



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Igor Fedyukin

**THE TRUBETSKOI CIRCLE:
ARISTOCRATIC *PETIT-MAÎTRES*
IN MOD-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
ST PETERSBURG**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 156/HUM/2017

*Igor Fedyukin*¹

**THE TRUBETSKOI CIRCLE:
ARISTOCRATIC *PETIT-MAÎTRES* IN MOD-
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ST PETERSBURG**

This paper is an attempt to reconstruct the social and cultural life of young aristocrats in mid-eighteenth century St Petersburg by focusing on one aristocratic circle, one that revolved around Prince Nikita Trubetskoi, the procurator-general. In particular it traces the ways on which sociable behavior and libertine practices intertwined with early traces of “Enlightenment,” affective turn, and discoursing on important societal issues such as the rules of noble service and the status of the nobility.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: Russia, nobility, service, affective turn, Elizabeth, sociability, libertines

¹ Igor Fedyukin, National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), Moscow, Russia. E-mail: ifedyukin@hse.ru.

Visiting “indecent woman,” such as Drezdentsha and her “crew” did not always work out as planned, of course. Sometimes early in the December of 1746 a group of officers gathered in St Petersburg in the apartment of Nikolai Chaadaev, an army ensign. Incidentally, Chaadaev was under house arrest at that time for having earlier beaten up a clerk to the powerful Count Aleksandr Ivanovich Shuvalov, the then head of the Secret Chancellery. Still, arrest or no arrest, Chaadaev hosted a dinner that night. His guests included Baron Petr Shafirov, a private of the Preobrazhenskii Guards and the grandson of Peter I’s vice-chancellor; Prince Vasiliĭ Dolgorukov, a lieutenant of the First Moscow Infantry Regiment; Nikolai Rzhhevskii, an NCO of the Preobrazhenskii Guards; and Ivan Izmailov, an NCO of the Horse Guards. Sometimes after 9pm the gentlemen decided to go to Uliana Maksheeva-*Udachka* (“the Lucky”), “a whore.” As many others inhabitants of the capital, *Udachka* rented a house at a large urban estate, in his case, that of Anastasia Aleksandrovna Naryshkina, whose late husband was a close relative of Peter I’s mother. Unfortunately, unbeknownst to the young men, *Udachka* has recently moved from her wooden house in the backyard, facing the Moika river, to a cheaper and more conveniently located apartment on the same estate, in the main courtyard. So, as the young men left their sleigh at the street and began walking towards her residence along the side passage, they were confronted by Naryshkina’s majordomo. He told the gentlemen that the lady in question was gone: clearly, *Udachka*’s parlor was far from clandestine. The visitors were unpersuaded, so the servants dared them to check it out for themselves, if they so wished, and cursed them. The gentlemen shouted some obscenities back, banged on *Udachka*’s closed door for a while, and eventually got on their way back to the sleigh, muddling through the show in the dark.

This story really should’ve ended here. Yet, for some reason the majordomo decided to teach the young aristocrats a lesson, and as the latter were about to depart, called for domestic serfs to attack the the visitors with clubs trying to cut them off from the sleigh. Baron Shafirov fled to the nearby house of General Izmailov, one of the young men’s father, to call for help, but others drew their swords. Two of Naryshkina’s domestics and a conscientious passerby who tried to break up the fight ended up wounded, Rzhhevskii got his on the head with a club, and Dolgorukov received some minor beating. The officers retreated into the nearby house of Nikolai Chirikov, a friend of theirs, and eventually went home. Naryshkina was not at her residence as all of this was happening, so she could not intervene; in the morning, however, she complained to the police, and everyone involved was detained, including the poor *Udachka* who was not even present at the melee. Only Rzhhevskii was left alone as his wound was so bad that he could not be moved around.²

This group of young aristocrats and guardsmen is typical of the wider universe of *petimetry* that became so visible in St Petersburg by 1750. Just like the majority of Drezdentsha’s clients, they were NCOs and junior officers of the guards or of the more prestigious regiments of the line stationed at the capital, such as the Ingermanland Infantry. While their botched visit to *Udachka* made a bit of a splash in the capital and attracted the sovereign’s attention, it was by no means unique: the records of the era are peppered with scandals of that or similar varieties. Only a year later, Prince Vasiliĭ Dolgorukov got involved in another incident, this time along with his brother Prince Petr, an NCO of the Guards, and a cousin of theirs, Prince Aleksandr Khovanskii.³ In October 1747, in Moscow, the three aristocrats dined – and drunk – at the house of a friend, Fedor Rzhhevskii, an officer of the Izmailovskii Guards and Princess Natalia Beloselskaia’s first cousin. They left at something past five in the afternoon and went to Anastasia Stepanovna Lopukhina, spent there some time in the company of their relatives – their mothers were also present – and went home past midnight. On the way, however, they stopped at the house of Princess Marfa Bariatinkaia, an elder lady, who afterwards complained about their

² Prince Nikita Trubetskoi to Prince Petr Trubetskoi, December 2, 1746. St Petersburg Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SPII RAN), f. 115, d. 337, l. 11-12; also, materials of police investigation of this episode, Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. RGADA, f. 8, op. 1, d. 50.

³ RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 6.

behavior to their mothers and eventually to the empress herself. Allegedly, the young gentlemen were drunk and insulted her. As a result, in March 1748 the trio landed under lock at the Secret Chancellery.⁴

While not very exceptional per se, these episodes are interesting for our purposes because they provide an entry point for exploring the life of one of the aristocratic circles in mid-eighteenth century St Petersburg – one that revolved around none other than Prince Nikita Trubetskoi, the procurator-general of the Senate. Prince Nikita's correspondence (it is on his letters to his son, Prince Petr, that our description of the failed expedition to Udachka is based), along with – predictably! – police files and Prince Petr's unpublished memoirs allow us to reconstruct how such circles operated, and how debauchery was intertwined with other forms of socializing, and socializing – with literary pursuits and with “serious” discourses about important societal issues.

Indeed, Trubetskoi's was arguably one of the most notable elite cultural circles in mid-century Russia. While Prince Mikhail Beloselskii was closely involved back in the 1720s with the Mons-Stoletov crowd and might have rubbed shoulders with Vasilii Trediakovskii in Tsarevna Ekaterina's antechamber, these contacts were rather tangential. Prince Nikita Trubetskoi, on the other hand, was in his youth closely and intimately associated with another leading poet of the age, Prince Antiokh Cantemir (1709-1744).⁵ It is to his friend Trubetskoi that Cantemir addressed one of his last satires. In one of his missives, Trubetskoi thanks Kantemir for his letter which was, apparently, written in verse: he feels obliged to reciprocate, but imagines Muse banning him from doing so due to his unworthiness. Still, he throws in some rhymed passages:

Are you the one to write in verses to Antiokh in London,
as you see that Muse herself is inferior to him?
Drop your pen...

Rather, Muse would advise the author to “keep company with Bacchus, for in wines you'd be able to know good taste.”⁶ The friends were also related by marriage: Prince Nikita's niece, Anastasia, was Prince Antiokh's step-mother. (She would later become Princess of Hessen-Homburg through her second marriage. Ivan Ivanovich Betskoi, the leading educational entrepreneur of Catherine II's reign, was her bastard half-brother). Both Prince Nikita's first wife Anastasia (née Golovkina) and his two sisters Maria (Princess Cherkasskaia in marriage) and Praskovia (Saltykova) appear to have been involved with the practice of composing love-themed “songs” in the 1720s as addressees, and Praskovia perhaps even as an author.⁷ Nor was Prince Nikita unfamiliar with the amorous practices at court. Rumors had it that around 1728 he had to tolerate, indeed, even witness his first wife's liaison with Ivan Dolgorukov, Peter II's young and haughty favorite, who threatened to throw out the cuckolded husband out from his own window. Prince Nikita's second wife Anna, the gossip went, much assisted her husband's career in the 1730s by being accommodating to Field-Marshal von Münnich's affection for her.

The younger generation of the Trubetskoi circle includes, of course, his own children, such as Prince Petr, but also his step-son Mikhail Mikhailovich Kheraskov (1733-1807), who would become one of the leading playwrights of the era and the director of the Moscow University. In the late 1740s-early 1750s Kheraskov was still enrolled in the Noble Cadet Corps, and the year after the Drezdesha affair he graduated as a sub-lieutenant and entered the Ingermanland Infantry Regiment: both his fellow cadets and fellow Ingermanland officers figure prominently in the papers of the Kalinkin Commission. Our narrative, though, centers on

⁴ RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 6-7.

⁵ For his biography and literature on him, see S.I. Nikolaev, “Kantemir Antiokh Dmitrievich,” in *Slovar' russkikh pisateley XVIII veka*, ed. A.M. Panchenko, vol. 2, K-P (SPb.: Nauka, 1999), 15-21.

⁶ Prince Nikita Trubetskoi to Prince Antiokh Kantemir, August 11, 1733. Helmut Grasshoff, *Antioch Dmitrievič Kantemir und Westeuropa. Ein russischer Schriftsteller des 18. Jahrhunderts und seine Beziehungen zur westeuropäischen Literatur und Kunst* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966), 280-82.

⁷ A.V. Pozdneev, *Rukopisnye peseniki XVII-XVIII vv.: Iz istorii pesen. sillabich. poehzii* (M.: Nauka, 1996), 295-302.

Trubetskoi's more distant kinsmen, the Khovanskii and the Dolgorukov brothers. Prince Aleksandr Khovanskii (1722-1794) and his brother Prince Petr Khovanskii (1724-1808) were the eldest among the numerous children of Prince Vasilii Petrovich Khovanskii (1694-1746). In his youth, Prince Vasilii gained some notoriety for his wild escapades: according to von Bergholtz, he, along with his fellows, got another young aristocrat dead drunk – and then put him in a coffin, took it to a church, and performed, or rather perverted, all the appropriate funerary rituals, not forgetting in the process to desecrate the church vessels. While this kind of behavior was very much in line with Peter I's own antics of the All-Drunken Assembly mode, in this instances the pranksters were condemned to death, though eventually pardoned and whipped in the tsar's presence. By the mid-1740s Khovanskii became Master of the Horse, and then the head of the Main Magistracy in Moscow – the executive body in charge of urban governance. After his death, Prince Vasilii was mourned by Prince Nikita Trubetskoi as his “friend,”⁸ but before that he arranged for his son Petr's marriage to his friend's daughter.

Prince Vasilii Dolgorukov (1726-1803), who got beaten up during the unsuccessful visit to Udachka the “whore,” as well as his brother Petr Dolgorukov, implicated in the Princess Bariatinskaia episode, were the sons of the one of the leading Petrine diplomates Prince Sergei Grigorievich Dolgorukov, beheaded in 1739 along with his relatives for their role in the 1730 political crisis. While they have been rehabilitated after Elizabeth's accession, Prince Vasilii by the late 1740s was merely a lieutenant in the 1st Moscow Infantry Regiment. His brother Prince Petr Dolgorukov was enrolled at the Noble Cadet Corps in 1732-1738: he was thus a member of the age cohort that included also Sumarokov, Ivan Melissino, Adam Olsufiev, and others – and that became famous for launching theatrical and poetical initiatives at this elite school. Prince Petr must have surely been acquainted with them. The Khovanskiis and the Dolgorukovs were first cousins: their mothers were the daughters of the late Vice-Chancellor Shafirov. So, Baron Petr Shafirov, who run for help during the fight with the Naryshkina's domestic serfs in 1746, was the Khovanskiis' and the Dolgorukovs' cousin. His father, the young princes' maternal uncle Isaia Shafirov was most notorious for his gambling, as a year earlier, in 1745, the empress issued a ban on selling or mortgaging his properties and on lending him money, as well as on playing cards or other games of chance with him; eventually, his estates were placed under stewardship, and he himself declared insane.⁹ His case, along with that of Grigorii Grigorievich Chernyshev, Beloselskii's brother-in-law, were among the earliest instances of direct interference by Elizabeth into the domestic affairs of her aristocratic subjects in order to curb their profligacy. In their testimonies, the Khovanskiis also listed as a cousin and friend Mikhail Sobakin, likewise a member of the Sumarokov age cohort at the Cadet Corps and an amateur poet in his own right: another literary connection.¹⁰ Notably, Naryshkina's son, Aleksandr, would later one also become their in-law, as in 1759 he married Prince Nikita Trubetskoi's daughter: in the late 1740, though, he was a page at the court and also one of Drezdensha's clients.

So typical in many other respects of the mid-century aristocratic milieu, Aleksandr and Petr Khovanskii also stand out for their stay in Paris in 1742-1746: the ultimate *petimetry* indeed, fresh from France! The brothers have been attached to the Russian mission in the French capital as the *chevalier d'ambassade*. Such appointments were used to prepare the scions of aristocrats families earmarked for diplomatic careers, Paris being the most popular posting, and in the mid-1740s the Russian mission in France boasted a set of especially illustrious *chevalier d'ambassade*, including the Golovin brothers, Golovkin, Efimovskii, Iaguzhinskii, and others.¹¹ Assignment to this rank usually resulted from lobbying by the young men's fathers or guardians.

⁸ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, January 1747. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 17.

⁹ RGADA, f. 8, op. 1, d. 195, l. 1-2, 20-21.

¹⁰ Aleksandr Khovanskii's testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 20-20 ob.; for Sobakin's biography and literature on him, see S.I. Nikolaev, “Sobakin Mikhail Grigor'evich,” in *Slovar' russkikh pisateley XVIII veka*, ed. A.M. Panchenko, vol. 3, R-Ya (SPb.: Nauka, 2010), 141-42.

¹¹ A. Berelowitch, “Evropeiskie obrazovatel'nye putesthestvia russkikh aristokratov.” (forthcoming).

In this case, their father claimed that his sons had learned at home “foreign languages, as well as arithmetic, geometry, fortification, geography and history”; in particular, they had allegedly been studying French for ten years. So, insofar as he knew that some other young aristocrats have already been assigned to such postings, he asked for his two eldest offsprings to be given a chance to prepare themselves for their future service to the sovereign by “seeing other countries and receiving more solid education and practice.”¹² Of course, Khovanskii’s father himself was well-positioned at the court, but it probably mattered that the embassy in Paris was headed first, by Prince Cantimir, Prince Trubetskoi’s dear friend, and then by Heinrich Gross, Cantimir’s former secretary.

According to the Imperial *reskript* addressed by Elizabeth to Gross, the diplomat was to exercise “appropriate supervision” over the young men and to direct them to learn “everything that might be required for them to perform their service in the future.”¹³ Some glimpses into Khovanskiis’ actual life in Paris could be gleaned from the reports of spies employed by the French police. Even though there is no evidence that the Khovanskiis ever rubbed shoulders with the literary and intellectual luminaries of the French capital, their contacts in Paris were certainly not limited to the Russian coterie. They certainly moved in diplomatic circles: the brothers are mentioned as the only Russian guests at a dinner given by the Danish ambassador, where the Swedish ambassador was also present. They also appear, along with Golovkin, Golovins, and Gross himself, at the gambling establishment of Madame Prévost.

The brothers left Paris on August 6, 1746, just about in time for their sister’s wedding to Petr Trubetskoi on November 12 of the same year.¹⁴ Upon their return the young aristocrats, along with their fellow *chevaliers d’ambassade*, the Dologorukovs and the Golovins, have been examined, upon Elizabeth’s order at the Cadet Corps. Alas, their mastery of “sciences” turned out to be far from impressive: while Prince Aleksandr did have a solid grasp of geometry, he knew only the very foundations of fortification, while Prince Petr had not advanced beyond the “first five rules” of arithmetic. They did have “some” familiarity with history and geography, but demurred from being examined in Italian, admitting that they could only “speak to some extent, but had never written anything.” In spoken French, they did turn out to be fluent, but as for writing, the princes still needed “some practice for better perfection”: their writing sample are indeed reasonably solid, but clearly inferior to those of other examinees.¹⁵ Overall, the brothers are the least accomplished in this cohort, especially if compared to the Dolgorukovs whom the examiners describe in glowing term, praising their mastery not only of mathematics all the way up to algebra, but also of “logics, metaphysics, morals, politics, natural law and the law of nations, theoretical physics, optics... also geography, history, *Institutiones Justiniani*,” and Latin. In French, the Dolgorukovs spoke, apparently, “dans tout sa pureté et avec un facilite admirable, leurs traductions sont fort exactes, leur style de lettres est coulant et phrases bien tournées, et leurs pensées exprimées avec autant de justesse que de netteté.”¹⁶ This gap between the Khovanskiis and their fellow *chevaliers d’ambassade* needs to be put in a perspective, though. Aleksandr and Vasili Dolgorukov (the namesakes and distant relations of the two Dologorukovs mentioned earlier as the Khovanskiis’ cousins), grew up in Europe and were educated under the supervision of a Jansenist abbe,¹⁷ while the Golovins were related to Fedor Golovin (1650-1705), Peter I’s first minister of foreign affairs and a de-facto chancellor. The Khovanskiis lacked such an extensive family exposure to the things western. Notably, Prince

¹² Khovanskii’s petition is in RGADA, f. 248, op. 11, kn. 633, ll. 295-295 ob.

¹³ Svetlana Zheltikova, Svetlana Tourilova, “Sostav rossiiskogo diplomaticheskogo predstavitel’stva vo Frantsii v XVIII veke. Po materialam Arkhiva vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi imperii,” in *La Russie et la France: XVIII^e-XX^e siècles*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Nauka, 2000), 84.

¹⁴ N.Yu. Trubetskoi, “Zhurnal sobstvennyi K.N.T. po vozvrashchenii v 1717 g. iz nemetskoj zemli,” *Russkaya starina* 1 (1870): 39.

¹⁵ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, November 27, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 7; the examination records are in Archive of Foreign Relations of the Russian Empire (AVPRI), f. 2, op. 2/6, d. 1676, ll. 20-27.

¹⁶ AVPRI, f. 2, op. 2/6, d. 1676, ll. 10-11.

¹⁷ B. A. Uspenskii, A. B. Shishkin, “Trediakovskii i yansenisty,” *Simvol* 23 (1990): 134-36.

Petr also claimed poor health, so much so that he requested an appointment in civil service: this might to some extent explain his indifference to mathematics; on the other hand, he did turn out to have “some knowledge of politics.”¹⁸ Still, even with all these caveats, it appears that not only the brothers had not learned much in Paris, but also that four years prior their father exaggerated their achievements quite liberally. Moreover, even these modest results at the examination were obtained by the Khovasnkiiis with the help of Prince Nikita, their patron: in his letter to his son the procurator-general mentioned that he talked to Johann Benjamin von Siegheim, the *ober-professor*, of the Cadet Corps, and “everything shall be fine.”¹⁹

This examination, run as it was by the teachers at the Noble Cadet Corps, is also notable as another reminder of the role this institution played in force-feeding young nobles with the affective language. All the samples the *chevaliers d’ambassade* had to translate are heavily laden with the vocabulary of emotional states. As a matter of fact, these short texts hardly have any factual content at all: there are no references to heroes and generals ancient or modern, to realities of military service or customs of the foreign lands. Rather, these are short musings on human nature and ways in which it might be affected by and deal with “hopes” and “despairs”; the ways one experiences friendship; what happens to our “reason” when it lacks sufficient “exercise,” and so forth.²⁰

Regardless of their academic failures, though, upon the brothers’ arrival in Russia their reputation was already in tatters. Prince Nikita was eager to extend to them his patronage, of course, due to his friendship with Khovanskii-*père* and to their new kinship through marriage. Yet, even as he congratulated his son with his wedding to their sister, he warned him that he had “heard and seen lots of bad things” about his new brothers-in-law. The senior, that is, Prince Aleksandr Khovanskii, “got into much gambling, playing *quidici* and *pharaon* for not inconsiderable money, and as he does not have luck, so he lost a lot.” The junior, Prince Petr, “does not like gambling, but is unable to contain his immoderation in conversing,” so much so that his chatter attracted unwelcome attention at a dinner given by Count Mikhail Vorontsov, the vice-chancellor. Allegedly, Petr “got so much into talking nonsense that they began ridiculing him by calling him Isaia Petrovich for his grandiloquence.”²¹ “Isaia Petrovich,” to whom the young man is being compared by way of an insult is none other than Baron Shafirov, his own uncle, who would be pronounced insane few years later.

A leading dignitary, such as Trubetskoi, was naturally a focal point of a network of younger relatives and clients, whom he was expected to provide with patronage. From Trubetskoi’s letters we see that he attempts to intercede on the Khovasnkiiis’ behalf with the empress (and had probably earlier helped with their assignment to Paris); monitors unfavorable court rumors about them; seeks to transfer them to Moscow to keep them out of harm’s way, and so forth. Just as Beloselskii’s house provided a stage for gatherings of his sons and their friends, younger brothers-in-law, kinsmen, aides-de-camp, and others, so did Trubetskoi’s residence on the Moika and his seaside dacha. So, the cells of “society” emerging in St Petersburg in mid-century are based, in many ways, on ties of aristocratic kinship and patronage.

The Trubetskoi circle was exceptional, of course, in terms of its literary interests, but more importantly, Prince Nikita’s letters demonstrate how these interests performed an important social function. Besides informing each other of their and their relatives’ health and discussing various property transactions in their correspondence, Trubetskoi and the members of his family maintained a lively commerce in society and court news. In particular, Prince Nikita’s letters to his son – they often also include sections added by his wife, Princess Anna, the playwright Mikhail Kheraskov’s mother – are full of references to various cultural events. Prince Nikita and Princess Anna attend a performance of *La Clemenza di Tito* by Metastasio in December 1746.²²

¹⁸ AVPRI, f. 2, op. 2/6, d. 1676, ll. 44-44 ob.

¹⁹ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, November 13, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 10-10 ob.

²⁰ AVPRI, f. 2, op. 2/6, d. 1676, passim.

²¹ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 15, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 2-2 ob.

²² Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 22, 1746; February 24, 1755. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 7 ob.

In February 1755, the princess is excited about the first ever staging of a “Russian opera,” that is, Aleksandr Sumarokov’s version of *Céphale et Prokris*: based on a Greek myth, its plot revolves, of course, around conjugal love and (in)fideliy. The princess is sick, yet extremely eager to go, so her doctor allowed her to attend only if she stays “wrapped up” (in some sort of a shawl, probably): “I don’t know if I have enough strength to sit, still I want it very much, there never has been [anything like that] in Russia, it would be such a pity to miss this performance.” Naturally, the performance is seen as but one in a long chain of various courtly entertainments, balls, masquerades, and fireworks: “There will be amusements every day.”²³ The princess is fascinated by the scale of some of these events, thrown either at the court or by the leading dignitaries in the fall 1754-winter 1755 to celebrate the birth of Grand Duke Pavel. With hundreds of masked guests in attendance, they serve also, naturally, as a vanity fair, providing a stage for comparing the ladies’ attires (“Maria Pavlovna was dressed up beyond and above everyone else, and all sparkling, truly impossible to describe the excellence of her robe, and though other young ladies tried to compete, they all failed to outshine her”) and their standing in the court hierarchy (“no young ladies were invited, besides maids of honor: our daughter was the only one, she got a ticket delivered [from the palace] at the last moment in the evening”).²⁴ It is also at a ball that Nikita Trubetskoi hopes to intervene with the empress on behalf of the Khovanskii brothers.²⁵ When possible, Prince Nikita dispatches to his son in Moscow printed descriptions of such festivities, including also multiple copies to be shared with friends and relatives.²⁶ In October 1754 he sends not only accounts of masquerades held by Ivan Ivanovich Shuvalov, the favorite, and Count Petr Ivanovich Shuvalov, his cousin and a leading minister, but also those of the accompanying fireworks and the samples of invitation tickets, and in the latter case, even a list of wines. Trubetskoi instructs his son to explain to all and sundry that he could not get enough copies to send to everyone, so “I employ you as my Mercury to make sure that everyone is informed by me about [these festivities]”²⁷: not only Prince Nikita positions himself as a benefactor and a source of information, but he also sets his son up to play, as an intermediary, a similar role in the Moscow society.

Conversation about literature and theater seamlessly blends into this commerce of news and gifts. Thus, the prince thanks his son and daughter-in-law for sending him “nice kerchiefs very much to my liking” and reciprocates by dispatching a copy of Mikhail Lomonosov’s new ode on the birthday of Grand Duke Paul. This also presents an occasion for passing a judgement on the poem – it is pronounced to be “as good as it, I recon, had rarely been the case in our language until now” – and an extra copy is included for Prince Petr’s brother.²⁸ Another ode by Lomonosov, likewise sent along with a description of a masquerade, is judged much more harshly: “he can only be excused on account of having composed it so fast.”²⁹ Still another portion of poetry is sent without revealing the author’s name: the father congratulates his son as “you’ve guessed it correctly that it’s done by Mr. Lomonosov,” but, it seems, disagrees with Prince Petr’s assessment of the verses: “To my mind, the former [a description of a firework], though short, is written much better than the latter [a description of illumination].”³⁰ The year 1754 was precisely the moment when Lomonosov emerged as a leading court poet – with support from Ivan Shuvalov, the favorite.

The Trubetskoi’s engagement with poetry is not limited to their interest in Lomonosov’s latest work, of course. Around the same time, in the fall of 1754, Prince Nikita informs his son of a scandal in the capital: Dmitrii Volkov, a secretary to Chancellor Bestuzhev-Riumin, attempted

²³ Nikita Trubetskoi and Anna Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, February 24, 1755. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 79-79 ob.

²⁴ Anna Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, October 17, 1754; October 27, 1754; November 13, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 45 ob., 47, 49 ob.-50.

²⁵ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, January 1, 1747. SPII RAN f. 115, d. 337, l. 15 ob.

²⁶ Nikita Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, January 2, 1755. SPII RAN f. 115, d. 337, l. 69.

²⁷ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, October 27, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 46 ob.-47.

²⁸ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, September 29, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 41 ob.-42.

²⁹ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, November 13, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 48 ob.

³⁰ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, November 10, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 56 ob.

to flee as he stood to be accused of embezzlement. For Trubetskoi, though, it is an occasion to share with his son “the verses composed by secretary ... Volkov not long before his escape”: Prince Petr was also to show this literary curiosity to his brother and uncle.³¹ Volkov was eventually pardoned, made a brilliant career, helped to draft the Emancipation of the Nobility manifesto in 1762, and continued to dabble in writing throughout the 1770s.³² Prince Petr himself, like his father, is known to have also tried his hand at versification: although little has survived of his works, he is reported to have “written diverse poems, and especially songs, that earned great praise,” and “practiced in translations.”³³ Indeed, his step-mother thanks him for sending an “ode on understanding of man” of his own composition, judged to be “very nice.”³⁴ The theme of this poem is noteworthy, as it is about half a year later that Prince Petr was accepted into the Blue Lodge in Moscow and became a mason³⁵: writing this ode for him was clearly related to self-reflection, to expressing his current intellectual and spiritual concerns.

Most importantly, we can see how writing poetry is also an element of sociable practices in this circle, into which the members of the extended network are drawn, however tangentially. Prince Petr’s brother-in-law, Aleksandr Khovanskii, described in his testimony the setting at the St Petersburg house of Prince Nikita and at his seaside dacha. Apparently, during the winter of 1747 the Khovanskii brothers, their various in-laws, and also Princess Bariatinskaia, whom they would so awkwardly visit in Moscow later on, played cards, “harmlessly laughed and made jocks” about each other – but also “made jocular verses.”³⁶

Such social gatherings were an occasion not only for making “jocular verses,” of course but also for conversations – apparently, it was not for nothing that Petr Khovanskii earned an unflattering reputation for grandiloquence and inability to restrain his public pronouncements. The topics of these conversations could rub those present the wrong way sufficiently so as to report them to the empress – and that is why the young men were questioned about them when detained by the Secret Chancellery in 1748. These topics were also the ones that we, in retrospect, tend to see as central for political discourse of the era: the status of old princely lineages vis-à-vis the newly titled families and the untitled nobility; the role of family hierarchies and the status and powers of fathers vis-à-vis their sons; the regime of mandatory service of the nobility instituted by Peter I; and the place of church rituals in the daily practices of post-Petrine elite.

Khovanskiis’ testimonies help us to imagine some of the contexts in mid-century St Petersburg where such discussions could take place. So, we find an engagement party for Anna Saltykova, the maid of honor to the empress celebrated on February 18, 1748, in the house of her father Vasili Fedorovich Saltykov: the young woman was betrothed to Prince Matvei Gagarin, a cousin of the Khovanskiis and the Dolgorukovs through his mother, also a Shafirov. The guests, in addition to the Trubetskoi and their wives, also include General Stepan Fedorovich Apraksin, of the Seven Years War fame; Princess von Hesse-Homburg; Prince Boris Golitsyn of the Admiralty accompanied by his daughter Anna – and his fiancé, Petr Alekseevich Apraksin (he would later be denounced to the Kalinkin Commission by one Maria Venediktova for having raped her). Also present is Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich Golitsyn (1718-1783), the nephew of Aleksandr Borisovich Kurakin and a chamberlain to the “young court.” Before the dinner the elder guests gather in Saltykov’s room, who is apparently sick and bedridden, while the younger generation hangs out in his daughter’s chamber. Once the dinner begins, the guests are seated

³¹ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 15, 1754. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 66 ob.

³² Iu.V. Stennik, “Volkov Dmitrii Vasil’evich” in *Slovar’ russkikh pisateley XVIII veka*, ed. A.M. Panchenko, vol. 1, A-I (L.: Nauka, 1988), 169-70.

³³ K.Iu. Lappo-Danilevskii, “Trubetskoi Petr Nikitich,” in *Slovar’ russkikh pisateley XVIII veka*, ed. A.M. Panchenko, vol. 3, R-Ya (SPb.: Nauka, 2010), 276-77.

³⁴ Anna Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, January 23, 1755. SPII RAN f. 115, d. 337, l. 66 ob.

³⁵ Memoirs of Petr Trubetskoi (entry for September 22, 1755). Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IRLI RAN), razriad II, op.1, № 475, l. 7 ob.

³⁶ Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 6-6 ob.

along a horseshoe-shaped table, so large the people at one end of it could not hear what their cousins on the other were saying.³⁷

It is in this context that the most bizarre of the conversations for which the brothers had to answer took place. According to Petr Dolgorukov, the elder ladies, the mothers of the two brides present, Saltykova and Golitsyna, were reflecting on the exciting fact that their daughters were born on the same month – and have now been betrothed on the same month, too: what a coincidence! At this point Petr Khovanskii interfered with a “joke”: not only were the two young women born and betrothed at the same time, he noted, but they also “do similar things, as one of them, a princess, marries a count and so renounces her princehood; while another, [an untitled] noblewoman, marries a prince.” There doesn’t seem to be anything funny about this joke, nor does it make much sense at all. Indeed, according to Dolgorukov, it has been met with silence: “And to this, nobody replied anything to Khovanskii.”³⁸ Yet, Stepan Fedorovich Apraksin took an offence: the way Apraksin understood the “joke” and related it to the empress, it sounded as if the young man implied that “unlucky is Prince Gagarin for wedding Saltykova, while lucky is Apraksin for wedding Princess Golitsyna.”³⁹ Reinterpreted this way, the phrase, at least, makes sense, while still hardly constituting a crime.

The Khovanskiis had also to answer for, allegedly, skipping the father’s funeral service (*panikhida*) in Moscow and even presuming to inquire “What sort of animal is it, funeral service, anyway?”⁴⁰ Prince Aleksandr maintained that he and his brothers, as a matter of fact, attended the church services “and all the neighboring houses ... could see how we all cried with great sorrow, so to say, with despair.” He did, however, have a conversation with Mikhail Sobakin, his cousin, whom Khovanskii praised for his ability to sign in the church during the funeral alongside the choristers without resorting to the relevant books. “There is nothing surprising about it, every [Orthodox Christian] has to be able to do it,” including Khovanskii himself, was Sobakin’s response. The prince supposedly could only excuse himself by explaining that “he knows these rituals very little due to his stay in foreign lands, and it is only the third funeral service that he attends since his return.”⁴¹

Khovanskii’s comments on the Russian noble’s obligation to serve took place in a different context, during his stay at the Russian embassy in France: another evidence of his extensive socializing in Paris. It also means, though, that the communication channels through which the empress and the Secret Chancellery could be informed about such talk reached as far as France. One might guess whether it was some visiting Russian official, such as Vice-Chancellor Mikhail Vorontsov, who upon his return to St Petersburg choose to inform Elizabeth (as a part of some sort of court intrigue, perhaps); or was it was the work of an informer recruited by the Secret Chancellery among the embassy staff. When questioned by the Secret Chancellery, Khovanskii admitted that he indeed “had occasions to discourse in foreign lands about the ways the prominent nobles are assigned to service here,” i.e. in Russia. He did not remember the details, but suggested that it probably happened at the residence of Ambassador Gross, as foreigners were asking Khovanskii all sorts of questions about Russian customs: “the way women dress, and so forth.” Among other things, these foreigners presented a pretty accurate picture of the legal framework of noble service at the time: “We’ve heard that everyone in your country, regardless of nobility, is enrolled as a private soldier, and every noble is forced to enter service at certain age.” This, according to these anonymous foreigners, “is very hard for you”: “You, for example, live here [in Paris] as a grandee and enjoy freedom (*zhivete v znati i v vole*), but upon your return home, you’d be forced to sign up as a soldier.”

³⁷ Testimonies of Aleksandr Khovanskii and Petr Dolgorukov, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 15 ob., 18-18 ob.

³⁸ Petr Dolgorukov’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 19 ob.

³⁹ Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 16 ob.; Empress Elizabeth to A.I. Shuvalov, March 14, 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 11 ob.

⁴⁰ Elizabeth to A.I. Shuvalov, March 14, 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 11 ob.; Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 22, 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 20-20 ob.

⁴¹ Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 22, 1748. RGADA f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 16 ob., 20-20 ob.

To this, the prince asserted, he reacted the way one would expect from a loyal subject. On the one hand, in this and all similar instances, he claimed, “I spoke about my Fatherland with such zeal that sometimes found myself forced to ask with due politeness that [the interlocutors], knowing that I am a Russian, would not [dare] say anything disadvantageous to Russia in my presence unless they seek a quarrel with me.” It is unclear whether he implied his willingness to fight a duel to defend his country’s honor, something which was not really a custom among the Russian nobility of that era yet. On the other hand, turning specifically to the issue of mandatory service which the “foreigners” construed as poorly compatible with the freedom that nobles enjoy in Europe, Khovanskii did not dispute their description of the Russian system, but offered a three-pronged rebuttal. First, he maintained that such a system “is quite tolerable for us, as we are born and raised in it.” Second, he launched a counterattack: “beyond that, I will prove it to you by reasoning that this is actually bad that you yourself don’t have this custom.” Inevitably, perhaps, he turned to justifying it with a reference to the “glory of His Imperial Majesty Peter the Great that spread across the entire universe.” It was Peter who began his own service a simple soldier climbing up the ladder of ranks “on his own merits” in order to learn how to perform each rank’s duties – thus setting an example for his subjects. Thirdly, Khovanskii argued, Russian nobles – except the (very few) unworthy ones, of course – do not suffer from having to begin service in lower ranks because they don’t get stuck in them anyway. Rather, they are encouraged by Her Majesty’s kindness, as the sovereign considers her nobles’ achievements and graciously promotes them accordingly.⁴² This speech, regardless of whether Khovanskii actually delivered it in Paris, or made it up while sitting under lock at the Secret Chancellery, is a strikingly vivid example of a mid-century aristocrat striving to reproduce the official discourse on the matter in his own words – and doing so in a remarkably articulate fashion. Perhaps, in this case the prince saw deviating from the state-sanctioned script as a dangerous act, indeed, as an explicitly political statement. Nor it is possible to say, of course, to what extent he interiorized this discourse.

Compare it to another speech, the one Khovanskii allegedly delivered at a gathering at Prince Nikita Trubetskoi’s house in a company that included also Prince Iakov Petrovich Shakhovskoi, in the future also a procurator-general and the author of extremely illuminating memoir, as well as “many others”: we can easily envision these dignitaries, mostly older ones, as they are questioning the young man fresh from Paris about “the French ways.”⁴³ In particular, the guests are curious to hear as to “the duty of sons towards their fathers [in France], how extensive it is in that land.” Prince Aleksandr begins his answer with a diplomatic equivocation, observing, quite non-controversially, that “there are good sons and bad sons in every land.” Then, however, he goes on to make a strong and, actually, programmatically-charged point: in France, supposedly, “fathers do not require from their sons to display their esteem externally, for example, [demanding] that the son would not seat when the father stands; that the son would not address his father without making a bow first, and so on.” While these types of behavior are also present in France, he explains, they are not counted for much. Rather, “in France a father seeks that his son loved him sincerely and without any pretense, and behaves towards his son the way two friends behave towards each other in our land.” At the same time, Khovanskii acknowledges, quite correctly, that this does not nullify the fathers’ power over their sons in France, which is in fact quite extensive, as there are “houses” (i.e. prisons) where a disobedient son could be dispatched by his father, “and there are still harsher punishments if the crime is very serious.”⁴⁴

The young Khovanskii here frames his observations regarding the prevalent mode of relationship between fathers and sons in Russia in terms of the central juxtaposition of his era, that of the less formal relationships based on “sincere” feelings, on the one hand, and the

⁴² Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 16 ob.-17 ob.

⁴³ Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, l. 16.

⁴⁴ Aleksandr Khovanskii’s testimony, March 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 16-16 ob.

“external,” superficial obedience, on the other. At the same time, Khovanskii strongly asserts that the informality of polite behavior among the elite is in no way detrimental to social order and, in fact, compatible with effectively maintaining social hierarchies and punishing offenders. The search for an institutional setup where the observation of their duties by the noble subjects would be ensured without burdensome and “degrading” enforcement of “external” rules was very much central for the debates among the elite leading up to the 1762 Emancipation of the Nobility.

The theme of “sincerity” of affections is also found in the Trubetskoi correspondence, although here it is interpreted quite differently. In March 1755, a younger relative, heavily pregnant, paid a visit to the Trubetskoi along with her husband – and in her letter Princess Anna feigned being scandalized by the couple’s open display of their conjugal affection: “I was surprised by her young husband every other minute and without any shame kissing her hands, and that they don’t part even for an hour.” Apparently, “nowadays many consider this [affectionate behavior] vulgar” – yet, Princess Anna pointedly concludes, “my prince [Nikita Trubetskoi] praised them greatly.”⁴⁵ Years earlier, asking his son to pass on greetings and wishes of good health to his father-in-law, Vasilii Khovanskii, Prince Nikita describes him as a person “whom I love, besides our kinship, truly and *not the way it is the custom nowadays*,” i.e. sincerely, we must presume.⁴⁶ In both cases, sincerity of affection is praised and presented as an echo of “older” forms of behavior – in contrast to the young Khovanskii, who seems to associate the traditional with formality and pretense.

When, in another letter, Prince Nikita reproaches his son for leaving behind his pregnant wife and sick children in order to visit his country estates, he pointed out that “we are rewarded by Lord with this sacrament of marriage so that living together we could find merriment in each other.” So, there is no reason to stay apart for spouses especially if the reason for the husband’s trip is hunting with hounds – and even the need to inspect the estates is not a sufficient excuse either.⁴⁷ Elsewhere, Prince Nikita instructs his daughter-in-law not to let his own son Petr to go away while she is unwell, presenting his own family life as an example: “It is not to my taste to live separately: I enjoy being with my wife, and do not wish to be without her.”⁴⁸ As it happens, when his wife, née Princess Khovanskaia, eventually died, Prince Petr took up a serf concubine. “Once I came to my estate where there was a popular festival, and saw a girl, not yet fifteen years of age, whose face and figure, as well as her modest behavior, appeared pleasing to me. Being a widower, I took her up into my house,” he recalled these events in his diary in the late 1780s. Eventually – after many years of cohabitation and having sired four children with her – Prince Petr decided to marry the woman: he felt compelled to “repay her with holy matrimony, out of gratitude,” as well as wanted to ensure for himself “sincere care in my afflictions” in his approaching old age. This intention, though, was met with resistance from the local bishop and from the prince’s relatives that took him over ten years to overcome. It is this resistance that provokes the prince, a life-long mason, a former senator, and an amateur writer, to launch a diatribe against the “arrogant pridefulness” of his kinsmen, obsessed as these were with their pedigree, the obsession that he himself allegedly lacked – thanks to his “upbringing,” he long ago “cast aside the nonsense” of judging people by their birth. One’s nobility or ignobility, he maintained, should be judged exclusively on the basis of actions, not birth, so he personally “always saw a human as a human, without any distinctions.”⁴⁹

We do not know how he would have reacted to the escapades of Nikolai Rzhnevskii, the one who got beaten up during the failed trip to Udachka, and who attracted the empress’ unwelcome attention again in 1750. After his recovery Rzhnevskii, it seems, carried on with his dissolute behavior: the rumors went that the young man, in the company of Mamonov, another

⁴⁵ Anna Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, March 27, 1755. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 85 ob.

⁴⁶ Nikita Trubetskaia to Petr Trubetskoi, January 3, 1747. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 16 ob.

⁴⁷ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, April 10, 1755. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 87 ob.

⁴⁸ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, March or April, 1755. SPII RAN f. 115, d. 337, ll. 85 ob. – 86.

⁴⁹ Memoirs of Petr Trubetskoi (entry for November 12, 1789). IRLI RAN, razriad II, op.1, № 475, ll. 22-22 ob.

sergeant of the Guards, and “others,” as well as a band of servants, were allegedly in the habit of riding around Moscow “and beating up various people and threatening to beat up others.” The Moscow governor could not confirm these reports, yet he did inform the sovereign that Rzhevskii had recently married a girl without her mother’s permission. The incident took place on the suburban estate of Rzhevskii’s sister where the ladies a question also came to pay a friendly visit. Apparently, while the mother was being entertained by the mistress of the house, the young man managed to get the appropriate church rituals performed uniting him with the girl. In his report, the governor seems to be sympathetic to the young man, stressing that the bride entered the union voluntarily, while the testimony of her mother (who complained to the authorities after the fact) is implicitly dismissed on account of her being “not completely praiseworthy in her conduct.”⁵⁰

Going back to the scandals of the late 1740s, it is hard to figure out from conflicting descriptions what exactly transpired between Baraitinakaia and her young guests to provoke the investigations to which we owe some of these records. Bariatinskaia insisted that the princes “yelled as one would expect from the drunk ones *and laughed at me*,” so that she had to ask them either to behave orderly, or to leave. That did not help, however, as Dolgorukov “shamelessly” pursued her (*on za mnoiu besстыdno nogami valachilsia*), and Khovanskii “embraced me as if I were an indecent woman and kissed my hands a dozen times.”⁵¹ The young men, on the other hand, insisted that they were not drunk (well, not really *that* drunk, anyway), that they did not do anything inappropriate, and that Bariatinskaia did not try to calm them down or asked them to leave. On the contrary, she took Prince Vasilii’s porcelain snuffbox as a gift and invited them to pay her visits again. The key for understanding the episode is probably the young men’s admission that they began teasing Bariatinskaia about the rumors regarding her impending marriage to Prince Ukhtomskii, an architect – “by way of laughing, politely offered her amusing conversations” on that subject. (Incidentally, no such marriage ever took place). The three princes maintained that on this occasion they engaged “in the same entertainments and amusements” with Bariatinskaia as they did at Trubetskoi’s.⁵² Perhaps, the widow saw it differently: judging by her handwritten notes, poorly scribbled and barely coherent, she was probably not very well accustomed to the informal ways of the tipsy *petimetry*. She might have been willing to tolerate and to go along with a more informal and playful mode of behavior and conversation in the presence of the powerful procurator-general of the Senate, insofar as he chose to set such tone in his parlor – but not in her own house.

His young kinsmen’s 1746 failed visit to Udachka provoked Trubetskoi to comment directly on this type of behavior. Writing to his son, Prince Nikita is relieved, of course, that Vasilii Dolgorukov’s troubles with the police are over and stresses that: “they only went to Udachka to *profiteer* as bachelors.” Still, he condemns Rzhevskii – the supposed ring-leader – as a “good-for-nothing” (*bezdel’nik*) and hastens to explain, “this cannot be approved of.” The reason for the disapproval, though, is that “it is quite enough that a prince Dolgorukov is being questioned by the police alongside a whore, and above all, that the sovereign deigns to be informed about it.” Overall, this episode is classified by him as “*shalost*,” a prank or mischief, and this type of behavior in general as “*skosyrstvo*,” or foppery.⁵³ Nor is Trubetskoi notably scandalized by the very presence of such nests of indecency in the area. And indeed, his own urban estate, it turns out, was also as much of a site of such activities as Beloselskii’s. According to the 1750 testimony of an eighteen-year old Avdotia Stanislavova, Drezdensha herself had at some point rented a “separate apartment” at Prince Nikita Trubetskoi property and run some of her masked “parties” there.⁵⁴ Whether it is possible that Trubetskoi could be unaware of them is an open question, of course.

⁵⁰ RGADA, f. 8, op. 1, d. 200, ll. 1-4 ob.

⁵¹ Princess Bariatinskaia to A.I. Shuvalov, March 28, 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 29-31.

⁵² Testimonies of Aleksandr Khovanskii, Vasilii and Petr Dolgorukov, March, 1748. RGADA, f. 7, op. 1, d. 1276, ll. 6-10 ob.

⁵³ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 22, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 12-12 ob., 10-10 ob.

⁵⁴ RGADA f. 8, op. 1, d. 98, ll. 1-2 ob.

Likewise, General Aleksei Tatishchev, the *politsmeister*-general, allegedly admonished Prince Vasiliï by pointing out “that as a grandee, he should have avoided such bad places and companies ... and there is nothing better to be expected from such indecent ones than diseases.”⁵⁵ This was the very same General Tatischev who, according to Prince Shcherbatov’s “*On the corruption of morals in Russia*,” “openly maintained his serf woman, whom he took away from her husband, as his *metresa* (*maitresse*, fr.), and his children [by her] were ennobled.”⁵⁶ So, when confronted in 1746 by Tatishchev, Prince Vasiliï Dolgorukov laughed at the general, rather than expressing remorse. To Tatishchev’s proposition that “there is nothing better to be expected from such indecent ones than diseases,” the young man “responded with laughter that if that’s the case, time to take up the doctors.” What struck Nikita Trubetskoi is that discussing with him this episode afterwards, Dolgorukov seemed to believe that the chief of the police was “joking” with him! Indeed, Prince Vasiliï offended his patron the procurator-general by paying him only one visit in the wake of this scandal (even though, as we might surmise, Prince Nikita tried to protect him, insofar as possible) – and in response to Trubetskoi’s inquiries about the affair, “he wasn’t really respectful.”⁵⁷

Author:

Igor Fedyukin, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Center for History Sources, Director.

E-mail: ifedyukin@hse.ru

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of National Research University Higher School of Economics.

© Fedyukin, 2017

⁵⁵ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 22, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, ll. 12-12 ob.

⁵⁶ A. Shcherbatov, “O povrezhdenii nraov v Rossii,” in *Izbrannye trudy* (M.: ROSSPEN, 2010), 464.

⁵⁷ Nikita Trubetskoi to Petr Trubetskoi, December 22, 1746. SPII RAN, f. 115, d. 337, l. 12-12 ob.