Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov and “Embezzlers”

Family connections within Russian bureaucracy in the first half of the
18th century

*Avraam Stepanovič Sverčkov et les « déprédateurs » : les liens de famille dans le
milieu administratif en Russie dans la première moitié du XVIII^e siècle*

Galina O. Babkova

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/8375>

DOI: 10.4000/monderusse.8375

ISSN: 1777-5388

Publisher

Éditions de l'EHESS

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 April 2016

Number of pages: 609-640

ISBN: 978-2-7132-2541-3

ISSN: 1252-6576

Electronic reference

Galina O. Babkova, « Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov and “Embezzlers” », *Cahiers du monde russe* [Online], 57/2-3 | 2016, Online since 01 April 2019, Connection on 20 April 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/8375> ; DOI : 10.4000/monderusse.8375

This text was automatically generated on 20 April 2019.

© École des hautes études en sciences sociales

Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov and “Embezzlers”

Family connections within Russian bureaucracy in the first half of the 18th century

Avraam Stepanovič Sverčkov et les « déprédateurs » : les liens de famille dans le milieu administratif en Russie dans la première moitié du XVIII^e siècle

Galina O. Babkova

EDITOR'S NOTE

Translated from Russian by Denise Mansurova and Iryna Bickle

- 1 On December 13th 1755 the board of the Moscow Imperial University submitted a promemoria [note] to the State Collegium of Justice asking them to send immediately a representative of the Collegium accompanied by prikaznye sluzhiteli [bailiffs] to the house of State Councillor Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov, who died on December 8th.¹ As quickly as possible they had to make an inventory of promissory notes and cash, present in the house, and also to make a copy of Sverchkov's will, which “remained in the house, signed by Mr. Sverchkov's hand and witnesses.”² The Collegium of Justice took its decision the following day: it granted the university's request and on December 14th sent the Secretary Il'ia Iazykov to Sverchkov's house.³
- 2 The reason for this rush was rather unusual: according to the oral will, dictated by A.S. Sverchkov on November 26th 1755 (written down by the Moscow State Bank junker Gavriil (Gavrila) Iushkov⁴), he had transferred a considerable part of his property to the newly established Moscow University.⁵ Referring to the authority of Ivan Ivanovich Shuvalov, university curator and “loving father of Russian children and benefactor of orphans,” Avraam Stepanovich expressed his desire to become a “donor of this most spiritual university.”⁶ Seeking the “auspices” of the University, Sverchkov “asked them to accept” an amount of “three thousand roubles” in cash, which remained after the sale of

his real estate in Saint-Petersburg ("two big stone houses") and "two villages near Riazan' and Kashin,"⁷ as well as promissory notes for a total amount of 16,376 roubles.⁸ The above-mentioned property had to remain at the University's entire disposal until the marriage of Sverchkov's younger daughter, *otrokovitsa devitsa Nastas'ia* [maiden Miss Nastas'ia, or Anastasiia], who was only 8 years old in 1755⁹. If she did not have any children, the money would revert "to the University forever and irrevocably for feeding orphan children in Russia, to feed their souls and bodies from the most spiritual university by the excellence of its science."¹⁰

- 3 Perhaps the university representatives would have been able to take possession (Collegiate Councillor Aleksei Mikhailovich Argamakov, director of the University, put the case under his personal control¹¹), but for a *chelobitnaia* (petition) submitted by A.S. Sverchkov's elder daughter Tatiana Avraamovna (married-name Iushkova) on December 22nd 1755. In her petition to the Collegium of Justice T.A. Iushkova requested, firstly, to sort out the situation in her father's "Moscow house," where already in Avraam Stepanovich's lifetime, "armed watchmen" were stationed at the store-room where "his different... possessions and acts" were kept, while after his death the watchmen were replaced by university guards. The latter, together with the Collegium of Justice, sealed her father's property.¹² Secondly, she insisted, in the interests of her sister Anastasiia, that the Collegium should make a detailed inventory of all the property located in the house in "Zemlianoi gorod in the parish of the Intercession of Holy Mary..., which is close to Vorontsovskoe pole,"¹³ and decide to whom to hand over "that movable property of my father" according to the existing legislation.¹⁴
- 4 The complaints led to many years of investigation (concluded in 1781), involving, at different stages, both A.S. Sverchkov's relatives, and the people whom in his will he referred to as *raskhititeli* [embezzlers]. The investigation resulted in a *sudnoe delo* [lawsuit]¹⁵ over the legacy. This lawsuit allows us to reconstruct the connections and relations within this particular family, to follow the dynamic and the character of their development over several decades while the investigation was taking place. The parties involved demonstrated their understanding of the notion of family through documentary testimonies, which, from their point of view, justified the legitimacy of their claims.
- 5 Recent historiography stresses the research potential of the acts and documentation of management and record keeping of this kind of lawsuits: *dukhovnaia* (will), *sgovornye* (commitments of marriage), petitions, property inventories, genealogic tables, etc. Consolidated in one legal case file, they can play a key role in the studies on the history of family, childhood, emotions, gender, etc., in early modern Russia.¹⁶
- 6 On the one hand, these documents are essential for better comprehension of how, in the first half of the 18th century, the family world of a representative of the Russian bureaucratic elite was built and how it influenced his choice of social strategies, shaped and secured social status and position. On the other hand, the analysis of the above-mentioned sources allows us to trace possible perspectives of further studies of family connections among clerks and define whether the family relationships (between close and distant relatives) recorded within this particular legacy case were typical or not. In addition to this, the history of this particular family and its members seems to have an absolute value of its own. Beyond any eventual conceptual conclusions and observations, it responds to what Pavel Uvarov defines as "'the basic instinct' of a historian": even if there is no "further generalization," reconstruction of an individuality, "private or collective," actualizes "the natural aspiration of a historian to bring the past back to life,"

where we see the actions of "real people, with their destinies, their unique features—virtues, sins and imperfections."¹⁷

- 7 The history of Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov's family is important for the study of social mobility, because he belonged to the category of clerks who were recruited from the lowest social strata and climbed the hierarchy ladder thanks to their personal qualities, skills and merits and also the patronage of the officials of higher ranks (there are reasons to presume that at varying times Aleksei Vasil'evich Makarov and Count Mikhail Gavrilovich Golovkin were A.S. Sverchkov's patrons¹⁸). Those clerks finally formed the higher level of office employees in a variety of central institutions and were involved in the actual implementation of authorities' reformative initiatives in the first half of the 18th century. In the context of the governmental objective to reinforce, systemize and standardize the whole system of state management, on the one hand, and the severe shortage of qualified specialists capable of meeting the needs of permanently growing state machine, on the other,¹⁹ A.S. Sverchkov and bureaucrats like him ensured "undisturbed operation of all units of the state machine."²⁰

Chancellery service

- 8 A.S. Sverchkov's activities in service and his career were connected to ulozhennyye komissii (the legislative commissions) that worked in Russia in the 1720s-1740s.²¹ As Avraam Stepanovich mentioned in his will, they were the very reason for *kamenaia pochechnaia skarbuta* [nephrolithiasis], from which he suffered from a "young age"; he was "contaminated" by "chancellery service [in] the noble commissions of the Senate, especially by drafting laws, both from foreign and domestic legislation."²²
- 9 In the above-mentioned context the personality of Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov first came to the attention of researchers. In his work on the history of the legislative commissions in Russia in the 18th century, published in 1887 and still retaining relevance, Vasilii Nikolaevich Latkin associated the cessation of legislation, which had been emerging since Elizaveta Petrovna's accession to the throne, with the retirement of A.S. Sverchkov, "the most active member [of the legislative commission] who had been the life and soul of drafting a new Ulozhenie (code) since the third commission of Peter I."²³ Even though he did not describe Sverchkov's role in the creation of a new legal code, V.N. Latkin drew attention to particular actions or events organized by Avraam Stepanovich in person or initiated by him. Latkin also presented numerous documents undoubtedly reflecting the importance of Sverchkov's both organisational and drafting law activities.²⁴
- 10 Several works by Aleksandr Sergeevich Zamuruev give quite a comprehensive description of Sverchkov's participation in legislation elaboration from 1720 to 1725; the above-mentioned publications represent "a major contribution to the studies on the Legislative commission of 1720 and its results."²⁵ Zamuruev specifically highlighted the role of commission chancellery and its head, Chief-Secretary A.S. Sverchkov, in the preparation of and discussions on materials for drafting the new code.²⁶ He drew an important conclusion that after 1724, in the context of the absence of Legislative commission members, Avraam Stepanovich and his clerks *de facto* continued working on the code and finished it by September 1726 while suggesting a method of compilation of legal sources and articles that was new for the Russian law.²⁷

- 11 In the most recent research Dmitrii Olegovich Serov expressed a high opinion of A.S. Sverchkov's role in the systematization of Russian legislation in the 1720s. Analysing the history of legislation drafting as well as the members and results of the legislative commission in the 1720s, Serov underlined the significance of the chancellery and its "permanent chief" Sverchkov, who ensured the steady functioning of the institution "in the context of insufficient stability in the presence of the Commission members."²⁸ Nikolai Nikolaevich Petrukhintsev in his studies on the internal policy of Anna Ioannovna's government and its attempt to draw up a "code of justice," also points out the fact that A.S. Sverchkov was the head of the legislative commission in the 1730s, and associates the decay of "the legislative impulse of the early years of Elizabeth's reign" with Avraam Stepanovich's retirement.²⁹
- 12 D.O. Serov was the first to reconstruct the main stages of A.S. Sverchkov's biography. The "Annotated name index" of his book "Stroiteli imperii: Ocherki gosudarstvennoi i kriminal'noi deiatel'nosti spodvizhnikov Petra I" published in 1999 includes Sverchkov's short biography.³⁰ Subsequently it was included as a separate biographical article in both editions (2007 and 2008) of the Biographical dictionary, the first part of D.O. Serov's "Administratsiia Petra I".³¹ Using newly discovered sources (a patent for Chief-Secretary rank, a podmetnoe pis'mo (anonymous denouncement) about the Vysshii sud (the Higher Court) activities, etc.) Serov stated the year of A.S. Sverchkov's birth and highlighted the main events of his career, paying special attention to Sverchkov's "substantial role" in "drafting the Ulozhenie of 1726."³²
- 13 The information on Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov's origins, early years and the beginning of his career is scant. He originated from a taxable stratum: probably from peasants of Nizhegorodskii uезд (see for more details below).³³ The information about the date of Sverchkov's birth is contradictory. In May 1718, during the census of Sankt-Peterburgskii ostrov [Saint-Petersburg island] A.S. Sverchkov, who lived at that time with his family and servants³⁴ in Posadskaia sloboda (Trading suburb) in the household of the judge of Raspravnaia palata (the Highest Court of the Senate) Ivan Ivanovich (Ivanov s [y]n) Leont'ev, reported that "he, Avraam, was thirty one years old,"³⁵ which means he was born in 1687³⁶. However, the will, which was written down according to A.S. Sverchkov's oral evidence, suggests a different year of birth – 1692. Avraam Stepanovich stated his exact age, 64 years, and, referring to his "saint patron day", pointed out that "up to this day, October 22 [1]755 I have lived a full sixty three years."³⁷
- 14 This type of contradiction in reporting his age is not a unique feature of A.S. Sverchkov's biography. On the one hand, it could have been a consequence of census data collection practices in the first quarter of the 18th century in Russia, when skazki [reports] were made by inhabitants themselves or written down according to their oral evidence; in the second case, instead of respondents' real ages, the data collectors' ideas about their ages were reported.³⁸ On the other hand, "indistinctness" in perception and measurement of time and therefore a lack of knowledge of one's own age, was typical of pre-industrial societies in general. In his comparative analysis of censuses held in Tula (1715, 1720) and Viatka (1710, 1717), Daniel Kaiser demonstrated that in early modern Russia in the context of a low level of "abstract notions" of time and with no tradition of registering age, most of the population did not "care" enough about their real age.³⁹ In particular, in her studies on Sankt-Peterburgskii ostrov censuses in 1717 and 1718, ol'ga Evgen'evna Kosheleva points out that for the inhabitants who provided data (even when they provided requested data themselves⁴⁰) "such notions as age, address and surname... did

not have the same level of accuracy and clear meaning" as they have "nowadays."⁴¹ However, age had a social implication: "inaccurate awareness of age was typical of peasants in the first place." The situation was different with nobility. Noblemen were much more aware of their age: firstly, because it was "associated" with their services and "was imperatively recorded at all frequent military reviews of the nobility," secondly, because the authorities punished and "sought to prevent fraud in age data committed in order to avoid service."⁴²

- 15 In this context, it is crucially important that A.S. Sverchkov, who managed to reach the rank of State Councillor and hereditary nobility, accurately recorded his own age. No matter what his origins and real age were, Avraam Stepanovich highlighted and emphasised his nobility, a status of which he considered himself to be a rightful member.
- 16 However, in the 1720s the question of Sverchkov's origins remained open. Thus, paragraph fourteen of the *podmetnoe pis'mo* on the activities of Vysshii sud, submitted in 1724, reported:

and that Sverchkov, a peasant son from Nizhegorodskii uezd, in year [1]712 pursuant to an order was taken as a *rekrut* (recruit) into Grigorov's regiment in Nizhnii by recruiter Matvei Zasetskii, and he escaped from the regiment and then showed up in *Raspravnaia palata* as a *pod'iachii* [clerk].⁴³
- 17 A.S. Sverchkov did serve in Senate *Raspravnaia palata*.⁴⁴ On November 13th 1713 he became *pod'iachii srednei stat'i* [a middle rank clerk] and the same year was sent to Nizhnii Novgorod to organize the provision of oatmeal from Kazanskaia guberniia [Kazan Province]. After that Sverchkov served for some time in *Zemskii prikaz* [the Land Chancellery].⁴⁵ In 1718 (in May at the earliest) A.S. Sverchkov was transferred from *Raspravnaia palata*, where he was performing the duties of a *saryi pod'iachii* [a senior clerk], to a newly established Collegium of Justice, within which, pursuant to the Collegium's decision, from March 2nd 1719 he was appointed the head of *Krepostnaia kontora* [the Deed Registration Office].⁴⁶ By the Senate order of February 27th 1719 A.S. Sverchkov was promoted to the rank of Collegiate Secretary, and on May 16th 1721 he became the Chief-Secretary of the Collegium of Justice.⁴⁷
- 18 The appointment to the chancellery of the legislative commission on August 19th 1720⁴⁸ was a turning point in Sverchkov's career. For the first time the presence of Chief-Secretary A.S. Sverchkov is reported in the *Protokol'nye zapiski* (minutes) of the legislative commission on January 30th 1721.⁴⁹ The Senate's order of June 11th of the same year, pursuant to an imperial personal decree, entrusted A.S. Sverchkov with directing the commission's exterior activities: he had to notify the commission members about sessions⁵⁰ and ensure their attendance, as well as to keep an eye on the actual drafting of laws. Sverchkov had to deliver weekly reports about the results of his control.⁵¹ From July 27th 1722, when the legislative commission moved from Saint-Petersburg to Moscow⁵², A.S. Sverchkov's name appeared in most of the minutes of the commission meetings.⁵³ Simultaneously, he continued to perform the duties of the Chief-Secretary of the Collegium of Justice and "was involved in *reketmeister* affairs."⁵⁴
- 19 From 1723 A.S. Sverchkov, not being a member of the legislative commission,⁵⁵ *de facto* assumed the lead of its chancellery⁵⁶ and was the main figure in charge of the work on the new legal code. In his letter of February 28th 1723 from "General'nyi dvor [the General Court] in Preobrazhensk" *kabinet-sekretar'* [the State Secretary] A.V. Makarov, addressing directly to *g[ospo]d[i]n ober-sekretar'* (Mr. Chief-Secretary), inquired about the progress in drafting:

Since His Imperial Majesty ordered the code to be composed in two parts, covering crimes against the state separately from civil crimes, I beg you to inform me immediately whether you are composing the code in this manner.⁵⁷

- 20 In his reply of March 3rd the same year, addressed to g[osu]d[a]r' moi premudry Aleksei Vasil'evich (my wise Milord Aleksei Vasil'evich), A.S. Sverchkov sent a "sheet" with a very detailed plan in accordance to which the new code was being drafted.⁵⁸ In spring 1723 A.S. Sverchkov set off to Saint-Petersburg with rough and final drafts of the commission's legal texts. Of all the commission members it was A.S. Sverchkov who bore the main burden of preparing the documents for "hearings and approval" in the northern capital.⁵⁹ Firstly, he "divided the Ulozhenie into two parts," separating crimes against the state from civil crimes; secondly, he compiled a register of articles from both, the existing decrees and the new ones; thirdly, he participated in the elaboration of several chapters on legal proceedings.⁶⁰ As a result, by the time of Peter I's death, "registers of all chapters and articles of the new code had been drafted" with Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov's "active personal participation."⁶¹
- 21 In the second half of the 1720s and early 1730s, despite the fact that "the presence" of the legislative commission was not "filled up with the required number of members," A.S. Sverchkov (appointed Chief-Secretary of the Senate by Empress's decree of June 1st 1726 and served in this position till 1741⁶²) and his chancellery continued working on the code, in particular on the votchinnaia glava [the chapter on real estate] and the section on religious crimes.⁶³ Between 1736 and 1742 Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov was the main figure of the legislative commission: he managed its activities as an independent institution⁶⁴ and was in charge of the elaboration of most of the projects. Sverchkov submitted proposals to the Senate and the Cabinet on the appointment of the new members of the commission chancellery⁶⁵, on the procedure of the discussion on particular sections of the code,⁶⁶ and on the collection and elaboration of decree extracts⁶⁷. In 1738-1739 A.S. Sverchkov actively participated in the Senate discussion on the real estate chapter of the future legal code⁶⁸. Simultaneously Avraam Stepanovich worked on the sudnaia glava [the court chapter], and in 1737-1739 he drafted a large project Ob uderzhanii pytki v malykh delakh [On avoiding tortures in minor cases], referring, alongside Russian law, to Swedish and Danish legislation⁶⁹.
- 22 From March 1738 until the end of October 1739 the Senate successively heard "projects composed by the Chief-Secretary," in particular the chapter O sude (On court), and Avraam Stepanovich "corrected and drafted" them straightway.⁷⁰ The discussion minutes contain a direct indication that once the hearing of the "court" part was finished the commission and the Senate would study "other chapters, which will be presented by Chief-Secretary Sverchkov."⁷¹ The minutes are most likely to refer to the project Ob umen'shenii pis'ma, kakim poriadkom postupat' [On the methods of reducing paperwork],⁷² elaborated by Sverchkov and presented to the Senate on June 2nd 1738. From October 1738 besides drafting, one of his most important tasks was the systematization of existing legislation. In 1738-1741 the legislative commission made up general "registers" of decrees according to the plan elaborated by Sverchkov. They included ukases issued from 1649 to 1740 and those ones dependant on General'nyi reglament [the General regulation].⁷³
- 23 A.S. Sverchkov's merits and efforts did not remain unnoticed: by the decree of January 2nd 1741, "signed with the name of Her Imperial Majesty, Her Imperial Highness Sovereign, great princess Anna of all Russia by her own hand,"⁷⁴ Sverchkov was granted the rank of

State Councillor, and, consequently, hereditary nobility.⁷⁵ On January 8th the same year he was appointed a member of the Revision Collegium. He was supposed to carry out this activity simultaneously with his legislation work and to proceed with "drafting the code."

⁷⁶

- 24 The coup of November 25th 1741 changed A.S. Sverchkov's situation. On December 1st the Senate decree ordered State Councillor "Avraam Sverchkov to be taken under guard."⁷⁷ It is unknown how long Avraam Stepanovich remained under arrest; he was released and returned to his duties in the legislative commission before December 26th 1741, the date he issued an instruction to begin the study of the papers submitted to the commission by Palata ob ulozhenii [the Legislative Chamber].⁷⁸ However, the commission's activities de facto were suspended due to the shift of power and on January 16th 1742 the Empress issued the decree "on dismissal of State Councillor Avraam Sverchkov from any service."⁷⁹ Apparently, Avraam Stepanovich did not have a desire to leave the commission of his own volition, since the Senate resolution from January 26th 1742 on the transfer of all commission affairs to Secretary Fedor Antonov had a special note of "calling the above-mentioned Sverchkov to the Senate to notify him about that."⁸⁰

- 25 Arrest, retirement and subsequent loss of positions in service did not significantly affect A.S. Sverchkov's social connections. On the contrary, in the 1740s and 1750s the field in which the former State Councillor's social activities took place and in which his social environment was formed up, not only included high chancellery functionaries, but was also enriched by the representatives of the titled nobility. The above-mentioned process seems to be a consequence of Sverchkov acquiring hereditary noble status and financial security, on the one hand, and the successful marriages in Sverchkov's family, on the other. The sources do not answer the question of how Avraam Stepanovich developed his marriage strategies and whether he was guided by pragmatic interests or true human feelings. However, in any case, the last marriage of Avraam Stepanovich and his material well-being, as well as his elder daughter's marriage and the further successful career of his son-in-law, Ivan Ivanovich Iushkov, reinforced the family's social position in general and Sverchkov's, in particular.

The family

- 26 In 1746, at the age of 53, Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov married Mariia Mikhailovna (Mikhailova doch') Sveshnikova (d. on August 20th 1755)⁸¹. The following year 1747, their daughter Anastasiia was born. This was Avraam Stepanovich's third marriage. There is no written evidence regarding Sverchkov's first wife. His second, or sredniia (middle), one, as Sverchkov referred to her,⁸² was Evdokiia Iakovlevna (Avdot'ia Iakovleva doch'), whom Avraam Stepanovich had been married to in 1718. For Evdokiia Iakovlevna, who was 4 years older than Sverchkov, it was most likely a second marriage: for A.S. Sverchkov's household the census of Sankt-Peterburgskii ostrov of 1718 recorded daughter, Tat'iana, six months old, and "stepdaughter" devka (maiden) Iryna Alekseevna ("Orina Alekseeva doch'"), "fourteen years old."⁸³
- 27 There is no evidence regarding the dowries brought to A.S. Sverchkov by his first two wives. The dowry brought by "the last" wife, Mariia Mikhailovna, consisted of, "by God's mercy, holy icons, diamond objects, gold and silver, pearls, and cloths, and copper ware"⁸⁴ worth 2,000 roubles; in addition, M.M. Sveshnikova was given "two devki from the

village Krasnikovo," the latter apparently belonged to her parents.⁸⁵ Mariia Mikhailovna's father Mikhail Ivanovich Sveshnikov, Secretary of the Collegium of Justice,⁸⁶ and his close relatives belonged to the same milieu of high rank kantseliarnye sluzhiteli [chancellery officials],⁸⁷ in which A.S. Sverchkov used to serve, and in which this type of marriage "was not rare."⁸⁸ Guarantors' signatures in sgovornaia made on January 29th 1746 attest to it: alongside guarantors from the military ranks we find the signatures of Nikita Mikhailovich (Mikhailov syn) Strukov, Secretary of the Collegium of Justice (who still occupied the post in 1754-1755⁸⁹) and Mikhail Afanas'evich (Afanas'ev syn) Antonov, "kamisar" of Glavnaia dvortsovaia kantseliariia [the General Court Chancellery].⁹⁰

- 28 M.M. Sverchkova's maternal relatives—her mother was Elena Ivanovna Bogdanova (Alena Ivanova doch' Bogdanova)⁹¹—belonged to the nobility, and also served in the chancelleries of central state institutions. On May 11th 1769 Mariia Mikhailovna's cousins, the children of her uncle Emel'ian Ivanovich Bogdanov, Aleksei and Aleksandr⁹², entered the dispute over Sverchkov's legacy. Aleksei Emel'ianovich Bogdanov, kantseliarist [chancellery clerk] of Moscow Provincial Chancellery, and his brother, Aleksandr Emel'ianovich Bogdanov, podkantseliarist [minor chancellery clerk] of the Collegium of State Income, submitted a petition to the Collegium of Justice and underlined the fact that they were "from nobility."⁹³ Elena Ivanovna Bogdanova owned a real estate: the village of Lomakino in Arzamasskii uезд in Zalesskii stan za Shednovskimi vorotami [Zalesskii district behind Shednovskii gates], and sel'tso Frolovo [the small village of Frolovo] in Vereiskii uезд. In 1721, both villages were "signed over" to her daughter, Mariia Mikhailovna; according to the Second Revision they together counted 199 "souls." M.M. Sverchkova "transferred" some of the peasants to her "Moscow household"; one "peasant's son, bachelor," Perfilii Ignat'ev, was bought by Sverchkova's son-in-law I.I. Iushkov in 1752. On April 29th of the same year, M.M. Sverchkova "with her husband's consent" sold Lomakino village, which included 118 "souls" and a pomeschchikov dom [landowner house], as well as the adjoining Chicherina and Romanovskaia pustoshi [wastelands]. The buyer, second major Demid Petrovich (Petrov syn) Arkatov paid 3,200 roubles to Mariia Mikhailovna.⁹⁴ In 1750 M.M. Sverchkova purchased sel'tso Rukavkino "with wastelands" in Moskovskii uезд in her own name and paid 2,100 roubles. It was the property of lieutenant Matvei Vasil'evich (Vasil'ev syn) Dmitriev-Mamonov. She also bought "Polushkino village," belonging to Iakov Ivanovich (Ivanov syn) Fongister, sub-lieutenant of the "Ladozhskii channel squadron," for 600 roubles.⁹⁵ Estates in Vereiskii uезд devolved to A.S. Sverchkov's younger daughter, Anastasiia Avraamovna.

- 29 Avraam Stepanovich and Mariia Mikhailovna Sverchkov maintained close relations with the Sveshnikovs. In the summer of 1755 Mariia Mikhailovna's uncle, her father's brother, Court Councillor Ivan Ivanovich (Ivanov syn) Sveshnikov, who directed kantseliariia sobstvennykh Eё Imperatorskogo Velichestva votchin [the Chancellery of Her Imperial Majesty's own estates]⁹⁶ from April 1753 to December 1763 with the rank of an army colonel, bought back Sverchkov's jewellery, a diamond ring and "other objects" that Avraam Stepanovich had earlier pledged to the merchant Fedor Serikov.⁹⁷ In addition, his svoiachina [sister-in-law), M.M. Sverchkova's stepsister Evdokiia Mikhailovna (Mikailova doch') Sveshnikova, stored some of her belongings at Sverchkov's house.⁹⁸ In paragraph thirteen of his will Sverchkov prescribed "to return" to Evdokiia Mikhailovna her "trunks and silver with her seal," as well as the loan of 300 roubles.⁹⁹

- 30 As within the ruling elite, members of which were bound by kinship relations that served as instruments of "integration" and maintenance of social status,¹⁰⁰ marriages between the families of collegiate and chancellery functionaries had the same purpose and contributed to eventual career development and new informal connections.¹⁰¹ In this context, A.S. Sverchkov and M.M. Sveshnikova's marriage was mutually advantageous: Avraam Stepanovich maintained and reinforced his position in bureaucratic circles, while Mariia Mikhailovna became a hereditary nobleman's wife. Signatures of persons attesting the sale of the village of Lomakino by M.M. Sverchkova in 1752 affirm that the Sverchkovs socialized within the functionary milieu. Among those who attested to the kupchaia [deed of purchase] we can find functionaries belonging to hereditary chancellery service families, who occupied different positions in the chancelleries of several collegiums; in particular, Councillor Ivan Ivanovich (Ivanov syn) Topil'skii, Nikolai Andreevich (Andreev syn) Kop'ev, protokolist [minute keeper] of the Collegium of Foreign Affairs, and Iurii Larionovich (Larionov syn) Ivanov, Secretary of the same collegium, signed the act.
- 31 A.S. Sverchkov had long-lasting relations with the Topil'skiis, who had been involved in the chancellery service since the 17th century.¹⁰² Sverchkov served under Ivan Ivanovich Topil'skii's father, Ivan Petrovich (1672-after 1734), in Zemskaiia kantseliariia [the Estate Chancellery]. I.P. Topil'skii served as a pod'iachii in Razriadnyi stol [The Military Service Chancellery], from 1713 as d'iak (clerk) of Voennaia kantseliaria [the Military Chancellery], from 1716 as Landrikhter of Moscow Province, from 1719 as the chief of Zemskaiia kantseliaria and as Ober-Landrikhter of Moscow Provincial Court and finally, from 1723 as the chief of Raskol'nicheskaia kontora (the Schismatic Chamber) of the Synod. His daughter Feodosiia Ivanovna was the first wife of the Cabinet Secretary A.V. Makarov. I.P. Topil'skii was, perhaps, the person who contributed to the progress of A.S. Sverchkov's career. In 1752, State Councillor Ivan Ivanovich Topil'skii, owner of 140 souls, served in the Collegium of Foreign Affairs with an annual salary of 1,000 roubles¹⁰³. N.A. Kop'ev most likely belonged to the Kop'evs' chancellery "clan," which originated in the taxable stratum. The members of this "chancellery family" advanced in their careers due to family relations with vice-chancellor baron Petr Pavlovich Shafirov.¹⁰⁴
- 32 The Sverchkovs' social circle was not limited by bureaucracy, it also included distinguished noblemen, who signed the deed of purchase in 1752, as well as Avraam Stepanovich's will in 1755. In 1752 a corporal of the lifeguard Semenovskii regiment, Prince Ivan Nikolaevich (kniaz' Nikolaev syn) Volkonskii and praporshchik Prince Mikhail Ivanovich (kniaz' Ivanov syn) Vadbol'skii signed the act "by their own hand."¹⁰⁵ The will shows only noblemen signatures: in November 1755 it was attested by Prince Vasilii Sergeevich (kniaz' Sergeev syn) Dolgorukov, captain of the Novgorodskii infantry regiment, Aleksandr Iur'evich (Iur'ev syn) Neledinskii-Meletskii, lieutenant of the lifeguard Semenovskii regiment, Prince Aleksandr Aleksandrovich (kniaz' Aleksandrov syn) Prozorovskii, lieutenant of the second infantry regiment, and Prince Iurii Vasil'evich (kniaz' Vasil'ev syn) Khovanskii, cornet of the lifeguard Mounted regiment.¹⁰⁶
- 33 The nature of the relations between A.S. Sverchkov and the above-mentioned persons, five of whom were princes, requires further investigation. However, at this stage it is already possible to suggest that Avraam Stepanovich and the Neledinskii-Meletskii met in official capacity. Aleksandr Iur'evich Neledinskii-Meletskii was a son of Stol'nik Iurii Stepanovich Neledinskii-Meletskii, a member of a boyar family. The latter started his service at the court of tsarina Praskov'ia Fedorovna and in 1706 he served in Rozriad [The

Military Service Chancellery] and later in Koniushennyi prikaz [the Stable Chancellery]. In 1719 Iu.S. Neledinskii-Meletskii became the judge of Denezhnyi dvor [the Monetary Court]. In the 1710s he belonged to the close circle of Peter I. In 1726-1728 Active State Councillor Iu.S. Neledinskii-Meletskii was a member of the Senate, where, as previously mentioned, A.S. Sverchkov occupied the post of Chief-Secretary.¹⁰⁷ Aleksandr Iurevich Neledinskii-Meletskii was granted the rank of lifeguard captain and retired in 1763. However, he subsequently returned to service and made a career in court, obtaining the position of Active Chamberlain in 1768. Iu.S. and A.Iu. Neledinskii-Meletskii possessed lands in Moscow Province.¹⁰⁸

- 34 The sources do not provide information on the level of emotional engagement and friendship between A.S. Sverchkov and the guarantors of his deals and acts. However, it is highly probable that the composition of A.S. Sverchkov's social circle, as well as a clear tendency to renounce his contacts with chancellery bureaucracy were a consequence of, firstly, the aspiration to strengthen his own noble status from that of a functionary (especially in the context of the increase of nobility's self-perception as a distinct social stratum, typical of the mid 1750s, resulting in the tendency to dissociate itself from other social groups and to codify the privileges and "the rights of their «estate»"¹⁰⁹), and, secondly, the high social and service position of Sverchkov's son-in-law, I.I. Iushkov.
- 35 Ivan Ivanovich Iushkov was the husband of A.S. Sverchkov's elder daughter, Tat'iana Avraamovna, whose mother was Avraam Stepanovich's second wife Evdokiia Iakovlevna. Tat'iana was born either in 1717 or 1718: she was "six months" old in 1718.¹¹⁰ In 1734 she married a nobleman, I.I. Iushkov; her dowry consisted of some imenie [property], which has not yet been identified, as well as a dvorovoe mesto [urban plot of land] in Proezzhi peregulok in the "parish of the Intercession of Il'ia Church."¹¹¹ I.I. Iushkov's father, Ivan Stepanovich Iushkov, was a stol'nik; I.I. Iushkov's uncle, Andrei Stepanovich, was also a stol'nik at the court of tsarina Praskov'ia Fedorovna.¹¹² Ivan Ivanovich Iushkov also began his service at court: in 1728 he was appointed a page of "tsesarevna and great princess Paraskeviia Ioannovna," and in 1730 he became her kammer-page. At the moment of his marriage with T.A. Sverchkova, Iushkov was a praporshchik of the Suzdal' infantry regiment, where he was "adjutant and served in different military campaigns." Ivan Ivanovich's career was very successful: in 1735 he was promoted to captain of the Ukrainian lant-milicia regiments, then in 1735-1737 he served as an executor in General 'nyi krigs-kommissariat [the General War Commissariat], in the Military Office and in the Military Collegium. In 1737 Iushkov achieved the rank of major and in 1740 he was sent to Glukhov to carry out an investigation.¹¹³ On March 11th 1741, I.I. Iushkov was given the rank of lieutenant colonel; the same year he moved to the civil service and was "promoted to Councillor of Shchetnaia kantora [the Audit Chamber] of the Military Collegium." From 1742, I.I. Iushkov served in the Collegium of Justice, and on December 18th 1753 "by personal decree of Her Imperial Majesty sovereign Elizaveta Petrovna was kindly promoted to the rank of State Councillor and appointed the main judge of Sudnyi prikaz [the Court Chancellery]."¹¹⁴ In the late 1750s, I.I. Iushkov was one of the members of the legislative commission and participated in the elaboration of a new legal code. By the Empress's personal decree of August 16th 1760 he was granted the rank of Active State Councillor and appointed "president of the Collegium of State Income"; by March 21st 1762 he had reached the rank of privy councillor and was ordered to perform the duties of Saint-Petersburg general-politsmeister (chief of police). In 1764 in the rank

of privy councillor I.I. Iushkov was appointed Moscow Governor and remained in this post until his retirement in 1773¹¹⁵.

- 36 I.I. Iushkov was a major landlord: by 1754 he owned vast estates in Moskovskii, Kashinskii, Rostovskii, Iaroslavskii, Galitskii, Vologodskii, Belozerskii, Aleksinskii, Volokolamskii, Ruzskii, Muromskii, Arzamasskii and Klinskii uezds, with more than 3,000 "souls" in total¹¹⁶. This fact probably explains why A.S. Sverchkov did not bequeath any movable or real property to his elder daughter Tat'iana Avraamovna. Apparently he considered that her future was rather well provided for. According to paragraph eleven of the will, Tat'iana "was blessed" with an icon "in a big silver framework with holy relics." The will also gave her the right to make decision on several matters. T.A. Iushkova could dispose of "other" holy icons and decide the future of several promissory notes on her sole discretion. The first promissory note, for 560 roubles, of which 50 roubles had been paid, was written for Iryna Sergeevna (Arina Sergeeva doch') Lodyzhenskaia, wife of the deceased kapitan komandor [captain commander] Vasilii Iur'evich (Yur'ev syn) Lodyzhenskii. A.S. Lodyzhenskaia could be given back the promissory note without covering the rest of the debt. The second promissory note for a total amount of more than 100 roubles including interest was given in the name of merchant Grigorii Medvedev; however, his widow and minor son were not able to pay. Sverchkov suggested "to free them from that debt."¹¹⁷
- 37 The Sverchkovs and the Iushkovs had quite close relationships: A.S. Sverchkov particularly regretted Tat'iana's absence from Moscow at the moment of drawing up the will. Expressing his unrest about the legacy's future, he underlined that, "moreover, my elder daughter is not in Moscow."¹¹⁸ Avraam Stepanovich also specified that before his younger daughter Anastasiia reached full age any amounts received from Sverchkov's securities, at discretion of Moscow University, could be transferred to "his son-in-law," which eventually did happen.¹¹⁹ I.I. Iushkov was entrusted with all further instructions over minor Anastasiia's real property under his "supervision and maintenance."¹²⁰
- 38 Thanks to I.I. Iushkov's family and service connections, A.S. Sverchkov approached the circle of highest state officials, who, in turn, perceived Avraam Stepanovich as belonging to "them" and highlighted that fact.¹²¹ In this context, a vivid discussion between the president of the Collegium of Justice, Nikita Mikhailovich Zheliabuzhskii, and prokuror (the prosecutor) of the same Collegium, Stepan Fedorovich Protasov, between December 13th and 22nd 1755 deserves special attention. At the meetings on December 13th and 14th, examining Moscow University's promemoria on Sverchkov's property, N.M. Zheliabuzhskii refused to sign resolutions referring to his svoistvo [relations by marriage] with one of the petitioners and presented pokolennaia rospis' [a genealogical table] that confirmed this fact. From Zheliabuzhskii's point of view, according to the existing legislation as I.I. Iushkov's vnuchatyi brat [grand brother], he could not participate in the decisions on matters concerning A.S. Sverchkov. S.F. Protasov did not find the motives persuasive: from his point of view, Zheliabuzhskii had to come back to his duties, since, firstly, he was not a relative of Sverchkov, and secondly, at that moment neither I.I. Iushkov, nor his wife had submitted any claim. The president of the Collegium of Justice insisted that he was right and refused to sign the resolutions.¹²² It should be noted that N.M. Zheliabuzhskii's father, Mikhail Vasil'evich Zheliabuzhskii, most likely knew Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov in person. In the early 1720s M.V. Zheliabuzhskii, at that time a judge of Moscow Nadvornyi sud, was a member of the legislative commission (since 1721), where, as previously mentioned, A.S. Sverchkov performed as Secretary.¹²³

- 39 Ivan Ivanovich Iushkov and Tat'iana Avraamovna Sverchkova had no children. Ivan Ivanovich reported to the census of functionaries in 1754: "does not have any children."¹²⁴ Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov regretted this very much (see below for details). This is the reason why Anastasiia, Tat'iana Avraamovna's younger stepsister, "was brought up" in the house of Ivan Ivanovich Iushkov, who treated her as his own daughter, even while her own father and mother were alive. In 1766, in coming into her inheritance, Anastasiia Avraamovna wrote about the years spent with Iushkov's family:

lived in the house of my brother-in-law Ivan Ivanovich, was grown and educated with such fatherly care as a parent cannot strive to feel to his daughter, and all the public can attest this, and for the fatherly education I owe him my gratitude forever.¹²⁵

- 40 The inventory of the property that remained after Anastasiia's death confirms her good education and knowledge of German and French languages. Books were kept in the second of her five "trunks": eighteen "Russian printed books of different titles, forty German and French books, also of different titles."¹²⁶ As her guardian, I.I. Iushkov was in charge of A.A. Sverchkova's financial affairs and, pursuant to the will, received from Moscow University the interests from Avraam Stepanovich's promissory notes and mortgages. The amounts were considerable: in 1760, 1761 and 1763 the university transferred to Iushkov 20,226 roubles 94 "and a half" copecks.¹²⁷
- 41 On July 26th 1766 Anastasiia Avraamovna Sverchkova married Vasilii Vasil'evich Zybin, retired second major, son of Vasilii Davidovich Zybin, who in the 1760s lived "over Moskva-river in the parish of the St. Nicholas the Wonderworker church in Kuznetsy"¹²⁸ and owned lands in Iaroslavskii uezd and Chernskii uezd.¹²⁹ By that time Anastasiia Avraamovna's elder sister had been dead for a long time: she passed away "childless before her younger [sister]'s marriage" in 1760. On September 27th 1766 A.A. Zybina came into possession of the rights to the property of her deceased parents and sister; she officially formalized at Krepostnaia kontora the receipt of her mother's and father's legacies from I.I. Iushkov, including "money, promissory notes and mortgages" for the total amount of 26,498 roubles 76 copecks, and the "amicable" division of her sister's legacy with I.I. Iushkov.¹³⁰ Anastasiia Avraamovna's marriage was short: "on June 20th" 1767 she died "in great suffering and unconscious."¹³¹
- 42 In his will Avraam Stepanovich foresaw such a course of events. Anxious about his daughters' health, he observed with regret that "for his sins" he had little "hope" for "my parental legacy." Tat'iana had no children, and, from her father's point of view, she was "very hopeless" in "producing heirs." "Severe illnesses," from which the elder daughter had suffered for more than 15 years, coupled with her weak health made the birth of heirs rather unlikely. The future of the younger daughter, eight-year-old Anastasiia, seemed vague to Sverchkov as well: at the moment of drawing up the will she was "still a minor" and had not had either "smallpox" or "any other epileptic deceases." In this context A.S. Sverchkov saw only one safe "shelter" and "refuge" for his "small property" in the event of extinction of the family line—the "most spiritual university", under the auspices of which he "asked," "begged" and "appealed" to receive his money, promissory notes and mortgages in the hope that they would provide for the education of orphans. This expression explicitly demonstrates that the capital he had accumulated could circulate and be inherited only within a narrow family circle, beyond which he recognized no family relations and called potential candidates nothing but "embezzlers."

132

“Embezzlers”

- 43 The event that followed the death of Sverchkov’s younger daughter Anastasiia Avraamovna Zybina in 1767 proved that Avraam Stepanovich’s suspicions about his legacy were not unfounded: an entire group of relatives beyond his family considered themselves eligible to claim the property of the deceased State Councillor and, moreover, to challenge the validity of his will.
- 44 In November 1768, pursuant to the Senate resolution, the Collegium of Justice resumed the examination in order to decide the future of the legacy. Based on Avraam Stepanovich’s will and the fact that A.A. Zybina died childless and did not leave any direct heir, Moscow University claimed its rights on Sverchkova-Zybina’s property.¹³³ However, the examination lingered.
- 45 On December 23rd 1768 the Collegium of Justice received a petition from “Aksin’ia Stepanova’s daughter, wife of the deceased kantseliarist Aleksei Fedorov syn Maslennikov.”¹³⁴ Aksin’ia Stepanovna Maslennikova, an illiterate, claimed to be Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov’s full sister, and, referring to the absence of either “close” or “distant” relatives of the deceased Sverchkov and his daughters, pretended to be the “only close legitimate heir”, followed by her son, registrar Ivan Maslennikov.¹³⁵
- 46 In paragraph six of his will, in concluding the section on promissory notes and loans, A.S. Sverchkov mentioned “podkantseliarist Maslennikov” and gave an unflattering reference about his service capacities and other qualities. First, Maslennikov did not get any service position due to his “incapacity to affairs” because “he was not fit for any service.” Second, he owed Sverchkov two promissory notes for a total amount of 175 roubles. Glavnyi Magistrat [the Principal Magistrate] had examined the failure to repay them, while the Collegium of Justice had limited Maslennikov’s legal capacity and forbade him to make any acts or transactions. Third, Maslennikov mortgaged the house “behind Tverskie vorota,” and Sverchkov had to buy it out “paying more than a hundred roubles”. This is why Avraam Stepanovich’s last will was unequivocal in regard to Maslennikov: he prescribed “not to give him back those promissory notes [and] not to withdraw them from the debt”, but, on the contrary, to proceed with them and recover “with recambio and with interest.” “His mother and my sister, widow Aksin’ia Stepan’s daughter,” could potentially “legalise” the above-mentioned house in her name “for free,” since “he [Maslennikov] for his ill deeds deserves no sympathy.”¹³⁶
- 47 In this way, A.S. Sverchkov, whose kinship relations were lacking any hints of emotional attachment and had a rather financial and business character, clearly and unequivocally made it known that his closest relatives—his full sister and nephew—were excluded as potential heirs and could not be considered as such. This is how his last will was interpreted by the members of the Collegium of Justice: in 1780, examining the case on A.S. Sverchkov’s will, they pointed out that “in his will Sverchkov completely passed over”¹³⁷ his full sister and her children. Maslennikov Jr.’s improper deeds do not appear to be the only reason for this decision. Alongside his widely known “ill behaviour,”¹³⁸ the rather low social and service positions of pod’iacheskaia zhena [clerk’s wife] A.S. Maslennikova and her son, suspended from the duties of podkantseliarist, might have played a role. In the late 1740s - mid 1750s the Maslennikovs were clearly discordant with

the social position of the Sverchkov family, whose social circle included chancellery elite and nobility.

- 48 Subsequently Ivan Alekseevich Maslennikov entered service: in the second half of the 1760s he served as Collegiate Registrar in the Collegium of State Income and lived in Moscow with his mother Aksin'ia Stepanovna, most likely near Arbat in the parish of the Intercession of Holy Mary in Levshino; the priest of the church Aleksei Kirillov was "her [Aksin'ia's] spiritual father."¹³⁹ I.A. Maslennikov also owned some "villages" where he went during his "absence" in the winter of 1770¹⁴⁰. Ivan Alekseevich was married; in the 1770s his daughter Ekaterina ("Katerina") joined the dispute over the legacy.¹⁴¹
- 49 If A.S. Sverchkov and subsequently his daughters sought to minimize contacts with the relatives, the latter, on the contrary, demonstrated a keen interest in what was happening in the Sverchkov, Iushkov and Zybin families; subsequently they attentively followed the court examination of the will. This fact is attested by Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova's petition, which was accepted, as previously mentioned, a few days after the Collegium of Justice examined the devolution of A.S. Sverchkov's legacy to the university. On November 11th 1768 the Senate issued a resolution based on the university's report: the latter informed the superior authority about the death of A.S. Sverchkov's only heir, A.A. Zybina, and requested the transfer (while allocating the "prescribed proportion" to Anastasiia Avraamovna's husband) of the remaining movable and real property, since "it belongs to Moscow University."¹⁴² The case was transmitted to the third Department of the Collegium of Justice on November 18th and heard at the collegiate meetings on November 20th and December 8th and 15th the same year. Then the Collegium issued a resolution to review the original text of the will, make extracts of decrees and take the decision according to them¹⁴³. A week later, on December 23rd 1768, A.S. Maslennikova's petition claiming a part of the legacy was received¹⁴⁴. The plaintiff, in particular, referred to the Senate ukase of November 11th 1768, pursuant to which the Collegium of Justice demanded the will¹⁴⁵. In addition, A.S. Maslennikova underlined that in her brother's will potential transfer to the university concerned only movable property, while Sverchkov "did not mentioned at all" his real estate "except the sale of the previously bought small village Rukavkino near Moscow."¹⁴⁶ Taking this into account, and referring to the fact that, in her interpretation, the will had been in force only until Sverchkov's daughter Anastasiia's marriage, subsequently losing any validity and becoming "null and void," Maslennikova declared herself to be "in all respects the closest legitimate heir by kinship."¹⁴⁷
- 50 In her hope to obtain the legacy, Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova repeatedly addressed the Collegium of Justice: she submitted petitions on May 15th 1769 and on January 29th 1770¹⁴⁸. It is remarkable that in much the same way as Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov recognized heirs only within the frame of his family, in her petitions his sister Aksin'ia Stepanovna ignored other close relatives. Connected through her husband and son with lower and middle ranked chancellery clerks, living in Moscow for several years (A.S. Maslennikova died before 1774¹⁴⁹), she did not maintain any contacts with the relatives who were not part of that circle and belonged to a different social stratum. However, these relatives existed, and in 1774 they joined the dispute over the legacy.
- 51 On September 15th 1774 the Collegium of Justice "reported" a petition by "Ivan's children, diakons Il'ia and Ivan, and Andrei, chorister of the house of his Eminence Antonii, bishop of Nizhni Novgorod and Alatorsk"; it had been received on September 11th the same year. Declaring themselves as grandchildren of Sverchkov's full sister, Domna Stepanovna

Gerasimova, they claimed the rights to the legacy of "our great-uncle State Councillor Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov" and complained about their great-aunt Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova, who disputed the legacy "without mentioning us."¹⁵⁰ The last sentence was not a mere figure of speech: total absence of contact was confirmed by A.S. Maslennikova's granddaughter Ekaterina Alekseevna. In the counter petition she wrote, in particular:

I, the undersigned, have never heard in my whole life from my grandmother Aksin'ia or my aunts Tat'iana Iushkova or Nastas'ia Zybina or my father or anyone else that my above-mentioned grandfather Avram Sverchkov had a full sister Domna.¹⁵¹

- 52 In their response the Grigor'ev brothers and their father, "priest Ioann Grigor'ev", attested both the kinship and the fact that A.S. Sverchkov and A.S. Maslennikova were well aware of the existence of relatives in Nizhnii Novgorod. To that end they referred to "outsiders who knew their kin" and were able to confirm the relevance of their declaration: Collegiate Assessor Semen Osipovich (Osipov syn) Zhegulin, "member" of the Moscow University board; Collegiate Assessor Timofei Grigor'evich (Grigor'ev syn) Maslovskii, "member" of the Glavnaia solianaia kontora [the Main Salt Office] (the latter was "busy" in Nizhnii Novgorod for a long time); Titular Councillor Ammos Pavlovich (Pavlov syn) Mendelev, Secretary of the Moscow Iamskaia kontora [the Post Office]; and retired Titular Councillor Mikhail Ivanovich (Ivanov syn) Ivanov, who acted as the Grigor'evs' poverennyi (legal representative) in 1774-1776.¹⁵²
- 53 The Grigor'evs (tserkovniki [clergymen], as E.I. Maslennikova called them¹⁵³) confirmed the relevance of their claims with a genealogical table of "the Sverchkov kin," attached to the petition (see ill. 1). According to this, the progenitor of the Sverchkov family was Grigorii; his son Stepan Grigor'evich Sverchkov had three children in his marriage with Kseniia Sverchkova: Avraam, Aksin'ia and Domna. As previously mentioned, Aksin'ia Stepanovna Sverchkova married kantseliarist Aleksei Fedorovich Maslennikov; their son Ivan Alekseevich Maslennikov died in March 1774¹⁵⁴. In her marriage with Gerasim (currently I do not have any information about his social status or career) Domna Stepanovna had a daughter Afim'ia, whose husband Ivan Grigor'ev was "the priest of the church of the Great Martyr Varvara in Novgorod." It was he who, by virtue of poverennoe pis'mo (the letter of attorney) of his children Il'ia, Ivan and Andrei Grigor'ev, submitted the petition and attested the accuracy of the genealogical table.¹⁵⁵

Illustration 1. Genealogical table of "the Sverchkov family"

RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 311.

- 54 Information about the "Sverchkov family" partially confirms the data of the previously mentioned *podmetnoe pis'mo* of 1724, which informed the authorities that A.S. Sverchkov was a "peasant's son from Nizhegorodskii uезд."¹⁵⁶ The facts cited by the Grigor'ev brothers and their father during the dispute over legacy attest to the following: Sverchkov did come from Nizhegorodskii uезд, where his relatives lived in the 1770s and he probably originated from the lowest social stratum. The matter requires further investigation; but the fact that the Sverchkov family belonged to the peasantry of Nizhegorodskii uезд is indirectly confirmed by the absence of any social characteristics in the information provided about his father, sister Domna, her husband and daughter. While in their description of the matrimonial connections of their "grand-aunt" Aksin'ia Stepanovna the authors of the petition pointed out that "she had been married to a kantseliarist Aleksei Fedorovich Maslennikov," and her son was "State Registrar Ivan Alekseevich Maslennikov," the information about "full grandmother" is much briefer: they only mentioned that "after her death Domna left her daughter and our ... mother Afim'ia," saying nothing about who their grandfather Gerasim was.¹⁵⁷
- 55 Despite mutual accusations of illegitimate claims, A.S. Sverchkov's grand-nephews succeeded in finding an agreement on the division of grand-uncle's legacy. The case was still being examined by the Collegium of Justice when on October 25th 1777 Ekaterina Ivanovna Maslennikova, Ivan Alekseevich's daughter and Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova's granddaughter, and her second cousins brothers Grigor'ev submitted two petitions on the same day. The petitions attested to the fact of the "amicable" division of the legacy, which by that time was not yet devolved. Brothers Il'ia Ivanovich and Ivan Ivanovich Grigor'ev, clergymen, as well as Andrei Ivanovich Grigor'ev, *podkantseliarist* of

the Chancellery of Nizhegorodskaiia Province, renounced any claims over the legacy, while in return E.I. Maslennikova agreed to compensate their potential portion of the latter. Subsequently Ekaterina Ivanovna, who married second major Nikolai Iur'evich (Iur'ev syn) Andreianov, voevoda of Dmitrov [governor of the town of Dmitrov], between July 1778 and September 1779, repeatedly petitioned the Collegium of Justice¹⁵⁸ in the hope of getting the legacy.

- 56 The Collegium of Justice did not deliver its final verdict on the case until 1780: on December 11th "by the majority of votes" the members of the Collegium did not recognize as well grounded the claims of Moscow University over the property of Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov, referring to the "expiration" of the will's validity at the moment of Anastasiia Avraamovna Sverchkova's marriage and devolution of the legacy to her; subsequent devolution of the property was subject to the existing legislation. The children and grandchildren of A.S. Sverchkov's sisters, Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova and Domna Stepanovna Gerasimova, were recognized as "close" legitimate candidates; the "amicable" agreement between them left Ekaterina Ivanovna Maslennikova, married Andreianova, as the only heir.¹⁵⁹
- 57 Study of Sverchkov's will suggests that only a nuclear family existed and had value for Avraam Stepanovich, who had acquired hereditary nobility through his service. Outlining the principles of his property division after his death, A.S. Sverchkov acted similar to the vast majority of noblemen, more than 90% of which, as Michelle Lamarche Marrese has pointed out, left their movable and unmovable possessions to their children, granting them exclusive rights to their property. However, while in the case of nobility a clear preference to a nuclear family did not demonstrate a break in kinship relations and in any sense did not mean a lack of the importance of fidelity to their kin¹⁶⁰, A.S. Sverchkov's situation was rather different. Originating from taxable *soslovie* [estate], successfully serving as Secretary and Chief-Secretary for many years—positions which "worked as a springboard for a successful career for persons of non-nobility origin,"¹⁶¹ and finally acquiring the rank of State Councillor and hereditary nobility thanks to his professional qualities and personal merits, Avraam Stepanovich consciously minimized any kinship relations or did not find it necessary to maintain them. Unlike childless noblemen, A.S. Sverchkov, while expressing well-grounded anxiety about the potential childlessness of his daughters and the subsequent absence of heirs, did not even consider bequeathing his property to relatives. It is natural to suggest that Avraam Stepanovich's full sister Aksin'ia Stepanovna Maslennikova, who lived in Moscow and attentively followed everything that was happening with her brother's family and property, could seek and sought contacts. However, in his view, possible contacts were considerably limited by the deviant behaviour of one of the representatives of the kin line: close relatives are not mentioned in the will. Moreover, Sverchkov took active (in his point of view) measures in order to prevent any potential possibility of devolution of his legacy to them. Another kinship line, whose social status was clearly discordant with the social positions and connections acquired by A.S. Sverchkov, and, moreover, could discredit them, was completely ignored. The reasons for such kind of behaviour seem to have the same grounds as the reasons that pushed a considerable amount of functionaries coming from unprivileged stratum to avoid the question of their ancestry and family in the census of 1754-1755. According to S.M. Troitskii, "as soon as originators from the lower social strata became hereditary noblemen through their service," they, firstly, used to "hide their origins, especially if their ancestors belonged to the taxable stratum of the Russian

population" and, secondly, "broke with their social environment."¹⁶² Social status as well as material well-being correlated with service status and a successful career that did not depend on the position of the kin and the relations within it, but, on the contrary, was determined by the personal achievements of a particular functionary.

- 58 The family "case" of Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov is ambivalent. On the one hand, it shows some models of behaviour that were widespread among a part of the emerging Russian bureaucracy.¹⁶³ Those collegiate officials who came from unprivileged states and did not belong to chancellery service families independently built their careers, friendships, matrimonial and other strategies, advancing in their service through personal contacts, knowledge and experience. They shaped the field of social and family interaction within a single nuclear family rather than on the basis of vertical kinship relations. Their social capital, career progress and material well-being and security were interrelated and depended on two generations (children and parents) integrated in a complex system of social contacts; kinship lines that potentially could reduce capital were being cut off. On the other hand, Sverchkov's "case" is undoubtedly unique: because of the fact that in eighteenth-century Russia only a retired State Councillor, Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov, bequeathed his property to Moscow University.¹⁶⁴

NOTES

1. The study was carried out in the framework of the Basic Research Programme at the National Research University, Higher School of Economics in 2016.

RGADA (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov – The Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts), f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 24, 61 ob.

2. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 1.

3. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 38-39.

4. At that time, Iushkov lived in A.S. Sverchkov's house. Subsequently, in 1765-1769 he served as a Secretary of Orel Provincial Chancellery and owned Senozhat' village in Orlovskii uезд (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 87; d. 22570, l. 190; f. 248, op. 117, d. 1464, l. 94; Spisok, nakhodiashchimsia u statskikh del gospodam senatoram, ober-prokuroram i vsem prisutstvuiushchim v kollegiiakh, kantceliariiakh, kontorakh, guberniiax, provintsiiax i gorodakh, tako zh prokuroram, ober-sekretariam, ekzekutoram i sekretariam s pokazaniem kazhdogo vstupleniia v sluzhbu i v nastoiashchii chin [The list of State officials, senators, chief prosecutors and all those present in collegiums, chancelleries, offices in guberniyas, provinces and towns, as well as of prosecutors, chief-secretaries, clerks and secretaries with indication of present rank and the year they entered the service], 1766, SPb., 1766), 157).

5. PSZRI (Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii – The complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire), 1st coll., vol. XIV, № 10346, 284-294.

6. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34; "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie statskogo sovetnika A.S. Sverchkova o peredache deneg i vekselei v opeku Moskovskomu universitetu [Last will and testament of State Councillor A.S. Sverchkov regarding the transfer of money and promissory notes at the disposal of Moscow Imperial University]," in E.E. Rychalovskii, ed., introduction, comm. D.N. Kostyshin, Istoriia Moskovskogo universiteta (vtoraia polovina XVIII-nachalo

XIX veka). Sbornik dokumentov [The history of Moscow University (the second half of the 18th century – the beginning of the 19th century). The collection of documents], vol. I: 1754-1755 (M., 2006), 286. The original copy of A.S. Sverchkov's will, published in 2006, is kept in the files of the Senate Chancellery in RGADA (Cf.: RGADA, f. 248, op. 106, kn. 2319). The files of the State Collegium of Justice include a court case "on enforcement of the will of retired Councillor A. Sverchkov" and contain a copy of the will (Cf.: RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34-37 ob). Due to orthographic divergences, citations are given both by the published original and archive copies.

7. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34 ob. In addition to that, according to the Second Revision A.S. Sverchkov owned 48 "souls" in Koporskii uezd (S.V. Chernikov "Vlast' i sobstvennost'. Osobennosti mobilizatsii zemel'nykh vladenii v Moskovskom uezde v pervoi polovine XVIII v. [Power and property: Features of landed property transfer in the Moscow district during the first half of the 18th century], Cahiers du Monde russe, 53, 1 (Janvier-mars 2012): 236).

8. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34 ob.-36, 51.

9. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34.

10. "v univerzitet vechno i nevozvratimo dlia siropitel'stva rossiiskikh detei, kotorye pitaiut dushi i telesa ot sviashcheniishago univerziteta radi prevoskhodnoi im uchrezhdennoi nauke" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 36).

11. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 39-39 ob.

12. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 27 ob.

13. Moscow census books 1739-1745 in the "Vedomosti politseiskogo pravleniia sed'moi komandy s'ezzhago dvora, kolikoe chislo pod obyvatelskimi dvorami zemli meroiu dlinniku i poperechniku sazhen', i na kakikh zemliakh te dvory sostoiat" [Register, made by the officials of the seventh police office, of the land area, measured in sazhen in length and width, and the layout and quantity of the buildings thereon] in the section "Iduchi ot Zemliannogo vala v Uzkii pereulok k Ilii Proroku" [Going from earthmound into narrow lane towards Il'ia the prophet] under number 727 refer to the household of "former Chief-Secretary" Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov ("Avraama Stepanova s[yna] Sverchkova"). The household dimensions were 122 sazhen wide in pereulok [bystreet], 55 sazhen long along the left "side of the Iauza river," and 40 sazhen and 1 arshin wide do ustupu [to shoulder]; the rear part was 23 sazhen wide, ustup [shoulder] – 2 sazhen, Perepisnye knigi goroda Moskv. Sostavleny v 1739-1745 godakh [Census books of the city of Moscow. Composed in 1739-1745], (M., 1881), vol. V, 71). The household was devolved to Sverchkov's younger daughter Anastasiia. In July 1744, A.S. Sverchkov bought it from a soldier's wife Dar'ia Ivanovna ("Ivanovna doch'") Burdova, "a white place in the Zemliannoi gorod in the parish of the Intercession of Holy Mary church in Vorontsovo pole," and sold it on March 21st 1748 to the second guild merchant Ivan Vasil'evich Murzin for 10 roubles. On April 20th 1748 A.S. Sverchkov bought from the same I.V. Murzin a household "in the Zemliannoi gorod in the parish of the Intercession of Holy Mary church in Vorontsovo pole... behind the gates." Before that, the household was owned by sokolii pomytchik [falconer] Iakov Kirillovich ["Kirillov syn"] Blaznov; his child, soldier Matvei, and his brother, sokolii pomytchik Dmitrii, sold it to Murzin. The dimensions of the household were the following: 7 sazhen $\frac{3}{4}$ arshin wide, 32,5 sazhen long. The household neighboured the estates of the deceased Prince Il'ia Mikhailov (on the right) and Prince Iakov Vasil'evich Sedel'nikov (on the left). Moskva. Aktovye knigi XVIII stoletia [Moscow. Books of deeds registration of the 18th Century] (M., 1897), vol. VII, 187, 191.

14. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 27-28. The files lack the resolution of the Collegium of Justice on this matter. However, indirect evidence suggests that A.S. Sverchkov's will entered into force: his property was placed under the direction of the university that was acting in the interests of Avraam Stepanovich's daughter Anastasiia. In his report to I.I. Shuvalov, dated June 12th 1757, the director of Moscow University, Ivan Ivanovich Melessino notably promised to

send by "the next post" to "your Excellency the latest statement on the Sverchkov amount." N.A. Penchko, ed. *Dokumenty i materialy po istorii Moskovskogo universiteta vtoroi poloviny XVIII veka: V 3 tomakh* [Documents and files on the history of Moscow University in the second half of the 18th century: In 3 Volumes], vol. I, 1756-1764 (M., 1960), 61. On January 29th 1770, in a promemoria, the board of Moscow University informed the Collegium of Justice that payments on the promissory notes left by Sverchkov were enforced pursuant to the "decree of the governing Senate of June 10th 1758" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 50-51 ob, 53 ob; d. 22570, l. 173).

15. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569-22571. I express my deepest gratitude to Dmitrii Olegovich Serov, who drew my attention to this case.

16. O.E. Kosheleva, "Otkhodia ot sveta sego ...": Chastnaia zhizn' moskovskoi elity XVII veka cherez prizmu zaveshchaniia ["Passing away...": Private life of Moscow elite in the 17th century through the prism of testaments] in Iu.L. Bessmertnyi, ed., *Chelovek v mire chuvstv: Ocherki po istorii chastnoi zhizni v Evrope i nekotorykh stranakh Azii do nachala novogo vremeni* [Man in the world of senses: Essays on the history of private life in Europe and some Asian countries in pre-modern time] (M., 2000), 339-386; N.V. Kozlova, ed., introduction and comm., *Gorodskaiia sem'ia XVIII veka: Semeino-pravovye akty kuptsov i raznochintsev Moskvy* [Urban family of the 18th century: Family acts and deeds of Moscow merchants and raznochinetzs] (M., 2002), 19-35; N.V. Kozlova, "«Na chei opeke dolzhny byt vospitany ...»: Opeka i popechitel'stvo v srede moskovskikh kuptsov v XVIII veke" ["By whom should be brought up...": Guardianship and trusteeship amongst Moscow merchants in the 18th century], in A.V. Iurasov, ed., *Ot Drevnei Rusi k Rossii novogo vremeni: Sbornik statei: K 70-letiiu Anny Leonidovny Khoroshkevich* [From Ancient Rus' to Modern Russia: Essays on the seventieth anniversary of Anna Leonidovna Khoroshkevich] (M., 2003), 341-358; N.V. Kozlova, *Liudi driakhlye, bol'nye, ubogie v Moskve XVIII veka* [Senile, ill and poor people in the 18th century Moscow] (M., 2010), 298-305, 316-320; N.V. Kozlova, "Istoriko-diplomaticheskaia kharakteristika semeino-pravovykh aktov dvorian pervoi poloviny XVIII v. [Historical and diplomatic characteristic of family acts and deeds of the nobility in the first half of the 18th century]," in N.V. Kozlova, A.Iu. Prokof'eva, ed., *ess. and comm., Dvoriane Moskvy: svadebnye akty i dukhovnye zaveshchaniia petrovskogo vremeni* [Moscow nobility: Commitments of marriage and testaments at Peter I time] (M., 2015), 22-29; N.V. Kozlova, "Znachenie semeino-pravovykh aktov dvorian dlia izucheniia sotsial'noi istorii" [Family acts and deeds of the nobility and its significance for the social history]," in *Dvoriane Moskvy*, 47-64; A.Iu. Prokof'eva, "Ėmotsional'nyi aspekt mezhlichnostnykh otnoshenii v Rossiiskoi gorodskoi sem'e XVIII v.: k postanovke problemy [Emotional aspect of inner family relations in Russian urban family of the 18th century: highlighting the problem]," *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*, series 8, story, 2, (March-April, 2011): 34-35; A.Iu. Prokof'eva, "Vnutrisemeinye i mezhlichnostnye otnosheniia v dvorianskoi srede [Inner family and personal relations among the nobility], in *Dvoriane Moskvy*, 30-46; M.L. Marrese, *Bab'e tsarstvo: Dvorianki i vladenie imushchestvom v Rossii (1700-1861)* [A woman's kingdom: noblewomen and the control of property in Russia, 1700-1861] (M., 2009), 99-226.

17. P.Iu. Uvarov, "Apokatastasis, ili osnovnoi instinkt istorika [Apokatastasis, or the basic instinct of a historian]," in P.Iu. Uvarov, *Mezhdu "ezhami" i "lisami": Zametki ob istorikakh* [Between the "hedgohogs" and the "foxes": Essays on historians] (M., 2015), 10, 11, 17, 30.

18. RGIA (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv – Russian State Historical Archive), f. 468, op. 39, d. 15, l. 28 ob. In summer 1726 it was A.V. Makarov who, following A.S. Sverchkov's demand, successfully solicited Gavriil Ivanovich Golovkin to grant a patent of chief-secretary rank to Sverchkov (RGADA, f. 154, op. 2, d. 279, l. 1-2).

19. S.M. Troitskii, *Russkii absoliutizm i dvorianstvo v XVIII v.: Formirovanie biurokratii* [Russian absolutism and the nobility in the 18th century: Making of bureaucracy] (M., 1974), 239;

P. Peterson, *Peter the Great Administrative and Judicial Reforms: Swedish Antecedents and the Process of Reception* (Lund, 1979), 106-108; A.N. Medushevskii, *Utverzhdenie absoliutizma v Rossii: Sravnitel'noe istoricheskoe issledovanie* [The establishment of absolutism in Russia: Comparative historical study] (M., 1993), 48-55, 251-260, 278-280; E.V. Anisimov, *Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* [State reforms and autocracy of Peter the Great in the first quarter of the 18th century] (SPb., 1997), 99-101, 104-105, 211-215; L.F. Pisar'kova, *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie Rossii s kontsa XVII do kontsa XVIII veka: Èvoliutsiia biurokraticheskoi sistemy* [State administration in Russia, the end of the 17th century – the end of the 18th century: Evolution of bureaucratic system] (M., 2007), 190-196; A.B. Kamenskii, "Statskii sovetnik Anisim Kniazev: avantiurist, likhoimets, uchenyi [State councillor Anisim Kniazev: Adventurer, bribe taker and scientist]," *Chelovek v kul'ture russkogo barokko*: Sb. statei po materialam mezhdunar. konferentsii IF RAN, Moskva, 28-30 sentiabria 2006 [Man in the culture of Russian baroque: Collection of papers presented at the international conference at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, September 28-30 2006] (M., 2007), 502-507; M.A. Kiselev, "Kazus D.V. Volkova: "Pod'iachie" na vershine vlasti v Rossiiskoi imperii [The case of D.V. Volkov: Clerks at the top of power in Russian Empire]," *Ural'skii istoricheskii vestnik*, 3, 36 (2012): 42-52.

20. Troitskii, *Russkii absoliutizm i dvorianstvo*, 4, 205.

21. On Russian legislative commissions of 1720s-1740s cf.: M.M. Speranskii, "Obozrenie istoricheskikh svedenii o Svide zakonov [Review of historical information on the law code]," in M.M. Speranskii, *Rukovodstvo k poznaniuu zakonov* [Guide to the study of laws] (SPb., 2002), 126-130; V.N. Latkin, *Zakonodatel'nye komissii v Rossii v XVIII stoletii: Istoriko-iuridicheskoe issledovanie* [Legislative commissions in Russia in the 18th century: A historic and judicial study], (SPb., 1887), vol. I, 1-80; Peterson, *Peter the Great Administrative and Judicial Reforms*, 306-307, 340-345; P. Peterson, "Användningen av dansk och svensk rätt i Peter den stores lagkommission, 1720-1725 [Use of Danish and Norwegian laws in the legislative commissions of Peter I]," in D. Tamm, red., *Danske og Norske Lov i 300 år* [300 years of Danish and Norwegian law] (København, 1983), 369-404; O.A. Omel'chenko, *Kodifikatsiia prava v Rossii v period absoliutnoi monarkhii (vtoraia polovina XVIII veka): Uchebnoe posobie* [Codification of law in Russia in the time of absolute monarchy (the second half of the 18th century): A manual] (M., 1989), 8-11; M.V. Babich, *Gosudarstvennye uchrezhdeniia XVIII veka: komissii petrovskogo vremeni* [State institutions in the 18th century: Commissions of Peter I time] (M., 2003), 130-135, 270-274; A.S. Zamuruev, *Raboty raznykh let* [Selected works] (Pskov, 2006), 6-367; D.O. Serov, *Sudebnaia reforma Petra I: Istoriko-pravovoe issledovanie* [Judicial reform of Peter I: Historical and judicial study] (M., 2009), 136-140, 384-402; D.O. Serov, "U sochineniia Ulozhen'ia rosiiskogo s shvetskim byt ...": *Ulozhennaia komissiia 1720 i ee trudy* ["To combine Russian law code with the Swedish one...": Legislative commission of 1720 and its works], in T.E. Novitskaia, ed., *Instituty gosudarstva i prava v ikh istoricheskom razvitii: sb. nauch. statei* [State and legal institutions and their historical development: Collection of essays] (M., 2012), 139-160.

22. "prikaznykh trudov [v] byvshikh pri Senate znatnykh kamisiiakh, a osobливо ot proektov sochineniia zakonov kak is chuzhestrannykh tak i iz svoikh prav" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34).

23. Latkin, *Zakonodatel'nye komissii*, 80.

24. Latkin, *Zakonodatel'nye komissii*, 24, 28-29, 34, 43, 44, 58, 60, 62, 72, 74, 75, 77-80.

25. Serov, "U sochineniia Ulozhen'ia rosiiskogo s shvetskim byt...", 141.

26. Zamuruev, *Raboty raznykh let*, 21, 28, 33, 34, 37-39, 48, 51, 53, 70, 85, 92, 104-105, 128, 139.

27. Zamuruev, *Raboty raznykh let*, 35, 39, 40, 51, 74, 94, 106-107, 130-131.

28. Serov, "U sochineniia Ulozhen'ia rosiiskogo s shvetskim byt...", 150, 152.

29. N.N. Petrukhintsev, *Vnutrenniaia politika Anny Ioannovny (1730-1740)* [Internal Policy of Anna Ioannovna (1730-1740)] (M., 2014), 50, 942-944, 947.
30. D.O. Serov, *Stroiteli imperii: Ocherki gosudarstvennoi i kriminal'noi deiatel'nosti spodvizhnikov Petra I* [Builders of the Empire: Essays on State and Criminal Activity of Peter I Associates] (Novosibirsk, 1996), 247.
31. D.O. Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I* [Peter I Administration] (M., 2007), 68; D.O. Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 2nd edition (M., 2008), 69.
32. Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 68.
33. *Ibid.*, 68, (2nd edition, 69).
34. The following persons lived with the Sverchkov family: "his maid servant Marina Nikita's daughter, thirty years old, and a Finn maid Mar'ia Matvei's daughter, eighteen years old, and a soldier's wife fifty years old" (RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, ch. III, kn. 8663-8947, l. 185).
35. RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, ch. III, kn. 8663-8947, l. 185.
36. This date of birth is cited by D.O. Serov in his biographical note on A.S. Sverchkov (Serov, *Stroiteli imperii*, 247; Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 68, (2nd edition, 69).
37. "okonchilos' mne sego [1]755-go godu oktiabria 22-go dnia otrodu shezdesiat tri goda" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34; "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie...", 283). Baptizing practices adopted in the Orthodox tradition suggest that A.S. Sverchkov's real birth date could fall in early September (Cf.: O.E. Kosheleva, "Poniatie vozrasta i vzrosleniia v istoricheskikh istochnikakh [The concept of age and growing up from historical sources]," *Vestnik Universiteta Rossiiskoi akademii obrazovaniia*, 2 (2000): 4-30).
38. O.E. Kosheleva, *Liudi Sankt-Peterburgskogo ostrova Petrovskogo vremeni* [People of Saint-Petersburg island at the time of Peter I] (M., 2004), 65, 165; D.H. Kaiser, P. Engel, "Time- and Age-Awareness in Early Modern Russia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, n° 35, 4 (Oct., 1993): 834. On the divergence between dates of birth generally accepted or reported in other sources and the information in the 1718 census of Sankt-Peterburgskii ostrov cf.: D.O. Serov, "Pravitel'stviushchii Senat v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka: kadrovyy vybor [Governing Senate in the first quarter of the 18th century: the choice of personnel]," in N.N. Petrukhintsev, L. Erren, eds., *Praviashchie elity i dvorianstvo Rossii vo vremia i posle petrovskikh reform (1682-1750)* [Ruling elites and nobility in Russia during and after the reforms of Peter I (1682-1750)] (M., 2013), 108-109 (notes). Analysis of files on the Sankt-Peterburgskii ostrov census suggests that A.S. Sverchkov's report on his age and family could have been written down from his words or on the basis of census taker's own observation (Cf.: RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, ch. III, kn. 8663-8947, l. 120, 127-127 ob., 157, 166, 173-174 ob., 186, 223 etc.). I express my deepest gratitude to Ol'ga Evgen'evna Kosheleva for her information on age, age awareness and estimation in early modern Russia.
39. Kaiser, Engel, "Time- and Age-Awareness in Early Modern Russia," 824-825, 827-828, 837.
40. O.E. Kosheleva cites the data provided in 1718 by pod'iachii Lazar' Kuchin, who "wrote two reports about him by his own hand: according to one of them he is 27 years old and his wife is 25, while according to the other he is 28 and his wife is 27" (Kosheleva, *Liudi Sankt-Peterburgskogo ostrova*, 68).
41. *Ibid.*, 67.
42. *Ibid.*, 167-168.
43. "a tot Sverchkov krestianskoi syn iz Nizhegoroditskogo uezdu i v 712-m godu byl vziat naborshchikom Matveem Zasetskim v Nizhnem po ukazu v rekruty v polk Grigorova, i s togo polku bezhal, a posle iavilsia v Rospravnoi polate v pod'iachikh" (Serov, *Stroiteli imperii*, 154-155; L.M. Balakireva, *Sudebnaia reforma Petra I: Iustits-kollegiia. Uchebnoe posobie* [Judicial reform of Peter I: the Collegium of Justice: A manual] (Novosibirsk, 2003), 328-329).
44. RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, ch. III, kn. 8663-8947, l. 185.
45. Zamuruev, *Raboty raznykh let*, 84.

46. In 1724 the author of the previously mentioned podmetnoe pis'mo gave a rather critical evaluation of A.S. Sverchkov's activity in Krepostnaia kontora, writing, in particular: "...the state duties, collected by Krepostnaia kontora, as well as the money collected for finished cases and chancellery services; it is unknown how these amounts were spent. The Collegium appealed for auditors from the whole country, as if for audit. But Sverchkov robbed them, sent them back, so the audit was never held" (...toi Krepostnoi kantory poshlinaia, zbiraemaia z gosudarstva summa, takozh chto zbiralas' s vershennykh del poshliny i kantseliarskie dengi, kudy v raskhod upotrebleny ne vedomo. I roskhodchiki po ukazu iz Iustits-kollegii, so vsego gosudarstva sobrany byli budto dlia schetu, a posle onoi Sverchkov obobrav ikh, i rospustil, a po se vremia nikhto ne shchitany) (Serov, Stroiteli imperii, 155). L.M. Balakireva does not confirm these accusations in her studies on the early period of the Krepostnaia kontora activities (Balakireva, Sudebnaia reforma, 328-331).

47. RGADA, f. 248, op. 12, kn. 648, l. 108-110; PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. V, № 3436, 739; Balakireva, Sudebnaia reforma, 138, 160; L.M. Balakireva, "Sozdanie Krepostnoi kantory pri Iustits-kollegii [Creation of the deeds registration office at the Collegium of Justice]," in A.A. Preobrazhenskii, ed., Rossiiskoe samoderzhavie i biurokратиia: Sbornik statei v chest' Natal'ii Fedorovny Demidovoi [Russian autocracy and bureaucracy: collection of essays in honour of Natal'ia Fedorovna Demidova] (Moskva-Novosibirsk, 2000), 204; Serov, Stroiteli imperii, 247; Serov, Administratsiia Petra I, 2nd edition, 69.

48. Zamuruev, Raboty raznykh let, 21.

49. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 19 ob.

50. On November 11th 1722 A.S. Sverchkov "orally informed the members that Senators would participate in the meeting on code drafting one by one" (RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 41).

51. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 23 ob.

52. Latkin, Zakonodatel'nye komissii, 24.

53. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 32 ob.; cf.: l. 33 ob.-34, 41, 49 ob., 51 etc.

54. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 39, 47, 56, 57, 94 ob.

55. In the list of the legislative commission staff of June 7th 1723 A.S. Sverchkov was referred to as sluzhitel' (a clerk), not a member. (RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 73).

56. Collegium secretaries and Senate chief-secretaries de facto performed duties of the chiefs of these institutions' chancelleries (D.O. Serov, "Poslednie d'iaki: iz istorii reformirovaniia sistemy grazhdanskikh chinov Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII v. [The last clerks: from the history of the reforming of the State ranks system, in Russia in the first quarter of the 18th century]," Ural'skii istoricheskii vestnik, 3, 32 (2011): 69, 72).

57. "Ponezhe ukaz ego Imperatorskago velichestva est takoi, chtob ulozhen'e sochinit' nadvoe i pribirat' o g[osu]d[a]rstvennykh prestupleniakh osobo, a o partikuliarnykh prestupleniakh osobo, togo radi onoe takim li obrazom u vas sochinaetsa, o tom menia uvedomit nemedlenno" (RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 57 ob. – 58).

58. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 58-59; Latkin, Zakonodatel'nye komissii, 28-29.

59. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 75 ob. -76.

60. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 75 ob -76; Latkin, Zakonodatel'nye komissii, 31, 33.

61. Zamuruev, Raboty raznykh let, 192.

62. Serov, Administratsiia Petra I, 2nd edition, 69; Opisanie dokumentov i del, khraniashchikhsia v arkhive sviateishego pravitel'stviushchego Sinoda [The description of documents and files kept in the archive of the Saint Governing Synod], (1542-1721) vol. 1, (SPb., 1868), CCCLIII; Opisanie dokumentov i del, khraniashchikhsia v arkhive sviateishego pravitel'stviushchego Sinoda, vol. 7, (1727) (SPb., 1885), 2-3; Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i povoleniiam, khraniashchimsia v S-Peterburgskom senatskom arkhive, za XVIII vek [The list of the highest ukases and orders kept in St.Petersburg senate archive, the 18th century], vol. II, (1725-1740) (SPb., 1875), № 1920, 39;

Senatskii arkhiv [The archive of the Senate], vol. 2, Zhurnaly i opredeleniia Pravitel'stviushchego Senata za 1732, 1735, 1737, 1738 i 1739 g. [Minutes and decisions of the Governing Senate, 1732, 1735, 1737, 1738 and 1739], (SPb., 1889), 282, 289.

63. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, l. 20-21 ob.; d. 9, ch. II, l. 20-33; d. 10, ch. II, l. 73; d. 33, ch. I, l. 1; PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. VIII, № 5567, p. 284-285; Sb. RIO, vol. 56, SPb., 1886, 329; Latkin, Zakonodatel'nye komissii, 58-59; Zamuruev, Raboty raznykh let, 108-109.

64. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 512 ob., 514; d. 9, ch. II, l. 129.

65. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 105.

66. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 111.

67. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 58; d. 9, ch. I A, l. 526.

68. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 85, 87, 109, 120.

69. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, l. 31; d. 37, ch. 1, 4; E.V. Akel'ev, G.O. Babkova, "«Daby rozyski i pytki mogli chinittsa poriadочно, kak ukazy povelevaiut». Evoliutsiia teorii i praktiki "rozysknogo" protsessa v Rossii pervoi poloviny XVIII v. [«So that criminal investigations and torture be properly conducted as prescribed by law»: Evolution in the theory and practice of criminal investigations in Russia during the first half of the eighteenth century], Cahiers du Monde russe, 53, 1 (Janvier-mars 2012): 26, 30-31.

70. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 536 ob., 537-538, 541-555, 597 ob., 617, 625-636 ob.

71. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 504 ob.

72. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. I A, l. 518 ob.

73. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, l. 31-33 ob.; d. 9, ch. II, l. 123.

74. "podpisannym imenem EĖ Imperatorskogo Velichestva Eia Imperatorskogo Vysochestva gosudaryni pravitel'nitsy velikoi kniagini Anny vsia Rossii sobstvennoiu rukoiu," Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniiam, vol. III, SPb., 1878, № 8120, 19.

75. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, l. 17 ob.; Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniiam, vol. III, № 8120, 19; Senatskii arkhiv, vol. 2, 363-364.

76. Senatskii arkhiv, vol. 2, 377, 537-538, 612-613.

77. Senatskii arkhiv, vol. 5, Zhurnaly i opredeleniia Pravitel'stviushchego Senata so 2 oktiabria po 23 noiabria 1741, s 25 noiabria po 12 dekabria 1741, s 16 dekabria 1741 po 15 dekabria 1743 [Minutes and decisions of the governing Senate from October 2 to November 23 1741, from November 25 to December 12 1741 and from December 16 1741 to December 15 1743] (SPb., 1892), 304. The matter requires further research, but A.S. Sverchkov's belonging to the circle of "confidants" of Count M.G. Golovkin could be one of the possible reasons for his arrest (RGIA, f. 468, op. 39, d. 15, l. 28 ob.; I express my deep gratitude to Mikhail Kiselev who pointed out these files to me). I.V. Kurukin as well refers to A.S. Sverchkov as a person "close to M. Golovkin", I.V. Kurukin, Anna Leopold'ovna (M., 2012), 235.

78. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, l. 33.

79. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 131; Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniiam, vol. III, № 8732, 86. It should be noted that A.S. Sverchkov did not receive his salary in full despite the fact that a Senate decree, pursuant to a resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers, ordered the full payment of "all salary due for the position of chief-secretary of the Senate" (Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniiam, vol. III, № 8526, 61). Sverchkov referred to this fact in his will, writing that he was not given 4,500 roubles (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 421 ob.; "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie..., " 286).

80. RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 9, ch. II, l. 139. Within the framework of the present paper I do not seek to reconstruct every stage of A.S. Sverchkov's career. Research on this matter will continue. However, it should be mentioned that along with serving as chief-secretary of the Senate and working in several legislative commissions, the Revision Collegium, etc., in the 1730s Sverchkov was also a member of several commissions, including the commission o uchrezhdenii vesov i mer (on introduction of weights and measurements), o Sankt-Peterburgskom stroenii (on

construction in Saint-Petersburg), o mashkerade (on masquerade) (together with other officials of legislative commission chancellery), and participated in the organization of the funerals of tsarevna Praskov'ia Ivanovna (1731) and tsarevna Ekaterina Ivanovna (1733) (RGADA, f. 342, op. 1, d. 8, ch. 2, l. 6 ob.; d. 8. ch. 3, l. 13; Sb. RIO, vol. 106, Iur'ev (1899), 302, 310; Sb. RIO, vol. 146, Iur'ev (1915), 80, 81, 91, 92; Materialy dlia istorii Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk [Materials for the history of the Imperial Academy of science], B.m., 1887, vol. IV, (1739-1741), 367-368; N.Iu. Bolotina, "Poslednii put tsarevny Praskov'i Ivanovny: tseremonial pokhoron chlena imperatorskoi familii Romanovykh [The last journey of tsarevna Praskov'ia Ivanovna: Funeral ceremony of the member of the Romanovs imperial family]," Romanovy v doroge: Puteshestviia i poezdki chlenov tsarskoi sem'i po Rossii i zagranitsu [Funeral ceremony of the member of the Romanovs imperial family, The Romanovs travels: journeys and trips of the members of the Tsarist family in Russia and abroad] (M. – SPb., 2016), 27).

81. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61-61 ob. Godovye liturgi (annual liturgies) for the deceased Mariia Mikhailovna Sverchkova were performed in the Saint Nicolas the Wonderworker church in Vorob'ino. In his will A.S. Sverchkov prescribed a payment of 20 roubles to Aleksei Danilov, the priest of this church (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 37; "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie...", 288).

82. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34.

83. RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, kn. 8663-8947, l. 185.

84. "B[o]zhiia miloserdiia s[via]tykh ikon, almaznykh veshchei, zolota i serebra, zhemchugu i platia i mednoi posudy" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61; d. 22570, l. 211, 216).

85. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61; d. 22570, l. 211, 216.

86. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61.

87. PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. VI, № 3534, 141.

88. Kiselev, "Kazus D.V. Volkova", 44.

89. RGADA, f. 248. op. 1, d. 8122, l. 32.

90. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 216.

91. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 212 ob.

92. The Bogdanov brothers had two full sisters – Evdokiia ("Avdot'ia") and Ekaterina ("Katerina") (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 67 ob.).

93. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 66.

94. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 66; d. 22570, l. 212-213; d. 22571, l. 431 ob.

95. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61; d. 22570, l. 213 ob.; d. 22571, l. 428 ob.

96. Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniiam, vol. III, № 10268, 270; Senatskii arkhiv, vol. XIII, Protokoly pravitel'stvuiushchego Senata po sekretnoi ekspeditsii 1764 i 1765 gg. Ukazy i poveleniia imperatritsy Ekateriny II za iul'-dekabr' 1763 i ianvar' 1764 godov [Minutes of the Governing Senate's secret department, 1764 and 1765. Ukases and orders of the Empress Catherine II, July – December 1763 and January 1764] (SPb., 1909), 471.

97. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 36; Istoriia Moskovskogo universiteta, 286.

98. "Avdot'ia Mikhailova doch'" Sveshnikova was born from the second marriage of M.I. Sveshnikov (d. before 1768) with Mariia Vasil'evna ("Vasil'eva doch'") Kop'eva. In the winter of 1769 E.M. Sveshnikova, who was illiterate, also entered the dispute over Sverchkov's legacy. On February 13th 1769 she submitted a petition which was heard the same day by the first department of the Collegium of Justice. After the death of her niece, Anastasiia Avraamovna, E.M. Sveshnikova claimed, as the closest relative on the maternal line, first, the dowry of her sister Mariia Mikhailovna Sverchkova, second, promissory notes in her name, third, money received by I.I. Iushkov from the sale of sel'tso Rukavkino and Polushkino village in Moskovskii uezd. The villages were acquired by A.S. Sverchkov in the name of M.M. Sverchkova "on behalf of" Count Roman Illarionovich Vorontsov, and were subsequently sold to the latter by Iushkov for 3,350 roubles in 1762. This fact served as the grounds for E.M. Sveshnikova's claim (RGADA,

f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61 ob.; d. 22570, l. 213 ob. -214, 216 ob.). On October 10th 1778 and on January 21st 1780 E.M. Sveshnikova submitted new petitions to the Collegium of Justice. At that time she lived in Moscow: Vasilii Pimenov, the priest of the church of the Assumption of Holy Mary in Pokrovka, was her spiritual father (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61-64, 67; d. 22571, l. 360-361; l. 375-375 ob., 403-410 ob., 422 ob., 425 ob.- 427 ob., 432-432 ob.).

99. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 36 ob.; Istoriiia Moskovskogo universiteta, 287.

100. W. McKenzie Pintner and D.K. Rowney, ed., *Russian Functionarydom: The Bureaucratization of Russian Society from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth century* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 88-89, 102; S.V. Chernikov, "Sostav i osobennosti sotsial'nogo statusa svetskoi praviashchei elity Rossii pervoi chetverti XVIII veka" [Composition and specific features of the Russian ruling elite's social status in the first quarter of the eighteenth century: Tradition and novelty], *Cahiers du Monde russe*, 51, 2-3 (April-September 2010): 276-277.

101. Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 106, 121, 163, 225.

102. N.F. Demidova, A. Ivanova, eds., *Sluzhilaia biurokратиia v Rossii XVII veka (1625-1700): Biograficheskii spravochnik* [Serving bureaucracy in 17th century Russia (1625-1700): biographies] (M., 2011), 565.

103. N.F. Demidova, *Sluzhilaia biurokратиia v Rossii XVII veka i ee rol' v formirovanii absoliutizma* [Serving bureaucracy in the 17th century Russia, and its role in the formation of absolutism] (M., 1987), 171; Troitskii, *Russkii absoliutizm i dvorianstvo*, 211, 259, 345; Medushevskii, *Utverzhenie absoliutizma v Rossii*, 254; Balakireva, *Sudebnaia reforma Petra I*, 125, 329; Serov, *Stroiteli imperii*, 155-156; Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 2nd edition, 54, 76.

104. Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 49, 89, 106, 121, 252-253; Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 2nd edition, 49-50; Troitskii, *Russkii absoliutizm i dvorianstvo*, 209, 211, 240-242, 252; Chernikov, "Vlast' i sobstvennost'", 212; T.A. Bazarov, "Pervyi rossiiskii vitse-kantsler P.P. Shafirov: puti integratsii v rossiiskuiu politicheskuiu elitu [The first Russian vice-chancellor P.P. Shafirov: The ways of integration into Russian political elite]," *Praviashchaia elita i dvorianstvo Rossii vo vremia i posle petrovskikh reform (1682-1750)*, 140-141.

105. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 213.

106. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 37-37 ob. In 1770 the above-mentioned persons, except the deceased general major Prince Iu.V. Khovanskii, confirmed the validity of A.S. Sverchkov's will, written by the latter "in sound mind and memory" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 169, 197, 202, 203, 206, 208). At that time Prince V.S. Dolgorukov, P.P. Shafirov's grandson and the son of Prince Sergei Grigor'evich Dolgorukov (executed in 1739), was retired in the rank of premier major and lived in Moscow in his own house "in the third part near Prechistenskie vorota in the parish of the Nativity of Holy Mary." He also owned land estates in Moskovskii and Orlovskii uezds. (RGADA, f. 248, op. 117, d. 1464, l. 81 ob.; f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 87; d. 22570, l. 169; f. 400, op. 11, d. 478, l. 86 ob.; PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. VIII, № 5532, 265; vol. X, № 7942, 944, 946; Chernikov, "Vlast' i sobstvennost'", 210; *Russkii biograficheskii slovar': Dabelov — Diad'kovskii* [Russian biographical dictionary: Dabelov — Diad'kovskii], (SPb., 1905), vol. 6, 563-565; Serov, *Administratsiia Petra I*, 95, 133-134; Bazarov, "Pervyi rossiiskii vitse-kantsler P.P. Shafirov," 138-139). In 1769 Prince A.A. Prozorovskii, a general major since 1763, was in the army during the first Russian-Turkish war. He owned Pokrovskoe village in Riazhskii uezd, which counted 60 "souls" as for 1763 (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, d. 22569, l. 87; 22570, l. 202, 203, 204-204 ob.; "Vedomost', uchinennaia v Kantore Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo banka dlia dvorianstva, po sile poluchennago v tu Kantoru sego 766 godu, Fevralia 21 dnia iz Pravitel'stviuushchago Senata ukaza dlia pripechataniia v gazetakh, ot kogo imiany zaimshchikov, v kotorykh godakh, mesiatsakh i chislakh nedvizhimye imeniia i v kakikh uezdakh skolko muzhska polu i v kakoi summe zalozheny, o tom znachit nizhe sego," *Moskovskie Vedomosti, Pribavlenie k № 68 Moskovskikh Vedomostei v piatnitcu avgusta 24 dnia, 1767 goda*. [Records, made in the office of the Moscow State Bank for the nobility, based on the Governing Senate order, received in the

office on February 21 of this year of 1766, instructing to publish in the newspapers in whose name the mortgage was taken, stating the location of the estate in the uezd, its male population, the date and the sum of the loan, The Moscow News, Appendix to № 68 of the Moscow News, Friday, August 24 1767], l. 34 ob.).

107. PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. IV, № 2125, 358; № 2197, 410; № 2213, 432; vol. V, № 3324, 679; sb. RIO, vol. 56, 6; Russkii biograficheskii slovar': NAAKE-Nakenskii – Nikolai Nikolaevich Starshii, izd. Imperatorskim Russkim Istoricheskim Obshchestvom, (SPb., 1914), vol. 11, 218; Medushevskii, Utverzhdenie absoliutizma v Rossii, 228; Serov, Administratsiia Petra I, 2nd edition, 37; Pissar'kova, Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie Rossii, 556; I.V. Kurukin, Èpokha "dvorskikh bur": Ocherki politicheskoi istorii poslepetrovskoi Rossii, 1725-1762 [Epoch of the "palace coups": essays on political history of Russia after Peter I, 1725-1762] (Riazan', 2003), 185.

108. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 87; d. 22570, l. 197, 206; f. 482, op. 1, ch. 1, d. 5711, l. 4; Chernikov, "Vlast' i sobstvennost'", 176, 197, 214.

109. S.V. Pol'skoi, "«Na raznye chiny razdeliia svoi narod ...». Zakonodatel'noe zakreplenie soslovnogo statusa russkogo dvorianstva v seredine XVIII veka" ["Dividing their people into different estates": Legal fixation of the Russian nobility's estate status in the mid-eighteenth century], Cahiers du Monde russe, 51, 2-3 (April-September 2010): 316.

110. RGADA, f. 26, op. 1, kn. 8663-8947, l. 185.

111. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 217, 219 ob.

112. V.V. Rummel', V.V. Golubtsov, Rodoslovnyi sbornik russkikh dvorianskikh familii [Collection of Genealogy of Russian Noble Families] (SPb., 1887), vol. 2, 758.

113. Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniim, vol. III, № 8008, 7.

114. "po imennomu EÈ Imperatorskogo Velichestva gosudaryni Imperatritsy Elizavety Petrovny ukazu vsemilostiveishe pozhalovan v statskie sovetniki i v Sudnoi prikaz v glavnye sudii" (RGADA, f. 248, d. 8122, ch. 3, l. 991-991 ob.); PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. XI, № 8676, 729; Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniim, vol. III, № 10354, 282,

115. Opis' vysochaishim ukazam i poveleniim, vol. III, № 11660, 12068, 439, 492; PSZRI, 1 coll., vol. XIV, № 10283, 201; vol. XV, № 11478, 744; vol. XVIII, № 13036, 13040, 13236, 13298, 409, 413, 808, 888; vol. XIX, № 13616, 13747, 276, 426 etc.; Senatskii arkhiv, vol. XIV, Ukazy i poveleniia imperatritsy Ekateriny II za fevral'-dekabr' 1764 goda [Ukases and orders of the empress Catherine II, February-December 1764] (SPb., 1910), 202; Rummel', Golubtsov, Rodoslovnyi sbornik russkikh dvorianskikh familii, 759. I.I. Iushkov's coat of arms, cf.: Gerbovník Anisima Titovicha Kniazeva 1785 goda: Izdanie S.N. Troinitskogo 1912 [Armorial of Anisim Titovich Kniazev, 1785: Published by S.N. Troinitskii in 1912], ed., comm., afterword O.N. Naumov (M., 2008), 214.

116. RGADA, f. 248, d. 8122, ch. 3, l. 991-991 ob.; Chernikov, "Vlast' i sobstvennost'," 221.

117. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 35-35 ob., 421, 422; "Dukhovnoe zaveschchanie...", 285.

118. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34; "Dukhovnoe zaveschchanie...", 284.

119. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 369 ob., 422.

120. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 36 ob.; d. 22571, l. 422, 474; "Dukhovnoe zaveschchanie...", 286, 287.

121. I.I. Iushkov's social position is unequivocally confirmed by the signatures attesting the division of property between Ivan Ivanovich and his niece Anastasiia Avraamovna Sverchkova, married Zybina, in September 1766. The act was signed by the following persons: Luk'ian Ivanovich ("Ivanov s[y]n") Komynin, ober-prokuror (chief prosecutor) of the 5th department of the Senate; senator general lieutenant Petr Dmitrievich ("Dmitriev s[y]n") Eroshkin; State Councillor Andrei Ivanovich ("Ivanov s[y]n") Kartashov, member of the Revision Collegium; Sergei Vasil'evich ("Vasil'ev s[y]n") Beklemishev, Moskovskoi gubernii prokuror (prosecutor of Moscow Province); general major Mikhail Iakovlevich ("Iakovlev s[y]n") Maslov, president of the Revision collegium; Fedor Ivanovich ("Ivanov s[y]n") Sukin, vice president of the Manufaktur

Collegium; Collegiate Councillor Mikhail Alekseevich ("Alekseev s[y]n") Pushkin, member of the Manufaktur Collegium; second major Baron Petr Ivanovich ("Ivanov s[y]n") Shafirov; Prince Aleksandr Vasil'evich ("Vasil'ev s[y]n") Khovanskii, lifeguard captain (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, d. 22571, l. 332-332 ob.).

122. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 40 ob. - 45.

123. RGADA, f. 286, d. 511, l. 719-730; Zamuruev, *Raboty raznykh let*, 33.

124. "detei nikogo ne imeet" (RGADA, f. 248, d. 8122, ch. 3, l. 991 ob).

125. "zhila v dome u nego ziatia moego Ivana Ivanovicha, i vospitana, i obuchena s takim evo obo mne otecheskim popecheniem, kak roditeliu o svoei docheri starattsia bolee nevozmozhno, o chem vsia publika zasvidetel'stvovat' mozhnet, za chto ia vsegdashneiu moeiu za evo ko mne otecheskoe vospitanie blagodarnostiu obiazana" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 216 ob.). In June 1778 providing a "report" about A.A. Sverchkova's property and its division following a request of the Collegium of Justice, I.I. Iushkov confirmed that "his above-mentioned daughter and my sister-in-law lived and got her education with my support." The protocol of case discussion in the Collegium of Justice from December 11th 1780 reported that before her marriage Anastasiia Avraamovna "was supported by Iushkov in his house and studied with all the commitment and diligence befitting her status" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 330, 447).

126. "ruskikh pechatnykh raznago zvaniia, sorok knig nemetskikh i frantsuskikh raznago zvaniia zhe" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 186, 307 ob).

127. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 51. According to a report from Moscow University's curator Vasilii Evdokimovich Adadurov to Catherine II, dated February 18th 1763, the decision to devolve the money and interest to I.I. Iushkov was taken pursuant to an "order" of I.I. Shuvalov without any "due determination". Justifying these actions, I.I. Shuvalov notably explained that the money received in virtue of Sverchkov's will "on the onset... of this college for the university needs" were "spent" by A.A. Argamakov; "this is why he, Shuvalov, did not dare to return it without interest, even more so that he knew the justice and the mercy of Her Imperial Majesty" (Senatskii arkhiv, vol. XII, *Protokoly Pravitel'stviuushchego Senata 1761, 1762 i 1763 g. Ukazy i poveniia Imperatritsy Ekateriny II* [Minutes of the Governing Senate 1761, 1762 and 1763. Ukases and orders of the empress Catherine II] (SPb., 1907), 318, 324-325).

128. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 93.

129. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 167, 168, 303.

130. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 61 ob, 83, 87; d. 22570, l. 216 ob - 218, 220 ob - 221. As a result of the division of her sister's legacy, A.A. Zybina got Ploskoe village in Kilnskii uezd, a household in Moscow "left from her deceased father... behind Pokrovskie vorota in the parish of the Intercession of Holy Mary church in Vorontsovskoe pole," dvorovoe mesto [a household place] in the parish of the Prophet Iliia church, a household beyond the city, located "behind the Sretenskie vorota and Zemlianoi gorod in the parish of the martyr Trifon church, on the ponds" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 216 ob - 218).

131. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57 ob, 62. The death may have been caused by pregnancy: A.A. Zybina's property that remained after her death included items for children (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 186 ob).

132. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 34-34 ob; "Dukhovnoe zaveschchanie...", 283-284.

133. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 51-51 ob.

134. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57.

135. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57, 60, 170 ob.

136. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 35 ob; d. 22571, l. 421-421 ob; "Dukhovnoe zaveschchanie...", 286.

137. RGADA, f. 282, ch. 7, op. 1, d. 22571, l. 481 ob.

138. In her petition to the Collegium of Justice Evdokiia Mikhailovna Sveshnikova, stepsister of Sverchkov's wife Mariia Mikhailovna, wrote that A.S. Maslennikova and her son "were disinherited by the deceased Mr. Sverchkov" "due to his [Maslennikov Jr.] ill actions" (RGADA, f. 282, ch. 7, op. 1, d. 22569, l. 62).
139. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 60.
140. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 170.
141. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 170, 319-322.
142. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 51-51 ob.
143. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 51-56.
144. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57. The petition was heard on January 8th 1769 (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57, 60-60 ob.).
145. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 57 ob.
146. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 58.
147. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 58-59.
148. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22569, l. 69-70 ob.; d. 22570, l. 170.
149. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 310.
150. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 310, 313.
151. "ia imenovannaia vo vsiu zhizn' babki moei Aksin'i i tetok moikh Tatiany Iushkovoi i Nastas'i Zybinoi i ottsa moego i ni ot kogo ne slykhala, chtoby u upomianutogo deda moego Avrama Sverchkova byla b sestra rodnaia Domna" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 320 ob).
152. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 314-314 ob, 315, 316; d. 22571, l. 327-327 ob. In December 1776 Luka Ivanovich ("Ivanov syn") Serebrennikov, "servant" of general lieutenant Nikolai Ivanovich Roslavlev, became poverennyi in the lawsuit. M.I. Ivanov could not represent the Grigor'evs anymore due to his "old age" and "frequent strokes" (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 339-341 ob.).
153. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 320.
154. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 317.
155. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 311, 312. On August 7th 1775, I. Grigor'ev submitted another petition to the Collegium of Justice on behalf of his sons (RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 327-327 ob).
156. Serov, *Stroiteli imperii*, 154.
157. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 310.
158. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 383-383 ob.
159. RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22571, l. 481-482.
160. M.L. Marrese, *Bab'e tsarstvo*, 201, 208, 210, 220-221.
161. Pisar'kova, *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie Rossii*, 299.
162. Troitskii, *Russkii absoliutizm i dvorianstvo*, 205, 221, 250, 241, 244-245.
163. Further research is required in order to assess how typical these models were.
164. The correspondence between Moscow University, the Collegium of Justice and the Senate in the 1760s and 1770s on existing legal grounds for the University to accept A.S. Sverchkov's property provides evidence for this. (Cf.: RGADA, f. 282, op. 1, ch. 7, d. 22570, l. 267-276, 278-288 etc.; d. 22571, l. 433 ob.-434 ob).

ABSTRACTS

State Councillor Avraam Stepanovich Sverchkov was a key figure in the legislative commissions between the 1720s and early 1740s. In 1755, he bequeathed a considerable part of his property to the newly established Moscow University. Reconstructed on the basis of a lawsuit over this legacy, the history of Sverchkov's family and kinship relations suggests that the category of bureaucrats he belonged to gave precedence to and valued the nuclear family. Coming from unprivileged estates and not being members of chancellery service families, these bureaucrats climbed the hierarchy ladder thanks to their professional skills, and independently built their careers, friendships, matrimonial and other strategies, advancing in service through personal contacts, knowledge and experience. Active participants in the actual implementation of state reforms in the first half of the eighteenth century, Sverchkov and officials like him formed the higher level of office employees in a variety of central institutions and ensured undisturbed operation of all the units of the state machine. Acquiring hereditary nobility through their service, these collegiate officials reduced the field of social and family interaction to the nuclear family to the exclusion of vertical kinship relations. Their social capital, career progress, material well-being and security were interrelated and depended on two generations (parents and children) integrated in a complex system of social contacts.

Avraam Stepanovič Sverčkov fut un personnage clé des commissions législatives chargées de la compilation des lois (1720-1740). En 1755, il légua une part considérable de ses biens à la toute jeune université de Moscou. Reconstituée sur la base du dossier judiciaire constitué pour le procès dont a fait l'objet ce legs, l'histoire de la famille de Sverčkov et de ses relations laisse à penser que, pour les serviteurs de son type, seule la famille nucléaire avait une importance capitale. Venant de classes non privilégiées, ces bureaucrates ne devaient leur ascension sociale qu'à leurs compétences professionnelles et construisaient de façon indépendante leurs carrières, leurs amitiés, leurs stratégies matrimoniales ou autres, progressant grâce à leurs contacts personnels, leurs connaissances et leur expérience. Participants actifs à la mise en place des réformes de l'État dans la première moitié du XVIII^e siècle, Sverčkov et d'autres comme lui constituaient le niveau supérieur des employés de bureau dans une multitude de services de l'administration centrale et assuraient le fonctionnement sans faille de toutes les unités de la machine de l'État. Acquérant le statut de noble héréditaire par leurs services, ces serviteurs limitaient le champ de leur interaction familiale et sociale à la famille nucléaire. Le « capital social » d'une telle famille se fondait sur les succès de carrière et le bien-être matériel de deux générations (parents et enfants), dans une articulation complexe de contacts sociaux (amicaux, professionnels).

AUTHOR

GALINA O. BABKOVA

School of History, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow,
gbabkova@hse.ru