

<https://doi.org/10.22364/jull.10.06>

Excerpts from History of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law at Dorpat (Yuriev) University in Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries

Dr. iur. Aleksandra A. Dorskaia

Faculty of Law, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia
Professor, Head of Department of International Law
E-mail: adorskaya@yandex.ru

The article defines the modalities of ecclesiastic law studies, the course that was introduced in 1835 at legal departments of Russian universities, including that of the University of Dorpat (Yuriev). The example of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law showcases the special status of the University of Dorpat (Yuriev), which was not subject to university charters of 1804, 1835, 1863 and 1884. The major tracks of religious policy in the Baltic region and the real religious landscape that had an impact on education are studied in the context of the work of M. E. Krasnozhen, a professor at the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law.

Keywords: ecclesiastic law, Chair of Ecclesiastic Law, the University of Dorpat (Yuriev), Baltic region, Orthodoxy, non-Orthodoxy, Protestantism, Catholicism.

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	84
1. <i>Religious Landscape and Confessional Policy in the Baltic Region, Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries</i>	85
2. <i>Personnel of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law of the University of Dorpat (Yuriev) in Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries</i>	87
3. <i>Characteristic Features of Ecclesiastic Law Studies at Yuriev University (Professor Mikhail Krasnozhen's Case Study)</i>	89
<i>Conclusions</i>	91
<i>Summary</i>	91
<i>Sources</i>	91
<i>Bibliography</i>	91
<i>Normative Acts</i>	92
<i>Other Sources</i>	92

Introduction

In the 19th century, the Russian Empire developed a new system of ecclesiastic law, which rested both on church canons (sacred scripture, decrees of the church councils, apostolic tradition and other sources) that were recognized by the state, and upon state ordinances that were related to the church.

Russian ecclesiastic law flourished for several reasons. Firstly, systematization of Russian law initiated by Mikhail Speransky among others regulated clerical and legal norms. Secondly, historic school of law fostered ecclesiastic law as a part of legal rather than theological studies. Thirdly, as of 1835, Orthodox Ecclesiastic Law was introduced as an obligatory course at the legal departments of Russian universities.

The government viewed studies of ecclesiastic law as a matter of state significance. For one thing, it maintained the “pre-eminent and predominant” status of Russian Orthodox Church, which was envisaged in the Digest of Laws of the Russian Empire. According to V. N. Kudryashov, the second part of the 19th century brought “a movement that saw the subject of all Russian national processes in the Russian state that purposefully shaped the nation, rather than in the Russian nation as an ethnic and religious unity.”¹ Besides, ecclesiastic law studies ought to promote Orthodoxy in “non-Orthodox” regions, thus functioning as missionary activities. In 1907, an anonymous brochure was published in Moscow. It read, that “Russia had nine universities, none of them being Russian by staff, goals or teaching.”² This idea certainly belonged to Russian nationalists; however, it partly reflected the circumstances under which ecclesiastic law studies developed. Yuriev, Kazan, Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa were, to a large extent, populated by non-Orthodox citizens, that is why the newly introduced Orthodox clerical law studies showcased numerous political problems, existing in the multiethnic and multireligious country. Those problems inevitably affected canonists.

Orthodox clerical law studies in Russia in late 19th – early 20th centuries concentrated at the universities (in Moscow, Yuriev, Kazan, Kharkov, St. Petersburg, Kiev, Tomsk), ecclesiastical academies and several educational institutions that taught clerical law (Demidov’s Legal School in Yaroslavl, Military and Legal Academy and Legal School in St. Petersburg).

1. Religious Landscape and Confessional Policy in the Baltic Region, Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries

Russia’s religious policy of that epoch until today has been assessed controversially. Some think that it was based on tolerance³, others assume that the Empire could be characterized as a “prison for nations.”⁴ Consequently, more and more researchers underline that religious issues should be analyzed only in the context of a particular period and region, taking into account the vast potential that kept the great Empire afloat for such a long time. Therefore, this topic has gained attention of foreign researchers. As Japanese researcher Kimitaka Matsuzato writes,

¹ *Kudrjashev, V. N. M. N. Katkov v rossijskom imperskom diskurse vtoroj poloviny XIX veka // Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Serija: Istorija. 2012, # 4(20), s. 40.*

² *O preobrazovanii Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta na nachalah russkoj gosudarstvennosti i russkoj narodnosti. M., 1907, s. 4.*

³ *Romanovskaja, L. R. Veroterpimost’ kak princip gosudarstvennoj konfessional’noj politiki Rossijskoj imperii // Innovacii v gosudarstve i prave Rossii. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-praktičeskoj konferencii / Petrov, A. V. (otv. red.). Nizhnij Novgorod: Nizhegorodskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. N. I. Lobachevskogo, 2008, s. 209–212.*

⁴ *Mihajlov, V., Mihajlova, N. Byla li carskaja Rossija «tjur’moj narodov»? // Svobodnaja mysl’. 2013, # 6(1642), s. 143.*

“the policy of the Russian Empire can be viewed neither through the lens of “prison for folks”, nor with the assistance of a bipolar opposition “oppression – resistance.”⁵

According to L.I. Rosenberg, the Baltic region (including the governorates of Estonia, Livonia, Courland, the districts of Rēzekne, Ludza, Dvinsk in Vitebsk region, as well as undistinguished town of Narva in the Yamburg district of the St. Petersburg governorate) that followed the footsteps of central European regions, on the one hand, was “a thorn in the side” of the Russian state mechanism, but on the other hand, it performed a special role of building bridges and establishing patterns to “westernize” Russia.⁶

Russian population there was scarce. The First Nationwide Census of 1897 indicated that in the Estonian governorate the Russian language was perceived as native only by 4.95% of the population, in the Livonian Governorate – by 5.24%, in the Courland Governorate – by 3.8%.⁷

The majority of the population were Lutherans or Catholics, although the overall number of Catholics in Russia was 11 506 834 (9.15% of population), Lutherans constituted 2.83 % (3 572 653 individuals).⁸ The legal system treated Catholics and Protestants absolutely differently. Protestants did not experience any political or civil restrictions; the government tolerated even Protestantism-based cults. For example, the Digest of Laws of the Russian Empire marked the cult of Moravian Church as “tolerable”. This cult evolved from the Lutheran Church in 1772 in Saxony and spread into the Baltic region. Moravian Church recognized the Augsburg confession, however, they accentuated “the religion of the heart” – an intimate and emotional experience of feeling unity with Christ – the patron and the saviour of the world, whereas Catholic Church and its adepts was viewed as an opponent. In 1905, the Ministerial Committee of the Russian Empire defined it as a “militant faith”⁹

The Baltic region was a centre to Old Believers, who arrived at the 17th century after they had been oppressed in Russia. In the 19th century, the Old Believers found active support with the local Lutheran authorities, who saw in Orthodoxy “the face of the enemy”.¹⁰ Besides, the ranks of the Old Believers were replenished by refugee serfs who sought shelter in Old Believer communities.

The Baltic region raised the issue of the legal status of Hebrews, as well. Firstly, a part of Baltic lands was assigned to the Jewish Pale. Initially, in 1804 the areas were defined where Hebrews could live (the final decision was made in 1835). Among others, Lithuania was defined as such an area. Besides, local Jews could live in the Courland governorate. Furthermore, the total number of Jews was not clarified. According to the 1897 Census, the western part alone was a home to

⁵ *Leont'eva, O. B.* Nacional'naja i konfessional'naja politika Rossijskoj imperii v sovremennoj istoriografii // Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 2012, # 8–2(99), s. 28.

⁶ *Rozenberg, L. I.* Rossijskij faktor v Pribaltijskom krae (XIX – nachalo XX v.) // Rossiija i sovremennij mir. 2007. # 1, s. 140–141.

⁷ Pervaja vseobshhaja perepis' naselenija Rossijskoj imperii 1897 g. Raspredelenie naselenija po rodnomu jazyku i uezdam 50 gubernij Evropejskoj Rossii // *Demoskop Weekly*, 2014, # 599–600. 19 maja–1 ijunja. Available at http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_lan_97_uezd.php?reg=1727 [last viewed 30.01.2017].

⁸ *Rubakin, N. A.* Rossiija v cifrah. Strana. Narod. Soslovija. Klassy (Na osnovanii oficial'nyh i nauchnyh issledovanij). SPb., 1912, s. 76.

⁹ Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj istoričeskij arhiv (RGIA). F.1263 (Komitet ministrov). Op. 2. D.5758, l.156 ob.

¹⁰ *Krastelev, M.* (igumen). Staroobrjadčestvo v Liflandii v jepohu Nikolaja I. Uchrezhdenie Rizhskogo vikariatstva // Cheljabinskij gumanitarnij. 2010. T. 1. # 10, s. 160.

433 726 Hebrews, although Pyotr Svyatopolk-Mirsky, the Governor-General of Vilnius, Kaunas and Grodno, reported that the real number amounted to 700 000.¹¹ Thus, the Hebrews living in the Baltic region were affected by restrictions imposed on their area of residence,¹² the right to buy and rent realty,¹³ and upon the right to enrol at universities.

Legal regulation of religious issues in the Baltic region was hallmarked by features that were not characteristic of the other parts of the Empire. For instance, elsewhere in Russia in all sorts of religious disputes the state stood with Orthodoxy. If a baby born to unknown parents had to be baptized, it would be christened by the Orthodox clergy. In the Baltic region, however, the baby could be baptized following the Lutheran tradition.

2. Personnel of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law of the University of Dorpat (Yuriev) in Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries

The University of Dorpat (from 1893 – University of Yuriev) was not subject to university charters of 1804, 1835, 1863 and 1884; it had a charter of its own. Therefore, the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law at the University of Yuriev was established later than at other universities of the country. However, in addition to four major departments that were present at the other universities, as well (Departments of Historic and Language Studies, Physics and Mathematics, Legal Department and Medical Department),¹⁴ the University of Yuriev established a Theological Department, following the pattern of Catholic and Protestant universities.

The complicated theological “landscape” of the Baltic region influenced the development of the Orthodox law school.

Professors of ecclesiastic law at the University of Yuriev were exposed to additional pressure, because the majority of their students were non-Orthodox. For example, in 1907 the university had 2734 students; 1536 of them were Orthodox Christians, 635 were Lutherans, 272 – Catholics, 11 – Reformed Protestants, 19 – Evangelists of Augsburg confession, 11 – adherents of Armenian-Gregorian Church, 243 – Hebrews, 1 – Old Believer, 2 – adherents of Edinoverie (coreligionists), 2 – Karaites, 1 – Baptist, 1 – Muslim.¹⁵ Gradually, the statistics started to change and the number of non-Orthodox students increased. In 1912, among the 2467 students of the university 919 were Orthodox, 952 – Lutherans, 295 – Catholics, 19 – Reformed Protestants, 20 – Evangelists of Augsburg confession, 40 – adherents of Armenian-Gregorian Church, 209 – Hebrews, 4 – Old Believers, 1 – adherent of Edinoverie, 1 – Karaite, 3 – Anglicans, 1 – Muslim, 1 – adherent of Armenian-Catholic Church, 2 – Mennonites.¹⁶

The first Professor of Orthodox ecclesiastic law was Lev Aristodovich Kasso. He had received Bachelor’s degree at Paris University, then participated at the courses of

¹¹ Biblioteka Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo arhiva (RGIA). Pechatnye zapiski. # 2466, d. 68.

¹² *Ivanova, N. Ju.* K voprosu o cherte osedlosti evreev v Rossijskoj imperii // Migracionnoe pravo. 2012, # 1, s. 37–40.

¹³ *Ivanova, N. Ju.* Narushenie prav evreev na priobretenie i arendu nedvizhimyh imushhestv v cherte postojannoj osedlosti v konce XIX veka // Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul’turologija i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. 2012. # 8–2, s. 73–77.

¹⁴ Svod zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. T. XI. Ch.1. St.403.

¹⁵ Lichnyj sostav Imperatorskogo Jur’evskogo universiteta. 1907 god. Jur’ev, 1907, s. 68.

¹⁶ Otchet o sostojanii i dejatel’nosti Imperatorskogo Jur’evskogo universiteta za 1912 g. Jur’ev, 1913, s. 61.

Heidelberg and Berlin Universities. In 1889, he became a Doctor of Law. On 29 July, he was appointed acting Associate Professor of ecclesiastic law at Dorpat University, however, on 1 July 1893 he transferred to the Chair of Local Law of the governorates of Estonia, Livonia and Courland. Later, he completely switched to civil law.¹⁷ Finding a Professor of ecclesiastic law turned out to be a difficult task.

The University of Yuriev made a valuable acquisition by hiring Michail Egorovich Krasnozhen (1860–1934), who spearheaded the studies of ecclesiastic law in the Baltic region. Unlike many of his colleagues, he did not belong to clergy. In 1881, he finished Kaluga High School with distinction and enrolled in the Moscow University's Legal Department. As a fourth year student, he began the studies of ecclesiastic law under Professor Pavlov and was even awarded a golden medal for his essay on this topic. Upon graduation, he remained at the Chair of ecclesiastic law to prepare for professorship. Consequently, Mikhail Krasnozhen, who had a legal, not theological education, made a conscious decision to occupy himself with ecclesiastic law.

In 1889, he passed the master's examination and went abroad to write his thesis "Glossarists of the Canonical Code of the Eastern Church: Aristenos, Zonaras, Balsamon". Mikhail Krasnozhen spent much time working in archives and libraries of Vienna, Munich, Rome and Florence. After two and a half years, he returned to Russia, defended his thesis and became a freelance lecturer at the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law of Moscow University. He taught a mandatory course for the fifth-year students of the Legal Department. Alongside this, for five years he acted as an assistant for attorneys-at-law (A. K. Vulfert and F. N. Plevako).

In 1893, Mikhail Krasnozhen was invited to hold a post of Professor Extraordinary of Ecclesiastic Law at Yuriev University, two years later he became Professor in Ordinary. In 1899, he gained the Dean's post at the Legal Department; however, he did not give up his research activities: in 1897, 1901, 1902 he went abroad to continue his studies of Greek Canon manuscripts.

On 22 April 1901, Professor Krasnozhen defended his doctoral thesis at the Kazan University. The main conclusion that he arrived at was that adherents of all non-Orthodox confessions in Russia were treated with tolerance. His official opponents, including I. S. Berdnikov, a renowned expert in ecclesiastic law, gave a high assessment of the paper,¹⁸ however, subsequently a discussion broke out. Professor Zagoskin, a famous expert in the history of Russian law, assessed the thesis as unsatisfactory. Prince Ukhtomsky, who represented the public, pointed out that recent eviction of thousands of Doukhobors from Russia, as well as anathema of Lev Tolstoy contradicted the conclusions of the thesis. Despite this, Professor Krasnozhen received the academic degree he applied for.¹⁹

Mikhail Krasnozhen was also engaged in public activities: from 1898, he was a church warden of the University Church of St. Alexander Nevsky; from 1902, he chaired the Student Literary Society at Yuriev University.²⁰

¹⁷ *Biograficheskij slovar' professorov i prepodavatelej Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo, byvshego Derptskego, universiteta za sto let ego sushhestvovaniya (1802–1902)*. Jur'ev, 1902. T. 1, s. 650–651.

¹⁸ *Uchenye zapiski Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo universiteta*. 1901, Ijul'-avgust. S. 17–20.

¹⁹ *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*. 1901, 27 aprelja.

²⁰ *Petuhov, E. V. Imperatorskij Jur'evskij, byvsnij Derptskej, universitet v poslednij period svoego stoletnego sushhestvovaniya (1865–1902 gg.)*. Istoricheskij ocherk. SPb., 1906, s. 109, 176.

3. Characteristic Features of Ecclesiastic Law Studies at Yuriev University (Professor Mikhail Krasnozhen's Case Study)

A professor of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law at Yuriev University faced numerous problems both in private and professional activities.

Firstly, he had to struggle for inclusion of ecclesiastic law into the curriculum of the Legal Department. The true attitude towards this course can be observed, if one analyses "Biographical Dictionary of Professors and Lecturers" of the University of Yuriev that was dedicated to the centennial of the university. The Dictionary assigned 179 pages to the professors of the Legal Department, only the final five of which were dedicated to the Chair of Ecclesiastic law.²¹ Mikhail Krasnozhen sought to promote his course to a new status.²² He would welcome any compromise. Although being opposed to the existence of the Theological Department at the university,²³ he would agree to preserve it, if he could establish a Chair of Ecclesiastic law there. His reasoning ran, as follows: "Many perpetrators who act against the regulations of the ruling Church justify their actions by being ignorant of clerical and civil norms."²⁴ This was a successful path, which ended in creation of the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law at the University of Yuriev. Apart from that, the course of ecclesiastic law received more academic hours. In 1912, spring and autumn trimesters, Professor Krasnozhen had four hours of lectures a week, besides, in autumn trimester he introduced practical seminars, lasting two hours per week and a special course on family law (one hour per week).²⁵ To compare, in 1913 the academic load was even throughout the year and consisted of four hours of lectures and two hours of practical seminars per week.²⁶

Secondly, Mikhail Krasnozhen was the only professor of ecclesiastic law at the university. In order to replenish the number of teaching staff, he made the following proposal: "Young people, who show best academic progress by the end of the course (by excellent conduct), should be invited to stay at the university (on allowance) to prepare for professorship at the chairs that lack professors (following the positive practice of our Ecclesiastical Academies)."²⁷ Professor Krasnozhen performed a great deal of work in this area; he tried to attract the students' attention by studying the most pressing topics. In 1909, the Legal Department offered its students to write essays on two topics: "Human Mistakes and Their Influence by Inculcation" (criminal law) and "On Special Office Established Under the Holy Synod to Consider Issues, Subject to Russian National Council" (ecclesiastic law).²⁸ On the one hand, this topic could not cause any demur from the Holy Synod, but on the other hand, it brought about a lot of "traps and pitfalls."

²¹ Biograficheskij slovar' professorov i prepodavatelej Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo, byvshego Derptskogo, universiteta za sto let ego sushhestvovaniya (1802–1902). Jur'ev, 1902, T. 1, s. 475–654.

²² Zakljuchenie juridicheskogo fakul'teta imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta po voprosam, predlozhenym Gospodinom ministrom narodnogo prosvshhenija otnositel'no zhelatel'nogo ustrojstva universitetov. B/m., b/g, s. 4.

²³ Osoboe mnenie dekana juridicheskogo fakul'teta M. E. Krasnozheny po voprosu 19-omu (o bogoslovskom fakul'tete). Jur'ev, 1907, s. 1.

²⁴ Osoboe mnenie dekana juridicheskogo fakul'teta M. E. Krasnozheny po voprosu 19-omu (o bogoslovskom fakul'tete). Jur'ev, 1907, s. 2.

²⁵ Otchet o sostojanii i dejatel'nosti Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1912 g. Jur'ev, 1913, s. 41.

²⁶ Otchet o sostojanii i dejatel'nosti Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1913 g. Jur'ev, 1914, s. 40.

²⁷ Osoboe mnenie dekana juridicheskogo fakul'teta professora M. E. Krasnozheny po nekotorym voprosam, kasajushhimsja Universitetskogo ustava. Jur'ev, 1905, s. 2–3.

²⁸ Kratkij otchet Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1908 g. Jur'ev, 1909, s. 6

On the whole, the improving role of ecclesiastic law studies at the University of Yuriev was Professor Krasnozhen's solely credit. The Chair of Ecclesiastic Law was perceived as similar to a volcano. Russian State Archive stores a letter of E. N. Temnikovskiy, a prominent ecclesiastic law expert to M. P. Chubinskij, the Rector of Demidov Legal School, where he dwells on his prospective appointment to the position of Professor Krasnozhen: "[...] I am slightly puzzled at the article in "Moskovskie vedomosti". It reads that Yuriev University awaits personnel changes. Krasnozhen is likely to be promoted, probably to become director... I am preparing myself for an unpleasant surprise – a trip to Yuriev."²⁹

Thirdly, during his stay in the Balkan region, Professor Krasnozhen was the first researcher to point out the new pressing issues and to describe them in his works: "Old and New Issues on Marriage (concerning Articles 352, 440, 441 and 359 of the new Criminal Code Project)" (Yuriev, 1898); "On Divorce in Russia" (Moscow, 1899); "Estonians and German in the Baltic Region" (Yuriev, 1900); "Orthodox Church's Attitude to Non-Orthodox" (Yuriev, 1900); "Attitude of the Russian Church and State Authorities to Non-Orthodox" (Yuriev, 1900); "Non-Orthodox in Ancient Rus" (Yuriev, 1903); "Old and New Laws on Divorce. Dedicated to the New Civil Code Project" (Yuriev, 1904), and others.

Fourthly, the University of Yuriev seemed to be short of funds to purchase study books in Russian. For example, in February 1902, members of the Russian Students' Circle wrote a letter to M. P. Chubinskij, a professor at the University of Kharkov, which read as follows: "The Russian Students' Society is interested in your book "Motives of Criminal Activity and Their Meaning", however, the Circle has no opportunity to buy the book because it is short of funds. Could you, please, send us a free copy of your work?"³⁰

Finally, the revolution of 1905–1907 and changes to legislation that it introduced, inevitably affected Professor Krasnozhen, because he stood in constant contact with students and had to answer their "tricky" religious questions, so he felt the disposition of Baltic people and their attitude to the decree from 17 April 1905 on "Fostering Religious Tolerance". Interestingly, in May 1905, Professor Krasnozhen addressed the Minister of National Education V. G. Glasov with a request to present his book "On Religious Freedom and Tolerance; Non-Orthodoxy in Russia" to Emperor Nicolas II. His request was met, and the Emperor received the book.³¹ At that time, Professor Krasnozhen delved into research; he published the works "Current Issues – Marriage and Divorce – Adultery – Freedom of Conscience and Religion – Research and Politics" (Yuriev, 1905); "The Newest Legislation on Russian Orthodox Church" (Yuriev, 1909), "The University Issue" (Yuriev, 1909) and others. The last known work by Mikhail Krasnozhen was written during World War I and was entitled "Fate of Macedonia" (Yuriev, 1915).

In 1918, the Baltic countries became independent and ecclesiastic law ceased to be the subject of specialized research.

²⁹ RGIA. F.1081 (Lichnyj fond M. P. Chubinskogo). Op. 1. D.427, l.4–4 ob.

³⁰ RGIA. F.1081 (Lichnyj fond M. P. Chubinskogo). Op. 1. D.529, l.1–1 ob.

³¹ RGIA. F.744 (Vysochajshie ukazy, reskripty i vsepodannejšie doklady po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosveshhenija). Op. 1. D.220, l.113.

Conclusions

The University Yuriev was the centre of ecclesiastic law studies in the Baltic region. Despite all the effort, the attempts to establish a research school for ecclesiastic law failed. Religious problems characteristic to Russia were concentrated in this region, where the majority of population was non-Orthodox. Besides, the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law had only one professor, which allowed no succession of teachers. However, the Chair of Ecclesiastic Law illustrated the importance of a single researcher in the development of the whole area of expertise.

Summary

1. Ecclesiastic Law in Russia existed as a legal system, containing church canons that were recognized by the state and state ordinances that were related to church.
2. As of 1835, Orthodox Ecclesiastic Law was introduced as an obligatory course at legal departments of Russian universities. Orthodox clerical law studies in Russia in late 19th – early 20th centuries revolved around universities (in Moscow, Yuriev, Kazan, Kharkov, St. Petersburg, Kiev, Tomsk), ecclesiastical academies and several educational facilities that taught clerical law (Demidov's Legal School in Yaroslavl, Military and Legal Academy and Legal School in St. Petersburg).
3. The University of Dorpat (from 1893 – University of Yuriev) was not subject to university charters of 1804, 1835, 1863 and 1884; it had a charter of its own. Characteristic of the University of Yuriev was the absence of a Chair of Ecclesiastic Law. It was established only in 1892.
4. In the late 19th – early 20th centuries, Michail Egorovich Krasnozhen (1860–1934) was the leading researcher of ecclesiastic law at the University of Yuriev, and he made a valuable contribution to the studies of the legal status of non-Orthodox religions in the Russian Empire.
5. All the religious challenges that existed in Russia were well reflected in the Baltic region, because the majority of its population was Protestant and Catholic.
6. In 1918, the Baltic countries became independent, and the ecclesiastic law ceased to be the subject of specialized research.

Sources

Bibliography

1. Biograficheskij slovar' professorov i prepodavatelej Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo, byvshego Derptskogo, universiteta za sto let ego sushhestvovanija (1802–1902). Jur'ev, 1902. T. 1.
2. *Ivanova, N. Ju.* K voprosu o cherte osedlosti evreev v Rossijskoj imperii // *Migracionnoe pravo.* 2012. # 1, s. 37–40.
3. *Ivanova, N. Ju.* Narushenie prav evreev na priobretenie i arendu nedvizhimyh imushhestv v cherte postojannoj osedlosti v konce XIX veka // *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul'turologija i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki.* 2012. # 8–2, s. 73–77.
4. *Kratkij otchet Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1908 g.* Jur'ev, 1909.
5. *Krastelev, M.* (igumen). Staroobriadchestvo v Lifljandii v jepohu Nikolaja I. Uchrezhdenie Rizhskogo vikariatstva // *Cheljabinskij gumanitarij.* 2010. T. 1. # 10, s. 157–162.
6. *Kudrjashev, V. N. M. N. Katkov v rossijskom imperskom diskurse vtoroj poloviny XIX veka // Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.* Serija: Istorija. 2012. # 4(20), s. 40–42.
7. *Leont'eva, O. B.* Nacional'naja i konfessional'naja politika Rossijskoj imperii v sovremennoj istoriografii // *Vestnik Samarskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.* 2012. # 8–2(99), s. 28.
8. *Lichnyj sostav Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta.* 1907 god. Jur'ev, 1907, s. 4–68.

9. *Mihajlov, V., Mihajlova, N.* Byla li carskaja Rossija «tjur'moj narodov»? // *Svobodnaja mysl'*. 2013. # 6(1642), s.143–162.
10. O preobrazovanii Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta na nachalah russkoj gosudarstvennosti i russkoj narodnosti. Moskva, 1907.
11. Osoboe mnenie dekana juridicheskogo fakul'teta profesora M. E. Krasnozheny po nekotorym voprosam, kasajushhimsja Universitetskogo ustava. Jur'ev, 1905.
12. Osoboe mnenie dekana juridicheskogo fakul'teta M. E. Krasnozheny po voprosu 19-omu (o bogoslovskom fakul'tete). Jur'ev, 1907.
13. *Petuhov, E. V.* Imperatorskij Jur'evskij, byvshij Derptsij, universitet v poslednij period svoego stoletnego sushhestvovanija (1865–1902 gg.). Istoricheskij ocherk. Sankt-Peterburg, 1906.
14. *Romanovskaja, L. R.* Veroterpimost' kak princip gosudarstvennoj konfessional'noj politiki Rossijskoj imperii // *Innovacii v gosudarstve i prave Rossii. Materialy Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-prakticheskoj konferencii / Otv. Petrov, A. V. (red.)*. Nizhnij Novgorod: Nizhegorodskij gosudarstvennyj universitet im. N.I. Lobachevskogo, 2008, s. 209–212.
15. *Rozenberg, L. I.* Rossijskij faktor v Pribaltijskom krae (HIH – nachalo HH v.) // *Rossija i sovremennij mir*. 2007. # 1, s. 140–160.
16. *Rubakin, N. A.* Rossija v cifrah. Strana. Narod. Soslovija. Klassy (Na osnovanii oficial'nyh i nauchnyh issledovanij). Sankt-Peterburg, 1912.
17. Uchenye zapiski Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo universiteta. 1901, Ijul'-avgust, s. 17–20.
18. Zakljuchenie juridicheskogo fakul'teta imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta po voprosam, predlozhennym Gospodinom ministrom narodnogo prosveshhenija otnositel'no zhelatel'nogo ustrojstva universitetov. B/m., b/g.

Normative Acts

1. Svod zakonov Rossijskoj imperii. Sankt-Peterburg, 1832. T. XI. Ch. 1. St. 403.

Other Sources

1. Biblioteka Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo arhiva (RGIA). Pechatnye zapiski. # 2466.
2. Otchet o sostojanii i dejatel'nosti Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1912 g. Jur'ev, 1913.
3. Otchet o sostojanii i dejatel'nosti Imperatorskogo Jur'evskogo universiteta za 1913 g. Jur'ev, 1914.
17. Pervaja vseobshhaja perepis' naselenija Rossijskoj imperii 1897 g. Raspredelenie naselenija po rodnomu jazyku i uezdam 50 gubernij Evropejskoj Rossii // *Demoskop Weekly*, 2014. # 599–600. 19 maja-1 ijunja // Available at http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_lan_97_uezd.php?reg=1727 [last viewed 30.01.2017].
4. RGIA. F.1263 (Komitet ministrov). Op. 2. D.5758.
5. RGIA. F.744 (Vysochajshie ukazy, reskripty i vsepoddannejsie doklady po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosveshhenija). Op. 1. D.220.
6. RGIA. F.1081 (Lichnyj fond M. P. Chubinskogo). Op. 1. D.427.
7. RGIA. F.1081 (Lichnyj fond M. P. Chubinskogo). Op. 1. D.529.