–438. (In Russian)
- Ob utverzhdenii rektorom universiteta professora I. A. Geima [Designation of the prof. I. A. Heim to the rector of the university]. *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA)* [Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)], f. 733, op. 28, d. 71 (1808–1811). (In Russian, unpublished)

- Ob uvol'nenii rektora Khar'kovskogo universiteta prof. T.F.Osipovskogo i ob utverzhenii rektorom V.Ia.Dzhunkovskogo [Dismissal of prof. T.F.Osipovskii from the rector of Kharkov University and designation of prof. V.Ia.Dzhunkovskii to the rector]. *Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA) [Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)]*, f. 733, op. 49, d. 414 (1820–1835). (In Russian, unpublished)
- Petrov F. A. *Formirovanie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii [Formation of the system of university education in Russia]*. Moscow, Moscow University Press, 2002, vol. 2, 816 p. (In Russian)
- Die Privilegien und ältesten Statuten der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen [The privileges and oldest statutes of the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen]*. Ed. by W.Ebel. Goettingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Publ., 1961, 193 p. (In German)
- Die preussischen Universitäten. Eine Sammlung der Verordnungen, welche die Verfassung und Verwaltung dieser Anstalten betreffen. Bd 1. Die Verfassung der Universitäten im Allgemeinen [The Prussian Universities. A collection of regulations relating to the constitution and administration of these institutions. Vol. 1. The Constitution of the universities in general]*. Ed by J.F.W.Koch. Berlin, Mittler Publ., 1839, 699 p. (In German)
- Rozhdestvenskii S. V. (gen. ed.); Maiakovskii I. L., Nikolaev A. S. (eds) *Sankt-Peterburgskii universitet v pervoe stoletie ego deiatel'nosti 1819–1919. Materialy po istorii Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta 1819–1835 [Saint Petersburg University at the first hundred years of its existence 1819–1919. Materials on the history of St. Petersburg University 1819–1835]*. Petrograd, 2-ia Gos. tipogr. [2<sup>nd</sup> State Print House], 1919, 760 p. (In Russian)
- Seredonin S.M. *Istoricheskiĭ obzor deiatel'nosti Komiteta ministrov: k stoletiiu Komiteta ministrov (1802–1902) [Historical review of the work of the Committee of Ministers: to the hundred anniversary of the Committee of Ministers]*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, ed. by Kantseliaria Komiteta Ministrov [The Chancellery of the Council of Ministers], 1902, vol. 1, 608 p. (In Russian)
- Schwinges R. Ch. *Rektorwahlen. Ein Beitrag zur Verfassungs-, Sozial- und Universitätsgeschichte des alten Reiches im 15. Jahrhundert [Rectoral elections. A contribution to the constitutional, social and University History of the Old Empire in the 15<sup>th</sup> century]*. Sigmaringen, Thorbecke Publ., 1992, 192 p. (In German)
- Vagner N. P. Iz zhizni velikogo geometra. Vospominaniia o N. I. Lobachevskom i ego otnoshenii k Kazanskomu universitetu [From the life of a great geometer. Memories of N. I. Lobachevskii and his relations to the Kazan' University]. *Knizhki nedeli [Small books weekly]*, 1894, March, pp. 5–34. (in Russian)
- Vasil'chikov A. A. *Semeistvo Razumovskikh [The Family of Razoumovskii]*. St. Petersburg, Tipogr. Imp. Akademii nauk [Print. House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences], 1880, vol. 2, 557 p. (In Russian)
- Vysochaishe utverzhdenyi Ustav Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta [Emperor Moscow University Charter by Imperial consolidation]. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZ RI) [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire (PSZRI)]*. St. Petersburg, Tipogr. II Otdeleniia S. E. I. V. Kantseliarii [Print. House of the II Department of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancery], 1830, vol. XXVIII, no. 21498, pp. 570–589. (In Russian)
- Zagoskin N. P. *Istoriia Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego sushchestvovaniia 1804–1904 [History of Kazan' University of the first hundred years of its existence (1804–1904)]*, Kazan', Tipogr. Imp. Kazanskogo universiteta [Print. House of the Imperial Kazan' University], 1904, vol. 4 (1819–1827), 692 p. (In Russian)
- Zhukovskaia T. N. "Imperatorskii universitet": sistema vysochaishego vmeshatel'stva v zhizn' rossiiskikh universitetov v pervoi polovine XIX veka ["Imperial university": a system of the highest interference to the life of Russian universities in the first half of 19<sup>th</sup> c.]. *Vlast', obshchestvo i reformy v Rossii v XIX — nachale XX v.: issledovaniia, istoriografiia, istochnikovedenie [Power, society and reforms in Russia at the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> c.: historical, historiographical and source studies]*. St. Petersburg, Nestor-Istoriia Publ., 2009, pp. 74–89. (In Russian)

**For citation:** Andreev A. Iu. The election of rectors in the first decades of university autonomy in Russia. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2016, issue 3, pp. 4–16. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2016.301

Статья поступила в редакцию 16 января 2016 г.; рекомендовано в печать 21 июня 2016 г.