



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Maya Lavrinovich

**WRITING HISTORY IN THE
ARCHIVE: THE CASE OF THE
MOSCOW ARCHIVE OF
FOREIGN COLLEGE (LATE
EIGHTEENTH – EARLY
NINETEENTH CENTURY)**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM
WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 191/HUM/2020

*Maya Lavrinovich*¹

**WRITING HISTORY IN THE ARCHIVE: THE CASE OF THE
MOSCOW ARCHIVE OF FOREIGN COLLEGE (LATE
EIGHTEENTH – EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY)²**

The paper addresses the problem of interacting of visual and written components for creating of historical narrativity, and its impact on the social practices of the archival employees in the late 18th – early 19th century. The research is focused on the case of Moscow Archive of Foreign College, where a gallery of those who administered Russian foreign affairs had been collected since 1780s. This gallery was juxtaposed by a voluminous chronicle that united the Archive and the College into an indivisible institution and thus emphasized the role of the archival officials in the state affairs.

JEL Classification: Z

Key words: Russia, 18th century, Moscow Archive of the College of the Foreign Affairs, the heads of the Russian foreign policy, history writing, Aleksei Malinovskii

¹ Senior Research Fellow School of History, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow), mlavrinovich@hse.ru

² The study was implemented in the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE)

The point of departure for my research is the changing status of the archive and archivists in the early modern period. On the one hand, since the seventeenth century, as European monarchs united the idea of personal and state power, the archives became both a sign and source of authority and power. The records on the decision-making, diplomatic negotiations, and administration stored in the royal repositories, became bound to the sovereignty defining the state.³ On the other hand, by the end of the eighteenth century, the status of historical records changed elsewhere, where the ‘Age of revolutions’ had its impact. There, the authoritative holdings had to serve the public good. Though Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg excluded Russia from this process shifting this phenomenon to 1917, in the case of the Moscow Archive, some signs of this transformation emerged simultaneously to that in the European states, not because of the end of *Ancien régime* or revolution, but due to the foundation of the Russian Empire and the moving of the capital to the new city of St. Petersburg, which became the point of rupture. At that point, a number of Muscovite institutions became defunct, whereas their archives, among them the Archive of *Posol’skii Prikaz*, still kept their documents (‘vestiges’), like those of the royal family or the church in France after 1789, which became “historical”. As a result of differentiation of the documents (for old and current) that followed from that turn, there appeared special archival staff well trained in history and those who managed current documents, or modest guardians of public records.⁴ As for the Moscow Collegiate Archive, it inherited not only the array of the diplomatic documents of Muscovy from *Posol’skii prikaz*, but also the dynastic documents of the Rurikids and Romanovs, including their testaments and other charters. In the times after Peter I, their documents were regarded as adjuncts to the current workflow, which were needed to be available for hitherto unforeseen reasons. The problem of their historical value arose only in the late eighteenth century.⁵

Neither Nikolai Bantysh-Kamenskii (1737–1814), who headed the Archive since 1783 jointly with two other former secretaries and since 1800 individually, nor Aleksei Malinovskii (1762–1840), his deputy and the head of the Archive since 1814, were trained as historians but were hired in the Archive as connoisseurs of foreign languages. Only Gerhard Friedrich Miller

³ Blouin, Francis X., Rosenberg, William G. *Processing the Past: Contesting Authority In History and the Archives*. Oxford, 2011, p. 20.

⁴ Blouin, Rosenberg, *Processing the Past*, p. 21

⁵ Yet in 1985, Boris Ilizarov emphasized that in Russia, prior to the eighteenth century, everyday office records were kept until their regulative qualities could be practically used, that is as instruments of administration or governing, not as that of memory. See: Ilizarov Boris S. ‘Arkhivnyi dokument v svete predstavlenii o sotsial’noi pamiati,’ in: *Arkhograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1985 g.* M., 1986, p. 47. Oleg G. Sanin suggested that Mikhail Grigor’evich Sobakin, the first supervisor of the Moscow Archive appointed by the Foreign College in 1744, was the first who comprehended the historical significance of the records kept there, see: Sanin Oleg G., ‘Mikhail Grigor’evich Sobakin – rukovoditel’ Moskovskogo Arkhiva Kollegii inostrannykh del,’ in: *Istoriia i arkhivy*, 4 (2017), p. 9–31, here p. 29.

[Müller] (1705–1783), academician and historian, who headed up the Moscow Archive de-facto from 1766 till 1783, was a professional. Nevertheless, being included in the networks of patronage, he was also charged with commissions by the higher officials, which were often personal and official simultaneously.⁶ Though without any special training in history or paleography, or any theoretical apprenticeship, Bantysh-Kamenskii and Malinovskii still did not want to accept the role of modest custodians, or guardians, of outdated papers either, as my research reveals.⁷ It was the time when the study of primary sources was taking centre stage, and referring to one's sources demonstrated the historian's ability to sort out the genuine from the fabulous.⁸ It seems like Bantysh-Kamenskii and Malinovskii felt the spirit of the time, when the physical space of the archive turned the archival records into historical, and people came to anticipate that archived documents could potentially be reused, to their advantage or disadvantage, and connote value, tradition and *usable* past.⁹ The archival gallery of the administrators of foreign affairs, collected by Bantysh-Kamenskii during 1780s – early 1800s and located in the archival chambers, defined the new historiographic program, presenting in one row the past and the present.¹⁰

* * *

The recent turn to the social history of the early modern record-keeping, reveals that the archives were not neutral and unproblematic reservoirs of historical facts, as was taken for granted due to the legacy of the nineteenth century historiography. It tended to obscure the extent to which the 'keepers' of records themselves played a critical part in establishing the parameters and boundaries of historical understanding.¹¹ How and by whom the papers were

⁶ Kamenskii Aleksandr, *Arkhivnoe delo v Rossii XVIII veka: istoriko-kul'turnyi aspekt*. M., 1991, p. 53; Idem, *Istoriia sozdaniia i publikatsii knigi G.F. Millera 'Izvestie o dvorianakh rossiiskikh'*, in: *Arkheographicheskii ezhegodnik za 1981 god*. Moscow, 1982, p. 169.

⁷ Their failure in reading, understanding, and translating of the *The Lay of Igor's Campaign* was underscored by some Russian formalists back in the 1920s, cf.: Dmitriev L.A., 'Pervye perevody 'Slova o polku Igoreve'', in: *Istoriia pervogo izdaniia 'Slova o polku Igoreve'*. M.; L., 1960, p. 271.); this opinion was supported independently by A.V. Kuchkin, 'O novom izdanii dogovorov i zaveshchaniu russkikh kniazei XIV–XVI vv.', in: *Rossiiskaia istoriia*, 3 (2016), p. 3–26, here p. 17, which concerns the charters of Grand Dukes of Muscovy. Still, in a document on Malinovskii's service composed prior to 1805, there was stated that he "had been initially instructed in Russian history and diplomacy by the late historiography Actual [State] Counselor Miller" (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (further – RGADA), f. 197, op. 1, d. 42., part 2, l, 36.) The first institutions for the professional training of historians that would enforce correct reading – that is, what sorts of things to "read" in a document and what to disregard – were nowhere in sight before 1800, see: Feldner Heiko, 'The New Scientificity In Historical Writing Around 1800,' in: Stephan Berger, Heiko Feldner, Kevin Passmore (eds.) *Writing History: Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. NY, 2010, p. 13.

⁸ Feldner, 'The New Scientificity,' p. 14.

⁹ Blouin, Rosenberg, *Processing the Past*, p. 21; Friedrichs Markus, 'The Rise of Archival Consciousness in Province France: French Feudal Records and Eighteenth-Century Seigneurial Society,' in: *Past and Present* 11 (2016), Supplement, p. 50f.

¹⁰ On the gallery, see details: Lavrinovich Maya, 'Portraits In The Archive Of the Foreign College In the Late 18th – Early 19th Century As a Means Of Its Officials' Self-Representation,' in: *Basic Research Program Working Papers, Series: Humanities, WP BRP 180/Hum/2019*.

¹¹ Walsham Alexandra, 'The Social History of the Archive: Record-Keeping in Early Modern Europe,' in: *Past and Present* 11 (2016), Supplement, p. 9–10.

referred to, read, arranged and used, as well as materiality of the objects and spaces (from ink to buildings), is crucial for understanding the impact of organized record-keeping on the mental frameworks, basic expectations and the daily social practices of the archival employees. The symbolic and non-literate use of writing resulted from this: the archive itself became a source of writing the history of its keepers. Far from neutral and impersonal texts, the archival administrative records were a forum within which officials engaged in a form of ‘creative writing’, amending and fabricating the history of the institutions for which they worked.¹²

Some unearthed sources of the *Excerpt* by Malinovskii, prove that he was carrying out an ambitious intention to become a historian of the Foreign College and its archive. By 1784, when Bantysh-Kamenskii brought the first portraits of the administrators of foreign affairs in Russia to the Archive, some evidence on the history of the foreign department was already collected there. In the 1770s, the archival secretaries, Bantysh-Kamenskii and Martyn Sokolovskii, under the supervision of Miller, completed excerpts concerning the *d'iaks* of *Posol'skii prikaz* and the members of Foreign College from the archival records with the note, “Touchant le Departem: des Affaires Etrangeres”.¹³ They started with the appointment of *d'iak* Fedor Kuritsyn in 1494 by Grand Duke Ivan III, and concluded with the appointment of vice-chancellor Count Ivan Osterman in 1775. The excerpts were detailed, reciting all the *d'iaks* of the *Prikaz*, the highest officials of the Foreign College, its presidents, vice-chancellors and chancellors. As they got closer to the present times, these records turned into service records, containing career trajectories, appointments, and awards.¹⁴ By 1781, Sokolovskii summarized these excerpts and composed a survey entitled, *News on the Posol'skii prikaz currently known as the State Foreign College*¹⁵. The information about the key figures in the foreign affairs administration of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, unearthed by Malinovskii's predecessors, turned out to be usable also for him, though not in a political vein. In the folder *The Chancellors' Biographies In Draft 1762–1815*, kept in his personal fund, he continued to collect notes on the service of the administrators of foreign affairs, following the same form of service record as the archival excerpts of the 1770s. He started with Chancellor Mikhail Vorontsov, the last one in the portraits' row, and concluded with vice-chancellor Aleksander Kurakin, who finally resigned in 1802.¹⁶ Chancellors, vice-chancellors, and the key members of the College during Paul I's (Fedor Rostopchin, Stepan Kolychev, Nikita Petrovich Panin,

¹² Walsham, ‘The Social History of the Archive,’ p. 46; Friedrichs, ‘The Rise of Archival Consciousness,’ p. 51.

¹³ RGADA, f. 180, op. 3, d. 90, l. 2.

¹⁴ RGADA, f. 180, op. 3, d. 90, l. 1–41ob.

¹⁵ RGADA, f. 180, op. 16, d. 440; clean copy: RGADA, f. 180, op. 6, d. 14, l. 1–4ob.

¹⁶ Drafts of the of biographies of the College's members – the brothers Malinovskii's contemporaries see: Otdel pis'mennykh istochnikov Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo museia (further – OPI GIM), f. 33, d. 26, l. 21–44).

Viktor Kochubei, Adam Czartoryski) and Alexander I's (Aleksandr Vorontsov, Andrei Budberg) reigns, compiled in the early 1800s, were tabulated in two columns according to the template of the archival excerpts from 1770s. Below, the abridged information was followed by more extended biographical notes on them. Aleksei worked these service records *per se*, into biographical notes together with his younger brother Vasilii Malinovskii (1765–1814), as the handwritings, though barely distinguishable, attest. The latter is famous as being the first director of the Tsarskoe Selo Lyceum and not as an official of the Foreign College, which he was for all his career.¹⁷ They replenished gradually, their notes on their contemporaries who administered foreign affairs (Nikita Ivanovich Panin, Ivan Osterman, Bezborodko) and even on historical figures (Vasilii Golitsyn, Aleksei Bestuzhev-Riumin), using the excerpts from the Archive. From them, the paper sheet with Vasilii Golitsyn's service record was torn out and placed into the collection of biographical notes which are kept separately in Chertkov's collection.¹⁸ If Aleksei could easily get the information from the records in his archive, not surprisingly, Vasilii could have access to some data about the officials due to his service, particularly, during 1780s. He authored draft memoirs on the highest officials which he observed while working as a secretary in Ivan Osterman's chancellery.¹⁹ The biographical notes compiled by them, contained evidence on the past or current service, awards, or retirement of the highest officials, including their origin or marriages if possible. These notes produced the framework for the essays of the *Biographies* (1816) – 'extended service records' that Malinovskii filled up with panegyric clichés, according to the eighteenth century notion of a statesman's biography being a commendation.²⁰ Those who ruled the foreign affairs after 1762, including the younger members of the College, were recited in the *Review of Changes* (1762–1817), attached to two later copies of the *Biographies*. Thus, during the 1800s, when the space of the Archive had been replenishing with the portraits of the recently resigned or late officials of the College (Osterman, Bezborodko, Kurakin, Voronstov), Malinovskii continued to collect and work on evidence on the College's highest officials from different sources, and introduced this information gradually into his comprehensive manuscript, *Excerpt on the regulations of the former Posol'skii prikaz, renamed later to the College of Foreign*

¹⁷ Being hired in the Archive two years later after Aleksei (1781), he embarked upon a career in the College in late 1783 in Petersburg as vice-chancellor Osterman's secretary. Observing his contemporaries – the highest officials of the College, he started to write down some notes since late 1780s guided by the purpose "to write a history of present time".

¹⁸ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 26, l. 36–36ob., 43; OPI GIM, f. 450, d. 804, l. 17–26ob., 35 – 39ob., on Vasilii Golitsyn: l. 4–4ob.

¹⁹ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 26. Aleksei Malinovskii signed the file with his own handwrite 'Memoires by my brother Vasilii Fedorovich Malinovskii'.

²⁰ Kalugin Dmitrii, *Proza zhizni. Russkie biografii v XVIII – XIX vv.* St Petersburg, 2015, p. 114.

*Affairs, on the officials ... who administered foreign affairs, and on the files currently stored in the Moscow Archive.*²¹

Part III of the *Excerpt* deals with the core of Malinovskii's activities – the storage and library of the Archive. Summarized, it was attached only to Chertkov's copy of the *The Biographical Data on the Administrators of Foreign Affairs in Russia* (further – *Biographies*), entitled, *About the Moscow Archive of the State College of Foreign Affairs*.²² In the copy to be presented to the Emperor, Malinovskii included only the description of the archival storage as the most important part of his 'realm', and ignored the library and gallery of those who administered foreign affairs. They both composed the sixth unit of the Archive. Sixteen portraits were recited in the Archival gallery, including also the portraits collected after 1784, with that of Rumiantsev being the last one.²³ According to the paper watermarks, Malinovskii wrote this part at a stretch in 1807 or 1808, after Bantysh-Kamenskii asked Count Nikolai Petrovich Rumiantsev to provide the gallery with his portrait. The date suggests that Malinovskii wrote this part in order to catch the interest of the newly appointed Chancellor Rumiantsev, both a professional diplomat and a collector of historical manuscripts, who also claimed status in the world of scholarship.²⁴ He was looking for Rumiantsev's patronage, that he would in fact retain till the Chancellor's death.

The pragmatic use of the text and even its parts, did not exclude that Malinovskii definitely wanted to become a 'historian' of the College and its archive. But what he wrote was not a historical narrative by its form. He shaped the *Excerpt* as annals, excluding any interpretation or explanation, just like Bantysh-Kamenskii. Like in the Middle Ages, his manner of writing consisted only of a list of events ordered in chronological sequence, lacking any imagination, following Hayden White.²⁵ In this regard, Part IV is especially remarkable, even being titled like annals: *Annual News on the Highest Orders and Decrees regarding the Moscow Archive issued by the Governing Senate and the State College of Foreign Affairs*. Its first version embraced the period from the early seventeenth century till 1796 the same as Part II, *The Nominal Roll* (listing of the officials) did. Together, alongside Part I that dealt with the history of the foreign department, they composed the earliest version of the *Excerpt* created during Paul I's reign, and sent it to the College in 1800. A draft of the Part IV, kept separately

²¹ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091.

²² OPI GIM, f. 445, op. 1, d. 96.

²³ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, l. 54ob.

²⁴ See: Bekasova Aleksandra V., "Uchenye zaniatiia" russkogo aristokrata kak sposob samorealizatsii (na primere grafa N.P. Rumiantseva,' in: *Voprosy estestvoznaniia i tekhniki*, 1 (1995), p. 24–39, esp. p. 37.

²⁵ White Hayden, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality,' in *Critical Inquiry*, Autumn, 7 (1980), 1, pp. 5–27, here p. 9.

in Malinovskii's fund, testifies to this textual structure.²⁶ But unlike Part II, Part IV had to do, not with the persons, but with an institution – the history of the Archive of *Posol'skii Prikaz* and Foreign College. Likewise, the history is told through the prism of keeping, transporting, inventorying, and sorting out the archival records. The first entry is that of 1614, when the tsar Mikhail Fedorovich gave an order to sort out the records that had been disarrayed during the political turmoil of the previous years.²⁷ The reign of Peter I is not represented here as a rupture in the history of the Archive when, in fact, the relevant documents turned to the 'vestiges' of an nonexistent department. From Peter I's reign, only a new inventorying of state-important records in 1699 and their relocation in a trunk, and transfer to a secure place to be safe from a fire in 1700, is mentioned.²⁸ To establish a link between the *Prikaz's* Archive and the newly appeared College, Malinovskii included the College's first staff (1720) and the *Instruction* issued for Aleksei Pochainov in 1722 to sort out the records of the *Prikaz*, in his annals.²⁹ Indeed, it was a way to represent history which was already used by Bantysh-Kamenskii or Sokolovskii under the supervision of Miller: in their excerpts from 1770s, they did not distinguish between the Muscovite *Prikaz* and the office established by Peter I: *d'iaks*, *dumnye d'iaks*, and *pechatniki* (those who had the state seal at their disposal) administered foreign affairs before Ordin-Nashchokin was appointed the Keeper of the State Seal and headed the *Prikaz* in 1667 as its *president*.³⁰ Thus, the archival officials insisted implicitly on their own version of institutional history, alleging that its new page was opened much earlier, and in Moscow, not in St Petersburg.

White noticed that the annals do not conclude, they simply terminate, since there is no central subject about which a story could be told.³¹ Malinovskii worked in this manner: after 1804, he amplified the text of *The Nominal Roll*, with further evidence on the changes in the foreign department, pasting new sheets of paper (with 1806 watermarks) and extended listing of the key figures, though briefly, till 1814 when Rumiantsev resigned, Count Karl Nesselrode was appointed the Emperor's reporter on foreign affairs, and Ivan Andreevich Weidemeier (1752–1820) started to fulfill the duties of the College's head.³² Part IV, *Annual News*, was continued almost synchronously till 1806, then entries were interrupted for the whole period

²⁶ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55.

²⁷ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55, l. 1a; RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, l. 63b.

²⁸ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55, l. 1a – 2; RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, l. 64.

²⁹ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, ll. 64b ob.– 65ob.

³⁰ RGADA, f. 180, op. 16, d. 440, l. 1. In the same vein, Miller in his *History of Russian Nobility* did his best to correlate *d'iaks* with state-, ober- and Senate secretaries of the Petrine time (see: Kamenskii A. (ed.), Gerard Fridrikh Miller, *Sochineniia po istorii Rossii. Izbrannoe*, M., 1996, p. 215)

³¹ White, 'The Value of Narrativity,' p. 12f.

³² RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, 54b – 54b ob.

of the Ministry of Rumiantsev (who obtained a full up-to-date version of the *Excerpt* in 1807 from Bantysh-Kamenskii, with a reminder to send his portrait to the Archive). The writing though, recommenced from 1807, but not earlier than 1814 according to the paper watermarks, and continued till 1817 – the date indicated both in the title of the *Excerpt* and the *Review of Changes*, attached to the later copies of the *Biographies*.³³ Indeed, annals as a means of writing history became antiquated in the eighteenth century, and Malinovskii, involved when not in academia but in translating and book editing, was aware of this fact. One should remember another fact: in his younger years, Malinovskii embarked upon a career of translator for the magazines published by the Moscow Rosicrucians, under the supervision of Nikolai Novikov who was engaged also in historiographical activities. On the one hand, they were supported by the Empress, who encouraged publishing of *Drevniaia Rossiiskaia Vivliofika*, and in the 1770s, Miller and Bantysh-Kamenskii supplied Novikov with the archival records for publishing.³⁴ On the other hand, Raffaella Faggionato argues, through this revival of the ‘literary monuments’ buried in the archives, Rosicrucians appropriated a duty that in the past had been assigned to the monk-chronicler (*letopisets*), guardian and defender of the spiritual legacy of Rus’.³⁵

Though taking into account the Masonic background, one should resort to White in order to intertwine Malinovskii’s choice in the complicated network of the career and power relations. For the annalist, White argued, there is no need to claim the authority to narrate events, since there is nothing problematic about their status as manifestations of a reality. It is necessary only to record events in the order that they come to notice, for since there is no contest, there is no story to tell.³⁶ Lacking a ‘problem’ did not allow Malinovskii to author a ‘normal’ narrative. The evidence taken from the official records of the previous epochs were unquestionable for Malinovskii as well as for Bantysh-Kamenskii. Being ‘learned officials’ and not historians,³⁷ they inventoried, copied and extracted documents that had meaning, just because they originated within an authoritative state institution which continuity through the centuries was an earnest authenticity of its history. This connection, strengthened by the departmental gallery, was essential for them, unlike Miller who, on the contrary, ignored the genealogy of the records placing more importance on the function or formal features of the

³³ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, l. 108 – 137.

³⁴ See correspondence between Novikov, Miller, and Catherine II’s secretary on these issues: RGADA, f. 180, op. 1, d. 49, l. 166; f. 199, folder 389, part 1, d. 2, l. 38; partly published in: Tikhonravov Nikolai, *Letopisi russkoi literatury i drevnosti*, vol. IV, M., 1862, p. 42 (3rd pag.)

³⁵ Faggionato Raffaella, *A Rosicrucian Utopia in Eighteenth-Century Russia. The Masonic Circle of N.I. Novikov*, S.l.: Springer, 2005, p. 137.

³⁶ White, ‘The Value of Narrativity,’ p. 22

³⁷ According to Bekasova, ‘‘Uchenye zaniatiia’ russkogo aristokrata,’ p. 37.

document.³⁸ Until Malinovskii became the chief of the Archive in 1814, he did not dare to author something like a narrative. The *Biographies* only aspired but failed to achieve narrativity, as they lacked ‘narrative closure’, according to White’s attribution of this kind of writing.³⁹ He featured ‘official biographies’ which language – the language of service – remained simple and recognizable.⁴⁰ Malinovskii did not avoid tropes as he did in the manuscript of the *Excerpt* – annals of the College and the Archive – but used pathetic definitions or sometimes metaphors to attest the officials. For instance, to evade any criticism of vice-chancellor Andrei Osterman, whose sons, vice-chancellor Ivan Andreevich and Moscow governor Fedor Andreevich, patronized him and his brother, he used a parable: “He [Andrei Osterman] walked along the path of fortune [*shchastie*].”⁴¹ Thus he alluded that Osterman ruined the families of the Dolgorukovs and the Golitsyns, being guided by his political interests. “Fortune”, a category from the seventeenth century’s court guides, not morality, was the underlying theme for Malinovskii, whereas narrativity is related to the impulse to moralize reality identified with the social system, of which Malinovskii had nothing to tell.⁴²

In this regard, Malinovskii’s works should be juxtaposed with history writing in the 1800s. In 1803, his contemporary, Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766–1826), was appointed the official historiographer at the Russian court due to the favour (*milost’*) of the higher officials who patronized him – a fact well-known to his contemporaries.⁴³ He obtained the monopoly to compose and publish a general writing on the history of Russia, a new rank, a pension, and the unique access to the documents stored in the Archive of Foreign College, not available to the public without a special permission from the College or the Emperor. During the following years, Karamzin authored the first Russian ‘great narrative’ – *A History of the Russian State*, using the archival records he was provided with by Malinovskii. Contributing to the official narrative in this way, Malinovskii could re-estimate the significance of the records kept by him.

³⁸ Samoshenko Vadim, *Istoriia arkhivnogo dela v dorevoliutsionnoi Rossii*. M., 1989, p. 57.

³⁹ White, ‘The Value of Narrativity,’ p. 9.

⁴⁰ Kalugin, *Proza zhizni*, p. 113.

⁴¹ NIOR RNB, f. 256, d. 260, p. 73.

⁴² White, ‘The Value of Narrativity,’ p. 17; in the other words, ‘historical understanding comes through both the narrative form of the history as well as its content then it has to be recognized that past events are highly unlikely to have their own ‘given’ much less discoverable for ‘what it was’ story’ (Alun Munslow, ‘Introduction,’ in: Munslow, ed., *Authoring the Past: Writing and Rethinking History* (London&New York, 2013), p. 5.

⁴³ Velizhev Mikhail, ‘Politik ponevole? Istoriograf, monarck I publichnaia sfera v Rossii nachala XIX veka,’ in: *Novoe Literaturnoe obozrenie*, vol. 151 (2018), 3.

Though earlier, he had already managed to present his writings to the Empress via vice-chancellor Osterman (1795) or had been working for the Chancellor Vorontsov compiling records on the Supreme Privy Council, these contributions were, firstly, only excerpts from the archival records, and, secondly, of private or departmental, but not public use. Now, due to Karamzin's activities, he could ascertain that the records kept by him were a source of profit and reputation at the highest and public level. Still, Malinovskii's writings had nothing to do with Karamzin's principles, who was preoccupied with the opinion of the posterity, and took the responsibility of conveying it to his contemporaries as a historian. Besides, Karamzin positioned himself as an opponent of bureaucracy, though accepting its privileges and benefits.⁴⁴ Karamzin considered his writing to be a business of public importance whereas Malinovskii was limited to his departmental, or state interests. Not accidentally, Malinovskii concluded the list of the portraits in Part III of the *Excerpt*, with a comment: "... the persons curious to see the Russian antiquities recall the important merits of famous persons who were the first ones in the administering of foreign affairs for the glory and good of the Russian empire during the last 150 years."⁴⁵ Malinovskii created the manuscript of the *Biographies* as a shortcut of four parts of the larger *Excerpt* during 1813–1816. His intention to present the manuscript to the Emperor, allows us to suppose that he competed with Karamzin, though within a limited field. Besides, through Karamzin, who had access to the aristocratic court circle, he involved state secretary Ioannis Kapodistria to hand the manuscript over to the Emperor – he managed to do this after more than a year's efforts.⁴⁶

Unlike Karamzin, Malinovskii had nothing to say to the posterity but addressed only the highest officials and the Emperor, writing the history of bureaucracy and of its relationships with the autocracy. Not surprisingly, in the late 1810s, Aleksei Arakcheev, who personified the soulless bureaucratic machine for Karamzin, became his patron and mediator at the court.⁴⁷ Malinovskii, a part and parcel of bureaucracy striving to gain a foothold in the hierarchy, underscored the significance of the Archive and of himself to the monarchy. The key text of the *Excerpt* that reveals his intentions, is Part IV, *Annual News on the ... Archive*, with the

⁴⁴ Especially his opposition to the bureaucracy was clear in the situation when he could not obtain an audience from Alexander I in 1816. Karamzin first refused to resort to the assistance of the Emperor's factotum Aleksei Andreevich Arakcheev who personified the imperial bureaucratic machine for the contemporaries but finally he had to, otherwise he could not reach Alexander I and receive funding to print the first eight volumes of his *History*. See: Iurii Lotman, "O drevnei i novoi Rossii v ee politicheskom i grazhdanskom otnosheniiakh" Karamzina – pamiatnik russkoi publitsistiki nachala XIX veka," in: Lotman, *Izbrannyye stat'i*, vol. II. Tallinn, 1992, p. 194–205, here p. 203f.

⁴⁵ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, ll. 63 ob. – 63a.

⁴⁶ See on this issue: Lavrinovich Maya, 'Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii (1762–1840): chinovnik na sluzhbe istorii,' in: Gus'kov S.N. (ed.), *Chiny i muzy: (materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii, 10–12 oktiabria 2016 goda)*. Sbornik statei. SPb., Tver', 2017, p. 72–93.

⁴⁷ His contemporaries emphasized this fact, for example, Mikhail Dmitriev in his memoirs: Dmitriev, *Glavy iz vospominanii moei zhizni*. M., 1998, p. 165.

Archive presented as an object of governing, and its petty-officials as screws of the bureaucratic machine. Importantly, the text sheds light on the personal motives that moved Malinovskii to create this “official narrative”. First, from the initial title of this part “...about... the activities of the archival officials since 1779”, follows that he intended describing the archival activities only since the year when the new College’s staff roll was approved, and he was admitted to the Archive as a petty officer. But later the author’s message changed: the date was deleted from the title, and the history of the Archive was started in 1614.⁴⁸ Malinovskii mentioned himself for the first time in the 1786 entry, with his first work being sent to the College, *The Register of the files Concerning the Crimea Tatars*.⁴⁹ Further, he gradually included his personal achievements in the chronicle of the state institution, not refraining to mention his services, ranks, or awards received from the College, or from the Empress, for the new registers, excerpts, and collections of files.⁵⁰ Noteworthy, in the preface to the *The Nominal Roll*, he presented *d’iaks* as indispensable for the state, underscoring their origin from the ‘middle estate’, whereas Russian nobles kept aloof from administration, preferring military service.⁵¹ Here, one cannot help but recognize Malinovskii’s own claims to participate in the state affairs, regardless of his low origin.

By the nineteenth century, growing bureaucracy started demanding its own symbolic representation. For both Bantysh-Kamenskii and Malinovskii, the Archive authorized their membership in the service tier, granting them a feeling of security through ranks and awards. As Richard Wortman pointed out, since Peter I’s reign, nobility was defined by service to the tsar and the state. The power of the “well-born”, who were destined to rule, derived from their service to the tsar, not from feudal privileges, and from their performance as cultivated westernized noblemen that distinguished them from the other estates of the realm.⁵² To be integrated in this ruling strata, Bantysh-Kamenskii and especially Malinovskii, who was not a nobleman by birth but obtained the noble status through service, had to represent themselves as indispensable for their institution and through it, for the state. To produce these meanings, they used the space of the archival building in the Muscovite style to locate there the

⁴⁸ According to the copy of Part IV separately kept in: OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55, l. 1a.

⁴⁹ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55, l. 13.

⁵⁰ OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 55, ll. 13, 14ob., 15 etc.

⁵¹ RGADA, f. 181, op. 11, d. 1091, l. 47.

⁵² Wortman Richard, ‘Cultural Metamorphoses of Imperial Myth under Catherine the Great and Nicolas I,’ in Wortman, *Visual Texts, Ceremonial Texts, Texts of Explorations*. Academic studies press 2013, p. 123.

westernized portrait gallery that linked together two epochs and lined up symbolically, a complicated history of the institution from Muscovy to their times as a continuous symbolic narrative.

For Malinovskii, it was important to emphasize both his personal and the Archive's contribution to state affairs. The portraits located in the archival chambers pushed him to look for details of the officials' service, but the only form of writing history available to him was making excerpts and presenting them in the form of a chronicle. The excerpts made by his predecessors, could become a powerful incentive, whereas his brother Vasili's notes on his contemporaries and access to their service data could facilitate his work. All these sources, painted and written ones, became connected through the larger manuscript – *Excerpt on the regulations of the former Posol'skii prikaz*, the meta-history of the Archive, compiled during the 1800s. The 'written gallery', the *Biographies*, was based on the *Excerpt*, as an official narrative was designed for the Emperor in order to demonstrate the ties of the Archive with the College as an institution, and with the key statesmen on the top of the state hierarchy whose images were displayed on the archival walls. Finally, by putting together the heads of *Prikaz* with the heads of the College, and underscoring the Archive's consistency on this background, Bantysh-Kamenskii and Malinovskii emphasized the continuity of the state institution, but if the former was more concerned with the visual impact, the latter highlighted the 'historical' component.

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

© Lavrinovich, 2020