



Copyright © 2024 by Cherkas Global University  
All rights reserved.  
Published in the USA

European Journal of Contemporary Education

E-ISSN 2305-6746

2024. 13(3): 607-612

DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2024.3.607

<https://ejce.cherkasgu.press>

**IMPORTANT NOTICE!** Any copying, reproduction, distribution, republication (in whole or in part), or otherwise commercial use of this work in violation of the author's rights will be prosecuted in accordance with international law. The use of hyperlinks to the work will not be considered copyright infringement.



**European Journal of  
Contemporary Education**



ELECTRONIC JOURNAL

## **The Paradigms of Development of the National University in the XVII – first half of the XIX century**

Andrii E. Lebid <sup>a, b, \*</sup>, Vitalii V. Stepanov <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Sumy State University, Sumy, Ukraine

<sup>b</sup> Cherkas Global University, Washington DC, USA

### **Abstract**

The article examines the history of the formation of the university paradigm (idea) in the Russian Empire and Ukraine, in particular. This process is studied in the context of several historical periods with their characteristic ideological, political, administrative, legal and other features. Under the university paradigm (idea) we understand a complex set of factors that determined the features of university education at a particular stage of its development.

The university paradigm (idea) is considered in the context of three main models of the university: pre-classical (university as a corporation of teachers and students), classical (research university of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century), and post-classical (mass university of the twentieth century).

The coexistence of two models/projects of the university in the Russian imperial university space: utilitarian and classical. These two university projects combined the features of Franco-Italian and German universities. The latter, in particular, ideologically and substantively expressed the neo-humanist views of W. von Humboldt.

The formation of the university paradigm (idea) is analyzed in the context of changing state policy towards the university: from promoting the creation and search for the best project to reactionism and reduction of university autonomy.

**Keywords:** higher education, university, paradigm, university idea, classical model of the university, utilitarianism.

### **1. Introduction**

The process of the formation of university education occupies a prominent place in the system of studying the “history of ideas” and everyday life. The emergence of the “mass university” calls into question the Humboldtian ideal of the “classical university.” The idea of the university

---

\* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: [a.lebid@socio.sumdu.edu.ua](mailto:a.lebid@socio.sumdu.edu.ua) (A.E. Lebid)

has never been static. The university as a corporation of students and professors has evolved from a pre-classical to an innovative model of organizing educational and scientific activities. All this time, the university corporation, on the principles of autonomy, has sought to reflect public needs and perceptions, partly shaping them.

However, the ideal of the university has remained an ideal, or rather, an aspiration. The university never had absolute autonomy and did not meet the ideals of free science. It was primarily an educational institution for training future officials, and in this way, it contradicted the university's mission of professionalization and raising the level of education. Since the first universities appeared, their models and traditions have changed. However, there remained something that makes it possible to talk about the university spirit, the idea. The university is both a national and supranational social phenomenon, an institution that has a significant impact on the cultural space.

The "idea of the university" has transcended borders and become the property of humanity. At the same time, the idea of a "national model" of the university has become a factor in the development of nation-states and their national symbols. Appropriate reference to the historical experience of university traditions is a necessary element of understanding the mission of the university today.

## **2. Materials and methods**

The materials for the preparation of this manuscript were various texts (projects, speeches, journalistic statements, articles, etc.) by representatives of the social and intellectual elite of the Russian Empire, which make it possible to understand the transfer of the European university idea and its impact on the formation and development of the national higher education system.

These texts were written by figures of university and school education, scientists, publicists, and others. All of them represented different areas of public opinion, and therefore partly contradictory interpretations of the content of the university idea.

The materials we have studied relate to the first plans and projects for the creation of a university at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the emergence of a coherent system of university education in the early nineteenth century. In addition, the materials we have analyzed are related to the reforms of the 30s and 40s of the nineteenth century, which crystallized the features of the model of a "classical" university in the Russian Empire.

The research is based on the principles of historicism and objectivity, which makes it possible to study historical phenomena through the peculiarities of its development and specific historical conditionality. These principles take into account the dynamism of the object of historical research.

In addition, general methods of scientific research were used to study the evolution of the university paradigm (idea): generalization, analysis, synthesis, comparison, induction, and deduction. General scientific research methods are the logical basis for special historical methods, in particular, historical-comparative (for comparing the features of paradigms, projects and models of university education in the Russian Empire); historical-topological (for identifying common features in models, projects and paradigms of university education in the Russian Empire) and historical-systemic (for a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of the university paradigm in the Russian Empire).

## **3. Discussion**

The university has always been a significant factor in influencing social processes and shaping the university space in cities. The university phenomenon is a key argument for civilizational development. The number of publications on various aspects of university history has increased by an order of magnitude (Kolesnikov, 2003; Kulakova, 2006; Kuznecova, 2007; Lapteva, 2000; Margolis, 2000; Nikolskij, 2008; Otechestvennye universitety..., 2005). The university field continues to be of interest to historians of ideas, in particular, in the study of the formation and evolution of the university idea in the Russian Empire (Olshannikova, 2017 and etc.).

In particular, Olshannikova N. studies the evolution of the Russian university idea in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The transformation of imperial universities from a utilitarian to a classical model is considered. The university idea is analyzed in the context of the statutes of the imperial universities: 1804, 1835, 1863, and 1884. The author also examines the issue of university autonomy. An important aspect of the study is a comparison of the mission of the first

university and the post-reform university. The mission of the first universities was to train officials for the civil service, and later - to develop science (Olshannikova, 2017).

Important for understanding the evolution of the university paradigm (idea) in the Russian Empire are certain kinds of “apologies” by representatives of the state apparatus and the intellectual elite, which substantiated the concepts and projects of future imperial universities (Antologiya..., 1985; Balugyanskij, 1834; Belinskij, 1838; Davydov, 1849; Fonkich, 2000; Gejm, 1799; Karamzin, 1803; Karamzin, 1991; Katkov, 1841; Neverov, 1839; Rozhdestvenskii, 1912; Suhomlinov, 1882; Uvarov, 2003; Vasilchikov, 1880; Yakob, 1808).

#### **4. Results**

The history of university education in the Russian Empire and Ukraine, in particular, can be studied in the context of several historical periods/stages, which were characterized by certain ideological, organizational, political-administrative, formal legal, content and other aspects. We propose to define this complex set of factors that determined the peculiarities of university education at a particular stage of its development through the concept of paradigm.

In view of this, it is advisable to distinguish several historical stages (paradigms) of university education in the Russian Empire in general and in Ukraine in particular. The beginning of this process can be seen at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with the emergence of the first universities in the Russian Empire. By the half of the nineteenth century, the process of finalizing the system of higher education in the empire was underway.

The process of broad “university intellectual expansion” was actively spreading across Europe, starting in the mid-fifteenth century. The Reformation and Counter-Reformation accelerated the creation of a network of universities affiliated with various religious movements: Catholics, Jesuits, Calvinists, and Lutherans. These processes became especially widespread in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Central and Eastern Europe, spreading among the Orthodox population. In particular, in the Ukrainian lands that were part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the time, the first Greek-Slavic schools were founded, as well as the Orthodox College in Kyiv, founded by Petro Mohyla. The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, which emerged on its basis, had every reason to have the same scope of university rights as the Catholic higher schools in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The final resolution of the issue of the Academy's university status became possible at the end of the seventeenth century, when Kyiv came under the rule of the Moscow state. The realization of the idea of building an Orthodox university fell on the shoulders of the new administration.

The lack of “education” was pointed out at the Church Council of 1666–1667, where, in particular, the idea of the need for “schools” to strengthen “the rank of the church and civil” was voiced. As a result, the idea of an Orthodox university project and the establishment of the Moscow Academy (Antologiya..., 1985: 236-240) was created. Modeled after the academy in Kyiv under Peter the Great, one was opened in Moscow with an emphasis on theological studies. However, the intention to open a multidisciplinary higher education institution based on the European model did not leave the statesmen in the future (Rozhdestvenskii, 1912: 3-6).

In this sense, we are talking about the so-called “pre-classical” university with all the signs of medieval class division. A university of this type was a privileged corporation of professors and students that enjoyed self-governing rights guaranteed by the highest state and church authorities. However, by the beginning of the eighteenth century in Europe, the pre-classical university was increasingly in crisis, failing to meet the educational needs of society and the state. Vocational schools (medical, military, engineering, etc.) competed with the existing universities, meeting the public demand for practical skills and knowledge. The ideas of utilitarianism gradually penetrated the Russian Empire. They did their best to promote the idea of a European university in the country. As a result, both the Moscow and Kyiv Academies, as a result of the Synodal Reform, acquired the features of schools for the clergy.

The realization of the idea of a European university in the Russian Empire was the founding of Moscow University in 1755. This made possible the transfer of leading European ideas and concepts in the field of education and their infiltration into the all-Russian imperial educational space. Gradually, the state concentrated a significant share of the administrative functions of universities, taking over the functions of organizing the educational process, recruiting faculty, controlling the level of teaching, etc.

The second half of the eighteenth century marked the processes of modernization of European universities, becoming a benchmark in the preparation of projects for imperial

universities to create an educated bureaucracy (Suhomlinov, 1882: 58-123). The revolution in France in 1789 made us take a somewhat skeptical look at the “fruits of education” (Gejm, 1799) and actualized the emergence of a number of apologies addressed to the supreme power. The task of these apologies is to justify the need to reform the education system of the Russian Empire in order to raise the authority of university education. Moreover, the government's policy on this issue was not entirely clear.

Under Emperor Alexander I, the decision to modernize universities was approved, although it was not clear what model of such changes would be used: either the concept of a “modernized university” or the concept of a “utilitarian university.” In fact, the model of the Russian Imperial University incorporated elements of both concepts. The bureaucratic functions were borrowed from the concept of the “utilitarian university” and are more typical of French and Polish universities. The internal organizational structure of the Russian Imperial University incorporated the features of a “modernized university”, similar to German universities.

Also, as a result of the educational reform of Emperor Alexander I, when the system of higher education in the Russian Empire was finally formed, the country was divided into six educational districts: Derpt, Vilna, Kazan, Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Kharkiv. Each of these districts was to have a leading university.

University autonomy, the transfer of ideas and concepts of university education from Europe, and the teaching and research activities of foreign professors contributed to the formation of corporate university values in the Russian Empire, giving impetus to the development of value concepts of higher education in the country. The phenomena of the “magnificent decade” – neo-humanism, progressivism, the social role of science and education – became crucial for the culture and social life of the empire (Karamzin, 1803: 261-268; Yakob, 1808: 68-86).

With the emergence of the Ministry of Public Education in 1802, there was a change in state strategy and policy in the field of education, in particular, in terms of assessing the impact of European (German) universities. The enlightenment metaphor of “enlightenment of the mind” was replaced by the principle of “corruption of minds.” This is obviously detrimental to the state, because it is necessary to educate not in learning, but in “trustworthiness.” And for this, a very limited range of knowledge is sufficient.

Apologists for such ideas were not only civil servants and public figures, but also leading intellectuals, criticizing educational reforms and policies because of their lack of adaptation to practice and detachment from social needs (Vasilchikov, 1880: 249-287; Karamzin, 1991).

Thus, the initial stage of the implementation of the European “university idea” in the Russian Empire had several outcomes. First, the emergence of universities in the country was an irreversible process. University projects and models were concretely implemented: first at the level of the creation of the Imperial Moscow University, and then others, including the creation of imperial educational districts and leading universities in them.

Secondly, there was an obvious need for a new ideological basis for university education, its “nationalization” in accordance with regional conditions and peculiarities. Such a basis was created in the 1830s and 1840s, when education was realized as an inalienable social value.

It was then that we can observe attempts to comprehend the retrospective and prospects of the imperial universities. The concept of the “Russian university” emerged as a reflection of the idea of “nationalizing” the university. Such a university reflected not so much the utilitarian functions of its existence as the ideological ones, contributing to the formation of the “spirit of the nation.” Accordingly, a national intellectual university elite was being formed among scientists and teachers, who were to replace foreign professors at universities.

The realization of science as a supreme value strengthened the social authority of university education. This was facilitated by Minister Uvarov's new university reform. The model of the “classical university” is being substantiated, in particular, through the academic mobility of professors, researchers, students, and public figures, primarily to German universities.

Minister S. Uvarov critically assessed the achievements of the pre-classical stage of university education, being skeptical about the effectiveness of educational policy (Uvarov, 2003: 231-237). To overcome the shortcomings, he initiated the development of a new Statute of Universities, which came into force in July 1835.

The propaganda of state policy in the field of university education and the establishment of a new ideology in the system of higher education in the Russian Empire was centrally conducted on the pages of the Journal of the Ministry of Public Education, founded on the initiative of the



Minister in 1834. Already in one of the first issues of the journal, an article was published that conceptualized the model of a “classical” university (Balugyanskij, 1834: 316-330). This established the models and standards of state policy in the field of higher education, and restored the concept of a “single university space” in Europe and the Russian Empire.

In addition to officials, the idea of a “classical university” found expression among representatives of the intellectual elite. They advocated the idea that the university was not just a “repository of knowledge” but had a far-reaching impact on social development (Belinskij, 1838: 250-277). The triumph of science in a classical university has a significant transformative effect on society (Neverov, 1839: 39-51; Katkov, 1841: 111-116).

During the “Gloomy Seven Years” of Emperor Nicholas I (1848–1855), the reception of the “classical” university ceased. There was a retreat of state policy toward reaction, close to the 1820s. The university was seen as a source of revolutionary unrest, especially against the backdrop of the events of 1848 in Europe. Minister S. Uvarov tried to defend the achievements of university policy. An article by I. Davydov, inspired by him, defended the idea of the “beneficial action” and “originality” of Russian universities (Davydov, 1849: 37-46).

The article aroused the anger of Nicholas I, who was opposed to university education, and served as one of the reasons for S. Uvarov's resignation. However, the spread of the university idea in public opinion was irreversible. State policy also inevitably had to change, and from the mid-1850s onward, there was a resumption of interaction in a single university space.

## 5. Conclusion

Thus, the “university idea” is a set of ideas about the mission of the university, its goals and objectives, as well as the specifics of the relationship between members of the university corporation and external stakeholders – society and the state and the state. The idea of a university is not something unchanging. It is defined by a number of philosophical, political, ethical, ideological concepts, etc.

An important role in conceptualizing and filling the content of the university idea belongs to the intellectual elite, which transmits the values of the university corporation within a specific value-sense universe.

The evolution of the university idea (paradigm) has gone through several stages in its development. Its peak is associated with the name of W. von Humboldt. And the university model built on this idea is usually called “classical”. It is characterized by an active combination of education, training, and research.

At the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, the classical model of the university had competitive advantages over the utilitarian model of the university. An important feature of the latter was the instrumentalism and technologism of university education. The nineteenth-century university was the center of political struggle and movements. Many expected it to lead the struggle for political rights and civil liberties.

University education in the Russian Empire almost always remained open to the transfer of ideas and innovations, promoted academic mobility and exchanges between faculty and students. At the same time, progressive ideas had to adapt to regional conditions within the state, to confront alternative concepts and ideas, the apologists of which were partly representatives of the authorities or the intellectual elite of the Russian Empire. The results of this complex conflict process directly influenced university reforms in the country.

## References

Antologiya..., 1985 – Antologiya pedagogicheskoi misli Drevnei Rusi i Russkogo gosudarstva XIV-XVII vv. [Anthology of pedagogical thought. Ancient Russia and the Russian State XIV-XVII c.]. Moskva: Pedagogika. 1985. [in Russian]

Balugyanskij, 1834 – Balugyanskij, M.A. (1834). Ustrojstvo yuridicheskikh fakultetov v raznyh inostrannykh universitetah [Arrangement of law faculties in different foreign universities]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvesheniya*. 8: 316-330. [in Russian]

Belinskij, 1838 – Belinskij, V.G. (1838). Rechi, proiznesennye v torzhestvennom sobranii Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta [Speeches delivered at the solemn meeting of the Imperial Moscow University]. *Moskovskij nablyudatel*. Ch. 17. 5: 250-277. [in Russian]

**Davydov, 1849** – *Davydov, I.I.* (1849). O naznachenii russkih universitetov i uchastii ih v obshestvennom obrazovanii [On the purpose of Russian universities and their participation in public education]. *Sovremennik*. T. 14. 3: 37-46. [in Russian]

**Fonkich, 2000** – *Fonkich, B.L.* (2000). «Privilegiya na Akademiyu» Simeona Polotskogo – Silvestra Medvedeva" ["Privilege to the Academy" by Simeon Polotsky – Sylvester Medvedev]. *Ocherki feodalnoi Rossii*. 4: 237-297. [in Russian]

**Gejm, 1799** – *Gejm, I.A.* (1799). O sostoyanii nauk v Rossii pod pokrovitelstvom Pavla I [About the state of sciences in Russia under the patronage of Paul I]. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya. [in Russian]

**Karamzin, 1803** – *Karamzin, N.M.* (1803). O publichnom prepodavanii nauk v Moskovskom universitete [About public teaching of sciences at the Moscow University]. *Vestnik Evropy*. Chast XII. Dekabr. 23-24: 261-268. [in Russian]

**Karamzin, 1991** – *Karamzin, N.M.* (1991). Zapiska o drevnej i novoj Rossii v ee politicheskom i grazhdanskom otnosheniyah [Zapiski o sovremennyyaya i novaya Rossii v its politicheskom i kivil'nomu relations]. Moskva: Nauka. Glavnaya redakciya vostochnoj literatury, 127 p. [in Russian]

**Katkov, 1841** – *Katkov, M.N.* (1841). Berlinskie novosti. (Iz pisma k redaktoru "Otechestvennyh zapisok") [Berlin News. (From a letter to the editor of "Otechestvennye zapiski")]. *Otechestvennye zapiski*. 6: 111-116 [in Russian]

**Kolesnikov, 2003** – *Kolesnikov, V.I.* (2003). Formirovanie sistemy upravleniya universitetami v Rossii [Formation of university management system in Russia]. *Pedagogika*. 2: 15-27. [in Russian]

**Kulakova, 2006** – *Kulakova, I.P.* (2006). Universitetskoe prostranstvo i ego obitateli [University space and its inhabitants]. Moskovskij universitet v istoriko-kulturnoj srede XVIII v. Moskva, 268 p. [in Russian]

**Kuznecova, 2007** – *Kuznecova, N.* (2007). O specifikke formirovaniya universitetskogo obrazovaniya v Rossii [On the specifics of formation of university education in Russia]. *Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii*. 6: 120-125. [in Russian]

**Lapteva, 2000** – *Lapteva, L.P.* (2000). Istoriya rossijskih universitetov XVIII – nachala XX veka v novejshej otechestvennoj literature: sb. statej [History of Russian Universities of the XVIII – the beginning of the XX century in the newest Russian literature]. Voronezh. Pp. 3-27. [in Russian]

**Margolis, 2000** – *Margolis, Yu.D.* (2000). Edinyim vdohnoveniem. Ocherki istorii universitetskogo obrazovaniya v Peterburge v konce XVIII – pervoj polovine XIX vekov [Unified Inspiration. Sketches of the History of University Education in St. Petersburg at the End of XVIII – the first half of XIX centuries]. SPb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 228 p. [in Russian]

**Neverov, 1839** – *Neverov, Ya.M.* (1839). Eduard Gans [Eduard Gans]. *Otechestvennye zapiski*. 6: 39-51. [in Russian]

**Nikolskij, 2008** – *Nikolskij, V.* (2008). Universitetskaya avtonomiya i akademicheskaya svoboda [University autonomy and academic freedom]. *Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii*. 6: 147-155. [in Russian]

**Olshannikova, 2017** – *Olshannikova, N.A.* (2017). Ideya razvitiya rossijskogo universiteta [Idea of development of russian university]. *Idei i Idealy*. 4(34): 105-112. [in Russian]

**Otechestvennye universitety..., 2005** – *Otechestvennye universitety v dinamike zolotogo veka russkoj kultury* [Domestic Universities in the Dynamics of the Golden Age of Russian Culture]. Pod red. E.V. Oleksyuka. SPb., 2005. 211 p. [in Russian]

**Rozhdestvenskii, 1912** – *Rozhdestvenskii, S.V.* (1912). Ocherki po istorii sistem narodnogo prosveshcheniya v Rossii v XVIII-XIX vv. [Essays on the history of public education systems in Russia in the XVIII-XIX centuries]. T. 1. SPb. Prilozheniya. Pp. 3-6. [in Russian]

**Suhomlinov, 1882** – *Suhomlinov, M.I.* (1882). Istoriya Rossijskoj akademii [History of the Russian Academy]. T.6. SPb., Pp. 58-123. [in Russian]

**Uvarov, 2003** – *Uvarov, S.S.* (2003). O sredstvah sdelat narodnoe vospitanie specialnym, ne otstupaya ot obshih vidov [On the means to make public education special, without departing from the general types]. Shevchenko M.M. Konec odnogo Velichiya: vlast, obrazovanie i pechatnoe slovo v Imperatorskoj Rossii na poroge Osvoboditelnyh reform. Moskva. Pp. 231-237. [in Russian]

**Vasilchikov, 1880** – *Vasilchikov, A.A.* (1880). Semejstvo Razumovskih [The Razumovsky family]: v 5 t. T.2. SPb: Tip. M.M. Stasyulevicha, 557 p. [in Russian]

**Yakob, 1808** – *Yakob, L.K.* (1808). O vliyanii universitetov na obrazovanie i blagosostoyanie naroda [On the influence of universities on education and welfare of the people]: Harkov. Pp. 68-86. [in Russian]