



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Elena Vishlenkova, Kira Ilina

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVISTS AS CORPORATE MEMORY AGENTS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 12/HUM/2012

Elena Vishlenkova¹, Kira Ilina²

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVISTS AS CORPORATE MEMORY AGENTS IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA³

This article examines the role of archivists in shaping the capacity and the structure of a university's memory. Drawing on sources such as laws and ministerial instructions, the authors analyze the government's archive policy with regard to universities and how professors and archivists were taking part in its implementation. Their participation included sorting documents and attributing them to individual 'cases', destroying some of the 'unnecessary' documents and preserving others that were designated for destruction. Based on information from service records and university reports, the article tracks changes in the corporate status of university archivists in nineteenth-century Russia.

JEL Classification: Z.

Keywords: Russian Universities, the Russian Empire, paperwork, clerical work, cultural practice, autonomy, identity, corporation, solidarity, profession, Polizeystaat.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Poletaev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities (IGITI). Deputy Director; E-mail: evishlenkova@mail.ru.

² National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Poletaev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities (IGITI). Senior research fellow; E-mail: glukist@mail.ru.

³ The results of the project "University Memory Culture in Russia: Mechanism of shaping and preserving", carried out within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2012, are presented in this work.

Traditionally, it is the authors of universities' histories who are believed to be the creators of narratives about the past of these institutions. Their intentions, their competence, and their political views, historians say, are responsible for the prevailing image of academic tradition⁴. However, the study of the Russian *deloproizvodstvo* system⁵ has led us to believe that the character of these narratives was influenced greatly by archivists or, to be precise, by the way they worked with documents.

In this article, to examine the archivists' role in shaping universities' memory, we reconstruct the practices of archive officers at Moscow, Kazan and Kharkov universities and at the Ministry of Public Education. Documents of the Moscow University are now kept in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts in Moscow (RGADA) and in the Central Historical Archive of Moscow (TSIAM). A large part of the Kharkov University archive was destroyed during the Second World War⁶. The surviving documents are kept in the State Archives of the Kharkov Region in Kharkov (DAKhO). Documents of Kazan University are kept in the National Archives of the Republic of Tatarstan (NA RT) and in the Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books of the Kazan Federal University Research Library (ORRK NB KFU). The Ministry of Public Education Archive is now held in the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA) in St. Petersburg.

Throughout the twentieth century, historians who used these document collections for their research work believed that they were just data pools collected with no apparent plan or selection policy. However, scrutinizing the whole of these sets of documents, we came to suspect that they represented certain systems of evidence or, in other words, these collections were products of a deliberate tactic of selecting, keeping, destroying and systematizing. This suspicion was strengthened by our reading the works of contemporary American archivists on the

⁴ Cf. e.g. Vishlenkova E.A., Sal'nikova A.A. Yubilejnye istorii Kazanskogo universiteta // Otechestvennaya istoriya. 2004. № 5. S. 133–141; Maslova E.S. Istorik M.K. Korbut (1899–1937): diss. ... kand. ist. nauk. Kazan', 2004; Litvin A.L., Sal'nikova A.A. Petlya Korbuta: vzlet i padenie «krasnogo» istorika // Rodina. 2010. № 7. S. 137–140; Kazanskij universitet v yubilejnykh izdaniyakh: 1856–1980: bibliograficheskij ukazatel' / sost. V.I. Shishkin; vstupit st. E.A. Vishlenkovej. Kazan': Izd-vo Kazanskogo un-ta, 2003. S. 25.

⁵ Vishlenkova, Elena. University Deloproizvodstvo (Paperwork) as a Cultural Practice and Institution (Russia, First Half of the 19th Century) // "Humanities" (WP BRP 03/Hum/2012) National Research University Higher School of Economics. 2012. 29 pp. URL: <http://www.hse.ru/data/2012/01/24/1264549655/03HUM2012.pdf>; Il'ina K.A. Deloproizvodstvennaya dokumentaciya kak istochnik izucheniya praktiki upravleniya rossijskimi universitetami pervoj poloviny XIX veka: diss. ... kand. ist. nauk. Kazan', 2012. 208 s.

⁶ Zhuravleva I.K. Ideal popechitel'stva – graf Severin Potockij // Kharkiv i Pol'scha: lyudi i podii: materiali mizhnarodnoï nauk.-prakt. konf., m. Kharkiv, 12 list. 2005 r. Kharkiv: Majdan, 2006. S. 57. Ucelevschie «dela» popali v Derzhavnyj arkhiv Khar'kovskoj oblasti (DAKhO), gde vtilis' v fond 3 «Kancelyariya Khar'kovskogo gubernatora», a razroznennye dokumenty po universitetu khranyatsya v fondakh 7 «Kancelyariya Khar'kovskogo gubernskogo prokurora», 40 «Khar'kovskaya dukhovnaya konsistoriya», 667 «Khar'kovskij universitet».

archeology of historical knowledge, and by Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg's observations concerning the controversy between historians and archivists⁷.

In order to test our working hypothesis, we looked for information about the university archivists and their service. Relevant data were found in documents concerning the appointment and dismissal of officers, in universities' annual reports, in official letters written by archivists as well as by council secretaries, rectors and curators. Taken together, they allow us to trace the rise of university archivists' corporate status and their practices of destroying certain groups of records and preserving others.

The corporate status of archivists

According to §72 of the University Statute of 1804, each university was supposed to have an archive and store there copies of outgoing papers and originals of all incoming ones⁸. The council secretary, an ordinary professor, was in charge of storing them. For this work, an extra 300 rubles a year was added to his salary. Professors willingly undertook this sunlighting as long as the workflow was small, but became reluctant as it grew in the 1820s⁹. Sorting out archival documents, they wrote, is a kind of work that is "prolonged and, tedious as it is, it requires greatest patience as well as accuracy, alertness, penetration and experience – so much so that it [should be] taken into consideration by the superior posts and kept in mind as such an exploit, the commission of which deserves a fair reward for the evident benefit it brings to the university and the [educational] district"¹⁰.

Not only was a university council archivist in charge of the safekeeping of the documents deposited in the archives, but he also acted as a translator and clerk for the board¹¹. In Moscow University, Assistant Professor Mikhail Snegirev performed these duties from 1811 to 1819¹². In Kazan, Peter Chaplygin was appointed to a similar position in 1813¹³. Both officials asked the authorities to release them from some part of their duties, since it was impossible to execute

⁷ Boles F., Young J.M. Exploring the Back Box: the Appraisal of University Administrative Records // *American Archivist*. 1985. Vol. 48 (Spring). P. 121–140; Beghtol C. Stories: Applications of Narrative Discourse Analysis to Issues in Information Storage and Retrieval // *Knowledge Organization: International Journal Devoted to Concept, Theory, Classification, Indexing and Representation*. 1997. Vol. 24. P. 64–71; Blouin F., Rosenberg W. *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority in History and the Archives*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2011. 257 pp.

⁸ *Ustavy imperatorskikh Moskovskogo, Khar'kovskogo, Kazanskogo universitetov, 5 noyabrya 1804* // *Sbornik postanovlenij po MNP*. T. 1. Tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra I. 1802–1825. SPb, 1864. № 47. Stb. 279.

⁹ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 40. File 116 «Zapiska, sostavlenная Departamentom narodnogo prosvescheniya po delu professora M.A. Pal'mina. Prilozhenie № 3 k delu o professore Pal'mine», posle 1829. Foll. 45, 29.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Fol. 108v.

¹¹ *Shtaty imperatorskikh universitetov: Moskovskogo, Khar'kovskogo i Kazanskogo* // *Ibid.* Shtaty i prilozheniya. S. 12.

¹² TSIAM. Fonds 459. Inv. 1. File 1156 «O kvartirnykh den'gakh ad'yunktu Snegirevu, ob uvol'nenii ego ot dolzhnosti arkhivariusa i perevodchika v pravlenii, o poruchenii onykh Podkhvatovu i Sozanovichu i o proizvozhdenii ad'yunktskogo zhalovan'ya: Snegirevu, Schepkinu i Lyubimovu», 1819. Fol. 3.

¹³ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. „Sovet“. File 46 «Dokumenty o naznachenii Chaplygina na dolzhnost' perevodchika i arkhivariusa universiteta i ego uvol'nenii, Vinokurova na dolzhnost' uchitelya risovaniya Kazanskoj gimnazii», 1813. Fol. 1.

them all at once¹⁴. This they were refused, but later on, university councils had to separate the archivist's office from translator's and clerk's. After long discussions, professors released archivists from the obligation to translate documents, but copying them remained their duty for a long time, as the career record of P. Polyantsev at Kazan University shows¹⁵. In 1822, Rector G.B. Nikolsky praised him in a letter to the district curator: "For a long time already, archivist and council, 14th class rank clerk Polyantsev has been asking for a next rank, which he does deserve, given his diligence, industry, age and education"¹⁶.

In 1826, rector and acting curator Karl Fuchs said in a letter to St Petersburg that, among others, he had sent his subordinate "Collegiate Registrar Polyantsev"¹⁷ to sort out the papers of the chancery. This implies that the archivist had not been bestowed upon the rank he aspired for. It may well be that his promotion failed due to allegations of Professor M.A. Palmin who, according to his complaint stored in the ministerial archives, alleged that Polyantsev conspired with the professor of state law and philosophy P.S. Sergeev to weave plots and that the two deliberately mixed up the folders stored in open bookshelves¹⁸.

In Moscow University, the situation was different. Reports from the first half of the 1830s show that the university had two archivists – a full-time one attached to the University Council (Collegiate Registrar I.N. Maslov) and a supernumerary (Collegiate Secretary N.E. Zimmerman) who was attached to the board¹⁹ and whose salary was provided from off-budget funds. Two archives and two archivists existed in Moscow until the structure of all Russian universities was unified in the mid 1830s²⁰.

Measures to declutter and organize documents in universities' archives were initiated in Russia in the late 1820s and early 1830's. Guided as much by their own needs (they had to get acquainted with the documents of their predecessors) as by the new archival policy of Nicholas I's government, the curators of the Kazan and Kharkov educational districts M.N. Musin-Pushkin and Yu.A. Golovkin initiated the description of the stacks of archival documents and the study of their contents²¹. Around the same time, the secretaries of the Moscow University

¹⁴ Ibid. Fol. 4.

¹⁵ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. „Sovet“. File 555 «Dokumenty ob uvol'nenii Komarova s dolzhnosti arkhivariusa universiteta i naznachenii na etu dolzhnost' Polyanceva», 1820. Fol. 5.

¹⁶ ORRK NB KFU. Ed. khr. 4019 «Pis'mo (chernovik) rektora Kazanskogo universiteta Nikol'skogo popechitelyu Kazanskogo uchebnogo okruga Magnitskomu, 20 noyabria 1822». Fol. 45.

¹⁷ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 40. File 203 «Delo ob uvol'nenii popechitelya Kazanskogo uchebnogo okruga M.L. Magnitskogo», 1826. Fol. 5.

¹⁸ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 40. File 116. Fol. 181v.

¹⁹ Cf. TSIAM. Fonds 418. Inv. 2. File 234 «Formy dlya sostavleniya ezhegodnogo otcheta po universitetu i Moskovskogo uchebnogo okruga», 1833. Fol. 4v.; RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 95. File 194 «Otchet imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za 1834», 1834. Fol. 26v–27; Ibid. File 195 «Otchet imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za 1835 g.», 1835. Fol. 25.

²⁰ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 95. File 203 « Otchet o sostoyanii i dejstviyakh imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za 1837/38 akademicheskij i 1838 grazhdanskij gody», 1839. Fol. 24.

²¹ Cf. NA RT. Fonds 92. Inv. 1. File 3412 «Ob osmotre g[ospodinom] popechitelem del kancelarii soveta Kazanskogo universiteta», 1831–1834; RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 49. File 1209 «Delo o nagrzhdenii rektora universiteta professora A.F. Pavlovskogo za uspeshnuyu rabotu organizovannoj im vremennoj komissii po privedeniyu v poryadok arkhiva universiteta», 1838.

council suggested twice (in 1832 and in 1835) that such work should be started there too, but the initiative was not supported by the local curator²².

The tremendous task of organizing the university archives led Kazan and Kharkov professors to raise the competency requirements for the archivist. He had to be not just a custodian of papers but an employee who understood well the peculiarities of the university and the interests of the academic class, commanded foreign languages and was able to maintain a scientific system of document search and storage. Professors' councils became very choosy in selecting candidates for the position, but, once the right man was found, they valued his work and defended him in the face of professional ministry officials.

This was all the more important because since the 1830s, university archives were no longer unique information sources for the authorities. The expanding intelligence network of His Imperial Majesty's Own Chancellery supplied the authorities with exhaustive information, as did members of statistic committees and officials for special missions with ministries, rectors, curators, and non-academic employees of universities. As a result, the 1835 Statute abolished the post of archivist and transferred the responsibility for the preservation of documents and the archive work to elected secretaries of boards and councils²³.

By contrast, the university community at that time was considering archiving not as an onerous duty imposed by bureaucrats anymore. Archives became a corporate value, a source of historical data. Professors cherished them as much as libraries or museum collections. And, because the Kazan University archivist was a skilled worker, the local council took his defense. In the National Archive of the Republic of Tatarstan, we have found the correspondence on this account between Rector Nikolay Lobachevsky and educational district curator Mikhail Musin-Pushkin as well as letters of the latter to the acting Minister of Public Education Nikolay Protasov and Minister Sergey Uvarov. Referring to the growing bulk of archival documents (28.000), the uniqueness of the evidence, and the address system created for the archive, the university sought to save the position for archivist A.S. Dobrosmyslov²⁴.

By 1837, Dobrosmyslov had already been sorting out the archive for eight years. He used to be a deacon but after the death of his wife in 1826 he had to quit the clergy. Apparently, he was literate and accurate, and thus he began to move quickly up the stairs of ranks. In summer 1827 he became a copyist in the Kazan Government Property Chamber. Two months later he was promoted to sub-clerk, and another three months later to clerk. The year after, he entered the

²² Cf. TSIAM. Fonds 418. Inv. 1. File 318 «O razbore del arkhiva soveta Moskovskogo universiteta», 1832; Ibid. Inv. 4. File 171 «Delo o razbore del arkhiva universitetskogo soveta», 1835.

²³ Obschij ustav imperatorskikh Rossijskikh universitetov, 26 iyulya 1835 // Sbornik postanovlenij po MNP. T. 2, otd. 1. Tsarstvovanie imperatora Nikolaya I. 1825–1837. St. Petersburg 1864. № 363. Stb. 758.

²⁴ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. «Pravlenie». File 4257 «Delo ob uvol'nenii arkhivariusa Dobrosmyslova ot sej dolzhnosti, tut zhe ob ostavlenii ego pri onoj», 1837–1838. Fol. 4–5v.; NART. Fonds 92. Inv. 1. File 4635 «Ob opredelenii pri universitete osobogo arkhivariusa», 1837–1838. Fol. 1.

chancellery of the University Board. Lobachevsky appreciated his skills and appointed him to the post of archivist²⁵. In this position, Dobrosmyslov took stock of the large archive²⁶.

Kazan professors managed to persuade the government to restore the office of the university archivist. Archivists, who, by the decree of 1838, were appointed by curators, did not have to copy documents anymore. Their only responsibility was storing and organizing documents of the university, and of the curator's office as well²⁷. Dobrosmyslov seems to have been a grateful employee. According to the rector's report of a fire in 1842, the archivist was among those who "never left the university during the whole time of fire accident and did nothing but saving the government property, especially that which was entrusted to their management; they acted with self-sacrificing, because they did not care about saving their own property"²⁸.

From 1832 on, annual university reports included data on the number of files placed in the archive, the condition of the archive and the decisions concerning it. A overall reading of these records for thirty years has allowed us to detect an interesting detail. In reports from Kazan and Kharkov, the names of the archivists are always specified (A.S. Dobrosmyslov in Kazan, I.T. Grigorevich and A.V. Vasilenkov in Kharkov), while the Moscow University archivist appears as an anonymous, except for the 1848 report, which says: "The university archive is now put in excellent order thanks to the efforts and diligence of the archivist, Titular Counselor Zimmermann, under the direct supervision of the Secretary of the Board."²⁹ Perhaps the personality of the archivist was mostly neglected because his status in the Moscow university corporation was rather low, but it might just as well be due to the lack of sufficiently skilled archivists in Moscow.

The archivists grew in status in 1850-1860's when the appointment procedure was changed. Instead of the curator's choice, they were now appointed by ballot voting in a meeting of the professors' council. In the archive of the Moscow University, documents survived that reflect Mikhail Larionov's election to this post³⁰. Apparently, by the mid-century archivists had become part of the corporation, and therefore they were to be elected like the other members of

²⁵ Ibid. File 4635. Fol. 3–4v.

²⁶ Ibid. File 3127. «Po predpisaniyu soвета Kazanskogo universiteta otnositel'no del kancelyarii popechitel'ya za prezhnie gody, nakhodyaschikhsya v arkhive universiteta», 1830–1831.

²⁷ Ibid. Fol. 10.

²⁸ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. «Pravlenie». File 5091 «O sgorevshem imuschestve, prinadlezhaschem universitetu i licam, zhivuschem v nem v pozhar 24 avgusta 1842 goda», 1842–1843. Fol. 2v.

²⁹ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 95. File 223 «Otchet o sostoyanii i dejstviyakh imperatorskogo Moskovskogo universiteta za 1847–48 akademicheskij i 1848 grazhdanskij gody», 1848. Fol. 42. Cf. also: TSIAM. Fonds 459. Inv. 2. File 1117 «Ob iz'yavlenii g[ospodinom] popechitelem Moskovskogo uchebnogo okruga blagodarnosti sekretaryu pravleniya kollezhskomu asessoru Ketcheru i arkhivariusu titulyarnomu sovetniku Tsimmermanu za privedenie del arkhiva v poryadok», 1848. Fol. 1–3.

³⁰ TSIAM. Fonds 459. Inv. 2. File 2788 «O vybore i naznachanii kollezhskogo sekretarya Larionova na dolzhnost' arkhivariusu Moskovskogo universiteta», 1863. Fol. 1–2.

the academic class. After Kazan University archivist Shlyapnikov died in 1886, a competition was announced to fill his post, to which eight contenders applied³¹.

The Archivist's Power

The fact that archivists were able to structure and define the size of universities' memory is testified to by the 'compression' of archives of the Department of Public Education (DPE) and universities.

For 34 years (1829–1863), V.P. Petrov was head of the DPE archive in St. Petersburg. Judging from his letter to Minister A.V. Golovnin (1865), he spoke French and German and was an educated and experienced but self-taught worker without a university degree. From 1827 to 1829, he served as a senior clerk in the chancellery of St. Petersburg educational district curator³².

Petrov put the archives and the office affairs of both the university and the curator in such an order that it caused the envy of ministerial officials who suffered from confusion in their documents. Having received an offer in 1829 to take office as archivist with the DPE and accepted it, Petrov found complete chaos. "Some files, he complained to the Head of department D.I. Yazykov, are tied together year by year, others are not tied and placed instead in a big mess all over the shelves and bookcases; for some of them, inventories and draft alphabetical [indexes] are made, while others are totally unsorted and in complete disarray. But even the files for which inventories exist are for the most part unstitched and unfinished; the sheets are not numbered, there are no proper inventories and no-one has ever collated copies with the originals."³³

Files in the archive were numbered in an arbitrary way, and documents were linked to thematic files (i.e. collections) with no fixed principle. Indexes were incomplete and were of little help when searching for reference. Since the ministry officials barely used the archive, no record was kept of documents checked out and in. Completed files weren't deposited in the archive since 1818, which meant that by 1829 about 25 000 of them were lying around in the rooms of the ministry. Besides, documents of the Commission for the Establishment of Public Schools for the years 1787 to 1802 had not been taken stock of³⁴.

Within six months Petrov counted the files stored in the archive and compared them with the lists. As a result, he discovered that quite a few documents from the first decade of the nineteenth century were lost: "Checking with the list showed that 83 files were missing, – Petrov

³¹ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. Pravlenie. File 7070 «Dokumenty o naznachanii na dolzhnost' arkhivariusa universiteta V. Shvedenberga, 27 yanvaria 1886 – 18 marta 1886». 20 foll.

³² Cf. Mesiatseslov s rospis'yu chinovnykh osob ili obschij shtat Rossijskoj imperii. SPb.: Imperatorskaya akademiya nauk, 1827. Part 1. P. 475; Idem. St. Petersburg 1828. Part 1. P. 493; Idem. St. Petersburg 1829. Part 1. P. 483.

³³ RGIA. Fonds 745 Inv. 1. File 107 «Raporty nachal'nika arkhiva V. Petrova o sostoyanii arkhiva i proizvedennykh v nem rabotakh, perepiska s Departamentom narodnogo prosvescheniya o navedenii spravok i prieme del», 1830. Fol. 1–1v.

³⁴ Ibid. Fol. 4.

reported to his superior. – Of these [83], I have found 28 in office rooms; where the remaining 55 are, is not known. I have the honor to present a specified list of these 55 [files] herewith. Beyond this, the waste is such that some registers could not be found either in the archive or in the offices of the Department."³⁵

In 1829–1834, Petrov reorganized the DPE archive after the fashion of the archives of the Ministry of Interior and the chancellery of the State Audit Office. By order of D.I. Yazykov, he visited these offices and studied the ‘new organization’ of archives implemented there. Having found these two systems useful and convenient, he developed a system based on them and adapted to the specific needs and workflow of the Ministry of Public Education. The archivist coordinated his plans, ideas and solutions with Minister Karl Lieven, who showed great interest in the archive. Not only did Lieven approve Petrov’s system, but he even appointed three officials to assist the archivist and money for bookshelves and storage boxes.

In 1862, in a letter to B.P. Monsorov, Petrov mentioned his role in making an efficient archive: "Prior to my entry into my present office, the archive was a terrible mess and, although there were only 10 thousand files in it, it was hard to find anything. Today, after more than 100 thousand files were destroyed at different times, there are still 140 350, but the archive is designed by me, I can say, so well that any requirements and inquiries are met immediately, which, as every clerk knows, makes the progress of affairs quicker."³⁶

Following the reorganization, the DPE archive, indeed, was used extensively for the development of university policy. Every government decision contained references to it. Only the Committee of Ministers was entitled to decide on destruction of any archival documents. But in the 1850s, the amount of paperwork increased by several times and, consequently, the number of files placed in the archive rose rapidly, leading to acute shortage of space and filing cabinets. To be able to store another set of documents, Petrov proposed to destroy some old collections³⁷ in accordance with the Decree of 19 October, 1861 ("Regulations concerning the storage and destruction of closed files of the Ministry of Public Education")³⁸. This proposal was supported by the head of department. Petrov himself was too old to do the sorting and selection of files himself. It was his successor D.I. Oshemetkov who did this job³⁹.

³⁵ Ibid. Fol. 2–3v.

³⁶ RGIA. Fonds 745. Inv. 1. File 136. «Doklad V.P. Petrova o sostave arkhiva i o prichinakh, zatrudnyavshikh napechatanie vseh opisej, perepiska s Departamentom narodnogo prosvescheniya o prieme del i navedenii spravok», 1862. Fol. 23–23v.

³⁷ Ibid. File 136. Fol. 24v.

³⁸ Cf. Ibid. File 91 «Pravila o khranении i unichtozhenii reshennykh del po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya», 1861–1863. Fol. 1–2.

³⁹ Cf. Adres-kalendar'. Obschaya rospis' vseh chinovnykh osob v gosudarstve. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaya akademiya nauk, 1857. Part 1. P. 158.

The government's decision gave archivists a wide room for initiative⁴⁰. Depending on their will and their intellectual priorities documents were now qualified as either historically and politically important or unimportant evidence. By December 1865, the Commission had read 50,645 files out of 120,000. Of these, 21 397 (42%) were destroyed, 6,643 (13%) were kept and 23,605 were designated for destruction⁴¹. This encompassing destruction policy had to do with the fact that in 1864, the ministry officials took away half of the archive's premises⁴².

In Petrov's time, documents were stored by districts. Now, "to bring the archive into an appropriate order and, through this, to allow a faster and more precise information retrieval from files, – Oshemetkov wrote in a report, – [we] made a rule of consolidating in one file the proceedings that concern various educational districts but are intrinsically linked with each other, such as explanations of various questions concerning the same order; appointment of surplus pensions for years of service; matters relating to the same individual or institution, etc."⁴³ This was a logical decision as far as the interests of paper work were concerned, but it made it difficult to modern scholars to find documents related to specific universities.

Oshemetkov's own idea of the tasks and interests of future historians (whom he referred to as 'fact sheet drawers') was such that he believed he would facilitate their work if he linked documents from different departments together to make thematic collections. "This sort of file linkage will be very useful for fact sheet drawers in future, – he wrote to the Head of DPE in 1867, – but it takes time and effort to achieve this goal; sometimes, to find the original file, one has to go through the inventories and alphabetical indexes of almost all districts, and this takes hours"⁴⁴.

University and school reports were collected by Oshemetkov in the inventory No. 95⁴⁵. However, it did not include reports of the 'reformed' Department, that is, from 1817 to 1833. It is difficult to say why the archivist took this controversial decision or failed to implement his plan in full. This situation gave rise to erroneous judgments in historiography. Thus, after studying the inventory No. 95, L.A. Bulgakova concluded that universities filed no reports at all between 1817 and 1833⁴⁶. Those who wrote after her never checked back this assumption, and it became a common place⁴⁷. At that, reports of these years do exist, only they are stored in a different place, namely in the collections of educational districts.

⁴⁰ RGIA. Fonds 745. Inv. 1. File 29 «O poriadke khraneniya i unichtozheniya arkhivnykh del po Ministerstvu narodnogo prosvescheniya», 1863–1897. Fol. 19v.

⁴¹ Ibid. Fol. 23.

⁴² Ibid. Fol. 35.

⁴³ Ibid. Fol. 37v.

⁴⁴ Ibid. Fol. 38.

⁴⁵ RGIA. Fonds 733. Inv. 95. File 1155 «Otchetny uchebnykh okrugov i raznykh uchrezhdenij», 1803–1861.

⁴⁶ Bulgakova L.A. Otchetny popechitelej po uchebnym okrugam i universitetam kak istoricheskij istochnik // Vspomogatel'nye istoricheskie discipliny. Vol. 10. Leningrad: Nauka, 1978. P. 246.

⁴⁷ Petrov F.A. Formirovanie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniya v Rossii. Vol. 1: Rossijskie universitety i Ustav 1804 goda. Moscow: MGU, 2002. P. 30.

By March 1867, under the direction of the chief archivist, officials reviewed and sorted out another 64,344 files. Of these, 30,742 (47%) were destroyed⁴⁸.

No less important was the role played by archivists of individual universities. In 1856, in the context of a paperwork reform, Minister A.S. Norov instructed the curators to decide on the destruction of "unneeded" archival documents, and at the same time come up with the "general principles" for the selection of papers in university archives⁴⁹. Following this instruction, the Moscow University developed an elaborate scheme to rank documents in terms of retention period and national importance⁵⁰.

Archivists and secretaries of university councils and boards were ordered to carry out the document destruction campaign. They had to separate 'original documents' from copies and destroy all duplicates. The Council decided that in future it should consider the inventory of current affairs annually in January and based on it documents pertaining to affairs of ten years ago should be destroyed⁵¹.

Kazan curator V.P. Molostvov held no group discussions: the rector was the only person whom he showed the message⁵². Rector I.M. Simonov suggested that the affair should be dealt with formally and all documents should be split into three parts: those to be kept perpetually, those to be kept temporarily, and those to be destroyed immediately. The first group was to include "files containing laws or regulations, resolutions on important issues, requirements of the authorities that are sent here for implementation, documents serving as sources for historical description of the university, documents (copies) concerning the origin of students and the like." Temporary storage was suggested for "files containing interim statements, all kinds of fact sheets and references, travel papers, [documents concerning] acquisition of state-owned property, administrative enforcements etc."⁵³ If this sort of selection had actually taken place, only texts reflecting educational efforts of the government and their results would have remained in the university archive, while ill fate would await the professors' records and correspondence.

However, these documents did survive in Kazan, although old archival inventories contain marks signaling their destruction. In 1875, N.N. Bulich, a professor of literary history, discovered documents relating to emperor Alexander I's rule, in boxes in the attic of the university building. In his letter to writer M.F. De Poulet, he wrote: "In my efforts to provide you with true information on some subject or another, I turned to our university archive which, as you could see from Artemyev's book you have read, contains great treasures and is barely

⁴⁸ RGIA. Fonds 745. Inv. 1. File 29. Fol. 40.

⁴⁹ TSIAM. Fonds 459 On. 2. File 2115 « O pravilakh unichtozheniya arkhivnykh del », 1856. Fol. 1–1v.

⁵⁰ Ibid. Fol. 14–19.

⁵¹ Ibid. Fol. 16v–19.

⁵² NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. «Rektor». File 1154 «Po predlozheniyu g[ospodina] popechitelya Kazanskogo uchebnogo okruga o dostavlenii emu svedeniya ob arkhivnykh delakh», 1856. Fol. 1–4.

⁵³ Ibid. Fol. 2v.

explored. Unfortunately, the place it is now kept in does no credit to the university. Half of the archive is placed under the roof, so that sometimes snow or rain drops fall right on the files; the old archivist is already very old and busy doing other things."⁵⁴ The person who showed Bulich the treasures hidden in the attic was none other than the 76-year-old Dobrosmyslov, the archivist of the Kazan University.

Apparently, in 1856, by the wish of Rector Simonov, the archival documents were divided into two almost equal parts. In accordance with the above mentioned formal approach, papers from the first quarter of the nineteenth century were considered "unneeded" and intended for destruction. Then the archivist marked the written off documents in the inventories, but instead of destroying them, he put them in boxes and hid them in the attic.

Upon learning that Dobrosmyslov was palsied, Bulich lamented: "He alone could show the way in the ugly chaos of our archives, and now I have to become archivist myself. [...] The day before, we had been climbing together up the iron stairs to the top, under the roof, and the nice old man, leaning on his stick and smiling good-naturedly, complained that the *stairs* were bad and that his *spectacles* were no good at all anymore. I feel so sorry for him!"⁵⁵

It was Rector N.A. Kremliov⁵⁶ who announced the old archivist's illness in a board meeting and, the same day, the rector "sealed the five doors to the university archive with two seals – that of the university board and his own one bearing his name."⁵⁷ Soon afterwards, Dobrosmyslov, who also filled the post of treasurer, died, and in July 1875 the archivist's position was conveyed on "Collegiate Assessor Shlyapnikov employed for this."⁵⁸ Two keys to the archive were also handed over to him.

With the approval of P.N. Shlyapnikov, Professor Bulich took the boxes from the attic to his apartment, and it was not until May 1887 that he returned them to the university at the request of the new archivist V.F. Schwedenberg⁵⁹. Now that he had got both parts of the university archive, Schwedenberg was at a loss and informed the university council: "I found files in the archive in complete disarrangement and confusion. Most of the files had no acceptance and delivery statements. Therefore, my first job was to find out what parts the abovementioned archive consisted of and to distribute the files properly, that is, according to offices, which, as it turned out later, were 27 by number. When distributing the files, I had – for lack of acceptance and delivery statements – to resort to tables of contents included in each file.

⁵⁴ Pis'mo N.N. Bulicha M.F. De-Pule, 25 yanvarya 1875 goda [Elektronnyj resurs] // Pis'ma N.N. Bulicha M.F. De-Pule / publ. i kom. M.M. Sidorovoj // Nashe nasledie. 2011. № 97. URL: http://www.nasledie-rus.ru/red_port/00208.php (last accessed: 12.09.2012).

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. «Pravlenie». File 6606 «Zhurnaly zasedanij pravleniya. T. 2», 1875. Fol. 131.

⁵⁷ Ibid. Fol. 403.

⁵⁸ Ibid. Fol. 403v.

⁵⁹ Ibid. File 7159 «Dokumenty o deyatel'nosti arkhiva universiteta», 1887. Fol. 222.

Where these were absent, too, I had to examine the contents of files to distribute them where they belonged. As far as I could see when sorting files out, some sheets were missing in many of them, in bound books the seals and cords were broken, some of the files pertaining to the printing-office were rotten, making it impossible to make any inquiries using them. Among the accounting books there are some worm-eaten ones. Besides, there are three bundles of unfiled original papers such as diplomas, certificates etc. Given all this disorder, I cannot accept any responsibility for the completeness of these files in case some waste is found"⁶⁰.

Schwedenberg was spared joining the archive parts into a whole. The Kazan University began preparing for its 200-year jubilee. A history of the university was to be written; for that end, it was ordered that archival documents from the first quarter of the nineteenth century should be brought to the library, where the official historian N.P. Zagoskin's study was⁶¹. Drawing on these documents, he wrote four volumes on the history of Kazan University during the first 25 years of its existence⁶². In the 1930s, these boxes of documents formed the basis of the Department of Manuscripts that was established in the University Library. Thus the university archive came to be stored in two different places.

Summing up, this study shows that during the nineteenth century the tasks of the university archivist changed. In the first third of the century, an archivist was normally a minor civil servant who, in addition to storing the closed files relegated from offices, carried out a number of clerical functions and was not a decision-maker. It was curators and members of the board of professors who determined the fate of the archive. As the public administration was modernized at the turn of the 1820s and 1830s and archives (both ministerial and university) were systematized in the process, the skill standards for archivists were strengthened and they acquired a higher corporate status. In institutional terms, the university archivists became members of the scientific community. From the mid-nineteenth century on, they were elected by the Professors' Council and given the right to systematize the university archives and to decide on their fate. The secret knowledge acquired through this work meant that the archivist turned from a professor's aid to the owner and keeper of the university's memory, a professional guide through its mazes.

⁶⁰ NA RT. Fonds 977. Inv. «Pravlenie». File 7159 «Dokumenty o deyatel'nosti arkhiva universiteta», 1887. Fol. 1-1v.

⁶¹ Ibid. Inv. «Istoriko-filologicheskij fakul'tet». File 1602 «O prazdnovanii 100-letnego yubileya Kazanskogo universiteta», 1894. Fol. 4.

⁶² Zagoskin N.P. Istoriya imperatorskogo Kazanskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego suschestvovaniya. 1804–1904. T.1–4. Kazan': Tipo-litogr. imp. Kazanskogo un-ta, 1902–1906.

Elena A. Vishlenkova

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Poletayev
Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies in the Humanities (IGITI). Deputy Director.
E-mail: evishlenkova@mail.ru, Tel. +7 (495) 621-37-02

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not
necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**