

Wiszenkova, Elena

University Archives as a Cultural Project : Russia, the first Half of the 19th Century

Rozprawy z Dziejów Oświaty 48, 183-195

2011

Artykuł umieszczony jest w kolekcji cyfrowej Bazhum, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych tworzonej przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego.

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie ze środków specjalnych MNiSW dzięki Wydziałowi Historycznemu Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



Elena Wiszlenkowa

Moskwa

University Archives as a Cultural Project (Russia, the first Half of the 19th Century)¹

One could argue that at this particular time Russian university archives presented the collections of evidence, carefully chosen and thought through. I have discovered this when taking part the project on history of the University of Kazan' linked to its 200th anniversary, and later, while participating in the international project *Ubi Universitas, ibi Europa*. The project has been supported by the Herda Henkel Foundation. Its aim was to study the introduction and adaptation of the model of university education in Russia in the 18th and the first half of the 19th cc. The first part of the project was focused on the prosopography of university corporations, the second – on their corporate culture, and the third one – on interactions between academics and townsmen. I led a team of scholars that was to write the section about the university culture. For three years the members of the group (that is, Roufa Galioullina, Kira Iljina and I) worked in the university archives of Kazan', Moscow and St Petersburg. We exchanged the copies of archival inventories and the texts of scanned documents. Together we commented and discussed archival documents and looked for a research approach relevant to the study of university culture.

The University as a phenomenon is treated in various research discourses. The sociology of education views a university as a social network with its own mechanisms of socialization, and ways to legitimize scientific knowledge, with particular behavior strategies and rhetoric. For the historians of science universities are the institutions that set parameters and

¹ The study was implemented in the framework of the Program of Fundamental Studies of the Higher School of Economics in 2011

defined the ways to legitimize an academic community and guarantee its reproduction. Historians of ideas usually work on the level of the textual analysis and intertextual space. We offered an aspect of analysis that enables one to unite these approaches into a dynamic model of the study of a 'university culture' – a social space formed around a particular institution. It is shaped by ideas and views on the role and place of academic disciplines and their practitioners in public life.

The analysis of historiography leaves an ambiguous image in the mind of a researcher. On the one hand, one could view Russian university culture as a sum of autochthonic loci with their own temporality. On the other hand, if one is to read studies of the state policy towards universities the picture that is drawn there is that of an integrated university space and shared history fractured by the University Charter of 1835². Our aim was to find correct rendition for this contradiction.

In order to understand the phenomenon of the university culture in Russia we focused our work on studying the changing forms of co-existence and the ways of interactions among academics and between academics and Russian bureaucrats. We also tried to find out how these forms depended on varying local circumstances. We were inspired by the hypothesis that an analysis of a university as an autonomous body seeks to reveal how in each case an institution established by the state was appropriated and adopted by academics, how it was enriched by its own unique life scenarios, and how the official rules were undermined and re-defined there. Thus we looked for the logic of the life of a community, and the latter often exceeded the limits of the declared norms of common life.

This purpose defined the criteria for the search of documents in the archives of Kazan', Kharkov, Moscow and St Petersburg. While working on our study we tried to feel the impulses of this corporate culture. Thus we were not interested in the documents generated by the state, or by a particular faculty as such, but rather in the situations of interaction and conflicts that revealed the subjectivity of actors, both within the university, and outside it, that is, with external agents. The cases of interactions

² For example: Е. С. Ляхович, А. С. Ревушкин, *Университеты в истории и культуре дореволюционной России*, Томск 1998; Ф. А. Петров, *Российские университеты в первой половине XIX века. Формирование системы университетского образования*, Москва 1998–2000, кн. 1–4; А. И. Аврус, *История российских университетов. Очерки*, Москва 2001; Ф. А. Петров., Д. А. Гутнов, *Российские университеты, [w] Очерки русской культуры XIX века*, т. 3, Москва 2001, s. 124–199; *История Казанского университета*, ред. И. П. Ермолев, Казань 2004.

(both positive and negative) indicated the values of the agents of communication and forced them to set the limits and to define the interests of their groups.

The found documents forced us to re-evaluate the existing views on the character of a university culture. They clearly demonstrate that Russian professors often did not want to have anything to do with university administration and did not value the right of autonomy that had been granted to them; that the relationship between professors and students could not be always defined as paternalist; that professors initiated a good number of prohibitive and disciplinary measures against students; that academic achievements rarely defined a person's status within an academic community; that having lost the identity of the intellectual missionaries on the 'East' and the agents of the state policy of modernization the academics formed professional communities of experts and then became the agents of rather independent policy aiming at the modernization of the state itself. Having got such findings and conclusions we did not risk publishing them without a set of relevant archival documents. So the monograph *Russian professors: university corporativism or professional solidarity* was produced³.

Only after that we have realized that the key to understanding of the specificity of Russian university culture is to be found in the set of university archives and the archive of the Ministry of Public Enlightenment. It sounds very trivial from the point of view of the source studies. What we mean here is not the possibilities but rather the limitations. We have formulated questions that had never been asked of archives before: who had the right to speak to the descendants on behalf of the university, and whose voices have been lost?⁴ What are the leading themes of statements preserved in the university archives? What were the positions of the creators of the revealed discourses into archives? How were various interpretations of university systematized within the same archive?

We use the notion of 'archive' in two senses: in its literary sense and as a metaphor. As for the first definition, it could be applied to the archival collections that serve as documentary base for almost all studies of Russian universities. Thus we worked with the collections of the State

³ Е. А. Вишленкова, Р. Х. Галиуллина, К. А. Ильина, *Русские профессора: университетская корпоративность или профессиональная солидарность*, Москва 2012 [in print].

⁴ This question was asked of the Post-Soviet archives by Adeeb Khulid in connection with Muslim studies: A. Khulid, *Searching for Muslim Voices in Post-Soviet Archives*, „Ab Imperio” 2008, no 4, s. 302–312.

Archive of Kharkov region, the National archive of the Republic of Tatarstan and the Department of manuscripts and rare books of the Kazan' University library, the Central Historical archive of Moscow, the Russian State archive of old charters and the department of written sources in the State Historical Museum (Moscow), Russian State History Archive and the Department of manuscripts in the Russian State Library (St Petersburg).

The second meaning of the notion 'archive' is linked to the research optics focused on the studies of culture. In order to explain its mechanics I have used the theory 'archeology of knowledge' by Michel Foucault. In his works the word 'archive' is used to describe discursive practices recorded in documents and the link between the practices and the social and cultural circumstances of their usage. Foucault has not written a history of universities, of course. But if one is to interpret the life of professors and students as a history of 'statements', including both verbalized ideas (their transfer and adaptation) and social expressions (non-verbal acts, strategies of behavior, choices of the forms of protest etc.) the archive could be presented as a place of the 'final assemblage' of these statements of various levels. It turns into a mould of a university culture.

The community of professors wrote about itself a great deal, in various forms and persistently, and produced the 'university *doxa*'. Pierre Bourdieu marked out this analytical category; he meant by it everything that is taken for granted by academics who therefore applied the categories of thought produced by themselves to their alma mater⁵. Bourdieu urged scholars to look at the *doxa* carefully, and try to see what it concealed and what it admitted. Answering his call we tried to clarify the conditions and rules of its production and thus to defocus the optics that had been created by the professors and the bureaucrats of the Ministry of education. Our attention was drawn to the practices of the self-description of a university as 1) an enlighteners of the Russians; 2) the apex of the state education system; and 3) as a national phenomenon.

The collections of documents we were dealing with showed that they were not just compendiums of odd texts. Their structure, the logic of references, the obvious presence of formularies and matrixes persuaded us

⁵ П. Бурдьё, *Университетская докса*, [in] *Socio-Logos'96. Альманах Российско-французского центра социологических исследований Института социологии Российской Академии наук*, Москва 1996. [Электронный ресурс] URL: <http://bourdieu.name/content/burde-universitetskaja-doksa-i-tvorchestvo-protiv-sholasticheskikh-delenij> (07.08.2011).

that an archive was a well thought-through system⁶. And as such it was a biased keeper of the secrets of a university culture. The reconstruction of intentions and circumstances of its creation, the analysis of the participation of numerous people and the struggle between bureaucrats, professors and administrators to control it helps to look deeper into relations within the university community.

An Archive preserves the fragments of 'big narratives' about a university. As it contains of thousands of fragments a scholar faces an illusion that s/he deals with random events. One begins to suspect that it is not true, since the seemingly heterogeneous sources have not produced a variety of scholarly interpretations. On the contrary, the Russian historiography of universities is all but monochrome⁷. It means that there must be something to ensure the uniformity of the assemblage of the archival evidences, the reproduction of the same discourse.

The explanation seems to lay in the fact that in most cases the scholars do not suspect the archives of compulsion. By compulsion here we mean the reproduction of the discourse that created and shaped the university archives of the first half of the 19th c. Since the scholars do not resist this compulsion with critical reflection they are left with no choice but to describe universities according to the in-built templates.

While working with documents we do not view them as a set of evidence but rather as the practice of administration and self-governance where a university acts as a modern institute of the empire. We view an archive as a cultural project created by the efforts of various subjects, and our aim is twofold: 1. to reveal the versions of the memory of universities which are left to us by the contemporaries; 2. to analyze the contents of the memory, to study the blocks and the ways to create discourses, and to interpret the particular university culture viewed in two aspects: group identity and the power of knowledge. In other words, we have been deducing the transformation of the idea of university corporativism and the emergence of expert consciousness.

The archives are not presented in our research as a collection of old documents, or a mirror of the past reality but rather as a 'place of assembly' of the cultural history of a university. This approach helped us reap-

⁶ *Циркулярное предложение о наблюдении правил и форм канцелярского порядка, 8 февраля 1834, [w] Сборник распоряжений по Министерству народного просвещения, т. 1, СПб 1866, kol. 899–901.*

⁷ See: E. A. Вишленкова, А. Н. Дмитриев, *Удобное прошлое для одной корпорации: постсоветские университеты в поисках классического статуса*, „Труды русской антропологической школы”, вып. 7, Москва 2010, s. 381–396.

praise the existing forms of description, to emphasize the plurality of meanings of the notions. Moreover, such 'quasi-obvious' claims as the love of professors to their students or the value of science and university autonomy to the academics has become a suspect statements. Thus we have been engaging in archeology (not history) of the university archives.

Now I will present the results of our study. For several years we analyzed the documents and have reconstructed a model of university culture on the basis of the critical reading of its archives. The completed study revealed a complex picture of the transfer and adaptation of university education in Russia. It does not match the mechanistic view of the steady advance of the university idea into Russia where the empire is presented as a space taken by invading ideas and civilized by universities.

In the early 19th c. Russian universities emerged as the education centers for the loci defined by the government – education districts. The academic communities of Moscow, Kazan' and Kharkov really felt as 'connecters of Russian lands and counties' and agents of modernization of the empire. Reporting to the ministry about the establishing of new gymnasiums and schools, describing human and natural resources of a district professors realized their civilizing mission⁸. It could be supported by the texts preserved in personal archives. In the 20th c. these texts ended up in manuscript departments of universities libraries⁹.

In 1820s the government has stroke a blow at this academic identity by publicizing the scandalous results of the state inspections of the universities¹⁰. And in 1830s the Ministry of education responded to the demands of the professors who lost in official paperwork by transferring the control over schools, the organization of research in districts and even the care of students to the official inspectors. In the administrative system created by the minister Sergey Uvarov a professor played a role of a lecturer (an articulator) of normative knowledge. His service was evaluated

⁸ Н. Попов, *Общество любителей отечественной словесности и периодическая литература в Казани с 1805 по 1834 г.*, „Русский вестник” 1859, т. 23, с. 65; Национальный архив Республики Татарстан (Казань), ф. 92. оп. 1, д. 1504 *Отчет по учебным заведениям Казанского учебного округа и формулярные списки о службе преподавателей, 1822*, к. 18, 22.

⁹ Отдел рукописей и редких книг Научной библиотеки Казанского федерального университета, j. hr. 10256, Ж. В. Щельванова, *К истории Научной библиотеки им. Н. И. Лобачевского Казанского государственного университета (первая половина 30-х гг. XX века)*, (на правах рукописи), к. 2–4.

¹⁰ А. Ю. Минаков, *Русский консерватизм в первой четверти XIX века*, Воронеж 2011, с. 241–246.

according to the numbers of teaching hours and students, as well as through the written confirmations of political and national loyalty.

The expanding (from 1820s onwards) bureaucratic control, and the introduction in 1830s of the evaluation system of professorial service blocked the development of reputation consciousness in Russian universities. Conflicts of identities, positions and academic opinions that emerged in 1830s within public space (they were recorded in minutes) had all chances to become a basis for professional norms, ethical values, and academic standards. They could produce a system of self-regulation. However the bureaucrats' negative relations to such forms of communication between their subordinates urged to stop all debates, conflicts and discussions at the meetings of the university councils. Later conflicts (including the criticisms of presented dissertations during public examinations and the assertion of so called 'separated opinion') were pushed into the deviation zone and were viewed as an attack on bureaucratic interests, as well as on academic corporation. In 1830–40s the professors were required to produce a 'consensual opinion', that is, one officially approved and accepted. It was recorded in numerous copies of official papers and was preserved in archives. The existing institute of a 'separated opinion' added to the majority decision was re-coded semantically. 'Dissenting opinion' now acquired a status of an addition to the 'consensual' one.

The bureaucrats suppressed the 'dissensions' and 'discord' of professors under the pretext of caring for the quality of university education, and set the regime of dominance and control¹¹. At the same time the academic community had not produced adequate mechanisms of resistance and ways to evaluate the quality of their own work. Thus the state's paternalism contributed to the development of corporate infantilism.

After the Uvarov's retirement in 1849, influenced by the growing criticism of his system Russian academic communities turned back to the analysis of German system of university education and its interaction with the state. It was supposed that having taken it into consideration helped to deliver universities from historical and local 'distortions'.

The archives studied by us provided persuasive arguments for the fact that due to historical circumstances the Russian university culture developed under the presumption of a 'university as an agent of state policy'. This setting defined the character of official correspondence and the type

¹¹ See more on that in: E. A. Вишленкова, P. X. Галиуллина, К. А. Ильина, *op. cit.*, s. 49.

of communications between academic bodies and administrative institutions of the empire¹². It should be noted that the government control over universities is not specific to Russian history. In the 19th c. many European countries experienced state control over the production and dissemination of knowledge. The specificity of Russian situation laid in the fact that the state required recently established universities to manage their records in the same way as other bureaucratic bodies did. Shared forms of reports and minutes, the common bureaucratic language, the same type of documents' circulation, uniform and impersonal texts made professors and students feel themselves as bureaucrats with no personal opinions or voices. The bureaucratic logic did not lead the view of Russian university as a partner and an ally of the state but rather as a part of the state mechanism. It obviously lowered the status of a Russian university in comparison to its Western counterparts.

The period under consideration saw a unifying tendency although the impression of a caesura is created by the change of the official correspondence style in 1830s. Official documents produced by universities in their communications of the early 19th c. were hardly formalized. The descriptions are imitative, the style is awkward but it enabled the authors to put their initiatives, dissenting opinions and personal reflection into official documents. The documents of 1830s are laconic, they contain brief annotations of a matter in question but they also incorporated into the wide network of bureaucratic correspondence and exclude any liberties with style and form. Every statement is put into a prescribed place within a table and is confirmed by references, excerpts and certificates. The volume of official correspondence grew and the communications with other administrative institutions of the empire intensified. Search through collections covering the period under consideration reveals that as a result of the change in the type of writing the correspondence of the academics became a part of state mechanism and was deprived of subjectivism in speaking and writing about a university. By making its description a task for state bureaucrats Uvarov acquired and left to future generations the type of official correspondence where university professors were presented as objects of the government's control and the 'instruments' of education¹³.

¹² К. А. Ильина, *Профессора и бюрократические коммуникации (Россия, первая треть XIX века)*, „История и историческая память” Саратов 2011, вып. 4, s. 114–131.

¹³ С. С. Уваров, *Циркулярное предложение управляющего министерством народного просвещения начальствам учебных округов о вступлении в управление министерством*, „Журнал министерства народного просвещения” 1834, cz. I, no 1, s. 1.

The main strength of the system proclaimed in 1830s was supposed to be its uniformity and clarity. University offices and the ministry – and later their archives – were getting evidence supporting the fact that the minister managed to reach equality among the universities in terms of the number of departments, lecturers, students, books and other positions. When reporting to the emperor Uvarov claimed this equality to be his achievement. At the same time the ‘alternative archives’ (personal texts by professors) gave evidence for the growing gap between metropolitan and provincial universities as far as the quality of teaching and research was concerned. Judging by this evidence the Uvarov’s system of administration created a hierarchy, that is, it replaced the district system of university education by a centric one. The universities of Kazan’ and Kharkov lost the status of scientific and cultural centers of ‘Eastern’ and ‘Southern’ loci. Instead they were discriminated financially, and it led to the exodus of the most active lecturers and researchers to the universities of Moscow and St Petersburg¹⁴. As a result the universities of Kazan’ and Kharkov became provincial, that is, second rate in comparison to the metropolitan universities.

Control over archives was a part of the government’s system of university administration. The type of official correspondence of the 1810–20s as well as the absence of strict criteria of the papers selected to be stored created the situation when the archives of the professorial councils preserved a variety of academics’ opinions on a wide range of subjects. Archival objects of that period are multi-layered and shape a non-structured discourse of university. Archivists of 1830s commissioned by the ministry to put the archives ‘in order’, that is, to inspect the evidence kept there faced a serious problem. When ‘examining’ the papers they had to adjust the evidence of an other cultural situation in accordance with the logic foreign to it. In order to do so they distributed the papers to various sections that reflected the institutional structure of the universities acquired after the introduction of the charter of 1835. The earlier texts however still looked alien to the structure of the unified official correspondence, so the bureaucrats called them the testaments to chaos in the organization of universities under Alexander I. For this reason these documents were destroyed in the archives of the Moscow University board¹⁵.

¹⁴ See more on that in: Е. А. Вишленкова, Р. Х. Галиуллина, К. А. Ильина, *op. cit.*, s. 176–177.

¹⁵ Центральный исторический архив Москвы, ф. 459, оп. 2, д. 2115, *О правилах уничтожения архивных дел, 1856*, к. 54–54об.

In Uvarov's opinion in an ideal state all universities and professors should have had one memory – a romanticized narrative of Russia's movement from ignorance to the state system of education. This kind of evidence was collected and left for preservation. Now these documents could easily be re-coded by scholars into a narrative of the natural growth of the idea of university in Russia¹⁶ or into a narrative about the circumstances favorable for the establishment of university tradition (system)¹⁷.

In the version of university history written by Uvarov in 1840s the state was the only sponsor of education¹⁸. After the monarch had approved it, individual and groups' memories were pushed off the limits of official correspondence preserved by the state. Therefore their fragments were preserved only in the field of private life – in letters, diaries and memoirs. The established state discourse was closed up in itself, cutting off all chances to create alternative histories. There could not have been an anthropologically-oriented history of universities, just as there could not have been local histories of Kazan', Moscow, Kharkov universities. They now turned into parts of the general history of the Russian university. And this history, in its turn, constituted a fragment of the larger history of the Russian state.

As a result of archives having been 'put in order' and the whole thematic collections having been erased certain aspects of university activities and the academic culture linked to them became hardly accessible. One can find some relevant evidence either in those universities where archives had not suffer from the inspection (and then extrapolate the results on the other universities) or in personal documents of professors that are fragmentary due to the way these collection had been formed.

Of all discursive categories we were interested in 'science' suffered the least from the inspection of the archives. Since scientific discourse was the least affected by the logic of state service and memory construction, the corresponding texts fill the collections of all university offices (the council, the board, the offices of the warden, rector and the faculty offices) and of ministry divisions. Their genres are: the minute of the university councils' debates over new Western theories, the projects of organizing research in Russian empire on the basis of these theories, instructions and

¹⁶ А. Ю. Андреев, *Российские университеты XVIII-первой половины XIX века в контексте университетской истории Европы*, Москва 2009.

¹⁷ Ф. А. Петров, *Зарождение системы университетского образования в России*, т. 1–4, Москва 2002–2003.

¹⁸ *Десятилетие министерства народного просвещения 1833–1843*, [w] С. С. Уваров, *Избранные труды*, Москва 2009, s. 347–368.

the itineraries of field expeditions, financial and scientific reports, texts justifying the political and public impact of these activities, wardens' reports to the ministry of education, the minister's answers, letters to various state officials.

Scientific discourse could not be exhausted by the official correspondence and could not be limited to localities. By definition it includes manuscripts and publications by scholars, mediums of their communication with colleagues at other Russian universities and abroad (letters, books with inscriptions, reviews etc.). This text-production got out of government's control and as it becomes clear now, violated the Uvarov's formation (or constructing) of the university memory.

Family archives of academics preserved in manuscript departments of libraries are full of letters from colleagues, diaries and memoirs, extracts from books and documents, published and manuscript reviews, notes of lecture courses, manuscript copies of dissertations. University libraries keep the articles published in University Transactions and local periodicals, monographs and pamphlets by researchers, and museums preserve the collections put together by scholars during their expeditions. Thus the re-creation of scientific discourse could only be achieved if one goes beyond the limits of official correspondence of the universities. Since it is the case it is easy to suggest that this discourse was to some extent free from the state discourse of university.

We have already demonstrated the interrupted, chaotic development of scientific studies in Moscow, Kazan', and Kharkov, and the circumstances of the emergence of the phenomena of 'university science' and 'Russian science'. While studying the mechanisms of group formation and the development of collective solidarity we have noticed that academic achievements of a scholar did not lead automatically to his rise in status within the corporation. Corporate status of a scholar would only grow in a case when his research was accepted by bureaucrats as important to the state (that is, commissioned by the authorities), or if scientific discoveries strengthened the reputation of Russia as a sponsor of science.

The politically important topics in the early 19th-century Russia include the studies of natural and human resources of the empire, the development of the rational methods of administration and business managements, enlightening projects – the Europeanization of local cultures¹⁹. The need

¹⁹ Е. А. Вишленкова, *Человеческое разнообразие в локальной перспективе: «большие теории» и эмпирические знания (Казань, первая половина XIX века)*, „Ab Imperio” 2009, no 3, s. 245–345.

to acquire new knowledge about the empire has apparently created a basis for the government's alliance with the specialists in the relevant fields, and it led to intensive production and careful preservation of the texts that reflected this interaction. In this section we deal with the specific features of the archives of scientific texts, and of the research culture reflected there, as well as the zones of interaction between the state and academics, and the local context of their research. Unlike historians of science we are not interested in the markers of scientific progress or in information about discoveries but rather in the mechanisms of selection and adaptation of Western knowledge in the 'field' studies of Russian reality, as well as in the conditional that formed expert consciousness within Russian academic communities. This approach enables us to notice the moments where Russian scientific discourse exfoliated, creating the layers of Western rationality and of specific local knowledge.

Of all range of scientific discourse we have chosen two cases to study: the expeditions of Kazan' ethnologists and the examination of medical and topographical descriptions of Russian empire by Moscow professors. The choice was determined by the preservation of the complete collections of these scientific texts that offered one a chance to analyse various aspects of research culture. The 'Kazan' phenomenon' helps one to follow the process of adapting universal knowledge, and the influence of local context on the research framework and on the implementation of the modernizing ideology that implied the civilizing mission of the empire. Moscow is presented as a place where the state as a customer communicated with the university-trained doctors as providers of new knowledge²⁰.

The scientific archives (in Foucault's sense) revealed by us are intertextual. They have direct and indirect references to concepts, ideas, rumours and stereotypes, that is, to other bearers of knowledge. Thus such collections could not be read hermetically.

Our research has shown that if in the spheres of self-regulation, teaching and even memory the professors were pushed aside and lost their subjectivity, in the scientific discourse the opposite development was the case. At the early 19th c. the voice of the authorities was unique but later it was lost in the choir of voices. It was not bureaucrats but rather scholars themselves who were interested in the state of scientific research as

²⁰ Е. А. Вишленкова, *Выполняя врачебные обязанности, я постиг дух народный»: самосознание врача как просветителя российского государства (первая половина XIX века)*, „Ab Imperio” 2011, no 2, s. 47–82.

they needed funding, the development of criticism and claimed the right to offer expert opinions on social problems of the empire and to help educate the state itself.

Thus in many respects the culture of socialization in Russian universities could be described as a closed system integrated into the logic of state management while the research culture and science – as an open system.

Of course, when we look at the culture of research in Russian universities through the lens of archival collections we only see some of its aspects. Firstly, we see the presence of the state there as a modernizer, the consumer of modern knowledge, and, therefore, its commissioner, censor and controller. Secondly, we see the influence of the local context of the universities' existence on the research optics of its scholars. Thirdly, we see constant desire of academics to overcome the limitations set upon the university science by the state. Russian scholars spoke the language of international science and used the models taken from Western science. They were forced to formulate their research goals within an intermediate zone between the expectations of the state (in the person of the minister, the wardens and their assistants) and the international criteria of research. This rises the question of the specific way to legitimate scientific knowledge in Russia.

As far as the scientific culture of universities is concerned the archival documents demonstrate the variety voices and intensive translations from the language of the reason of state to the one of the universal reason of science.

As scientific texts suggested numerous and often impersonal addressees and the wide intertextual space their archive did not have limits. It is not surprising therefore that the scientific culture of universities formed the ideas of the autonomous process of the production of knowledge and its value. It shaped an idea that there were other ways of modernization (based on the use of new knowledge) apart from those imposed on Russian professors by the state. Thus the formulas of socialization did not offer any preconditions for the emergence of expert identity, but they rose within the sphere of the culture of scientific creativity.

That is how the dynamics of transfer and adaptation processes looks like though the lens of university archives.