

**Educating Elite in a Contested Borderland:  
A Case Study of Kiev Institute for Noble Girls**

By

Nataliia Zakaluzhna

Submitted to  
Central European University  
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Alexei Miller  
Second Reader: Professor Victor Karady

Budapest, Hungary

2011

## **Statement of Copyright**

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

## Abstract

Relying on the experience of Kiev Institute for noble girls as a case study, this research proceeds along two major lines. First, it shows the collisions of the nationality policy of the 19<sup>th</sup> Romanov Empire in its Western borderlands, yielding thereby to the recent scholarship, which has undermined the assumption that it was uniformly repressive and/or consistent.

By the same token, this thesis reassesses the history of elite schooling in the 19<sup>th</sup> Romanov Empire, stating that highly prestigious both male and female boarding schools, explicitly destined for the traditional social elites, were a part of the state's image and self-representation as a *noble* one. In other words, the study argues that even at the turn of the century, when the Empire was indeed modernizing, it remained *noble* in its essence, of which elite schools were a significant part.

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, my utmost gratitude to Prof. Alexei Miller, for his expertise and the insights he has shared, as well as for challenging and improving my work. He has greatly shaped my thinking and my indebtedness to him is boundless.

I would also like to thank Prof. Victor Karady, who has always had kind concern and consideration regarding my topic. His advice and assistance were both inspiring and supportive.

I owe a lot to my friends Kateryna Sosnina and Iurii Chepela. To Katia, for her unselfish and unfailing support, and to Iura, for his time and effort. Meaningless discussions at 3.30 A.M. over a cup of the worst coffee ever is exactly what one needs for writing a good thesis.

Last, but not least – my many thanks to Zhenia Lezhenin, for his love, continuous support and warm encouragement. Despite his obvious dislike to history, he has carefully read and widely criticized my study.

## **Abbreviations**

DAK – Derzhavnyi arkhiv mista Kyeva (State Archive of the City of Kyiv)

TSDIAK – Tsentral’nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv  
(Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in the City of Kyiv)

f. – fond (archival collection)

op. – opys (subdivision within archival collection)

spr. – sprava (folder within archival collection)

ark. – arkush (page number)

# Table of Contents

|                                                                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction.....                                                                                              | 1  |
| Chapter I. Theoretical framework .....                                                                         | 6  |
| 1.1. Nationality policy in the imperial borderland: Western provinces in the 19th century Romanov Empire ..... | 6  |
| 1.2. Kijów-Kiev-Kyiv: a city in the 19th century Romanov Empire.....                                           | 12 |
| 1.3. Educating rulers: elite schooling in the 19th century Romanov Empire .....                                | 15 |
| Chapter II. Quest for loyalty: elite education and the Southwestern Borderland of the Romanov Empire .....     | 18 |
| 2.1. Claiming the space .....                                                                                  | 18 |
| 2.2. Creating the space: a case study of Kiev Institute for noble girls .....                                  | 25 |
| Chapter III. Profile of an elite: social and ethnic composition of the Institute's students.....               | 37 |
| 3.1. Preliminary remarks .....                                                                                 | 37 |
| 3.2. Maintaining the sense of elitism: social composition of the Institute's students .....                    | 40 |
| 3.3. Empire's very various elites: ethnic composition of the Institute's students.....                         | 46 |
| Chapter IV. Elite schooling: meanings and content of the Institute's education .....                           | 53 |
| Conclusion.....                                                                                                | 62 |
| Appendix .....                                                                                                 | 67 |
| Bibliography.....                                                                                              | 68 |

## Introduction

In the wake of the 1831 uprising Polish universities in Warsaw and Vilna were closed, as well as an extensive network of Polish schools across the Western borderlands was abolished. A new, Russian, one was introduced instead, expected to play a crucial role in the social reproduction of the loyal elites. A part of these changes, Kiev University of Saint Vladimir, established in 1834, and its “female” version Kiev Institute for noble girls, opened in 1838, were called to provide “proper” education to men and women from the Southwestern Borderland of the Romanov Empire. The atmosphere of the 1830s these institutions came into being reveals their prime importance to the Russian Crown, as well as their further development signifies by no means less important changes in the imperial attitude to its very diverse elites.

The above-mentioned considerations to a large extent determined both the framework and the approach used in the research. The experience of Kyiv Institute for noble girls is put into the imperial changing context of the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. Relying on the school as a case study, I will endeavor to show both inconsistency and contradictions of the nationality policy of the Romanov Empire in its Western borderlands. Marked by two uprisings, the fact that the state was indeed nationalizing, it, nevertheless, was not as planned and repressive as national narratives tend to depict it.

By the same token, I will argue that the developments of the modernizing Empire, which had lead to the major social transformations, and namely to the emergence of non-noble elites – those of commerce and of education, hardly shook “the noble character” of the state, whether perceived or real. Even at the turn of the century the Empire remained *noble* in its

essence, images, and self-representations, of which highly prestigious elite schools were a significant part.

It is apparent that with tasks thus formulated, this research is not a contribution to the scholarship on history of women's education; neither is it "a chapter" in the institutional history. What it is is a study intended to show how important changes of the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century shaped and re-shaped one particular institution.

The thesis is based on series of archival holdings, as well as on a number of published sources. The activity of the Institute is mostly documented by the registers of State Archive of the city of Kyiv, F. 144 "Kyiv Institute for noble girls." The latter contains files of official records and correspondence, supplemented by an extensive collection of statistical data, though accounts on the Institute's student body is largely missing or lost. The correspondence was of a special interest for the purposes of this work, providing useful insights into the motivations and the intentions of those, responsible for the school. Consisting mostly of exchange of letters between Kievan General-Governor, administrator of Kiev Educational District, the Institute's officials, and Saint-Petersburg, it was particularly intensive in the period of 1833-1838, which preceded the opening and within which both the meanings and the aims of the school were discussed, and in the years of 1859-1867, on the eve and in the wake of the 1863 uprising, which had led to the major reorganizations in the Institute's administration.

The experience of the school can also be partially reconstructed on the basis of the materials from Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in the city of Kyiv, F. 707 "Administration of Kyiv Educational District" and F. 442 "Office of the Kyiv, Podillia and Volyn' General-Governor." These holdings comprise the correspondence between General-Governor and administrator, as well as their reports to the Emperor, concerning both the



Institute and the schooling in the region in general. It is here that the information on the prohibition of Polish-language education, introduction of Russian into the teaching of Catholic religion, and discussions on the school's curriculum can be found.

The official history of Kiev Institute for noble girls, composed in 1888 by Mikhail Zakharchenko<sup>1</sup>, findings of the one-day census of 1874, conducted in Kiev on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, 1874 and published by the Southwestern Department of Russian Geographical Society<sup>2</sup>, as well as complete list of Little Russian noble families, put together by Vladislav Lukomskii and Vadim Modzalevskii<sup>3</sup>, complete my primary sources.

Structurally the thesis is organized into four chapters. The first chapter deals with some theoretical premises, important for the purposes of this work. I will start with a summary of a number of recent studies on the imperial nationality policy in the Western borderlands, focusing on the main approaches used by historians for assessing its meanings and practices. I will proceed with an overview of scholarly books on contemporary Kiev as providing a context for the Institute's development and stressing the efforts of the Empire, aimed at proving and ensuring the city's belonging to "the Russian space." The chapter will end with an outline of the discussions on the elite schooling in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Romanov Empire.

In the second chapter I will briefly describe the efforts of the imperial authorities, who for much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century worked hard to assure the Romanovs' claims to the Western borderlands, both current and historical. In addition, I will provide a sketchy analysis of these politics, aimed at re-claiming the region from the Poles, its depolonization and subsequent

---

<sup>1</sup> Mikhail Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo instituta blagorodnykh devits* (Kiev, 1888)

<sup>2</sup> Pavel Chubinskii, "Obzor dannykh o naselenii goroda Kieva po odnodnevnoi perepisi, proizvedennoi 2 marta 1874 goda" in *Zapiski Uigo-Zapadnogo otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva*. Tom 2. Za 1874 god (Kiev, 1875)

<sup>3</sup> See Vladislav Lukomskii and Vadim Modzalevskii, *Malorossiiskii gerbovnik* (Saint-Petersburg, 1914)

russification. I will then continue with an account of Kiev Institute for noble girls as a case study along to major lines. First, I will argue that both the Institute and the University were originally destined for acculturation of the local Polish elites and their mobility toward imperial ones – integration via education was a chief goal back then. By the same token, the former were granted substantial privileges in terms of access to schooling in the region, like that of free education in a highly expensive elite female boarding school. However, “nationalization” of the Empire together with the impact of the 1863 uprising changed dramatically imperial attitude to its Polish elites. As a result, following the second rebellion the latter were rather hindered access to education than encouraged to it. Thus, for instance, the local nobles lost the exclusive right to study their daughters in the Institute for free.

Second, I will show that Kiev Institute, alongside with Kiev University, was expected to stay for “the Russianness” of the city, reinforcing Kiev’s belonging to the Russian cultural and civilizational space. In its architecture, as well as in the projects concerning its name, proposed though not realized, the Institute clearly resembled the University. Furthermore, the places chosen for both schools’ buildings accounted for the beginning of a new, Russian, city center.

The third chapter explores the social and ethnic composition of the Institute’s students. I will start with preliminary remarks, framing thereby methods and approaches used in the prosopographical survey on the school’s student body. I will then continue with the social composition, underlining the changes in it over time, provided there were any. I will argue that during all the period under consideration here the Institute was striving to defend its status as first and foremost social elite enterprise, especially when, reacting to the developments of the modernizing Empire, was “obliged” to weaken its requirements, concerning the social origins

of its students. The chapter will end with an analysis of the ethnic composition, intended to show the collisions of the imperial nationality policy as regards its Polish elite.

The last chapter outlines the meanings and the content of the Institute's education, stressing its two different, yet mutually complementary sides. As Russian school, it was supposed to provide Russian education to mainly Polish elite of the Empire. Hence, I will focus on the approaches, methods, and textbooks used for teaching Russian language and literature, Russian history, and Russian geography, proclaimed the three chief subjects and the essence of Russian schooling. I will argue that this curriculum, introduced in line with Count Sergei Uvarov's "nationalization" of education, was expected to contribute to both establishing cultural affiliation and ensuring loyalty of the local elites to "the Throne and Fatherland."

As elite school, Kiev Institute was aimed not only at intellectual formation of its students, but also at moulding of their personalities, habits, and manners. Thus, I will show that both its status of a boarding school and its heavy emphasis on morality, as well as that its curriculum centered on living languages, literature, and arts were all together anticipated to turn the institution into an exceptional school of character formation.

Everyday life in imperial Kiev, as well as in imperial Southwestern Borderland was a multi-lingual affair, which brings certain ambiguity into the task of rendering places and names. For the sake of clarity and consistency, I have transliterated the names of places, institutions, and individuals according to the dominant language of the state at the time: thus, for instance, Kiev, not Kijów or Kyiv. By the same token, the terms "Little Russian/Little Russians," not "Ukrainian/Ukrainians" were used.

## Chapter I. Theoretical framework

### 1.1. Nationality policy in the imperial borderland: Western provinces in the 19th century Romanov Empire

In framing my approach, I rely on a number of recent studies on the nationality policy in the Romanov Empire's Western borderlands, which have challenged the assumption that it was uniformly repressive and/or even consistent<sup>4</sup>. Scholars argue that multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-confessional as they were, these lands presented a clear case of a complex and contested frontier, claimed by different actors, none of which was actually capable of fully

---

<sup>4</sup> Edward C. Thaden was the first to provide a generalizing analysis of the imperial nationality policy in its Western borderlands, which in his interpretation comprised all geographically western regions of the Romanov Empire, however different in their administration: Western Borderland itself, Kingdom of Poland, Baltic provinces, and Great Duchy of Finland. See Edward C. Thaden, *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855-1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); Idem, "Russification in Tsarist Russia" in *Interpreting History: Collective Essays on Russia's Relations with Europe*. Edward C. Thaden with collaboration of Marianna Forster Thaden (New York, Boulder, 1990), pp. 211-220; Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863-1914* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press), 1996; Witold Rodkiewicz, *Russian Nationality Policy in the Western Provinces of the Empire, 1863-1905* (Lublin: Scientific Society of Lublin, 1998); Mikhail Dolbilov and Alexei Miller (eds.), *Zapadnye okrainy Rossiiskoi imperii* (Moscow: NLO, 2006). This is the first synthetic study of the imperial nationality policy in the Western borderlands, understood broader as territories, which once belonged to the Polish Commonwealth, but were later, starting from the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, acquired by the Romanov Empire; Alexei Miller as well emphasized the collisions of the nationality policy in the imperial Western borderlands on the example of "the Ukrainian question". See Alexei Miller, *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Central European University Press, 2003); On the Southwestern Borderland see Daniel Beauvois, *Rosiiska vlada i polska shliakhta v Ukraini. 1793-1830* (Lviv: Kalvaria, 2007); originally published in French as *Pouvoir russe et noblesse polonaise en Ukraine 1793-1830* (Paris, 2003); Idem, *Shliakhtych, kripak i revizor* (Kyiv, 1996); originally published in French as *Le noble, le serf et le réviseur. La noblesse polonaise entre le tsarisme et les masses ukrainiennes: 1831—1863* (Paris, Archives contemporaines, 1986); Idem, *Bytva za zemliu v Ukraini 1863-1914. Poliaky v socio-etnichnykh konfliktakh* (Kyiv 1998) ; originally published in French as *La bataille de la terre en Ukraine (1863—1914). Les Polonais et les conflits socio-ethniques* (Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1993) ; On the Northwestern Borderland see Darius Staliunas, *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863* (New York: Rodopi, 2007); Mikhail Dolbilov, *Russkii krai, chuzhaia vera: Etnokonfessionalnaia politika imperii v Litve i Belarussii pri Alexandre II* (Moscow: NLO, 2010)

ensuring its claims. By pointing out the disputes, which divided imperial officials, both central and sent to the region, as well as politically active local Polish elites, historians portray these territories as a place of a constant struggle, in which consent was just as often as contest, emphasizing that none of the two was strong enough to either russify the region or polonize it. Stressing the heterogeneity of methods, used by the imperial authorities to prove their claims, both current and historical, to the above mentioned lands and to ensure the loyalty of local elites, these studies argue for the importance not to overestimate the consistency and the planned character of the imperial politics, as national narratives tend to do.

That these efforts often lacked coordination, were contradictory, limited in practice and largely unsuccessful is also underlined more than the strength of a russifying state: in the absence of clear criteria for “russification”/“Russianness” no consistency would have been possible. Witold Rodkiewicz, for instance, claims that instead of unsuccessfully trying to implant a Russian landowning class in the Western provinces, the Empire should have spent that money on the primary education of the local Little Russian and Belorussian peasantry in “Russian spirit,” but that imperial authorities were reluctant to think in such terms<sup>5</sup>.

Similarly, Theodore R. Weeks notes that in their “russification campaigns” imperial functionaries not always were guided by the ideas of “ethnic nationalism,” often pursuing quite different goals, like that of rationalizing the administrative practices of a modernizing state<sup>6</sup>. Alexei Miller as well stresses that many of the imperial officials remained hostile to the principles of modern nationalism, especially when nationalizing Empire began to contradict their social or any other identifications: a distrust to radical nationalism as capable of

---

<sup>5</sup> Rodkiewicz, *Russian Nationality Policy...*

<sup>6</sup> Weeks, *Nation and State...*, pp. 3-18

undermining the imperial state and the legitimacy of its traditional elites was strong enough even at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>7</sup>. Likewise, Darius Staliunas points out that the imperial functionaries though not so much in nationalist as in traditional categories, the most important of which was loyalty<sup>8</sup>.

However, the diversity of the imperial nationality policy in the Western borderlands should not be misunderstood for its weakness, as well as that it changed dramatically over the 19<sup>th</sup> century should not be overlooked. Historians, on whom I rely in framing my approach, argue that the nationality policy of the Romanov Empire in its Western borderlands by no means was a mere reaction of the state to the challenges it was facing, nor was it, however, a master plan of the Empire. Following the partitions and up to the 1831 uprising the imperial authorities preferred to rely on local elites and implemented indirect rule, which implied granting the latter substantial self-governmental powers and certain privileges in exchange, like that of separate education, tailored to the dominant Polish culture of the region.

The 1831 uprising refigured this situation to a large extent. Re-invented around that same time as primordially Russian, the Western provinces were now presented as Russian lands “spoiled” with Polishness – that is, polonized<sup>9</sup>. Thus, depolonization campaign was intended to re-claim the region from the Poles, reduce and eventually eliminate Polish influence there. Studies, on which I rely in my understanding of the imperial nationality policy, stress a clear-cut difference between depolonization of the Western borderlands, undertaken after the 1831 uprising, and affirmation of their “Russianness”/russification. Depolonization quite often, if not always, implied promoting a certain “ethnic group,” seen as a potential ally in a struggle with

---

<sup>7</sup> Miller, *The Ukrainian Question...*

<sup>8</sup> Staliunas, *Making Russians...*

<sup>9</sup> Up to the 1850s in the official discourse these lands were called “provinces returned from Poland”

the Polish influence across the region or as being able to undermine the Polish claims to these territories<sup>10</sup>. It did not yet, however, presuppose making it Russian. What it did presuppose was collaboration with the local Polish elites, intended to bring them closer to the Russian cultural and civilizational space. That is why, as it will be shown in the subsequent chapters, they were granted substantial privileges in term of access to education in the region.

Similarly, the affirmation of “the Russian character” of the Western borderlands, launched in the wake of the 1863 uprising, that is, russification of the region, should not be misunderstood for russification<sup>11</sup> of particular “ethnic groups,” which lived there. That not the uprising alone had triggered this shift from depolonization to russification has been emphasized by a number of historians: the Empire indeed was learning to employ nationalism for the purposes of its legitimization<sup>12</sup>. By promoting Russian landowners, Russian officials, and Russian institutions, the imperial state undoubtedly contributed to the expansion of “Russianness” of the provinces. However, as it is argued in the studies, I rely on, assimilation of individual “ethnic groups” was not always an aim. The latter was not, of course, a case with the Little Russians and the Belorussians, regarded as a component part of an all-Russian nation. Here the “national aspirations” were considered to be “the sabotage with the national body.”

---

<sup>10</sup> Consider the example of Jews, Germans, and Lithuanians in the region; see also chapter 3 on the Institute’s professors and teaching personal – replacing officials of Polish origin not necessarily implied substituting them with those of Russian one

<sup>11</sup> Here “russification” is understood as defined by Alexei Miller: “the actions or strategies that imply an effort to make someone Russian and/or an effort of someone to become Russian” in Alexei Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism* (Central European University Press, 2008), p. 50

<sup>12</sup> Thus, Mikhail Dolbilov and Alexei Miller argue for the significance of peasant emancipation, which presented the imperial authorities with the problem of the future national and political development of this large social estate, together the concept of an all-Russian nation gaining more and more support, both among Russian nationalists and governmental officials. See Dolbilov, Miller (eds.), *Zapadnye okrainy...*

However, assimilation of the Lithuanians and especially the Poles was hardly ever an end in itself. On the contrary, following the 1863 uprising, the latter were hindered access to education, most importantly through the so-called *numerus clausus*, which limited the number of those of Polish descent at each particular institution with 10 % or 20 %. What such a measure reveals about the imperial authorities' views on the possibility of russifying the Poles is quite clear.

In framing my approach, I also rely on Alexei Miller's suggestion to avoid using the term "russification," widely employed to define nationality policy in the Western borderlands, as being too loose of a concept<sup>13</sup>. Stressing the discussions over the meanings of "russification" among the imperial officials, especially in relation to different "ethnic groups," as well as over the meanings and criteria of "Russianness"<sup>14</sup> itself, Miller points out that the extent to which both the state and the society were ready to accept "russification" varied. In other words, not all "ethnic communities" were regarded as "capable" of becoming Russian, and "rejected assimilation"<sup>15</sup> was quite often.

He further very reasonably argues that instead of dragging all the varieties of the imperial nationality policy under the common umbrella of "russification," it is more accurate to speak about assimilation, acculturation, integration, and symbolic appropriation of space. In Miller's interpretation, which I share, acculturation "does not affect a sense of group belonging

---

<sup>13</sup> Miller, *The Romanov Empire...*, pp. 45-65

<sup>14</sup> For instance, in Slavophile discourse "Russianness" was connected first and foremost with Orthodoxy, while Mikhail Katkov stressed the importance of language; not to mention that quite often these concepts of religious and secular, modern and pre-modern understandings of "Russianness" were variously and tangentially combined. See Dolbilov, Miller (eds.), *Zapadnye okrainy...*, pp. 236-242, 277-279

<sup>15</sup> Consider the example of Jews



or identity, while the assimilation process inevitably does”<sup>16</sup>. As it will be shown in this thesis, the school politics of the Romanov Empire in regard to its Polish elite were aimed at ensuring the latter’s cultural and civilizational loyalty as well as its integration into the “imperial space,” but did not necessarily presuppose changes in its ethnic identification: turning the Poles into the Russians was hardly ever an aim. Yet that the imperial schools politics contributed a lot to the assimilation of those willing to adopt Russian culture and become Russian is also clear.

I find yet two suggestions very important for the purposes of this work. Both of them belong to Staliunas. First, he argues, in my opinion quite convincingly, that in interpreting the nationality policy, it is important to consider what the imperial authorities thought and wrote on the subject, that is, what were their intentions, reasoning and argumentation, these being more accurate categories of analysis than simple examination of what they actually did<sup>17</sup>. Thus, what may look as assimilation from the point of view of the modern nationalism might not be intended to make someone Russian back there<sup>18</sup>.

Second, sharing Miller’s assertion that not all of the “ethnic groups” were regarded as both “ours” and “capable” of becoming “Russians, Staliunas argues that “there is much evidence that certain local officials did not believe in the possibility at this time of Russifying the “Poles,” that is, “Catholics from the Northwestern region, excluding peasants”<sup>19</sup>. In his interpretation, this definition of “the Pole” indicates that the authorities did not understand the term *ethnically*. Catholics, the Poles were regarded as “them,” that is, “strangers,” who “would

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, p. 48

<sup>17</sup> Staliunas, *Making Russians...*, p. 57

<sup>18</sup> It is, of course, a quite different question how the imperial nationality policy was perceived by local elites – as russifying or not

<sup>19</sup> Darius Staliunas, “Did the Government Seek to Russify Lithuanians and Poles in the Northwestern Region after the Uprising of 1863-64?” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 5, Num. 2 (Spring 2004), New Series, p. 278

always remain the enemies of Russia”<sup>20</sup>. Even conversion was not considered as a sign of the Pole becoming the Russian; more importantly, change of religion by those of Polish origin was often viewed with suspicion<sup>21</sup>. Hence, Staliunas concludes that imperial politics towards its Polish elite should rather be understood as aimed at acculturation or integration, not assimilation<sup>22</sup>. This his observation is of a chief importance for the given thesis, which deals with the elite school, precisely destined for the Polish nobility coming from the three Southwestern provinces of the Romanov Empire.

### ***1.2. Kijów-Kiev-Kyiv: a city in the 19th century Romanov Empire***

Michael Hamm was the first to provide a synthetic study of Kiev and its population<sup>23</sup>. Even though his research was done during the Soviet period, and the author was denied access to archival holdings, this did not prevent him from producing an excellent overview of the city’s developments during the 19<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Hamm was widely criticized for viewing Kiev history as a conglomeration of separate histories of its ethnic sub-communities, in isolation from each other. His methodological division into “Polish Kiev,” “Ukrainian Kiev,” “Russian Kiev,” and “Jewish Kiev” though did contribute to the better understanding of the motivations, national activists were driven by, failed to note the continuous interaction between them, marked both by contest and consent. Rather than presenting Kiev as a very diverse urban center with very heterogeneous elite, Hamm has chosen

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, p. 283

<sup>22</sup> Staliunas, *Making Russians...*, p. 70

<sup>23</sup> Michael Hamm, *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800-1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)

to depict it as a place of a constant struggle, either of sub-communities with each other or of sub-communities with ephemeral imperial order.

Exactly this narrative of disintegration was challenged in a recent PhD dissertation by Faith Hillis<sup>24</sup>. In her study of urban politics in late imperial Kiev, Hillis shows that it indeed was a multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-confessional full-fledged city, where representatives of different “ethnic sub-communities” managed to play an integral role in politics, commerce, and culture<sup>25</sup>. Her assertion that imperial policy, especially economic one, often contradicted with imperial claims to Kiev as a Russian city is of a special interest for this research.

Similarly to Jeremy King<sup>26</sup>, whom she largely borrows methodology from, Hillis states that there was nothing “natural” about the creation of national identities, mainly because the masses, national activists were appealing to, often “remained apathetic or even hostile toward national identifications”<sup>27</sup>. In framing her approach, Hillis relies on Rogers Brubacker’s critique of the “identity” concept, replacing it with “identification” as a more accurate<sup>28</sup>. Again like King, she argues that at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> – beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century residents of multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-confessional urban center, Kiev became by that time, found

---

<sup>24</sup> Faith Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation: Urban Politics, Community and Violence in Kiev, 1863 – 1907*. Unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University, 2009)

<sup>25</sup> Hillis mentions even a distinctive Kiev dialect, which emerged in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, “as Ukrainian and Yiddish expressions infiltrated the Polish-inflected Russian spoken in the region” as proving “the atmosphere of accommodation that prevailed at the upper ranks of society”. Ibid, p. 1

<sup>26</sup> Jeremy King, *Budweisers Into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005)

<sup>27</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 30

<sup>28</sup> Rogers Brubacker and Frederick Cooper, “Beyond Identity”. *Theory and Society*. 29, No. 1 (February, 2000), pp. 1-47

themselves compelled to choose a single ethnic identity<sup>29</sup>. Similarly to King, she challenges the common perception of a state as a chief actor of “nationalization”<sup>30</sup>, emphasizing the importance of local politics in this process<sup>31</sup>.

It seems, however, that in claiming that the very practice of local politics together with the economic developments of the modernizing Empire “produced, challenged, and shaped these identifications”<sup>32</sup>, Hillis has followed the path opened by Ernest Gellner and other radical modernists all too faithfully. And though her suggestion to avoid assuming “that pre-existing class or ethnic identities determined historical subjects’ ideological views”<sup>33</sup> as methodologically constraining is very reasonable, her treatment of these identifications as purely constructed requires further explanation. Hillis fails to mention that to assert the created nature of “national identities” is not to deny that they rely on already existing realia<sup>34</sup>. Her study, nevertheless, is of particular interest for this thesis in providing a context for the Institute’s development, acknowledging the city’s importance for the Romanov Empire, both current and historical, and in describing the efforts of the imperial officials aimed at shaping Kiev as a Russian city.

---

<sup>29</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 4

<sup>30</sup> Here “nationalization” is meant as imposing or assuming a certain national/ethnic consciousness or identification; a definition given by King in King, “The Nationalization of East Central Europe” in *Staging the Past: the Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*. Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield (eds.) (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001), pp. 112-113

<sup>31</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 4

<sup>32</sup> Ibid

<sup>33</sup> Ibid

<sup>34</sup> For more on this see Alexander J. Motyl, “Inventing Invention: The Limits of National Identity Formation” in *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation*. Ron Suny and Michael Kennedy (eds.) (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), pp. 57-78

### 1.3. Educating rulers: elite schooling in the 19th century Romanov Empire

It is always difficult to define such vague notions as that of an “elite,” and paraphrasing what Dominic Lieven once said about aristocracy, everyone knows what elite means until one has to write on the subject<sup>35</sup>. The same problem of definition exists with regard to “elite schooling,” since it is necessary to find criteria, which enable to classify something as being that. I suggest referring as to “elite” to those schools, which were explicitly established to educate traditional social elites and part of whose self-representations was continuing emphasis of that fact. In such case, universities in the Romanov Empire were hardly elite schools, even though for much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in their social composition they remained noble enterprises<sup>36</sup>, while privileged military and both male and female civilian boarding schools – were.

Raison d’être of such schools was clear – social reproduction of traditional elites; that is why studying there required a certain inherited social status. Lieven argues that in most cases, and especially in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, at least theoretically it was not enough simply to be a noble: one had also to belong to a specific section of nobility – to be a child of a colonel or a civil counselor, or to stem from titled families or families ennobled before 1685<sup>37</sup>.

However, it would be a mistake to think that all the boys and girls studying in elite schools were necessarily coming from old, wealthy, and aristocratic families. Lieven states that

---

<sup>35</sup> Dominic Lieven, *The Aristocracy in Europe, 1815-1914* (Columbia University Press, 1993), p. xiii

<sup>36</sup> Consider, for instance, Lieven’s assertion that in 1862 73% of universities’ students in the Romanov Empire were of a noble origin. Dominic Lieven, *Russia’s Rulers under the Old Regime* (Yale University Press, 1989), p. 29

<sup>37</sup> Lieven, *Russia’s Rulers...*, p. 52-53; for more detailed information see Brockhaus and Efron. *Entsyklopedicheskii slovar* (XVII, pp. 859-860 for Alexander Lycee; XXII, pp. 588-589 for Corps des Pages; XXIV, pp. 922-923 for the School of Law)

schools' intake of children from "every-day service noble families" was also relatively large<sup>38</sup>. Rigorous social requirements in terms of access to education, provided by them, were rather part of schools' self-representations as highly prestigious and influential institutions than an actually conducted policy.

This trend became even clearer in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when modernizing Empire gave rise to the emergence of non-noble elites, as well willing to study their children in the state's most prestigious institutions, since entry there undoubtedly increased one's social standing. It would, nevertheless, be a mistake to assert that the schools did not try to defend their status as first and foremost social elite enterprises. By increasing entrance requirements, passing through which demanded a very good prior home training and establishing extremely high fees they were trying to maintain their sense of elitism<sup>39</sup>.

Lieven argues that in general "the schools indeed owed their aristocratic aura less to the social origins of their pupils than to their self-image and history"<sup>40</sup>. Founded by the Romanovs, they "attracted the patronage and the close attention of members of the imperial family"<sup>41</sup> and the latter never ceased to show them favor and respect, which obviously contributed to their sense of separateness and exclusiveness. In other words, the aristocratism of these schools was more symbolic and perceived than a real one.

Elite schools, unlike other educational institutions of the Empire, were aimed not only at intellectual formation of their pupils. Quite often boarding ones, they were closed worlds,

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 54-55. Lieven states that the only school that can be regarded as truly aristocratic is Coprs des Pages.

<sup>39</sup> For instance, those, studying at Alexander Lycee, were required to pay 400 rub per year, at School of Law – 350 rub/year, see Brockhaus and Efron...

<sup>40</sup> Lieven, *Russia's Rulers...*, p. 111

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, p. 108

whose task was to mould personalities, characters, habits, values, and manners<sup>42</sup>. That is why, their curriculum was extremely wide and diverse; more importantly, something in between a secondary school and a university, they were obliged to provide courses from both<sup>43</sup>. As a result, they “suffered somewhat from trying to teach too much in too little time”<sup>44</sup>. Nevertheless, by comparison with secondary schools, courses taught there were fuller and better structured; significantly, they were taught by better teachers with high academic reputations, since these schools always attracted good scholars as their professors and teaching personnel<sup>45</sup>.

Closer to the end of the century, however, the *raison d’être* of elite schools became somewhat unclear. The Empire no longer relied exclusively on its “first estate”; the latter was learning to live in a new world, where following the traditional ethos was not always an aim. The reason why these institutions survived was, perhaps, though the state was indeed modernizing, it, nevertheless, remained *noble* in its essence and its self-representations, of which privileged schools were a large part<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>42</sup> Lieven, *The Aristocracy...*, p. 161-162

<sup>43</sup> Idem, *Russia’s Rulers...*, p. 108

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, p. 178

<sup>45</sup> Lieven, *Russia’s Rulers...*, p. 110

<sup>46</sup> For some interesting remarks on how the Romanov Empire was trying to maintain its *noble* character in post-1861 period, quite often even despite the aspirations of its modernizing nobility see Seymour Becker, *Nobility and Privilege in Late Imperial Russia* (DeKalb IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1985); Becker also challenges a common perception of post-1861 nobility as a declining class, arguing that the latter was capable of and was indeed successfully modernizing itself

## Chapter II. Quest for loyalty: elite education and the Southwestern Borderland of the Romanov Empire

### 2.1. *Claiming the space*

Following the partitions of Poland at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Romanov Empire acquired vast territories to the west and south of Kiev up to the river Zbruch, which from then on made a new border with the Habsburg Empire. A part of Polish Eastern *Kresy*, these lands presented a clear case of a contested borderland: claimed by different actors, entailing the diversity of possible identity projects, these were multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-confessional territories with large Polish, Jewish and Little Russian populations.

For much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century imperial authorities worked hard to turn this part of the Eastern *Kresy* of the former Polish Commonwealth into the Southwestern Borderland of the Russian Empire. Having neither enough resources, nor enough competent state officials to immediately implement direct rule and in general feeling no need in it, Romanovs preferred to rely on local elites and hence, following the third partition, did not rush into making region's administrative structures conform to those of the rest of the Empire. The fragility of imperial claims to these territories was also reinforced by the fact that the local landowning elite was almost exclusively Polish, only in Kiev province in 1812 outnumbering Orthodox – that is, presumably ethnically non-Polish, forty to one<sup>47</sup>.

It was, hence, only after the 1831 uprising, when the loyalty of local Polish elite was questioned, that the strong administrative apparatus, aimed at reducing Polish influence, was

---

<sup>47</sup>Michael Hamm, *Kiev. A Portrait, 1800-1917* (Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 56. As Hamm states, in 1812 there were 43 667 Catholic noblemen in Kiev province as compared to 1 170 Orthodox ones



introduced: in 1832 Count Vasili Levashov was appointed as the first Governor-General of newly established Kievan General Governorate, which comprised three Southwestern provinces – Kiev, Podolia and Volyn’. And it was at this time when re-invention of Kiev as a Russian city began.

Prior to that Kiev was rather a small provincial town than a full-fledged city, having in 1817 a little more than 23 000 inhabitants, mostly of Jewish and Polish origins<sup>48</sup>. However, it suited perfectly for the cause of becoming a place, from where a Russian culture would disseminate across the Southwest. A capital of Kievan Rus’ state and a site of Eastern Slavs conversion to Christianity, Kiev was re-invented as “the Mother of Russian cities” and “the Cradle of Russian Orthodoxy” and out of a border city soon became a heartland – a place where Russia had originated<sup>49</sup>.

Such re-presentation of Kiev not just as a current Russian city but as a primordially Russian city was more than a mere change in perception: a contrast between the city’s newly ascribed significance and meaning and its actual condition of a declining “village” was too striking to leave it as it was. Hence, the Russian Crown launched a campaign to industrialize and modernize the city and to turn it into a real urban center. From then on Kiev experienced a

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, p. 21. Compare it to 215 000 inhabitants of Moscow in 1813, 300 000 citizens of Saint-Petersburg in 1800, and 56 300 people living in Vilna in 1811

<sup>49</sup> For more on this see Oleksii Tolochko, “Mapping the Lost Capital: Historical Topography of Kiev as an Antiquarian Project.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. Vol. 35, no. 1 (Fall 2001), pp. 85-91; Idem. “Zamitky z istorychnoi topografii domonhol’skogo Kyeva,” parts 1-5. *Kyivska starovyna*. No. 3 (1997), pp. 152-167; No. 5 (2000), pp. 144-163; No. 6 (2000), pp. 166-169; Idem. “Kyevo-Rus’ka spadshchyna v istorychnii dymtsi Ukrainy pochatku XIX st.” in *Ukraina i Rosia v istorychnii retrospektyvi: Narysy v 3-kh tomakh*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. Tom 1. Vladyslav Verstiuk, Viktor Horobets, Oleksii Tolochko, *Ukrainski proekty v Rosiiskii imperii* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2004), pp. 250-350

constant growth of population – from 29 000 inhabitants by 1835 to more than 50 000 by 1845<sup>50</sup>.

A now Russian city, to its west and south it remained, however, surrounded by lands, which were overwhelmingly “non-Russian” dominated – landed nobility was predominantly Catholic and Polish, entrepreneurs and artisans – Jewish<sup>51</sup>. While imperial officials were trying hard to prove Russia’s historical claims to these territories, economic developments contributed to the further enrichment of local Polish elite<sup>52</sup>. As Michael Hamm argues, a great capital this region began to enjoy since its lively engagement with the sugar industry concentrated mostly in the hands of the biggest Polish landowners, who had enough assets – both land and money – to make a highly-demanding sugar production profitable<sup>53</sup>.

Prior to the uprising of 1831 there was little attempt by imperial authorities to regulate the “ethnic” composition of the Southwest in general and Kiev in particular. After that – reclaiming the region from the Poles always included campaigns launched at those, considered to bear the most of the Polish influence there – *szlachta*. Between 1836 and 1845 an extensive audit of *szlachta*’s noble ranks was conducted. Those, who could not testify their noble origin, were declassified. As a result, 83% of Polish noblemen, mostly those belonging to *szlachta zagrodowa*, lost their noble status<sup>54</sup>, the latter bearing at least two long-lasting results. Daniel Beauvois states that reach Polish noblemen, who were able to confirm their status and had enough resources to purchase released property concentrated in their hands most of the land in

---

<sup>50</sup> Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 24

<sup>51</sup> Daniel Beauvois, *Shliaktych, kripak i revizor* (Kyiv, 1996), p. 68

<sup>52</sup> Faith Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation: Urban Politics, Community and Violence in Kiev, 1863 – 1907* (Unpublished PhD dissertation. Yale University, 2009), p. 46

<sup>53</sup> Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 24. Count Lev Potocki was the first to built the sugar beet refinery in Kiev province in 1834

<sup>54</sup> Beauvois, *Shliaktych...*, p. 205. Beauvois argues that of 410 000 Polish noblemen living in the Southwest in 1840, 340 000 were declassified

the Southwest, turning into wealthy and very influential magnates<sup>55</sup>, and those declassed, who were now equated with the smallholders, had to find another places where to go and what to do. Kiev, which by that time was confidently becoming the Empire's sugar capital, a center of commerce and finance, seemed to be the best option<sup>56</sup>. Faith Hillis argues that large Polish population moving to Kiev made newly re-claimed Russian city even more "Polish" than it used to be, though she fails to mention how great this "migration" actually was<sup>57</sup>.

However, it would be a mistake to think that imperial authorities did not strive to defend the "Russianness" of the city. Following the 1831 uprising, Orthodox merchants and traders were offered tax breaks and other economic incentives, if only they agreed to come to live in the city<sup>58</sup>. But more importantly, in 1836 Kiev was excluded from the Pale of Settlement, meaning that from then on Jews could live in the Southwest, Kiev province included, but not in the city itself<sup>59</sup>. Suddenly regarded as a part of a "Polish conspiracy" and "stubbornly" refusing to become culturally affiliated with the Russian state, they were no longer needed: even their economic importance to the city did not help them to avoid being expelled.

A sugar boom of the mid-century and great investments to the city contributed, nevertheless, to its continuing growth: if in 1861 Kiev could boast 70 500 inhabitants, in 1874 it had already more than 127 000 people<sup>60</sup>. Within some more than ten years the city indeed

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. Hamm states that even in 1861 as much as 90% of the land in the Southwest belonged to the Poles. See: Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 56

<sup>56</sup> By the mid-1850s, Kiev province accounted for almost half of the Empire's sugar production. See: Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 24

<sup>57</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 51, 84-85

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, p. 49

<sup>59</sup> Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 120

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, p. 25

became a multi-cultural, multi-lingual and multi-confessional urban center<sup>61</sup>. Several reasons can be indicated as leading to that. First, following the 1863 uprising yet another “depolonization” campaign, aimed first and foremost at elimination of the Polish *szlachta* as a *chief* landowning class in the Southwest, was launched. Laws, forbidding the Poles to acquire land in the region, implementing a 10% flat tax on estates, already held by them, and stating that the Orthodox should constitute at least half of the landowners, together with recruitments campaigns of bringing Russian settlers to the region resulted in the fact that by 1884 40% of the land there was owned by Orthodox as compared to 17% in 1865<sup>62</sup>. Thereby, cultural and demographic situation in the Southwest was refigured to a large extent. Those Poles, who lost their lands, following the first way of declassified after the 1831 uprising, went to Kiev, where soon began to account for the considerable part of the city’s technocratic elite, engineers, those bearing free professions, and upper-rank merchants<sup>63</sup>. In 1874 there were 10 409 Poles living in Kiev<sup>64</sup>.

Second, Kiev was again opened to Jewish settlement. Already in 1857 Kievan Governor-General Prince Illarion Vasil’chikov suggested that it would be “useful” to allow

---

<sup>61</sup> For how imperial national, urban and economic politics contributed to Kiev becoming a *less* Russian city, at least in ethnic terms, in the wake of the 1863 uprising see chapter *Russification and Capital: The Paradoxes of the Post-1863 de-Polonization* from the recent PhD dissertation by Faith Hillis, pp. 50-72

<sup>62</sup> Daniel Beauvois, *Bytva za zemliu v Ukraini 1863-1914. Poliaky v socio-etnichnykh konfliktakh* (Kyiv, 1998), pp. 31-46. Beauvois argues that corruption and a number of loopholes in legislation allowed the Poles to retain land in lien or to acquire new properties through joint stock companies; and those who managed to keep their estates after 1863 soon turned into powerful sugar industrialists, owning in 1884-1885 49 of the Empire’s 251 sugar refineries. Ibid, pp. 148-152

<sup>63</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 57. Hillis shows, for instance, that of 1494 merchants of the first and second guild registered in Kiev in 1864, 267 were Polish, comprising more than 17% of the city’s wealthiest merchants. Ibid, p. 51

<sup>64</sup> Pavel Chubinskii, “Obzor dannykh o naselenii goroda Kieva po odnodnevnoi perepisi, proizvedennoi 2 marta 1874 goda” in *Zapiski Uigo-Zapadnogo otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva*. Tom 2. Za 1874 god (Kiev, 1875), p. 202

highly acculturated and politically reliable Jewish merchants of the first and second guilds to invest in the city and reside there, which was done in 1859<sup>65</sup>. Three years later, in 1862, following the example of Jews' emancipation conducted by Alexander Wielopolski in Kingdom of Poland, Vasil'chikov argued for yet more broadening of Jewish rights, including that of purchasing land and immobile property in the Southwest, suggesting to use them as allies in the struggle against the Poles<sup>66</sup>. From then on, Kiev, a booming urban center, became a major destination for Jewish entrepreneurs; as a result, in 1874 Jews already comprised 13 803 of its residents<sup>67</sup>. Their commercial success helped them to integrate into the city's elite, which by no means was homogeneous, with ease: the latter, focused on acquiring a maximum profit from what it was doing, in its majority remained indifferent to ethnic or confessional claims<sup>68</sup>. It was only in the late 1870s – early 1880s that a group of ideologically extreme intellectuals began to challenge city's multi-cultural accommodation and namely, the status of its Jewish capitalists<sup>69</sup>.

Third, Kiev experienced a constant growth of Orthodox population, composed in its overwhelming majority of the imperial officials, students, urban workers, and emancipated peasants in search for job, reaching in 1874 the number of 100 056 people<sup>70</sup>. It is, however, statistically relatively difficult to assess the weight of the Little Russians and the Russians

---

<sup>65</sup> Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 121-122

<sup>66</sup> Alexei Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism. Essays in Methodology of Historical Research* (Central European University Press, Budapest New York, 2008), p. 112. Initially, Vasil'chikov's suggestion was accepted and the corresponding law was introduced, but as early as March of 1864 a new law renewed a ban on land and immobile property acquirement by Jews. Miller argues that in the wake of the 1863 uprising imperial officials in their relations with Polish *szlachta* preferred to rely on force and no longer needed Jews as allies.

<sup>67</sup> Chubinskii, *Obzor dannykh o...*, p. 202

<sup>68</sup> Hillis. *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 85

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, p. iii

<sup>70</sup> Chubinskii, *Obzor dannykh o...*, p. 202; though Hamm, for instance, argues that emancipation of peasants did not seriously affect the city, referring to the history of Kiev, written in 1860s by Nikolai Zakrevskii, where there was no word about this, and the fact that population of Kiev changed little between 1861 and 1870: from 70 050 to 70 591, respectively. Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 25

within this group. Though one-day census of 1874 asked for “mother tongue,” its findings can hardly be regarded as representatively describing the city’s ethnic composition, mainly because people often did not know what was “mother tongue”<sup>71</sup>. Bilingual or even multilingual as they were, they rather indicated Russian as their first language, meaning, of course, the language they most often used.

In general, it is safe to say that by the mid-1870s Kiev became an extremely diverse urban center. According to one day census of 1874, representatives of over forty “nationalities” lived there<sup>72</sup>. Similarly to other cities in the Romanov Empire, less than one-third of Kiev residents were born there<sup>73</sup>. Between 1870 and 1889, the city’s population increased yet by 142%, while the rate of growth in Kiev’s Polish and Jewish populations was even greater – 287% and 264%, respectively<sup>74</sup>. A city of multiple identifications, it however managed to live up to the early 1880s without major conflicts. It was only with the growth of national movements at the turn of the century, which taught people to think *ethnically*, that Kiev out of the diverse city turned into the city of contested identities.

---

<sup>71</sup> Of those 100 056 who were Greek-Orthodox and thus regarded as ethnic Russians, Little Russians and Belorussians 58 173 claimed Russian to be their mother tongue; 38 553 – Little Russian/Ukrainian; 1479 – Belorussian; 1 851 people did not answer that question at all. That people often did not know what was “mother tongue” was pointed out by Chubinskii. Chubinskii, *Obzor dannykh o...*, p. 201. It is also worth mentioning that by asking for “mother tongue,” Little Russian activists anticipated to reduce the level of assimilation among the Little Russians

<sup>72</sup> Ibid, pp. 191-194

<sup>73</sup> Ibid, p. 190. According to the census, only 28, 33 % of Kiev inhabitants in 1874 had been born there; 45, 52 % came from the three Southwestern provinces; 13, 28 % - from the imperial core; 8, 27 % - from the Northwest; 1, 86 % - from Kingdom of Poland; 1, 71 % were foreign citizens; 0, 60 % had been born in Baltic provinces; 0, 07 % - in Grand Duchy of Finland; 0, 21 % came from Caucasus; and 0, 15 % - from Siberia. It is interesting that of 1, 71 % foreign citizens living in Kiev in 1874 and thus comprising 2170 people 40, 02 % had been born in Hohenzollern Empire and 29, 25 % - in Habsburg Empire; the remaining number came from other European countries.

<sup>74</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 72-73. Hillis argues that an astounding growth of Polish population again is explained by a flood of declassed *szlachta* into the city

## 2.2. *Creating the space: a case study of Kiev Institute for noble girls*

Following the 1831 uprising an extensive network of Polish educational institutions in the Southwest, the Poles were prior permitted to operate, was abolished. If establishing of a strong administrative apparatus in the region was first and foremost aimed at reducing Polish influence in politics and commerce, then this operation was thought to minimize the influence of Polish language and culture. The latter by no means was an easy task to do. A large school network across the Western Borderlands, the Poles enjoyed prior to 1831, did contribute to the further polonization of the region. Beauvois notes that the “Polishness” of these territories was so great that even nobles of Orthodox origin – that is, presumably ethnically Little Russians, and Russians spoke Russian with a Polish accent<sup>75</sup>. Polish was also used as the language of administration, and it was only after the 1831 uprising that Russian was introduced instead. Most of the signs in Kiev, including those on the local headquarter of the nobility, were in Polish and city’s officials did not bother to translate them into Russian<sup>76</sup>.

It was only after the 1831 uprising that imperial policies aimed at re-claiming the region from the Poles became more or less consistent. A new cultural policy launched by the Russian Crown required re-drawing of already existing educational districts, this being more than a mere administrative action. In 1832 Vilna educational district, created in 1803 and tailored to the dominant Polish culture of the local elite, the manifestation of a symbolic unity of the Polish

---

<sup>75</sup> Beauvois, *Bytva za zemliu...*, p. 31

<sup>76</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 42. For instance, the sign on Kiev noblemen committee read “Dworzańska Kommissja” in huge golden letters. See Hamm. *Kiev...*, p. 56; precisely this prevalence of Polish language and culture in the Southwest, and especially among the elites, allowed Polish intellectuals to insist that Kijów was a Polish city.

Eastern *Kresy* within the Russian Empire<sup>77</sup>, ceased to exist; and three southwestern provinces received Kiev educational district instead.

Instead of closed Vilna University a new, Russian one was established in Kiev in 1834 with Volyn' Lycee transferred to Kiev as its nucleus<sup>78</sup>. Johannes Remy argues that imperial authorities hoped that the University would not only weaken the capacity of the local elite to pursue “a revanchist program,” but also would develop Orthodox intellectual potential across the Southwest, so the representation of the Poles within all spheres of life would fade away in a natural way<sup>79</sup>. Although his argumentation is true to a large extent, Remy fails to mention that the University was also intended to bring local elites closer to the Russian civilizational space, to acculturate them, and to contribute to their mobility toward and integration into imperial elites. Loyalty rather than ethnic identity was in quest there<sup>80</sup>.

It is clear that because of its newly ascribed meaning, Kiev as a place for a Russian university was a not a random choice. Not without purpose was the University also given the name of Saint Vladimir, in honor of a Kievan Rus' Prince of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, who converted his state to Christianity: once again the city was enshrined as “the Cradle of Russian

---

<sup>77</sup> Vilna educational district comprised eight Western provinces of the Romanov Empire – former Lithuanian and Rus' lands, regarded in the Polish tradition as the Eastern *Kresy* of the Commonwealth.

<sup>78</sup> It is worth mentioning that though theoretically University was opened to anyone (serves, obviously, excluded) and its aim was rather social reproduction of elites by education, who were to fill bureaucratic posts, than traditional social elites, for the much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century it remained a noble enterprise. For instance, 87% of those in attendance in 1834-1863 were of noble origin. See Leszek Zasztowt, *Kresy 1832-1864. Szkolnictwo na ziemiach litewskich i ruskich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* (Warszawa, 1997), p. 138-139

<sup>79</sup> Johannes Remy. *Higher Education and National Identity: Polish Student Activism in Russia, 1832-1863* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000), p. 48

<sup>80</sup> Although it is also true that imperial policy towards the University and its students changed a lot after the 1863 uprising. See chapter 3



Orthodoxy”<sup>81</sup>. From then on, the University stood for the “Russianness” of the city, reinforcing Kiev’s belonging to the Russian cultural and civilizational space<sup>82</sup>. The University was not, however, the only Russian educational institution established in the city with the aim of drawing the region from the sphere of Polish influence. Simultaneously with it, its “female version” – Kiev Institute for noble girls – was opened in 1838.

In August of 1888, at the celebration of the Institute 50-years anniversary, the director of Kiev-Funduklei and Kiev-Podolia female gymnasiums Sergei Grigor’ev stated:

Today marks exactly 50 years since the opening of Kiev Institute for noble girls – this first purely Russian female educational institution in the Southwestern provinces (...). Difficult and high task was entrusted to it: to support, strengthen and develop religious, moral and purely Russian elements in the above mentioned region<sup>83</sup>.

Grigor’ev was very precise in marking the most important feature of the institution – its “Russianness”, called to create a new, Russian, space in the recently re-claimed territories. In this, he was surprisingly close to Count Vasilii Levashov, Kievan Governor-General, who in July of 1833 first wrote to Nicholas I, suggesting establishing in Kiev a privileged school for the daughters of nobility coming from the Southwestern Borderland. In his report, Count noted that it was because of a lack of “proper institutions and education” that local elite remained hostile to “the Throne and Fatherland”<sup>84</sup>. Sharing Count Sergei Uvarov’s disregard to private education as “filled with national prejudices,” which “by no means brought them [the Poles]

<sup>81</sup> Cynthia Whittaker, *The origins of modern Russian education: an intellectual biography of count Sergei Uvarov, 1786-1855* (Northern Illinois University Press, 1984), p. 193

<sup>82</sup> Though it is true that Kiev University became also a place where in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Little Russian/Ukrainian movement had originated. For more detailed information see Alexander Dmitriev, “Ukrainskaia nauka i ee imperskie konteksty”. *Ab Imperio* (4/2007) <http://abimperio.net/cgi-bin/aishow.pl?state=showa&idart=2018&page=1&idlang=2&Code=> (latest accessed: 05.03.2011)

<sup>83</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 614, ark. 137

<sup>84</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 1, ark. 4-7. Further references to this document in the text list the relevant pages in brackets.

closer to Russia,” Levashov argued for the necessity of creating a network of public schools, aimed at establishing a cultural affiliation of local Polish elite to the Empire (ark. 6). General-Governor claimed that men’s education alone was not enough to bring up “a future generation,” loyal to the state, since women’s influence in the family was just as significant; that is why he argued that female education should also be posed under the government’s supervision and stood up for the immediate establishing of Kiev Institute for noble girls (ark. 5).

Levashov was well aware of that it would hardly be an easy task to interest local nobles in sending their daughters to the Russian institute, especially as long as they could continue to study their children in a hidden network of Polish private schools and pensions (ark. 6). He did not, however, argue for their persecution and closing. His conviction was that that distrust the Poles had towards the Russian educational institutions was to a large extent a result of the Empire’s failure to show them the advantages of public schools (ark. 5). Count noted that the only way to remedy the situation was to encourage local elites’ education there, so “they could see with their own eyes” what Russian schools could boast (ark. 6-7). Levashov stated that Poltava Institute for noble girls hardly suited that role, mainly because of its poorness and Poltava’s relative distance, while Kiev, a center of “the provinces returned from Poland,” was a perfect choice: with enough money invested in it the Institute could turn into a highly prestigious elite school (Ark. 5).

Since the Emperor did not hasten with the answer, in November of 1833 Levashov again wrote to Nicholas I, asking for permit to open an institute for noble girls in Kiev and repeating his assertion of the importance of the Russian institution for the “proper education” of local

elite<sup>85</sup>. At this time he enlisted the support of Kiev educational district's administrator Egor von Bradke, who also appealed to the Emperor, stating that:

(...) the Russian government should immediately take a lead in female education as well, since in the region women have great influence over the youth and support in it hostile, sometimes even up to the fanaticism, attitude towards the Russian state<sup>86</sup>.

In January of 1834 Nicholas I finally gave his positive answer and entrusted Levashov with the task of elaborating the school's statute. Together with von Bradke they developed the statute, which almost literally repeated that of Poltava Institute with one significant difference: if in Poltava could study noble girls from wherever they were, in Kiev, according to the Governor-General and administrator's suggestions, only the daughters of nobility coming from the Southwest should have the right to study, both for money and – the needy ones – for free<sup>87</sup>. In August of 1834 they received back the statute with the Emperor's remarks on it, wondering if it not be better to allow Russian officials, sent to the region, as well to study their children in the school<sup>88</sup>. Levashov replied with the negative answer, insisting that the Institute's first and foremost aim was to show the local Polish nobility the advantages of schooling, provided by the Russian state, and to educate it in a "proper manner" – that is, loyal to "the Throne and Fatherland"<sup>89</sup>. He further argued that to permit Russian officials to educate their daughters in the Institute would turn it into something similar to Poltava Institute, where "only the children of poor officials of Russian origin study, while Polish nobility shows no favor and support"<sup>90</sup>.

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, ark. 8

<sup>86</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 614, ark. 14

<sup>87</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 1, ark. 53

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, ark. 51-52

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, ark. 5

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, ark. 5, 53-54

Levashov main goal was to attract as many as possible of the local elite to active participation in Russian institutions; hence, he proposed to entrust the Institute to the nobility of the Southwest. According to his suggestions, provincial nobility assemblies obtained the right to choose among the nobles of the respective provinces those, who deserved the most to study their daughters for free, though final decision was left to the Governor-General<sup>91</sup>. Furthermore, he also suggested including the representatives of local nobility into the Institute's Council, so they could take part in the Institute's administration as well. Count's arguments convinced the Emperor and in November of 1834 Nicholas I confirmed the statute, leaving only one of Levashov's requests not complied: free education was indeed guaranteed only for those from the Southwestern Borderland, while the paid one was open to anybody, wherever they might come from<sup>92</sup>.

It is clear from Levashov's reports to the Emperor and his correspondence with von Bradke and Little Russian Governor Prince Nikolai Repnin that he saw the Institute not only as serving pure educational purposes, but also as bearing a symbolic meaning. Not accidentally did he pay so much attention to the questions of choosing the place for the Institute's own building, which was yet to be built, as well as to how the latter should look like. In his letter to von Bradke from the 26<sup>th</sup> of November of 1833, he rejected the idea of building the school in Vladimerskoe (Klovskoe) urochishche on Pechersk, as it was originally planned, calling it to be "inappropriate" and proposed a new place – Lipki, an area, which rises just above Kreshchatetskaia ravine, claiming to have chosen it because of its central location between the

---

<sup>91</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 13, ark. 59

<sup>92</sup> DAK, f. 144, op.1, spr.1, ark. 79

Old City, Podol, Pechersk and the would-be New City<sup>93</sup>. von Bradke supported the idea, adding one more reason in favor of that place: closeness to the University would be convenient for the teachers<sup>94</sup>. None of them was stopped by the fact that the location they chose belonged to the University, which had its own plans towards it. At the beginning of 1835 they wrote to Count Sergei Uvarov, asking for his permit to retain the land and proposing to pay off to the University its value, and received what was asked for<sup>95</sup>.

The choice of place, made by Levashov, could hardly be better. Even at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, despite the fact that the territory, adjacent to the Institute's building, was almost completely built up, the Institute, due to its location at the height, stood apart and together with the surrounding garden dominated that whole part of the city, called Dvortsovaia, attracting, as noted by Mikhail Zakharchenko, attention by its picturesqueness<sup>96</sup>. More importantly, together with the place chosen for the University's building, it counted for the beginning of a new, Russian, city center.

Levashov paid a lot of attention to the choice of the Institute's appearance as well. He entrusted the task of constructing the Institute's building to the Building Committee of Kiev University of Saint Vladimir with architector Vikentii Beretti as its head<sup>97</sup>. Beretti, following his own plan of consolidation of the first classical structural ensemble in the new Russian city center, in 5 years, from 1838 till 1843, erected the 4-flour 100m long building in the style of

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, ark. 10

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, ark. 11

<sup>95</sup> Mikhail Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo instituta blagorodnykh devits* (Kiev, 1888), p, 17

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, srp. 3, ark. 3

late classism, very similar to that of the University, and painted it in yellow and white, reinforcing thereby building's belonging to the new, precisely planned, city center<sup>98</sup>.

The efforts to shape a new Russian space in the city became even clearer, when the position of Kievan General-Governor was occupied in 1837 by Dmitrii Bibikov. During the years of 1838-1850, Bibikov's engineers constructed bridges and streets, mostly broad avenues, and elaborated a systematic address system, which assisted Kiev's inhabitants in "knowing" the city and each other<sup>99</sup>. Hillis argues that by transforming what had once been a conglomeration of separate settlements into a single city, Bibikov's program also explicitly emphasized Russian claims on Kiev, both historical and current<sup>100</sup>. Furthermore, complaining that the street names often "do not correspond to their prominent buildings, to important historic monuments, and to recent events," Governor-General established a committee to re-name streets after saints (St. Timothy's Street), state institutions (Gendarme and Kadet Ways), rulers (Tsar's and Elizabeth's Boulevards), and historical figures (Iaroslav's Embankment, Nestor's Street)<sup>101</sup>.

A part of this symbolic appropriation of space was also Bibikov's attempt to re-name Kiev Institute for noble girls, "corresponding to its significance and meaning." In April of 1844 he wrote to the Emperor suggesting granting the school a new name, modeled on that of the Imperial University of Saint Vladimir – Imperial Institute of Saint Olga, in honor of the Kievan Rus' Princess of the 10<sup>th</sup> century, who was the first among the Kievan rulers to convert to Christianity:

---

<sup>98</sup> All newly-erected buildings there were painted in these colors, except for that of the University, painted in dark red. Pavlo Al'oshyn, "Batko i syn Beretti (z arkhitekturnoi spadshchyny)," *Arkhitektura Radianskoi Ukrainy*, 1938, № 3, pp. 39-48

<sup>99</sup> Mykhailo Rybakov, *Nevidomi ta malovidomi storinki istorii Kyeva* (Kyiv: Kyi, 1997), p. 185, 188

<sup>100</sup> Hillis, *Between Empire and Nation...*, p. 46

<sup>101</sup> Rybakov, *Nevidomi ta malovidomi*, p. 186, 189-190, quotation on page 186

Kiev – the cradle of saint Orthodoxy and our Russian government – is called by Your Majesty to a new great and heroic deed: to enlighten this land with Russian, moral education. To fulfill this Regal thought, Your Majesty wished to establish in Kiev the University and the Institute and dedicated the former to the honor of the Great Enlightener of Russia Prince Vladimir, equal to the apostles. Together with this Great name lives in Kiev and in every Russian heart the memory of Saint Great Princess Olga, who was the first to light up this land with Christianity. Hence, would not Your Majesty mind to honor the Princess, dedicating her Kiev Institute (...) <sup>102</sup>

Once again Bibikov called to enshrine the city as “the Cradle of Russian Orthodoxy,” but at this time this was not realized: the Institute retained its initial name; just the graduation was shifted to the 11<sup>th</sup> of July, the day of Saint Olga <sup>103</sup>.

Clearly, the University and the Institute were established simultaneously with more or less identical goals: not only to stand for “the Russianness” of Kiev, shaping the recently re-claimed space as Russian, but also to integrate local elites into imperial ones and to drag them into the Russian cultural and civilizational space. Depolonization of the region, the Empire had undertaken after the 1831 uprising, was not, however, its russification. Imperial officials promoted Russian institutions, which were designed to reduce and eventually eliminate Polish influence in these territories, but they did not yet want to make them Russian. It was only at the beginning of the 1860s, when, as Alexei Miller argues, “the concept of an-all Russian nation that included all Eastern Slavs had already become quite dominant, not only in the discourse of Russian nationalism, but in the views of governmental circles” that depolonization alone ceased to be enough: the affirmation of “the Russian character” of the region was also needed <sup>104</sup>. In

---

<sup>102</sup> TSDIAK, f. 442, op. 1, spr. 4823, ark. 18

<sup>103</sup> Ibid

<sup>104</sup> Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism...*, p. 113

line with this, the status of Kiev Institute for noble girls as providing free education solely to the daughters of the needy local (*read - Polish*)<sup>105</sup> nobility was also questioned.

In 1859 Kievan General-Governor Prince Illarion Vasil'chikov wrote to Vitalii Shulgin, who at that time hold the position of the Institute's inspector of classes, responsible for the form and the content of education provided by it, stating that he considered it to be "not right" that only children of the nobles coming from the Southwest could study there for free<sup>106</sup>. Vasil'chikov was also against the fact that the Institute's administration was virtually entrusted to the local (*read - Polish*) nobility, while, in his opinion, the prime task of the government was to support and encourage "indigenous Russian population of the Southwest" (ark. 28). Two years later, in 1861, in his note to the head of the Third Section and the Gendarmie Board, Vasil'chikov claimed approximately the same, at this time referring to Kiev University:

The domination of the Polish element in the university gives the Poles an opportunity to retain their character within a circle separate from the Russians and form their own political aims. Therefore, I consider it to be necessary to make Russian element dominate in the university and thereby restrict the admission of the Poles<sup>107</sup>.

In this, as well as in stating that local Polish elite *in corpore* was "hostile towards the state" and "politically opposing to it," Vasil'chikov shared the chief assumptions of the Russian nationalists, and already by the beginnings of the 1860s many of this thoughts were met with understanding by some, if not lots of imperial officials<sup>108</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> Consider Hamm's assertion that at the beginning of the 1860s 87% of the landed nobility in Kiev province were of Catholic origin; in Volyn' – 93%; and in Podillia – 89%. See Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 56

<sup>106</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 215, ark. 27-28. Further references to this document in the text list the relevant pages in brackets.

<sup>107</sup> Quoted in Staliunas, *Making Russians...*, p. 101

<sup>108</sup> Dolbilov, "Polonofobia i politika russifikatsii v Severo-Zapadnom krae imperii v 1860-e gg" in *Obraz vraga*. Sost. L. Gudkov (Moscow: OGI, 2005), p. 136



Archival holdings do not contain the answer, given to Vasil'chikov, but that he was heard is clear: in the wake of the 1863 uprising exactly his suggestions were taken as the basic principles for the changes being introduced. At the end of the year a general reform of the Institute's administration was conducted: that part of the Institute's statute, which guaranteed a right for free education solely for the daughters of the needy nobles coming from the Southwestern provinces, ceased to exist; instead, a new system of scholarships was introduced, eligible for which from then on were all the girls, irrespectively to where they came from<sup>109</sup>. As a result, local nobles, initially entrusted with the task of choosing whom to study for free in the Institute, lost the right to do it. Furthermore, in 1866 it was decided that starting from 1867 the Institute's Council would consist only of three people – the school's director, inspector of classes and head of economic department: representatives of local nobility were excluded from it<sup>110</sup>.

The argumentation for these decisions was too much similar to that of Vasil'chikov to be a pure accident. Introducing the changes, Shulgin argued that they would not only contribute “to elimination of Polish spirit and turn of minds,” but also help “to strengthen the Russian origins of the region”<sup>111</sup>.

That the ideas like those of Vasil'chikov appeared before the uprising but were implemented only under the influence of it reveals one very important thing: imperial policies aimed at re-claiming the region from the Poles, whether or not they included also an affirmation

---

<sup>109</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 21, ark. 8; similarly to that, the so-called *numerus clausus* were introduced at Kiev University, which meant that from then the number of students of Polish origin in the University could not exceed 20%. See Zashtowt, *Kresy...*, p. 137, 141

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

<sup>111</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 244, ark. 15

of its “Russianness,” by no means were mere reaction to the uprisings or served purely punitive purposes; neither were they, however, a grand strategy of the Empire.

Yet that the imperial attitude to its Polish elite changed dramatically over these years is apparent. The Poles, seen as “failing to integrate,” with the second rebellion perceived as a confirmation of that, were no longer trusted. More important, with the concept of an all-Russian nation confidently gaining support, they were now regarded as chief rivals in the struggle for the Eastern Slavs. Hence, their acculturation and integration via education was no longer needed.

## Chapter III. Profile of an elite: social and ethnic composition of the Institute's students

### 3.1. Preliminary remarks

During fifty years under consideration here – that is, from 1838 till 1888, Kiev Institute for noble girls was attended by 2202 students, of which 1283<sup>112</sup> completed their course of studies, while 672 left the school without having completed theirs<sup>113</sup>. Though reasons for leaving varied, most of them had to do with the fathers obtaining positions in the other parts of the Empire and thus being obliged to move: of 672 girls 564 left the Institute precisely because of this<sup>114</sup>. Within the indicated period, the number of those leaving the school per year was approximately the same. Hence, no speculations can be made as to whether school leaves were connected with some other events happening at that time as well.

During the years of 1838-1888 the Institute experienced a constant growth of students, starting from 40 in 1838 and up to 253 in 1888, boasting on the average 185 students per year<sup>115</sup>. It should be noted, however, that this growth was due to the increase in number of those, studying for money. The number of those, studying for free – both prior and after 1863, when the new system of scholarships was introduced – remained fixed: comprising 60 per year in the first case and a set number per scholarship per year in the second case.

This chapter is based on the lists of students in attendance that comprise both future graduates and those enrolled without having completed their studies. Providing a lot of useful insights, such an approach lacks, however, some very important details. Thus, in the absence of

---

<sup>112</sup> This number does not include those who were to graduate in 1888

<sup>113</sup> Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo...*, pp. 62-63, 84-85

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid, p. 63

the lists of would-be students and graduates it is impossible to assess the so-called “hidden history” of admission and exclusion – that is, whether certain social and/or ethnic groups were preferred as compared to the others in terms of access to education.

That data on students is very poorly preserved is yet another problem. While original intention was to identify students every tenth years, the only available information was for the years 1838, 1840, 1843, 1847, 1857, 1862, 1876, 1880, and 1888. More importantly, the lists contain data on students’ names, years of enrollment, social origins and religious affiliations only, which seems hardly enough for a real prosopographical survey. Such classic background variables as “mother tongue” and “place of birth” are missing. However significant, on the other hand, they would yield minimal information to this particular case study. Coming from very diverse territories, bilingual or even multilingual as they were, students and their parents would rather declare as their first language the most frequently used one<sup>116</sup>. Furthermore, often being born when their fathers were still young adults starting their carriers, they moved every time their fathers were sent to different regions. The latter considerably diminishes the importance of “birthplace” as representatively describing regional ties.

Two other fundamental background variables – that of family’s social standing and that of religion – are, fortunately, well-preserved. Data on students’ social origins include references to nobility; father’s standing within *The Table of Ranks*, if in service; as well as indications of aristocratic titles (See Table 1). What concerns the ethnic composition of the Institute’s students, here certain approximations were inevitable<sup>117</sup>. Differentiation by names, as done, for

---

<sup>116</sup> That was precisely a problem with the results of the one-day census of 1874 in Kiev as to the languages spoken. See chapter 2

<sup>117</sup> It is worth mentioning that Jews were not permitted to study at the Institute, similarly to other elite schools of the Romanov Empire

instance, in prosopographical studies on the students' body in Habsburg Empire, was not quite possible. There "the ethnic character" of students' names and surnames is regarded as providing representative ethnic data, since a clear distinction can be made between names of German, Magyar and Slav origins<sup>118</sup>. In this particular case study, with most names and surnames being Slav, such a distinction would not be plausible. This left religious affiliation as the only background variable with reference to ethnicity (See Table 2).

Indication of ethnic origins based on confession seems, nevertheless, methodologically reasonable, since Catholics in the region were most likely to be of Polish background, Lutherans – of German, while Orthodox – of Little Russian and Russian. The latter two both being Orthodox is precisely a reason why it is statistically relatively difficult to assess the exact number of each of them among the Institute's students. However, a complete list of Little Russian noble families, published by Vladislav Lukomskii and Vadim Modzalevskii in 1914, contributed to the task of distinguishing between these two "ethnic groups," as least in regard to those, belonging to nobility<sup>119</sup>.

Attempting to be as complete and exhaustive as permitted by available archival sources, this survey lacks, however, some very important details. Thus, such significant fact as that of social and/or religious affiliation of the body granting the scholarship in the post 1863 period, in relation to the social and/or religious background of those receiving it remained outside of the scope of this research. Similarly, the relations between social and/or religious origins and

---

<sup>118</sup> See for instance the recent special issue of *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*. Victor Karady (ed.), *Elite Formation in the Other Europe (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Century)/Elitenformation im "anderen" Europa (19.-20. Jahrhundert)*. *Methods. Cleometrics*. No. 124. HSR Vol. 33 (2008) 2

<sup>119</sup> See Vladislav Lukomskii and Vadim Modzalevskii, *Malorossiiskii gerbovnik* (Saint-Petersburg, 1914)

academic achievements were not analyzed<sup>120</sup>, as well as tracing of the future lives of the Institute's students was not accomplished. Nevertheless, the main goal of this survey – that is, to examine whether or not and why the percentages of various social and religious cohorts among the Institute's students were increasing or decreasing in time was realized.

### **3.2. Maintaining the sense of elitism: social composition of the Institute's students**

According to the statute of Kiev Institute for noble girls, confirmed in 1834, only the legitimate daughters of both hereditary and personal nobles had the right to study there, irrespectively of those sections of nobility they stamped from<sup>121</sup>. In other words, to attend Kiev Institute one did not have to belong to a specific part of a noble estate, as was the case, for instance, with Alexander Lycee or Corps des Pages, but simply to be a noble<sup>122</sup>. As an exception, the similar right was obtained by the daughters of clergy, employed in the school for the purposes of conducting masses and giving religious instruction<sup>123</sup>. Hence, of 37<sup>124</sup> students in attendance in 1838 all but one were of a noble origin: 28 of them belonged to the hereditary nobility, while 8 – to personal<sup>125</sup>. It is interesting that overwhelming majority of students came

---

<sup>120</sup> Such important background variable as “previous education,” which can provide with interesting data on the level of education among different social and religious denominations, was of no use for this study for two reasons. First, females at that time would rather receive home training, irrespectively of their social and religious background. Second, similarly to other elite schools in the Romanov Empire, the Institute enrolled children at relatively young age – from ten to thirteen; thus the school was very likely to be the first educational institution visited

<sup>121</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 98, ark. 1-13

<sup>122</sup> See Brockhaus and Efron, *Entsyklopedicheskii slovar* (XVII, pp. 859-860 for Alexander Lycee; XXII, pp. 588-589 for Corps des Pages; XXIV, pp. 922-923 for the School of Law)

<sup>123</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 98, ark. 1-13

<sup>124</sup> There were 40 girls in attendance in 1838, but data is available only for 37 of them

<sup>125</sup> Lists of students in attendance in 1838 and 1840 are preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 85, ark. 26-45

from rank and file service noble families: of 36 of them only three were regarded as landowning nobility, while the rest were presented according to their standings within *The Table of Ranks*<sup>126</sup>. Another important observation is that one third of those in service possessed the lowest positions and ranks: ninth and lower<sup>127</sup>.

The situation changed slightly within the next ten years: in 1840 of 60<sup>128</sup> students in attendance 59 were daughters of nobles<sup>129</sup>; in 1843 – 163 of 166<sup>130</sup>; and in 1847 – 193 of 197 studying in the Institute at that year<sup>131</sup>. Similarly, they belonged predominantly to the hereditary nobility, in 1840 outnumbering personal four to one (48 as compared to 11)<sup>132</sup>; in 1843 – eight to one (145 as compared to 18)<sup>133</sup>; and in 1847 – almost nine to one (173 as compared to 20)<sup>134</sup>. Furthermore, as in 1838 social standings of most families reveal their belonging to the service nobility: 51 of 59 in 1840<sup>135</sup>; 146 of 163 in 1843<sup>136</sup>; and 178 of 193 in 1847<sup>137</sup>. It should be noted that the percentage of those possessing mainly the lowest positions and ranks somewhat increased within this period, comprising in 1847 47 % (84 of 178)<sup>138</sup> of those in service as compared to 43 % (63 of 146) in 1843<sup>139</sup> and already mentioned 32 % in 1838.

However, already with the beginning of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the Institute lost its status of an elite school providing education solely to the representatives of the

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid

<sup>127</sup> Ibid

<sup>128</sup> There were 65 girls studying in the Institute in 1840, but information is preserved only for 60 of them

<sup>129</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 85, ark. 26-45

<sup>130</sup> There were 170 girls in attendance in 1843, but data is available only for 166; lists of students in attendance in 1843 and 1847 are preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 129, ark. 14-28

<sup>131</sup> Ibid

<sup>132</sup> See reference 15

<sup>133</sup> See reference 16

<sup>134</sup> See reference 17

<sup>135</sup> See reference 15

<sup>136</sup> See reference 16

<sup>137</sup> See reference 17

<sup>138</sup> Ibid

<sup>139</sup> See reference 16

traditional social elites. Recognizing the importance of non-noble elites, namely those of commerce, for the modernizing Empire, in 1855 the latter were granted a permit to educate their children at the state's most prestigious institutions. Thus, according to Kiev Institute's new statute, confirmed in the same year, the daughters of hereditary honorary citizens and merchants of the first guild obtained the right to study there<sup>140</sup>.

It would be a mistake though to assert that the Institute did not try to defend its status as first and foremost social elite enterprise. Together with allowing students of a non-noble origin to apply, the new statute stated that those of a noble one would be preferred the enrollment<sup>141</sup>. In addition, entrance requirements were toughened, especially in regard to such classic "aristocratic subjects" as those of foreign languages<sup>142</sup>, passing through which required very good previous home training that exactly the noble families were the most likely to offer to their children.

As a result, lists of those in attendance in 1857, 1862 and 1876 indicate only slight changes in the social composition of Kiev Institute's students' body: as in the previous years the school remained a noble monopoly. Of 197 studying in 1857 194 belonged to nobility, two were children of clergy and only one girl came from the family of a merchant of the first guild<sup>143</sup>. In 1862 of 163<sup>144</sup> in attendance 156 were of a noble origin, while three had been born into clergy, yet three – into merchants of the first guild, and one girl was a daughter of a hereditary honorary citizen<sup>145</sup>. However, by year 1876 the number of nobles attending the Institute dropped by 4 % as compared to 1862, comprising 205 of 220 those studying at that

<sup>140</sup> Zakharchenko, *Istoriia Kievskogo...*, p. 45

<sup>141</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 325, ark. 1

<sup>142</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 54, ark. 108-109

<sup>143</sup> List of students in attendance in 1857 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 197, ark. 143-167

<sup>144</sup> There were 164 girls studying in the Institute at that year, but dad were preserved only for 163 of them

<sup>145</sup> List of students in attendance in 1862 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 236, ark. 39-60



time; 8 of 220 were children of clergy and yet 7 – merchants of the first guild<sup>146</sup>. In the absence of the lists of would-be students it is only possible to speculate whether this underrepresentation of students of a non-noble origin was caused by an intentional policy of the Institute's officials aimed at maintaining the school's sense of elitism or simply by reluctance of non-noble elites to educate their daughters there, or by both. Yet, that the Institute was striving to defend its status of an elite school meant for the social reproduction of the traditional elites is, nevertheless, clear.

As in the previous years, the predominance of hereditary nobility remained intact, however in percentage ratio it somewhat decreased within this period, comprising in 1857 161 of 194<sup>147</sup>; in 1862 – 123 of 156<sup>148</sup>; and in 1876 – 172 of 205 students of a noble origin<sup>149</sup>. Similarly, overwhelming majority of those with a noble background belonged to the service nobility: 178 of 194 in 1857<sup>150</sup>; 139 of 156 in 1862<sup>151</sup>; and 180 of 205 in 1876<sup>152</sup>.

In 1878 the statute of Kiev Institute in regard to those, eligible to apply, was once again changed. At this time, all not obliged to pay a capitation tax, obtained the right to study there<sup>153</sup>. However, like in the previous times, this influenced the social composition of the Institute's students only to an extent. List of those in attendance in 1880 and 1888 show that the overwhelming majority of places were once again taken by nobility: 224 of 249<sup>154</sup> and 230 of

---

<sup>146</sup> Data on students in attendance in 1876 is preserved in DAK, F. 144, op.4, spr. 12, ark. 16-37

<sup>147</sup> See reference 30

<sup>148</sup> See reference 32

<sup>149</sup> See reference 33

<sup>150</sup> See reference 30

<sup>151</sup> See reference 32

<sup>152</sup> See reference 33

<sup>153</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 54, ark. 108-109

<sup>154</sup> Data on students studying in 1880 is preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 276, ark. 5-11

253<sup>155</sup> respectively; 13 in 1880 and 5 in 1888 were daughters of clergy; and 12 in 1880<sup>156</sup> and 18 in 1888<sup>157</sup> – came from the families of merchants. Similarly, most of those of a noble origin had been born into hereditary nobility, outnumbering personal almost five to one, both in 1880 (189 as compared to 35)<sup>158</sup> and 1888 (190 as compared to 40)<sup>159</sup>. A predominance of those belonging to the service nobility remained intact as well.

In general, despite two changes of the Institute's statute, which considerably broadened the range of those with the right to study there, by the end of the 1880s the school managed to remain a predominantly noble enterprise. However, even though most of the students stamping from nobility belonged to its hereditary section, they were far from all having been born into old, wealthy and aristocratic families. In fact, all available data on the social origins of the Institute's students contain only four references to aristocratic titles: three of prince<sup>160</sup> and one of count<sup>161</sup>. On the contrary, the school's intake of children from rank and file service nobility was very large.

All this brings back Lieven's assertion that elite schools "indeed owed their aristocratic aura less to the social origins of their pupils than to their self-image and history"<sup>162</sup>. Thus, founded by the Romanovs, Kiev Institute enjoyed the close attention and the patronage of the imperial family. Special scholarships and awards granted personally by either Emperor or

---

<sup>155</sup> Data on girls in attendance in 1888 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 650, ark. 49-71

<sup>156</sup> See reference 41

<sup>157</sup> See reference 42

<sup>158</sup> See reference 41

<sup>159</sup> See reference 42

<sup>160</sup> Princess Elizaveta Baratova (in attendance in 1847), Princess Józefina Woroniecki (in attendance in 1857), and Princess Katerina Nesvitskaia (in attendance in 1862)

<sup>161</sup> Countess Evelina Prater (in attendance in 1848)

<sup>162</sup> Lieven, *Russia's Rulers...*, p. 111

Empress to the best students on the basis of their academic achievements, regular visits<sup>163</sup>, mandatory presence of a member of the imperial family at final exams and graduations, as well as that graduates with the highest marks were invited to serve as *Hofdamen* at the court<sup>164</sup>, the court being a lasting impression, contributed to the school's sense of exclusiveness and aristocratism.

Significantly, the teachers employed at the Institute were all scholars with high academic reputations. Vladimir Ikonnikov, the school's tutor of Russian language and literature, as well as Russian history and the dean of historical and philological faculty of Kiev University of Saint Vladimir, argued that "it was considered a great honor, especially for the young professors, to be offered a position in the Institute"<sup>165</sup>. According to the school's statutes, only lectures of Kiev University could be invited to teach there and, as an exception, those of the First Kiev Gymnasium<sup>166</sup>. More importantly, lists of professors for the years of 1838-1888 show that this part of the Institute's statute had been followed to a large extent<sup>167</sup>. Distinguished scholars as well added an aristocratic touch to the school's image and self-representations.

---

<sup>163</sup> For instance, Nicholas I visited the school 6 times; Alexander II and his wife also 6 times; Alexander III – two times

<sup>164</sup> Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo...*, pp.55-57

<sup>165</sup> Vladimir Ikonnikov (ed.), *Biograficheskii slovar professorov i prepodavatelei Universiteta sv. Vladimira, s 1834-1844 g.* (Kiev, 1884), pp. 764-765

<sup>166</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 88, ark. 5

<sup>167</sup> See lists published in Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo...*, pp. 114-117

### 3.3. *Empire's very various elites: ethnic composition of the Institute's students*

As it has been shown in the previous chapter, Levashov's intention was to attract as many as possible of the local (*read - Polish*) nobles to the studies in Russian educational institutions. Being well aware of the importance of the Russian school for the integration of the local Polish elites into imperial ones, he insisted that the former should be in every possible way preferred in terms of access to education in the region. As a result, the statute of Kiev Institute for noble girls, confirmed in 1834, stated that only the daughters of needy nobility coming from three Southwestern provinces had the right to study there for free. Well-to-do local nobles as well as those stamping from other parts of the Empire were obliged to pay<sup>168</sup>. Granting a free education in an elite school was a substantial privilege, considering that the fees during the fifty years under consideration here were relatively large and tended to increase in time: from 280 rub per year in 1842 to 410 rub in 1878<sup>169</sup>.

That the Institute was established predominantly for local nobility with the aim of dragging it to the sphere of Russian influence was once again reconfirmed at its opening ceremony, on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of August of 1838. Addressing the public, Count Il'inskii, a member of the school's Council, stressed:

(...) Inhabitants of this land! For you, solely for you is being opened this new source of inexhaustible good deeds. Thus, namely you will be filled with the sense of responsibilities being entrusted to you by this paternal care (...) You will prove yourselves worth of this benefaction; happy and inevitable result of that will be prosperity of your children!<sup>170</sup>

<sup>168</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 1, ark. 79

<sup>169</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 21, ark. 5-9

<sup>170</sup> Quoted in Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo...*, p. 21

According to the statute of Kiev Institute, the number of those studying for free comprised 60 students per year<sup>171</sup>, 20 from each of three Southwestern provinces. As it has been already mentioned, the task of choosing prospective students was entrusted to the local noble assemblies, which were to present candidates to the General-Governor, for whom the final decision was left.

However, already the first enrollment proved to be a problem. Bibikov, who by that time occupied the position of Kievan General-Governor, in line with his campaign of an extensive audit of *szlachta*'s noble ranks, rejected most of the candidates (for instance, 13 out of 14 nominated by Podolian noble assembly)<sup>172</sup>. Accusing local nobility of "daring to choose girls of a non-noble origin"<sup>173</sup>, meaning, of course, those who had not yet or could not testify their noble background, Bibikov demanded to nominate other ones. As a result, all 20 of those with the right for free education were chosen only by the beginning of 1839.

Considering that the local nobility was predominantly Catholic and Polish, it should not come as a surprise that the overwhelming majority of students, attending for free in 1838, were of a similar origin – 16 of 19 (84 %)<sup>174</sup>. However, among those, who paid for their education at the Institute, prevalence of Catholics was considerably lower – 11 of 18 (61 %)<sup>175</sup>. This trend

---

<sup>171</sup> Except for the first two enrollments in 1838 and 1840, when this number constituted 20 (7 from Kiev and Volyn' provinces and 6 from Podolia) and 10 students (3 from Kiev and Volyn' provinces and 4 from Podolia) respectively, because of the absence of the Institute's own building, which was yet to be built, and the impossibility to house more in the temporary one

<sup>172</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 13, ark. 121

<sup>173</sup> Ibid, ark. 121, 148, 160

<sup>174</sup> There were 20 girls studying for free in 1838, but data is available only for 19 of them; list is preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 85, ark. 26-45; DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 13, ark. 52, 53, 54-57

<sup>175</sup> Ibid

became even clearer in the following years. Thus, of 29 studying for free in 1840 25 were Catholic (86 %), while of 31 studying for money only 16 (52 %)<sup>176</sup>.

By 1843<sup>177</sup> the percentage ratio of Catholics somewhat dropped as compared to the previous years, both among those attending for free – to 77 % (43 of 56) and those paying for their education – to 44 % (48 of 110). This tendency of a constant growth of Orthodox students among those studying for free, as well as among those obliged to pay preserved within the next years: in 1847 of 58 locals 33 were of Catholic background (57 %), while of 139 paying – 58 (42 %)<sup>178</sup>; in 1857 37 of 57 (65 %) and 66 of 140 (47 %) respectively<sup>179</sup>; and in 1862 – 24 of 45 (53 %) and 43 of 118 (36 %) respectively<sup>180</sup>.

It should be noted that the decrease of students with Catholic religious affiliation, though equally stable among both groups, was considerably more tangible among those studying for money. Another important observation is underrepresentation of Catholics among those granted a permit to study for free and thereby coming from three Southwestern provinces: in 1862 their percentage ratio comprised 53 %, while at that same time Catholic nobility accounted for 90 % of all landed nobility in the Southwest<sup>181</sup>.

However, in the absence of the lists of would-be students no definite answer can be given as to whether this underrepresentation was caused by the Institute's policy aimed at attracting to the school more Orthodox nobles and thus preferring them by admission or simply

<sup>176</sup> List of students in attendance in 1840 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 85, ark. 26-45; DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 49, ark. 32-34

<sup>177</sup> There were 60 students attending for free in 1843, but there is information only about 56 of them; list of students in attendance in 1843 is preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 129, ark. 14-28

<sup>178</sup> List of students in attendance in 1847 is preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 129, ark. 14-28

<sup>179</sup> List of girls in attendance in 1857 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 197, ark. 143-167

<sup>180</sup> There were 164 girls studying in the Institute at that year, but data is preserved only for 163 of them; list of is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 236, ark. 39-60

<sup>181</sup> Hamm, *Kiev...*, p. 56

by a disinterest of the local Polish elites to send their daughters to the Russian educational institution, or by both. Yet, that imperial school politics in the prior 1863 period were meant for integration and acculturation of the local nobility is, nevertheless, apparent: not without purpose was the latter granted considerable privileges in terms of access to education.

In general, in the years of 1838-1862 students of Polish origin comprised 49 % of Kiev Institute's student body, and their number tended to decline within this period: from 73 % in 1838 to 41 % in 1862. This data is more or less comparable to that available on the students of Kiev University of Saint Vladimir. Here, in the years of 1838-1863 the Poles accounted for 53 % of the student body<sup>182</sup>. Similarly, their number decreased in time: from 63 % in 1838 to 48 % in 1863<sup>183</sup>.

In the wake of the 1863 uprising, as it has been shown in the second chapter, the general reform of the Institute's administration was conducted. Instead of guaranteeing free education solely to the daughters of the Southwest nobles, a new system of scholarships was introduced, eligible for which were all girls, irrespectively of their regional ties. Lists of students in attendance in 1876, 1880 and 1888 indicate dramatic changes in the Institute's ethnic composition as compared to the previous years. Thus, of 220 students in 1876 200 were of Orthodox background, while only 18 of Catholic and yet two of Lutheran<sup>184</sup>; of 249 in 1880 – 234, 13 and 2 respectively<sup>185</sup>; of 253 in 1888 – 240, 10 and 3 respectively<sup>186</sup>. Hence, by the end of the 1880s the percentage ratio of Catholics among the Institute's students dropped to 4 %.

---

<sup>182</sup> Zasztowt, *Kresy...*, pp. 138

<sup>183</sup> Ibid

<sup>184</sup> Data on girls in attendance in 1876 is preserved in DAK, F. 144, op.4, spr. 12, ark. 16-37

<sup>185</sup> Data on students studying in 1880 is preserved in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 276, ark. 5-11

<sup>186</sup> Data on girls in attendance in 1888 is available in DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 650, ark. 49-71

Again, it is only possible to speculate as to an extent, to which this was a result of an intentional policy of preferring those of Orthodox origin. What is clear though is that the Empire's interest in integration of its Polish elite had considerably weakened already by the beginning of the 1860s. Vasil'chikov's letter and the reasoning, given by Shulgin, when introducing the 1863 changes, where the phrases of "the importance of promoting Russian elements in the land"<sup>187</sup> prevailed, together with the fact that the similar transformations happened at the University<sup>188</sup> show that the imperial authorities no longer counted on the acculturation of the local nobility. In contrast to the previous period, at this time the latter was rather hindered access to education in the region than encouraged to it. Segregation and not integration was now the aim.

It should also be mentioned that the percentage ratio of those of Little Russian origin among the Institute's Orthodox students was relatively small during all period under consideration here, comprising in general no more than 15 % (for instance, 2 of 10 in 1838<sup>189</sup>; 4 of 20 in 1840<sup>190</sup>; 16 of 55 in 1843<sup>191</sup>; 20 of 101 in 1847<sup>192</sup>; 5 of 86 in 1857<sup>193</sup>; and 8 of 93 in 1862<sup>194</sup>). However, that the only way to distinguish Little Russians from their Russian peers was to identify whether or not they were on the list of Little Russian nobility, published in 1914, considerably diminishes the accuracy of the above calculations. Nevertheless, such insignificant intake of the daughters of Little Russian nobles is probably explained by the

---

<sup>187</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 244, ark. 15

<sup>188</sup> Here the so-called *numerus clausus* were imposed, which meant that from then the number of students of Polish origin could not exceed 20%; see Zasztowt, *Kresy...*, p. 137, 141

<sup>189</sup> See reference 61

<sup>190</sup> See reference 63

<sup>191</sup> See reference 64

<sup>192</sup> See reference 65

<sup>193</sup> See reference 66

<sup>194</sup> See reference 67



existence of similar elite female boarding schools in Poltava and Khar'kov, to where the former were more likely to send their children.

Focusing on the ethnic composition of the Institute's students, this survey leaves outside of its scope yet another important question – that of the ethnic composition of its officials and professors. Some preliminary remarks on the topic can, nevertheless, be made. Relative indifference of the imperial school bureaucracy as to the ethnic selection in the Western borderlands was undermined both after the 1831, but especially after the 1863 uprising. Initially, replacement of teachers and professors of Polish background did not necessarily presuppose substituting them with Russian ones. Thus, elimination of Polish lecturers from Kiev University in 1839 resulted in that the latter became dominated by German professors, namely from Doprat University, and not by Russians<sup>195</sup>. In other words, in hindering the Poles access to positions in education, the imperial authorities were ready to support representatives of other “ethnic groups”.

However, already by the beginning of the 1860s the idea that depolonization of the Western provinces should necessarily be accompanied by the affirmation of their “Russian character” became quite significant. Another idea, gaining more and more support, that of an all-Russian nation, together with yet another uprising in 1863 strengthened those moods to a large extent. Significantly, around this time, as it has been shown by Richard Wortman, the Empire was starting to adopt “national ways” of legitimizing itself<sup>196</sup>, the latter bearing one very important long-lasting result as to the ethnic selection of its bureaucrats. Starting from the 1880s, having been born an Orthodox Russian became a chief precondition for obtaining

---

<sup>195</sup> Zasztowt, *Kresy...*, p. 137

<sup>196</sup> See, for instance, chapters “Making of Russian Tsar” and “Birth of National Myth” from Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of power: Myth and ceremony in Russian monarchy* (Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 243-281

positions within the highest ranks of government and administration<sup>197</sup>. In line with this, in 1886 the statute of Kiev Institute was once again changed: it stated that from then on only teachers, professors and officials of Russian origin and Orthodox confession could be offered a position in the school, except for those giving religious instruction in “foreign faiths” and foreign languages<sup>198</sup>. An extent to which this was followed is yet to be estimated. What is apparent now is that the Empire was indeed nationalizing<sup>199</sup>, with “Russianness” gradually becoming its part and parcel.

---

<sup>197</sup> Miller, *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism...*, p. 57

<sup>198</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 54, ark. 208

<sup>199</sup> Here “nationalizing” is meant as defined by Brubaker: “an ‘*unrealized*’ nation-state, in which the elites aim to remedy this perceived defect, to make the state what it is properly and legitimately destined to be, by promoting the language, culture, demographic position, economic flourishing, or political hegemony of the nominally state-bearing nation” in Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism reframed* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 63

## Chapter IV. Elite schooling: meanings and content of the Institute's education

Kiev Institute for noble girls illustrates well two major points of Count Sergei Uvarov's educational reforms. As Russian institution, it was intended to provide "Russian" schooling mainly to the Polish elite of the Empire, aimed at ensuring its loyalty to "the Throne and Fatherland." As public school, it was supposed to put an end to private education, largely disregarded by the Minister as "notorious breeding ground of Polish national feeling"<sup>200</sup>. Integration via education was Uvarov's chief goal, so imperial very diverse elites "would be merged into a larger entity, to which they would owe their loyalty and tie their destiny and whose claim to political and cultural leadership they would recognize"<sup>201</sup>.

"Nationalization" of education, launched by Uvarov, together with the impact of the 1831 uprising, meant, of course, that Polish would no longer be used as the language of instruction in the Western provinces, except in teaching of Catholic religion<sup>202</sup>. However, predominance of Polish in public life was hardly shaken, as well as its status of the first language of the local elite remained intact.

In line with this, Polish received special treatment at the Institute, explicitly destined for the Southwestern nobility. In his letter to Levashov from the 28<sup>th</sup> of November of 1833 von Bradke wrote:

---

<sup>200</sup> Quoted in Whittaker, *The origins of modern Russian education...*, p. 196

<sup>201</sup> Quoted in Ibid, p. 108

<sup>202</sup> It is hardly worth mentioning that it was one thing to proclaim that from then on Russian was going to be the language of instruction, and a quite different to implement it. Separate teachers had been maintained for instruction in Polish up to the 1836, when "a law excluded them from all school staffs, including that of the university, and each secondary school was required to employ two teachers of Russian language and literature instead". See Ibid, p. 196

(...) I consider it in all respects necessary and useful to have among the teaching personal of Kiev Institute a teacher of Polish language and literature, as well as a teacher for giving instruction in Catholic religion, who could also serve as a priest at the Institute's Catholic church. These additions are required by the land's nature itself (...) <sup>203</sup>

Levashov, apparently supposing to attract thereby yet more of the local elite to the school, agreed with von Bradke and added Polish to the curriculum, confirmed by the Institute's statute of 1834<sup>204</sup>. Hence, Polish, removed from the region's schools and reinstated there as a subject for study only much later<sup>205</sup>, was taught in the Institute from its very beginning. Furthermore, in distribution of the teaching hours it received the exact same number of lessons per week as did Russian, that is, two<sup>206</sup>. Not bearing a public function, the school was permitted to lecture Polish, all this being pretty revealing: the prohibition of Polish-language education was to a large extent a punishment for the uprising, not a measure intended to assimilate the Poles.

It was only after the 1863 uprising, when Polish was completely forbidden in the Western provinces, even in public life, that it was eliminated from the course of the Institute's studies. What is interesting is that released hours were given not to Russian, but were reallocated between French and German, and later rendered to English, established as a subject for study in 1871<sup>207</sup>.

Ban on the Polish language in the region is often regarded as aimed at cultural assimilation of its inhabitants<sup>208</sup>. Such explanation seems, however, not convincing enough. It largely disregards the fact that re-invented as primordially Russian, these territories where now

<sup>203</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 1, ark.11

<sup>204</sup> Ibid, ark. 62

<sup>205</sup> Staliunas, "Did the Government Seek...", pp. 276-277

<sup>206</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 236, ark. 82-83

<sup>207</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 301, ark. 12

<sup>208</sup> See, for instance, chapter "Kulturnyi terror (shkoly i presa)" in Beauvois, *Shliakhtych...*

presented and perceived as inhabited by overwhelmingly “Russian people,” where only the elites were Polish or polonized. Hence, by imposing Russian, the imperial authorities were rather willing to remedy the situation, in which “Russian people” were “compelled” to receive education in Polish, than to assimilate anybody. Staliunas further argues that given that learning (in) Russian did not necessarily presuppose rejection of one’s “native tongue,” introduction of Russian should be treated as meant for acculturation of the Poles, depolonization of the Lithuanians, and safeguarding of the Belorussians and the Little Russians against Polish influence with their subsequent integration into an all-Russian nation<sup>209</sup>.

No longer taught, Polish was, nevertheless, still used for giving instruction in Catholic religion, but only until 1865, when Russian was imposed instead<sup>210</sup>. An extent, to which introduction of Russian into Catholicism reveals a secular perception of “Russianness,” where language was thought to be more important than religion, as well as whether or not the imperial authorities saw this measure as might be leading to mass conversions of Catholics (namely those of a non-Polish descent) into Orthodoxy, has been discussed by a number of historians<sup>211</sup>. Dolbilov in his recent study on the ethno-religious policy of the Romanov Empire in its Northwestern Borderland very reasonably argues that in doing this the imperial officials were

---

<sup>209</sup> Staliunas, “Did the Government Seek...”, p. 280; Idem, *Making Russians...*, pp. 189-296

<sup>210</sup> TSDIAK, f. 707, op. 31, spr. 266, ark. 3

<sup>211</sup> See, for instance, Weeks, “Religion and Russification: Russian language in the Catholic Churches of the Northwest Provinces after 1863,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2/1 (2001), pp. 87-110; Dolbilov, “The Russifying Bureaucrats’ Vision of Catholicism: The Case of Northwestern *krai* after 1863,” in *Russia and Eastern Europe: applied “imperiology.”* Andrzej Nowak A (ed.) (Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2006), pp. 197-221; Idem, *Russkii krai, chuzhaia vera: Etnokonfessionalnaia politika imperii v Litve i Belarussii pri Alexandre II* (Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2010); Staliunas, *Making Russians...*, pp. 131-188

reluctant to think that the usage of Polish was rather a part of a traditional religious identity than a sign of a modern Polish nationalism<sup>212</sup>.

Dolbilov's other observation is that despite the fact that after the 1863 uprising Polish elite *in corpore* was no longer trusted and Catholicism was often perceived as interfering establishing loyalty "to the Emperor and the Throne," the former was never denied its top-rank status among the "foreign religions"<sup>213</sup>. Thus, for instance, the Institute continued to employ a separate teacher for giving Catholic religious instruction even when by the end of the 1880s the percentage ratio of students with Catholic religious affiliation dropped to 4 % and comprised less than 10 students per year<sup>214</sup>. It was done despite the school's statute, which asserted that the minimum number of girls of a particular confession for having a special teacher should be more than 10<sup>215</sup>. The latter was precisely a reason why students of Lutheran origin never enjoyed such a privilege, neither had they their separate church and, hence, were obliged to visit the city's one. On the contrary, the school's Catholic church functioned throughout all the period under consideration here, being one of the three existing in Kiev at that time<sup>216</sup>.

However disposed towards the Polish elite, the school was, nevertheless, Russian with "Russianness" being a component part of its program of study. Thus, in line with Uvarov's "nationalization" of education, the Institute's statute proclaimed Russian language and literature, Russian history and Russian geography as the three basic courses and the essence of education, aimed at establishing both loyalty and cultural affiliation to the state:

---

<sup>212</sup> Dolbilov, *Russkii krai, chuzhaia vera...*, p. 755

<sup>213</sup> Ibid, pp. 748-756

<sup>214</sup> See chapter 3

<sup>215</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 1, ark. 62

<sup>216</sup> Beauvois, *Shliakhtych...*, pp. 312-313

Particular attention should be paid to giving religious instruction, this being the foundation of any kind of education, as well as to teaching of fatherland's (*otechestvennogo*) language, literature, history and geography, these being the chief subjects of Russian education (...) The aim is to fill the students with rigorous morality and to establish in their hearts firm and unshakable feelings of true devotion to the Throne and the Fatherland, as well as of Christian love to family and one's neighbour (...) <sup>217</sup>

It is worth mentioning that the syllabus of Russian language also contains references to Russian as “*otechestvennyi* (fatherland's) language” and not as “mother tongue” <sup>218</sup>. Furthermore, explanatory note to the course suggests that the Institute's officials did not expect Russian to inevitably substitute students' native language, provided it was different; they did, however, anticipate them to master Russian to an extent necessary for its fluent use <sup>219</sup>.

The modern idea of history lessons as playing the very important role in formation of the patriotic feelings, as well as in establishing sense of belonging to the larger entity by no means was unknown to the imperial educators. Not without purpose was history declared the second most important subject for study in the school:

A teacher of history should be aware not only of educational, but also of moulding influence of his discipline, the main aim of which is awakening and strengthening of love to the Fatherland (...) It is clear then that the key attention in the course should be given to history of Russia (...) <sup>220</sup>

During the period under consideration here, that is, from 1838 till 1888 two history textbooks <sup>221</sup> were in use in the Institute for the sake of the above-mentioned purposes: first, Nikolai Ustrialov's *Outline of Russian history for educational institutions* <sup>222</sup> and later, starting

<sup>217</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 2, ark. 9, 11

<sup>218</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 4-5

<sup>219</sup> Ibid, ark. 6-8

<sup>220</sup> Ibid, ark. 11-12

<sup>221</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 147, ark. 3; DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 11

<sup>222</sup> Nikolai Ustrialov, *Nachertanie russkoi istorii dlia uchebnykh zavedenii* (Saint-Petersburg, 1839)

from the 1860s, Dmitrii Ilovaiskii's *Guides to Russian History*<sup>223</sup>, the latter further developing the “national narrative,” founded by Ustrialov.

Ustrialov's vision of Russian history suited perfectly for the cause of ensuring the Romanovs' claims to the Western borderlands. The first officially approved textbook, *Outline* showed “unity of Polish, Lithuanian and Russian history” and, referring to “Russian *narodnost*’ (nationality),” argued for primordially “Russian character” of the region, undermining thereby Polish claims to these territories<sup>224</sup>. The idea of the Western borderlands, now presented as “Western Russia,” being a component part of Russian history was carried on by Ilovaiskii's *Guides to Russian history*. Portraying these lands as Russia's birthplace, Ilovaiskii stated that their acquirement by the Romanov Empire was nothing else but “return” of what was primordially Russian<sup>225</sup>.

Similarly to history, geography as well was expected to teach the Institute's students “to love their Fatherland”; in addition, it was called to assist them in “knowing” “their Fatherland”<sup>226</sup>. Since real tours were hardly possible back there, virtual ones became the basic pedagogical approach<sup>227</sup>. In general, Russian geography course consisted of two parts: the first one provided description of the country as a whole, the second one presented information on

<sup>223</sup> Dmitrii Ilovaiskii, *Sokrashchennoe rukovodstvo ko Vseobshchei i Russkoi istorii: kurs mladshchego vozrasta* (Moscow, 1915); Idem, *Rukovodstvo k Russkoi istorii: kurs srednego vozrasta* (Moscow, 1901); Idem, *Kratkie ocherki Russkoi istorii: kurs starshegovostrasta* (Moscow, 1912)

<sup>224</sup> David B. Saunders, “Historians and Concepts of Nationality in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia,” *Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (January, 1982), p. 60

<sup>225</sup> For more on history textbooks in the 19th century Romanov Empire see Serhy Yekelchuk, “The Grand Narrative and Its Discontents: Ukraine in Russian History Textbooks and Ukrainian Students' Minds, 1830s-1900s” in Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen (eds.), *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003), pp. 229-256

<sup>226</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 13

<sup>227</sup> Real tours in the Romanov's Empire started to be organized in the early 1900s. See Marina, Loskoutova, “A Motherland with a Radius of 300 Miles: Regional Identity in Russian Secondary and Post-Elementary Education from the Early Nineteenth Century to the War and Revolution,” *European Review of History*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002), esp. p. 15



the Empire's provinces<sup>228</sup>. Though the ways these provinces were further joint into the regions differed in different textbooks<sup>229</sup>, the aim was clear: to show the diversity and the richness of the state, while stressing its unity<sup>230</sup>. A virtual tour, in its turn, was expected to strengthen this perception of various and peculiar regions all together composing "the Fatherland," as well as contribute to establishing the emotional attachment to it<sup>231</sup>.

Three textbooks on Russian geography<sup>232</sup> were in use in the Institute during the years 1838-1888: first, Alexander Obodovskii's *Short geography of Russian Empire*<sup>233</sup>, then Fedor Studitskii's *Geography of Russia*<sup>234</sup>, and later, from the mid 1860s, Dmitrii Semonov's *Fatherland's Studies (Otechestvovedenie)*<sup>235</sup>. Studitskii was one of the first to give his narrative a form of an imaginary journey: the students were invited to start their trip in Pskov, were then sent to Saint-Petersburg and Moscow, later to Nizhnii Novgorod, Iaroslavl, Kostroma and Tver', with Novgorod as final destination<sup>236</sup>. His choice of cities for a virtual tour is pretty revealing: referring to a heartland of Russia, Studitskii thereby emphasized the region's importance for the history of the Empire.

However, an extent to which courses' syllabus were followed, as well as approved, accepted or recommended textbooks were used in the school should not be overestimated. The

<sup>228</sup> DAK, f.144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 13

<sup>229</sup> See Loskoutova, "A Motherland with a Radius...", pp. 7-22

<sup>230</sup> Semonov's *Otechestvovedenie*, comprised of several separate brochures on different regions of the Empire under the common title of "Fatherland's Studies", is probably the best example of such an approach to geography teaching; see reference 35; Loskoutova argues that "this way of treating the diversity of the country played down the distinctive character of the borderlands of the Empire," Loskoutova, "A Motherland with a Radius...", p. 21

<sup>231</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 4, spr. 2, ark. 11

<sup>232</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 147, ark. 3; DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 12-13

<sup>233</sup> Alexander Obodovskii, *Kratkaia geografia Rossiiskoi Imperii* (Saint-Petersburg, 1844)

<sup>234</sup> Fedor Studitski, *Geografia Rossii* (Saint-Petersburg, 1843)

<sup>235</sup> Dmitrii Semonov, *Otechestvovedenie: Rossia po rasskazam puteshestvennikov i uchenym issledovaniem* (Saint-Petersburg, Moscow, 1864-1869)

<sup>236</sup> Loskoutova, "A Motherland with a Radius...", pp. 14-15

Institute's statute permitted the lecturers to change, add, and leave out what they wanted<sup>237</sup>. Even in the 1870s, with Count Dmitrii Tolstoi seeking further standardization of education, no strict obligation to follow official curriculum was imposed there: the professors as previously were permitted to design their courses, use their own notes, and choose the textbooks<sup>238</sup>.

\*\*\*

In his characteristic of education, provided by the elite educational institutions across the 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe, Lieven argues that "the intellectual side of school life was relatively less interesting to the society than the moral"<sup>239</sup>. In line with this, Kiev Institute's statute asserted:

The main goal of education is nurturing in the students' thoughts the rules of pure morality, moulding of their hearts, as well as acquisition of knowledge not so much deep as broad and chief, characteristic of every well-educated society<sup>240</sup> (...) Teaching of courses should be done in the right spirit, so reported knowledge, developing students' wit and taste, would also yield to the strengthening of their moral and religious bases. In general, all subjects have the duty to support the moral and religious education<sup>241</sup>.

Such a heavy emphasis on morality and character formation was precisely a reason why the Institute was a boarding school. Furthermore, up to the mid 1860s its students could not leave its walls, except in cases of serious illnesses or deaths of close relatives<sup>242</sup>; it was only in 1864 that they obtained the right for summer vocations outside the school<sup>243</sup>. The discipline

<sup>237</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 98, ark. 18-19

<sup>238</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 301, ark. 5; in this, Kiev Institute was not unique: so was the situation with other educational institutions of the Romanov Empire at that time as well

<sup>239</sup> Lieven, *Aristocracy...*, p. 162

<sup>240</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 98, ark. 19-20

<sup>241</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 147, ark. 42

<sup>242</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 1, spr. 98, ark. 32

<sup>243</sup> Zakharchenko, *Istoria Kievskogo...*, p. 50

there was extremely strict, as well as absolute obedience was demanded. Everything was done according to the clock: the girls woke up, went to bed and had literary every minute of their day watched and regulated<sup>244</sup>. Though supervision over the Institute's students often verged on spying, such an approach to elite education was hardly unique. Lieven states that "allowing a child's personality to develop unhampered was by no means the aim back then, for human nature was not trusted"<sup>245</sup>.

It was only in the late 1860s – early 1870s, when the imperial educators started experimenting with new themes and approaches, that the advantage of a more flexible training became apparent<sup>246</sup>. As a result, in 1879 the school was allowed to enroll the so-called "visiting students," who were not obliged to live there. Likewise, in 1880 those accepted as "boarding ones" were permitted to leave the Institute for Christmas and Easter<sup>247</sup>.

Lacking freedom, Kiev Institute for noble girls gave the latter, nevertheless, a very stimulating, broad, and cultured course of studies. As an elite school, it was interested not only in intellectual formation of its students, but also in moulding of their personalities, values, habits, and manners. It should not, hence, come as a surprise that despite "Russianness" being proclaimed the essence of the Institute's education, its curriculum centered around literature and living languages, as well as such classic "aristocratic subjects" like that of arts, dancing, and music<sup>248</sup>. Heavy emphasis on perfect French, refined elegance and tact added yet more aristocratic touch<sup>249</sup>.

---

<sup>244</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 1

<sup>245</sup> Lieven, *Russia's Rulers...*, p. 85

<sup>246</sup> Loskoutova, "A Motherland with a Radius...", p. 15

<sup>247</sup> DAK, f. 144, op. 6, spr. 5, ark. 26

<sup>248</sup> Ibid, ark. 7-10

<sup>249</sup> Lieven, *Russia's Rulers...*, p. 100

## Conclusion

Kiev Institute for noble girls, established in 1838, was a part of the imperial efforts, meant for re-claiming the region from the Poles, that is, turning Eastern *Kresy* of the former Polish Commonwealth into the Western Borderlands of the Russian Empire. As Russian institution, it was expected to stay for “the Russianness” of Kiev as well. Its building, erected in the style of late classicism by Vikentii Beretti, who quite unsurprisingly was also responsible for constructing the building of Kiev University of Saint Vladimir, on the location, which dominated Dvortsovaia part of the city, was intended to make Kiev look “Russian.” Both, the University and the Institute, counted for the beginning of a new, precisely planned, Russian city center.

At the same time, Kiev Institute for noble girls was destined primarily for the daughters of the Southwestern (*read - Polish*) nobles. According to the school’s statute, only they could study there for free. Granting a free education in an elite school was a substantial privilege, considering that the fees during all period under consideration here were really high. Furthermore, the local noble assemblies obtained the right to nominate prospective students for free places, though the final decision was entrusted to the General-Governor. By the same token, the representatives of the local nobility were invited to serve as members of the Institute’s Council, acquiring thereby the possibility to influence its decisions. As a result of such policy, 73 % of those in attendance in 1838 were of Polish descent, while their percentage ratio among those studying for free was even higher – 84 %.

In general, in the years of 1838-1862 the Poles accounted for 49 % of Kiev Institute's student body, though their number tended to decline within this period: from 73 % in 1838 to 41 % in 1862. This data is more or less comparable to that available on the students of Kiev University. Here, in the years of 1838-1863 those of Polish origin comprised 53 % of the student body. Similarly, their number decreased in time: from 63 % in 1838 to 48 % in 1863. In the absence of the lists of would-be students no definite answer can be given as to whether this decline was caused by an intentional policy, aimed at attracting to the school more Orthodox nobles and thus preferring them by admission or simply by a disinterest of the local Polish elites to send their daughters to the Russian educational institution, or by both. Yet, that the local nobility was granted considerable privileges in terms of access to education signifies one very important thing: imperial school politics in the prior 1863 period were meant for integration and acculturation of the local Poles.

"The Russianness" of schooling, proposed by the Institute, was also expected to contribute to the above-mentioned task. Russian language and literature, Russian history and Russian geography were regarded as formative subjects, capable of ensuring cultural affiliation, emotional attachment and, therefore, loyalty to "the Throne and Fatherland." Literature heroes, history textbooks, stressing the Borderland's belonging to the Empire, current and most importantly historical, geography textbooks with virtual tourism, intended to show diversity yet unity of the state, were all together called to teach the Institute's students if not "to love their Fatherland," than definitely tie their destinies to it.

Yet "nationalization" of the Empire together with the impact of the 1863 uprising refigured this situation to a large extent. Polish elites of the state, both "not ours" and "not capable" of becoming Russian, were no longer trusted, as well as their claims to these territories

were now perceived as being able to undermine the imperial project of an all-Russian nation. Thus, in the wake of the rebellion, the Southwestern nobles lost the right to educate their children in the school for free. Instead a new system of scholarships was introduced, eligible for which were all girls, irrespectively of where they came from. Consequently, the local noble assemblies were deprived of the task of filling in free places and the representatives of the local nobility were excluded from the Institute's Council. It seems obvious what such measures reveal about the imperial officials' views on the possibility of russifying the Poles. In contrast to the previous period, segregation, not integration was now the aim.

In the decades following the 1863 changes the ethnic composition of the Institute's students altered dramatically, with those of Catholic religious affiliation and thus of Polish descent comprising by the end of the 1880s only 4 % of the school's students as compared to 73 % in 1838 and 41 % in 1862. Although it is true that in the absence of the lists of would-be students it is only possible to speculate as to what were the reasons for such a transformation, the latter is very significative. The Empire was indeed nationalizing, with "the Russianness" gradually turning into its component part. By the end of the 1880s the idea of Russians as "a state-bearing nation" became important enough for those of Orthodox confession and Russian origin to be preferred in obtaining certain positions within government and administration. Thus, starting from 1886 the Institute was required to employ as its teaching and administrating personal only people of that descent, except for giving instruction in "foreign faiths" and foreign languages. In other words, depolonization of the Southwestern Borderland alone was not enough anymore; affirmation of its "Russian character" was as well needed. Perceived as inhabited by overwhelmingly "Russian people," this region was now also regarded as belonging to the Russian national territory.

Raison d'être of Kiev Institute for noble girls consisted, however, not only in acculturation and integration of the local Polish elites. As a highly prestigious school, it was intended to participate in the social reproduction of the traditional, that is, social elites. That is why, originally only the daughters of both hereditary and personal nobles obtained the right to study there, alongside with the children of clergy, working at the Institute, as an exception. As a result, 98 % of those in attendance in 1847 had been born into nobility, 88 % of them coming from its hereditary section.

Yet reacting to the developments of the modernizing Empire and the importance of the non-noble elites for it, mostly those of commerce, as well willing to study their children at the state's elite schools, the Institute found itself "obliged" to alter its entry requirements as regards the social origins of its students. However, two changes of the school's statute in 1855 and 1878 influenced the social composition of its student body only to an extent. As in previous years, Kiev Institute remained a noble monopoly: thus, 90 % of those in attendance in 1880 and 91 % in 1888 had been born into nobility, with 84 % and 83 % of them coming from its hereditary section, respectively. In the absence of the lists of would-be students an extent, to which this was a result of an intentional policy of the school's officials, is opened to discussion. What is apparent, however, is that the Institute indeed was striving to ensure its status as first and foremost social elite enterprise by toughening its entry requirements as regards foreign languages and establishing really high fees.

It would be, nevertheless, a mistake to assert that all the girls, studying at the school, stamped from old, wealthy or aristocratic families. The Institute's intake of students coming from the rank and file service nobility was very large, comprising 92 % in 1838, 89 % in 1862, and 88 % in 1876. It was, therefore, history and image, as well as self-representation of the

school that it owed its “aristocratism” to. Founded by the Romanovs, it enjoyed both the patronage and the favor of the imperial family, which undoubtedly contributed to the Institute’s sense of elitism.

As an elite school, Kiev Institute aimed at both character and personality formation of its students, as well as moulding of their habits and manners. A heavy emphasis on morality, literature, such classic “aristocratic subjects” as foreign languages, arts, dances, and music, refined elegancy and tact was anticipated to yield to the above-mentioned task.

It is true that closer to the end of the century the *raison d’etre* of elite schools became somewhat unclear. The reason why these institutions survived was, above all, though the Empire was indeed modernizing, it, nevertheless, remained *noble* in its essence, of which privileged schools were a large part.



## Appendix

**Table 1**

**Social composition of the Institute's students**

| Years | Total number of students | Nobility |      | Clergy |       | Hereditary honorary citizens | Merchants |       |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|------|--------|-------|------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| 1838  | 37                       | 36       | 97 % | 1      | 3 %   |                              |           |       |
| 1840  | 60                       | 59       | 98 % | 1      | 2 %   |                              |           |       |
| 1843  | 106                      | 104      | 98 % | 2      | 2 %   |                              |           |       |
| 1847  | 197                      | 193      | 98 % | 4      | 2 %   |                              |           |       |
| 1857  | 197                      | 194      | 98 % | 2      | 1 %   |                              | 1         | 1 %   |
| 1862  | 163                      | 156      | 96 % | 3      | 1.8 % | 1 0.4 %                      | 3         | 1.8 % |
| 1876  | 220                      | 205      | 93 % | 8      | 4 %   |                              | 7         | 3 %   |
| 1880  | 249                      | 224      | 90 % | 13     | 5 %   |                              | 12        | 5 %   |
| 1888  | 253                      | 230      | 91 % | 5      | 2 %   |                              | 18        | 7 %   |

**Table 2**

**Religious composition of the Institute's students**

| Years | Total number of students | Catholic |      | Orthodox |      | Lutheran |     |
|-------|--------------------------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|-----|
| 1838  | 37                       | 27       | 73 % | 10       | 27 % |          |     |
| 1840  | 60                       | 40       | 67 % | 20       | 33 % |          |     |
| 1843  | 106                      | 50       | 47 % | 55       | 52 % | 1        | 1 % |
| 1847  | 197                      | 91       | 46 % | 101      | 51 % | 5        | 3 % |
| 1857  | 197                      | 103      | 52 % | 86       | 44 % | 8        | 4 % |
| 1862  | 163                      | 67       | 41 % | 93       | 57 % | 3        | 2 % |
| 1876  | 220                      | 18       | 8 %  | 200      | 91 % | 2        | 1 % |
| 1880  | 249                      | 13       | 5 %  | 234      | 94 % | 2        | 1 % |
| 1888  | 253                      | 10       | 4 %  | 240      | 95 % | 3        | 1 % |

# Bibliography

## Archival primary sources

Derzhavnyi arkhiv mista Kyeva (DAK)

Fond 144, *Kyivs'kyi instytut shliakhetnykh divchat*

Tsentrал'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv (TSDIAK)

Fond 442, *Kantseliaria Kyivskogo, Podilskogo i Volynskogo General-Gubernatora*

Fond 707, *Upravlinnia Kyivskogo uchbovogo okruhu*

## Published primary sources

Chubinskii, Pavel. "Obzor dannykh o naselenii goroda Kieva po odnodnevnoi perepisi, proizvedennoi 2 marta 1874 goda" in *Zapiski Uigo-Zapadnogo otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva*. Tom 2. Za 1874 god. Kiev, 1875.

Lukomskii, Vladislav and Modzalevskii, Vadim. *Malorossiiskii gerbovnik*. Saint-Petersburg, 1914.

Zakharchenko, Mikhail. *Istoria Kievskogo instituta blagorodnykh devits*. Kiev, 1888.

## Secondary Literature

Al'oshyn, Pavlo. "Bat'ko i syn Beretti (z arkhitekturnoi spadshchyny)." *Arkhitektura Radianskoi Ukrainy*, 1938, № 3, pp. 39-48.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Beauvois, Daniel. *Szkolnictwo Polskie na zimeiach litewsko-ruskich, 1803-1832*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1991.

———. *Shliakhtych, kripak i revizor*. Kyiv, 1996.

———. *Bytva za zemliu v Ukraini 1863-1914. Poliaky v socio-etnichnykh konfliktakh*. Kyiv 1998.

———. *Rosiis'ka vlada i polska shliakhta v Ukraini. 1793-1830*. Lviv: Kalvaria, 2007.

Becker, Seymour. *Nobility and Privilege in Late Imperial Russia*. DeKalb IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Belousov, Aleksandr. "Institutki" in *Institutki: Vospominania vospitannits institutov blagorodnykh devits*. Bokova, Vera and Sakharova, Liubov', eds. Moscow: NLO, 2005.

Berlyns'kyi, M.F. *Istoriia mista Kyeva*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991.

Brokhaus, F.A. and Efron, I.A., eds. *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. St. Petersburg: Brokhaus-Efron, 1902, XVII: pp. 859-860; XXII, pp. 588-589; XXIV, pp. 922-923.

Brower, Daniel R. *The Russian City between Tradition and Modernity, 1850-1900*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Brubaker, Rogers and Cooper, Frederick. "Beyond Identity". *Theory and Society*. 29, No. 1 (February, 2000), pp. 1-47.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism reframed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Carr, Stephen. *Public Space*. Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Danilova, Al'bina. *Blagorodnye devitsy. Vospitannitsy Smolnogo institute*. Moscow, 2007.

Dmitriev, Alexander. "Ukrainskaia nauka i ee imperskie konteksty". *Ab Imperio* (4/2007)

<http://abimperio.net/cgi-bin/aishow.pl?state=showa&idart=2018&page=1&idlang=2&Code=> (latest accessed: 05.03.2011).

Dolbilov, Mikhail. "Russification and the Bureaucratic Mind in the Russian Empire's Northwestern Region in the 1860s." *Kritika* 5.2 (2004), pp. 245-271.

———. "Polonofobia i politika russifikatsii v Severo-Zapadnom krae imperii v 1860-e gg" in *Obraz vruga*. Sost. L. Gudkov. Moscow: OGI, 2005, pp. 127-174.

———. "The Russifying Bureaucrats' Vision of Catholicism: The Case of Northwestern *krai* after 1863," in *Russia and Eastern Europe: applied "imperiology."* Andrzej Nowak, ed. Warsaw: Instytut Historii PAN, 2006, pp. 197-221.

———. *Russkii krai, chuzhaia vera: Etnokonfessionalnaia politika imperii v Litve i Belarussii pri Alexandre II*. Moscow: NLO, 2010.

Dolbilov, M. and A. Miller, eds. *Zapadnye okrainy Rossiiskoi imperii*. Moscow: NLO, 2006.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Głębocki, Henryk. *Fatalna sprawa: Kwestia polska w rosyjskiej myśli politycznej (1856-1866)*. Krakow: Arcana, 1997.

Golobutskii, Volodymyr et al., eds. *Istoriia Kieva*. Kiev: Akademiia Nauk Ukrainskoi SSR, 1963-1964.

Goodman, Nelson. "How Buildings Mean." *Critical Inquiry*, 11, no. 4 (June 1985), pp. 642-653.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993.

Hamm, Michael F., ed. *The City in Late Imperial Russia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

———. *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800-1917*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Hillis, Faith. *Between Empire and Nation: Urban Politics, Community and Violence in Kiev, 1863 – 1907*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Yale University, 2009.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Ranger, Terence. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Ierofalov-Pylypchak, Borys. *Arkhitektura imperskogo Kyeva*. Kyiv, 2000.

Ikonnikov, Vladimir, ed. *Biograficheskii slovar professorov i prepodavatelei Universiteta sv. Vladimira, s 1834-1844 g.* Kiev, 1884.

———. *Kiev v 1654-1855 gg.: Istoricheskii ocherk*. Kiev: Tipografiia Imperatorskogo Universiteta sv. Vladimira, 1904.

Kappeler, Andreas. "The Ambiguities of Russification." *Kritika* 5.4 (2004), pp. 291-297.

———. *Russland als Vielvolkerreich: Entstehung, Geschichte, Zerfall*. Munich: Beck, 1992.

Karady, Victor, ed. *Elite Formation in the Other Europe (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Century)/Elitenformation im "anderen" Europa (19.-20. Jahrhundert)*. Methods. Cleometrics. No. 124. HSR Vol. 33 (2008) 2.

Kasimenko, Aleksandr et al. *Istoriia Kieva*. (2 vols.) Kiev: Vydavnytstvo Akademii nauk Ukrainy, 1960.

King, Jeremy. "The Nationalization of East Central Europe" in *Staging the Past: the Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*. Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield, eds. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001, pp. 112-113.

King, Jeremy. *Budweisers Into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Komzolova, Anna. *Politika samoderzhavii v Severo-Zapadnom krae v epokhu Velikikh reform*. Moscow: Nauka, 2005.

Kovalyns'kyi, Vitalii. *Kyivs'ki miniatiury*. Kyiv: Kupola, 2006.

Lieven, Dominic. *Russia's Rulers under the Old Regime*. Yale University Press, 1989.

———. *The Aristocracy in Europe, 1815-1914*. Columbia University Press, 1993.

Loskoutova, Marina. "A Motherland with a Radius of 300 Miles: Regional Identity in Russian Secondary and Post-Elementary Education from the Early Nineteenth Century to the War and Revolution." *European Review of History*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002), pp. 7-22.

Lotman, Iurii. *Besedy o russkoi kulture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)*. Saint-Petersburg, 2008.

Miller, Alexei. *The Ukrainian Question: The Russian Empire and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Central European University Press, 2003.

———. *The Romanov Empire and Nationalism*. Central European University Press, 2008.

Mironov, Boris. *Sotsialnaia istoriia Rossii perioda imperii (XVIII – nachalo XX veka). Genesis lichnosti, demokraticeskoi sem'i, grazhdanskogo obshchestva i pravovogo gosudarstva*. V 2-kh t. Saint-Petersburg, 1999.

Motyl, Alexander J. "Inventing Invention: The Limits of National Identity Formation" in *Intellectuals and the Articulation of the Nation*. Ron Suny and Michael Kennedy, eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001, pp. 57-78.

Neal, Zachary P. "Locating Public Space" in *Common Ground: Readings and Reflections on Public Space*. Anthony M. Orum, Zachary P. Neal, eds. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Plokhyy, Serhii. "Beyond Nationality." *Ab Imperio* 4 (2007): 25-46.

Ponomareva, Varvara and Khoroshylova, Liubov'. *Mir russkoi zhenshchiny: vospitanie, obrazovanie, sud'ba. XVIII – nachalo XX veka*. Moscow, 2006.

———. *Mir russkoi zhenshchiny: sem'ia, professia, domashnii ukhad. XVIII – nachalo XX veka*. Moscow, 2009.

Remy, Johannes. *Higher Education and National Identity: Polish Student Activism in Russia, 1832-1863*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2000.

*Research in the College Context: Approaches and Methods*. Stage, Frances K. and Manning, Kathleen, eds. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2003.

Rodkiewicz, Witold. *Russian Nationality Policy in the Western Provinces of the Empire (1863-1905)*. Lublin: Scientific Society of Lublin, 1998.

Rozhdestvenskii, Sergei. *Istoricheskii obzor deiatelnosti Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshchenia, 1802-1902*. Saint-Petersburg, 1902.

Rybakov, Mykhailo. *Nevidomi ta malovidomi storinki istorii Kyeva*. Kyiv: Kyi, 1997.

Sarbei, Vitalii et al., eds. *Istoriia Kieva*. (4 vols.) Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1983.

Saunders, David B. "Historians and Concepts of Nationality in Early Nineteenth-Century Russia." *Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (January, 1982), pp. 44-62.

Shandra, Valentyna. *Kyivs'ke general-gubernatorstvo, 1832-1914*. Kyiv, 1999.

———. *Malorosiis'ke general-gubernatorstvo, 1802-1856*. Kyiv: Derzh. kom. arkhiviv Ukrainy, 2001.

Shevchenko, Maksim. "Sergei Semenovich Uvarov" in *Rossiiskie konservatory*. Moscow: Russkii Mir, 1997.

Staliunas, Darius. "Did the Government Seek to Russify Lithuanians and Poles in the Northwestern Region after the Uprising of 1863-64?" *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 5, Num. 2 (Spring 2004), New Series, pp. 273-289.

———. *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863*. New York: Rodopi, 2007.

Thaden, Edward C. *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855-1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

———. "Russification in Tsarist Russia" in *Interpreting History: Collective Essays on Russia's*

*Relations with Europe*. Edward C. Thaden with collaboration of Marianna Forster Thaden. New York, Boulder, 1990, pp. 211-220.

Tolochko, Oleksii. "Mapping the Lost Capital: Historical Topography of Kiev as an Antiquarian Project." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. Vol. 35, no. 1 (Fall 2001), pp. 85-91.

———. "Zamitky z istorychnoi topografii domonhol'skogo Kyeva," parts 1-5. *Kyivska starovyna*. No. 3 (1997), pp. 152-167; No. 5 (2000), pp. 144-163; No. 6 (2000), pp. 166-169.

———. "Kyevo-Rus'ka spadshchyna v istorychnii dymtsi Ukrainy pochatku XIX st." in *Ukraina i Rosia v istorychnii retrospektyvi: Narysy v 3-kh tomakh*. Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. Tom 1. Vladyslav Verstiuk, Viktor Horobets, Oleksii Tolochko, *Ukrainski proekty v Rosiiskii imperii*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2004, pp. 250-350.

Virchenko, Vira. *Zhinochi navchal'ni zaklady u m. Kyevi (1861-1920 rr.)*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Kyiv, 2006.

Weeks, Theodore R. *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863-1914*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996.

———. "Religion and Russification: Russian language in the Catholic Churches of the Northwest Provinces after 1863," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2/1 (2001), pp. 87-110.

Whittaker, Cynthia. *The origins of modern Russian education: an intellectual biography of count Sergei Uvarov, 1786-1855*. Northern Illinois University Press, 1984.

Wortman, Richard. *Scenarios of power: Myth and ceremony in Russian monarchy*. Princeton University Press, 2006.

Yekelchuk, Serhy. "The Grand Narrative and Its Discontents: Ukraine in Russian History Textbooks and Ukrainian Students' Minds, 1830s-1900s" in Kappeler, Andreas; Kohut, Zenon E.; Sysyn, Frank E. and von Hagen, Mark, eds., *Culture, Nation and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2003, pp. 229-256.

Zakharchenko, M.M. *Kiev: teper' i prezhdde*. Kiev: S.V. Kul'zhenko, 1888.

Zasztowt, Leszek. *Kresy 1832-1864. Szkolnictwo na ziemiach litewskich i ruskich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*. Warszawa, 1997.

Zorin, Andrei. *Kormia dvuglavogo orla: literatura i gosudarstvennaia ideologia v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII – pervoi treti XIX veka*. Moscow: NLO, 2001.