

STUDIE / ARTICLE

Beautiful and Difficult Years of Adolescence. Aristocratic Education in Late Imperial Russia

ZBYNĚK VYDRA

Institute of Historical Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, University of Pardubice

Beautiful and Difficult Years of Adolescence. Aristocratic Education in Late Imperial Russia

The article focuses on the education and upbringing of aristocrats in late imperial Russia (the 1850s–1917). It is based primarily on sources of a personal nature (non-published and published memoirs and diaries). Their analysis shows the main elements, continuity and discontinuity in the education of boys and girls from aristocratic families during their adolescence, i. e. from the age of twelve/thirteen to sixteen/eighteen. Unlike childhood, for which homeschooling was typical, the period of adolescence was significantly more dynamic. The aristocratic education was more influenced by state educational reforms, growing civic awareness, and various ideas about the best preparation for future life and a career. Aristocratic families chose from among elite noble schools, private lycées, or state public schools (gymnasiums). The nobility's approach to education was slowly being democratised. More and more aristocrats studied at state public schools (gymnasiums). At the same time, criticism of the conservative conditions of the education system was heard from the ranks of the aristocracy.

Keywords: imperial Russia, aristocracy, history of education, history of everyday life

Introduction. Sources and methods

Socio-cultural history and the history of everyday life have traditionally occupied a prominent place in global research on late imperial Russia. For a long time, however, the focus has tended to be on the lower classes (peasants, workers), while the elites, especially the nobility, have stood rather on the sidelines.¹ Russian historiography is different; it has been writing about the nobility relatively extensively in recent years. Instead, works focused on the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century, or the so-called Golden Age of the nobility, predominate. This is also true for the subtopic of education, which is of particular interest to us.²

Few historians have dealt with the period of late imperial Russia (the 1850s–1917). Education, schooling, and everyday life are mainly discussed using the examples of particular families or individual educational institutions. However, it

1 In Western historiography, the most relevant, influential, and inspirational works on the late imperial Russian nobility as a social group are twenty or more years old. See Seymour BECKER, *Nobility and Privilege in Late Imperial Russia* (Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1985); Dominic LIEVEN, *The Aristocracy in Europe, 1815–1914* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); Priscilla ROOSEVELT, *Life on the Russian Country Estate. A Social and Cultural History* (New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 1995). For the Baltic German nobility, an autonomous part of the broader Russian nobility, see Heide W. WHELAN, *Adapting to Modernity. Family, Caste, and Capitalism among the Baltic Germany Nobility* (Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1999). Two major and more recent contributions to the social history of nobility/aristocracy in the last years of the Russian Empire are Matthew RENDLE, *Defenders of the Motherland. The Tsarist Elite in the Revolutionary Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Douglas SMITH, *Former People. The Last Days of Russian Aristocracy* (London: Pan Books, 2013). Several important books were published on the pre-emancipation nobility. See Jessica TOVROV, *The Russian Noble Family. Structure and Change* (New York – London: Garland Publishing, 1987); Michelle Lamarche MARRESE, *A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700–1861* (Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press, 2002); Mary CAVENDER, *Nests of the Gentry. Family, Estate, and Local Loyalties in Provincial Russia* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007); Patrick O'MEARA, *The Russian Nobility in the Age of Alexander I*. (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019); Katherine PICKERING ANTONOVA, *An Ordinary Marriage. The World of a Gentry Family in Provincial Russia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012). Biographies of aristocrats are very rare. For one major exception, see Adele LINDENMEYER, *Citizen Countess. Sofia Panina and the Fate of Revolutionary Russia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2019).

2 Marina Vladimirovna KOROTKOVA, *Sem'ia, detstvo i obrazovanie v povsednevnoi kul'ture dvorianstva v XVIII – pervoi polovine XIX vv.* (Moskva: APKiPPRO, 2009); Olga Sergeevna MURAV'IEVA, *Kak vospityvali russkogo dvorianina* (Moskva: Linka-Press, 1995); Alina SHOKAREVA, *Dvorianskaia sem'ia: kul'tura obschcheniia. Russkoe stolichnoe dvorianstvo pervoi poloviny XIX veka* (Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2017).

was just during this period when the life of the nobility underwent fundamental economic and social transformations connected with the abolition of serfdom and the gradual change of the society of the estates into a civic one, and a loosening of the identity of the estate of the nobility. Since the late 1850s, the educated and publicly active part of society was wondering what role the nobility should assume in the new conditions. Uncertainty about the future of the nobility was part of social discourse until the First World War.³

The Russian education system was changing significantly as well. The 1860s brought the reform of secondary schools, the expansion of university autonomy, the development of girls' education, and the establishment of private gymnasiums. Therefore, it is essential to ask whether and to what extent these processes and the resulting challenges were reflected in the system of aristocratic upbringing and education. How did the nobility enter the education system? Did they respond to changing trends in education? Did they prefer a specific type of school, and were these preferences changing over time? Did they elaborate a coherent educational strategy? Were they active, or were they just passively adapting to state policy?

The following article is directly related to the study on the upbringing and education of children.⁴ In this text, I have decided to focus only on education and upbringing in adolescence, which corresponds to the age from twelve/thirteen to sixteen/eighteen (with a few exceptions).

The age of university studies was deliberately set aside for several reasons. The first reason is that the interconnection of education and upbringing and the joint influence of school and family mainly concerned children and adolescents. University studies represented a different phase in the life of noblemen and noble-

3 Cf. Igor Anatolievich KHRISTOFOROV, *"Aristokraticeskaja" oppozitsiia Velikim reformam. Konec 1850–seredina 1870-kh gg.* (Moskva: Russkoe slovo, 2002), pp. 138–149. Some representative examples of a discussion at the end of the 19th century, see: Aleksei Ivanovich ELISHEV, *Dvorianskoe delo. Sbornik statei* (Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija, 1898); Grigorii Aleksandrovich EVREINOV, *Proshloe i nastoiashchee znachenie russkogo dvorianstva* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografija A. Benke, 1898); Valentin Vasilievich IARMONKIN, *Zadacha dvorianstva* (Sankt Peterburg: tip. MPS, 1895); Aleksei Dmitrievich PAZUKHIN, *Sovremennoie sostoianie Rossii i soslovnyi vopros* (Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija, 1886); Anton Antonovich PLANSON, *O dvorianstve v Rossii. Sovremennoe polozenie voprosa* (Sankt Peterburg: Kalashnikovskaja tip. A. L. Trunova, 1897); Fedor Emil'evich ROMER, "Padenie dvorianstva," *Russkii vestnik* 2, 1900, pp. 733–734; Nikolai Petrovich SEMENOV, *Nashe dvorianstvo* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografija Spb. akc. obsh. pech. dela v Rossii E. Evdokimov, 1899).

4 Zbyněk VYDRA, "Education and Aristocratic Childhood in Late Imperial Russia," *Kulturne dejiny / Culture History* 12 (2022), 2, pp. 237–258.

women – it was a period of adulthood resulting from Russian state law, according to which a nobleman became an adult at the age of sixteen and could enter the civil service. At the age of eighteen, he could get married. Girls became eligible to marry at the age of sixteen.⁵ The second reason for omitting university years is purely practical – it is a complex issue worthy of a separate study.

As well as in my previous study on children's education, I focus only on one part of the nobility. The reason is apparent: Russia's hereditary nobility was heterogeneous and numerous. At the end of the 19th century, there were about 1.2 million hereditary nobles, i.e. around 200,000 families.⁶ Thus, I have chosen the aristocracy as the representative group, for which I used the definition offered by Dominic Lieven years ago: the aristocracy consisted of titled (princes, counts, barons) and untitled families, interconnected by family and property ties, close to the imperial family and court, and with the extensive land property.⁷ About 830 titled families lived in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century.⁸ At the same time, I agree with other Lieven's observation: "To construct a table which would illustrate all the relationships and connections running through Petersburg's social and political élite is impossible."⁹ Therefore, when I use the terms aristocracy and nobility alternately in the text, I always refer to – unless explicitly stated otherwise – the higher layer of nobility: the aristocracy.

I have also tried to carry out a quantitative analysis and answer the question: How large was the group of aristocracy studying at the selected educational institutions? Such an analysis is difficult to perform, and this attempt has clear limitations. Firstly, it encounters the ambiguity of the researched group. To identify members of the group by the title of nobility is simple but insufficient. Secondly, the sources from which the quantitative analysis can be performed are only helpful to

5 Gugo Eduardovich BLOSFELDT, *Sbornik zakonov o rossiiskom dvorianstve* (Sankt Peterburg: Izdanie knizhnago magazina iuridicheskoi literatury Davida Vissarionovicha Chichinadze, 1901), p. 2.

6 Avenir Pavlovich KORELIN, *Dvorianstvo v poreformennoi Rossii, 1861–1904 gg. Sostav, chislennost', korporativnaia organizatsiia* (Moskva: Nauka, 1979), p. 42.

7 Dominic LIEVEN, "Elites," in: *Cambridge History of Russia*, vol. 2, 1689–1917 (Cambridge 2006), pp. 227, 232–234. Lieven's conception, see more: Idem, *Aristocracy in Europe*. Russian historiography rarely uses the term aristocracy, and if so, it is more often in contemporary works. Cf. Evgenii Evgen'evich YUDIN, *Kniazia Yusupovy. Aristokraticheskaia sem'ia v pozdneimperskoi Rossii* (Moskva: RGGU, 2012), pp. 49–76; Cf. I. A. KHRISTOFOROV, *"Aristokraticheskaia" oppozitsiia*.

8 A. P. KORELIN, *Dvorianstvo*, p. 31.

9 D. LIEVEN, *Russia's Rulers under the Old Regime* (New Haven – London: Yale University Press, 1990), p. 57.

a limited extent. School commemorative and jubilee books usually contain lists of graduates and sometimes even all internal students (external students, only taking school-leaving examinations before entering university, are generally not on the lists). This makes them immensely useful, but they often merely state names and titles without further information. Therefore, we can determine the number of titled nobles with considerable reliability, but we cannot compile complete and accurate statistics. In many untitled names, it is not possible to establish whether they were nobles or not. In exclusively noble schools, such as the Imperial Alexander Lyceum or the Page Corps, it is not always possible to determine whether the person in question was an “ordinary” nobleman or part of the narrower aristocratic society. Thus, when dealing with secondary schools, we focused on the titled families, aware that the statistics are incomplete. The analyses concerning the share of the aristocracy among students are only illustrative.

The following pages, therefore, have no ambition to provide an exhaustive explanation of the issue of aristocratic education. The aim is to point out the essential elements in the education and upbringing of the aristocracy during the reign of the last three emperors (1855–1917), with references to an earlier period. These draw on the literature mentioned above focused on the first half of the 19th century and some aristocratic sources.

I view education primarily from the personal perspective of the subjects of the educational process. Naturally, I consider the institutional context, state educational policy, and how individual educational institutes functioned. However, the subjective reflection of young noblemen and noblewomen comes first. For that reason, I primarily use sources of a personal nature: diaries and, in particular, memoirs. In the 19th century, Russia had a rich diary tradition, especially in the case of well-born and aristocratic families.¹⁰ For us, one of the main sources is the child and youth diary of Count Aleksei Aleksandrovich Bobrinskii (1852–1927) from the 1860s.¹¹ The diaries are part of the extensive personal collection of A. A. Bobrinskii

10 See Larisa ZAKHAROVA, *Memuary, dnevniki, chastnaia perepiska vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, *Istochnikovedenie istorii SSSR XIX-nachala XX vv.* (Moskva: Moskovskii Universitet, 1970), pp. 346–367; Laura ENGELSTEIN – Stephanie SANDLER (eds.), *Self and Story in Russian History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000); Barbara WALKER, *On Reading Soviet Memoirs: A History of the “Contemporaries” Genre as an Institution of Russian Intelligentsia Culture from the 1790s to the 1970s*, *Russian Review* 59, July 2000, no. 3, pp. 327–352; Jochen HELLBECK – Klaus HELLER (eds.), *Autobiographical Practices in Russia / Autobiographische Praktiken in Russland* (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2004).

11 Only recently historians have started to be more interested in Aleksei Bobrinskii. Cf. Petr Serafimovich KABYTOV – Ekaterina Petrovna BARINOVA, “Gosudastvennaia i obshchestvennaia

deposited in the Russian State Archive of Old Acts (RGADA) in Moscow.¹² They remain nearly unknown to researchers and, above all, almost no one has systematically worked with children's and youth diaries.¹³ Aleksei's younger brother Vladimir (1853–1877) also kept a journal, and his childhood and youth notes supplement and extend Aleksei's records. However, Vladimir's notes are not so extensive and do not cover such an extended period.¹⁴

The second essential type of source is memoirs. They occur in two basic types: political (official) memoirs and memoirs written in the style of a family chronicle. Depending on the author's intellectual background and literary abilities, both types often became a comprehensive observation of society and time. For us, the most beneficial memoirs are those written in the style of family chronicles. The authors followed the conventional scheme and devoted part of their memories to their childhood, upbringing, and studies. The first type of memoir is irrelevant to our topic if the authors focused on describing their public career or military service in adulthood and did not mention their childhood and adolescence.

Most of the quoted memoirs are related to exile. The Russian post-revolutionary diaspora was, indeed, of a global nature; however, the aristocracy preferred

deiatel'nost' grafa Alekseia Aleksandrovicha Bobrinskogo," *Severo-Zapad v agrarnoi istorii Rossii* 25, 2019, pp. 169–182; Mikhail Nikolaevich BARYSHNIKOV, "Graf A. A. Bobrinskii v promyshlennoi zhizni Rossiiskoi imperii," *Izvestiia Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A. I. Gercena*, 2015, nr. 175, pp. 71–79; Aleksandr Sergeevich SMIRNOV, "Graf Aleksei Aleksandrovich Bobrinskii i novaia vlast'," *Problemy istorii, filologii, kul'tury*, 2015, nr. 2, pp. 300–308; Igor Lvovich TIKHONOV, "Poslednii predsedatel' Imperatorskoi arkhologicheskoi komissii graf A. A. Bobrinskoi," in: *Neuskii arkhologo-istoriograficheskii sbornik: k 75-letiiu kandidata istoricheskikh nauk A. A. Formozova* (Sankt-Peterburg: S.-Peterburgskii gos. universitet, 2003), pp. 95–117.

- 12 Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Drevnikh Aktov Moscow (furthermore RGADA), f. 1412, op. 8, ed. khr. 268–300. There are more than forty diary notebooks covering the period from 1860s till 1917. The diaries have not been published yet, except for notebooks from 1910–1911 and a separate diary from February 1917. "Dnevnik A. A. Bobrinskogo," *Krasnyi arkhiv*, 1928, vol. 1 (26), pp. 125–150; Zbyněk VYDRA, "Únorová revoluce v Petrohradě v deníku hraběte Alexeje Bobrinského," *Slovanský přehled / Slavonic Review* 101 (2015), 2, pp. 387–414.
- 13 Cf. Zbyněk VYDRA, "Vospitanie i posvednevnaiia zhizn' v aristokraticheskoi sem'e epokhi Aleksandra II: graf Aleksei Aleksandrovich Bobrinskii i ego dnevnik," in: *Aleksandr II i ego vremia. K 200-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia* (Sankt-Peterburg: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii universitet im. A. I. Gertsena, 2019, pp. 115–129); Idem, *Education and Aristocratic Childhood*, p. 240.
- 14 RGADA, f. 1412, op. 7, ed. khr. 68 Dnevniky (detskie) Bobrinskogo Vladimira Aleksandrovicha, 1865–1866; ed. khr. 69, Iunosheskie dnevniky Bobrinskogo Vladimira Aleksandrovicha, 1867–1868.

certain countries. Most of the authors mentioned above settled permanently in France or stayed there for a longer time. In exile, the associations of nobility were established, the aristocracy maintained mutual contacts, and strengthened their sense of belonging by entering into marriages. An integral part of the shared aristocratic culture was writing and publishing memoirs preserving family and collective memory and passing it on to the next generations. The emigrants considered themselves the sole protectors and heirs of Russia's cultural traditions. Only some of the authors of exile memoirs were politically active individuals trying to explain and defend their political role in pre-revolutionary Russia and the whirlwind of revolutionary events. There were various other motives for writing memoirs as well. The authors intended to bear witness to the tumultuous events they had experienced and witnessed. On a personal level, they needed to cope with the rapid change in their status due to losing their homeland and closest ones. At the same time, they wanted to retain their memories of home for the family memory for future generations.

For this reason, aristocratic memoirs were often very descriptive in detail. The aristocrats tried to capture everything essential from their lives, family history, and everyday life of their milieu. Everything remained only in memory, nothing of it was abroad, and it did not even exist in Russia anymore. Using Lidia Vasil'chikova's words, "a vanished world turned to dust". The irreversibility of the past was one of the strong motifs in the memoirs, as evidenced by their titles (e.g., *Vanished Russia; From the Drowned World; The Way of Bitterness*). Through memoirs, the emigrants tried to preserve the image of their lives and the whole of pre-revolutionary Russia. Exile memoir literature was predominantly fixed on the pre-revolutionary period. Many memoirs ended with the revolution and the departure into exile, as if life outside Russia did not exist.¹⁵

Almost thirty sources of a personal nature, most of which have been published (see Table 1), were used for this study. Most sources were created after 1860 and covered the entire period until the First World War. The authors can be divided into three generational groups. The first one is the generation from the period the 1850s–1870s that entered secondary schools during the reign of Alexander II

15 For more details on aristocratic memoirs in exile and the USSR see Zbyněk VYDRA, "Exile and Soviet memoirs: Family mansions in aristocratic family memories after the Russian Revolution of 1917," in Radmila Švaiříčková-Slabáková (ed.), *Family Memory: Creation, Transmission and Usage in History and Today* (New York: Routledge, 2021), pp. 162–176. Further cf. Julia HILDT, *Der russische Adel im Exil. Selbstverständnis und Erinnerungsbilder nach der Revolution von 1917* (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2018).

and Alexander III. This generation was already affected by educational reforms in the 1860s. The second generation from the period the 1880s–1890s studied at the end of the reign of Alexander III, but mainly under Nicholas II. Finally, the third generation of noblemen, born in the first decade of the 20th century, completed their studies during the First World War. In the case of the youngest group, they had only managed to finish their home education by the revolution. In our story, the youngest nobleman leaving his memories of the pre-revolutionary period is Count Pavel A. Grabbe (born 1902). For all the persons mentioned in the table below, I no longer indicate their noble titles and patronymics in the following text.

Table No. 1 – Aristocrats and personal sources

title and name	years of life	source	form of secondary education
Prince Vladimir P. Meshcherskii	1838–1914	published memoirs	Imperial School of Jurisprudence
Count Aleksei A. Bobrinskii	1852–1927	unpublished diary	home education
Count Vladimir A. Bobrinskii	1853–1877	unpublished diary	home education
Prince Boris A. Vasil'chikov	1860–1931	published memoirs	Imperial School of Jurisprudence
Prince Sergei M. Volkonskii	1860–1937	published memoirs	state gymnasium
Prince Georgii E. L'vov	1861–1925	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Prince Evgenii N. Trubetskoi	1863–1920	published memoirs	private gymnasium; state gymnasium
Countess Varvara Bobrinskaia, née L'vova	1864–1940	unpublished memoirs	home education

Prince Vladimir A. Obolenskii	1869–1950	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Princess Mariia S. Bariatinskaia, née Bashmakova	1871–1933	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Countess Sofia V. Panina	1871–1956	unpublished memoirs	Ekaterinskii Institut (state school for noble girls)
Prince Mikhail V. Golitsyn	1873–1943	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Prince Aleksandr D. Golitsyn	1874–1957	published memoirs	home education; state gymnasium
Count Emmanuil P. Bennigsen	1875–1955	published memoirs	Imperial School of Jurisprudence
Prince Pavel P. Lieven	1875–1963	unpublished memoirs	home education; real school (Realschule)
Prince Aleksei V. Obolenskii	1877–1969	published memoirs	state gymnasium
Aleksandr V. Davydov	1881–1955	published memoirs	state gymnasium
Prince Vladimir A. Drutskoi-Sokolinskii	1881–1943	published memoirs	state gymnasium; Imperial School of Jurisprudence
Prince Illarion S. Vasil'chikov	1881–1969	published memoirs	state gymnasium
Count Valentin P. Zubov	1884–1969	published memoirs	home education
Countess Edith Sollohub, née Martens	1886–1965	published memoirs	home education

Princess Lidiia L. Vasil'chikova, née Viazemskaia	1886–1948	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Prince Feliks F. Yusupov	1887–1967	published memoirs	private gymnasium
Prince Sergei E. Trubetskoi	1890–1949	published memoirs	state gymnasium
Count Ivan I. Stenbok-Fermor	1897–1986	unpublished memoirs	private gymnasium
Princess Irina D. Golitsyna, née Countess Tatishcheva	1900–1983	published memoirs	home education
Count Pavel A. Grabbe	1902–1999	published memoirs	Alexander Military School; Page Corps

Many of the nobles on the list were linked by family ties. There were brothers (Aleksii and Vladimir Bobrinskii), fathers and sons (Evgenii and Sergei Trubetskoi), and married couples (Illarion and Lidiia Vasil'chikovy). Other ties were formed through marriages, further underscoring the interconnectedness of the aristocracy.

Some authors would go into great detail – Pavel Grabbe wrote an entire chapter on the Page Corps, Mikhail Golitsyn on the gymnasium, and Emmanuil Bennigsen on the Imperial School of Jurisprudence. Others paid scant attention to this part of their life, dismissing it with only a few sentences (Mariia Bariatinskaia, Edith Sollohub). Still, even these have informative value and complete the overall image of aristocratic upbringing and education from childhood to the threshold of adulthood.

What to do with an adolescent aristocrat? Possibilities for further education.

At the age of thirteen or fourteen, childhood turns into adolescence. The process of upbringing and educating aristocratic scions was changing, especially for sons, whose educational strategy began to be shaped concerning their envisaged careers. Not all adolescent aristocrats had a clear idea of their future since childhood. In

this respect, the family and the positive example of the father or elder, successful siblings played a vital role. But even though the children perceived these examples, they did not necessarily have to form their particular goals according to them. Little Aleksei Bobrinskii considered many options but did not commit much detail to his diary.

The period of adolescence was connected with much emotional turbulence, and some young aristocrats sank deep into their vortexes. Aleksei Bobrinskii's diary reveals the deluges of emotions shaking the young man for several years. Since 1867, when he was fifteen, his youth diaries were already very different from the children's, paying less and less attention to education. In the literature, there is an assumption that he studied in Vevey, Switzerland, in a private boarding school founded by Jean-Jacques Rousseau.¹⁶ This idea corresponds to a biography written by his son Aleksei in exile.¹⁷ Naturally, it is possible that the teachers, who visited him during his stay in Switzerland, came from this boarding school. Nevertheless, Bobrinskii himself does not mention anything like this in the diary. In detail, he only recorded passing the final examinations at the 2nd St. Petersburg Gymnasium in April/May 1870, after which he was allowed to enter university. Once more, he wrote down the examination results in a special notebook. It cannot be said that he would have excelled: he was dissatisfied with his performance in history (he got an overall grade "two") and considered "three" in cosmography to be unfair.¹⁸

Bobrinskii's diaries also changed from a formal point of view. While Russian predominated in the children's diaries, it was increasingly supplemented with French in the youth diaries, which eventually came to dominate. For example, from 18 January to 30 May 1867, the journal is written almost entirely in French.¹⁹ However, there was no pattern in changing languages because, at other times, French intertwined with English.²⁰ The sudden dominance of French most likely coincided with the new role of an adolescent aristocrat entering the great world of St. Petersburg balls and theatres.

16 Igor L'vovich TIKHONOV, "Predvoditel' dvorianstva, senator, deputat, ministr, arkholog. Graf A. A. Bobrinskii," in: *Znamenitye universanty. Ocherki o pitomtsakh Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta*, vol. 1 (Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2002), p. 72.

17 Bakhmeteff Archive (furthermore BAR), Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York. Bobrinskii Papers. Graf Aleksei Aleksandrovich Bobrinskii 1852–1927, p. 4.

18 RGADA, f. 1412, op. 8, ed. khr. 275, l. 134–142; ed. khr. 238, l. 3.

19 Ibidem, ed. khr. 272.

20 Ibidem, ed. khr. 272, l. 39.

Social life completely absorbed Alexei and what he would note down in the first place were social contacts, information about entertainment (skating, balls, visits to theatres), and acquaintances with girls. The diaries became more sentimental: Aleksei was very sensitive and often in love. We can notice an outburst of platonic love for Grand Duchess Ol'ga Konstantinovna,²¹ love for Princess Aleksandra ("Ara") P. Viazemskaia in the winter of 1867–1868,²² feelings for Princess Vera A. L'vova in 1869–1870,²³ Mariia D. Naryshkina in 1871,²⁴ and finally the greatest love for Countess Sofia P. Shuvalova in 1872–1874.²⁵ Just as Aleksei confided intimate feelings to the diary, he feared that strangers would read his notes: "[...] I am afraid of my diary being attacked," the young count wrote on 29 December 1867, adding: "I fear that anyone could read my diary".²⁶ The days when the children's author gave his diary to his parents so they could read it were gone for good.²⁷ A few years later, in October 1875, Aleksei remembered his young loves with an ironic smile: "What an inquisitive child I was. And how curious love is. I loved twenty people simultaneously."²⁸ In this respect, diaries are a genuinely invaluable authentic source, capturing the author's immediate emotional and mental processes. If other adolescent aristocrats experienced similar expressive movements, they usually did not write about them in their memoirs. For whatever reason, young love was not what they wanted to tell their readers about.

Comparing Bobrinskii's notes with Aleksandr A. Polovtsov's (1832–1909) diary reveals that Polovtsov, already at the age of six, clearly imagined that his life

21 Ibidem, ed. khr. 270, l. 8, 9, 10, 34. Grand Duchess Ol'ga Konstantinovna (1851–1929), granddaughter of Emperor Nicholas I, since 1867 wife of King George I of Greece.

22 RGADA, f. 1412, op. 8, ed. khr. 271, l. 62; Ibidem, ed. khr. 272, l. 6–7. Princess Aleksandra Pavlovna Viazemskaia (1855–1928, according to other data 1851–1929), married Dmitrii S. Sipiagin (1853–1902).

23 Ibidem, ed. khr. 274, l. 38, 50; ed. khr. 275, l. 120. Princess Vera Aleksandrovna L'vova (1848–1924), married Prince Petr G. Volkonskii (1843–1896). Her elder son Aleksandr Petrovich married Sof'ia Alekseevna Bobrinskiaia, daughter of Aleksei Aleksandrovich.

24 Ibidem, ed. khr. 275, l. 207, 225. Mariia Dmitrievna Naryshkina (1849–1925) married Prince Fedor Sergeevich Golitsyn (1850–1920).

25 Ibidem, ed. khr. 275, l. 236, 284; ed. khr. 276, l. 23. In 1879, Countess Sof'ia Petrovna Shuvalova (1857–1928) married Count Alexander Konstantinovich Benckendorff 1849–1916/17).

26 Ibidem, ed. khr. 271, l. 62.

27 See Z. VYDRA, *Education and Aristocratic Childhood*, p. 241; Andrei V. MAMONOV, "Detskii dnevnik A. A. Polovtsova," *Rossiiskaia istoriia* 2015, No 3, p. 171.

28 RGADA, f. 1412, op. 8, ed. khr., 274, l. 115.

would be connected with civil service.²⁹ Polovtsov came from a significantly more modest family background than Bobrinskii. Rather than to the court aristocracy, his family belonged to the service nobility, and Polovtsov could hardly have imagined himself without a civil servant career. Bobrinskii's position was different. Being the eldest son in a very wealthy family, he did not have to enter the civil service, yet his future was fully guaranteed. Nevertheless, the possibility of an aristocrat not engaging in public affairs in late imperial Russia was almost out of the question. The state/homeland service was the basic idea on which the mentality of the nobility was based, and this idea was fostered from a very young age. In the 1860s, about three-quarters of nobles had been in the civil service at some stage of their lives.³⁰ Sergei Trubetskoi wrote: "I always used to hear that everyone was obliged to 'serve' Russia somehow [...] From the conversations of adults, I clearly understood that all adults (understand – men) must somehow engage in public affairs. Being a 'rich idler' and living only for own pleasure was something very shameful, almost embarrassing. 'Noblesse oblige' – this was tacitly considered an absolute duty. From the interviews and notes of adults, I deduced that we were obliged to serve not anyone in particular but society, science, art."³¹

The reforms of the 1860s further strengthened the public engagement of the nobility: mainly the abolition of serfdom and the introduction of local self-government. Similarly, Varvara Bobrinskaia remembered the atmosphere of the 1860s and the 1870s: "Everybody was rushing to serve the liberated people. My father left the guard regiment, settled in the countryside, and became a Justice of the Peace."³²

At the same time, noblemen were automatically assumed to set an example with their behaviour. Feliks Yusupov recalled that home education's basis was simplicity, modesty, and responsibility towards others: "The more you have, the more you owe to others. Be modest. If, in something, you are at a higher position than others, may God protect you from showing it to them."³³ Lidiia Vasil'chikova perceived her state of nobility as something extraordinary and differentiating her from

29 A. V. MAMONOV, "Detskii dnevnik," pp. 174–175.

30 S. BECKER, *Nobility*, p. 113.

31 Sergei Nikolaevich TRUBETSKOI, *Minushee* (Moskva: DEM, 1991), pp. 48–49.

32 Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii Moscow (furthermore GARF), f. 5819, Bobrinskaia Varvara Nikolaevna, op. 1., ed. khr. 5, Khronika moi zhizni. Vospominaniia (1864–1930), l. 11.

33 Feliks Feliksovich YUSUPOV, *Memuary v dvuch knigach. Do izgnaniia. 1887–1919* (Moskva: Zakharov, 1998), p. 31.

other people, not in terms of haughty superiority, but in terms of obligation and responsible service.³⁴

The service to the homeland and society could take various forms. The ideal of service was materialised in two essential social roles: a nobleman-landowner and a state servant. These two roles may not have always been in accordance with each other. The time when every nobleman owned land and at the same time served the state was over. The abolition of serfdom eliminated a strong bond between the nobles and the state, which had so far guaranteed the nobility property rights. At the end of the 19th century, many nobles believed that the state had dismissed them and saw their public role either in the service to their estate or the nearest society, not in the state civil or military service.

According to Varvara Bobrinskaia, “The attitude to the military and civilian career was disdainful and contemptuous. All young people were destined to go through university and then embark on a journey of service to the nation.”³⁵ Illarion S. Vasil’chikov observed that many of his university friends and colleagues had come to the belief that “for landowners, land ownership means duty and obligation – to bring as great benefit to the local peasants as possible, to provide them with the improvement of material and cultural conditions.”³⁶ Using slightly different words, Boris A. Vasil’chikov aptly notes, “Some served the government, others served the people opposing the government, but all of them found complete satisfaction in serving [...] the service was considered a duty of a nobleman.”³⁷

Obtaining a proper education was necessary for achieving the ideal of public service, whatever the ideal involved. For young noblemen, education opened various ways of publicly asserting themselves. However, the ways they would choose depended not only on them; the family, traditions, and financial possibilities played an important role. Homeschooling was expensive and not available to all noble children. Aristocratic families did not have to worry about the financial cost and provided their children with home education up to the period of adolescence when the children were to start attending secondary school. A completed secondary education was generally considered the standard for noble sons. Moreover, it was a pre-

34 Lidia Leonidovna VASIL’CHIKOVA, *Ischeznuvshaia Rossiia. Vospominaniia kniagini Lidii Leonidovny Vasil’chikovoï 1886–1919* (Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskie sezony, 1995), p. 75.

35 GARE, f. 5819, op. 1, ed. khr. 5, l. 13.

36 Illarion Sergeevich, VASIL’CHIKOV, *To, chto mne vspomnilos...* (Moskva: OLMA-PRESS, 2002), p. 54.

37 Boris Aleksandrovich VASIL’CHIKOV, *Vospominaniia* (Moskva: Nashe nasledie, 2003), p. 90.

requisite for enrolling at university and joining the civil service. For civil service, there was a direct imperative of the law: according to the imperial decree of 9 August 1809, career advancement was conditioned by a university education. Only a university graduate, or one who passed a special exam, could achieve the 8th grade of the Table of Ranks, i.e. the rank of a collegiate assessor.³⁸ And if the applicant had not studied at a Russian secondary school, he could not enter university (unless he passed special exams).³⁹

Before and at the beginning of the 1860s, secondary education was primarily at home. Teachers from gymnasiums went to a family, and every year, boys, as external students, took exams to advance to the following year. They only started attending classes in the final grade, or – like Aleksei and Vladimir Bobrinskii – they merely passed the school-leaving examination.⁴⁰ The eight-year full-time study became more common in the following decades. Nevertheless, both types of education continued to coexist. For example, at the Katkov Lyceum in Moscow, in 1905, Prince Vladimir V. Golitsyn and Prince Mikhail L. Shakhovskoi were among the graduates, and while Golitsyn had studied at school only from the sixth to the eighth class, Shakhovskoi had done so for eight years.⁴¹

-
- 38 The rank of collegiate assessor guaranteed (until 1845) gaining the hereditary nobility. University education and civil service were thus a means of social advancement even for the non-nobles. Cf. Evgeniia Konstantinovna SYSOEVA, *Shkola v Rossii XVIII – nachalo XX vv. Vlast' i obshchestvo* (Moskva: Novyi khronograf, 2015), p. 91; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, Sobranie II (1825–1881)*, vol. 9 (1834), part 1, nr. 7724 (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia 2 Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi e. i. v. Kantseliarii, 1835), pp. 656–657.
- 39 Count Pavel Aleksandrovich Bennigsen (1845–1919) did not finish his studies at the Imperial School of Jurisprudence and left Russia to study in Heidelberg. To be allowed to enter the civil service, he returned to Russia and enrolled at the University of Derpt (Tartu). However, as he did not have a certificate of completing gymnasium classes at the Imperial School of Jurisprudence, he could only enrol as an external student. To be able to begin serving at the Ministry of the Interior, he had to pass a special exam. It was not difficult. See Emmanuil Pavlovich BENNIGSEN, *Zapiski (1875–1917)*, vol. 1 (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo im. Sabashnikovvykh, 2018), pp. 23, 26–27.
- 40 GARF, f. 5819, l. 15; University College of London. School of Slavonic and East European Studies Library. Lieven Collection. Paul LIEVEN, *Dela davno minuvshikh let i teni tekhn, kago uzhd net, 1875–1925*, in: London School of Slavonic and East European Studies, Lieven Collection, p. 32; Valentin Platonovich ZUBOV, *Stradnye gody Rossii* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Indrik, 2004), pp. 14–15.
- 41 *Spiski byvsikh i nastoiashchikh vospitannikov Imperatorskogo Litseia v pamiat' Tsesarevicha Nikolaia. Prilozhenie k "Litseiskomu Kalendariu" na 1907–1908 uchebnyi god* (Moskva: Universitetskaiia tipografiia, 1908), pp. 54–55.

The choice between in-class study and homeschooling very much depended on the family. Pavel Lieven studied at home because his mother wanted to shield him from the possible negative influence of his classmates. Pavel understood her motives, but in retrospect, he was critical of this method because education in isolation from a group of children from other families and social classes made his social interaction in adulthood more difficult.⁴² For this reason, other parents made the opposite decision to Princess Lieven. Sergei Trubetskoi believed that: “Father and Mother [...] quite rightly decided that while the family had the most significant educational importance in childhood, later the boys would greatly benefit from immersing themselves in the ‘social’ life of the school. [...] They considered it desirable for us to come into contact with gymnasium classmates from other social classes than just the one we were born into.”⁴³

In this case, the fact that Sergei’s father Evgenii had also studied at the gymnasium and his views on education were progressive played a role.

The nobility discussed the education issues very intensively – more so by the provincial nobility that felt more threatened by social changes than by the aristocracy. Local noble assemblies perceived strengthening liberal and democratic sentiments in society as a problem and considered maintaining privileged aristocratic education on the principle of closed institutions of the estates to be one of the means of facing it. However, there was no general agreement. Some aristocratic assemblies (e.g. in the Vladimir and Voronezh Provinces) promoted the schools of the estates, while others (e.g. in the Tambov and Tver Provinces) wished for civic-oriented schools. At the same time, at the beginning of the 20th century, the aristocracy demanded state funding of aristocratic schools.⁴⁴

Elite aristocratic schools

The debates about education and schools primarily took place among the provincial nobility. Still, to some extent, they affected the aristocracy living permanently in St. Petersburg and Moscow, which also depended on the state’s school policy. While in Great Britain, there was a tradition of elite, independent, private second-

42 P. LIEVEN, *Dela davno minuvshikh let*, p. 33.

43 S. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Minuvshie*, p. 37

44 Ekaterina Petrovna BARINOVA, *Rossiiskoe dvorianstvo v nachale XX veka. Ekonomicheskii status i sotsiokul’turnyi oblik* (Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2008), p. 70.

ary schools (Eton, Harrow, Winchester), the Russian aristocracy had nothing of this kind. Even if estate schools were open only for the nobles, they were state institutions founded from above, not from below, by the nobility. The educational models were transferred from the West but adapted to the needs of the state. If they paid attention to education, Peter the Great and other emperors/empresses were primarily concerned with training state officials. The state controlled the educational system and changed it according to temporary political interests. The aristocracy could choose between two main directions in education: military and civilian schools. In this field, the closest model to Eton's was the Page Corps, the Imperial Alexander Lyceum, and the Imperial School of Jurisprudence. All three schools were exclusively aristocratic; however, they were established by the state rather than by aristocratic self-government.

The Page Corps was the most prestigious way to begin an army career. The aristocracy and the army were traditionally closely linked. The most prestigious part of the army was the Imperial Guard, and the aristocracy wanted to enter mainly its ranks. The ways to join the Guard differed, but the Page Corps remained the most elite school preparing its future officers. The beginnings of the Page Corps date back to the reign of Peter the Great. The final form of the Corps as an elite cadet school crystallised in the early 19th century.⁴⁵ Studying at the Page Corps was significantly cheaper than at the Alexander Lyceum or the Imperial School of Jurisprudence. Full-time learners studied at the expense of the state, and for external students, parents paid 200 roubles a year.⁴⁶ However, it was not enough to be a hereditary nobleman to be allowed to join the Corps. Accepted were only the boys who were (a) sons or grandsons of generals, (b) sons or grandsons of envoys, governors and governorate marshals of the nobility, (c) sons or grandsons of civil servants of the first three classes, (d) great-grandsons of civil servants of the first two classes.⁴⁷

45 Otto Rudolfovich von FREIMAN, *Pazhi za 183 goda (1711–1894). Biografii byvshikh pazhei, s portretami* (Fridrichshavn: Tipografiia aktsionernogo obshchestva, 1894); Dmitrii Mikhailovich LEVSHIN, *Pazheskii Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva Korpus za sto let*, 2 vols. (Sankt-Peterburg: Pazheskii iubileinyi komitet, 1902).

46 S. V. BOGDANOV, "Vospitanie elity. Fenomen privilegirovannogo obrazovaniia v Rossiiskoi imperii kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka," *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta* 3 (30), 2015, p. 11.

47 German Sergeevich CHUVARDIN, "Pazheskii korpus kak elitoobrazujushchaia struktura Rossiiskoi imperii v period pravleniia imperatorov Aleksandra III – Nikolaiia II," *Istoriia. Sotsiologiia. Kul'turologiia. Etnografiia* 4 (2012), p. 43.

The institution's prestige was high because the chosen students were, in their senior years, selected to become the "chamber pages" and serve at the imperial court, where they were assigned to members of the imperial family. Excellent study results could facilitate a further career in the army and open the door to court society. For many families, the Page Corps was a traditional institution where they sent their sons. During the existence of the Page Corps, for example, thirteen members of the count family of Grabbes studied there. Pavel Grabbe was the last of the family to join the Corps in 1915. First, thirteen-year-old Pavel studied in the Alexander Cadet Corps. "What did you expect? It's not the Page Corps," his elder brother said, brushing off his disappointment with this school, which did not have a bad reputation but was not so prestigious. Thus, Pavel soon moved to the Page Corps, which immediately impressed him with the magnificence of its seat in the Vorontsov Palace. However, his enthusiasm quickly faded, and he began to be opposed to everything military. Father's arguments that he comes from a military family and must honour tradition (Father was a Corps graduate, too) were of little avail. In the end, Pavel did not have to solve the dilemma of whether to continue at this school or not: the revolution in 1917 brought an end to his studies and the Page Corps.⁴⁸

The curriculum of the Page Corps corresponded to the programme of the classical gymnasium, and besides, it was extended by military theory, fencing, dancing lessons, and horseback riding. A graduate of the Page Corps was to be an exemplary "officer-courtier". A particular group of courses included professional military subjects: military history, tactics, fortification, military topography, and hippology. The range of subjects was so broad that some students complained about the too theoretical and superficial schooling, as there was no time left for teaching in detail.⁴⁹ From its beginnings until the revolution, Page Corps was closely connected with the Imperial Guard. During the reign of the last three emperors, more than 80 % of graduates joined the various guard regiments, most of them serving in the cavalry. Those who opted for infantry most often chose the oldest of the regiments – Preobrazhenskii. A small minority joined ordinary army regiments, and a truly exceptional choice was the civil service.⁵⁰

48 Paul GRABBE, *Windows on the River Neva. A Memoir* (New York: Pomerica Press Limited, 1987), pp. 89–101.

49 CHUVARDIN, *Pazheskii korpus*, pp. 49–50.

50 O. R. von FREIMAN, *Pazhi za 183 goda*; D. M. LEVSHIN, *Pazheskii korpus*, vol. 2, pp. 347–367. In some years, Levshin states fewer graduates than Freiman, whose list is, in general, more detailed.

The civil alternatives to the Page Corps were the Imperial School of Jurisprudence (*Imperatorskoe uchilishche pravovedeniia*) and the Alexander Lyceum. Both institutions functioned on the principle of the estates and were established to educate and prepare young people from aristocratic families for civil service. The school fees were high even when compared to private gymnasiums. In the 1890s, students of the Imperial School of Jurisprudence paid 700–800 roubles a year; students of the Alexander Lyceum even paid up to 900 roubles a year. At the same time, at the private Bychkov/Gurevich gymnasium, school fees ranged from 90 roubles in the first year to 250 in the fourth and the following years. Both schools offered study scholarships.⁵¹

The Imperial School of Jurisprudence was founded in 1835 and combined gymnasium studies with university studies of law. Although it trained future civil servants, some significant figures of the Russian cultural scene were also among its students. Probably the most famous graduate who took a completely different direction was Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky. In the middle of the 19th century, strict discipline ruled in the school. Vladimir Meshcherskii was sent to a preparatory class at the age of eight and experienced the arrival of a new director, the “terrible Colonel Iazykov.” One disobedient student was caught with his waistcoat unbuttoned, hands in pockets, and acted rebelliously against the serving officer, and was sentenced to twenty blows with a cane. Then, the poor boy was expelled from the school.⁵² At the end of the 19th century, the Imperial School of Jurisprudence no longer practised similar draconian methods but otherwise functioned in almost the same paramilitary system as under Nicholas I, including bullying of younger students by older ones.⁵³ The number of students in graduate years slightly increased, from about twenty-five up to thirty in the first two decades to thirty-five up to forty during the reign of Nicholas II. During its entire existence, the school had 2,580 graduates. Among them, the number of titled aristocrats was more or less stable. There were 188 aristocratic graduates, but we only consider this number to be a definable minimum. It is evident that more aristocrats studied at this school, but not all of them completed their studies (see the case of Count Pavel Bennigsen,

51 Vladimir Andreevich DRUTSKOI-SOKOLINSKII, *Da blagoslovenna pamiat'. Zapiski russkogo dvorianina (1880–1914 gg.)* (Orel: Variant V, 1996), p. 76; S. V. BOGDANOV, *Vospitanie elity*, p. 9.

52 Vladimir Petrovich MESHCHERSKII, *Moi vospominaniia*, vol. 1 (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia kn. V. P. Meshcherskogo, 1897), pp. 3–9.

53 The description of the atmosphere, see E. P. BENNIGSEN, *Zapiski*, pp. 87–88; V. A. DRUTSKOI-SOKOLINSKII, *Da blagoslovenna pamiat'*, pp. 69–71.

cited above). We know that a title was not the only criterion for a person to be ranked among aristocrats. Among the title graduates, barons predominated (97 in total), and in the vast majority, they were members of the Baltic families. However, the most successful family were the Obolenskii Princes, whose nine members completed their studies, followed by the Korf Barons, with eight graduates.⁵⁴

The Alexander Lyceum was more focused on humanities, emphasising languages (besides French and German, English was taught there, too), history, and philosophy. The Imperial Alexander Lyceum was founded in Tsarskoye Selo in 1811, and initially, before moving to St. Petersburg in 1843 and changing its name, it was called The Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum. In their first graduate year (1817), Prince Aleksandr M. Gorchakov, the future Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Aleksandr S. Pushkin were among its outstanding students. In Tsarskoye Selo, students were admitted to the lyceum once every three years. Every year, from 1848, its curriculum gradually became closer and closer to that of the Faculty of Law of St. Petersburg Imperial University. However, it was still an aristocratic school, so the curriculum included music, dance, fencing, and physical education. The number of students at the lyceum was around 180, of which 50 studied at state expenses, the others at their own cost. About 15–18 pupils studied in each of the first two classes (younger and older preparatory classes), and from the first to the sixth grades, there were around 30 students in each class.⁵⁵ The lyceum lost some of its lustre in the second half of the century. Yet, it remained a prestigious institution, which was essentially monarchist, patriotic, and conservative, but, at the same time, also one of the most cultural and cosmopolitan in Russia. Several extraordinary personalities of Russian culture and most foreign ministers graduated from the Alexander Lyceum.⁵⁶

54 The lists of the Imperial School of Jurisprudence graduates, see Nikolai L. PASHENNYI, *Imperatorskoe Uchilishche Pravovedeniia i Pravovedy v gody mira, vojny i smuty* (Madrid: Izdanie Komiteta Pravovedskoi kassy, 1967). Further to the history of the school, cf. Emma Aleksandrovna ANNENKOVA, *Imperatorskoe uchilishche pravovedeniia* (Sankt Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Rostok, 2006).

55 S. V. BOGDANOV, *Vospitanie elity*, p. 9.

56 Besides Gorchakov, Nikolai Giers (Foreign Minister 1882–1895), Prince Aleksei Lobanov-Rostovskii (Foreign Minister 1895–1896), Count Vladimir Lamzdorf (Foreign Minister 1901–1906), Aleksandr Izvol'skii (Foreign Minister 1906–1910), and Sergei Sazonov (Foreign Minister 1910–1916) graduated from this school. D. LIEVEN, *Aristocracy*, p. 178. For new literature on the history of the Lyceum, see Svetlana Vasilievna PAVLOVA, *Imperatorskii Aleksandrovskii (byvsbii Tsarskosel'skii) Litsei* (Moskva: Paritet, 2002); Svetlana Davydovna RUDENSKAIA, *Tsarskosel'skii – Aleksandrovskii litsei 1811–1917* (Sankt Peterburg: Lenizdat, 1999). An over-

All three schools maintained a distinct identity. They functioned as a closed community, a “brotherhood” with a strong ethos. As a military school, the Page Corps had an even more specific “code of honour” tied to the Knights of Malta.⁵⁷ The students’ daily lives were bound both by written and unwritten rules. They were categorically forbidden to drive fast by carriage and by car. They were prohibited from visiting restaurants, cafes, and buffets at railway stations, inns, clubs, dance parties, and amusement parks. Only the students of the last year received permission to visit selected restaurants. The students were allowed to visit the imperial theatres and some other selected stages (Novyi teatr, Novaia opera, Teatr Literaturno-khudozhestvennogo obshchestva, etc.). However, they were not allowed to sit closer than in the seventh row from the stage in the imperial theatres and the fourth row in others. Being closer to the stage was considered inappropriate and tasteless. Visiting entertainment establishments, usually connected with making acquaintances unsuitable for minors, was prohibited. Horseback riding was only allowed outside the city or on the islands.

Besides these standard regulations, each school had its own rules as well. Unlike the students of the Imperial School of Jurisprudence, the students of the Lyceum were forbidden to go by tram. The students of the Page Corps had to rent a carriage immediately at the exit from the institute, even if they did not need to. Some bans were relaxed over the years (e.g., in the 1880s, it was allowed – unofficially – to visit private theatres), or the students circumvented them in various ways. Emmanuil Bennigsen admitted that the students of the Imperial School of Jurisprudence had been secretly let into separate restaurant private rooms. Most students, however, often ended up in the buffet of the Nikolaev Railway Station.⁵⁸ Suppose someone violated both written and unwritten rules and thus affected the honour of the student community and the school. In that case, it could lead to the ostracisation of the student within the community or even prevent him from a future career in such a closed company as a guard regiment.⁵⁹

view of the Lyceum graduates, see *Pamiatnaia knizhka litseistov za rubezhom*, Paris: Izdanie Ob'edineniia b. Vospitannikov Imperatorskogo Aleksandrovskego Liceia vo Francii, 1929.

57 G. S. CHUVARDIN, *Pazheskii korpus*, p. 46.

58 E. P. BENNIGSEN, *Zapiski*, p. 98. Further, see Valentina Aleksandrovna VEREMENKO, *Deti v dvorianskikh sem'iakh Rossii (vtoraia polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.)* (Sankt-Peterburg: Leningradskii gos. Universitet im. A. S. Pushkina), pp. 140–141.

59 S. V. BOGDANOV, *Vospitanie elity*, pp. 11–12; D. LIEVEN, *Russia's Rulers*, pp. 112–113.

Between military and civic education. Cadet corps and gymnasiums

Elite educational institutions cultivated the noble spirit and helped preserve the estates' exclusivity. However, they could not meet the demand for education either from the side of the nobility or the state, which required a sufficient number of educated and, at the same time, noble officials and soldiers. The needs of the civil service and public administration continued to grow, and the nobility, aware of the importance of education, had to look for other types of schools.

In the first half of the 19th century, cadet corps (*kadetskie korpusy*) were reserved for the nobility in the field of military education. Thereby the nobles formed the core of the officer corps. In 1825, there were five cadet corps, and another fourteen were founded under Nicholas I. With the advent of reforms in the 1860s, cadet schools' image also had to change. Military Minister Dmitrii Miliutin deprived them of the exclusivity of the estates and turned them into military gymnasiums.⁶⁰ There were only a few exceptions. A unique position was held by military schools that ranked among secondary school institutions but practically functioned as a two-year follow-up study extending the already completed secondary education. Predominantly graduates of military gymnasiums enrolled at this school. The Nicholas Cavalry School, reserved only for nobles, was the most prestigious. Its graduates were expected primarily to join the guard cavalry regiments, which therefore included many representatives of the aristocracy as a result. In 1864–1889, among 1,806 graduates, there were 102 titled noblemen. One of them was Baron Gustav von Mannerheim, the future Finnish field marshal and president.⁶¹ On the other hand, although the Alexander Military School in Moscow mainly admitted nobles, it was far from attractive to the aristocracy. It was an infantry school, and, in the comparable period (1864–1889), it had significantly more graduates: 636 altogether, though only 31 were titled.⁶²

60 John L. H. KEEP, *Soldiers of the Tsar. Army and Society in Russia 1462–1874* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), p. 371; Bruce W. MENNING, *Bayonets before Bullets. The Russian Imperial Army, 1861–1914* (Bloomington – Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992), p. 34.

61 Mannerheim studied at the school from 1887 to 1889. Nartsis Nartsisovich BUKOVSKII, *XXV godovshchina Nikolaevskago kavaleriiskago uchilishcha 1864–1889* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografia I. A. Litvinova, 1889), Appendix, pp. 17–165, 160.

62 Vladimir Ivanovich KEDRIN, *Aleksandrovsкое voennoe uchilishche 1863–1901* (Moskva: Tipografia G. Lissnera, 1901), pp. 20–127.

Miliutin's reform democratised military education. The number of students went up, there were more competitors to the nobility, and the proportion of noblemen decreased, although not dramatically – from 89 % to 81 %. In 1882, the new Minister of War, Pyotr S. Vannovskii, restored the model of the cadet corps, with fourteen out of eighteen reserved exclusively for nobles. Nonetheless, he did not manage to reverse the trend: in the following decades, the decline of nobles continued. In 1881–1897, it fluctuated between 62 % and 71 %.⁶³

At the end of the 19th century, only 25 % of noble boys studied at military schools. The reason could be a smaller choice of military schools than civilian ones. For the aristocracy, school fees did not play a significant role (moreover, tuition was more or less the same for military and civilian schools, approximately 400–500 roubles per year); a more important consideration was the school's prestige. Furthermore, joining military service was not necessary to graduate from a military school. Many nobles made a military career after graduating from a civilian school: Count Aleksandr V. Golenishchev-Kutuzov (1846–1897) graduated from the Alexander Lyceum (1866), then joined the army and remained in it.⁶⁴ Count Dmitrii F. Geiden (1862–1926) graduated from the gymnasium at the Imperial St. Petersburg Institute of Philosophy (in 1880) and continued his studies at the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics. Still, after graduating from the university, he joined the cavalry artillery of the Imperial Guard. Finally, he graduated from the Nikolaev Academy of the General Staff.⁶⁵

Perhaps the crucial reason for the relative decline in the popularity of military schools was that the possibilities of employment outside the army (for example, in the civil service) expanded. A new ethos of public service pervading Russian educated society in the 1860s led many nobles from the army to the civilian sphere. There were more civil schools than military ones, and a greater variety was available. The primary type of secondary school for the nobility was a classical gymnasium. Real schools were intended for the bourgeoisie, that was not supposed to continue

63 S. BECKER, *Nobility*, p. 123.

64 *Pamiatnaia knizhka litseistov, 1811–1911* (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, 1911), p. 74; *Sbornik biografii kavalergardov*, vol. 4, 1826–1908 (Sankt-Peterburg: Ekspeditsiia zagotovleniia gosudarstvennykh bumag, 1908), p. 259.

65 *Pamiatnaia knizhka gimnazii pri Imperatorskom Sanktpeterburgskom istoriko-filologicheskom institute 1870–1895* (Sankt-Peterburg: Parovaia Skoropechatnia G. Pozharova, 1895), pp. 32–33.

studying at university.⁶⁶ In 1897, 56 % of all hereditary nobles studied at gymnasiums.⁶⁷

In the first half of the 19th century, this had not been the case for a long time, so few nobles studied at gymnasiums. The nobility distrusted the civic type of school, different from the traditional education of the estates, and did not like the composition of the subjects either. The aristocracy preferred educational activities to upbringing, even though fencing, dancing, and horseback riding were gradually introduced into the gymnasium curriculum. Under Nicholas I, the approach to gymnasiums slowly began to change: aristocratic applicants for the study were given priority; teaching classical languages was introduced at gymnasiums, and in general, gymnasiums came closer to university studies. The graduates of gymnasiums were given an advantage when entering the civil service. A positive step toward the nobility was the establishment of exclusive aristocratic boarding gymnasiums.⁶⁸

In the 1860s and early 1870s, gymnasiums underwent a significant transformation. The Statutes of Gymnasiums and Progymnasiums of 19 November 1864 confirmed the dominance of the classical system and the dualism of secondary schools: classical gymnasiums were primarily intended for the nobility, whereas real gymnasiums and progymnasiums (four-year schools) for sons from the merchant and middle-class families, sons of clerics and, exceptionally, peasants. Only graduates of gymnasiums were expected to continue their studies at university. Studies at classical gymnasiums lasted seven years and included religion, Russian and Old Church Slavonic languages, including literature, two old and two new languages (Latin and Greek; French and German), mathematics, physics and cosmography, history, geography, natural history, penmanship, art, and drawing. Real gymnasiums, later renamed real schools, did not have old languages in their curricula. They were more focused on new languages, mathematics, physics, and natural history, to which they added chemistry. Their superiority in numbers evidenced

66 It was not until 1888 that even graduates of real schools were allowed to study at universities, but only at the faculties of mathematics, physics and medicine. At the beginning of the 20th century, the nobles made up about 1/3 of the students at real schools. With a few exceptions, they were not members of aristocratic families but rather impoverished hereditary or personal nobles. E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, p. 388.

67 S. BECKER, *Nobility*, p. 123.

68 The situation in the first half of the 19th century, cf. E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, pp. 118–122, 123–124, 137–139, 159–160.

the preferential position of classical gymnasiums: in 1861, out of 94 secondary schools in Russia, there were 83 gymnasiums.⁶⁹

The Minister of National Enlightenment, Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoy (in office from 1866 till 1880), to counter “liberalism” and “nihilism”, intended to make gymnasiums more exclusive (he was a top graduate of the Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum in 1842). Although gymnasiums remained open to everybody, non-noble students were supposed to be discouraged by the demands of study and thus unable to continue their studies at university. The new Statutes of Gymnasiums and Progymnasiums were adopted on 30 July 1871.⁷⁰ The Statutes prolonged gymnasium studies to eight years (the last – 7th class – took two years), emphasising old languages, mathematics, and physics, while the Russian language, literature, and humanities were removed from the curriculum. Even though Tolstoy was dismissed in 1880 and his departure was celebrated by the intelligentsia throughout Russia, little was changed in the system. During the reign of Alexander III, the Ministry of Enlightenment was led by Ivan Delianov, Tolstoy’s deputy, whose views corresponded to those of his boss. Until the end of the century, not much changed.

Table No. 2 Comparison of school subjects at classical gymnasium according to the Statutes of 1864 and 1871⁷¹

Subject	Number of lessons per week according to the Statutes of 1864	Number of classes per week according to the Statutes of 1871
Religion	14	13
Russian Language and Literature	24	24

69 For the reform of 1864, E. K. SYSOEVA. *Sbkola*, pp. 232–239. Complete text of 1864 Status in: *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii. Sobranie 2-oe. Vol. 39. Part 2* (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia 2 Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi e. i. v. Kantseliarii, 1864). Nr. 41472, pp. 167–179.

70 Complete text of the 1871 Status in: *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii. Sobranie 2-oe. Vol. 46. Part 2* (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia 2 Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi e. i. v. Kantseliarii, 1874), Nr. 49860, pp. 85–99. For the development of secondary education under Tolstoy, see E. K. SYSOEVA, *Sbkola*, pp. 247–258.

71 Iosif Osval'dovich GOBZA, *Stoletie Moskovskoi 1-i gimnazii 1804–1904 gg. Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk* (Moskva: Sinodal'naia Tipografiia, 1903), p. 189.

Logic	-	1
Latin	34	49
Greek	24	36
Mathematics (including Physics and Mathematical Geography)	28	37
History	14	12
Geography	8	10
Natural History	6	-
French or German	19	19
Neat Handwriting, Art and Drawing	13	-
Neat Handwriting	-	5
In total	184	206 ⁷²

A strict regime bound gymnasiums. The curriculum was based on the drill of Latin and Greek grammar, and the knowledge of ancient history, philosophy, and culture were of lesser importance. The Russian youth were to learn logical thinking and discipline and not to ponder about the complexities of the world. Conservative officials and headmasters approved Tolstoy's classicism, but students were not enthusiastic about it. Aleksei V. Obolenskii studied at the Imperial Lyceum of Tsarevich Nicholas in Moscow: "Up to this day, I do not understand why they taught us Latin and Greek to the exclusion of new languages; they paid no attention to them, while in Latin and Greek we were forced to read and write without a mistake."⁷³

Evgenii Trubetskoi agreed after his experience with the private Gymnasium of Franz Ivanovich Kreiman in Moscow and the state gymnasium in Kaluga. He felt a "Tolstoy lie" in both institutions: "The classical gymnasium represents an

72 It was possible to study one or two new languages, in the latter case the total number of lessons increased to 225.

73 Aleksei Vasilievich OBOLENSKII, *Moi vospominaniia* (Stockholm: Rodnye perezhvony, 1961), p. 57.

irreplaceable level of humane education for teaching literature, history, and philosophy. It would be an excellent school if a classical gymnasium provided but modest basics of humane education. Mastering ancient languages would be a precious gift if it led to comprehending ancient culture's spirit. Unfortunately, we missed this at our Russian gymnasium. The means became the ends. It was almost exclusively a grammar school that taught the formal ability to think and distracted the mind, but at the same time, it gave the mind absolutely no content [...]. The lack of semantic reading of ancient writers was a general shortcoming of the Tolstoy gymnasiums, for which an ancient author was only a source of grammar exercises [...]. During my six-year studies at the classical gymnasium, I don't remember a meaningful reading of ancient writers."⁷⁴

Some students failed in the ancient classical languages. Pavel Lieven fell behind with Greek so much that he had to leave the 3rd St. Petersburg Gymnasium and graduate from a real school (in 1894). He did not understand why he should spend hundreds of hours learning dead languages when there were much more practical things to learn. A real school with a greater emphasis on natural sciences suited him much more: "How interesting botany, zoology, and astronomy are, and how important it is for an educated person to be familiar with them."⁷⁵

Conditions in gymnasiums began to change only at the beginning of the new century. The Ministry of Enlightenment, led by General Pyotr Vannovskii, introduced a change in the curricula of secondary schools. Most gymnasiums transferred Latin into the third year and Greek into the fifth. Moreover, Greek became an optional language. In the first two years of study, the Russian language, history (in which education for patriotism was emphasised), and physical education were emphasised more. When teaching ancient languages, schools began to focus on reading classical authors instead of drilling grammar.⁷⁶ Students hailed the new direction of gymnasiums; Sergei Trubetskoi admitted that secondary education, compared to his father's generation, had progressed and developed in the right di-

74 Evgenii Nikolaevich TRUBETSKOI, *Vospominaniia* (Sofia: Rossiisko-bolgarskoe knigoizdatel'stvo, 1922), p. 5. For further complaints about formalism in teaching classical languages, see B. A. VASIL'CHIKOV, *Vospominaniia*, pp. 18–19; E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, pp. 340–341.

75 P. LIEVEN, *Dela davno minuvshikh let*, pp. 40–41. Pavel's elder brother Anatol (1872–1937) graduated from the mentioned gymnasium in 1891.

76 Curriculum using the example of the 1st Moscow gymnasium, see I. O. GOBZA, *Stoletie*, p. 18. For the secondary school's reform, see E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, pp. 392–393; Patrick L. ALSTON, *Education and the State in Tsarist Russia*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969, pp. 159–162.

rection.⁷⁷ The accompanying phenomenon of the changes was the loosening of discipline to the extent that one British observer stated: “Programme of Gymnasia has become easier in recent years. Greek is taught only in the top class; there is less Latin translation and no Latin composition. [...] Everything is made easy, too easy for the boys, they do nothing. [The discipline] has undoubtedly declined since the days of Count Dmitry Tolstoy, who forced them to work.”⁷⁸

In summary, at the end of the 19th century, students had somewhat ambivalent feelings about state gymnasiums. Although Sergei Volkonskii was grateful to his parents for enabling him to study at a classical gymnasium, he found the antiquated system disgusting. He did not think that his studies had significantly expanded his knowledge.⁷⁹ Last but not least, students were aware of the political influence on how schools were run: “As eleven-year-old or twelve-year-old boys, we already felt the interference of politics in school management. Therefore, we lost respect for it.”⁸⁰ It was often a severe challenge for gifted students. Admittedly, a young aristocrat in Russia had to undergo a more complicated educational process than his counterpart in England or Germany. At the same time, an educated Russian with such a life experience was motivated to engage in public activity and was “more intellectually alive, less secure, less carefree and more adult than their Prussian or English peers.”⁸¹

In the first years after the implementation of Tolstoy’s reforms, the attempt to transform gymnasiums into mainly aristocratic schools was not successful: while the number of gymnasium students increased from 28,202 to 51,097 in 1864–1875, the percentage of noble students decreased from 70 % in 1864 to 52.8 % in 1875. By 1895, it had risen slightly to 56.2 % but never returned to its original level.⁸² The aristocracy did not lose interest in studying, but the number of non-nobles in schools increased, especially from the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Although aristocratic families criticised the teaching mode and subjects’ composition, their sons continued to be sent to gymnasiums. In some cases, it was directly at the request of the boys. Aleksandr D. Golitsyn persuaded his parents to send him to the senior year of the gymnasium because he wanted to get a graduate’s medal. As an

77 S. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Minuvshee*, p. 56.

78 Bernard PARES, *Russia and Reform* (London: Constable, 1907), p. 213.

79 Sergei Mikhailovich VOLKONSKII, *Moi vospominaniia*, vol. 2, *Rodina*, Moskva: Isskustvo, 1992, p. 50.

80 E. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Vospominaniia*, p. 7.

81 D. LIEVEN, *Aristocracy*, p. 176.

82 E. K. SYSOEVA, *Sbkola*, pp. 257, 273; P. L. ALSTON, *Education*, p. 115.

external student, he would not have been entitled to it. Therefore, Golitsyn entered the 2nd Kharkov Gymnasium with his faithful childhood friend, Prince Aleksandr B. Kurakin.⁸³

Vladimir Obolenskii followed a similar course. His mother, Aleksandra, the founder of a successful girls' gymnasium in St. Petersburg, hated Tolstoy's classicism so much that she preferred sending her son to military school. However, Vladimir wanted to attend university, and the easiest way was via a gymnasium. As a military school graduate, he would have had to pass special exams, and it would not have been easy for him to enter university. Thus, he enrolled at the Bychkov private gymnasium. Teaching ancient languages was not so strict there, at least in the first years. As it was a private school, only members of wealthy families could afford to study there, and there were fewer students in classrooms: in the third year, there were only sixteen students, and in the fourth, eleven. On the contrary, in the state gymnasiums, there were up to forty students in the class. However, according to Obolenskii, the disadvantage of a private school was a weak discipline. In higher classes, there were a lot of "completely debauched boys who swore profanely, got drunk, and lived immorally." Unlike some of his classmates, Obolenskii did not succumb to their destructive influence; nevertheless, he was relieved to have completed his gymnasium studies: "I remember the day of graduating from gymnasium as one of the happiest in my life."⁸⁴

In any case, private gymnasiums were the main alternative to state gymnasiums. There was not much difference between the curricula of public and private schools. However, private gymnasiums were more progressive in various respects. The Gymnasium of K. I. Maia (founded in St. Petersburg in 1856) was the first in Russia to introduce physical education, which started to be taught at state gymnasiums only in 1889.⁸⁵ Private schools were more elitist, with fewer students in a class, warranting a more individual approach to students. The above-mentioned Bychkov (later Gurevich) gymnasium was very popular with the nobility. Besides Obolenskii, Count Vladimir A. Musin-Pushkin (1868–1918, graduated in 1908), Prince Viacheslav V. Tennishev (1878–1959), and Feliks Yusupov belonged to its graduates. Vladimir A. Drutskoi-Sokolinskii also studied there briefly before leaving for the Imperial School of Jurisprudence.⁸⁶ The Polivanov Gymnasium in Mos-

83 Aleksandr Dmitrievich GOLITSYN, *Vospominaniia* (Moskva: Russkii put', 2008), p. 99.

84 Vladimir Andreevich OBOLENSKII, *Moia zhizn' i moi sovremenniki. 1869–1920, Vol. 1* (Moskva: Kuchkovo pole, 2017), p. 82. On studies at the Bychkov gymnasium in general, see pp. 71–83.

85 E. K. SYSOEVA, *Sbkola*, pp. 303–304, 404.

86 V. A. DRUTSKOI-SOKOLINSKII, *Da blagoslovenna pamiat'*, pp. 54, 56.

cow was in great demand. Although it was not founded until 1868, it quickly became known for its humanistic orientation, close attention paid to Russian and foreign literature, and top teaching staff, earning a reputation as the best school in Moscow.⁸⁷ Within the first 25 years of its existence, the gymnasium was attended by 200 students, of whom 21 had a noble title (one baron, ten counts, eight princes).⁸⁸ In contrast, within a hundred years of existence, the 1st Moscow Gymnasium had only 25 titled graduates out of 2,505. And within fifty years of its existence, the 2nd Moscow Gymnasium had 841 graduates, but only two of them were titled noblemen.

One state lyceum in Moscow also captured the aristocracy's attention. Families looking for a school with an entirely conservative orientation would choose the Lyceum of Tsarevich Nicholas, also known as the Katkov Lyceum. The founder's surname was suggestive of the school's spirit, as Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov was one of the most prominent figures of conservative thinking in the 1860s–1880s.⁸⁹ The Lyceum was famous for emphasising ancient languages more than classical gymnasiums. In 1895, university courses at the Faculty of Law were opened at the lyceum. Graduating from these courses enabled the students to complete their university studies in as little as three years. Forty-three graduates with the title of nobility, out of a total of 631 in 1873–1907, show that this school was given much greater preference by the aristocracy than Moscow state gymnasiums.⁹⁰

87 Georgii Evgenievich L'VOV, *Vospominaniia* (Moskva: Russkii put', 2002), p. 31; E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, p. 304.

88 *Moskovskaia muzhskaia gimnaziia L. I. Polivanova. Dvadcatipiatiletie moskovskoi chastnoi gimnazii, uchrezhdennoi L. I. Polivanovym. 1868–1893* (Moskva: Tipografia M. G. Volchianinova, 1893) (the list of graduates, pp. 33–44).

89 He ran the newspaper *Moskovskiiia Vedomosti* and the magazine *Russkii vestnik*, was an exponent of Russian nationalism, a convinced supporter of the autocracy and a strong central government. Especially after taking up in 1881, he represented a new political course and the anti-liberal spirit of the time. He also took part in Tolstoy's gymnasium reform. Cf. Galina Pavlovna IZMESTIEVA, "Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov," *Voprosy istorii*, 2004, 4, pp. 71–92; Petr Andreevich ZAIONCHKOVSKII, "Aleksandr III i ego blizhaishee okruzhenie," *Voprosy istorii*, 1966, 8, pp. 130–146.

90 *Spiski byvsbikh i nastoiashchikh vospitannikov Imperatorskogo Litseia v pamiat' Tsesarevicha Nikolaia. Prilozhenie k "Litseiskomu Kalendariu" na 1907–1908 uchebnyi god* (Moskva: Universitetskaia tipografia, 1908).

Table No. 3: Comparison of selected secondary schools⁹¹

School	Type of school	Period	Number of graduates	Graduates with the title of nobility
The 1st St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1838–1880	619	4 (0.64 %)
The 2nd St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1832–1905	1549	12 (0.77 %)
The 3rd St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1827–1910	1868	32 (1.71 %)

91 Sources for the Table are: Dmitrii Nikolaevich SOLOV'EV, *Piatidesiatiletie S.-Peterburgskoi Pervoi gimnazii, 1830–1880* (Sankt Petersburg: Tipografia 2 Otdeleniia Sobstvennoi e. i. v. Kantseliarii, 1880); Aleksandr Viktorovich KURGANOVICH, *Istoricheskaia zapiska 75-letia S.-Peterburgskoi vtoroi gimnazii*, 3 vols. (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia E. Arngol'da, 1880–1905); B. V. FEDOROV (ed.), *Tret'ia Sankt-Peterburgskaia muzhskaia gimnazii i ee vypuskniki 1823–1918 gg. Istoriko-biograficheskii spravochnik* (Sankt-Peterburg: VIRI, 2011); Sergei Vasilievich LAVROV, *Pamiatka byvshim uchenikam S.-Peterburgskoi 3-j gimnazii* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipolitografii V. Kene i K°, 1911); *Piatidesiatiletie S.-Peterburgskoi Larinskoi Gimnazii 1836–1886* (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografia M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1886); Konstantin Alekseevich IVANOV, *Piatidesiatiletie S.-Peterburgskoi Piatoi Gimnazii, 1845–1895* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipogr. Vysochaishe utverzhd. Tovar. "Obshchestvennaia Pol'za", 1896); Konstantin Feodos'evich BUTKEVICH – Leonid Petrovich NIKOLAEV, *Istoricheskaia zapiska izdannaia ko dnu piatidesiatiletia s.-peterburgskoi sestoi gimnazii (1862–1912)* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografia V. D. Smirnova, 1912); Nikolai Aleksandrovich KUSOV, *Dvadsatipiatiletie S.-Peterburgskoi sedmoi gimnazii (byvshei vtoroi progimnazii) (1867–1892)* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografia M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1893); *Pamiatnaia knizhka S.-Peterburgskoi vos'moi gimnazii preobrazovannoi iz V progimnazii, 1874–1899* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipo-Litografii K. Birkenfel'da, 1900); *Kratkii otchet ob Imperatorskoi Nikolaevskoi Tsarskosel'skoi gimnazii za poslednie XV let ee sushchestvovania. (1896–1911) (dopolnenie k kratkomu ist. ocherku etoi gimnazii za pervye 25 let (1870–1895)* (Sankt Peterburg: s. n., 1912); I. O. GOBZA, *Stoletie Moskovskoi 1-i gimnazii*; Sergei Vikentievich GULEVICH, *Istoricheskaia zapiska o 50-letii Moskovskoi 2-oi gimnazii. 1835–1885* (Moskva: Tipografia E. Lissner i Iu. Roman, 1885); Petr VINOGRADOV, *Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk piatidesiatiletia Moskovskoi III gimnazii (1839–1889 g.)* (Moskva: Tipografia A. Levenson i K°, 1889); Dmitrii Aleksandrovich SOKOLOV, *Piatidesiatiletie Moskovskoi 4-oi gimnazii. (1849–1899 gg.)* (Moskva: Tipografii „Russkago T-va pechatnogo i izdatel'skogo dela“, 1899); *Spiski byvshevik i nastoiashchikh vospitannikov Imperatorskago litseia v pamiat Tsesarevicha Nikolaia. Prilozhenie k "Litseiskomu Kalendaru" na 1907–1908 uchebnyi god* (Moskva: Universitetskaia tipografia, 1908); *Dvadsatipiatiletie moskovskoi chastnoi gimnazii, uchrezhdennoi L. I. Polivanovym. 1868–1893* (Moskva: Tipografia M. G. Volchaninova, 1893).

The 4th St. Petersburg (Larin) Gymnasium	state	1836–1886	746	6 (0.8 %)
The 5th St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1845–1895	666	2 (0.3 %)
The 6th St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1867–1911	1641	17 (1.03 %) ⁹²
The 7th St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1870–1892	251	0
The 8th St. Petersburg Gymnasium	state	1874–1899	316	3 (0.94 %)
The Imperial Nicholas Gymnasium (Tsarskoye Selo)	state	1875–1910	718	7 (0.97 %)
The 1st Moscow Gymnasium	state	1804–1904	2505	25 (0.99 %)
The 2nd Moscow Gymnasium	state	1839–1885	841	2 (0.23 %)
The 3rd Moscow Gymnasium	state	1845–1889	840	7 (0.83 %)
The 4th Moscow Gymnasium	state	1850–1899	893	6 (0.67 %)
The Lyceum of Tsarevich Nicholas (The Katkov Lyceum, Moscow)	private/ state, only for the nobles	1873–1907	631	43 (6.8 %)
The Polivanov Gymnasium (Moscow)	private	1868–1893	200	21 (10.5 %)

92 The 1st titled graduate only in 1887 (Baron Mikhail Taube), all the others in the 1890s and the first decade of the 20th century.

The figures presented in the table mentioned above show the numbers of graduates, rather than the total numbers of students that were, in fact, significantly higher. Studying at a gymnasium did not necessarily mean finishing the studies. Regardless of social background, successful graduates were a minority: only 4–9 % of students completed their gymnasium studies in due course, a third studied for 9–11 years, and two-thirds did not complete their studies.⁹³ Failure did not avoid aristocrats either. For example, thirteen titled nobles studied at the 8th St. Petersburg Gymnasium from 1874–1899, but only three graduated.⁹⁴ From 1836–1886, nineteen titled nobles studied at the 4th St. Petersburg Larin Gymnasium, and six completed their studies.⁹⁵

The causes of failures cannot be generalised. Some students were not good enough to pass the exams; others decided to leave school for family reasons. Prince Sergei E. L'vov, the elder brother of Georgii L'vov, gave up his studies at the Polivanov Gymnasium to run a family homestead.⁹⁶ It is impossible to determine the ratio of successful and unsuccessful students of aristocratic origin reliably, as the lists of students of particular schools usually state only graduates. Moreover, it is difficult to determine whether some students eventually finished their studies elsewhere. Changing schools was not unusual: brothers Sergei and Evgenii Trubetskoi first studied at the private Kreiman Gymnasium in Moscow, but after two years, they transferred to the state gymnasium in Kaluga because their father Nikolai Petrovich was appointed vice-governor and the family moved. Vladimir Drutskoi-Sokolinskii studied at the gymnasium for only one year and continued at the Imperial School of Jurisprudence.⁹⁷ Count Nikolai A. Bobrinskii (1890–1964), son of Aleksei Alekseevich Bobrinskii and Varvara Bobrinskaia, studied at the Polivanov Gymnasium (1899–1904) but graduated as an external student at the provincial gymnasium in Tula (1908).

Just as siblings learned together in childhood, they often enrolled at the same secondary school, although they could not be in the same class because of their age difference. All three brothers, Viazemskii – Boris (1883–1917), Dmitrii (1884–1917), and Vladimir (1889–1950), graduated from the 3rd Gymnasium in St. Petersburg. Brothers Mikhail and Ivan Kurakin graduated from the same school too. Three brothers, Counts Gendrikov – Aleksandr (1875–1945), Stepan (1882–

93 Statistics from 1897. E. K. SYSOEVA, *Shkola*, pp. 359–360.

94 *Pamiatnaia knizhka S.-Peterburgskoi vos'moi gimnazii*, p. 66

95 *Piatidesiatiletie S.-Peterburgskoi Larinskoi Gimnazii*, Appendix 2 and 3, pp. 10–68.

96 G. E. L'VOV, *Vospominaniia*, p. 31.

97 V. A. DRUTSKOI-SOKOLINSKII, *Da blagoslovenna pamiat'*, pp. 54, 56.

1909) and Dmitrii (1885–1912), studied at the 8th St. Petersburg Gymnasium. Nevertheless, only the eldest Aleksandr finished his studies.⁹⁸

Family tradition also played an important role in choosing the school. Sons were sent to the same school where their fathers, uncles, and grandfathers had studied. However, traditions and parents' ideas sometimes clash with the scions' stubbornness, as with Feliks Yusupov. His father wanted to send him to a military school (he graduated from the Chuguev Infantry Junker College after failing to finish the Page Corps). Still, Feliks was not in the least attracted by a military career. Therefore, he deliberately failed the entrance exams. After that, the parents sent their spoilt son, used to asserting his own opinion, to the Gurevich private gymnasium.⁹⁹

While boys were expected to study, studies were completely optional for girls. The general approach to girls' education is illustrated by Edith Sollohub's statement relating to the early 20th century: "My childhood was coming to an end, and I could no longer keep unwelcome thought out of my mind. What next? Marriage? Yes, that is what would be expected of me. Or more studies? No – boys could become students, but this was not yet a suitable career for well-brought-up young girls."¹⁰⁰

While boys attended gymnasiums, albeit sometimes only the final year, girls from aristocratic families were educated at home. This was certainly the case in the 1870s and 1880s. At the end of the century, the situation began to change somewhat. Much depended on the atmosphere in the family. If the parents were responsive and understanding, they could comply with the daughter's wish to study at a public school. At age ten, Lidiia Vasil'chikova started her studies at the girls' (Tagantsev) gymnasium in Moscow in 1896. She did well, only struggling with mathematics, and in the class of 32 girls, she was one of the top students. She graduated from the school with a gold medal. Her memories of the gymnasium years were only pleasant and joyful. In general, she thought very highly of the Russian education system. She sent her children to a French lyceum in exile but did not believe the French system could have equalled the Russian one.¹⁰¹

98 *Pamiatnaia knizhka S.-Peterburgskoi vos'moi gimnazii*, pp. 33, 42.

99 F. F. YUSUPOV, *Memuary*, p. 74.

100 Edith SOLLOHUB, *The Russian Countess. Escaping Revolutionary Russia* (Exeter: Impress Books, 2009), p. 39.

101 The description of Vasil'chikova's gymnasium studies, see L. L. VASIL'CHIKOVA, *Ischeznuvshaia Rossiia*, pp. 69–75.

However, even at the beginning of the 20th century, Vasil'chikova was an exception rather than a rule. Girls with the title of nobility were still a rare appearance in public schools. The private gymnasium of S. A. Arsen'evoi in Moscow was a girls' counterpart to the Polivanov boys' gymnasium, which was very popular with the aristocracy. Within 25 years (1873–1898), 166 female students graduated from this gymnasium, with only two titled graduates among them – Princess Natal'ia Kropotkina (in 1885) and Baroness Ekaterina Cherkasova (in 1887). Princess Liubov' Lobanova-Rostovskaia studied at the gymnasium for only a year and did not complete it.¹⁰² The Bestuzhev girls' higher courses, probably the most famous of the public girls' schools, had 3,620 graduates within twenty-six years. Nevertheless, there were only fifteen girls with the title of nobility among them.¹⁰³

More noblewomen frequented special aristocratic institutes. These had been founded since the 18th century and, for a long time, presented the only educational alternative to home education. The first institution, in terms of duration and prestige, was the Smolny Institute, founded by Catherine II in St. Petersburg in 1764. The other schools tried, in vain, to match it.¹⁰⁴ In a certain respect, it was a girls' version of the Page Corps – while the boys from the Corps ended up as guard officers, many graduates of the Smolny became court ladies. Until the beginning of the First World War, 6,041 girls graduated from the Smolny, of which 344 (5.7 %) had a noble title. In contrast, the oldest Moscow noble girls' school, the Moscow School of the Order of St. Catherine, had 3,289 graduates in 100 years of existence (1803–1903) but only 78 (2.37 %) with a noble title. And the Mariinskii Institute in St. Petersburg, in a hundred years (1797–1897), released 1,492 noblewomen into the world, but only three of them had a noble title.¹⁰⁵

102 *Dvadcatipiatiletie Moskovskoi chastnoi gimnazii S. A. Arsenevoi. 1873–1898 gg.* Moskva: A. A. Levenson, 1899, pp. 27, 28, 46.

103 *Peterburgskie vysshie zhenskii kursy. Spisok okonchivshikh kurs na S.-Peterburgskikh vysshikh zhenskikh kursakh*, Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1911–1913.

104 For the most complete history of the Smolny Institute, see Nikolai Petrovich CHEREPNIN, *Imperatorskoe Vospitatel'noe obshchestvo blagorodnykh devits*, 3 vols. (Sankt-Peterburg – Petrograd: Gosudarstvennaia Tipografiia, 1914–1915). In the 3rd volume, there is the list of graduates up to 1914, pp. 471–683. The list of female students in 1914 on pp. 747–754.

105 Nikolai Sergeevich KARTSOV, *Mariinskii institut 1797–1897. Istoricheskii ocherk* (Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiia Sanktpeterburgskogo gradonachal'stva, 1897), List of graduates: Appendix, pp. 33–54; *Moskovskoe uchilishche ordena sv. Ekateriny, 1803–1903 gg. Istoricheskii ocherk* (Moskva: s. n., 1903). For the list of graduates, see pp. 476–546.

The noble girls' institutes undoubtedly retained their significance until the revolution. Nevertheless, they were perceived in different ways. On the one hand, they were seen as traditional and prestigious institutions; on the other hand, as outdated schools educating girls in the spirit of the late 18th century. Sofia Panina, who studied at the Ekaterinskii Institute in the 1880s, described it as a "greenhouse for growing girls from the privileged class".¹⁰⁶ There were thirty similar "greenhouses" in Russia (ten in St. Petersburg, four in Moscow, and sixteen in provincial towns).¹⁰⁷ In 1882, when Sofia began to attend this school, approximately 330 girls studied in its seven grades. The curriculum was very close to the curriculum of classical gymnasiums, but there were fewer Latin and Greek lessons, and girls learnt more modern languages. The institute also had a pedagogical class, which enabled impoverished noblewomen to gain a teaching qualification. Everyday life at the institute was not very pleasant. The inmates had to cope with poor sanitary conditions, due to which they were often ill. For purely personal grounds, Sofia Panina did not have many reasons to remember the institute for good, as joining it was a traumatic experience for her. At the direct command of emperor Alexander III, she was taken from her mother, entrusted to the care of her grandmother, and sent to the institute, where she spent the next five years. After initial defiance and resistance, she integrated into school life, and she soon became an excellent student and graduated as the fifth-best in her year. Nevertheless, bitter memories prevailed in her: she considered the moral principles proclaimed and observed in the institute to be the exact opposite of the absolute sincerity her mother had brought her up with.¹⁰⁸

Admission to a secondary school was not always easy for aristocratic children, whether private or public. They were used to being brought up in a domestic environment, and now they had to become a part of a team. In particular, it was difficult for an only child, who had so far enjoyed the exclusive attention of the parents and educators. Ivan Stenbok-Fermor was shocked when he first entered the

106 BAR, Panina Papers, box 6, *Moi gorod*, pp. 8–9.

107 "Instituty zhenskii", in: *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, vol. 13 (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografia I. A. Efrona, 1894), pp. 244–245.

108 BAR, Panina Papers, box 6, *Moi gorod*, pp. 3–4. Further, see A. LINDENMEYR, *Citizen Countess*, pp. 34–37, 48–49, 58, 60–63. For the history of the Ekaterinskii Institut, see Nikolai Sergeevich KARTSOV, *Neskol'ko faktov iz zhizni Sankt-Peterburgskogo uchilishcha Ordena Sv. Ekateriny* (Sankt Peterburg: s. n., 1898); Elizaveta Emmanuilovna PANKRATIEVA, *S.-Peterburgskoe uchilishche ordena sviatoi Ekateriny (Ekaterinskii institut), 1798–1898. Istoricheskii ocherk i opisaniie prazdnovaniia iubileia Uchilishcha* (Sankt Peterburg: Tipografia E. Evdokimova, 1899).

building of the German gymnasium in St. Petersburg to sit the entrance exams. On the stairs, he got entangled in a huddle of students jostling and shouting at each other, even giving a few nudges to the startled Ivan. He was not used to anything like that, and it unhinged him to such an extent that even though he was well prepared for the exams, he ultimately failed them and was not accepted to the gymnasium. Within a year, he was more mentally resilient; he repeated his exams and entered school.¹⁰⁹

Inclusion in the collective meant a double challenge for schools where not only nobles studied. Aleksei Obolenskii was right, claiming that “Classical education did not have the results expected by the enlightenment ministers Tolstoy and Delianov,” as Russian education was infused with the spirit of liberalism and radicalism, and the number of non-noble students increased steadily in gymnasiums.¹¹⁰ Even noble students, who often faced prejudice, suffered as a result. Aleksandr Davydov studied at the 2nd Moscow Gymnasium in the 1890s and judged his school years as: “[...] very precious and useful. I must say I was fortunate for the elite of my class was composed of good elements. I came from a circle that was unknown to them that of high society where my mother held an influential position. In the eyes of schoolmates, this was not an element in my favor and I had to be very careful.¹¹¹

The isolation within the collective was one of the reasons why Pavel Grabbe preferred to leave the Alexander Military School to join the Page Corps. As soon as the students found out that he was the son of the count having a high position at the imperial court, they started to keep their distance from him.¹¹² Even after years, Prince Sergei M. Volkonskii remembered that his performance was automatically diminished in the eyes of those around him by the fact that he was an aristocrat. The noble title created “an insurmountable gap of mistrust and prejudices [...] In the eyes of those who called themselves ‘intelligentsia’; it took twenty years before

109 In the end, he did not finish the gymnasium. He went over to the Page Corps, from which he graduated in 1917. Ivan I. STENBOCK-FERMOR, *Memoirs of Life in Old Russia, World War I, Revolution, and in Emigration. Completed in Palo Alto, California, 1976* (Berkeley: University of California, 1986), pp. 68–69.

110 A. V. OBOLENSKII, *Moi vospominaniia*, p. 57.

111 Alexander DAVYDOFF, *Russian Sketches. Memoirs* (Tenafly, New Jersey: Hermitage, 1984), pp. 138–139.

112 P. GRABBE, *Windows on the River Neva*, p. 83. Pavel’s father, Count Aleksandr N. Grabbe-Nikitin, was the commander of the Imperial convoy, the monarch’s personal military guard, composed of Cossacks.

I changed from ‘Prince Volkonskii’ to ‘Sergei Mikhailovich’.”¹¹³ Evgenii Trubetskoi felt equally “inferior”. He had grown up in the countryside, playing with peasant boys. He had not perceived any difference in status. He did not see the title of a prince as something extraordinary. And suddenly, when he entered secondary school at the age of eleven, he was exposed to the jeers of “democrats”. Some teachers also looked down on him.¹¹⁴ His son Sergei Trubetskoi noted a very similar feeling a generation later: “My ‘principality’ naturally evoked a cold and unfavourable attitude of ‘leftists’ and intellectuals in general. I much embarrassed them by not resembling the type of an aristocrat that they, God knows why, imagined. I was not a ‘bighead’ and a ‘white-lining’ person,¹¹⁵ and besides, the leaders of our ‘leftists’ were amazed to see that the ‘prince’ was definitely not less, but equally and perhaps even better-educated than they were.”¹¹⁶

Radical views from secondary schools and universities found their way into aristocratic families. In some cases, the offspring studying at these schools were “infected”, although mostly only for a short time. Evgenii Trubetskoi experienced his “nihilistic period” in the 6th and 7th years of the gymnasium.¹¹⁷ At other times, home teachers with liberal or socialist views came to families and tried to instil them in their students. Varvara Bobrinskaia remembered that in Kyiv in 1876: “My younger brothers were taught by a young, lovely girl who suddenly disappeared. Within a few days, the police came to our house to look for her: she was a terrorist. Our Russian teacher was Ivan Ivanovich Basov. He did not hide his extreme and sometimes very strange opinions. The summer he left us, he was arrested at a point when he was about to blow up a railroad bridge. Our teacher at the country estate was Aleksei Zakharovich Pepelnitskii. He was trying to evoke a revolutionary mood in me and my younger brother. He was a type of nihilist, the son of a priest, isolated from society, capable, and energetic. He brought us nerve-racking books and made us outraged [...] Undoubtedly, he influenced us. Fortunately, we were children.”¹¹⁸

113 S. M. VOLKONSKII, *Moi vospominaniia*, pp. 49–50, 194. According to Lidia Vasil’chikova, there was a stereotype that all princes were “loafers-idlers”. L. L. VASIL’CHIKOVA, *Ischeznuvschaia Rossiia*, p. 76.

114 E. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Vospominaniia*, pp. 6–8, 38–44, 72–75.

115 A student from a wealthy family avoiding student associations, hostile to radical student activities. The word is derived from the white lining of student uniforms, which only students from wealthy families could afford.

116 S. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Minuvshee*, p. 53.

117 E. N. TRUBETSKOI, *Vospominaniia*, pp. 38–44.

118 GARF, f. 5819, op. 1., d. 5, l. 16–17.

Indeed, radical views usually did not fall on fertile ground, and young aristocrats did not grow up to be revolutionaries. The most famous exception was Prince Petr Kropotkin, but in most cases, the maximum in opinion shift was liberal tendencies.

Conclusion

Between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, aristocratic young men were prepared for army and state or local government service. Most of them, however, continued to study at a university: of the twenty-two men listed in Table 1 who could enter university before 1917, sixteen demonstrably did so. At least half of them enrolled at the Faculty of Law. Aleksei Bobrinskii started his studies at the Faculty of Law at St. Petersburg University; however, he did not complete them. From his diary, it is evident that he interrupted his studies due to health issues: he suffered in September 1872.¹¹⁹ Nevertheless, this fact did not fatally affect his career. He was allowed to join the civil service, and concurrently with his work in the office of the Committee of Ministers, he took important positions in the self-government of the noble estates. From 1875 to 1878, he was the district Marshal of Nobility in St. Petersburg, and from 1878 to 1898, he was the St. Petersburg provincial Marshal of Nobility.¹²⁰

There was a whole range of educational models for adolescent aristocrats. In the hereditary nobility, civilian education prevailed over military education. This was also the case with the aristocracy represented in all the types of secondary schools that served as a prerequisite for entering university. From the 1870s, despite their aversion to some aspects of the educational system, boys from aristocratic families studied at classical state gymnasiums more and more often. It was one of the results of Alexander II's civic reforms, which contributed to the development of secondary education in Russia. In the last quarter of the 19th century, the transition from closed education based on noble estates to more open civic education had become apparent.¹²¹ While Aleksei A. Bobrinskii, who grew up at the turn

119 RGADA, f. 1412, op. 8, ed. khr. 275, l. 278, 290–291.

120 It was quite possibly connected with the influence of his father, as Count Aleksandr Alekseevich was also the provincial Marshal of Nobility in 1869–1872.

121 S. BECKER, *Nobility*, pp. 120–121, 124–125; Vera Romanovna LEIKINA-SVIRSKAIA, *Intelligentsiia v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka*, Moskva: Mysl', 1971, pp. 51–53, 60–64; *Rossiia 1913 god. Statistiko-dokumental'nyi spravocchnik*, A. P. Korelin (otv. red.) – A. M. Anfimov (red. sost.) (Sankt-Peterburg: BLITS, 1995), pp. 333, 346–347.

of the era, did not attend a gymnasium and studied at home, his son Aleksei (1893–1971) graduated from a state gymnasium.

At the same time, until the First World War and the revolution, the ethos of privileged noble estates had been maintained, and the aristocracy preferred particular institutions. Private gymnasiums were preferred to state gymnasiums, and elite aristocratic schools – the Page Corps, the Alexander Lyceum, and the Imperial School of Jurisprudence – retained a central place in the educational system. It was similar in girls' education, which was also democratised in the second half of the 19th century, but much more cautiously. If they studied away from home, the girls from aristocratic families did so predominantly in aristocratic institutes such as the Smolny Institute. In any case, the beginning of the 20th century offered a growing range of possibilities, and a more substantial presence of female aristocrats at girls' gymnasiums was more a matter of time.

SUMMARY

In late imperial Russia (the 1850s–1917), the life of the nobility underwent fundamental economic and social transformations connected with the abolition of serfdom and the gradual change of the society of the estates into a civic one, and a loosening of the identity of the estate of the nobility. Since the late 1850s, the educated and publicly active part of society, which included the nobility, was wondering what role the nobility should assume in the new conditions. Uncertainty about the future of the nobility was part of social discourse until the First World War.

The Russian education system was changing significantly as well. The 1860s brought the reform of secondary schools, the expansion of university autonomy, the development of girls' education, and the establishment of private gymnasiums. Therefore, it is essential to ask whether and to what extent these processes and the resulting challenges were reflected in the system of aristocratic upbringing and education. The analysis of various sources, mainly of a personal nature (non-published and published memoirs and diaries), shows continuity and discontinuity in the education of boys and girls from aristocratic families during their adolescence, i. e. from the age of twelve/thirteen to sixteen/eighteen. Unlike childhood, for which homeschooling was typical, the period of adolescence was significantly more dynamic. The aristocratic education was more influenced by state educational reforms, growing civic awareness, and various ideas about the best preparation for future life and a career. Aristocratic families chose from among elite aristocratic schools, private lycées, or state gymnasiums. The nobility's approach to education was slowly being democratised. More and more aristocrats studied at state public schools. At the same time, criticism of the conservative conditions of the education system was heard from the ranks of the aristocracy.

In the aristocracy's value system, the service to the state and society occupied a key position. Therefore, education was crucial. A completed secondary education was generally considered the standard for noble sons. Moreover, it was a prerequisite for enrolling at university and joining the civil service. In the 1860s, secondary education took place primarily at home. Teachers from gymnasiums went to a family, and every year, boys, as external students, took exams to advance to the following year. The eight-year full-time study became more common in the next decades. Nevertheless, both types of education continued to coexist.

The choice between in-class study and homeschooling very much depended on the family. The aristocracy could choose between two main directions in education: military and civilian schools. Among the aristocracy, elite institutions intended exclusively for the

nobility enjoyed long-lasting popularity: the Page Corps, the Imperial Alexander Lyceum, and the Imperial School of Jurisprudence. All three schools maintained a distinct identity. They functioned as a closed community, a “brotherhood” with a strong ethos. Elite educational institutions cultivated the noble spirit and helped preserve the estates’ exclusivity. However, they could not meet the demand for education either from the side of the nobility or the state, which required a sufficient number of educated and, at the same time, noble officials and soldiers. The needs of the civil service and public administration continued to grow, and the nobility, aware of the importance of education, had to look for other types of schools.

In military education, aristocrats studied in great numbers at cadet schools. Regarding civilian schools, they chose between state gymnasiums and private lycées. Civilian education prevailed over military education. The aristocracy was represented in all the types of secondary schools that were a prerequisite for entering university. From the 1870s, despite their aversion to some aspects of the educational system, boys from aristocratic families studied at classical state gymnasiums more and more often. The transition from the education of the noble estates to civic education had become apparent.

Nonetheless, the ethos of privileged noble estates had been maintained, and the aristocracy preferred particular institutions until the end of the Tsarist empire. Private gymnasiums were preferred to state gymnasiums, and elite schools – the Page Corps, the Alexander Lyceum, and the Imperial School of Jurisprudence – retained a central place in the educational system of the aristocracy. It was similar in the sphere of girls’ education. The girls from aristocratic families studied predominantly in aristocratic institutes such as the Smolny Institute. However, the beginning of the 20th century offered a growing range of possibilities, and a more substantial presence of female aristocrats in girls’ gymnasiums was a matter of time.

RESUMÉ

V pozdně carském Rusku (50. léta 19. století–1917) prošel život šlechty zásadními ekonomickými a společenskými proměnami spojenými se zrušením nevolnictví a postupnou změnou stavovské společnosti na společnost občanskou. Výrazně se měnil i ruský vzdělávací systém. Šedesátá léta 19. století přinesla reformu středních škol, rozšíření univerzitní autonomie, rozvoj dívčího školství a vznik soukromých gymnázií. Proto je důležité položit si otázku, zda a do jaké míry se tyto procesy a z nich vyplývající výzvy promítly do systému šlechtické výchovy a vzdělávání. Rozbor různých pramenů především osobního charakteru ukazuje na kontinuitu i diskontinuitu ve vzdělávání chlapců a dívek ze šlechtických rodin v době jejich dospívání, tedy od dvanácti/třinácti do šestnácti/osmnácti let. Na rozdíl od dětství, pro které bylo typické domácí vzdělávání bylo období dospívání výrazně dynamičtější. Šlechtické rodiny si vybíraly z elitních šlechtických škol, soukromých lyceí nebo státních gymnázií. Přístup šlechty ke vzdělání se pomalu demokratizoval. Stále více aristokratů studovalo na státních veřejných školách. Z řad aristokracie přitom zaznívala i kritika konzervativních poměrů ve školství.

V hodnotovém systému aristokracie zaujímal klíčové postavení služba státu a společnosti. Dokončené střední vzdělání bylo obecně považováno za standard pro šlechtické syny. Navíc to byla podmínka pro přijetí na vysokou školu a vstup do státní služby. V 60. letech 19. století probíhalo středoškolské vzdělávání stále ještě především doma. Osmileté denní studium na některé z veřejných škol se stalo běžnějším v dalších desetiletích. Přesto oba typy vzdělávání nadále koexistovaly.

Aristokracie si volila mezi dvěma hlavními směry vzdělávání: vojenským a civilním. Dlouhodobě oblíbeně těšily elitní instituce určené výhradně šlechtě: Sbor pážat, Carské Alexandrovské lyceum a Carská právní škola. Všechny tři školy si udržovaly svébytnou identitu a fungovaly jako uzavřená komunita, čímž pomáhaly udržovat stavovskou exkluzivitu šlechty. Nedokázaly však uspokojit poptávku po vzdělání ani ze strany šlechty, ani ze strany státu, který vyžadoval dostatek vzdělaných a zároveň šlechtických úředníků a vojáků. Potřeby státní správy a veřejné správy stále rostly a šlechta tedy hledala i jiné typy škol.

Civilní školství (gymnázia) převládalo nad vojenským (kadetní školy). Šlechta byla zastoupena na všech typech středních škol, které byly předpokladem pro vstup na vysokou školu. Od 70. let 19. století chlapci ze šlechtických rodin stále častěji studovali na klasických státních gymnáziích. Nicméně etos privilegovaných šlechtických panství byl zachován a aristokracie preferovala konkrétní instituce až do konce carské říše. Soukromá gymnázia byla upřednostňována před státními a elitní šlechtické školy si udržely ústřední místo ve

vzdělávacím systému aristokracie. Podobně tomu bylo i ve sféře vzdělávání dívek. Dívky ze šlechtických rodin studovaly převážně ve šlechtických ústavech, jako byl Smolný institut. Počátek 20. století však nabízel stále větší škálu možností a výraznější zastoupení aristokratek na dívčích gymnáziích bylo otázkou času.