

MICHAEL PUSHKIN

RAZNOCHINTSY IN THE UNIVERSITY
GOVERNMENT POLICY AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN
NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA

The change in the social background of university students in nineteenth-century Russia, and in particular the “arrival of the *raznochintsy*¹”, to use Mikhailovskii’s celebrated term, have long been considered a major turning-point in Russian social history and a watershed in the development of the revolutionary movement. Historians have often attributed to it the chief role in producing the evolution of ideological attitudes between the “Fathers” of the 1840’s and the “Sons” of the 1860’s and the upsurge in radical agitation in the universities on the eve of the Emancipation of the Serfs.

Empirical data on the subject have appeared in a number of monographs and articles published chiefly since the early 1950’s.² Most of these

¹ For brief notes on this and the other main social groups discussed in the article, see Glossary, pp. 51f.

² N. Hans, *History of Russian Educational Policy, 1701-1917* (London, 1931); W. H. E. Johnson, *Russia’s Educational Heritage* (New Brunswick, 1950), p. 290; A. G. Rashin, “Gramotnost’ i narodnoe obrazovanie v Rossii v XIX i nachale XX v.”, in: *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, No 37 (1951), pp. 28-80; Yu. N. Egorov, “Studenchestvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta v 30–50-kh godakh XIX v., ego sotsial’nyi sostav i raspredelenie po fakul’tetam”, in: *Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta, Seriya istorii, yazyka i literatury*, 1957, No 14, pp. 5-19; V. R. Leikina-Svirskaya, “Formirovanie raznochinskoi intelligentsii v 40-kh godakh XIX v.”, in: *Istoriya SSSR*, 1958, No 1, pp. 83-104; C. A. Anderson, “The Social Composition of University Student Bodies: The Recruitment of Nineteenth-Century Élites in Four Nations”, in: *The Year Book of Education 1959* (London, 1959), pp. 502-06; Yu. N. Egorov, “Reaktionnaya politika tsarizma v voprosakh universitetskogo obrazovaniya v 30–50-kh gg. XIX v.”, in: *Nauchnye Doklady Vysshei Shkoly, Istoricheskie nauki*, 1960, No 3, pp. 60-75; L. K. Erman, “Sostav intelligentsii v Rossii v kontse XIX i nachale XX vekov”, in: *Istoriya SSSR*, 1963, No 1, pp. 161-77, esp. p. 174, Table X; id., *Intelligentsiya v pervoi russkoi revolyutsii* (Moscow, 1966), p. 29; A. P. Pollard, “The Russian Intelligentsia: The Mind of Russia”, in: *Californian Slavic Studies*, III (1964), pp. 1-32; A. Kahan, “Social Structure, Public Policy, and the Development of Education and the Economy in Czarist Russia”, in: *Education and Economic Development*, ed. by C. A. Anderson and M. J. Bowman (London, 1966), pp. 363-75; E. Chutkerashvili, *Kadry dlya nauki* (Moscow, 1968), p. 60; D. R. Brower, “Fathers, Sons, and Grandfathers. Social Origins of Radical Intellectuals in Nine-

contributions have been devoted to rather limited historical periods; one of the aims of this article will be to summarize the major developments in the social composition of the Russian universities³ over the period for which quantitative data are available (1835-1914). Our particular concern will be, however, the detailed analysis of the period from the 1850's to the 1880's. In the last few years some scholars have begun to argue that the major turning-point in the democratization of the universities came in the late 1860's and early 1870's rather than a decade earlier.⁴ Unfortunately, our knowledge of the crucial decade of the 1860's has hitherto been served by rather unreliable data.⁵ We hope to provide a sounder basis for the view

teenth-Century Russia", in: *Journal of Social History*, II (1968-69), pp. 333-55; M. Pushkin, "The Professions and the Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia", in: *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, XII (1969-70), pp. 72-99; G. I. Shchetinina, "Universitety i obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Rossii v poreformennyi period", in: *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, No 84 (1969), pp. 164-215; L. V. Kamosko, "Izmeneniya soslovnogo sostava uchashchikhsya srednei i vysshei shkoly Rossii (30-80-e gody XIX v.)", in: *Voprosy Istorii*, 1970, No 10, pp. 203-07; V. R. Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka* (Moscow, 1971), pp. 57-65; M. Confino, "On Intellectuals and Intellectual Traditions in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Russia", in: *Daedalus*, CI (1972), No 2, pp. 117-49; A. Besançon, *Education et société en Russie dans le second tiers du XIXe siècle* (Paris, 1974), pp. 82-84; T. B. Ryabikova, "Chislennost' i soslovnyi sostav studentov Moskovskogo universiteta", in: *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta, Istoriya*, 1974, No 5, pp. 57-67; D. R. Brower, *Training the Nihilists. Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca and London, 1975), pp. 114, 118; G. I. Shchetinina, *Universitety v Rossii i ustav 1884 goda* (Moscow, 1976), pp. 71-72, 192-203; J. T. Flynn, "Tuition and Social Class in the Russian Universities: S. S. Uvarov and 'Reaction' in the Russia of Nicholas I", in: *Slavic Review*, XXXV (1976), pp. 232-48; R. J. Brym, "A Note on the *Raznochintsy*", in: *Journal of Social History*, X (1976-77), pp. 354-59; G. I. Shchetinina, "Alfavitnye spiski studentov kak istoricheskii istochnik. Sostav universitetskogo studenchestva v kontse XIX - nachale XX veka", in: *Istoriya SSSR*, 1979, No 5, pp. 110-26.

³ The students of higher technical institutions also participated actively in the revolutionary movement (see, for example, V. A. Antonov, "K voprosu o sotsial'nom sostave i chislennosti revolyutsionerov 70-kh gg.", in: *Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v poreformennoi Rossii*, ed. by L. M. Ivanov (Moscow, 1965), pp. 336-44, esp. p. 340, Table II). The question of this group's social background is of considerable importance, but the available information is rather fragmentary. Our earlier study (Pushkin, loc. cit., p. 81) concluded that they were considerably more plebeian than their university counterparts. Other data may be sought in Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya*, op. cit., pp. 78, 110, 112, 116-19, 122, 126, 137, 150-51, 177-78; Erman, "Sostav", loc. cit.; Johnson, *Heritage*, op. cit.; Brym, "A Note", loc. cit., p. 359, Table 2.

⁴ Confino, "On Intellectuals", loc. cit., p. 146, note 36; Besançon, *Education*, op. cit., pp. 82-84; Brower, *Training the Nihilists*, op. cit., p. 114.

⁵ Kamosko, "Izmeneniya", loc. cit., p. 204, and Shchetinina, *Universitety*, op. cit., pp. 70-71, cite figures for 1855 and 1875; Kamosko states "no information" on the social origins of the 3,591 students in 1866. Rashin, "Gramotnost'", loc. cit., p. 78 (and after him Kahan, "Social Structure", loc. cit., p. 370, and Brower, *ibid.*), quotes data for 1864-65, but his figure of 14% for the peasantry is impossibly high for that date and leads one to approach the data with some caution. The fault lies not in Rashin's misinterpretation of

that the period 1865-75 saw the most fundamental changes, but at the same time to question some currently accepted ideas about the exact timing of this process and the social groups which participated in it. We shall examine how successfully the government was able to control the social background of students at each stage, and how far the changes in their origins reflected broader social changes involving the bureaucracy and the teaching profession. We shall in addition present new data on the distribution of the social estates in the various university faculties in 1863 and 1880.

The generation of 1840: the true "arrival of the raznochinetns"?

The social background of Russian university students in the pre-Emanicipation period and the evolution of government policy towards it have already been the subject of systematic study.⁶ It is clear that the students' origins remained almost unchanged for most of the period between the mid 1830's and the mid 1850's, with approximately two-thirds of the students coming from the families of nobles or civil servants. Relatively little attention has been paid, however, to one significant deviation from this pattern. In the seven years after 1836, the proportion of students from these backgrounds dropped by over five per cent.⁷ The explanation for this change may be sought in the related histories not only of the universities and the gymnasiums, but also of the bureaucracy, which was chiefly recruited from them.

Speranskii's 1809 decrees⁸ had made it more difficult for civil-service

correct data, but in the source material itself, which Rashin has faithfully transcribed: *Obzor deyatelnosti Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya i podvedomstvennykh emu uchrezhdenii v 1862, 63 i 64 godakh* (St Petersburg, 1865) (hereafter *Obzor deyatelnosti*), *Prilozheniya*, p. 230.

⁶ S. V. Rozhdestvenskii, "Soslovnyi vopros v russkikh universitetakh v pervoi chetverti XIX veka", in: *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya* (hereafter *Zhurnal*), New Series, IX (1907), pp. 83-108; J. T. Flynn, "The Universities, the Gentry, and the Imperial Russian Services, 1815-1825", in: *Canadian Slavic Studies*, II (1968), pp. 486-503; Egorov, "Studenchestvo", loc. cit.; id., "Reaktsionnaya politika", loc. cit.; Leikina-Svirskaya, "Formirovanie", loc. cit.; Ryabikova, "Chislennost'", loc. cit.; Flynn, "Tuition", loc. cit.

⁷ See Table 1. This change from 1836 onwards and its subsequent reversal were first noted by Egorov ("Studenchestvo", p. 6; "Reaktsionnaya politika", p. 63), who explained the reversal, but not the democratization itself. Egorov, however, did not make use of the *Zhurnal* data for 1835 and 1840 presented in our Table 1, which alter the picture somewhat (see below, pp. 28f.). Others (e.g., Flynn, "Tuition", p. 242, note 24) do not mention these fluctuations when referring to this period, although Leikina-Svirskaya's article ("Formirovanie") has as its theme the formation of the *raznochinetns* intelligentsia in the 1840's.

⁸ *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii* (hereafter *PSZ*), First Series, No 23559, 3

candidates from the nobility to avoid the state educational system. The 1813 restriction on the entry of serfs into gymnasiums and universities⁹ and the 1819 introduction of secondary-school fees¹⁰ also helped to increase the proportion of nobles in the gymnasiums, which had reached almost three-quarters by 1826-27.¹¹ The 1827 ban on serfs¹² and Shishkov's 1828 statute,¹³ which abandoned the principle of the democratic ladder introduced in the reforms of 1803-04,¹⁴ were equally effective. By 1833 the proportion of nobles in the gymnasiums had reached almost four-fifths and this level was maintained for the next twenty years.¹⁵

The democratization of the universities between 1836 and 1843 cannot therefore be explained by similar changes in the gymnasiums in the preceding years. However, in the late 1830's and early 1840's the total number of students enrolled increased in the gymnasiums by more than two-thirds¹⁶ and in the universities by almost three-quarters.¹⁷ This growth followed a rather modest expansion of the gymnasiums in the first few years of Nicholas I's reign (some fifteen per cent from 1826-27 to 1833). As a result, despite the static social composition of the gymnasiums in the late 1830's and early 1840's, the absolute number of their non-noble pupils grew by over 1,100 between 1833 and 1843, while 1,068 extra university places became available between 1836 and 1843. In fact, non-nobles accounted for less than half of the new university places (485 in all). This is not surprising, since numerical changes which had begun slowly in the gymnasiums in the late 1820's and only accelerated after 1833 could not be expected to have found their full expression in the universities so soon afterwards.

A closer analysis of the changes in the universities at this time reveals a more complex situation. The discrepancies between the 1835 and 1836 data make it difficult to judge whether there was any real movement away from

April 1809, pp. 899-900; No 23771, 6 August, pp. 1054-57. All dates for PSZ are given in Old Style.

⁹ P. L. Alston, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford, 1969), p. 28.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ See Table 2.

¹² PSZ, Second Series, No 1308, 19 August 1827, pp. 675-77.

¹³ *Ibid.*, No 2502, 8 December 1828, pp. 1097-1127; No 2503, pp. 1127-28.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, First Series, No 20597, 26 January 1803, pp. 437-42; No 20598, 24 January, p. 442; No 21497, 5 November 1804, pp. 569-70. Under the reform pupils could proceed from one level of the system to the one above with no built-in barriers. Control was decentralized: in each region the university ran the secondary schools, which in turn were responsible for the elementary schools.

¹⁵ Uvarov's school regions reform, *ibid.*, Second Series, No 8262, 25 June 1835, pp. 756-58, and charter of the universities, No 8337, 26 July, pp. 841-55, had political and administrative rather than social goals.

¹⁶ See Table 2.

¹⁷ See Table 1.

the elite towards the other social groups in the late 1830's. It does seem clear, however, that within the elite itself there was a substantial improvement in the noble percentage in the universities at the expense of the civil servants and *oberofitsery*.¹⁸ The early 1840's, on the other hand, are characterized by a democratization at the expense of the noble/civil-servant group as a whole, with perhaps the lower urban estates as the chief beneficiaries.

Important changes were also taking place in the civil service at this time. The nobles were demanding that limits be imposed on the social benefits accruing from promotion in the bureaucracy, and the middle classes, from whom the rapidly expanding bureaucracy would increasingly have to be recruited, wished for a greater recognition of their new status.¹⁹ This led in 1832 to the foundation of the new social estate of "honorary citizens". The main non-noble groups entitled to apply for membership were those eligible for civil-service careers: sons of personal nobles and of Orthodox priests, first-guild merchants and Russian-university graduates.²⁰

¹⁸ *Oberofitsery* were company-grade commissioned officers in the Russian army (captain and below), mostly soldiers who had worked their way up through the ranks to officer status and thus to ennoblement. The children of such servicemen who were born before their fathers were ennobled were known as *oberofitserskie deti* or simply as *oberofitsery*. Children of civil servants in the same situation were personally entitled to the status of "hereditary honorary citizens", but were often referred to as "children of civil servants" in university documents. See Ryabikova, "Chislennost'", p. 65; Egorov, "Reaktsionnaya politika", p. 61, note 4; P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Pravitel'stvennyi apparat samoderzhavnoi Rossii v XIX v.* (Moscow, 1978), pp. 25-26.

¹⁹ See W. M. Pintner, "The Social Characteristics of the Early Nineteenth-Century Russian Bureaucracy", in: *Slavic Review*, XXIX (1970), pp. 429-43, esp. pp. 435-37; A. P. Korelin, "Dvoryanstvo v poreformnoi Rossii (1861-1904 gg.)", in: *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, No 87 (1971), pp. 91-173, esp. p. 97. For a recent account of the effects of the expansion at the lower end of the bureaucracy, see H. A. McFarlin, "The Extension of the Imperial Russian Civil Service to the Lowest Office Workers: The Creation of the Chancery Clerkship, 1827-1833", in: *Russian History*, I (1974), pp. 1-17; Korelin's book of the same name (Moscow, 1979) and *Russian Officialdom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. by W. M. Pintner and D. K. Rowney (Chapel Hill, 1980), which includes two new articles by Pintner, both arrived too late to be used in this article.

²⁰ PSZ, Second Series, No 5284, 10 April 1832, pp. 193-95. It is common practice in textbook accounts of this manifesto to suggest that it provided for civil servants below the ninth rank to earn the title of "honorary citizen" by service. See, for example, F. A. Brokgauz and I. A. Efron, *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, IXA (18) (1893), pp. 523-24; M. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation* (New York, 1963), II, p. 786; S. Pushkarev, *The Emergence of Modern Russia, 1801-1917* (New York, 1963), p. 28; H. Seton-Watson, *The Russian Empire, 1801-1917* (Oxford, 1967), p. 240. (Both Florinsky and Seton-Watson give the date of the manifesto as 10 February 1832.) No such provision was in fact included in the 1832 manifesto. Indeed, at this time anyone on the fourteenth and lowest grade of the Table of Ranks automatically earned the higher title of "personal noble", and would have no need of the inferior status of an "honorary citizen". It was

This measure had no more success than those pursued in the educational system in re-establishing the exclusive privileges of the noble estate. Between 1836 and 1843 almost two-thirds of those reaching the eighth rank (and hereditary ennoblement) were of non-noble origin.²¹ The proportion of nobles within the bureaucracy as a whole did not drop in the second quarter of the century, remaining steady at about forty per cent of the total. There were, however, contradictory developments within it. In the central bureaucracy there was an overall increase of seventeen per cent in the proportion of nobles, although in the bottom ranks a slight democratization occurred. In the provincial agencies, on the other hand, the noble proportion declined overall by some twelve per cent, but their representation in the bottom ranks increased slightly.²²

The close ties of recruitment and social milieu between the universities and the bureaucracy are well-known. However, any close correlation between the social origins of bureaucrats and those of university students is extremely difficult to establish.²³ For example, the sons of clergymen were among those most frequently reaching the eighth rank at this time and their numbers in the bureaucracy as a whole were rising (from 17.5% to 20.1% during the second quarter of the nineteenth century). Yet the proportion of priests' sons in the universities barely changed at all at this time. The proportion of the urban estates, both merchants and petty bourgeois, was halved within the bureaucracy. Very few of the lower townspeople were achieving ennoblement through service, yet their proportion of the student body was holding steady, or even rising slightly. The proportion of honorary citizens and merchants in the universities remained roughly the same during this period (at seven or eight per cent of the total). The only data we have which separate the honorary citizens from the merchants indicate that it was the former rather than the latter who achieved ennoblement through service at this time. It has been argued elsewhere that education was the single most important factor determining rank in the bureaucracy;²⁴ one main group of the honorary citizens consisted of those with degrees and

only when the ranks at which nobility was conferred were raised in 1845 (from the eighth to the fifth rank for hereditary nobility and from the fourteenth to the ninth for personal nobility) that the bottom five ranks became eligible for "honorary citizenship" (PSZ, Second Series, No 19086, 11 June 1845, pp. 450-51).

²¹ Korelin, "Dvoryanstvo", loc. cit., p. 159.

²² Pintner, "Social Characteristics", loc. cit., p. 435, Table 7, and p. 437, Table 9. Data on the other social changes within the bureaucracy in the second quarter of the century presented below in this section are from the same source, with additional material from Korelin, "Dvoryanstvo".

²³ See note 45 for comments on Brym's attempt to do this.

²⁴ Pintner, "Social Characteristics", pp. 441-43.

diplomas from Russian universities and art schools. One might expect their sons to be especially likely to acquire a higher education. Yet of the seven or eight per cent of students from the honorary citizens and merchants in 1835 and 1840, at most one per cent were the sons of honorary citizens.

Similar problems arise if we attempt to analyze the elite groups in these terms. In the bureaucracy, the overall proportion of noble civil servants remained steady at about two-fifths of the total during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, but the sons of junior military officers and civil servants (ranks nine to fourteen), or those born before their fathers were ennobled, grew from one-fifth to almost one-third of the bureaucracy. Since the higher and secondary schools were the main sources of recruitment to the bureaucracy, one might expect the sons of lower-ranking state servants to have been increasing their numbers faster than those of the nobility within the universities. Yet the only national data which do not treat the elite as a single group for this period (the figures for 1835 and 1840) suggest quite the opposite.

It is equally difficult to seek parallels between the universities and the bureaucracy in terms of Pintner's distinction between the capital and the provinces. The nobles improved their position in the central bureaucracy, but their proportion in St Petersburg university dropped.²⁵ The percentage of nobles in the provincial agencies decreased, but in Moscow, Kazan and Kharkov universities it increased. If we look only at the bottom ranks of the bureaucracy, on the other hand, we find considerable consistency with the changes in the universities. The nobles are seen to be losing ground both in the bottom ranks of the St Petersburg bureaucracy and in the capital's university, but to be improving their position in the bottom ranks of the provincial agencies and in the provincial universities. Similarly, the proportion of "servicemen"²⁶ rises very substantially in the bottom ranks of the central agencies and also increases slightly in St Petersburg university. The percentage of "servicemen" rises in the bottom ranks of the provincial agencies, and also increases slightly in one of the provincial universities (Kharkov); on the other hand, it actually drops somewhat in two other provincial universities (Moscow and Kazan). Thus the correlation appears to be valid for both the central and provincial nobility and for the civil servants in the capital, although in some cases there are differences of degree. The evidence for the lower section of the elite in the provinces is contradictory.

Despite the close relationships between the universities and the bureaucracy during this period, it would be wrong to assume too close an

²⁵ See Table 3.

²⁶ Pintner's term for civil servants and *oberofitsery* combined.

identification between the patterns of social change in the two institutions. However, the changes within the elite do seem to correlate somewhat at local level where the lowest ranks of the bureaucracy are concerned. Possession of a university degree normally entitled graduates to enter the bureaucracy above the bottom level of the Table of Ranks. Possessors of first degrees entered at rank twelve, and of the first post-graduate degree (*kandidat*) at rank ten.²⁷ It is possible, therefore, that the university students and a substantial section of the bottom ranks of the bureaucracy emerged out of the same contingent of gymnasium pupils. Unfortunately, we do not possess any data on the gymnasiums which separate the nobles and non-nobles within the elite. The democratization of the early 1840's may have a simpler explanation, though. The rapid expansion of student numbers in the late 1830's and early 1840's may in itself have provided a sufficient pool of enthusiastic young career-bureaucrats who were less able than the landed nobles to find sources of income outside the bureaucracy.

The reaction of the 1840's

It is difficult to know whether the democratization would have continued after 1843, if the government had not feared for its effects on the civil order²⁸ and initiated a series of measures designed to stem the advancement of non-nobles in the bureaucracy and the educational system. In 1839 tuition fees were introduced in the universities²⁹ and they were increased in 1845.³⁰ In the same year non-noble candidates for gymnasiums and universities were required to obtain certificates of release from their guilds or "artels", which were likely to resent the additional tax burden involved.³¹ The manifesto of 11 June 1845 raised the level on the Table of Ranks at which ennoblement was conferred.³² A new series of restrictions³³ followed in the wake of the 1848 revolutions elsewhere in Europe, culminating in the

²⁷ Zaionchkovskii, *Pravitel'stvennyi apparat*, op. cit., p. 262.

²⁸ Alston, *Education*, op. cit., p. 36; A. Sinel, *The Classroom and the Chancellery: State Educational Reform in Russia under Count Dmitry Tolstoi* (Cambridge (Mass.), 1973), p. 18; Hans, *History*, op. cit., p. 77.

²⁹ Hans, *ibid.*

³⁰ Sinel, *ibid.* Flynn, "Tuition", pp. 242-44, explores in detail the changes in Uvarov's position and his differences with the Tsar on the question of tuition fees. He reveals that there was a three-year delay in the implementation of the increase.

³¹ PSZ, Second Series, No 19094, 14 June 1845, p. 455.

³² See note 20; PSZ, Second Series, No 19086. The proximity of this decree to No 19094 provides a good demonstration of the interrelation between educational policy and developments in the bureaucracy.

³³ Sinel, *Classroom*, op. cit., pp. 22-23; Alston, *Education*, p. 40.

numerical quotas of 1849,³⁴ the resignation of Uvarov on 20 October 1849,³⁵ and a report to the Tsar by his successor, Prince P. A. Shirinskii-Shikhmatov, which produced the decree “On the preferential acceptance into the university of young men who have the right to enter the civil service”.³⁶

By the end of the 1840’s³⁷ the drop in the proportion of noble students before 1843 had been almost totally reclaimed. The recovery in enrolments after 1853 produced no general democratization, and the percentage of nobles’ and civil servants’ sons in the universities remained almost constant until the middle of the 1860’s. However, we cannot accept the conclusion that “by the end of the reign of Nicholas I the Russian Universities had been purged of students of lower origin with no ‘external’ education; they became privileged institutions for the sons of gentry and officials.”³⁸ If this was the government’s intention, its hopes were only realised to a modest degree.

The late 1850’s: a major turning-point?

The recovery of student numbers in the late 1850’s is largely attributable to a change in government policy after the death of Nicholas I. It is worth noting, however, that the numbers in fact began increasing before his death. In the last two years of his reign, a rise of more than five hundred took place in overall numbers, probably as a result of the replacement of Shirinskii-Shikhmatov by the more flexible A. S. Norov as Minister of Education. The debacle of the Crimean War led to a general re-appraisal of Russia’s situation in government and educated circles, and eventually to the reforms of the 1860’s. The late 1850’s saw a relaxation of censorship and the revocation of a number of the more repressive features of Nicholas I’s

³⁴ Ryabikova, “Chislennost’”, pp. 59-60, describes the history of this measure in some detail.

³⁵ Sinel, *Classroom*, p. 21.

³⁶ I.e. sons of hereditary and personal nobles, of civil servants both on and below the Table of Ranks, of first-guild merchants and unranked scientists and artists. Ryabikova, “Chislennost’”, p. 60.

³⁷ See Table 1. The difference in the two sets of data for 1848-49 and 1849 suggests that Leikina-Svirskaya’s figures include the more “democratic” Dorpat university (cf. note 42) alongside the five Russian universities. See Johnson, *Heritage*, p. 270, Table 12, and p. 287, Table 32. His figures for Dorpat (567 in 1835, 618 in 1855) approximately account for the difference. Another source gives a total of 623 in 1851. See *Statisticheskie materialy dlya opredeleniya obshchestvennogo polozheniya lits, poluchivshikh obrazovanie v Imperatorskom Derptskom Universitete s 1802-1852 goda* (St Petersburg, 1862), A. Obshchee chislo uchivshikhsya v Imperatorskom Derptskom Universitete, 1802-1852, no page numbers.

³⁸ Hans, *History*, p. 79.

educational policy, including the repeal on 23 November 1855 of the 1849 numerical restrictions.³⁹ In the following four years the number of students increased by more than a third to 4,998 in 1859.⁴⁰

This expansion of the universities on the eve of Emancipation is often said to have been accompanied by a major change in the social background of university students.

More upsetting than mass was the composition of the invasion. Numerous incoming candidates for degrees were non-nobles, the so-called “black students”, among whom predominated the impoverished, ill-prepared, and ambitious sons of provincial government officials.⁴¹

This hypothesis is not easy to justify statistically. In the five universities for which comparable data are available for 1855 and 1863,⁴² the proportion of nobles and civil servants rose on average by over three per cent. The increase ran into double figures at Kazan and also at St Petersburg, where the increase had already come close to ten per cent by 1859. The change was less substantial in Kharkov and Moscow, but in the latter case the process had already clearly begun by 1861. Only Kiev university registered a fall in the combined percentage of nobles and civil servants. There is thus no evidence for a general democratization of the universities at this time, involving a redistribution of student numbers from the sons of nobles and civil servants to the other social estates.

Data for this period which separate the civil servants from the nobles are scarce and need to be approached with some caution. Our data for St Petersburg, Moscow and Kazan universities pair the personal nobles with the hereditary nobles in 1848-49, but with the non-noble bureaucrats for 1863.⁴³ The increase in the lower section of the elite is not therefore based

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁴⁰ Alston, *Education*, p. 45; Johnson, *Heritage*, p. 270, Table 12, and p. 287, Table 32. Note that the last column of our Table 1 does not necessarily contain the absolute totals of students (cf. notes 55, 113, 117).

⁴¹ Alston, *ibid.*

⁴² The data on individual universities are contained in Table 3. Dorpat is not included, as no separate data are available for 1855. Because Dorpat, by far the most “democratic” of the universities, is included in the 1863 aggregate in Table 1, that table shows a slight overall democratization between 1855 and 1863, whereas Table 3 indicates the opposite in most cases. The 1863 figures for St Petersburg should perhaps be treated with some caution. Student numbers were only at one-third of their previous level, as the university had only just been re-opened after its closure in 1861. On the other hand, the numbers are not all that far below those for Kiev, Kazan, Kharkov and Dorpat universities.

⁴³ It is possible that some historians use the term “nobility” when referring only to the hereditary nobles, and either “personal nobles” or “civil servants” when referring to the two groups taken together. There is no reason to assume this inaccuracy in the work from which the data are taken, Leikina-Svirskaya, “Formirovanie”, pp. 86-87. She has faithfully transcribed the figures from her own source (I. I. Davydov, “O naznachanii

on comparable groupings and cannot be used to justify the claim that the sons of lower-ranking bureaucrats were prominent in any democratization.

In the case of St Petersburg university, however, where the student troubles were most extreme and which has come to be treated as something of a test case, we possess other apparently comparable figures which suggest that a significant democratization was taking place in the 1850's.⁴⁴ Between 1841 and 1849, as might be expected from the restrictive policies of these years, the proportion of nobles rose by ten per cent, while that of the non-noble civil servants and clergy dropped somewhat. In the decade of the 1850's, however, the proportion of nobles' sons dropped by some five per cent, while that of the non-noble bureaucrats increased by ten per cent and of the clergy by seven per cent. If the non-noble bureaucrats are treated as part of the *raznochintsy* rather than of the elite, the St Petersburg student body is seen to have undergone a slight democratization during the 1850's. Alternatively, if the non-noble bureaucrats are included in the elite, a substantial degree of democratization can be said to have taken place within that elite.⁴⁵

We also know that the proportion of honorary citizens' and merchants' sons increased slightly in Russian universities between 1855 and 1863.⁴⁶ In view of the fact that from 1845 lower-ranking bureaucrats became entitled

russskikh universitetov i uchastie ikh v obshchestvennom obrazovanii", in: *Sovremennik*, 1849, No 3, p. 45).

⁴⁴ See Table 3 for the changes within the elite. The data on the clergy (some 4% in 1841, 3% in 1849 and 10% in 1859) are taken from Brower, "Fathers", loc. cit., pp. 344-45, and Leikina-Svirskaya, "Formirovanie", p. 87.

⁴⁵ Brym, "A Note", p. 356, argues that the inclusion of the non-noble bureaucrats in the *raznochintsy* is consonant with one of the widely accepted definitions (that of Mikhailovskii and Lenin). It does seem likely that most of the students labelled in university statistics as "children of civil servants" were not of noble origin, though the fathers of some of them may have been ennobled after the birth of their children. Zaionchkovskii, *Pravitel'stvennyi apparat*, pp. 25-26, note ***, suggests that they were the children of the civil servants "of the lowest ranks". Shchetinina, "Alfavitnye spiski", loc. cit., pp. 122-23, states that the civil-servant (*chinovnik*) group normally excluded unranked civil servants, but adds that it may also have included the most varied social categories and probably originated in large part from not very well-off petty office-workers. Brym attempts indirectly to quantify the different groups within the student elite by inference from their relative proportions within the bureaucracy; as we have seen, the correlation is not easy to establish. He does not refer to Brower's 1859 data, and as a result his own figures ("A Note", p. 359, Table 1) appear to support the idea that there was no democratization of any kind in the late 1850's. His support for the "*raznochintsy* thesis" rests not on the argument that the *raznochintsy* element grew as a proportion of the student body at this time, but rather on the fact that the inclusion of the non-noble bureaucrats in the *raznochintsy* increases the group's size.

⁴⁶ See Table 1.

to apply for honorary citizenship, it is possible that here too we may detect a grain of truth in the hypothesis.

The expansion of the student body in the late 1850's was thus clearly accompanied by complex social changes. In most universities the proportion of nobles' and civil servants' sons was increasing; on the other hand the absolute number of students from the other social estates was also increasing, and at Kiev university their proportion within the student body was rising. At St Petersburg university the proportion of non-noble bureaucrats' and priests' sons was growing. At the same time the proportion of nobles among radical students there was markedly lower in the 1850's than it had been in the 1840's,⁴⁷ and also lower in the years 1855-69 than during the period 1840-55.⁴⁸ These two sets of figures suggest that the late 1850's were an important period of change in the social background of radical students.⁴⁹ It is not therefore surprising that the student disturbances on the eve of Emancipation confirmed the government's old fears about the political unreliability of non-noble students. The "student-*raznochinets*" thesis can thus still be shown to have some qualified validity in the late 1850's.

Although the evidence for a democratization of the universities in the late 1850's may be only partially valid, substantial changes were certainly taking place in the gymnasiums at this time. The secondary schools had hardly been affected by the social engineering of the 1840's. The proportion of the elite in the secondary schools only increased very slightly between 1843 and 1853. In the next decade, however, the number of gymnasium pupils increased by 57%, and the proportion of nobles' and civil servants' sons dropped substantially. By 1865 they provided less than 70% of the pupils for the first time in forty years, and this democratization gathered pace in the late 1860's and early 1870's.⁵⁰ The universities, on the other hand, experienced no general democratization between 1853 and 1863, despite an even greater numerical expansion (62%) than the gymnasiums. Only in the late 1860's and early 1870's was the elite's predominance among university students finally and decisively broken.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Brower, "Fathers", p. 343.

⁴⁸ Id., *Training the Nihilists*, p. 42, Table 2.

⁴⁹ Brower concentrates on comparing the proportion of nobles among radical students with that among the student body as a whole at any one time, and it is true that there were always more nobles among the radicals. This should not, however, lead us to ignore the *changes* in the radicals' origins or to miss their similarity to the changes in the background of the St Petersburg student body as a whole.

⁵⁰ See Table 2.

⁵¹ See note 4 and Table 1.

The 1860's: the years of reform

The relaxations of the first years of the reign of Alexander II produced a heady atmosphere in the universities, in which student protest grew rapidly. The unrest was mainly about academic rather than political issues, but the government was still determined to crush it before it had the opportunity really to take a hold. In May 1861 a new series of repressive measures was introduced, much of it purely disciplinary in nature.⁵² However, it did also include certain steps which affected the social composition of the universities. Firstly, the number of students to be exempted from payment of tuition fees was cut almost to nil. The Ministry made it more difficult for students to bypass the university as a source of funds by imposing prohibitive restrictions on the activities of corporate student charitable organizations. This was a very simple and direct means of keeping poor students out of the universities. Secondly, the government announced the establishment, at the end of the gymnasium course, of final examinations upon which university entrance was to depend. The decree of 1861 coincided with the appointment of a new Minister of Education, Admiral E. P. Putyatin. These developments merely exacerbated the tension in the universities, and, when protests and resignations from academic staff were added to the student unrest, the struggle came to a head on 20 December 1861 with the famous closure of St Petersburg university. Five days later Putyatin was dismissed from his post after a ministry of only a few months.⁵³ The university did not re-open for a year.

Putyatin was succeeded by A. V. Golovnin, a man of well-known liberal views, who had already been involved in government reforms in other areas. It was to Golovnin that the Emperor entrusted the task of undertaking a wholesale expansion and modernization of the various levels of the educational system. His efforts culminated in three major legislative initiatives: the university statute of 18 June 1863, the elementary-school statute of 14 July 1864 and the statute on progymnasiums and gymnasiums of 19 November 1864.⁵⁴ The elementary- and secondary-school statutes both proclaimed the right of all classes and faiths to a basic education. However, the distinction at secondary level between the four-year progymnasium and the seven-year gymnasium, and that between gymnasiums of the classical and the "real" type, produced a built-in means of channelling the different classes into different careers. The classical school was still the only route to a university education; its "relevance" was

⁵² Sinel, *Classroom*, p. 27.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵⁴ PSZ, Second Series, No 39752, 18 June 1863, pp. 621-38; No 41068, 14 July 1864, pp. 613-18; No 41472, 19 November, pp. 167-79.

not always instantly obvious to the less well-off families, for many of whom tuition fees at the secondary level were a major obstacle.

The main significance of the university statute of 1863 lay in the re-assertion of the institution's autonomy from the state. It has been suggested that it also encouraged a rapid increase in student numbers, but the figures suggest otherwise (from 4,551 in 1863 to 5,634 in 1875).⁵⁵ The real expansion came later, but the intention was undoubtedly present from the start. The number of university chairs was raised from 42 to 61. Lectures were opened to external students. In 1865 and 1869 existing institutions at Odessa and Warsaw were designated as new universities.

The air of optimism surrounding the universities was shattered by the attempted assassination of the Emperor, Alexander II, on 4 April 1866. The would-be assassin was a student drop-out from Kazan and Moscow universities called Dmitrii Karakozov.⁵⁶ Residual hostility to the universities came once more to the surface, and the liberal Golovnin was dismissed. His replacement was the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, Count Dmitrii Tolstoi. The new minister immediately set about instituting a thorough re-examination of the whole educational system.

In 1869 he announced his three-point programme: concentrate resources on the secondary schools rather than the universities; strengthen the already existing separation of secondary schools into the practical and the academic types; and enforce the necessary discipline on the nation's future civil servants through rigid centralization.⁵⁷ In July of the same year a committee set up to investigate the student disorders recommended examinations for all first-year candidates.⁵⁸ Tolstoi's aim was to expand the educational system in order to meet Russia's pressing needs in the modern era, but at the same time to control as closely as possible the selection and training of the new specialists, so that men of the right social and ideological type might be recruited.

Tolstoi's reform of the secondary schools was finally implemented in 1871 and 1872. The gymnasium statute of 30 July 1871⁵⁹ finally ensured the dominance of the classics over all other subjects. The length of the gymnasium course was extended by the addition of a two-year preparatory

⁵⁵ 4,551 represents the overall total of students in 1863, not only the total of those whose social origins were known as in Table 1, see note 117. By 1875 the overall total in those same six universities, excluding the new ones at Odessa and Warsaw, had increased only slightly to 4,870. See Johnson, *Heritage*, p. 287, Table 32; *Zhurnal*, CLXXXVII (1876), p. 52 (for Warsaw total).

⁵⁶ Shchetinina, *University*, p. 75, note 158.

⁵⁷ Alston, *Education*, pp. 86-87.

⁵⁸ Sinel, *Classroom*, p. 98.

⁵⁹ PSZ, Second Series, No 49860, 30 July 1871, pp. 85-99.

class and of an eighth year at the senior stage. These features of the statute should have stemmed the flow of non-nobles into the gymnasiums, the first by emphasizing subjects that were not obviously “useful” and the second by adding to the burden of tuition fees. On 15 May 1872 the *Realschule* statute⁶⁰ became law. Tolstoi believed that the “classical” and the “real” gymnasiums were not sufficiently dissimilar to ensure the direction of middle- and lower-class students away from the universities and the civil service. The *Realschulen* set up under the 1872 statute were far more narrowly technical and commercial than the “real” gymnasiums.

Finally, the failure of the universities to enforce sufficiently rigidly the proposals of the 1869 committee into the student disorders gave Tolstoi the excuse he needed: on 8 December 1872 a unified examination system was instituted in the gymnasiums.⁶¹ This was to culminate in the “gymnasium final” (*attestat zrelosti*), an examination at the end of the gymnasium course which henceforth was to provide the only route into the university. Thus Tolstoi had completed his plan to monitor the academic and social reliability of university entrants.

1865-75: the decline of the hereditary nobles

Despite the thoroughgoing character of these reforms, the gymnasiums became an extremely effective instrument of upward social mobility during Tolstoi’s years at the Ministry of Education. Unlike the universities, their numerical expansion was very rapid indeed, the number of pupils doubling between 1868 and 1878. All the expected barriers to lower-class children were more than counterbalanced by the increased accessibility of the gymnasiums to many town-dwellers. The two preparatory years, far from putting off the middle classes, actually provided an easy route into the gymnasiums for any child with minimal standards of literacy and numeracy. In the decade before 1878 the noble proportion dropped by seventeen per cent.⁶² A similar social transformation overtook the universities at the same time. Tables 1 and 4 demonstrate the remarkable consistency of the proportion of nobles’ and civil servants’ sons, taken as a single group, within the two periods involved (1835-65 and 1875-1907). They also suggest that the fundamental process of democratization was already complete by 1875, as suggested by Confino, rather than by 1880, as implied by Brower’s choice of dates.⁶³

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, No 50834, 15 May 1872, pp. 626-36.

⁶¹ Alston, *Education*, p. 97.

⁶² See Table 2.

⁶³ Confino, “On Intellectuals”, p. 146, note 36. Brower, *Training the Nihilists*, p. 114, following Rashin, compares the years of Nicholas I, the mid 1860’s and 1880.

It would be gratifying to be able to explain the universities' social transformation as a direct consequence of Tolstói's unwitting democratization of the gymnasiums. However, the changes in the gymnasiums could only be expected to have just begun filtering through to the universities in the period of a decade, and such a major social change as that which overtook the universities would be most unlikely to have been completed by 1875 as a result of measures taken only three or four years before, and which were a relatively indirect method (compared with quotas, for example) of influencing the social composition of the gymnasiums. It would seem more likely that the changes in the universities between 1865 and 1875 were the result of similar social changes in the gymnasiums in the years before the ministry of Count Tolstói. However, as we shall see, completely different social groups were involved in the two sets of changes.

The university data published until now for this period are often rather vague in certain important respects. They do not always distinguish between the different layers of the upper class, and in some cases (such as the data for 1875 and 1878 in Table 1) they treat all the categories other than the nobles and bureaucrats and the clergy as a homogeneous group of "raznochintsy" or "others". If distinctions are made between the different non-noble groups, they tend to be based on the inaccurate data for 1864-65, and thus produce false conclusions about the educational advance of some of these groups. The importance of distinguishing between all the different social groups involved may be seen from an examination of Tables 1 and 4.

Between 1865 and 1875 not only the percentage but also the absolute number of nobles in the universities dropped substantially. This may have resulted partly from increased hostility to the universities after the Karakozov incident in 1866. In addition, the "gymnasium final" probably kept the weaker noble candidates out of the universities for the first time. However these effects were confined to the hereditary nobility; for while its percentage was almost halved between 1863 and 1880, that of the personal nobles and civil servants showed a marked increase, and these contradictory tendencies were maintained after 1880.

The brief supremacy of the seminarians

It was, however, the sons of the clergy who chiefly accounted for the modest numerical expansion in the universities during this period and filled the gap left by the drop in the number of hereditary nobles. Like the sons of personal nobles and bureaucrats, the clergy were already well represented in the secondary system and were in a good position to benefit from greater opportunities at the higher level. When the "gymnasium

final” was introduced in 1872, seminary students were exempted from the requirement.⁶⁴ As a result, at a time when the “gymnasium final” was successfully limiting the increase in student enrolments and the absolute number of nobles was dropping, large numbers of clergymen’s sons entered the universities. They increased their proportion of the student body by twenty-five per cent between 1865 and 1878. The other group to benefit from the eclipse of the hereditary nobles was the peasantry, but the doubling of its percentage was achieved from a tiny initial base. Meanwhile the percentage of the urban estates fell slightly, and they therefore played no role in the “decline of the elite”⁶⁵ in these years.

The vast majority of priests’ sons in the universities would have attended church seminaries, and most pupils in the seminaries would have been priests’ sons. It is therefore possible to trace more precisely the timing of the social changes in the universities between 1865 and 1875 by analyzing the secondary schools attended by new undergraduates. However, as Russia evolved into a more modern society, the significance of the system of social estates began to decrease as they were replaced by economic or occupational categories. It is useful, therefore, to check ambiguities in the data on social origins against economic indices, such as the various types of financial assistance available to students in Russian universities.⁶⁶

These data have their own limitations, however. They indicate the general direction of change without distinguishing between the different social groups involved. Furthermore, grants, stipends and tuition-fee exemptions⁶⁷ were more likely than social origin to reflect sudden changes in government policy.⁶⁸ It is unsafe to rely solely on tuition-fee exemptions⁶⁹ as evidence of social changes among the students, since alterations in their provision were sometimes balanced by opposite changes in the numbers of grants or stipends. Nor should aggregate figures of the three main types of assistance be taken as a true indication of the actual proportion of students in receipt of aid. The stipends often carried

⁶⁴ Sinel, Classroom, p. 99.

⁶⁵ Brower’s term, *Training the Nihilists*, p. 114. Reliance on the *Obzor deyatel’nosti* data for 1864-65 leads to the erroneous conclusion that the urban estates more than doubled their combined percentage in the student body between 1865 and 1880. See note 118.

⁶⁶ The data both on secondary schools attended and on financial assistance are given in the annual reports of each university published in the following year in the *Zhurnal*. See note 143.

⁶⁷ Respectively *posobie*, *stipendiya*, *osvobozhdenie ot platy za uchenie*.

⁶⁸ As in 1861; see above, p. 37.

⁶⁹ As Shchetinina does, *University*, pp. 73-74, Tables 3-4. The number of exemptions remained unchanged between 1868 and 1877, but dropped substantially in the next few years, just when enrolments were increasing rapidly and the urban estates were flooding into the universities.

with them an exemption from tuition fees.⁷⁰ Because some students received more than one kind of assistance, the aggregate figure at St Petersburg university in the late 1860's was over 120 per cent.⁷¹ It is not therefore easy on the basis of such figures to deduce the real number of impoverished students from noble or civil-service families.⁷²

Despite these drawbacks, analysis of the data on secondary-school attendance with supporting evidence about financial assistance does enable us to clarify the timing of the democratization in the late 1860's and early 1870's. The late 1860's saw a very substantial overall increase in the provision of financial assistance to students.⁷³ However, this increase is almost entirely accounted for by the leap in the number of grants, which were financially far less generous than stipends (averaging fifty instead of two or three hundred roubles). The level of both stipends and exemptions remained fairly static in the late 1860's.⁷⁴ All types of assistance increased between 1869 and 1870, but the level of grants fell away somewhat in the following year. Thus between 1865 and 1871 the overall level of grants, stipends and tuition-fee exemptions increased substantially.

In the same period a number of universities, such as Kazan, Kharkov and Odessa, experienced a ten- or fifteen-percent increase in the proportion of seminarians among their new students.⁷⁵ By 1868 Kiev university had more than doubled the proportion of priests' sons among its student body as a whole compared with 1863, chiefly at the expense of the hereditary nobles.⁷⁶ The data for Moscow and St Petersburg universities during these years are rather more ambiguous. They appear to have attained a higher proportion of seminarians than the other universities by the mid 1860's, but the level fluctuated sharply during the following half-dozen years or so.

⁷⁰ "Universitetskii vopros. Izvlechenie iz materialov, sobrannykh otelom Vysochaishe uchrezhdennoi Komissii dlya peresmotra Obshchego Ustava rossiiskikh universitetov, pri poseshchenii ikh v sentyabre, oktyabre i noyabre 1875 goda", in: *Zhurnal, CLXXXVII, Sovremennaya letopis'*, p. 141.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, CXXXVII (1868), p. 144; CXLVIII (1870), p. 32.

⁷² See Kamosko, "Izmeneniya", p. 204.

⁷³ See Table 5.

⁷⁴ Although Kamosko (*ibid.*) does not explicitly distinguish between the late 1860's and early 1870's in relation to the provision of financial assistance, her choice of data tends to exaggerate the increase in the late 1860's and to underestimate that in the first half of the 1870's. This is because she includes the exceptional year of 1870 alongside the other years (1866, 1867 and 1874) she has selected from the full year-by-year list given in the *Zhurnal*.

⁷⁵ See Table 6.

⁷⁶ From 7.1% in 1863 to 15.3% in 1868; the 1880 level was still only 18.6%. See note 117; *Zhurnal, CXXXVII, Sovremennaya letopis'*, p. 306; *Universitety i srednie uchebnye zavedeniya v pyatnadsati guberniyakh po perepisi 20-ogo marta 1880 goda* (St Petersburg, 1888), p. 6.

Unfortunately, the available information on student financial aid at Moscow university⁷⁷ in the late 1860's totally contradicts the data on the seminarians and thus compounds the ambiguity. It is far more helpful, however, in the case of St Petersburg university. There the proportion both of seminarians and of financial assistance increased considerably between 1865 and 1868-69. Both levels dropped again between 1869 and 1870, at a time when the level of financial aid to Russian students as a whole was increasing sharply. The severity of the 1869 student disorders in St Petersburg may well explain this anomaly.

The evidence from St Petersburg, Kiev, Kazan, Kharkov and Odessa universities clearly demonstrates that the democratization of the universities cannot be attributed solely to the seminarians' exemption from the "gymnasium final" in 1872, since its origins reach back at least to the late 1860's. However, the years 1872-75 did show a clear increase in the level of all types of student financial assistance. The seminarians' exemption in 1872 was immediately reflected in large increases in their numbers among the new students at Kazan, Kharkov, Odessa and Warsaw universities. Their level at Moscow and St Petersburg actually dropped between 1872 and 1873, but began to rise thereafter. At Kiev university there was a sharp drop in the proportion of seminarians in the new intake between 1871 and 1872, and the recovery in their level only began after 1874. There are, nevertheless, clear signs of an increase in the level of financial assistance from 1872-73 even in the universities, which were slower to react to the social changes and whose development in the late 1860's and early 1870's was more ambiguous.

Although the democratization of the universities was already well under way by the late 1860's, there can be no doubt that the seminarians' exemption from the "gymnasium final" in 1872 led to a considerable acceleration in the tempo of the change. By the end of 1875, even those universities whose response to the exemption was not immediate had reached a higher level of seminarians among their student body as a whole than had characterized their new intake alone a few years previously.⁷⁸ This evidence that the influx of seminarians was affecting not only the provincial universities but also those in the capital cities provoked two worried reports from the Ministry of Education in 1876. The first report⁷⁹ spoke of

⁷⁷ Data on financial assistance at St Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev universities are contained in Table 7.

⁷⁸ See Table 6.

⁷⁹ "O chisle okonchivshikh kurs v gimnazyakh i o chisle postupivshikh v universitety v 1875 g. sravnitel'no s 1874 g.", in: *Zhurnal*, CLXXXIII (1876), pp. 88-93.

the former seminarians, who are both extremely numerous in our universities and who, unfortunately, in respect both of their education and of their upbringing, are greatly inferior to the graduates of the present-day gymnasiums.⁸⁰

By early December 1875, nearly thirty per cent of all St Petersburg university students came from seminaries, even though, as the Ministry pointed out, that university contained no Medical Faculty, which normally took on a large number of seminarians. Between 1874 and 1875 there was an eight-percent drop in the proportion of gymnasium graduates in the new entry to Russian universities. In the same year, the absolute number of gymnasium graduates entering Russian universities rose by sixteen per cent, but the number from other secondary institutions increased by seventy-nine per cent.⁸¹

The second report, published later in 1876, noted that in the autumn of 1875, more than a quarter of all Russian undergraduates (excluding Dorpat university) had come from church seminaries. The proportion of seminarians varied from eight per cent in Warsaw to forty-seven per cent in Odessa, where well over half of all students were from the clerical estate.⁸² The report catalogued in some detail the growing impoverishment of university students and the overall increase in financial assistance. It concluded that the increase in financial assistance was falling further and further behind the growing numbers of needy students. As a result, students in Odessa, for example, were organizing charity shows and prevailing upon their professors to buy tickets; begging (*poproshainichestvo*) was also a serious problem.⁸³

Thus in the late 1860's and early 1870's it was the sons of priests and, to a lesser extent, of bureaucrats (including now the personal nobles) who were increasingly choosing higher education as a route to a good career. By contrast, the changes in the gymnasiums from the mid 'fifties onwards had involved mainly the urban estates and, to a lesser extent, the peasantry.⁸⁴ The changes in the universities could not therefore have resulted from those in the gymnasiums. They were in part the outcome of Tolstoi's secondary-school reforms of the early 1870's, but even this was in no way related to the gymnasium or *Realschule* statutes. It was rather an unintended side-effect of the way the "gymnasium final" was implemented.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

⁸² "Universitetskii vopros", loc. cit., p. 136.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

⁸⁴ See Table 2.

Social estates and faculty choice

The social composition of the various faculties in Russian universities has recently been studied in some detail for the first time.⁸⁵ The data from that study, together with Ministry of Education figures for 1863 and 1880, can give a broad indication of the way in which the different faculties were affected by the democratization of the student body in the period of sharpest change.⁸⁶ The 1863 and 1880 data enable us to distinguish in more detail between the different estates within the three main social groups, and they also provide comparable data about university teachers. There is a fairly high level of consistency in the distribution of the social estates within the various faculties, both between staff and students and between the three years studied.

The Medical Faculty, true to its literary stereotype, emerges as the most consistently popular one among non-noble students and staff, and as the only faculty in which the proportion of nobles and civil servants among the students continued to drop between 1875 and 1880. Most strongly affected by the influx of seminarians was the Humanities Faculty. It was more popular among them and the petty bourgeois than among the other groups. The hereditary nobles and merchants entered it in relatively small numbers; among staff from the personal nobility its popularity relative to other faculties declined sharply between 1863 and 1880.

The Law Faculty was much less popular among non-noble students, except that among staff from the honorary citizens and merchants the Law Faculty ranked second only to Medicine, and it was the most popular faculty among students from that estate. In other respects it followed the traditional pattern.⁸⁷ After the merchants it was most popular among the hereditary nobles, then personal nobles, clergy and petty bourgeoisie, in that order.

⁸⁵ Shchetinina, "Alfavitnye spiski", pp. 115-20.

⁸⁶ See Tables 8 and 9. Sinel, *Classroom*, p. 204, note 42, claims that the Ministry did not provide data of this kind before the 1880's. The tiny Faculties of Theology at Dorpat and Oriental Languages at St Petersburg are included in our tables, but not in our analysis. For the sake of brevity, we shall refer to the History and Philology Faculty as "Humanities" and to the Physics and Mathematics Faculty (when undivided) as "Science". Our analysis takes account both of the social composition of each faculty, as seen in Tables 8 and 9, and of the proportion of each social group within the universities entering a particular faculty.

⁸⁷ Sinel seems to imply that the Law Faculty stood alongside Medicine in popularity among non-noble students as a whole when he writes that "the career-oriented faculties of jurisprudence and medicine attracted the most students by far, and the proportion of the university population from the nonnoble estates mounted steadily from 33 percent in 1864 to 53 percent in 1881." (*Classroom*, p. 101)

The Science Faculty was most popular among both sections of the nobility and least among the clergy, with the urban estates in between. However, its two departments (Mathematics and Natural Sciences) developed differently in their social composition. The Mathematics Department was consistently popular among nobles and unpopular among clergy. The urban estates and peasantry gained ground within it up to 1875, but declined somewhat in the late 1870's (like the clergy, but contrary to their own development in the other faculties). The Natural Sciences Department was broadly similar in social composition in 1863, but it experienced a much stronger impact from the influx of priests' sons than the other faculties, with the exception of Humanities.

The typical faculty preferences of the different social groups emerge clearly from the analysis. The hereditary nobles preferred Science and Law, the latter being the primary training for a civil-service career. The personal nobles and civil servants were the least consistent of the groups in their preferences, but the Law and Science Faculties were again the most popular. Their interest in the Humanities had waned by 1880, when their two weak areas (Humanities and Medicine) coincided with those of the hereditary nobles. Of all the social groups, the most career-oriented were the honorary citizens and merchants, among whom the vocational faculties of Law and Medicine were the most popular. The clergy and lower townspeople generally favoured the Humanities and Medicine, with Humanities the most popular among the clergy and Medicine among the petty bourgeoisie. The clergy were least attracted to Mathematics and the petty bourgeoisie to Law.⁸⁸

Teachers and bureaucrats

The teaching staff of Russian universities came from slightly different backgrounds in the 1830's compared with the post-Emancipation period.

⁸⁸ Shchetinina, "Alfavitnye spiski", pp. 119-20, Tables 7-8, also introduces interesting data for 1903-04, with a highly differentiated series of social groups. Unfortunately, these only cover three universities (Kiev, Kazan and Odessa). A comparison with the same three universities in 1880 produces a very consistent and predictable result. All faculties experienced substantial increases in the percentages of both sections of the urban estates and of the peasantry, accompanied by a sharp deterioration in the position of the clergy. The major difference between the faculties lay in the fact that those faculties least affected by the influx of seminarians before 1880 (Mathematics and Law) experienced the smallest movement back towards the elite between 1880 and 1903-04 (in the case of Mathematics the percentage of the elite actually dropped). Conversely, Humanities and Natural Sciences, most affected earlier on by the advance of the clergy, were the only faculties to move back sharply towards the elite (by twelve and fifteen per cent respectively) after 1880.

The nobles and civil servants (and to a lesser extent the honorary citizens and merchants) increased their representation among university staff during this period at the expense of the clergy and the foreigners, demonstrating the increasing secularization of the universities and their greater reliance on native teachers. They exhibited a broadly similar social evolution to that of their students between 1863 and 1880. Although the degree of change was very different, its direction was in most cases identical to that experienced by the students. In both cases the hereditary nobles and petty bourgeois decreased as a proportion of the total, whereas the percentage from the personal nobility and civil servants and from the clergy increased somewhat. Only the honorary citizens and merchants failed to correspond to the students' pattern: their proportion of the teaching body rose, while that of the students dropped very marginally.⁸⁹

Among secondary-school teachers in 1880, the proportion of nobles and civil servants was close to that of the university students and staff (all in the vicinity of forty or forty-five per cent); the same was true for the urban estates (fifteen or twenty per cent).⁹⁰ The redistribution of university staff from hereditary nobles to personal nobles and bureaucrats and to the clergy had lagged behind that of the students, but in the case of the secondary-school teachers it had gone much further. By 1880 a similar proportion of gymnasium pupils were of noble or civil-service backgrounds to that among their teachers and among university staff and students, but over a third were from the urban estates⁹¹ (a position reached by university students a few years later). Thus, in slightly different ways, both teachers and taught in the secondary schools had advanced further than their university counterparts towards social democratization.

In the second half of the century, as earlier, the social changes in higher and secondary education corresponded in some ways to changes in the imperial services. Especially in the first dozen or so years after Emancipation, there was a strong tendency towards the reinforcement of the

⁸⁹ See Table 9. The only data we possess about the social origins of university staff after 1880 are those for Moscow university in 1896. We cannot fully agree with Leikina-Svirskaya in her conclusion that "we see in the student milieu a continuing process of democratization, but in the professorial milieu this process is held back" (*Intelligentsiya*, pp. 177-78). It is true that the rate of democratization was faster among the students before 1880 and that the Moscow data do indicate a movement in the opposite direction among the staff by 1896. However, one should not ignore the fact that a similar regression occurred among the students between 1895 and 1900. Furthermore, Leikina-Svirskaya compares the 1861 and 1896 figures for Moscow university with the 1880 data for staff in all universities (46.2% were nobles or civil servants) as against those for Moscow university alone (53.6%). As a result the regression after 1880 is rather exaggerated.

⁹⁰ See Table 10.

⁹¹ See Table 2.

ranks of the career bureaucrats at the expense both of the hereditary nobility and of the landed element.⁹² For example, the period of most rapid change in the officer corps occurred before the military reform of 1874 had been introduced. The drop in the percentage of hereditary nobles in the officer corps was four times as great in the decade after 1864 as in the longer period from 1874 to 1897 (six times as great at *oberofitser* level).⁹³ Pressure built up in the early 1880's for the government to raise the level on the Table of Ranks at which hereditary nobility was conferred. Such a move was recommended by the first of a series of commissions to investigate the problem, sitting under the chairmanship of Taneev in 1882-83, but their proposal was not implemented.⁹⁴

It would be wrong, however, to conclude from these moves that the hereditary nobility was being squeezed out of the bureaucracy. The limited data at our disposal suggest not only that more non-nobles were acquiring hereditary nobility through service, but also that the economic decline of the gentry was leading many more nobles than before to seek exclusive careers in the bureaucracy as an alternative livelihood to landowning. Thus in relation to the bureaucracy it is not the social decline of the hereditary nobles, but rather the economic demise of the landed gentry which furnishes a parallel with the fall of the hereditary nobility in the universities.⁹⁵

The rise of the urban estates after 1880

From the late 1870's onwards, serious attempts were made to reverse the tide of democratization in the universities and gymnasiums. By 1879 the Committee of Ministers was expressing concern about the "extreme damage" caused by the admission into higher education of individuals with inadequate financial resources.⁹⁶ The seminarians' exemption from the gymnasium final was withdrawn early in 1879,⁹⁷ and the percentage of

⁹² Pintner, "Social Characteristics", p. 437, Table 10, and p. 434, Table 4; P. A. Zaionchkovskii, "Vysshaya byurokratiya nakanune Krymskoi voiny", in: *Istoriya SSSR*, 1974, No 4, pp. 154-64; id., *Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie v kontse XIX stoletiya* (Moscow, 1970), pp. 112-17.

⁹³ Korelin, "Dvoryanstvo", p. 157.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 99, 161; Zaionchkovskii, *Pravitel'stvennyi apparat*, p. 29; P. Kenez, "Autocracy and the Russian Army", in: *Russian Review*, XXXIII (1974), pp. 204-05; A. S. Nifontov, "Formirovanie klassov burzhuaznogo obshchestva v russkom gorode vtoroi poloviny XIX v.", in: *Istoricheskie Zapiski*, No 54 (1955), pp. 239-50.

⁹⁶ P. A. Zaionchkovskii, *Krizis samoderzhaviya na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh godov* (Moscow, 1964), p. 111.

⁹⁷ Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya*, p. 105; Sinel, *Classroom*, p. 99. Sinel cites only Odessa university (the most extreme case) as an example of the effects of the exemption. Leikina-Svirskaya, *ibid.*, p. 60, unlike Sinel, follows through the effects of the 1879

students from the clerical estate quickly dropped back to its original level. Although the number of nobles increased thereafter in proportion to the general rise in student numbers, the ground lost in the late 1860's and early 1870's was never regained.

The initial effect of the stringent enforcement of the gymnasium final had been to hold back the expansion of the universities. However, the sharp increase in the number of gymnasium pupils during Tolstoi's ministry finally bore fruit at the higher level in the late 1870's. Despite the lifting of the seminarians' exemption in 1879, university numbers rose by nearly sixty per cent between 1878 and 1880. Similarly, the rapid improvement in the position of the urban classes in the gymnasiums from the mid 1860's was reflected in the universities at the beginning of the 1880's. The proportion of students from the lower urban classes and the peasantry increased by twenty-five per cent between 1880 and 1895, with the major part of the change coming in the first half of the 1880's.⁹⁸ The democratization of 1865-75 produced greater student poverty and the beginnings of the debate about the "intellectual proletariat". However, the combination of a massive numerical expansion after 1878 with a new phase of democratization after 1880 created distinct new problems. The Legal Populist Vorontsov noted in November 1883 that it was only in the previous four or five years that graduate unemployment had reached really significant levels.⁹⁹

The 1884 university statute completed the centralization of the educational system.¹⁰⁰ In 1887 quotas were imposed on the mainly urban Jewish community in order to limit their entry into the universities and gymnasiums.¹⁰¹ In the same year prostitutes' children were banned from the gymnasiums,¹⁰² university fees were increased,¹⁰³ and the gymnasium preparatory classes, a third of whose pupils were of peasant or worker

measure, but her lack of data between 1880 and 1895 leads her to underestimate the speed with which the measure achieved its aim. See Tables 1, 4 and 6.

⁹⁸ See Tables 1 and 4.

⁹⁹ V. Vorontsov, "Kapitalizm i rabochaya intelligentsiya", in: *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, CCLXVII (1884), *Sovremennoe obozrenie*, p. 139. The article is dated 16 November 1883.

¹⁰⁰ PSZ, Third Series, No 2404, 23 August 1884, pp. 456-74. Tolstoi had been preparing the statute since the mid 1870's, but its enactment was delayed by his enforced resignation in 1880 during Loris-Melikov's "constitutional" manoeuvre. After the Tsar's assassination Tolstoi returned as Minister of the Interior. For an authoritative account of the government's discussions on the universities, see Zaionchkovskii, *Krizis*, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

¹⁰¹ Alston, *Education*, p. 130; Shchetinina, *University*, pp. 203-04.

¹⁰² Hans, *History*, p. 147.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

origin, were abolished.¹⁰⁴ Finally Delyanov's "circular about the cooks' children" of 18 June 1887¹⁰⁵ proved far more effective in the short term than Tolstoi's manipulation of curricula had been in the early 1870's in reducing the non-noble element in the gymnasiums. Between 1886-87 and 1889-90 members of the urban estates in the gymnasiums declined by a fifth, of whom nearly half were Jews. This was achieved at the cost of a drop of one-sixth in the total number of pupils, but by 1894 numbers had risen again by over three thousand.¹⁰⁶ The social effects of the policy lasted longer than the numerical contraction, reaching their peak in 1894. The proportion of nobles had dropped by about ten per cent between the early 1870's and the early 1880's, but by 1894 these losses had almost been reclaimed.¹⁰⁷ In the late 1890's, however, the demands of industry produced a growing revolt against the Tolstoi system,¹⁰⁸ and the proportion of nobles in the gymnasiums fell from over a half in 1894 to less than a third in 1914.¹⁰⁹

There were no major changes of policy towards the social composition of the universities during this period apart from the increase in tuition fees in 1887. It was hoped that the manipulation of the gymnasiums would have the desired effect, and this hope was not entirely without foundation. The elitist policies typified by the "cooks' circular" achieved their goal in the universities exactly when one would have expected. The resurgence of the nobility in the gymnasiums occurred in the years up to 1894. The democratization of the universities, however, continued unabated at that time, reflecting the same process in the gymnasiums up to the mid 1880's. The gains achieved by the nobles in the gymnasiums in the late 1880's and early 1890's finally reached the universities in the second half of the 1890's: by 1900 the nobles once again accounted for more than half of university students. These gains were even more short-lived than those in the gymnasiums. By 1907 the noble proportion had returned to its 1895 level, and by 1914 a further nine per cent had been ceded to the non-nobles. Once again the main victims were the hereditary nobles; between 1880 and 1914 the percentage of students from the families of personal nobles and civil servants was still rising.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

¹⁰⁵ Shchetinina, *Universitety*, pp. 199-200; Johnson, *Heritage*, pp. 154-55.

¹⁰⁶ Alston, *Education*, pp. 130-33.

¹⁰⁷ See Table 2.

¹⁰⁸ Hans, *History*, p. 178.

¹⁰⁹ See Table 2.

¹¹⁰ See Tables 1 and 4.

Conclusion

The common division of the student body into broad groups such as “elite” and “*raznochintsy*”, “nobles” and “non-nobles” or “sons of nobles and civil servants” and “others” cannot fully do justice to the complexity of the social changes in Russia’s universities during the nineteenth century. The specific analysis of all the social groups involved is an essential part of any account of the problem. Much detailed work still remains to be done, especially in relation to the late 1850’s. It is nevertheless possible to outline the main historical changes in the social background of Russian university students.

The democratization of the universities proceeded in a number of distinct historical stages. In the early 1840’s there were some slight signs of democratization at the expense of the elite, but they were quickly reversed by legislation. During the late 1850’s, when the nobles and bureaucrats as a group were gaining ground almost everywhere, Kiev university experienced the opposite tendency. At the same time in St Petersburg university the sons of bureaucrats and priests increased their percentage at the expense of the nobility. The third phase (1865-75) was the most fundamental, for it was at this time that the national predominance of the hereditary nobles in the universities was decisively broken by the priests’ and bureaucrats’ sons. This phase was itself divided into two stages: the late 1860’s, when the seminarians began to take advantage of the new opportunities in the universities; and the years after 1872, when their influx was accelerated by their exemption from the new “gymnasium final”. Finally, the years 1880-85 saw the replacement of the priests’ sons by the students from the lower urban estates as the chief beneficiaries of democratization. Despite a brief and partial resurgence in the late 1890’s, the hereditary nobility never regained its pre-eminent position in the Russian universities.

Glossary of social groups

From Petrine times the population of Russia was officially divided into legal social estates (*sosloviya*). The main estates in nineteenth-century Russia were the nobility, clergy, urban estates and peasantry, together with a number of minor groups such as the *raznochintsy* and foreigners.

The term *raznochintsy* literally means “people of different ranks”. From the early eighteenth century it usually referred in official documents to people in a transitional position between social estates. Some would have left their parents’ estate by virtue of education or military service, others (such as foundlings or illegitimates) may never have been ascribed to an

estate. Until they became entitled to enlist in another estate, they were officially classed as *raznochintsy*. During the nineteenth century the term came increasingly to denote educated commoners; in this sense the non-noble ranked bureaucrats might be considered as *raznochintsy* (see note 45). In the 1860's the term acquired a new socio-cultural connotation, referring to those educated commoners who had put themselves outside the value-system of conventional Russian society (cf. "nihilists", "new people"); the term was even used at the time to include disaffected children of the nobility itself. In our title the term *raznochintsy* is used in the sense of educated commoners. In the statistical tables, however, it refers to those of the non-noble students officially classed as *raznochintsy* because of their transitional status. By the end of the nineteenth century the significance of the social estates had so declined that the 1897 census did not include the *raznochintsy* in its tables on the social estates. The national figure of 0.8% in 1858 is qualified in the source by serious doubts about how the figures were compiled in the different regions. A full quantitative account of the group's development is therefore difficult. We do, however, possess useful data on St Petersburg and Moscow, St Petersburg: 1801 – 17.3%; 1811 – 22.4%; 1821 – 14.0%; 1831 – 14.1%; 1869 – 2.7%; 1881 – 2.8%; Moscow: 1788-94 – 10.1%; 1834-40 – 8.3%; 1871 – 1.2%; 1882 – 0.9%.¹¹¹

The *hereditary nobility* was open not only to the children of hereditary nobles, but also to all military commissioned officers and the upper ranks of the civil service (see note 20). In 1858 the hereditary nobles constituted 1.0% of the population as against 1.1% in 1897. *Personal nobility* could not be inherited. It was open to civil servants on the lower levels of the Table of Ranks (*ibid.*). *Civil servants (chinovniki)* were officials with a rank (*chin*) on the Table of Ranks. The legal privileges of non-noble civil servants were similar to those of personal nobles, and they were often counted as a single group in official statistics. In 1858 the personal nobles and civil servants represented between them 0.5% of the population, compared with 0.6% in 1897 (see note 45). *Oberofitsery* were the lowest-ranked commissioned officers in the armed forces (see note 18). The *clergy* was a social estate in

¹¹¹ A. G. Rashin, *Naselenie Rossii za 100 let (1811-1913)*. Statisticheskie ocherki (Moscow, 1956), p. 124, Table 87, and p. 126, Table 89; Sankt-Peterburg po perepisi 10 dekabrya 1869 goda, I (St Petersburg, 1872), Pt 3, pp. 110-11, 116-17; Sankt-Peterburg po perepisi 15 dekabrya 1881 goda, I (St Petersburg, 1884), ch. 1, pp. 242-43; Statisticheskie svedeniya o zhitelyakh g. Moskvy po perepisi 12 dekabrya 1871 goda, I (Moscow, 1874), Pt 3, pp. 68-69; Perepis' Moskvy 1882 goda (Moscow, 1885-86), II, ch. 1, pp. 27-32. For more detailed accounts of the *raznochintsy*, see Ch. Becker, "Raznochintsy: The Development of the Word and the Concept", in: *American Slavic and East European Review*, XVIII (1959), pp. 63-74; G. N. Vul'fon, *Raznochinno-demokraticeskoe dvi-zhenie v Povolzh'e i na Urale (Kazan, 1974)*.

which parishes were usually inherited within families, although this tended to decline during the latter part of the nineteenth century. In 1858 the Christian clergy constituted 0.9% of the population, as against 0.6% in 1897. The *urban estates* were divided into two groups: the *merchants* (0.7% in 1858, 0.3% in 1897) and the *lower townspeople* (petty bourgeois, lesser tradesmen and artisans), who in 1858 accounted for 6.5% of the population, compared with 11.9% in 1897. In 1832 the new legal estate of *honorary citizens* was introduced (see note 20). In 1858 the honorary citizens represented only 0.04% of the population, but by 1897 their numbers had increased to 0.4%. The *raznochintsy* were often included among the urban estates in university statistics. 0.1% of the population were *foreigners* in 1858, and 0.3% in 1897.¹¹²

¹¹² All the above figures for 1858 and 1897 refer to European Russia and not to the whole Russian Empire, for purposes of comparability. They are drawn from *Statisticheskie tablitsy Rossiiskoi Imperii*, II (1863), pp. 267-93; *Obschii svod po Imperii rezul'tatov razrabotki dannykh pervoi vseobshchei perepisi naseleniya, proizvedennoi 28 yanvarya 1897 goda* (St Petersburg, 1905), I, pp. 160-87.

	Hered- itary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Clergy	Honorary citizens & merchants	Petty bourgeois & artisans	Razno- chinsky	Peas- antry	For- eigners	Others	Total
1835 ^{113*}		616	245	99	118	123	105	15	18		1,339
%		46.0	18.3	7.4	8.8	9.2	7.8	1.1	1.3		
1836 ¹¹⁴		967			98	334		16	29		1,444
%		67.0			6.8	23.1		1.1	2.0		
1840 ^{115*}		1,044	273	166	143	215	125	29	34		2,029
%		51.5	13.5	8.2	7.0	10.6	6.2	1.4	1.7		
1843 ¹¹⁴		1,550			187	674		42	59		2,512
%		61.7			7.4	26.8		1.7	2.3		
1848-49 ¹¹⁶		2,506		279			1,152				3,937
%		63.7		7.1			29.3				
1849 ¹¹⁴		2,252			207	771		63	77		3,373
%		66.8			6.1	22.9		1.9	2.3		
1853 ¹¹⁴		1,685			188	597		36	60		2,566
%		65.7			7.3	23.3		1.4	2.3		
1855 ¹¹⁴		2,051			237	750		31	72		3,141
%		65.3			7.5	23.9		1.0	2.3		
1863 ¹¹⁷	1,868	827		348	387	593		66	86		4,175
%	44.7	19.8		8.3	9.3	14.2		1.6	2.1		
1864-65 ¹¹⁸		2,744		388		364	570 ¹¹⁸		18		4,084
%		67.2		9.5		8.9	14.0		0.4		
1875 ¹¹⁹		2,057		1,434		1,001					4,492
%		45.8		31.9		22.3					
1876-77 ¹²⁰		46.4		27.9	8.7		12.0		1.7		
%		2.273		1.810		1.162			2.9		
1878 ¹¹⁹		43.3		34.5		22.2					
%		1.929		1.920	745	1,014		262	429		5,425
1880 ¹²¹	1,894	23.5		23.4	9.1	12.4		3.2	5.2		8,193
%	23.1	1.911		1,962	736	989		233	404		
1880 ¹²¹	1,885	23.5		24.2	9.1	12.2		2.9	5.0		8,120
%	23.2	1.911		24.2	9.1	12.2		2.9	5.0		

* The lower elite is referred to as *oberofitsery* in the original sources.

Table 2. *Social origins of gymnasium students in percentages, 1801-1914*

	Nobles & civil servants	Clergy	Urban estates	Peas- antry	For- eigners	Others	N
1801 ¹²²	33.0	2.0	34.0	27.0			
1826 ¹²³	72.7	3.1	22.3	1.9			6,533
1826 ¹²²	69.5	3.2	23.2	4.0			
1826-27 ¹²⁴⁻²⁵	72.2	3.1	22.8	1.9			6,533
1833 ¹²⁵⁻²⁶	78.9	2.1			19.0		7,495
1843 ¹²⁵⁻²⁶	78.7	1.7			19.6		12,784
1853 ¹²⁵⁻²⁶	79.7	2.3			18.0		15,069
1863 ¹²⁵⁻²⁶	73.1	2.8			24.1		23,693
1864-65 ¹²⁷	69.7	3.6	20.7	3.9		2.1	26,772
1868 ¹²⁶	67.3	3.7	22.9	3.6		2.5	26,457
1868-69 ¹²⁷	66.5	3.8	23.2	4.6			
1871 ¹²⁴⁻²⁵	59.5	4.6	27.8	5.7	1.1		
1872-73 ¹²⁷	57.9	5.7	28.6	6.3			
1873 ¹²⁵	55.6	5.4	30.7	7.1	1.2		
1874 ¹²⁶	57.7	5.6	29.0	6.4		1.2	36,069
1874-75 ¹²⁷	52.5	5.8	33.0	7.0			
1876 ¹²⁵	49.8	4.6	34.0	7.1	1.5		
1877-78 ¹²⁷	50.2	5.4	35.2	8.9		0.3	42,409
1878 ¹²⁶	50.2	5.4	35.3	7.5		1.6	53,072
1881-82 ^{124-25, 127}	47.5	5.2	37.2	8.0	2.1		65,751
1885 ¹²⁶	49.1	5.0	35.9	8.0		2.0	71,522
1889 ¹²⁶	53.6	4.4	33.4	6.3		2.2	59,772
1894 ^{124, 127}	56.4	3.4	31.6	6.0	1.7	0.9	62,863
1904 ¹²⁴⁻²⁵	45.5	4.5	36.8	11.4	1.6	0.3	96,530
1907 ¹²⁵	39.4	5.0	39.0	13.4	1.3	1.9	107,296
1914 ¹²⁴⁻²⁵	32.3	5.6	36.8	22.0	1.0	2.3	152,110

Table 3. Percentage of hereditary nobles, personal nobles and civil servants among students in five Russian universities, 1835-1904¹²⁸

	St Petersburg			Moscow			Kiev			Kazan			Kharkov		
	Hereditary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Hereditary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Hereditary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Hereditary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Hereditary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants
1835 ^{113*}	60.0		17.0	38.7		16.5	79.2		7.5	26.2		36.5	49.7		11.8
1838 ¹²⁹	65.1		14.9												
1839-40 ^{130*}				43.1		10.3									
1840 ^{115*}	57.1		18.1	46.4		10.1				32.5		30.5	58.7		13.3
1841 ¹³¹	52.4		16												
1842-43 ^{132*}				51.6		11.8									
				44.5		10.2									
				43.5		9.6				43.4		24.0			
1848 ¹¹⁶	62.0		11.8												
1848-49 ¹¹⁶										68.3		68.3	66.1		
1848-49 ^{133*}										60.4		60.4	63.7		
1853 ^{133*}				61.8			76.4			51.0		51.0	66.3		
1855 ^{133*}				62.1			74.3								
1855 ^{133*}				63.7			77.4								
1859 ^{114*}															
1859-60 ^{131, 134}	72.4														
1859-60 ^{131, 134}	57.0		19/22												
1860-61 ¹³⁵	85.8														
1861 ¹³⁶				65.0											
1863 ¹¹⁷	53.5		18.8	50.3		18.0	48.4		23.3	29.6		35.1	48.9		19.1
1868 ¹³⁷															
1878 ¹³⁸							42.3		22.4						
1880 ¹²¹	26.1		28.2	19.8		26.2	22.4		26.5	10.6		21.1	21.2		18.1
1903-04 ¹²⁰				19.8		27.7	18.3		28.9	7.0		43.8			

* The lower elite is referred to as *oberofitsery* in the original sources.

Table 4. *Social origins of university students, 1885-1914*

	Hered- itary nobles	Personal nobles & civil servants	Clergy	Honorary citizens & mer- chants	Petty bourgeois, artisans & <i>raznochintsy</i>	Peas- antry	For- eigners	Others	Total
1885 ¹³⁹	3,760	751	3,370						7,881
%	47.5	9.9	42.6						
1885 ¹¹⁹	4,706	931	4,078						9,715
%	48.4	9.6	42.0						
1888 ¹¹⁹	4,803	936	4,302						10,041
%	47.8	9.3	42.8						
1889 ¹³⁹	2,647	514	1,830						4,991
%	51.2	10.1	42.6						
1895 ¹⁴⁰	5,140	554	3,758	880		768	229		11,329
%	45.4	4.9	33.2	7.8		6.8	2.0		
1895 ¹⁴⁰	5,376	592	5,621				243		11,832
%	45.4	5.0	47.5				2.1		
1900 ¹⁴⁰	6,429	1,188	2,424	1,458		656	181		12,336
%	52.1	9.6	19.6	11.8		5.3	1.5		
1900 ¹⁴⁰	6,749	1,221	4,823				206		12,999
%	51.9	9.4	37.1				1.6		
1907 ¹²⁵	14,328	3,546	7,245	3,666		2,201		782	31,768
%	45.1	11.2	22.8	11.5		6.9		2.5	
1913 ¹²⁵	2,732	10,101	3,884	3,884	8,675	4,758		1,868	35,695
%	7.7	28.3	10.9	10.9	24.3	13.3		5.2	
1914 ¹⁴¹	2,625	9,948	3,938	3,938	8,394	5,112		967	34,543
%	7.6	28.8	11.4	11.4	23.3	14.8		2.8	

Table 5. *Percentage of students receiving financial assistance, 1866-74*¹⁴²

	Tuition-fee exemptions	Grants	Stipends	Total
1866	31.4	9.6	18.5	59.5
1867	29.3	16.4	17.6	63.3
1868	32.6	24.8	18.4	75.7
1869	30.9	24.1	18.7	73.7
1870	34.7	27.1	21.4	83.2
1871	34.1	22.3	20.9	77.3
1872	36.0	22.2	20.1	78.3
1873	36.4	21.9	23.2	81.5
1874	39.7	24.5	25.1	89.3

Table 6. *Percentage of new students from Orthodox seminaries, 1863-79*¹⁴³

	SPb	Moscow	Kiev	Kazan	Kharkov	Dorpat	Odessa	Warsaw
1863		1.5	2.2*	7.0	2.2			
1864			8.0*					
1865	12.5	19.5	3.9*	1.4	0.0		7.9*	
1867			7.7*					
1868	24.8							
1869							13.8	
1870	17.5*	9.3		12.2	7.4		17.8*	
1871	23.8	19.2	13.1*	14.7	9.2*		23.0	2.0
1872	24.8	21.2	3.7	62.8	17.3		23.5	2.9
1873	16.1*	9.9	5.4		37.0		46.3*	6.1
1874	20.5	17.9	3.1	41.2	38.4	0.9	46.5	17.4
1875	31.2	14.5	8.5	34.5	42.4		50.9	19.9
1875 ^{144**}	29	26	14	36	36		47	8.5
1876	19.2	9.4	0.4	34.7	43.1	0.8	47.8	
1877	31.2	9.7	3.3	41.2	49.4	1.8	59.8	
1878	24.5	7.9	3.6	39.8	40.6	0.0	69.0	
1879	0.95	0.0*	***	6.1	***	0.3	7.8	

* A number of students from secondary schools of other religious denominations are excluded here for purposes of comparability.

** Pertaining to all students.

*** A break-down by secondary school was published, but with no mention of Orthodox seminaries.

Table 7. *Aggregate percentage of students receiving tuition-fee exemptions, grants and stipends in three universities*¹⁴⁵

	St Petersburg		Moscow		Kiev	
1857			25.6			
1860			25.0			
1861			25.9			
1863			48.1	55.4		
1865	84.2		70.6			
1867	124.8	106.9				
1868			73.3		59.1	52.4
1869	121.1					
1870	99.1	89.7	80.3	81.8		
1871	87.4	75.4	53.0	53.7	46.6	48.4
1872	79.2	72.2			54.7	56.4
1873	79.9	85.7	109.0			
1874	81.7	72.9	106.8	114.9	72.3	67.4
1875					68.4/73.2	57.0/64.0
1876					45.3/46.1	44.3/56.3
1877			103.3	92.6	61.2	62.3
1878					56.6	53.2
1879			93.1	90.7		30.7

Table 8. *Social origins of university students by faculty in percentages, 1863, 1875-76¹²⁰ and 1880¹²¹*

Faculty	Year	Hered- itary nobles	Personal nobles & civil servants	Clergy	Honorary citizens & mer- chants	Petty bourgeois, artisans & <i>raznochinsky</i>	Peasants	For- eigners	Others	N
Mathematics	1863	52.4	20.1	4.1	6.4	12.8	1.7	2.6		468
	1875-76	53.25		19.5		27.25				
	1880	28.7	28.0	17.3	7.5	11.6	3.1		3.8	843
Natural sciences	1863	57.0	17.5	3.5	10.0	8.8	1.2	2.0		690
	1875-76	42.75		40.0		17.5				
	1880	26.0	22.4	24.6	10.5	11.9	2.0		2.5	789
Law	1863	52.4	19.8	6.2	10.6	8.9	1.3	0.9		1,354
	1875-76	56.0		24.0		20.0				
	1880	34.9	26.0	15.0	10.7	7.9	1.8		3.7	1,790
Humanities	1863	42.4	19.8	13.2	6.9	14.6	0.3	2.8		288
	1875-76	31.0		51.3		17.6				
	1880	19.0	23.6	34.5	6.5	8.1	3.0		5.4	914
Medicine	1863	31.1	21.3	12.1	9.6	21.2	2.3	2.5		1,246
	1875-76	40.6		34.4		25.0				
	1880	17.3	22.1	25.7	9.2	15.7	3.6		6.4	3,693
Oriental languages	1863	23.5	26.5	2.9	2.9	35.3		8.8		34
	1875-76	35.0		35.0		30.0				
	1880	9.4	25.0	25.0	18.8	21.9				32
Theology	1863	4.2	13.7	32.6	4.2	35.8	3.2	6.3		95
	1880	4.5	8.3	29.5	3.0	13.6	22.0		18.9	132
	1863	44.7	19.8	8.3	9.3	14.2	1.6	2.1		4,175
1880	23.1	23.5	23.4	9.1	12.4	3.2		5.2	8,193	

Table 9. *Social origins of university staff in percentages, 1834,¹⁴⁶ 1835,¹⁴⁷ 1863¹¹⁷ and 1880¹⁴⁸*

Faculty	Year	Hered- itary nobles	Personal nobles	Civil servants	Clergy	Honorary citizens & mer- chants	Petty bourgeois, artisans & <i>raznochintsy</i>	Peas- antry	For- eigners	Others	N
Science*	1863	47.1	11.8		9.4	2.4	16.5	1.2	11.8		85
	1880	47.1	21.7		4.3	4.3	6.5	1.4	4.3	10.1	138
Law	1863	44.7	4.3		17.0	10.6	10.6	2.1	10.6		47
	1880	38.0	13.0		12.0	10.9	7.6		12.0	6.5	92
Humanities	1863	36.6	12.7		18.3	5.6	11.3		15.5		71
	1880	28.2	7.0		22.5	9.2	7.7	2.1	17.6	5.6	142
Medicine	1863	30.5	11.0		12.2	12.2	22.0	1.2	11.0		82
	1880	23.8	8.8		15.0	14.3	8.2	0.7	11.6	17.7	147
Oriental languages	1863	38.5	7.7		15.4	7.7	7.7	15.4	7.7		13
	1880	36.8	10.5		26.3	7.7	10.5		5.3	10.5	19
Theology	1863	33.3					33.3		33.3		6
	1880				28.6				28.6	42.9	7
All	1834	28.5		8.4	23.4	2.9	6.3	0.4	28.0	2.1	239
	1835	28.4		7.2	20.1	4.9	8.0	0.4	25.8	5.3	264
	1863	39.1	10.2		13.5	7.2	15.8	1.6	12.5		304
	1880	33.4	12.3		14.3	9.2	7.5	1.1	11.4	10.8	545

* Not divided into separate departments of Mathematics and Natural Sciences in these data.

Table 10. *Social origins of secondary-school teachers in 1880*¹⁴⁹

	Hered- itary nobles	Personal nobles & civil servants	Clergy	Honorary citizens & mer- chants	Petty bourgeois, artisans & <i>razno- chintsy</i>	Peas- antry	Others	Total
All teachers %	1,074 12.9	2,186 26.2	2,554 30.6	472 5.6	749 9.0	299 3.6	1,022 12.2	8,356
Male teachers %	579 9.1	1,369 21.6	2,317 36.6	321 5.1	633 10.0	285 4.5	832 13.1	6,336

Notes to the Tables

In a number of cases the percentages which appear in the original sources have been re-calculated.

¹¹³ Zhurnal, XII (1836), p. 330. Data for St Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, Kazan and Kharkov universities are in Table 1. Dorpat is excluded for purposes of comparison with Egorov. The Zhurnal data for this period have been almost totally ignored in the secondary literature, except by Flynn ("Tuition", pp. 241-42, note 22), who refers to the 1840 data but cites no figures. In addition to the national data for 1835 and 1840, the Zhurnal also contains useful material on individual universities for other dates in this period (see notes 128, 130, 132).

¹¹⁴ Egorov, "Studenchestvo", pp. 6-14, Tables 1-6. The group entitled *raznochintsy* clearly includes both the clergy and the petty bourgeois. The elite group in Egorov's tables is labelled "nobles and *oberofitsery*"; with no mention of civil servants. Comparison of Egorov's data with those of Leikina-Svirskaya for Kazan in 1848-49 ("Formirovanie", pp. 86-87) and especially with Ryabikova's Moscow data, taking into account an average of 8-10% for the clergy, clearly demonstrates that Egorov's elite group is likely to include the non-noble civil servants.

¹¹⁵ Zhurnal, XXXII (1841), pp. 32-35. Same universities as in note 113. Flynn (*ibid.*) points out that both Egorov and Ryabikova unnecessarily omit the clergy as a separate group from their tables. He also notes the inconsistencies between individual universities in the categorization of some of the minor non-noble groups. The same is in fact true of the 1835 data.

¹¹⁶ Leikina-Svirskaya, "Formirovanie", pp. 86-87. Same universities as in note 113, with the addition of Dorpat. See note 37.

¹¹⁷ Sbornik spravochnykh svedenii po Ministerstvu Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya za 1862 i, chast'yu, za 1863 i 1864 gody (St Petersburg, 1864), no page numbers. 4. Statisticheskie vedomosti ob uchebnykh zavedeniyakh, A. University, table entitled "Podrobnaya vedomost' o studentakh v universitetakh k 1-mu yanvarya 1863 goda". Same universities as in note 116. The absolute total of students at the time of the survey was 4,551, but the social origins of 376 (8.3%) were not discovered. Of these, more than three-quarters (293) were at Kiev university. Rather surprisingly, this source has been almost totally ignored. The only reference to it that we have seen is in Hans, History, p. 244 (bibliography).

The two sections of the elite are labelled here as "hereditary nobles" and "personal nobles", with no mention of civil servants. The Zhurnal also published data at this time

for some of the individual universities referred to in the *Sbornik spravochnykh svedenii*, and likewise dated 1 January 1863. The elite is not subdivided in the *Zhurnal* materials, but is clearly labelled in each case as “sons of nobles and civil servants”. Most of the *Zhurnal* figures are very close to those in the *Sbornik*. For example (*Zhurnal* figures first), *St Petersburg*: 275 nobles and civil servants out of 383 (71.8%); 205 hereditary nobles and 72 personal nobles out of 383 (72.3%); *Kazan*: 263 out of 399 (65.9%) as against 120 and 142 out of 405 (64.7%). These figures strongly suggest that the same social groups are included in the elite in both sources, and that the “personal nobles” in the *Sbornik* in fact include the civil servants, as was the normal custom in university statistics (see Shchetinina, *University*, p. 71, Table 1). *Zhurnal* data from CXIX (1863), Pt 2, pp. 283, 495; CXX (1863), Pt 2, pp. 403, 452-53.

¹¹⁸ *Obzor deyatelnosti, Prilozheniya*, p. 230. Same six universities as in note 116. The figure of 14.0% for the peasantry is impossible to accept in the light of all the other data presented. One can only assume that the “urban estates” consist solely of the honorary citizens and merchants and that the petty bourgeois, artisans and *raznochintsy* are included with the peasantry. As a result, those scholars reproducing this source give a false impression about which social groups participated in the democratization of the universities at this time. See Rashin, “Gramotnost’”, p. 78, Tables 58-59; Kahan, “Social Structure”, p. 370, Table 6B; Brower, *Training the Nihilists*, p. 114. In the data for individual universities, not reproduced by other scholars, the *Obzor deyatelnosti* gives figures of about 76% for the nobles and civil servants at Kazan and Kharkov universities, far higher than at any other date. In these two cases a section of the urban estates (perhaps the honorary citizens) appears to have been included in the figure for nobles and civil servants as well as in that for the peasantry.

¹¹⁹ Kamosko, “Izmeneniya”, p. 204 (Kamosko’s figures reproduce those in Shchetinina, “University”, loc. cit., pp. 166, 205-06). Same universities as in note 113, plus Odessa. In all four years, the data for the urban estates and the peasantry are included in the single column “Others”. Kamosko claims (note 4) that “in this and following tables (except the column headed ‘Total’) data about foreign students are omitted, as they are of no significance for the solution of the present question.” However, the totals do in fact tally with the sum of the individual figures presented. This does not seriously affect the overall picture, as the level of foreign students was normally about 2%.

¹²⁰ Shchetinina, “Alfavitnye spiski”, p. 118, Table 6, p. 120, Table 9, and p. 121, Table 10. Same universities as in note 116, minus Kharkov (our Table 1); same universities as in note 113, plus Odessa (our Table 8).

¹²¹ *University*, as in note 76; Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya*, p. 62 (lower row). The census covers the universities included in note 116, plus Odessa and Warsaw. The data in the upper row are taken from our transcription of the census. Leikina-Svirskaya’s are apparently from various sources. She refers to “(1880 – the year of the census)” (p. 57), and describes the way in which the 1880 census differs from her other data in dividing the nobility into two sections (p. 60). However, she does not include this source in her list of materials used in connection with the universities (p. 332, note 7), but only in relation to the secondary schools (p. 331, note 2). Whatever the reason, her data differ considerably from our own, with a total of 8,120 instead of 8,193, and with figures for most groups between 9 and 25 lower than our own. The one exception is the case of the clergy, given as 42 higher than in our data. Almost all the significant differences relate to Kiev and Dorpat universities. Leikina-Svirskaya has also included as “foreigners” the group entitled “other estates” in the census. These other estates presumably include the foreigners, but may well also include other marginal groups. A figure of 5% seems rather high for the foreigners alone, when in all our other data up to 1900 (except 1864-65, when the percentage was lower still) the foreigners represented 1½-2½% of the student body.

¹²² Hans, *History*, p. 236.

- ¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- ¹²⁴ Kahan, "Social Structure", p. 370, Table 6A.
- ¹²⁵ Rashin, "Gramotnost'", pp. 72-74, Tables 47-51 (gymnasiums); p. 78, Tables 58-59 (universities).
- ¹²⁶ Kamosko, "Izmeneniya", pp. 205-06.
- ¹²⁷ Sinel, Classroom, p. 204, Table 1.
- ¹²⁸ For data not included here on these and other individual universities, see Egorov, "Reaktionnaya politika", pp. 61-67, Tables 1-5; Erman, *Intelligentsiya*, op. cit., p. 29; id., "Sostav", p. 174, Table 10; Hans, *History*, p. 79; Leikina-Svirskaya, "Formirovanie", pp. 86-87; Ryabikova, "Chislennost'", p. 65, Table 6; Shchetinina, "Alfavitnye spiski", pp. 120-21, Tables 9-10; id., "University", pp. 166, 205-06; id., *University*, pp. 71-72, 199-203; *Trudy Odesskogo Statisticheskogo Komiteta* (Odessa, 1867), p. 129; *Zhurnal*, VIII (1835), p. 321; CCII (1879), p. 41; CCIII (1879), pp. 74-75; CCVII (1880), p. 24; CCVIII (1880), pp. 43-45; CCIX (1880), pp. 84-85, 165; CCX (1880), pp. 71-72; CCXI (1880), pp. 94-95.
- ¹²⁹ Hans, *History*, p. 79.
- ¹³⁰ *Ofitsial'no-uchebnye pribavleniya k Zhurnalu Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*, 1840, p. 90.
- ¹³¹ Brower, "Fathers", pp. 344-45.
- ¹³² *Ofitsial'no-uchebnye pribavleniya*, 1843, p. 70. Two sets of percentages are given in Table 3 because the source gives two different totals.
- ¹³³ Egorov, "Reaktionnaya politika", pp. 61-67, Tables 1-5.
- ¹³⁴ Brower, *Training the Nihilists*, p. 42, Table 2. Brower in "Fathers" gives a total for the nobles of 585 out of 1,026, which is 57 per cent. His figures for the non-noble bureaucrats differ in his two pieces by 3 per cent.
- ¹³⁵ Confino, "On Intellectuals", p. 146, note 36.
- ¹³⁶ Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya*, p. 177.
- ¹³⁷ *Zhurnal*, CXXXVII, *Sovremennaya letopis'*, p. 306.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, CXCVI (1878), pp. 155-56.
- ¹³⁹ Shchetinina, *University*, pp. 199-200, Tables 12-13. The 1885 row covers St Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, Kharkov and Odessa universities; the data for 1889 refer to St Petersburg, Kiev, Kazan and Odessa.
- ¹⁴⁰ Leikina-Svirskaya, *Intelligentsiya*, pp. 63-64. For both 1895 and 1900, the upper row includes the universities of St Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, Kharkov, Dorpat and Warsaw. In each case the lower row also includes Odessa university. The data for Odessa differ from the others in that all the urban estates and the peasantry are taken as a single group. Leikina-Svirskaya provides separate overall totals and percentages for each of the three estates involved, based on the other six universities. Her main series of overall totals includes Odessa, and groups the three estates into one. However, in the 1895 table, she cites figures of 5,140 for the nobility and 554 for the clergy which in fact represent the totals for those estates *excluding* the Odessa students (the correct totals are 5,376 and 592). We have therefore attempted to avoid confusion by including two complete tables for each of 1895 and 1900. The upper row excludes Odessa completely and includes all the individual estates for the other six universities. The lower row includes Odessa and groups the three estates into one. It may be noted that the two sets of rows differ in most cases by no more than about 0.2%, which illustrates the typicality of Odessa students in their social origins.
- ¹⁴¹ Chutkerashvili, *Kadry*, op. cit., p. 60, Table 3-1. He states (p. 59) that the "Others" column includes some workers. Rashin does not specify at all.
- ¹⁴² "Universitetskii vopros", pp. 175-76.
- ¹⁴³ Data on seminarians and financial assistance are taken as follows from *Zhurnal*, *Sovremennaya letopis'*. *St Petersburg*: CXXIX (1866), pp. 559-65; CXXXVII, p. 144;

CXLIII (1869), p. 79; CXLVIII, p. 32; CLV (1871), pp. 78-79; CLXI (1872), p. 33; CLXVIII (1873), p. 69; CLXXV (1874), pp. 55-56; CLXXVIII (1875), p. 118; CLXXXV (1876), p. 41; CXC (1877), pp. 131-32; CXCVI, pp. 278-79; CCII, p. 84; CCVIII, pp. 134-35; *Moscow*: XCVII (1858), p. 43; CIX (1861), p. 63; CXIII (1862), p. 57; CXXIV (1864), Pt 2, pp. 27-28; CXXX (1866), pp. 396, 399-401; CXXXVII, pp. 304-05; CXLI (1869), pp. 28, 220; CXLVIII, p. 169; CLVII (1871), pp. 41-42; CLXIV (1872), pp. 53-55; CLXIX (1873), p. 117; CLXXV, p. 78; CLXXX (1875), p. 105; CLXXXVI (1876), pp. 11-12; CXC I (1877), pp. 126-27; CXCVI, pp. 155-56; CCVIII, pp. 43-45; *Kiev*: CXXIII (1864), Pt 2, p. 78; CXXV (1865), p. 390; CXXX, pp. 113-15; CXLIV (1869), pp. 175-76; CXLIX (1870), pp. 186-87; CLVI (1871), pp. 49 (page misnumbered here), 64; CLXIII (1872), p. 93; CLXVII (1873), pp. 76-77; CLXXIII (1874), p. 92; CLXXIX (1875), p. 70; CLXXXV, p. 69; CXC I, p. 46; CXC VII (1878), p. 16; CCIII, pp. 239-40; CCIX, p. 165; *Kazan*: CXXIII, Pt 2, p. 697; CXXXII (1866), pp. 20-21; CXXXIX (1868), pp. 305-06; CXLIV, pp. 165-66; CXLIX, pp. 12-13; CLVI, pp. 129-31; CLXII (1872), pp. 63-65; CLXX (1873), pp. 10-11; CLXXXII (1875), p. 85; CLXXXVIII (1876), pp. 69-70; CXCIII (1877), pp. 142-43; CXC VIII (1878), p. 25; CCVI (1879), p. 47; CCX, pp. 71-72; *Kharkov*: CXXIII, Pt 2, pp. 451, 455-56; CXXXI (1866), pp. 523-25, 531-35; CXXXIX, p. 298; CXLIII, pp. 209-10; CXLIX, pp. 26-27; CLVIII (1871), pp. 97-98; CLXII, p. 13; CLXIX, p. 14; CLXXVI (1874), p. 44; CLXXXI (1875), p. 29; CLXXXVII, pp. 190-91; CXCIV (1877), pp. 36-37; CXCIX (1878), p. 23; CCVI, pp. 96-97; *Dorpat*: CXXXIX, p. 394; CXLIV, pp. 23-24; CLI (1870), pp. 40-41; CLIX (1872), p. 7; CLXIV, p. 66; CLXX, pp. 94-95; CLXXVI, p. 201; CLXXXIII, pp. 24-25; CXCIII, p. 126; CXCIX, p. 52; CCIII, pp. 74-75; CCIX, pp. 84-85; *Odessa*: CXXXII, pp. 20-21, 40-41; CXXXIX, p. 390; CXLI, p. 28; CXLIV, p. 18; CXLIX, p. 196; CLV, p. 178; CLXIII, p. 215; CLXVII, pp. 8-9; CLXXII (1874), p. 46; CLXXIX, p. 6; CLXXXIX (1877), p. 32; CXCII (1877), p. 59; CC (1878), p. 37; CCII, p. 41; CCVII, p. 24; CCXI, pp. 94-95; also *Trudy Odesskogo Statisticheskogo Komiteta*, IV (1870), pp. 215-16; *Warsaw*: *Zhurnal*, CLI, pp. 28-29, 32-33; CLVIII, p. 9; CLXIV, p. 129; CLXVI (1873), pp. 130-31; CLXXIV (1874), p. 111; CLXXXII, p. 24; CLXXXVII, p. 52; CXCII, pp. 14-15; CXC VII, p. 81.

¹⁴⁴ "O chisle okonchivshikh kurs", loc. cit., p. 93.

¹⁴⁵ Sources as in note 143. Table 7 only includes years where there are data for all three types of financial assistance. Where two sets of figures appear in one column, they indicate the percentage of students receiving assistance in the two halves of the year. It should be noted that these percentages are sometimes taken from the separate totals given for each semester, but sometimes from a single total given for the whole academic year. The Kiev totals for the two halves of 1875 and 1876 do not tally with the sums of the individual figures presented. We have therefore given two pairs of percentages.

¹⁴⁶ *Zhurnal*, IX (1836), p. 133.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, XI (1836), p. 635.

¹⁴⁸ *University* (cf. note 76), p. 12.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 436-41.