

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS

“In Me You Will Find Your Defender”: F. M. Klinger as the First Curator of the Dorpat University and His Relationship with G. F. Parrot.

This research is dedicated to F. M. Klinger, the first curator of the University of Dorpat. The paper explores his activity in Dorpat: what place did the University occupy in his life and how much did he contribute to its development. The study examines the nature of his relationship with the first rector G. F. Parrot and identifies whether Klinger and Parrot's assertions about the concept of university were in essence similar. The research is based on materials of private correspondence, the memoirs of Klinger, Parrot and their contemporaries as well as some official documents. The relevance of the research stemmed from drawing attention to one of the first six curators of Russian universities—F. M. Klinger, whose personality and activity has not yet been the subject of a separate study.

Careful analysis of the materials led to the following major conclusions. Firstly, Klinger showed a paternalistic attitude towards the university. He contributed to the scientific development and tried to keep the University out of trouble and save its honor in some incidents. Secondly, throughout the period of his curatorship, Klinger strictly pursued a government policy of centralization and tried to carry out the bureaucratic unification in accordance with the Enlightenment ideas. Thirdly, Parrot found in Klinger a major defender of the University. Despite the different assertions about the university idea, they were able to overcome serious conflicts in pursuit of a common cause.

Georg Friedrich Parrot, professor of physics and the first Rector of the Dorpat University, was the person who determined the nature of this institution at its foundation. A native of Montbéliard, brought up on the ideals of the Enlightenment, played, according to A. Iu. Andreev, the role of one of the most influential “agents of transfer” of the traditional university concept to Russia (Andreev & Posokhov, 2012, p. 194).

The Dorpat University was initially opened in 1802 by the local nobility following the example of the Gottingen University. However, visiting professors did not

appreciate being dictated to by the local nobility. Under these circumstances, Parrot as a representative of professors of Dorpat, managed to get close to Alexander I and gain the university autonomy and independence from the local nobility. The University's autonomy was established by the Founding Act and then extended to apply to all Russian universities (Andreev & Posokhov, 2012, p. 192). Independence from the local nobility was ensured by the fact that now the University was under the Ministry of Public Education and free from the control of the local nobility. Thus, it transformed from a local university into an imperial.

However, the autonomy was “balanced” by the new post of university curator (Zhukovskaya, 2009, p. 76). He acted as an intermediary between the Ministry of Public Education and the university. Obeying directly the former, the curator would report to the Ministry about his actions, submit for the approval of professors elected by the University Council, make financial reports, and so on. This is why Parrot needed in this position a person with whom he shared similar ideas and someone not connected with the local nobility.

He found the kind of person in an adherent of German Enlightenment—Friedrich Maximilian Klinger. As Goethe's friend and a famous representative of the literary movement *Sturm und Drang*, Klinger came to Russia at the end of the 18th century and appeared to be one of those progressive, highly educated men who surrounded Alexander I at the beginning of his reign (Gavrilina, 2017a, pp. 36–38). Klinger was one of the founders of the first Russian university statutes and the initiator of many educational reforms, both secular and military. He was appointed the curator of the Dorpat University with active assistance on Parrot's part and on his personal recommendations.

Adam Czartoryski wrote that a “well-intentioned person, full of aspiration to serve prosperity and the spread of sciences” was appointed a curator of Dorpat (*Memuary...*, 1913, pp. 289–291). F.-C. La Harpe noted: “Among the people of that time, who could benefit greatly, Mr. Klinger undoubtedly took an honorable place” (Andreev & Tozato-Rigo, 2014, p. 490).

Klinger was an adherent of the Enlightenment ideology. Contemporaries defined him as a philosopher of the “anti-religious direction” (*Dnevnik...*, 1913, p. 82), close to Voltaire and Diderot, “a passionate admirer of the teachings of the French Revolution” (Schubert, 1962, p. 70). A future friend and colleague of Klinger, Professor K. S. Morgenstern, when visiting him during his trips to the capital, was perplexed: “The conversations turned into such dangerous political

arguments that on my first visits to Petersburg I was surprised at how such things are possible” (Rieger, 1880, p. 638).

Parrot’s ideas were similar. During the visit of Alexander I on May 22 in 1802 the professor held a speech in the spirit of the Enlightenment that admired the Emperor. He promised on behalf his colleagues “to work with diligence and fidelity for the dissemination of useful knowledge” and “to respect humanity in all its classes and in all its forms, not to distinguish the poor from the rich”. Alexander was impressed by how much of that responded to his own aspirations. A friendly correspondence began between the Emperor and the professor (Andreev, 2009, pp. 24–26).

An interesting detail is that love towards the new young monarch was the thing that united Klinger and Parrot. The meeting which was the starting point for their relationship was described, according to Parrot, by Professor Morgenstern. In the autumn of 1802, when Parrot was in St. Petersburg, seeking the Founding Act, he had an opportunity to observe with Alexander I preparations for the lifting of the balloon on the square in front of the First Cadet Corps, whose director Klinger was. Preparations were not successful, and there was a moment when Klinger quickly pushed the monarch away from the dangerous place. After Alexander’s departure, Klinger walked along with Parrot and spoke of his fervent love towards the Emperor. This made a great impression on Parrot and gave him an idea of proposing his candidacy to the Tsar (Petukhov, 1902, pp. 29–30).

Getting down to business, both were fascinated and both were inspired. In February 1803, Klinger wrote to Parrot: “Let’s work and hold bravely, I hope everything will run its course, we have the will and the strength, and the magnanimous monarch will give us the means, and moreover, he inspires us the way no one else on the throne has inspired us.”¹

Thus, Parrot fought for the University’s autonomy from Alexander I, and Klinger was the person who held the post of the curator through whom the central government tried to control the University’s affairs. This makes their relationship an interesting issue to explore. Obviously, Parrot hoped to find an ally in Klinger, but were his expectations met?

The purpose of this research is to investigate Klinger’s activity as the first curator: What place did the University occupy in his life? Did he contribute much to

¹ An Parrot, 8/02/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 234.

its development? It is interesting to examine the nature of his relationship with Parrot and to identify whether Klinger's and Parrot's assertions about the concept of university were in essence similar. The study is based on materials of private correspondence, memoirs of Klinger, Parrot and their contemporaries as well as some official documents.

One of the paragraphs of the Preliminary Rules stated that "the curator was responsible for the improvement of the district entrusted to him" and should bring "the university and other schools [...] into a flourishing state" (*Sbornik postanovlenii*, 1864, col. 16). Klinger took this position very responsibly. In one of the first letters to Morgenstern he wrote: "A difficult and great job is ahead of us, but several people who set themselves a noble goal have succeeded more than they conceived at first. I hope that in a year we will be able to say the same about ourselves..."²

According to Parrot, Klinger, who notified him that the Main Administration of Schools had begun to develop a general statute for all Russian universities, promised to protect all those items that Parrot managed to "win" from the monarch.

In the conflict with the local nobility, Klinger also showed himself as Parrot's ally. The nobility, who had lost power over the university, was looking for other ways to reassert its influence. The best illustration of this opposition is the case with the Gymnasium of Mitava. The Courland nobility appealed to the Minister of Internal Affairs with a request to spread the authority of the Gymnasium of Mitava and rename it a the Knight's Academy. In fact, they tried to make the second university out of the gymnasium (Rozhdestvenskiy, 1902, p. 92). Klinger was very angry about such "arbitrariness"; he took a firm position and did not allow the independence of the gymnasium nor its renaming.³

Outraged by the incident, the curator insisted that the university itself should stay as far from conflicts as possible and assumed the responsibility to protect it. He wrote to Parrot: "This is my job now",⁴ "you have nothing to fear,⁵[...] every morning I wear my armor, I can rely on it, because I forged it myself".⁶ Klinger identified this confrontation, stretching over several years, in his letters

² An Morgenstern, 17/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 64.

³ An Parrot, 24/02/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 236; An Parrot, 13/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 241; An Parrot, 26/04/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, pp. 256–257.

⁴ An Parrot in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 236.

⁵ An Parrot, 26/04/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 257.

⁶ An Parrot, 26/04/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 257.

as “Kampf” (‘fight’). It took him a lot of strength, but in this sense he fully justified Parrot’s hopes.

Thus, at first glance, Parrot found an ally in the person of the curator and it determines the nature of their correspondence. In March 1803, Klinger wrote to Parrot: “You can count on me in everything where there is law [...]; in me you will find your defender”.⁷ Identifying himself as a University’s defender coincided with the image of curator, which Parrot hoped to find in Klinger. However, the key point in this phrase is the emphasis on the “law”. A strict adherence to the law, which characterizes Klinger, often caused a misunderstanding between the rector and the curator.

At the very beginning of their working together, the two figures had a conflict about the monthly financial reporting of the University to the Ministry. Klinger wrote that this reporting did not deprive the University of the right to acquire whatever it wanted, and unnecessary resistance would have a bad effect on the University’s reputation, but Parrot demanded a petition for the cancellation of this accountability. The petition was eventually submitted by Klinger, but the curator said bluntly: “I cannot be a university lawyer here and I will not be”.⁸

This episode clearly illustrates the difficult situation in which Klinger found himself in. On the one hand, there was the University with its desires, on the other—the Ministry with its requirements. So, as an agent of the central government Klinger could neither enforce many of the free-thinking desires of the University Council nor could he ignore the demands of the Ministry. As a link between the educational institution and the higher power, the curator was caught between two fires.

In those cases where the requirements of the university went beyond his legal rights, Klinger was strict and adamant. For example, a talented student Williams, a serf, filed to the rector a request for his release, asking him to appeal to the Emperor. The Council approved the student’s request and redirected it to Klinger. However, Klinger rejected the request on the grounds that the Council acted above his rights. “If the Council”, Klinger wrote, “believes that he has the right to make the submission concerning release from serfdom, then he must refer to the relevant law, and I will very readily pass the report on to the minister” (Martinson, 1954, p. 113).

⁷ An Parrot, 4/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 237.

⁸ An Parrot, 3/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 239.

In cases where the letter of the law was on the side of the university, Klinger was not afraid to act as his intercessor, even if the case was quite “inappropriate”. One such example concerns the complaint about the prohibition of the book *On the Situation of Peasants in Livonia and Eastland* by the Livonian provincial board. According to the law, Klinger wrote, the board has no right to “extend its measure without any higher order” to what was printed in the university press. At the same time Klinger justified himself by saying that he wanted only to point out the illegality of the actions of the provincial board, “without, however, entering into any comments about the contents of the book” (*Opisanie...*, 1921, pp. 91–93).

The curator approached the election of professors very cautiously: “I believe that teaching is the most important task of the university”.⁹ Klinger was against electing those professors in whose scientific training he doubted, clarifying that he was not speaking against individuals, but “for the cause and honor of the university”.¹⁰ In a letter to Parrot he wrote: “I hope that this would not be perceived as interfering with the university’s freedom”.¹¹

If Klinger believed that the fulfilment of certain formal requirements cannot be regarded as violation of the university’s freedom and it is better to “keep silent” than to enter a conflict, Parrot was more principled and did not want to “adapt”. He wrote to Klinger: “Some of our actions on both sides are, perhaps, misinterpreted; We are separated from each other and stand on different points of view”.¹² Klinger complained about it in a letter to Professor Morgenstern: “What you wrote to me about our glorious Parrot, made me upset. I do not know what he lacks, or even less—how to help him. Who wants too much too quickly cannot be satisfied, whether he is a king or a professor”.¹³

Also, different fields of vision opened before the two figures standing “at different points of view”. Klinger had a clear idea about the way decisions were made “at the top”, and therefore looked at some situations more realistically. According to Professor J. W. Krause, “quite accurately familiar with the gear mechanism of the state machine, he could do little for Dorpat” (Krause, 1902, p. 339). In Klinger’s own words, he had to “fight” not only in Dorpat, but also in the ministry.¹⁴

⁹ An Morgenstern, 17/03/1804 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 71.

¹⁰ An Morgenstern, 4/01/1815 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 169; An Morgenstern, 30/05/1816 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 179.

¹¹ An Parrot in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 243.

¹² Parrot an Klinger, 27/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 250.

¹³ An Morgenstern, 17/03/1804 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 71.

¹⁴ An Parrot, 27/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 248.

As the curator said, he tried to solve a particular issue “choosing the best way, according to his knowledge and position”.¹⁵ A Klinger’s letter to Morgenstern reads: “Our glorious rector will be very angry with me, but if I sometimes make him angry, it happens so that, after all, he is pleased with me”.¹⁶

The strict observance of the laws that he enforced must not be understood from one-sided perspective, exposing the curator as a blind executor of ministerial will. Klinger understood that ignorance of the orders of the central government is fraught with attacks on him by the reactionaries, both Baltic and Russian. Therefore, the desire not to go beyond the law was, first of all, due to the desire to protect the university, which the curator proudly called “mine”.

Thus, the relationship between the curator and the rector can be characterized by the fact that the first played the role of a buffer that mitigated the conflicts between Parrot and the Ministry of Education. Worrying about the honor of the university, he repeatedly asked Parrot to hush up some conflict situations that might hurt it.¹⁷ Parrot, “more a dreamer than a practitioner”, as Professor M. Korf defined him (Sapozhnikova, 2008, p. 108), could not always correctly appreciate the conditions and circumstances, while Klinger was much more practical, had a soberer view of the situation and tried to soften Parrot’s passion.

In this regard, it is interesting that Klinger stressed in his letters to Parrot the difference between German universities and the Dorpat University, noting that the conditions and circumstances of its existence were somewhat different than in Germany.

It brings us to another ground for disagreement between Klinger and Parrot—the difference of their perceptions of what a Russian imperial university should be like. According to Parrot, a university is an independent corporation that should not be accountable to anyone. In Klinger’s view, the main task of a university is “to shape the young sons of the Fatherland into worthy citizens of the State”, “needed for the benefit of the country”. This is closely related to Klinger’s perception of students (for further detail see Gavrilina, 2017b, p. 52).

One of the stumbling blocks was the problem of teaching in Russian. “Lectures in Russian universities should be started as soon as possible in Russian,”¹⁸ wrote

¹⁵ An Parrot, 6/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 240.

¹⁶ An Morgenstern in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 65.

¹⁷ An Parrot, 17/02/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 234.

¹⁸ An Parrot, 6/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 240.

the curator to the rector. In this sense, Klinger acted in the interests of the Empire and tried to carry out the bureaucratic unification. He showed himself as a mediator of the tendencies brought by the European Enlightenment, namely, the idea of unifying state institutions and the administrative apparatus on the basis of a single official language, which was first proposed by Joseph II.

In fact, such a tendency led to the harassment of local scientists, detriment to the language of the local elite and the Council could not find it acceptable, taking into account that the number of Ostsee students in the first quarter of the 19th century ranged from 80–90% (Tankler, 1996, p. 93). However, Klinger's desire to make Russian the language of teaching in Dorpat should be viewed not as an attempt to violate the local language and self-awareness of the local people, but as a means to achieve bureaucratic uniformity to facilitate administrative rule in the Empire.

This state of affairs made Klinger to conclude with sadness nearing the end of his career: "I know that from the very beginning to the present moment my destiny is to be misunderstood and unknown in Dorpat, if not by all, by many. So it is and so it will be".¹⁹

However, it would be wrong to rank Parrot among those who misunderstood the role of the curator. The two figures were able to overcome serious difficulties and differences in pursuit of a common cause, showing respect for one another. Klinger wrote: "[T]he business that faces us both is too important to think about mutual pleasures in every respect [...]; I will continue to act with the same perseverance and energy as long as I have enough passion and patience";²⁰ "Nothing has any influence on me and only the university directs me".²¹ Parrot asked to continue the former trusting relations instead of the official and formal proposed by Klinger: "We will act together, you in common affairs, I in particular [...]. I highly respect you with all your politics, and ask you to love me with all my simplicity".²²

Probably, the rector partly understood Klinger's position and at the same time paid tribute to his personal qualities and interest in the fate of the University. In a personal letter to the Emperor Parrot wrote: "While his [Alexander] attention is drawn to other parts of his huge Empire, Klinger takes care of us instead of Him. I saw him up close, I admired him, he is a rare man, a fighter for truth

¹⁹ An Grindel, 31/01/1811 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 273.

²⁰ An Parrot, 27/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 248.

²¹ An Parrot in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 243.

²² Parrot an Klinger, 27/03/1803 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 250.

and law” (Bienemann, 1902, p. 211). Parrot even recommended Klinger for the position of Minister of Education to Alexander: “With him, Dorpat flourished. With him, all Russian universities will rise” (Bienemann, 1902, p. 211).

These Parrot’s words were fair in many respects. Professor Morgenstern, closely observing the activities of the curator, recalled that he was “very conscientious in money matters, even in details”. Under Klinger’s close supervision, the construction of new buildings was well under way. By the year 1805, an anatomical theater was built, in 1806 a library was opened, which for 37 years was headed by Morgenstern. By the year 1808 new clinics were ready, in 1809 the construction of the main building was completed, and in 1810—the observatory. At the same time, there appeared chemistry, physics and anatomy laboratories, a botanical garden and even a museum of art (Rieger, 1880, p. 586). In 1808, Klinger wrote to his German friend: “My University excellently moves forward. Buildings, for which the monarch has allocated 600 thousand rubles, are nearing completion, research equipment was purchased for 200 thousand—and it is not liked by well-known people here [...], but I conduct my business with energy and strength, not paying attention to these people”.²³

Thus, Klinger belongs to the first generation of Russian curators, who treated the university as their own child (Andreev & Tsygankov, 2015, p. 78). Being true to the Enlightenment values, they patronized science and scientists (Zavgorodnyaya, 2007, p. 182).

However, the low level of student discipline and constant conflicts with the local government hurt painfully these paternalistic feelings of the curator. This was compounded by “partisan disagreements” among the professors. If after visiting the Dorpat University in summer 1804 Klinger found it “in a very good, flourishing and very promising present state” (*Periodicheskoe sochinenie...*, 1804, p. 73), in December 1811 he wrote to Morgenstern: “As for my visit to Dorpat, I cannot say anything else about this, except that in any case I would undertake such a journey with extreme reluctance”.²⁴ He noted with sorrow that it was hardly possible to hope to bring things to a better position: “the passions and personalities seem to have already gained too much, so that everything else is sacrificed to them”.²⁵

Thus, the atmosphere within the walls of the University was unhealthy. If Klinger was ready to go into battle with all the external circumstances that hampered

²³ An Wolzogen, 12/08/1808 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 119.

²⁴ An Morgenstern, 25/12/1811 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 146.

²⁵ An Morgenstern, 25/12/1811 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 146.

the development of the University, the discord inside the University itself got the curator down.

However, the internal state of affairs at the University was not the only reason why Klinger's attitude towards it changed dramatically in the second period of his curatorship. His only son, who he was so proud of and admired in his letters to friends and family, died in the Battle of Borodino. This death had a tragic effect on Klinger's vigor. "After this loss, his courage sank to the bottom," wrote Professor Krause (1902, p. 339). As a consequence, Klinger's wife fell seriously ill and the curator wrote that he remained "alone in the whole world", without a goal and without hope.

The apathy did not correspond to his personality, though. In a sense, the cruelty of life towards him satisfied his passion for struggle and made him similar with the Storm and Stress heroes of his own novels. In this "rebellion" against fate he found a sense of existence and overcame all the difficulties as a "fighter".²⁶ So, in 1814, he wrote to a friend: "I'm standing, and I will stand".²⁷

Nevertheless, the University surprised him with new reasons for disappointment. The general negative impression of Klinger about the institution was exacerbated by certain unpleasant incidents, such as money theft in 1813. The curator was extremely indignant, he wrote that the University had tarnished his honor and that "all irritation in the Russian service" came to him from the University.²⁸

Thus, for the curator, the University turned from his own "child" into a place of service he hated: "The University of Dorpat has overshadowed all my well-functioning official activity and placed a sense of regret and indignation in me".²⁹

In 1816, the curator was stunned by a case of illegal awarding of the doctor's degree to the tailor Walter and the manufacturer Weber by the Faculty of Law. These persons were promoted without theses, not having master's degrees or passing a complete examination, but with the approval of the dean and the rector of the faculty. To avoid outside control, all this happened at a time when the university was closed for vacations.

The rumors nevertheless spread and reached St. Petersburg. Furthermore, during the investigation it was found out that the law department did not observe all

²⁶ An Goethe, 26/05/1814 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 162.

²⁷ An Nicolovius, 11/02/1814 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 157.

²⁸ An Morgenstern, 15/05/1814 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 166.

²⁹ An Morgenstern, 18/05/1815 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 169.

the required rules in other cases either. Thus, all promotions in the Faculty of Law for 15 years of its existence were in question (Andreev & Posokhov, 2012, pp. 382–383). This incident created the most unfavorable impression of the university, not only in the nearest surroundings, but even abroad (Petukhov, 1902, pp. 274–275).

The principled, unwavering follower of justice and order was shocked: “I did not know [...] that from scientists and high-minded people [...] one should not expect justice and legitimacy”,³⁰ “if I have been tired of the university, now I’m completely exhausted”.³¹

Despite all his disappointment, he did everything possible to save the honor of the University, but in December 1816, Klinger reported in a letter to Morgenstern that he had asked the monarch for resignation from the post of a curator “because of poor health”.³²

What was the reason for Klinger’s resignation? Some researchers consider that it was a change in the government’s course, under which “progressive figures of this time turned out to be unnecessary” (Kozyreva, 2000, pp. 104–112; Smolyan, 1958, pp. 31–77). Indeed, the government’s turn to reaction in the years of the Holy Alliance had a painful impact on the fate of universities. As Kusber noted, the growing mysticism and activity of the Bible society was evidence of attack on the liberal spirit of the statutes of 1803 and 1804 (Kusber, 2009, p. 79).

In these conditions, in January 1817, the curator of the Kazan educational district M. A. Saltykov wrote in one of his letters: “Klinger is requesting his dismissal, saying that he has no wish to attend the funeral of the university entrusted to him” (Andreev & Posokhov, 2012, p. 227). Another interesting letter belongs to N. M. Karamzin: “From now on, the curators will be people of well-known piety. Klinger was dismissed: I was told that he was considered a freethinker...” (*Pisma...*, 1866, p. 204).

Thus, the circumstances of Klinger’s resignation are not entirely clear: was it a resignation or a dismissal? Several factors need to be taken into account: firstly, the internal situation at the University; secondly, a political factor; thirdly, Klinger’s age and his state of health (he was 65 years old; he suffered from some health problems and had an ill wife). According to Krause, “he secluded himself in a quiet, private life, requiring no responsibility” (Krause, 1902, p. 339).

³⁰ An Morgenstern, 24/04/1816 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 177.

³¹ An Morgenstern, 24/10/1816 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 189.

³² Am Morgenstern, 28/12/1816 in *Briefbuch*, 1896, p. 192.

In summary, throughout the period of his curatorship Klinger strictly pursued a government policy of centralization, counteracting the aspirations of the local nobility to subordinate the influence of the university and other educational institutions of the Dorpat educational district. He saw in this task the desire of Alexander I, and justification of his hopes became the determining factor for Klinger's patronage activity. He took every incident at the University as a personal drama; he tried to protect the institution from all the troubles, but could not bear it when the University itself became the cause of a major scandal.

Klinger fits perfectly among the first generation of Russian curators, for whom the attitude towards the university as a "child" was inherent. He contributed to the development of science at the University: he carefully approached the election of professors, headed the construction of laboratories, tried to improve student discipline and so on.

The curator actively interfered in university affairs, trying to contribute to its development following his own perceptions which often did not coincide with Parrot's views. The conflict of authority turned out to be possible because in the Act of Resolution the specific functions of the curators were not legislated. Thus, the contradiction between the powers of the curator and the autonomous rights of the university was laid since the very beginning (Zavgorodnyaya, 2007, p. 181).

Nevertheless, Klinger cannot be called a "violator" of the University's "self-government". His unwillingness to submit one or another request of the Council must be seen not as a desire to limit the rights of the University, but as an attempt to protect it from unnecessary criticism.

Actually, Parrot found in Klinger the University's most important beneficiary and friend, whose patronage, however, was limited by legal matters. The two figures were able to overcome serious difficulties and differences in pursuit of a common cause, showing respect for one another. They both tried to bring about improvement and positive change at the University of Dorpat, each trying to do so from his own unique perspective.

Irina A. Gavrilina

Faculty of History, Lomonosov Moscow State University

References

- Andreev, A. Iu.** (2009), *Rossiiskie universitety XVIII – pervoi XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoi istorii Evropy* [Russian universities in the 18th and the first half of the 19th century in the context of university history in Europe], Moscow: Znak.
- Andreev, A. Iu. & Posokhov, S. I.** (2012), *Universitet v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII – pervoi poloviny XIX veka* [University in the Russian Empire in the 18th and the first half of the 19th century], Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Andreev, A. Iu. & Tozato-Rigo, D.** (2014), *Imperator Aleksandr I i F.-S. Lagarp: Pis'ma. Dokumenty* [Emperor Alexander I and F.-C. Laharpe: Letters. Documents], Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Andreev, A. Iu. & Tsygankov, D. A.** (2015), 'Popechitel Imperatorskogo universiteta v sisteme narodnogo prosveshcheniya Rossiiskoi imperii pervoi poloviny XIX v.' [Curator of the Imperial University in the public education system of the Russian Empire in the first half of the 19th century], *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Svyato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta. Seriya Istoriya Russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 70–97.
- Bienemann, F.** (1902), *Der Dorpater Professor Georg Friedrich Parrot und Keiser Alexander I*, Reval.
- Briefbuch* (1896), *Briefbuch zu Friedrich Maximilian Klinger. Sein Leben und Werke*, vol. 2, Darmstadt: Verlag von Arnold Bergsträsser.
- 'Dnevnik...' (1913), 'Dnevnik Etiena Dyumona ob ego priedze v Rossiyu v 1803 g.' [Diary of Etienne Dumont about his arrival in Russia in 1803], *Golos minuvshogo*, no. 3, pp. 80–108.
- Gavrilina, I. A.** (2017a), 'Nemetskiy prosvetitel na russkoi sluzhbe (1780–1830 gg.)' [German Enlightenment in Russian service], *Platonovskie chteniya: XXII userossiiskaya konferentsiya molodykh istorikov (Samara, 9–10 dekabrya 2016 g.): materialy i doklady*, Samara: Samarskii universitet, pp. 36–38.
- Gavrilina, I. A.** (2017b), *Rektor G. F. Parrot i popechitel F.M. Klinger: dva vzglyada na razvitie. Derptskogo universiteta v pervye gody ego sushhestvovaniya (1802–1803)* [Rector G. F. Parrot and the curator F. M. Klinger: two views on development. Dorpat University in the early years of its existence], *Klio*, no. 10, pp. 47–56.
- Krause, J. W.** (1902), 'Das erste Jahrzehnt der ehemaligen Universität Dorpat. Aus den Memoiren des Professors Johann Wilhelm Krause,' *Baltische Monatsschrift*, no. 53, pp. 238–241.
- Kozyreva, M. G.** (2000), 'Sudba nemetskogo pisatelya v Rossii: F. M. Klinger' [The fate of a German writer in Russia], in *Nemtsy v Rossii*, St. Petersburg, pp. 104–112.
- Kusber, Y. A.** (2009), "'Dalekie tsentry nauki?" Nemetski vzglyad na rossiiskie universitety XIX – nachala XX v.' ["Far centers of science?" German view on Russian universities in the 19th and early 20th century], in *Byt russkim po dukhu i evropeitsem po*

- obrazovaniiu*": *Universitety Rossiyskoi imperii v obrazovatel'nom prostranstve Tsentralnoi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII–XX v.*, Moscow: ROSSPEN, pp. 71–82.
- Magnitskiy, M. L.** (2014), 'O vodvorenii illyuminatstva pod raznymi ego vidami v Rossii' [On the emergence of Illuminati in different forms in Russia], in A. Yu. Minakova (ed.) *Pravoslavnoe prosveshchenie*, Moscow: Institut russkoi tsivilizatsii, Rodnaia strana, pp. 261–332.
- Martinson, E. H.** (1954), *Istoriya osnovaniya Tartuskogo (b. Derptskogo-Yurievskogo) universiteta* [History of the founding of the Tartu (former Derpt-Yuriev) university], Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningradskogo universiteta.
- Memuary ...* (1913), *Memuary knyazya Adama Chartoryzhskogo i ego perepiska s imperatorom Aleksandrom I* [Memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski and his correspondence with Emperor Alexander I], Moscow: K. F. Nekrasov publ.
- Opisanie ...* (1921), *Opisanie del arkhiva Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya* [Description of the Archives of the Ministry of Public Education], vol. 2, Petrograd: Vtoraya gosudarstvennaya tip.
- Periodicheskoe sochinenie...* (1804), *Periodicheskoe sochinenie ob uspekhakh narodnogo Prosveshcheniya* [Periodical issue on the progress of public education], no. 7, St. Petersburg: Pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk.
- Petukhov, E.** (1902), *Imperatorskiy Yurievskiy, byvshiy Derptskiy, universitet za sto let ego sushchestvovaniya (1802–1902)* [Imperial Yuriev, former Dorpat University during the century of its existence (1802–1902)], vol. 1, Yuriev: Tip. K. Matissena.
- Rieger, M.** (1880), *Friedrich Maximilian Klinger: Sein Leben und Werke, Bd. 2: Klinger in seiner Reife*, Darmstadt: Verlag von Arnold Bergsträsser.
- Rozhdestvenskiy, S. V.** (1902), *Istoricheski obzor deyatelnosti Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya 1802–1902* [Historical overview of the activities of the Ministry of Public Education 1802–1902], Yuriev: Izdatel'stvo: M-vo nar. pros.
- Sapozhnikova, N. V.** (2008), 'Epistolarno-panoramnaya proektsiya "Russkogo KHIKH veka" v pismakh "cheloveka vtorogo plana". Akademik-romantik G. F. Parrot' [Epistolary-panoramic projection of the "19th-century Russia" in the letters of "people in supporting role". Academician-romantic G.F. Parrot], in *Chelovek vtorogo plana v istorii: sbornik nauchnykh statei*, Rostov-na-Donu, no. 5, pp. 104–113.
- Sbornik postanovleniy...* (1864), *Sbornik postanovleniy po ministerstvu narodnogo prosveshcheniya* [Collection of resolutions on the Ministry of National Education], vol. 1, St. Petersburg: tip. V. S. Balashova.
- Schubert, F.** (1962), *Unter dem Doppeladler: Erinnerungen eines Deutschen in russischem Offiziersdienst, 1789–1814*, Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag.
- Smolyan, O.** (1958), 'Klinger v Rossii' [Klinger in Russia]. *Uchenye zapiski. Kafedra russkogo literatury Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta im. A. I. Gertsena*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 31–77.
- Tankler, H.** (1996), 'Dorpat, a German-speaking University in the Russian Empire,' in M. Norrback & K. Ranki (eds.) *University and Nation. The University and the*

Making of the Nation in Northern Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries, Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, pp. 91–100.

Zavgorodnyaya, O. N. (2007), *Popechitelstvo v istorii universitetov Rossii v pervoi polovine XIX veka. Diss. kand. ist. nauk* [Curators in the history of Russian universities in the first half of the 19th century], PhD thesis, Moscow.

Zhukovskaya, T. N. (2009), “Imperatorskiy universitet”: sistema vysochaishego vmeshatelstva v zhizn rossiiskikh universitetov v pervoi polovine XIX veka’ [“Imperial university”: a system of the highest interference in the life of Russian universities in the first half of 19th century], in *Vlast’, obshchestvo i reformy v Rossii v XIX – nachale XX v.: issledovaniya, istoriografiya, istochnikovedenie*, St. Petersburg: NestorIstoriia, pp. 74–89.