

Время выполнения задания – 180 мин.

Статья на английском языке.

Задание 1.

В соответствии со своим выбором специализации магистерской подготовки выберите одну из предложенных тем для написания эссе:

Выберите и выполните только один из блоков заданий.

Блок 1. История знания

Выберите одну из предложенных тем и напишите эссе по этой теме:

1. Локальная история: преимущества и перспективы.
2. Структуры исторического времени.

Блок 2. История России и Запада

Выберите одну из предложенных тем и напишите эссе по этой теме:

1. Биография как средство исторического познания.
2. Физическая, ментальная и историческая география Европы и России.

Задание 2.

Прочитайте предложенную статью на английском языке. Напишите рецензию на русском языке, охарактеризовав цель, которую ставит автор статьи, источники, на которые он опирается, задачи, которые решаются в статье. Кратко охарактеризуйте выводы, к которым приходит автор. Объем рецензии – не более 30 - 40 строк письменного текста (1 – 1,5 страницы) на листе формата А4.



A Profile of the Russian Bureaucracy on the Eve of the Great Reforms

Author(s): W. Bruce Lincoln

Source: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Neue Folge, Bd. 27, H. 2 (1979), pp. 181-196

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41045908>

Accessed: 14-02-2018 11:19 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*

W. Bruce Lincoln, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb

A Profile of the Russian Bureaucracy on the Eve of the Great Reforms*

During the past decade, the problem of the Imperial Russian bureaucracy in the mid-nineteenth century has become the focus of considerable scholarly inquiry. WALTER PINTNER'S two articles on the bureaucracy before 1861 have provided useful material about the educations and property holdings of higher-level civil servants,¹ and two additional articles by the Soviet historian P. A. ZAJONČKOVSKIJ have done much the same thing for the highest-ranking civil servants and provincial governors on the eve of the Crimean War.² ZAJONČKOVSKIJ has provided further information for earlier and later portions of the nineteenth century in his recent book, "The Governmental Apparatus of Autocratic Russia in the Nineteenth Century,"³ and, in some of my own work, I have dealt with similar problems relating to the reign of Nicholas I.⁴ Recent scholarly monographs by TERENCE EMMONS, S. FREDERICK STARR, and DANIEL FIELD have focused upon how the bureaucracy dealt with problems of change as they related to specific reform issues in the years just after the Crimean War,⁵ and more general works by H.-J. TORKE, ERIK AMBURGER, GEORGE YANEY, RICHARD WORTMAN, LUCIE LUIG, and F. B. KAISER have sought to deal with the nineteenth-century Russian state apparatus and its personnel in a broader manner.⁶

*The author is indebted to the International Research and Exchanges Board, the Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad Program, and Northern Illinois University for the support which made possible the research for this article.

¹ W. M. PINTNER *The Russian Higher Civil Service on the Eve of the Great Reforms*, in: *Journal of Social History* (1975) pp. 55-69; IDEM *The Social Characteristics of the Early Nineteenth-Century Russian Bureaucracy*, in: *Slavic Review* 29 (1970) pp. 429-443.

² P. A. ZAJONČKOVSKIJ *Gubernskaja administracija nakanune Krymskoj vojny*, in: *Voprosy istorii* (1975) No. 9, pp. 33-51; IDEM *Vysšaja bjurokratija nakanune Krymskoj vojny*, in: *Istorija SSSR* (1974) No. 4, pp. 154-164.

³ P. A. ZAJONČKOVSKIJ *Pravitel'stvennyj apparat samoderžavnoj Rossii v XIX v.* Moskva 1978.

⁴ W. BRUCE LINCOLN *Russia's 'Enlightened' Bureaucrats and the Problem of State Reform, 1848-1856*, in: *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* 12 (1971) pp. 410-421; IDEM *The Genesis of an "Enlightened" Bureaucracy in Russia, 1825-1856*, in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. N. S. 20 (1972) pp. 321-330; IDEM *The Daily Life of St. Petersburg Officials in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, in: *Oxford Slavonic Papers*. N. S. 8 (1975) pp. 82-100; IDEM *The Ministers of Nicholas I: A Brief Inquiry Into Their Backgrounds and Service Careers*, in: *The Russian Review* 34 (1975) pp. 308-323; IDEM *The Composition of the Imperial Russian State Council under Nicholas I*, in: *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 10 (1976) pp. 369-381.

⁵ TERENCE EMMONS *The Russian Landed Gentry and the Peasant Emancipation of 1861*. London 1968; S. FREDERICK STARR *Decentralization and Self-Government in Russia, 1830-1870*. Princeton 1972; DANIEL FIELD *The End of Serfdom: Nobility and Bureaucracy in Russia, 1855-1861*. Cambridge, Mass. 1976.

⁶ H.-J. TORKE *Das russische Beamtentum in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 13 (1967) pp. 7-345; ERIK AMBURGER *Geschichte der Behördenorganisation Rußlands von Peter dem Großen bis 1917*. Leiden 1966; GEORGE YANEY *The Systematization of Russian Government: Social Evolution in the Domestic Administration of Imperial Russia, 1711-1905*. Urbana 1973; RICHARD WORTMAN *The Development of a Russian Legal Consciousness*. Chicago 1976; LUCIE LUIG *Zur Geschichte des russischen Innenministeriums unter Nikolaus I.* Wiesbaden 1968; and F. B. KAISER *Die russische Justizreform von 1864. Zur Geschichte der russischen Justiz von Katharina II. bis 1917*. Leiden 1972.

Table 1^a. Personnel in the Russian Table of Ranks, 1847–1851
 (Figures Given by Year, with Percentage of Increase or Decrease in Parentheses)

Agency	1847	1848	1849	1850	1851
SEIVK, GS, ID,					
KM, KP	343	379 (+10.5)	368 (-3.0)	451 (+22.6)	619 (+37.3)
MDU	1998	1962 (-1.8)	2022 (+3.1)	2080 (+2.9)	2082 (+0.1)
MF	11038	10522 (-4.7)	11024 (+4.8)	11735 (+6.4)	10981 (-6.4)
MJu	12081	12274 (+1.6)	13013 (+6.0)	14029 (+7.8)	13349 (-4.8)
MVD	20314	20517 (+1.0)	23227 (+13.2)	24874 (+7.1)	27653 (+11.2)
MID	585	598 (+2.2)	615 (+2.8)	638 (+3.7)	636 (-0.3)
MNP	4024	4350 (+8.1)	4618 (+6.2)	4681 (+1.4)	4817 (+2.9)
MGI	4206	4570 (+8.6)	4835 (+5.8)	5157 (+6.6)	5362 (+4.0)
GUPSPZ	1091	1210 (+10.9)	1393 (+15.1)	1605 (+15.2)	1751 (+9.1)
PV	2262	1904 (-15.8)	1973 (+3.6)	2049 (+3.8)	2094 (+2.2)
VGK	291	317 (+8.9)	337 (+6.3)	327 (-3.0)	309 (-5.5)
VDDPI	1301	1377 (+5.8)	1460 (+6.0)	1466 (+0.4)	1478 (+0.8)
VBU	1308	1407 (+7.6)	1384 (-1.6)	1341 (-3.1)	1422 (+6.0)
VCP	378	916 (+142.3)	959 (+4.7)	1268 (+32.2)	1647 (+29.9)
VVKF	108	106 (-1.8)	100 (-6.0)	118 (+18.0)	130 (+10.2)
VGK _o	219	197 (-10.0)	ND	ND	ND
OVČ	2430	2912 (+19.8)	3134 (+7.6)	3382 (+7.9)	2294 (-32.2)
Totals	63978	65823 (+2.9)	70462 (+7.0)	75201 (+6.7)	76624 (+1.9)

Abbreviations Used in Tables

GK	= Gosudarstvennaja Kanceljarija
GS	= Gosudarstvennyj Sovet
GUPSPZ	= Glavnoe Upravlenie Putej Soobščeniia i Publichnyh Zdanij
ID	= Inspektorskij Departament
KKM	= Kanceljarija Komiteta Ministrov
KM	= Komitet Ministrov
KP	= Komissija Prošenij
MDU	= Ministerstvo Dvora i Udelov
MF	= Ministerstvo Finansov
MGI	= Ministerstvo Gosudarstvennyh Imuščestv
MID	= Ministerstvo Inostrannyh Del
MJu	= Ministerstvo Justicii
MM	= Morskoe Ministerstvo
MNP	= Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveščeniia
MVD	= Ministerstvo Vnutrennih Del
ND	= No Data
OVČ	= Ostavnye Voennye Činy
PV	= Počtovoe Vedomstvo
SEIVK	= Sobstvennaja E. I. V. Kanceljarija
VBU	= Vedomstvo Blagotvoritel'nyh Učreždenij
VCP	= Vedomstvo Carstva Pol'skogo
VDDPI	= Vedomstvo Duchovnyh Del Pravoslavnogo Ispovedanija
VGK	= Vedomstvo Gosudarstvennogo Kontrolja
VGK _o	= Vedomstvo Gosudarstvennogo Konnozavodstva
VKZ	= Vedomstvo Kavkaza i Zakavkaza
VM	= Voennoe Ministerstvo
VVKF	= Vedomstvo Velikogo Knjažestva Finljandskogo

These recent works have increased our knowledge about the Russian bureaucracy in the mid-nineteenth century considerably, but we have yet to obtain a composite view of the bureaucracy as it existed during the crucial decade prior to the onset of the legislative processes which produced the Great Reforms of the 1860s. We do not yet know the answer to the crucial question: What sort of civil service did the Russian government have at its command as it approached the Great Reform era? To be sure, tales of corruption, incompetence, and malfeasance abound in the diary and memoir literature of the period as well as in mid-nineteenth century *belles lettres*. Yet material about the size and composition of various agencies, the manner in which they treated the officials who served in them, and the way in which their personnel changed, has remained elusive and scarce.

For much of the nineteenth century, such questions may well remain unanswered for some time to come, for the necessary data remain scattered and difficult to assemble. Yet for the crucial period of 1847 to 1857, the years in which the civil apparatus which would be charged with implementing the Great Reforms was being formed, the materials for preparing such a composite portrait of the Russian bureaucracy,⁷ although long overlooked, are available and can provide us with further insights into the nature and composition of Russia's administration on the eve of the Great Reforms. These materials are contained in the annual reports of the Inspektorskij Departament, established by Nicholas I on September 5, 1846, as a sort of civil service oversight bureau, and abolished

Table 1^b. Personnel in the Russian Table of Ranks, 1852-1857
(Figures Given by Year, with Percentage of Increase or Decrease in Parentheses)

Agency	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856	1857	Percent increase since 1847
SEIVK, GS, ID							
KM, KP	449 (-27.5)	419 (-6.7)	430 (+2.6)	ND	ND	484 (+41.1)	
MDU	2133 (+2.4)	2089 (-2.1)	2092 (+0.1)	ND	ND	2322 (+16.2)	
MF	12623 (+14.9)	13156 (+4.2)	13028 (-1.0)	ND	ND	13416 (+21.5)	
MJu	14901 (+11.6)	15962 (+7.1)	15837 (-0.8)	ND	ND	16619 (+37.6)	
MVD	26899 (-2.7)	27391 (+1.8)	27393 (00.0)	ND	ND	29814 (+46.8)	
MID	642 (+1.0)	607 (-5.4)	588 (-3.1)	ND	ND	639 (+9.2)	
MNP	5009 (+4.0)	5077 (+1.3)	5139 (+1.2)	ND	ND	5427 (+34.9)	
MGI	5616 (+4.7)	5906 (+5.2)	5821 (-1.4)	ND	ND	6166 (+46.6)	
GUPSPZ	1864 (+6.4)	1994 (+7.0)	2048 (+2.7)	ND	ND	2042 (+87.2)	
PV	2133 (+1.9)	2145 (+0.6)	2118 (-1.3)	ND	ND	2353 (+4.0)	
VGK	329 (+6.5)	285 (-13.4)	264 (-7.4)	ND	ND	314 (+7.9)	
VDDPI	1507 (+2.0)	1494 (-0.9)	1544 (+3.3)	ND	ND	1814 (+39.4)	
VBU	1369 (-3.7)	1523 (+11.2)	1512 (-0.7)	ND	ND	1741 (+33.1)	
VCP	1713 (+4.0)	1976 (+15.4)	2244 (+13.6)	ND	ND	2760 (+630.2)	
VVKF	136 (+4.6)	137 (+0.7)	140 (+2.2)	ND	ND	155 (+43.5)	
VGK _o	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
OVČ	3886 (+69.4)	3979 (+2.4)	4042 (+1.6)	ND	ND	4073 (+67.6)	
Totals	81209 (+6.0)	84140 (+3.6)	84239 (+0.1)	ND	ND	90139 (+40.9)	

⁷ Here bureaucracy is defined to include all officials holding rank in the Table of Ranks unless otherwise specified.

by Alexander II on April 18, 1858.⁸ Taken together, these reports provide an annual composite of the Russian bureaucracy for an entire decade.⁹

During the decade between 1847 and 1857, the Russian bureaucracy increased at an average annual rate of four percent, although the rate of increase ranged from a low of 0.1 percent in 1854 to a high of seven percent in 1849. In terms of raw numbers, this meant that the number of officials in the Table of Ranks rose from 63 978 in 1847 to 90 139 in 1857,¹⁰ or a total of 40.9 percent for the entire decade (see above, Tables 1^a and 1^b). As one might expect, the vast majority of these officials were in the lower ranks. Indeed, at no time during the years for which we have adequate data to make a determination did the number of officials who held grade eight or above (i. e. the rank of *kolležskij assessor*, which conferred lifetime nobility) reach eighteen percent of the total of officials in the Table of Ranks. Thus, the vast majority of the bureaucracy, and never less than 78.2 percent, were at grade nine or below (see Table 2).

Table 2. A Comparison of Higher vs. Lower Grades in the Table of Ranks, 1847–1857

Year	Number and Percentage of Officials at Grade VIII or Above in the Table of Ranks		Number and Percentage of Officials at Grades IX–XIV in the Table of Ranks		Number and Percentage of Officials with Retired Military Rank	
	Number of Officials	Percentage of the Total Number of Officials in the Table of Ranks	Number of Officials	Percentage of the Total Number of Officials in the Table of Ranks	Number of Officials	Percentage of the Total Number of Officials in the Table of Ranks
1847	10671	16.7	50877	79.5	2430	3.8
1848	11129	16.9	51782	78.7	2912	4.4
1849	11096	15.7	56232	79.8	3134	4.5
1850	11406	15.2	60413	80.3	3382	4.5
1851	11875	15.5	62455	81.5	2294	3.0
1852	12206	15.0	65117	80.2	3886	4.8
1853	12410	14.8	67751	80.5	3979	4.7
1854	12258	14.6	67939	80.7	4042	4.7
1855	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
1856	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
1857	15620	17.3	70446	78.2	4073	4.5

⁸ These annual reports, from which the statistical materials for this essay have been drawn, are the following: *Otčet po Inspektorskomu Departamentu Graždanskago Vedomstva za 1847 god. Central'nyj gosudarstvennyj istoričeskij archiv v Leningrade* (cited hereafter CGIAL). Fond 1409, opis 2, delo No. 6829-86; *Otčet . . . za 1848 god. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-104*; *Otčet . . . za 1849g. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-132*; *Otčet . . . za 1850g. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 1, d. No. 6829-181*; *Otčet . . . za 1851g. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-230*; *Otčet . . . za 1852 god. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-285*; *Otčet . . . za 1853 god. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-349*; *Otčet . . . za 1854 god. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-418*; *Otčet . . . za 1856g. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-562*; *Otčet . . . za 1857g. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-621*.

⁹ When I first discovered these *otčety* in 1973, they were uncatalogued. Although they have since been catalogued, the sheets contained in them remain unnumbered except for the *otčety* for 1847, 1850, and 1857. There are no *otčety* for 1855, and those for 1847, 1856, and 1857 are incomplete.

¹⁰ These figures include retired military personnel serving in civil agencies.

Given the fact that it usually was necessary to reach grade six before an official began to receive a salary which permitted him even a modest standard of living,¹¹ the vast majority of bureaucrats who held rank in the Table of Ranks lived a miserable existence. Indeed, in 1847, the average monthly salary in the St. Petersburg bureaucracy, including food and housing supplements (for which a number of lesser officials did not qualify), was 67.8 rubles. But our calculations of this modest figure are inflated by the fact that officials in His Majesty's Own Chancery, the State Chancellery, and the State Secretariats for Polish and Finnish Affairs all received unusually high average salaries, ranging from 120 rubles for those in the State Chancellery to 238 rubles for those in the State Secretariat for Finnish Affairs. Average salaries in the Ministries of Justice, Interior, Finance, State Domains, Public Education, Imperial Court and Crown Lands, the Postal Department, the State Comptroller's Office, and the Central Directorate of Roads and Public Buildings all were below 67 rubles per month, and in the Ministry of Justice, it stood at 37.1 rubles.¹² Of

Table 3. Officials in the Russian Civil Service Not Having Rank in the Table of Ranks, 1850–1857^a

Agency	1850		1851		1852		1853		1854		1857 ^b	
	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel	No. w/o Rank	% of Agency Personnel
SEIVK	12	2.6	13	2.1	6	1.3	17	4.0	21	4.7	ND	ND
MDU	500	29.4	564	17.6	593	21.7	606	22.5	605	22.4	ND	ND
MF	4729	28.7	4825	30.5	5879	31.8	5286	28.7	5357	29.1	ND	ND
MJu	7766	35.6	8123	37.8	9496	38.9	8273	23.3	8405	34.7	ND	ND
MVD	8466	25.4	8250	23.0	8795	24.6	9879	26.5	10234	27.2	ND	ND
MID	33	4.9	24	3.6	28	4.2	33	5.2	30	4.6	ND	ND
MNP	1032	18.1	1260	21.2	1375	21.5	1686	25.0	1735	25.2	ND	ND
MGI	1462	22.1	1205	18.3	1280	18.6	1535	20.6	1596	21.5	ND	ND
GUPSPZ	257	13.8	281	14.9	317	14.5	368	15.6	382	15.7	ND	ND
VGK	56	14.6	63	16.1	59	15.2	47	14.2	35	11.7	ND	ND
PV	544	21.0	628	23.4	624	22.6	705	24.7	698	24.8	ND	ND
VDDPI	1211	45.2	1485	50.1	1357	47.4	1519	50.4	1540	49.9	ND	ND
VBU	309	18.7	198	12.2	227	14.2	287	15.9	310	17.0	ND	ND
Totals	26377	26.0	26919	26.0	30036	27.0	30251	26.4	30968	26.9	32073	26.2

^a There are no data for the years 1855 and 1856.

^b There are no data for individual agencies for 1857.

¹¹ The best source for this is P. I. NEBOLSIN *Bjudžetv Peterburgskich činovnikov*, in: *Ekonomičeskij ukazatel'* No. 11 (16 March 1857) pp. 241–250. See also A. A. CHARYTONOV *Iz vospominanij A. A. Charytonova*, in: *Russkaja starina* 25 t. 81 (1894) pp. 116–117; F. G. TERNER *Vospominanija F. G. Ternera*. Vol. 1, S.-Peterburg 1910, p. 68; and A. I. ARTEMEV *Dnevnik*, 1 janvarja – 31 ijulja 1856g. Gosudarstvennaja Publičnaja biblioteka, Leningrad (cited hereafter GPB). Fond 37, delo No. 158/9 and passim.

¹² *Otčet . . . za 1847 god*. CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829–86/44–45. It is unfortunate that the *otčet* for 1847 is the only one which includes such data.

course, senior officials received far more, and the lower ranks far less. But if we remember that a modest apartment cost from fifteen to twenty rubles per month, and that food was equally expensive, it is clear that many bureaucrats in Russia's capital lived on the edge of poverty.¹³ Thus, for most officials in St. Petersburg, the eighty-ruble winter coat purchased by Gogol's fictional scribe Akakij Akak'evič cost from one to two month's salary.

Russia's sprawling bureaucratic proletariat was further swollen by the presence of petty chancery scribes who, although they served in the bureaucracy, had not yet achieved rank in the Table of Ranks. The numbers of these so-called *kanceljarskie služiteli* rose from 26377 in 1850 (the first year for which figures are available) to 32073 in 1857, or approximately 21.6 percent.¹⁴ Equally important, the ratio of civil officials not having rank in the Table of Ranks to those who did remained nearly constant, ranging only from a low of twenty-six percent in 1851 to a high of twenty-seven percent in 1852 (see Table 3).

This apparently steady and rapid growth of the Russian bureaucracy in the decade prior to the Great Reforms would seem to reveal a considerably different situation than that which emerges from the diaries and letters of contemporaries. For the men who served in Russia's central administrative institutions expressed frequent fears about positions being eliminated and the numbers of civil servants being reduced.¹⁵ The reasons for this sense of uneasiness among bureaucrats most probably stemmed from the fact that, when one looks beyond the over-all figures for the bureaucracy to those for various agencies, it becomes clear that the growth of the bureaucracy in the decade between 1847 and 1857 was a far more irregular and erratic process. Thus, in 1848, a year in which the over-all number of civilian personnel in the Table of Ranks increased by only 2.9 percent, we find an increase of 142.3 percent in the Table of Ranks personnel serving in the State Secretariat for Polish Affairs, while five agencies suffered reductions in their personnel which reached as high as 15.8 percent in the case of the Postal Department. Likewise, in 1854, a year in which the number of officials in the Table of Ranks increased by a miniscule 0.1 percent, the composition of various agencies was far from static. Increases of personnel ranged from a high of 13.6 percent, again in the State Secretariat for Polish Affairs, to reductions of more than seven percent in the Office of the State Comptroller (see Tables 1^a and 1^b).

The personnel lists for separate agencies show the erratic character of the bureaucracy's expansion during the decade even more dramatically. The personnel in the State Secretariat for Polish Affairs increased at a rate far in excess of other agencies, with an increase of 630.2 percent during the decade. But the Ministry of Roads and Public Buildings increased by 87.2 percent, and two other large agencies, the Ministries of Interior and State Domains, increased their personnel by at least seven percent above the average (see Tables 1^a and 1^b).

Perhaps more striking in demonstrating the irregular growth of the bureaucracy in this decade, five central agencies grew at a considerably slower rate. Thus, while the civil

¹³ CHARYTONOV *Iz vospominanij* pp. 116-117; NEBOL'SIN *Bjudzety* pp. 241-250; ARTEMEV *Dnevnik*, 1 janvarja 1857-31 maja 1857 g. GPB, f. 37, d. No. 160/75.

¹⁴ ZAJONČKOVSKIJ mentions that only figures for the year 1857 are available on the numbers of *kanceljarskie služiteli* in the Russian bureaucracy (*Pravitel'stvennyj apparat* p. 68). In fact, they are available for the years 1850 through 1854, as well as for 1857, in *Vedomost'* No. 14 of the *otčet* for each year. Zajončkovskij did not locate the *otčety* for any of the years between 1847-1857, except for 1847, 1850, and 1857.

¹⁵ This theme runs throughout ARTEMEV'S diaries for 1855-1857. See GPB, f. 37, d. Nos. 157-162, *passim*.

bureaucracy of 1857 was 40.9 percent larger than it had been a decade earlier, the Ministry of the Imperial Court and Crown Lands had increased its personnel by only 16.2 percent, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had increased by less than ten percent, the Office of the State Comptroller by just less than eight percent, and the Postal Department by a mere four percent (see Tables 1^a and 1^b). Clearly the growth of Russia's bureaucracy was far more sporadic and erratic than the over-all figures would lead one to believe.¹⁶ Further, the irregular character of the process must have served to hinder institutional development to some degree, especially in those agencies where the number of officials fluctuated considerably from one year to the next. Notable fluctuations of personnel within agencies thus gave rise to a sense of insecurity. Likewise, it gave the impression to young men seeking positions in the civil service that the number of new positions was decreasing when, in fact, the reverse was the case.

The Russian statesman P. A. VALUEV once wrote early in his career that "everyone knows that the lower official ranks are only a Purgatory through which runs the measured highway to the Paradise of delights [i. e. the rank of *statskij sovetnik*] for those who are ambitious."¹⁷ Certainly promotion to the rank which carried with it hereditary noble status was much desired by junior bureaucrats, but its attainment could be a lengthy and arduous process. According to the 1842 "Digest of the Laws of the Russian Empire," officials were divided into three categories [*razrjady*] based upon their level of formal education,¹⁸ and each category functioned according to a different schedule as far as promotions for time served in grade [*za vyslugu let*] were concerned. Thus, it took an official in the first category a total of twenty-four years to rise from the rank of *kolležskij registrator* (grade fourteen) to that of *statskij sovetnik* (grade five) by means of promotions for time served in grade, while it required thirty years for officials in the second category, and a total of thirty-seven years for officials in the third category. This promotion schedule was lengthened further in the case of officials who were not of noble origin, so that it required twenty-six, thirty-six, and forty-two years respectively for first, second, and third category officials to reach the rank of *statskij sovetnik* if all their promotions were for time served in grade and came on time.¹⁹

Yet even though officials were eligible for time in grade promotions after a given number of years had elapsed, this did not ensure that promotions would come according to schedule. Indeed, the portion of officials in the Table of Ranks who received promotions each year ranged from only 5.9 percent in 1854 to 10.2 percent in 1851, and only in one

¹⁶ In his recent study ZAJONČOVSKIJ uses only the over-all figures for personnel increases for the years 1847, 1850, and 1857, rather than analyzing them on an agency-by-agency basis (*Pravitel'stvennyj apparat* pp. 66-70).

¹⁷ P. A. VALUEV *Otryvki iz zamečanij o porjadke graždanskoj služby v Rossii (1845g.)*. CGIAL, f. 908, o. 1, d. No. 24/29.

¹⁸ Officials in the First Category were obliged to have a certificate of graduation from an élite school (such as the Imperial School of Jurisprudence or the Lyceum at Carskoe Selo) or a university. Graduation from a gymnasium entitled an official to be entered in the Second Category, while those with only elementary or home educations were inscribed in the Third Category. In the case of officials who had received their educations at home, they could be inscribed in the Second, or even First, Category if they successfully completed the appropriate examination. *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. Sobranie 2-oe. S.-Peterburg 1830-1885* (cited hereafter PSZ II). Vol. 9, No. 7224.

¹⁹ *Svod zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. Ustavy o službe graždanskoj. S.-Peterburg 1842-1912*. Vol. 3, articles 520, 570-571, 586-587, 604-606.

year (1851) did it exceed ten percent (see Table 4). Given the fact that most promotions below grade five required no more than four years of service in grade, the promotion figures that we have for the 1847–1857 period indicate that far more bureaucrats were eligible for time in grade promotions than received them.²⁰ Thus, there was no certainty, or even probability, in fact, that an official would reach the coveted rank of *statskij sovetsnik* before middle age or even before retirement, although it was theoretically possible to do so through time in grade promotions according to Russia's civil service statutes.

Such a promotion schedule as we have just summarized could be shortened considerably by promotions for merit [*za otličie*] rather than for time served in grade. Thus, an official in the first category could reach grade five from grade fourteen in the space of fifteen, rather than twenty-four, years, while his counterparts in the second category could do so in twenty-two years rather than thirty, and those in the third category could do so in twenty-six years rather than thirty-seven. For officials with élite or university educations, this was especially significant since they often entered the service at grades nine or ten, and thus, by means of merit promotions, theoretically could gain hereditary noble status in as little as nine years, or before they reached the age of thirty.²¹

Table 4. Numbers and Percentages of Officials in the Table of Ranks Promoted, 1847–1857

Year	Number of Civil Officials in the Table of Ranks	Number of Officials in Table of Ranks Promoted for Time Served in Grade	% of Officials in Table of Ranks Promoted for Time Served in Grade	Number of Officials in Table of Ranks Promoted for Merit	% of Officials in Table of Ranks Promoted for Merit	% of Total Promotions for Merit	Total Number of Officials Promoted	% of Officials in Table of Ranks Promoted
1847	63978	5336	8.3	511	0.8	8.9	5847	9.1
1848	65823	5144	7.8	720	1.1	12.2	5864	8.9
1849	70462	5486	7.9	555	0.8	9.2	6041	8.7
1850	75201	4360	5.8	962	1.3	18.1	5322	7.1
1851	76624	6626	8.6	1256	1.6	15.9	7882	10.2
1852	81209	6543	8.1	665	0.8	9.2	7208	8.9
1853	84140	5537	6.6	756	0.9	12.0	6293	7.5
1854	84239	4207	5.0	719	0.9	14.6	4926	5.9
1855	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
1856	ND	5244	ND	957	ND	15.4	6201	ND
1857	90139	7358	8.2	506	0.6	6.4	7864	8.8

²⁰ Those promotions which required more than four years of service in grade were as follows: First Category officials: promotion from grade nine to grade eight (10 years for officials of non-noble origin); Second Category officials: promotion from grade nine to grade eight (10 years for officials of non-noble origin), and promotion from grade six to grade five (six years for all officials); Third Category officials: promotion from grade nine to grade eight (5 years for officials of noble origin, 10 years for officials of non-noble origin), promotion from grade seven (6 years for all officials), promotion from grade six to grade five (eight years for all officials). Ibidem.

²¹ PSZ II, vol. 9, No. 7224.

In order to be eligible for promotions based upon merit rather than time served in grade, Russian bureaucrats had to have accomplished "some sort of particular achievement on behalf of the service in administrative affairs, or to have demonstrated particular merit and achievement as an official."²² One might expect that, in a state where the Emperor preferred senior officials who were "not so much wise as service-oriented,"²³ and where he valued service longevity in making ministerial appointments,²⁴ promotions for merit rather than for time served in grade would be a relatively rare occurrence. Yet, while they were by no means the rule, they were not infrequent when one considers the bureaucracy as a whole. Indeed, the percentage of merit promotions between 1847 and 1857 ranged from a low of 6.4 percent in 1857 to a high of 18.1 percent in 1850 (see Table 4). On the surface, at least, it would seem that the official who was willing to serve his Emperor diligently and energetically could expect to see his efforts recognized through merit promotions which would speed him along the "measured highway to the Paradise of delights," to the coveted rank of *statskij sovetnik* and hereditary noble status.

As in the case of the bureaucracy's growth during the years between 1847 and 1857, the matter of promotions becomes much more complex when we look beneath the over-all figures for the decade. Promotions for merit in the Russian bureaucracy, in fact, depended upon other factors in addition to "some sort of particular achievement on behalf of the service in administrative affairs" or "particular merit and achievement as an official." Of course, it was well-known to mid-nineteenth century Russians that an ambitious official could advance his career by obtaining the patronage of a highly-placed statesman or senior bureaucrat, and this was a recurring theme in the diaries, letters, even *belles lettres*, of the period. "By the fortunate chance of drawing attention to oneself by a clever trick or by successful flattery, the careers of many [officials] in Russia are advanced," wrote one contemporary.²⁵ S. I. ZARUDNYJ, the official who played a central role in drafting the Judicial Reforms of 1864, put the matter even more bluntly when he remarked in a satirical essay that "if you have a patron, you will be considered a genius, competent in everything, and you will advance rapidly. But if you do not have a patron, you will be considered a total fool, fit for nothing, and knowing nothing."²⁶

Yet the matter of obtaining merit promotions was more complex than simply winning the favor of a senior statesman, and the promotion statistics for the 1847-1857 period make this quite clear. Most striking of all, promotions for merit occurred with far greater frequency in some agencies than in others, and ambitious officials thus stood a far better chance of advancing their careers there than elsewhere. At the top of the scale stood a group of elite Ministries and Directorates where promotions for merit accounted for between thirty-five and one-hundred percent of all promotions granted. These included (in descending order) the State Secretariat for the Affairs of the Grand Duchy of Finland (100%), the Chancery of the Committee of Ministers (51.5%), the Commission on

²² Ibidem.

²³ Baron M. A. KORF Dnevnik za 1840g. Central'nyj Gosudarstvennyj archiv Oktjabr'skoj revoljucii, Moskva (CGAOR). Fond 728, o. 1, d. No. 1817/III/264.

²⁴ LINCOLN The Ministers of Nicholas I pp. 319-320.

²⁵ A. E. CIMMERMAN Vospominanija Generala A. E. Cimmermana, 1825-1856gg. Rukopisnyj otdel Gosudarstvennoj biblioteki im. V. I. Lenina, Moskva (ROGBL). Fond 325, karton 1, papka 1/176-177.

²⁶ A. S. ZARUDNYJ (ed.) Pišmo opyt'nago činovnika sorokovykh godov mladšemu sobratu, postupajuščemu na službu, in: Russkaja starina 30 t. 100 (1899) p. 543.

Petitions (48.6%), the State Chancellery (48.1%), His Majesty's Own Chancery (41.7%), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (40.1%), and the State Secretariat for Polish Affairs (35.7%) (see Table 5).

**Table 5 (Part 1). Promotions for Time Served in Grade (TG)
and for Merit (M) by Agency, 1847–1857^a**
(Percent of Merit Promotions Given in Parentheses)

Agency	1847			1848			1849			1850		
	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)
SEIVK	28	5	(15.2)	33	20	(37.7)	13	8	(38.1)	12	25	(67.6)
GK	7	1	(12.5)	5	3	(37.5)	4	5	(55.5)	10	3	(23.1)
KKM	3	1	(25.0)	1	5	(83.3)	1	5	(83.3)	3	2	(40.0)
KP	5	2	(28.6)	4	2	(33.3)	2	4	(66.7)	4	5	(55.5)
MDU	366	26	(6.6)	336	8	(2.3)	302	49	(4.0)	251	38	(13.1)
MJu	326	48	(12.8)	330	19	(5.4)	493	20	(3.9)	285	101	(26.2)
MF	858	87	(9.2)	906	76	(7.7)	906	63	(6.5)	967	90	(8.5)
MGI	240	57	(19.2)	333	47	(12.4)	281	56	(16.6)	237	50	(17.4)
MVD	849	151	(15.1)	793	119	(13.0)	838	179	(17.6)	690	148	(17.7)
MNP	985	0	(0.0)	682	15	(2.1)	1060	22	(2.0)	635	4	(0.6)
MID	55	26	(32.1)	54	23	(29.9)	77	31	(28.7)	53	40	(43.0)
VGK	54	8	(12.9)	46	6	(11.5)	61	6	(8.9)	49	7	(12.5)
VDDPI	262	2	(0.7)	356	5	(1.4)	291	6	(2.0)	244	3	(1.2)
GUPSPZ	303	40	(11.7)	294	6	(2.0)	281	8	(2.8)	199	37	(15.7)
PV	342	16	(4.5)	347	15	(4.1)	336	16	(4.5)	343	18	(5.0)
VBV	275	2	(0.7)	157	9	(5.5)	158	12	(7.1)	178	5	(2.7)
VGK _o	23	2	(8.0)	24	4	(14.3)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
VCP	119	22	(15.6)	58	291	(83.4)	107	27	(20.1)	95	322	(72.2)
VVKF	0	0	(0.0)	0	0	(0.0)	0	2	(100.0)	0	0	(0.0)
VKZ	236	18	(7.1)	361	47	(11.5)	275	36	(11.6)	125	64	(33.9)

^a There are no data for 1855.

Below these élite agencies, where positions were obtained by birth, connections, or obvious merit demonstrated in an élite school or university, stood a second group of Ministries and Directorates where merit promotions accounted for between twelve and seventeen percent of the total: the Ministry of State Domains (16.8%), the Office of the State Comptroller (14.7%), the Ministry of Interior (14.2%), and the Ministry of Justice (12.1%) (see Table 5). Actually, the percentage of merit promotions for officials serving in the central offices of the Ministries of Interior, Justice, and State Domains must have been considerably higher, since a particularly large portion of the officials served in the provinces where they were far less likely to receive merit promotions than in the capital. Indeed, according to the figures for 1847 (the only year in which such data were included in the annual reports of the Inspektorskij Departament), only 760 (4.3%) of the officials in the Ministry of Interior, 1617 (14.9%) of the officials in the Ministry of Justice, and 793 (22.5%) of the officials in the Ministry of State Domains served in St. Petersburg.²⁷

²⁷ *Obščaja vedomost'. Otčet . . . za 1847g.* CGIAL, f. 1409, o. 2, d. No. 6829-86/44-45.

**Table 5 (Part 2). Promotions for Time Served in Grade (TG)
and for Merit (M) by Agency, 1847–1857**
(Percent of Merit Promotions Given in Parentheses)

Agency	1851			1852			1853			1854		
	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)
SEIVK	33	22	(40.0)	16	35	(68.6)	37	15	(28.8)	13	21	(61.8)
GK	12	4	(25.0)	8	4	(33.3)	7	2	(22.2)	3	7	(70.0)
KKM	4	2	(33.3)	2	5	(71.4)	1	2	(66.7)	5	2	(28.6)
KP	3	3	(50.0)	4	2	(33.3)	3	2	(40.0)	2	4	(66.7)
MDU	331	30	(8.3)	313	18	(5.4)	270	16	(5.6)	253	19	(7.0)
MJu	546	66	(10.8)	690	87	(11.2)	612	70	(10.3)	281	113	(28.7)
MF	934	85	(8.3)	936	89	(8.7)	676	77	(10.2)	613	71	(10.4)
MGI	247	121	(32.9)	274	60	(17.9)	199	71	(26.3)	242	41	(14.5)
MVD	909	179	(16.4)	808	183	(18.5)	721	196	(27.3)	557	119	(17.6)
MNP	983	28	(2.8)	907	36	(3.8)	753	20	(2.6)	669	34	(4.8)
MID	60	17	(22.1)	69	33	(32.5)	60	18	(23.1)	59	119	(66.9)
VGK	45	4	(8.2)	42	1	(2.3)	42	4	(8.7)	29	23	(44.2)
VDDPI	313	7	(2.2)	413	3	(0.7)	310	6	(1.9)	137	10	(6.8)
GUPSPZ	378	10	(2.6)	246	8	(3.1)	342	25	(6.8)	356	21	(5.6)
PV	389	10	(2.5)	378	19	(4.8)	267	19	(6.6)	121	20	(14.2)
VBU	213	43	(16.8)	198	9	(4.3)	135	10	(6.9)	163	13	(7.4)
VGK _o	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
VCP	628	597	(48.7)	567	32	(5.3)	508	150	(22.8)	161	60	(27.1)
VVKF	0	0	(0.0)	0	0	(0.0)	1	1	(50.0)	0	0	(0.0)
VKZ	598	25	(4.0)	672	41	(5.7)	593	52	(8.0)	543	22	(3.9)

In Russia's remaining ministries and central directorates, the portion of merit promotions was below ten percent, with the lowest percentages being in the Ministry of Public Instruction (2.6%) and the Theological Department of the Orthodox Faith (2.1%). Clearly, these were not the agencies in which an energetic and ambitious young official would wish to serve, for demonstrated merit or devotion to departmental affairs seems to have been recognized only rarely. Indeed, in the Ministry of Public Instruction, for example, there was one year (1847) in which none of the 985 promotions were for merit, and this seems to have been a policy which was not altered by a change of Ministers, for, in 1850, under the new Minister Prince Širinskij-Šichmatov, only four of 635 promotions were for merit, and in 1857, under yet another Minister, only ten of 1375 promotions involved merit (see Table 5).

Within all of these agencies, of course, the percentage of merit promotions sometimes fluctuated rapidly from year to year. Thus, in the Chancellery of the Committee of Ministers, the percentage ranged from twenty-five percent in 1847 to 83.3 percent the following year, while in the State Secretariat for Polish Affairs, it was as high as 83.4 percent in 1848 and as low as 3.8 percent in 1857 (see Table 5). In some other Ministries, the percentages were more constant, varying only a small percentage each year, and this must have provided officials with at least some indication of the Ministries in which merit stood a reasonable chance of being recognized and those in which time served in grade was the major criterion for advancement. Thus, it was probably no accident that the young and

Table 5 (Part 3). Promotions for Time Served in Grade (TG) and for Merit (M) by Agency, 1847–1857
(Percent of Merit Promotions Given in Parentheses)

Agency	1856			1857			Total Promotions 1847–1857		Average Percent of Merit Promotions
	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	(%)	TG	M	%
SEIVK	25	25	(50.0)	42	4	(8.7)	252	180	41.7
GK	9	20	(69.0)	2	13	(86.7)	67	62	48.1
KKM	7	6	(46.1)	5	4	(44.4)	32	34	51.5
KP	4	6	(60.0)	5	4	(44.4)	36	34	48.6
MDU	339	121	(26.3)	563	24	(4.1)	3324	349	9.5
MJu	503	58	(10.3)	546	52	(8.7)	4612	634	12.1
MF	805	115	(12.5)	1185	64	(5.1)	8786	817	8.5
MGI	276	21	(7.1)	499	47	(8.6)	2828	571	16.8
MVD	872	205	(19.0)	1018	123	(10.8)	8055	1602	14.2
MNP	721	64	(8.1)	1375	10	(0.7)	8770	233	2.6
MID	49	77	(61.1)	95	38	(28.6)	631	422	40.1
VGK	46	19	(29.2)	80	6	(7.0)	494	85	14.7
VDDPI	115	12	(9.4)	164	2	(1.2)	2605	56	2.1
GUPSPZ	427	16	(3.6)	583	5	(0.9)	3409	176	4.8
PV	118	44	(27.2)	98	15	(13.3)	2739	192	6.5
VBU	287	35	(10.9)	320	7	(2.1)	2084	145	6.5
VGK _o	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
VCP	194	61	(23.9)	402	16	(3.8)	2839	1578	35.7
VVKF	0	12	(100.0)	0	0	(0.0)	0	15	100.0
VKZ	447	40	(8.2)	376	72	(16.1)	4226	417	9.0

ambitious officials who would emerge as Russia's enlightened bureaucracy in the late 1840s and early 1850s sought positions in the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of State Domains, and the Ministry of Justice, while those who were less aggressive and ambitious were content to allow their careers to advance according to time in grade promotions in such agencies as the Ministry of Public Instruction, the Postal Department, the Directorate of Roads and Public Buildings, and the Theological Department of the Orthodox Faith. Likewise, it is probably not mere coincidence that no cadre of enlightened bureaucrats developed in the Ministry of Public Instruction, and that the cadre which emerged in the Ministry of Finance was very small indeed.

Officials sometimes sought to better their service positions and to improve their chances for promotions by transferring from one agency to another, although transfers were relatively rare during the decade, and it is questionable that they brought accelerated promotions except in isolated cases.²⁸ We have the necessary data only for the years

²⁸ Perhaps the most prominent case in which officials received rapid promotions for transferring from one agency to another was that of the young and talented men who transferred into the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevič's Naval Ministry in the early 1850s. These so-called *Konstantinovcy* included Prince D. A. Obolenskij, Count D. A. Tolstoj, Prince F. N. L'vov, A. V. Golovnin, M. Ch. Reutern, D. N. Nabokov, and B. P. Mansurov. All were under the age of thirty-five (Mansurov was only twenty-five); all of them had élite or university educations; and several of them (Obolenskij, Tolstoj, Gólovnin, Reutern, and Nabokov) would rise to ministerial rank later in the century. All of them entered the Naval Ministry as Department Directors, with rank six or higher. A. V. GOLOVNING Kratkij očerk dejstvii Velikago Knjazja Konstantina Nikolaeviča po Morskomu Vedomstvu so vremeni vstúpljenja v upravlenie onym po janvař 1858g. GPB, f. 208, d. No. 2/271.

1848–1854, but the transfers for these years were remarkably constant, involving from 1.2 percent of the officials in the Table of Ranks in 1853 to 2.1 percent in 1850. Clearly, transfers from agency to agency were relatively rare during the decade before the Great Reforms, and generally reflected the portion of officials in the entire Table of Ranks who served in a particular agency. Thus, for example, the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Justice which, in 1854, included 70.1 percent of all the officials in the Table of Ranks, accepted 71 percent of the inter-agency transfers in that year (see Table 6).

Table 6. Inter-Agency Transfers, 1848–1854

		Agencies into which Officials Transfer																		
		SEIVK, ID	GS, KM, KP	MDU	MID	MVD	MF	MGI	MJu	MNP	GUPSPZ	VDDPI	VGK _o	PV	VGK	VBU	VCP	VVKF	Totals	
Agencies out of which Officials Transfer	SEIVK, ID	0	0	3	0	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	19	
	GS, KM, KP	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	18	
	MDU	1	2	1	2	107	28	15	18	11	15	2	0	3	2	2	0	0	209	
	MID	1	1	1	0	28	7	3	4	7	3	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	61	
	MVD	16	9	114	20	0	547	272	1527	151	252	15	1	75	6	61	2	0	3068	
	MF	5	5	24	3	333	0	99	107	30	10	7	1	31	2	10	4	0	671	
	MJu	9	5	62	10	1428	210	128	0	37	62	8	0	66	0	18	5	0	2048	
	MGI	8	1	26	4	243	129	0	104	40	38	8	1	14	5	10	2	0	633	
	MNP	4	2	16	3	167	65	34	46	0	12	5	0	20	2	12	3	0	391	
	VM	3	2	29	5	110	41	26	18	29	15	7	0	4	3	3	5	0	300	
	MM	0	1	5	0	31	11	6	2	4	3	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	68	
	GUPSPZ	3	1	13	0	67	34	13	27	7	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	175
	VDDPI	1	2	4	1	46	23	13	16	13	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	126
	VGK _o	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
	PV	1	0	4	1	38	24	5	8	4	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	96
	VGK	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	VBU	0	0	5	0	28	5	6	4	17	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	69
VCP	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	
VVKF	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Totals		52	32	309	49	2645	1140	622	1884	355	428	58	4	222	23	126	32	1	7982	

The minimal number of transfers would lead one to conclude that there was considerable continuity of personnel in the Russian bureaucracy during the decade prior to the Great Reforms. Yet, in fact, there was a remarkably large turn-over in personnel every year, although it declined steadily during the decade. Thus, the annual turn-over in personnel in Russia's civilian bureaucracy, including retirements, releases, dismissals, deaths, new entries, and transfers, totalled 23.1 percent of the entire number of officials in the Table of Ranks in 1848, and declined to 14.6 percent by 1854 (see Table 7). At the beginning of the period, one official out of every five was new to his service assignment every year, and the number had declined only to one in seven by the end of the period. Office Section Chiefs (*stolonačal'niki*) upon whom the conduct of administration depended so heavily, and their immediate superiors, the Departmental Directors, must

14*

Table 7. Annual Turnover in the Russian Bureaucracy, 1848–1854

Year	Released or Retired	Dismissed	Died in Service	New Entries	Transfers	Total	Percent of the Total Number of Officials in the Table of Ranks
1848	3770	201	2178	7994	1055	15198	23.1 %
1849	3722	165	1255	9781	1140	16063	22.8 %
1850	3680	102	1159	9680	1580	16201	21.5 %
1851	3961	93	1021	6498	1164	12737	16.6 %
1852	4435	85	1161	10266	1034	16981	20.9 %
1853	3991	61	1449	8432	1049	14982	17.8 %
1854	4193	71	1233	5596	1191	12284	14.6 %

have been particularly hard-hit by this situation since the bulk of the turn-over occurred among the lower ranks in the bureaucracy which they directed. As a result, the official who remained within his agency, and devoted himself diligently and efficiently to service assignments, must have been a prized commodity indeed to his superiors.

At this point, we should perhaps summarize our findings about the nature of the Russian bureaucracy on the eve of the Great Reforms. As we indicated earlier, Russia's civil bureaucracy within the Table of Ranks increased during the decade by 26 161, or 40.9 percent, an average annual increase of about four percent. Such an increase appears to be dramatic but, in fact, it represented a reduction in the rate of increase which has characterized the bureaucracy during the previous half-century. Indeed, between 1796 and 1847, the number of civil officials who held rank in the Table of Ranks increased from approximately 16 000²⁹ to 63 978, or an average annual increase of six percent, and the reduction in over-all growth of the bureaucracy between 1847 and 1857 may at least partially account for the fears expressed by officials about impending personnel reductions in their agencies. More important, perhaps, these increases were unevenly spread throughout the bureaucracy, with the bulk of the new personnel going into those three civilian agencies - the Ministries of Interior, State Domains, and Justice - that would be most involved in drafting the Great Reform legislation of the 1860s. Thus, these three agencies increased their personnel by a total of 15 988, or 61.2 percent of the total increase for the entire bureaucracy in the Table of Ranks, during the decade (see Tables 1^a and 1^b).

While these agencies represented the largest increase in personnel during the decade, they also were among those which became known for recognizing merit as a factor in the advancement of the careers of officials who served in them. Although the over-all portion of merit promotions was not so high in these agencies as it was in certain more élite offices, one can at least assume, as we indicated earlier, that the percentage of merit promotions was considerably greater among officials who served in their central offices. Certainly this

²⁹ ЗАЈОНКОВСКИЈ Правител'ственниј аппарат pp. 66-67.

was true of those officials who emerged within these agencies to play a major part in drafting the Great Reform legislation, and a number of them reached the coveted rank of *statskij sovetnik* while they were still in their early or middle thirties.³⁰

The ability of such men to reach high rank quickly in the Ministries of State Domains, Interior, and Justice, was especially significant because it meant that they gained control of the ministerial office sections or, in some cases, full departments, that would play crucial roles in developing the methodology for transforming Russia and in assembling the data needed to plan reform. Most important, they would do so while they were still young enough to believe that the bureaucracy could serve as a vehicle for change, and before they had become so steeped in the routine of bureaucratic formalism and procedure that they could conceive of change only in the narrowest procedural terms. As a result, nearly a full decade before the government of Alexander II began to draft the Great Reform legislation, they would be in a position to begin assembling the necessary reform personnel, men who, unlike the bulk of Russia's central bureaucracy, would be well-educated, share progressive views, and bring to their tasks the virtues of efficiency and hard work. They were able to attract this sort of rare official, in part, because of their personalities and connections with St. Petersburg's intellectual and scholarly world, but also because their agencies could offer the lure of more rapid merit promotions.³¹

Thus, the Russian bureaucracy on the eve of the Great Reforms, although considerably larger than had been the case a decade earlier, had reduced its growth rate considerably in comparison with the previous half-century. Equally important, it was becoming more stable in that the annual turn-over of personnel during the period had fallen steadily from a high of 23.1 percent in 1848 to the figure of 14.6 percent in 1854. Of course, this did not mean that the bureaucracy had eliminated its many failings during the course of a decade. In fact, one of its major problems, the burgeoning quantity of meaningless paperwork, increased during that time, despite efforts to stem the tide.³² Likewise, many senior officials

³⁰ Among others, this category included A. P. Zablockij-Desjatovskij, N. A. Miljutin, A. D. Schumacher, M. N. Ljuboščinskij, M. Ch. Reutern, A. V. Golovnin, A. K. Giers, D. N. Tolstoj, S. I. Zarudnyj, and V. P. Butkov, all of whom would play an important part in drafting the Great Reform legislation. See the service records of these men located in CGIAL, fondy 1162, and 1349.

³¹ In 1851, Minister of Interior L. A. Perovskij told the Emperor that "bureaucratic formalities have reached the point of absurdity" at a time when his own Ministry was generating some 31 000 000 official papers a year, and a few years later, in 1857, the economist L. W. Tengoborski remarked that "les écritures et les correspondances se multiplient, on pourrait dire, dans des proportions géométriques." L. A. PEROVSKIJ O pričínach umnoženija deloproizvodstva vo vnutrennem upravlenii (March 1851). CGIAL, f. 1287, o. 36, d. No. 137/15; L. V. TENGOBORSKII Extraits du Mémoire secret du Conseiller Privé Actuel Tengoborskii (janvier 1857). CGIAL, f. 851, d. No. 50/289-290. According to one contemporary, even the Emperor sometimes had to wait for four or five months to receive answers to some of his routine requests for information. ARTEMEV Dnevnik, 1 janvarja - 31 ijulja 1856g. GPB, f. 37, d. No. 158/48.

³² See especially M. P. VESELOVSKIJ Zapiski M. P. Veselovskago s 1828 po 1882. GPB, fond 550.F.IV.861-420. On a broader scale, this problem is evident from even a cursory reading of the annual reports of central government agencies. In addition to those reports of the Inspektorskij Departament already cited, the *otčety* of the Ministry of Justice are particularly interesting in this context. Concern with quantity rather than substance became so extreme in the Ministry of Justice that the number of cases processed by the Senate and the Chambers of Justice were computed in great detail but, with the exception of crimes committed by state officials, the Ministry's *otčety* usually neglected to identify the crimes involved in the cases that were processed. See: *Otčety Ministerstva Justicii* in CGIAL, fond 1405, opis 52.

continued to be more concerned with form than with substance in administration, and tended to define progress in terms of increased numbers of cases processed by their agencies.³³ However, the Russian bureaucracy on the eve of the Great Reforms was probably a more stable entity than it had been at any time during the first six decades of the nineteenth century and, in terms of its personnel, was better able to carry out reforms than had been the case in earlier decades.

³³ See GOLOVNIN *Kratkij očerk. GPB, f. 208, d. No. 2/271*; W. BRUCE LINCOLN *Nikolai Miliutin: An Enlightened Russian Bureaucrat. Newtonville, Mass. 1977, pp. 30 - 38*; LINCOLN *The Genesis of an "Enlightened" Bureaucracy in Russia pp. 326 - 329.*

