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That a career of an official can be representative and at the same time very particular, was recently demonstrated by Evgenii Akelev and Anna Joukovskaïa in their seminal essay on the lineage of Shagarovs’ – the small officials of the town of Sevsk in southeastern Russia who became hereditary nobles in four generations. The authors resort to Eduardo Grendi’s statement on “normal exception” coined within the methodology of microhistory. The authors reveal what one of the central figures of microhistory historiography Natalie Zemon Davis called “the social creativity of the so-called inarticulate”. The successful career of the Shagarovs was secured either by their relative wealth or by their capability to balance at the intersection of several juridical and socio-economic groups. Not only those who “lost” their names in the centuries but also those whose names are on the surface of the historical narrative deserve to receive this kind of study. In the case of “great men” microhistorians usually focus on obscure clues that have traditionally been ignored or devalued as insignificant. The case studied in this paper, that of Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii, differs essentially from that of the Shagarovs who were in fact unearthed by the authors of the paper. Malinovskii, however, is an ideal case to create what microhistorians call “a prosopography from below”: studied analytically, his life trajectory reveals “the relationships, decisions, restraints, and freedoms faced by real people in actual situations”. Malinovskii’s unusual career was secured by the happy choice made by him or by his father for him and supported by the aristocrats’ patronage. The elder Malinovskii, Fedor Avksentievich (1731/32?–1811), a Moscow parish priest, was obliged these connections to his service as the dean at the St. Trinity Church in Troitskaia sloboda at the north of Moscow, at the Samoteka-river (1765–1797/8). Probably, he contacted the Moscow freemasons from the Novikov’s circle too. Aleksei, the elder of his six children (three sons and three daughters) made a fantastic career: senator, a member of the Russian Academy (Rossiiskaia Akademiia), a chevalier of several Russian orders, he became Head of the Moscow Archive of the College of Foreign Affairs in 1814 and remained at this position till his death in 1840. But first of all he
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9 The date of birth is calculated by me according to the birth Fedor Malinovskii specified in the confessionary registers of St. Trinity Church for many years (TsGA Moskvy. F. 203. Op. 747. D. 311. L. 122, 520, 318.) It differs from the date usually pointed out by the historians (1737).
became an hereditary nobleman and a serf-owner.\textsuperscript{11} Aristocratic patronage, combined with the decision to study in the gymnasium at the Moscow University, not in the Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy, as it was ubiquitous among the priests’ sons, secured him a successful career in the long perspective. The choice turned to be a real advantage.

In 1835, Head of the Moscow Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the chairman of the Society of Russian History and Antiquities (Observestvo istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh), senator, full privy councilor Aleksei Malinovskii wrote to the Minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Empire, Count Karl Nesselrode:

Your Excellency have let me to stay \textit{in my estate near Moscow} in summer and to call on the Archive several times per month, but now I have another occasion: \textit{My daughter Princess Dolgorukova}, who resides in Tsarskoe Selo, is going to give birth in July. I would like to visit her for a week without entering St. Petersburg.\textsuperscript{12} (emphasized by me. – \textit{M.L.})

Really, it was a very successful life trajectory, bearing in mind that Aleksei was born as a son of the parish priest. When Bourdieu addressed the question of the determinism and conscious choice, he emphasized rather the deterministic and unconscious aspects, the strategies which are not the result of “a genuine strategic intention”.\textsuperscript{13} Giovanni Levi formulated a hypothesis for dealing with biographical material: a life cannot be understood only by means of its distinctive or unique qualities, but on the contrary, by returning each apparent abnormality back to the norms by demonstrating it has a place in a historical context which accommodates it. This perspective maintains a balance between the specificity of the individual destiny and the social system in general.\textsuperscript{14} The fact that a priest’s son achieved such a prominent position in the Russian society of \textit{ancien regime} was taken as a normal one by the historians as they were seized by the veil of Malinovskiis’ alleged noble origin. When examined carefully, the circumstances of his rise turn to be buried under the thick layer of mythology which struck roots even in the historiography.\textsuperscript{15} This mythology (which looks like an intentional deception from our point of view) speaks for the value the family attached to the imagined fact of its Polish noble origin and for the goals the

\textsuperscript{12} OPI GIM. F. 33. D. 31. L. 31.
\textsuperscript{14} Levi, “The Uses of Biography”, 69.
\textsuperscript{15} Anthony G. Cross, \textit{U Temzskikh beregov: Rossiiane v Britanii v XVIII veke} (On the banks of the Thames) (St. Petersburg, 1996), 46; Paola Ferretti, \textit{A Russian Advocate of Peace: Vasilii Malinovskii} (1765–1814) (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), 12. Ferretti does not question the conclusion by Svetlana Dolgova made on the base of the document signed by the members of the Polish family of Malinowski. The origin of this confirmation will be regarded below.
brothers wanted to achieve, and hence, speaks for the socio-cultural model they adhered. The case of Aleksei Malinovskii is not only his personal experience of social mobility. It also illuminates the structures of the society which lifted him to its top.

To understand what made his rise possible I resort to the concept of patronage which has been only recently applied to the history of early modern Russia. The relationships of patronage imply long-lasting voluntary, unequal and unofficial connections between people of different social status based on the exchange of different resources. This system penetrated all social and political structures of modern European societies, not excluding Russia. These relationships tied together people from different *sostoianiiia* being an evidence of an interaction within the society arranged, as appears, on the basis of a rigid status hierarchy. The interaction between people in a society based on formally rigid social regulations was possible due to patronage which functioned not only at the level of the aristocracy and its environment, but also at the every level of society. The Russian poet and scholar Mikhail Lomonosov claimed his social status as an independent scientist and recognition of his scientific studies thanks to the Shuvalov’s and Vorontsov’s patronage. His social identity had been shaped through the advantages provided by the patronage, rather than through the position of a professor of chemistry at the University.

The parish of St. Trinity on the Samoteka-river where Malinovskii’s father Feodor Avksent’evich was the dean since 1765 turned to be the main source of Aleksei Malinovskii’s connections with his patrons from the Moscow aristocracy and Russian ruling elite. Though yet Feodor’s father Avksentii Fillipov was the priest there since 1721, according to the confessionary registers of St. Trinity church, neither he nor his son did wear the last name Malinovskii. However, Feodor Avksent’evich is known in the memoirs of the contemporaries (e.g., Martyn Nikoforovich Sokolovskii, Stepan Petrovich Zhikharev) after his last name Malinovskii at least since the 1780s. So did his three sons, who were indicated in the Moscow University examination registers published in *Moskovskie vedomosti* as Malinovskii in the late

---

1770s – early 1780s. Yet in 1782, Aleksei was registered in the confessionary registers as archivariusy Feodorovy; but already three years later Aleksei and his youngest brother Pavel were registered as Feodorovy Malinovskie. Having obtained the documental evidence of their noble origin in the 1790s, the brothers implemented the myth about their origin from the Polish Szlachta and misled even some contemporary scholars.

There is no reliable evidence on the origin of their family name. The clergy had not got any family names until ca. 1730/40s, i.e. before a significant number of the children from the clergy became educated in the ecclesiastical schools. The presence of the Ukrainian teachers in the schools at that time was crucial for endowing the future deacons and priests with family names. Whereas a bulk of students bore the same patronymic names and hence were undistinguished from one another, the malorossiiane were accustomed that everyone bore family names, both laymen and clergymen. They started to invent family names for their students, usually ending at –skii. In the case of Malinovskii this trend had joined the convention to endow students with the names after famous hierarchs of the Russian Church: Fedor Avksent’ev syn could have received his “family” name after Moscow archbishop Platon Malinovskii, a malorossiianin by birth, who ruled the Moscow eparchy since 1745 till his death in 1751, i.e. in the very time of Fedor’s education in the Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy. The version that the Moscow Malinovskiis belonged to the noble kin from Ukraine who could have joined the clergy (in fact, a common thing among shliakhta) and thus “lost” their noble status in Russia only plays for the myth created by the Malinovskiis.

Malinovskii the elder, Aleksei’s father, was ordained priest in 1760. After his father’s death in 1765, he received the parish. Whether he was an Enlightened priest and his spiritual mentorship was respected by the prominent persons or just because of the vicinity of the parish and the place of Cherkasskie ogorody – the land given as a dowry to Princess Varvara Alekseevna Cherkasskaia, Nikolai Petrovich Sheremetev’s (1752–1809) mother, – Feodor

---

21 Moskovskie vedomosti, Supplement to #54 July 7, 1777; Supplement to #55, July 11, 1778; Supplement to #97 December 3, 1782.
22 TsGA Moskwy. F. 203. Op. 747. D. 520. L. 318 (alongside with Vasilii, who had already embarked upon the career in the Archive in late 1782); D. 542. L. 11 (here Vasilii was not mentioned here as he moved to St. Petersburg in late 1783).
23 See footnote 13.
25 Vladimir Vladimirovich Sheremetevskii, Famil’nye prozvishcha velikorusskogo dukhovenstva v XVIII i XIX stoletiakh (Moscow, 1908), 3f, 95f.
27 I. Orlov, Istoricheskoe opisanie moskovskoy Troitskoy tserkvi, chto v Troitskoy, s eya prihodom (M., 1844), 50, 93f.
28 So Orlov, Istoricheskoe opisanie, 93.
Malinovskii became the spiritual father of Count Sheremetev. Another official of a high rank whose household belonged to the parish of St. Trinity on the Samoteka-river was vice chancellor Count Ivan Andreevich Osterman (1725–1811), who inherited a house in the parish in 1782 after his childless uncle Vasiliy Ivanovich Streshnev. In 1798, after his transfer to the Blagoveshchenskii Cathedral in the Kremlin as an archpriest and soon after to the University’s Church of St. Tatiana as its dean, he left his house in the parish and moved to Sheremetev’s summer house at Cherkasskie ogorody with his elder son Aleksei, by that time — secretary of the Moscow Archive of the College of International Affairs. A few years earlier, between 1792 and 1794, a charitable hospital (goshpital’) was founded at Ogorody by Count Nikolai Sheremetev.

The historians use to explain Malinovskii’s transfer from his parish in St. Trinity in 1798 by the investigation of Novikov’s affair (1792). However, it hardly had to do with it: according to the confessional registers of the St. Trinity church, Malinovskii was its dean at least in 1796 – the last year he had been indicated as the archpriest living with his elder son Aleksei at the parish of St. Trinity, and he sent the text of his inauguration sermon in the University’s church to Count Sheremetev to St. Petersburg in November 1798. It addition to the chronological non-compliance, such a transfer was too honorable and prestigious to be a punishment, taking in account that Feodor Malinovskii became also the Moscow University’s catechist (zakonouchitel’). Nevertheless, Malinovskii the elder did have some connections to the Moscow freemasons: it was not just a coincidence that Catherine II mentioned his name in her questionnaire for Novikov wondering if “pop Malinovskii” was also involved into the freemasonic activities. On the other hand, the elder Malinovskii maintained relationships with the officials of the Moscow Archive of the College. Its Head in 1783–1814, Nikolai Nikolaevich Bantysh-Kamenskii (1737–1814), was his mate in the Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy and was taught among others by Petr Levshin (metropolitan Platon), yet a student of theology. Till 1799/1800, Bantysh-Kamenskii shared the chief position in the Archive with both Martyn

29 A. I. Vinogradov, S. E. Berezovskiy, Strannoprìimnyy dom grafa Sheremetyeva v Moskve 1810-1910 gg. (M., 1910), 8, 17. Orlov, Istoricheskoе opisanie, 58–59. S.R. Dolgova, Knyaginya E.R. Dashkova i sem’ya Malinovskih (M., 2002), 100; till now, there is no any reliable version to explain, why Fedor Malinovskii started to be well received at the Sheremetevs’.
30 Orlov, Istoricheskoе opisanie, 61. Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 200. Ivan Osterman settled there as soon as he left the state affairs in 1797 (Orlov, Istoricheskoе opisanie, 66–67, the date here mistakenly: 1795).
31 Vinogradov, Berezovskiy, Strannoprìimnyy dom grafa Sheremetyeva, 12.
32 Orlov, Istoricheskoе opisanie, 93–94. Ferretti repeats this baseless conclusion (Ferretti, A Russian Advocate of Peace, 14).
33 TsGA Moskwy. F. 203. Op. 747. D. 695. L. 60. The register for the year 1797 was not found in the archive. Orlov pointed out that Malinovskii moved to Blagoveshchenskii sobor as its presbyter in October 1798 and then the dean of St. Tatiana at the Moscow University.
35 Возможно, у Екатерины были какие-то причины подозревать Ф.А. Малиновского. Вопросный пункт к Новикову №55 гласил: «… также и о попе Малиновском сказать, вашего ли он сборища?» Malinovskii the elder is mentioned as a questionable freemason at: Serkov pointed out Feodor Malinovskii (Serkov, Russkoe masonstvo, 515).
Sokolovskii and Johann Gotthilf Stritter. Sokolovskii mentioned priest Malinovskii and his son Vasiliy among his guests on October 31, 1783, soon after Gerhard Friedrich Miller’s [Müller] death.37

Malinovskii obtains a position in the Moscow Archive of the State College of Foreign Affairs: Sheremetev or Vorontsov?

Even not yet having reached full 9 years, in the early 1771, Aleksei was admitted to the gymnasium at the Moscow University as a pupil ‘at his own expense’ (na svoem koshe) which means that his father was able to pay for him (and a few years later also for his younger brothers). His last years in the gymnasium were the time when the Russian freemasons mostly transferred their activities from St. Petersburg to Moscow. Georgii Vernadskii, after Nikolai Longinov, definitely reckons Malinovskii among the members of the first student society in Russia, and under the Masonic patronage – Sobranie Universitetskikh pitomtsev since 1781. One of the society’s purposes was translation of moralistic works of past and present. Very likely that these first translation experience paved Malinovskii the way for his further translations of the French and German theatre pieces in 1780s–90s.38

In October 1778, he left the gymnasium without entering the “rector’s class” – the last one which opened the way to the University (the students of this class had a privilege to attend the lectures of the University professors).39 He was hired as a clerk in Mezhevaia (Land survey) chancellery on a position outside the Table of ranks40 as he did not graduate a university. Just in a month, he left the chancellery formally because of a disease, and with an intention to continue studying at home privately.41 Most probably, the real cause was the decision to embark upon another, more perspective career. As it is unknown how did it occur, but one can suppose that the decision originated not without an influence of someone from the Masonic circle: assistance of

---

38 Georgii Vernadskii, Russkoe masonstvo v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II (Petrograd 1917; St. Petersburg 2001), 276f. Mikhail Nikolaevich Longinov, Novikov i moskovskie martinisty (Moscow, 1867), 135, 137. Aleksandr Feofanov also reckons Aleksei Malinovskii among those University students who were engaged in the Novikov’s translation activities for his freemasonic magazine Utretnii svet in the late 1770s. (A.M. Feofanov, Studenchestvo Moskovskogo universiteta XVIII – pervoy chetverti XIX veka (M., 2011), 206.) However, in 1777–1779 the magazine was published in St. Petersburg. By this fact the possibility of such translations cannot be entirely rejected, but it certainly made this activity more complicated; Novikov moved to Moscow in 1779, and in 1780 the magazine was ceased.
40 RGADA. F. 1294. Op. 2. D. 3606. L. 1–2. Malinovskii did not graduate the University, for he had never been a student despite of historians’ assertions (Vinogradov, Berezovski, Strannopriimnyy dom grafa Sheremeteva, 17; Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 177–178; Dolgova, Knyaginya E.R. Dashkova i sem’ya Malinovskih, 14); he applied for a position in Mezhevaia chancellary as a “pupil” (uchenik) of Moscow University.
41 “Nadlezhit … vedat’ vse ustavy gosudarstvennyia...”: Dokumenty RGADA po istorii gosudarstvennoi sluzhby Rossii XVIII v., Istoricheskii arkhiv, 2 (1999), C. 211.
high-ranked masons for the petty officials was a common thing among the freemasons.\textsuperscript{42} In the late 1779, he was admitted to the Archive as an actuary (\textit{actuarius}) with the annual salary of 100 rubles starting from February 1, 1780, though in the Archive he passed the exam in foreign languages not well.\textsuperscript{43}

The last but not least underlying reason which made his admission to the archive possible, was the new staff schedule of the College of Foreign Affairs confirmed on January 28, 1779.\textsuperscript{44} Anna Joukovskaia points out that this document reduced considerably the limits of maneuver for the College’s chiefs (Nikita Ivanovich Panin and Ivan Osterman): from here out, they could exercise control over only the employees of the lower ranks (from 14 to 10), i.e. translators, secretaries on different positions, actuaries, copyists, students, interpreters etc.\textsuperscript{45} According to the article 11, the expenditures of the College for its Moscow Archive officials were fixed at 2740 rubles annually.\textsuperscript{46} During the next months, the staff schedule was followed by a number of regulations issued by the College. They demonstrate these new margins of administrative power which in fact favoured Aleksei Malinovskii and in a year – his brother Vasili too. On August 12, 1779, the College issued an \textit{ukaz} to Head of the Moscow Archive Gerhard Miller prescribing to promote some chancellery officials to the next ranks or to raise salaries for the others within the limits of 2740 rubles. For the rest of the amount, Miller was allowed to admit new chancellery officials and to set their salaries after his own consideration having submitted these new appointments to the College thereafter.\textsuperscript{47} The first staff schedule of the Archive according to the new staff schedule was composed in 1781. Aleksei Malinovskii was on the list among other actuaries being paid 150 rubles annually (instead of 100 rubles set out by Miller’s decision in December 1779).\textsuperscript{48}

After Svetlana Dolgova, it is usually admitted that Malinovskii applied for a position in the Archive due to the direct protection of Nikolai Sheremetev.\textsuperscript{49} However, this fact is not proved by any historical sources. Sheremetev himself was not involved with the College personally whereas even the smallest position in the College and its Archive was too valuable to admit it to be covered without patronage. This assertion is proved by further promotions on the

\textsuperscript{42} Vernadskii, \textit{Russkoe masonstvo}, 266.
\textsuperscript{44} Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (PSZ):44 (Kniga shtatov):2, № 14834 (January 28, 1779).
\textsuperscript{46} PSZ:44:2, № 163.
Archive positions made for Sheremetev. The Moscow connections of the elder Malinovskii – with his mate Bantysh-Kamenskii and, possibly, metropolitan Platon – could have contributed to the process by the direct agreements with Head of the Archive Miller who he had recently received carte blanche for admitting chancellery officials to the Archive. Then, I consider it important to reconstruct the Malinovskii’s protection network in Petersburg.

Sheremetev had to set his connections in motion to arrange an admission to the Archive for the son of his confession father. Both Nikolai Sheremetev and his father Petr Borisovich did support a strong relationship with the Vorontsovs family, who kept their influence over the College of Foreign Affairs during two generations. Mutual services linked the elder generation and two generations with each other. In 1784, Aleksander Romanovich Vorontsov (1741–1805), in his letter to Petr Borisovich Sheremetev (1713–1788), emphasized “friendship” which had tied together both “houses” since many years, especially Petr Sheremetev with Vorontsov’s late father Roman Illarionovich (senator and governor, died 1783) and uncle Mikhail Illarionovich (state chancellor, died 1767). In 1787, Petr Sheremetev addressed to Aleksander Vorontsov, a relatively young but influential politician, senator and a member of the Imperial Council, asking him to give him a hand in a complicated case which was the inheritance division with his father’s first marriage’s descendants.

There are only a few drafts written by Aleksander Vorontsov to Nikolai Petrovich Sheremetev (1784 and 1804) and a few undated clean copies from Sheremetev to Vorontsov concerning the portraits of Vorontsovs’ ancestries. There are also few indirect evidences of the younger Sheremetev and Vorontsov connections.

These close ties between two families of equal corporate standing were based on the mutual utility and convenience representing “social friendship”. It did not imply emotional affection but the exchange of services and could provide also a favour of arranging an advantageous position for a young protégé of one of the parties. The College of Foreign Affairs was the starting point of Aleksander Vorontsov’s brilliant career. His uncle Mikhail Vorontsov was the state chancellor and the head of the College since 1758. Aleksander’s first appointment

---

50 Например, начале 1800 г. Шереметев ходатайствует перед Ф.В. Ростопчиным, первоприсутствующим в Коллегии, чтобы устроить туда своего незаконнорожденного брата Я.П. Реметева (Russkii arkhiv 7 (1896): 340), а в 1805 г. – перед А. Чарторыйским, неофициально исполняющим должность канцлера, с просьбой определить в архив своего родственника графа Ф.М. Шереметева (Russkii arkhiv 8 (1896): 494), хотя А.Ф. Малиновский был помощником управляющего архивом.


was that of chargé d’affaires to Vienna in 1761. Later, in the 1770s – early 1790s, he controlled the College via one of the clients of the Vorontsovs’ party, Aleksander Andreevich Bezborodko who obtained the leading positions in the College since the early 1780s. These relationships on the top of the imperial power are mentioned here as important ones since these grandees not only shaped the foreign policy of the empire, but also influenced the careers and life trajectories of petty and middle officials, who would later become subsequently indispensable for their patrons.

On the other hand, long-lasting intellectual ties connected Aleksander Vorontsov and Gerhard Friedrich Miller, the academician and the head of the Moscow Archive (since 1766, formally since 1776). Yet being 15 years old, in 1756, Vorontsov published a couple of translations from Voltaire in Ezhevesiachnye sochinenia – Russia’s academic journal edited by Miller. Their correspondence in 1769, 1775, and 1781–1783 had been preserved. In 1770s – early 1780s Vorontsov enjoyed Miller’s services as a historian and archivist while working at his political projects: he requested historical information about the origins of Russian nobility (boiare, diaki, and “the tsar’s duma”). These relationships though not equal were based on mutual utility and service: Vorontsov seems to follow the pattern of his uncle Mikhail Vorontsov – the Lomonosov’s patron enjoying the role of a patron of an academician.

The main service Miller rendered to the Vorontsovs was, however, their lineage starting from the 14th century. Using his archival skills, he managed to “connect” the boiars’ lineage of the Vorontsovs who were almost exterminated during the reign of Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century, with the Vorontsovs from the 18th century – the offspring of petty service nobles from the 17th century. The prominent Russian archivist Pavel Mikhailovich Stroev, by the way an official in the Archive since 1816, wrote in 1858 that the lineage was composed “too clumsily, too hardly, and to the same absurdly in the beginning”, as the Counts Vorontsovs and the Highness Prince [Mikhail Semenovich Vorontsov] are of “entirely different breed.” Miller “did
Vorontsov appreciated the archival research made by Miller on his requests, and promised him reciprocal services when needed in a letter of 1781. Miller did not wait long to accept Vorontsov’s proposal and asked him to provide his widowed step-daughter, burdened with six children, with a pension. Their epistolary dialogue was characteristic for patron-client relationships: Miller ensured Vorontsov he would “pay” for this benefaction and would be merit for his further favour (milosti). Due to the Vorontsov’s efforts, Miller was granted the Order of St. Vladimir of the 3rd degree shortly before his death, the commission which he attributed “mostly to your [Vorontsov’s] recommendations”. In October 1783, Vorontsov, mourning the death of Miller in a letter to his widow, Christina Miller, called him «a friend of mine and of my household (moi i domu moemu priiatel’). The “house” (dom) should be understand here in the framework of the concept of “house citizenship”. Secretaries, relatives, managers and those who resorted to the protection of the head of the household, including children, were considered to belong to “dom”. The word “friend” (priiatel’) was neither random here nor emotionally coloured. It was a clear definition of Miller’s place in the hierarchy as a Vorontsov’s client, though his position was quite high on the corporate ladder. In early modern Europe, the words clients, patronus, clientele were not used any more but were replaced by the euphemistic expressions such as “friends” (or priiateli or znakomtsy) for clients. This tradition had struck its roots also in the Russian soil not later the 17th century. The emphasis on reciprocal service and friendship expressed and embodied in epistolary exchanges was an indispensible feature of clientage relationships – unequal but voluntary and based on mutual obligations.

66 Ovet grafa A.R. Vorontsova vdotve Millera (23 oktyabrya 1783 g.), in Archiv knyazy Vorontsova, vol. 30 (M., 1884), 388.
68 Ibid.
69 See the evidence and the examples of the word usage from the epistolary sources in the seminal work: Krom, „Formen und Patronage,” 322, 326; the translator of the Horatian poetry Nikolai Popovskii, a Lomonosov’s student, used the words “znakomtsy” and “druz’ia” as translations for „clientium” (Horace III, 1:15–16), published as: N.P. [Neprosveshchenny ostupite…], in: Poleznno uveselenie, vol. 7 (M., 1760), 3—5.
70 The basic review of the mechanisms of patronage and its language forms in the early modern France is: Kettering, “Friendship and Clientage,” 139–58.
Taking in account the relationships between Petr and Nikolai Sheremetevs with the Vorontsovs on the one hand, and Aleksander Vorontsov with Miller in the 1770s – early 1780s, on the other, the person of Vorontsov seems to be an appropriate figure to have enough influence in the College itself and in the Archive to put Aleksei on a position of a clerk taking in account also his father’s connections with the Archive’s officials.

The higher staff displacements at the College in the early 1780s did not pass by the Malinovskiis. Nikita Ivanovich Panin, the educator of the Grand Duke Pavel Petrovich and the first member of the College since 1763, the high friend and protector of the younger Vorontsovs (Aleksander, Semen and Ekaterina Romanovichi, and her uncle via her husband Prince Mikhail-Kondratii Dashkov’s kinship), was once betrothed with Nikolai Sheremetev’s sister Anna Petrovna (died in 1768). In 1781, he asked for a leave but was not welcomed in his office by the empress any more. After his death in March 1783, Count Ivan Andreevich Osterman, since 1782 – a formal parishioner of the St. Trinity church at the Samoteka-river in Moscow, became Head (glavnoupravliaushchii) of the College, and another «friend» of the Vorontsovs, Aleksander Bezborodko, was appointed the second member of the Foreign College and the personal reporter of the empress. Right after these appointments, in April 1783, Osterman and Bezborodko signed the first promotion for Aleksei Malinovskii: he obtained the position of translator in the Archive.

Ennoblement

In 1792, 12 years passed since Malinovskii had got his position in the Archive. Basically, after “faultless service” during this period, he could reckon for the promotion to the rank of collegiate assessor (the 8th), which secured the hereditary nobility status for non-nobles.

---


74 A letter by Vasilli Malinovskii to Count Aleksander Vorontsov, Arkhiv kniazia Vorontsova: 30 (Moscow 1884), 391.

by birth at the civil service according to the regulation of 1765. The imperial decree of December 1790 confirmed this regulation prescribing to promote only nobles for the excellent service and capabilities” leaving for the non-nobles a chance for a promotion not earlier than after 12 years of service. However, after examining certificates from the College in late 1792, the Senate rejected a promotion for Malinovskii and some other non-noble officials from the Archive as it did not find any “merit” (отличность) in their service. It seems to be like a bolt from the blue for Malinovskii. Now he could reckon only upon the promotion as a nobleman, which did not depend on the period of “faultless” service. But in April, 1791, the ukaz of December, 1790 was supplemented by another one. It specified that the noblemen had to present their nobility certificates approved and confirmed according to the Charter to the Nobility of 1785 in order to be promoted to the 8th rank. Thus it was not enough to find a noble person bearing the same family name among the old documents in the Archive and to compose a lineage to connect him to his own family. Malinovskii needed a real evidence of his nobility. According to Dolgova, in early 1793, he took a 15-days long leave from the Archive and left for Mogiliev province, which was recently annexed to the empire from Rzeczpospolita. But according an entry in the name register of the Archive, in 1793 Malinovskii took a 15-days leave for St. Petersburg. Therefore the assertion that he “found” or met the шляхтичи Malinowskis in the newly annexed region should be called into question or rejected at all.

Polish nobles were often willing to sell noble patents, and for enough money, anyone could acquire Polish nobility. It was an ubiquitous practice at that time, and it was the way Praskov’ia Kovaleva would get proof of her noble lineage few years later.

By now I have not got any direct evidence on those who could have helped Aleksei to reach the genuine Malinowskis and to incline them to confirm that Aleksei Malinovskii was their kinsman. But still it is possible to unearth some details and connections. The genuine Malinowskis resided in the Rohaczew powiet of Rzeczpospolita which became Rogachev uezd of Mogilev province after the first division of Poland in 1772. They belonged to the line of the coat of arms Pobjó
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76 PSZ. Vol. 17. № 12465.
77 PSZ. Vol. 23. № 16930.
80 Dolgova, “Алексей Федорович Малиновский”, 183.
which had a distinctive greyhound’s head or body on its top. The brothers František and Dominik Malinowskis, the sons of Vinzent Malinowski, come to light due to the petition, the rotmister of Rohaczew powiet (uezd) Tadeusz Ryzygodzki submitted in March 1801 to the emperor complaining against the arbitrariness of František and Dominik Malinowskis from the Rohaczew powiet (uezd) whose land estate he had been renting for few years. Ryzygodzki mentioned also two shliakhtichi who took part in the illegal activities of the brothers Malinowskis being in the service of the full state councilor (deistvitel’nyi statskii sovetsnik) Levashov. Pavel Artem’evich Levashov (1719?–1820), retired Russian diplomat, had received a land estate in the newly annexed Polish province of Mogilev from the empress and went to spend there his old years in 1786. A remote kinsman of the Vorontsovs, he wrote letters to Aleksander Vorontsov from his way to his new estate reporting to him about his observations in the Western provinces of the empire. He reached the estate of Staroe Selo in Rogachev uezd at Easter and already in July wrote that in his immediate neighborhood in Rogachev starostvo (uezd) the landowner Malinowski had a quarrel with the peasants which ended with a real fight (500 people against 300, and four shliakhtichi were killed). Obviously, the behavior of the Malinowskis from Rogachev uezd was characteristically conflicting which the both cases reveal. The figure of Levashov unites the both cases contributing to identify the family who agreed to approve their alleged relationship with the Moscow Malinovskiis. Thus, was not Aleksander Vorontsov that who connected Aleksei Malinovskii with the shliakhtichi Malinowski via Levashov in the early 1790s?

Although the purpose of Aleksei Malinovskii’s voyage to Petersburg in 1793 remains unclear, it certainly had to do with the problem of his nobilitation. The Polish Malinowskis signed the certificate about their relationship with Aleksei and his brothers yet on December 1, 1793, and another half a year passed until the certificate was translated into Russian in Mogilev. Notably, all those who signed the certificate belonged to the descendants of Ian-Samuel Malinowski, chashnik chernigovskii: at least ten of them were brothers, cousins and second cousins to each other (accordingly, uncles and second uncles, nephews and second nephews, including Dominik and František and their second uncle Antonii, premier-major of the
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85 Archiv knyazya Vorontsova, vol. XIV (М., 1879), 448.
Polish crown army, later elected the chair of the noble trusteeship of Mogilev province (1795)). They confirmed that they had common ancestors with the Moscow Malinovskiis, among them the Polish shliakhtich Ivan Malinowski who allegedly joined the Russian service in 1655. A corresponding entry was found by Aleksei Malinovskii in the Archive and attached later to the certificate sent to the Gerol’dia department of the Senate. In June 1794, marshal of the nobility of Mogilev province Michal Holyński, and not the College of Foreign Affairs as Dolgova insists, issued confirmed that Aleksei Malinovskii was “a natural and a real nobleman”. That was the very document he needed to obtain the next rank according to the decree of 1791 – not because of his faultless service but as a nobleman. Already on September 10, 1794, i.e. only three months after signing, Malinovskii was granted the desired rank of collegiate assessor by the imperial decree (counting from September 2nd, 1793). His coat of arms (a version of Pobóg) was registered in Gerol’dia and inserted to the 4th part of Obshchii gerbovnik dvorianskih rodov in 1799 – only two years later than that of Count Sheremetev.

In fact, this attempt to find someone from Polish Malinowski who would agree to confirm the kinship with him was not the first one for Aleksei. Yet in May of 1791 he had asked for a 3-weeks leave from the Archive for the first time and set out to Smolensk province. Though this province was a right one to look for someone from the Polish szlachta but obviously it did not succeed: maybe he did not know any suitable or useful person there. This voyage tips the scales in favor of the version that he started to prepare his nobilitation earlier in order not to wait until 12 years of his service had passed. Then he anchored his hope on the 8th rank as a 12-years service benefit – the hope which also failed. The second attempt was a success: but he travelled not to Mogilev province but to Petersburg.

It is unlikely that the Polish Malinowski signed the certificate without any fee, but the benefit which Aleksei Malinovskii and his brothers won was greater than any amount paid. This affair, dubious from the contemporary point of view, paved him the way to the further ranks and purchasing of serfs – that what he actually was seeking if regarded retrospectively. The speed at which he started purchasing populated estates reveals his intentions. Yet before he received a certificate from Mogilev and obtained formally the noble status, in November 1793, he
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87 The kinship is reconstructed according to: Iatskevich, “Maly gerbovnik”, 256f; Mesyatseslov s rospis’yu chinovnykh osob v Gosudarstve, na leto ot Rozhdestva Khristova (SPb., 1795), 245.Gerbovnik, part IV, 111–12.
submitted a petition about a 7-days long leave from the archive to travel to Kaluga.\textsuperscript{92} If in the official register of the Archive of July 1793 the translator Aleksei Malinovskii was indicated as the priest’s son who did not own any male serfs or peasants.\textsuperscript{93} The next year, he himself erased the entry reflecting his previous status in the register (in an official paper!) and wrote down that he originated “from the nobility” and owned 27 male serfs in Kaluga province.\textsuperscript{94} It should have been the first serfs he purchased – the acquisition which did not come to light in the later sources. By 1798, the Archive’s secretary in the rank of collegiate accessor Malinovskii possessed 90 male serfs in Moscow and Riazan’ regions.\textsuperscript{95} How did he purchase them?

His new version of his origin Aleksei Malinovskii declared officially in 1803 in his documents submitted to the Moscow noble assembly. Petitioning to include him in the noble register (\textit{dvorianskaia kniga}) of Moscow province, he filled out a form (\textit{formular}) where he pointed out three land estates with totally 145 male serfs as his property and specified how he obtained them. 20 males and 11 females in Ruzskii uezd of Moscow province were bought in 1794 (i.e. soon after those 27 serfs in Kaluga region were bought: the year he had got the confirmation of his noble status, he received the award of 500 rubles from Catherine II for his \textit{Historical and Diplomatric collection of the affairs that took place between Russia and Crimea},\textsuperscript{96} the sum which could contribute to this purchase). A quite large set of serfs (70 males, 60 females) was bought in Riazan’ province in 1797 (it was the year when Malinovskii composed Sheremetevs’ lineage for and got 1000 rubles for it). By 1803, his last purchase were 105 serfs (55 males, 50 females) in Dmitrovskii uezd of Moscow province in 1802, and they were bought not privately (through \textit{kupchaia}) like two previous estates but at a public sale (auction).\textsuperscript{97} In November 1803, he received his nobility certificate also from the Moscow noble assembly as a landowner of Moscow province.\textsuperscript{98} To complete, by 1820 he possessed 719 male serfs who were scattered not only in Moscow and Riazan’ provinces but also in Tver’ and Tula provinces too. Hence, during the period of about 20 years, he increased the number of male serfs in about 5 times (from 145 to 719).\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{92} RGADA. F. 180. Op. 1. D. 69. L. 329. Though the purpose of the trip was not indicated, undoubtedly, he went there to purchase serfs.


Thus, the acquiring of nobility status was of crucial importance for Malinovskii career, both official and, as it will come to light below, informal. Over the years he made a huge career and status jerk: his salary at the beginning of his service in the Archive in 1780 was 100 rubles per year; later on, along the growing ranks and growing official salary (348 rubles annually in 1794, and 1200 rubles in 1803), he got also additional fees for the lineages he composed for the aristocrats who requested the Archive about the origin of their families in order to be included in the studbooks (Rodoslovnye knigi) according to the Charter to the nobility of 1785 and after the imperial decree of 1797 on the All-Russia Armorial (Gerbovnik) (among them Sheremetev). He also was granted with extra sums of money for compiling the archival documents on the history of Russia’s relations with other nations. In 1800s, in the private service of Count Sheremetev, he earned about 15,000 rubles only during 1803–1806 for supervising the construction of Sheremetev’s Almshouse; his newly obtained estates should have been profitable either. He not only accumulated land estates but conducted an appropriate way of life assuming the role of a barin. His first leave to his village for four weeks he had got already in May 1794, having addressed directly to vice-chancellor Ivan Andreevich Osterman, his patron in the College, who two months earlier presented Malinovskii’s Historical and Diplomatic collection to the empress.

This new role shaped also his epistolary style. For example, in May 1805, he informed Sheremetev that he had to leave the construction of the Almshouse in Moscow unattended for 10 days because of a fire which devastated 16 households in his derevnishka. Besides, a number of house serfs lived at his place at Sheremetev’s Almshouse that he supervised till 1826 and later in his private house.

Malinovskii and Sheremetev

Malinovskii and Sheremetev exchanged services yet in 1790s. Their further long-time connection (about 10 years of direct communication) represent the relations of exchange within the patron-client relationships: patron gave material benefits, advancement, and protection in

---

103 PSZ. Vol. 24. № 17749 (20.01.1797 г.).
return for a client’s loyalty and service, demonstrations of respect and esteem, information and advice.\footnote{In her book, Sharon Kettering defines the patron-client relationship as a dyadic, personal, vertical, unequal, reciprocal, exchange relationship. (p. 20) The definition has become classical for the early modern historical studies. Sharon Kettering, \textit{Patrons, Brokers, and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France} (Oxford, 1986), 18.} How could be a petty official useful for one of the richest magnates in the empire? Or, what valuable services could he provide for him to support their relationships of mutual assistance? In the late 1790s, Malinovskii fulfilled two very important commissions for Sheremetev. After the Emperor Pavel I ordered the \textit{Gerol'diia} Department of Senate to compose the \textit{All-Russia Armorial of the Noble Lineages} (\textit{Vserossiiskii Gerbovnik}) in 1797,\footnote{PSZ. \textit{Vol. 24. \textnumero 17749 (20.01.1797 g.).}} Malinovskii, by request of Count Sheremetev, composed the genealogy of his lineage, in fact fictitious. In the Archive, he found proper documents to trace the lineage of the Sheremetevs to the legendary Prussian king Veidevut (\textit{Widewuto})\footnote{A Prussian cultural hero, the founder of the social order of the Prussian tribes.} who allegedly ruled at the estuary of the Vistula river.

To accomplish this order, Malinovskii not only used the materials collected by Miller which covered the family history beginning with the quasi-historical figure of Andrei Kobyla and his son Fedor Koshka (mentioned in the testament of Dmitrii Ivanovich Donskoi in 1381) till the 18\textsuperscript{th} century,\footnote{Geschlechter-Tabelle der Familie Scheremetew, in: RGADA. \textit{F. 199. P. 279. Ch. 2. D. 40; F. 199. P. 246. D. 9. Kopii gramot, diplomov i proch. Sheremetevym dannykh na 18 listakh.}} but found out some archival documents himself. As he wrote to Sheremetev, he included his “ancestors both mentioned by my worthy mentor Miller and those whom I added myself having found them [in the Archive]”.\footnote{RGIA. F. 1088. Op. 1. D. 208. L. 9.} His reference to Miller as his mentor (\textit{uchitel’}) in this context was not only rhetorical. He went the path paved by the historiographer who composed a untrustworthy lineage of the Vorontsovs. If Miller seems not to deceive the public deliberately, just confirming an “obvious” fact that the 18\textsuperscript{th} century Vorontsovs were the descendants of the old \textit{boiars’} family of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, Malinovskii realized what he was doing: in a letter to Sheremetev written in December, 1797, he explained him the possibilities to avoid “the historical criticism” of his work and added that his “zeal to pleasure your Excellence [is] unlimited”.\footnote{RGIA. F. 1088. Op. 1. D. 208. L. 7 ob., 9–10.} Hence, Sheremetev himself knew that his lineage was a fiction at least before Andrei Kobyla who came “aus Preußen”. However, it was a necessary means to support the family prestige as other aristocratic families also deducted their lineages from legendary foreign ancestors.\footnote{M.E. Bychkova, \textit{Legendy moskovskikh boyar} (M., 1997), 16.} The Shremetevs’ coat of arms published in the \textit{All-Russia Armorial} includes the golden crown with two crosses one under another – the traditional emblem of those who were identified as the Weitewuto’s descendants. The description of the coat of arms was also
composed by Malinovskii.\textsuperscript{118} Sheremetev granted him 1000 rubles and promised him his further gratitude and assured him to be equally useful when needed.\textsuperscript{119} This scheme of mutual relationships matched that which existed between Miller and Aleksander Vorontsov: professional skills exchanged for the services at the highest level of power. In his letter of 1798, Malinovskii congratulated Sheremetev with the appointment as \textit{oberkamerger} by Paul I and openly referred to Sheremetev’s protection he had been enjoying at that time.\textsuperscript{120}

The next but not less important service Malinovskii provided to Sheremetev soon after he composed his lineage, was his assistance at supplying Sheremetev’s beloved Praskov’ia Kuznetsova-Zhemchugova with a noble pedigree. Born in 1768 as a daughter of a smith in Kuskovo, she shone as an actress in Sheremetev’s estate theatre.\textsuperscript{121} Whereas sex imposition was a routine in private serf theatres,\textsuperscript{122} Nikolai Sheremetev fell in love with Praskov’ia and openly lived with her since his father died in 1788.\textsuperscript{123} He freed her as Kovaleva in 1798 but did not dare to marry her during the reign of Paul I.\textsuperscript{124} To make their future marriage absolutely unambiguous he needed to “nobilitate” her, and for this deal a real evidence of her noble origin was necessary. While a person authorized by Sheremetev was sent to Belorussian provinces which previously belonged to Rzeczpospolita to unearth \textit{a shliakhtich} Kovalevskii who would be ready to give a signed evidence of his relationship with Praskov’ia,\textsuperscript{125} Malinovskii contributed the deal conducting the archival research. Among the documents of \textit{Razriad} in the Archive, he found the Polish nobleman Iaakub (Yakov) Kovalevskii who was captured during the Russo-Polish war in 1664 and then admitted to the Russian service in 1667.\textsuperscript{126} It was only a matter of Malinovskii’s skills to link him with the family of Sheremetevs’ serfs who originated from Yukhotskaia volost’ (near Yaroslavl’) and then settled in their estate of Kuskovo.\textsuperscript{127}

To understand Malinovskii’s career, either official or informal, the fact that Praskov’ia’s nobilitation scheme was identical to his own used in 1793/94, is of great importance. Forging of genealogy and family documents, even passing off the documents as authentic, was a ubiquitous

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Obshchyi gerbovnik dvoryanskikh rodov Vserossiyskikh imperii, nachaty v 1797m godu. Chast’ 2. Pervoe otdelenie, soderzhashchee: Gerby rodov knyazheskikh, grafskikh i dvoryanskikh rossiyanskikh imperii. №10. Reprint (SPb., 1992).}

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Otgoloski XVIII veka. Vyp. XI. Vremya imperatora Pavla. 1796 – 1800 gody (M., 1905), 230.}

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Russkii arkhiv 7 (1896): 329.}


\textsuperscript{124} P. A. Bessonov, \textit{Praskov'ya Ivanovna, grafiniya Sheremeteva. Ee narodnaya pesnya i rodnoe ee Kuskovo (Biograficheskiy ocherk)} (M., 1872), 77.

\textsuperscript{125} Bessonov, \textit{Praskov'ya Ivanovna, grafiniya Sheremeteva}, 82f.

\textsuperscript{126} Bessonov, \textit{Praskov'ya Ivanovna, grafiniya Sheremeteva}, 81.

practice in the 18th century (whereas it was illegal for a noble to marry a serf). Sheremetev himself seems to have believed in the noble origin of Praskov’ia’s family, which was the most important thing. In his letters to Aleksander I and the empress Elizaveta Alekseevna on the eve of Praskov’ia’s death, he declared that he had a legal heir and confessed his secret marriage pointing out that his wife was “d’origine polonaise”.128

Malinovskii was appointed the chief of the office of Sheremetev’s Moscow household soon after Nikolai Sheremetev married Praskov’ia Kovaleva in November 1801, before they left Moscow for Petersburg in early 1802.129 In the same year, Malinovskii admitted Sheremetev’s proposal and became the supervisor of the long-lasting construction of Sheremetev’s Almshouse (Strannopriimnii dom) at Cherkasskie ogory, where he lived with his father since 1798. In 1803, the year Praskov’ia’s Sheremeteva died, the hospital, previously not an outstanding undertaking, was turned into a large scale project. Sheremetev spent a considerable portion of his wealth to transform the hospital under construction into a memorial for his wife.130 The measure of Sheremetev’s confidence to Malinovskii was very high, given the importance that Sheremetev attached to the construction even before the death of Praskov’ia Sheremeteva. Yet in 1802 he wrote to Malinovskii:

I entirely rely on you and expect from you a favor for me and a success fulfilling my commission. You do know how strong my desire is to see a speedy end of the good start and I am sure that you will offer the assistance that I expect from you. Remaining with entirely sincere reverence and devotion…131

In his turn, Malinovskii assured Sheremetev in his and his father’s readiness to serve him at the establishing of the “hospital” and reported at once about his negotiations with the contractors in order to make abatement on the materials.132 Sheremetev attached a great importance to this memorial to his late spouse. As Sheremetev wrote in May 1803,

Because of Aleksei Fedorovich’s friendship [emphasized by me. – M.L.] to me, and being now responsible to implement the decision highly confirmed [i.e. the Charter of the Almshouse confirmed by the emperor in April 1803], I provided him with the authority to complete the construction.133
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129 Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 212.
It can be questioned, after Kettering, to what extent their relationships were based on
totality of service but intensely affectionate and durable. Malinovskii emphasized that Sheremetev’s favour was precious for him not because of the “magnificence” of the Count’s person but because of “the true goodness” of his heart and his Christian rules “which are so rare in the present society (svet)”. In 1803, Sheremetev recommended Malinovskii to an unknown person as a man “aussi honnête que serviable“, moved only by honour: “n’a été guidé par aucun motif d’intérêt, mais par honneur". In his letters of that time, Malinovskii, in his turn, named Sheremetev his ‘benefactor’ (blagodetel’), expressing his gratitude for the protection and emphasizing that he was a source of his well-being, never interpreting their connection as “friendship”. Such terms (goodness or kindness, benefits, etc.) implied the gracious, voluntary bestowal of a gift by a superior upon an inferior. Playing on the religious feelings of Sheremetev and using his dismal mood after his spouse’s death, he gained additional finances for the construction though the spending was already enormous. Obsequiousness overwhelmed the Malinovskii’s letters but nevertheless Sheremetev emphasized his “true friendship” to Malinovskii and his father, the priest:

… [I] wish you sincerely peace of mind, health and I want you to keep your affection and friendship to me which are so pleasant and which I wish to retain forever. Besides I ask you not to give up your care for the Strannopriimnyi dom… Please convey my respect to your batiushka…

Explaining the exaggerated rhetoric of patron-client language or poetic of patronage, Luba Golburt argues that the shade of flattery was discursively interconnected with friendship in the early modern world, whereas Sharon Kettering emphasized the social background of the deceit and hypocrisy: it were the differences in rank which gave patron-client relationships an artificial, sycophantic air. Reciprocity of the exchange was obligatory for patron-client relationships, creating dependence, whereas friends were independent because their exchange was voluntary. Kettering makes a reservation that friendship could exist with inferiors who had power and who could offer what a superior needed but the reality was fluid, and friendship and clientage can be
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134 Kettering, Patrons, Brokers, and Clients, 18.
136 Russkii arkhiv 8 (1896): 484; По мнению Бартенева, это письмо Шереметева к А.Р. Воронцову.
137 Kettering, Patrons, Brokers, and Clients, 15.
conceptualized at either end of the same continuum, separated by many permutations and combinations.\textsuperscript{143}

The relations between Sheremetev and Malinovskii were not only unequal, but even unilateral hence, not “friendly”. Unequal relationships based on gratitude and dependence did not always produce a genuine emotional band, particularly when rewards were much-needed.\textsuperscript{144} The political reality of these relationships should not be confused with the effusive rhetoric in which they were expressed, according to Kettering: the formal rhetoric of clientage conceals the cold, hard reality of men and their ambitions meshing into place.\textsuperscript{145}

Their correspondence from the 1800s, when Sheremetev stayed in St. Petersburg as the chief marshal of the court and Malinovskii headed his Moscow household, is really vast. The latter reported on the Count’s Moscow household (at least two estates, Ostankino and Kuskovo, and three buildings in the city) and on the construction of the Almshouse as well as on Sheremetev’s errands he was running on in Moscow. Sheremetev demanded from his Moscow household office, supervised by Malinovskii, to do their best to avoid “a slightest delay ... in completing of this institution with the joined efforts”. He also recommended “to beware” some omissions, which occurred “at the beginning of the construction with materials’ supply and the … accounting”.\textsuperscript{146} Malinovskii enjoyed the full confidence of Sheremetev’s in all his household and finance affairs until 1806. A great embezzlement which was revealed that year, did not result in the loss of his confidence to Malinovskii. In an undated document, which originated soon after (as Malinovskii was mentioned there as state councilor – the rank he obtained in 1805), Sheremetev, addressing to general auditor Rastorguev who inspected his Moscow, wrote about Malinovskii: “A well-learned man of good rules, always faithful to me and diligent, he has won my trust and affection (priviazannost’). And with all his diligence, good intentions and honest rules, it would not be possible to achieve the desired success entirely.”\textsuperscript{147} Nevertheless, Sheremetev was looking for a person who could replace him as the trustee since he had no desire to deal with this undertaking any more. The project was frozen, and the completed Almshouse was not opened until Sheremetev died.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{143} Kettering, “Friendship and Clientage,” 142, 146.
\textsuperscript{144} Kettering, \textit{Patrons, Brokers, and Clients}, 21.
\textsuperscript{145} Kettering, \textit{Patrons, Brokers, and Clients}, 22.
\textsuperscript{148} See details in: Lavrinovich, «Kak possorilis’». 
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MALINOVSKII AND VORONTSOV

In the years Count Aleksander Vorontsov headed Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the highest rank of state chancellor (1802–1805), Malinovskii, already in the rank of the collegiate councilor, fulfilled his commissions in the Archive. His endeavours were crowned by the rank of state councilor (the 5th rank) in 1805. At the Archive, on the orders of the chancellor, he composed different excerpts from the diplomatic papers from the past century, for example, that from the conferences of foreign ministers [ambassadors] in Russia from 1725 to 1741.

In early 1800s, Malinovskii’s relationships with the Chancellor Vorontsov were not only formal: they corresponded with each other on the service affairs also privately. In April 1804, in a private letter to the Chancellor, Malinovskii reported about the readiness of “the excerpts from the memorials of the British ministers [ambassadors] at the court” and apologized for being late with them because of a long illness.

In 1805, the year the Chancellor died, Malinovskii was occupied with his commission to compose “an excerpt from all the files of the Supreme Secrete Council relating to the inner and the external state administration supplied with historical explanations”. This commission, mentioned by Malinovskii at least one year earlier in his letter to Vorontsov, had to do with Vorontsov’s political ideas and the project of the comprehensive state reform he was obsessed at that time what attached more value to the Malinovskii’s archival work. The commissions Malinovskii fulfilled for Vorontsov resembled very much those Miller fulfilled for him twenty or thirty years earlier. Though Bantysh-Kamenskii was Malinovskii’s immediate supervisor, he asked Vorontsov about a leave for a week to his estate, as ten years earlier he asked Osterman.

On the 1st of March 1804, chancellor Vorontsov, who was allowed an indefinite leave by the emperor to improve his health on January 16, 1804, honored the Collegiate archive in Moscow by his personal visit. One month later Prince Adam Jerzy Czartoryskii, his deputy, announced “the highest favor for Bantysh-Kamenskii and his employee, the collegiate councilor...

149 Excepting the very first one, which was given in 1802 and concerned the current affairs of the Archive. Then the report was made up by the Archive’s chief Bantysh-Kamenskii. OPI GIM. F. 33. Op. 1. D. 55. L. 25 ob.
Malinovskii, for improvement and order found by the State Chancellor in the State Archive».

Later at the same month the Archive received the prescription from Czartoryskii to deliver all necessary chronicles and annals to the newly Imperial Society for Russian history and antiquities at the Moscow University (OIDR) — all that taking in account that both Bantysh-Kamenskii and Malinovskii were elected the honorable members of the Society. It was not an unusual prescription: previously the Archive received similar orders from the College, vice-chancellor or even from the Empress herself: in 1773, the empress prescribed Miller to deliver all the necessary documents to Nikolai Novikov who started publishing Древняя российская вивлиография. Henceforth, the both officials who belonged to the Imperial Society had to supply the Society with the documents they considered necessary. Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin, who was appointed the state historiographer in 1803, frequented the archive in 1800s at the personal permission of the Chancellor; later Malinovskii delivered him the documents from the archive and necessary books from the Archive’s library thus further contributing to the business of state importance, История государства Российского.

The year 1804 was crucial for Malinovskii’s relationships with Vorontsov. In March 1804, Count Vorontsov demanded a demarcation of his lands bordering with that of Count Sheremetev in the uyezd of Atkarsk in Saratov province, in selo Balanda allegedly because of lacking of water sources in his lands neighboured to the Sheremetev’s. These lands were granted to Vorontsov by the emperor in the early 1800s. Obviously, Vorontsov’s requirement was a bolt from the blue for Sheremetev as the messy text of his letter to Malinovskii from March, 1804 reveals:

Please take the trouble to drag us with Count [Vorontsov] apart. I wish to please him but I’m not inclined to cut off the land from the peasants’ homesteads; as you can see the desire of His Excellency [Vorontsov] is to make exchange without pulling apart. Hence, to avoid changing bad for worse, I ask you to establish this very xxxx necessary for me at a decent and friendly way xxxx to deliver me a means to divide…

159 Состав OIDR при Московском университете с открытием общества по 1 мая 1890 (М., 1890), 1.
Vorontsov did not insist on a trial. He argued that his very incentive was to come to an agreement and to maintain peace avoiding a trial which could be easily resolved in favor of the chancellor.\textsuperscript{164} Both Sheremetev and Vorontsov had authorized special persons to conduct the affairs in the uezd of Atkarsk. From the part of Vorontsov, it was one of his managers Ivan Firsov, who served him for many years until Vorontsov died. In July 1804, Sheremetev asked yet Malinovsky to find a means “to calm” Count Vorontsov or to provide him with a “means and thought”. On August, 9 Vorontsov informed his manager that Sheremetev was ready to “change lands”, the information which had to do with the Sheremetev’s announcement addressed to Malinovsky on August, 12 that he had already made some concessions and was intended to settle the land division without a trial. He asked Malinovsky to deliver a letter containing this announcement to Vorontsov.\textsuperscript{165} This commission was not an ordinary one – to deliver his correspondence, but a special one: to meet Vorontsov and to win his favour for Sheremetev. Having received a leave in early 1804, Vorontsov stayed either in the estate of Andreevskoe or in Moscow where Malinovskii could have visited him. Sheremetev certainly took into consideration Malinovskii’s ties with Vorontsov and his sister which were at their pinnacle at that period. Probably, a result of this visit was the amicable agreement between Vorontsov and Sheremetev that was submitted to the Mezhevaia chancellery together with their common petition about a division of land on December 1, 1804.\textsuperscript{166} Importantly, Vorontsov assumed the obligation to pay a compensation for the land lost by Sheremetev.\textsuperscript{167} Besides this evident involvement in the affair, it turns out that Malinovskii was engaged in it on the level of the household offices of both grandees what comes to light in the Vorontsov’s correspondence (with his managers, between them and Vorontsov’s confidant Kirill Stepanovich Ryndin) in August–December 1804. The Vorontsov’s chief manager Fedor Dugin suspected Malinovsky and other Sheremetev’s household officials playing unfairly: they were delaying the signing of the amicable agreement waiting until the surveying of the Vorontsov’s land would be completed, the fact which would make an exchange possible only by a purchase contract. Then Sheremetev would not agree for any contract considering it “obscene”, whereas Vorontsov would “loose the right to dispute”.\textsuperscript{168} In his letter to Sheremetev from September 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1804, Vorontsov referred to Sheremetev’s concessions he had made one month before and regretted that Sheremetev’s managers did not compromise with his ones and denied the project of a common petition. He

\textsuperscript{165}Russkii arkhiv 8 (1896): 495–96.
insisted that he wanted to „drift apart“ in a friendly way though he could also resort to the formal procedure. To avoid it, he asked Sheremetev to instruct his managers to complete this affair without further problems, just because of “your friendly relation to me”. Vorontsov repeated the words “friendship” or “friendly” five times in the last part of his letter emphasizing that it were the Sheremetev’s managers who did not want a quick outcome. Again, he attached a project of their common petition based on the assumed amicable agreement.169 This letter was preceded by the Malinovskii’s private letter to Vorontsov from August 24: it contained some excerpts from the conferences of French ministers at the Russian court, which Malinovskii made for the chancellor in the Archive. It is noteworthy that official matters were discussed side by side with the private ones. Thus both lines of Malinovskii’s relationship with Vorontsov – that as of an official subordinated and of a client simultaneously were combined in one letter. Referring to the problem of land division with Sheremetev, Malinovskii revealed that the manager Dugin betrayed his doubt to him, whether the very agreement of Count Sheremetev in fact “meant political rejection”. He tried to dispel such a suspicion and assured Vorontsov that Sheremetev decided for this deal in good faith. He added that he was not responsible for the duration of the formal procedures in the Sheremetev’s chancellery but promised to do his best to bring them to an end as soon as possible.170

Yet in October the deal was not finished. Vorontsov demanded from his managers to put an end to it even if Sheremetev had drawn back from the first agreement and the conditions had become less advantageous. One of his managers addressing to Malinovskii rebuked openly Sheremetev’s employees in this delay and suspected Sheremetev’s chancellery of intentions “to a new entanglement.”171 Malinovskii assured the Vorontsov’s manager, “there will be no suspension either”, and instructed him to address him if needed: he will repress “their sophistication which caused the delay.” He recognized that a certain game in order to gain some benefits from the land exchange between the grandees took place in the chancellery of Count Sheremetev and undertook the commitment to assist Vorontsov’s managers. When the deal was over, the manager Firsov submitted an invoice of the expenses “spent totally for land surveying and exchange” in the uezd of Atkarsk to Vorontsov’s chief manager Dugin. From the total amount of 21,000 rubles, 180 rubles were spent “to treat [na ugoschenie] the Count

Sheremetev’s surveying and household office”\textsuperscript{172} – a relatively small but revealing sum of money.

\textbf{Princess Dashkova and Malinovskii}

There was also the third part in the patronage system built around, for and by Malinovskii. Princess Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova (née Vorontsova) was a link which can be identified as a broker according to Sharon Kettering’s classification.\textsuperscript{173} The favourable period of her relationships with Malinovskii coincides with the period, her brother Aleksander was Minister of foreign affairs in the rank of state chancellor (1802 – 1805). As a broker, she was a proper figure to intercede between Malinovskii and her brother, and to muster influence and resources for former. Though it is considered that Malinovskii was acquainted with Dashkova since 1770s when he got used to attend the gatherings of \textit{Vol’noe rossiiskoe sobranie} at the Moscow University,\textsuperscript{174} it is unlikely that Princess Dashkova, an aristocrat (or even another member of the \textit{Sobranie}, the academician Gerhard Miller), could pay attention at a student, priest’s son aged 10–16. At least there is no any evidence about their probable \textit{personal} acquaintance at that time.

On the contrary, theatre could be a strong tie between Malinovskii and Dashkova and hence a springboard for their relationships. Alongside with the official career in the Archive, Malinovskii was engaged in the translations of theatre pieces for the Moscow public theatre. At the early 1780s, he started with the French pieces, in ten years he undertook also the German ones. He translated and published a number of theatre pieces in the magazine \textit{Rossiiskii featr} edited by Dashkova.\textsuperscript{175} All the Vorontsovs were fond of theatre, patronized it and even sheltered.\textsuperscript{176} Aleksander Vorontsov, having resigned and settled in his estate of Andreevskoe in Vladimir province in late 1792, transferred there his theatre from the estate of Alabukhi in Tambov province and tried to create in Andreevskoe something similar to Nikolai Sheremetev’s


\textsuperscript{173} Kettering, \textit{Patrons, Brokers, and Clients}, 55: Brokers not only secured material benefits for their clients, they also connected them to the outside world and interceded for them when regular channels proved inadequate.

\textsuperscript{174} Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 177; The \textit{Sobranie} was established in 1771 and existed till 1783; others date its foundation as late as 1774, the year its first volume was issued (S. S. Dmitriev, G. A. Veselaya, “Zapiski knyaginii Dashkovoy i pis'na sester Vil'mot iz Rossii,” in Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova, \textit{Zapiski. Pis'ma sester Vil'mot iz Rossii} (Moscow, 1987), 10. It should be taken into consideration that 1771 was the year of the plague outbreak in Moscow and all the gatherings were prohibited by the authorities.

\textsuperscript{175} Самая ранняя отдельная публикация относится к 1781 г. См.: СК XVIII №5609; в том же году он публикует свой перевод Максима Ларошфуко, считающийся первым переводом Ларошфуко в России: \url{http://pushkinskijdom.ru/Portals/3/PDF/XVIII/10_tom_XVIII/Shreder/Shreder.pdf}; Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 210; \textit{Rossiyskiy featr, ili Polnue sobranie vsekh rossiyskih featral'nykh sochineniy}. Ch. 1– 43 (SPb., 1786—1794). The issues of the magazine are not preserved.

estate theatre in Kuskovo.\textsuperscript{177} In 1799, at her brother’s in Andreevskoe, Princess Dashkova attended the performance of the theatre piece \textit{Bednost’ i blagorodstvo dushi} (Armut und Edelsinn) by August von Kotzebue, translated by Malinovskii.\textsuperscript{178} The première of this theatre piece took place one year earlier in the Moscow public theatre.\textsuperscript{179} Dashkova, impressed by the performance in Andreevskoe, decided to arrange her own theater in the estate of Troitskoe near Moscow, and Malinovskii could be very useful for her.\textsuperscript{180}

At the end of the 1790s Malinovskii broke off his translation activities. My assumption is that by that time he had enough sources of income being involved in too many affairs which made the translations unprofitable. In 1793, he obtained the position of the Archive’s secretary (348 rubles annually)\textsuperscript{181}; after Martyn Sokolovskii died in 1799 and Stritter resigned the next year, Nikolai Nikolaevich Bantysh-Kamenskii remained the last of the three Archive’s heads appointed in 1783, with Malinovskii became his right hand. During the 1790s, he composed lineages after the requests of the aristocrats in the Archive\textsuperscript{182} and edited newly unearthed historical sources (among them \textit{Slovo o polku Igoreve}\textsuperscript{183}), finally, he ran on errands of Sheremetev at least since the late 1790s. He already became a landowner, and maybe it was his status too that did not allow him to sign the translations for public theatre. The memoirist Stepan Zhikharev insisted that in the early 1800s Malinovskii “forced” the young people who served in the Archive (Vasilii Zhukovsky, the Turgenevs brothers) to translate from German. Presumably, he edited these translations until the Moscow theatre of Michael Maddox was closed and burnt out after the season of 1804/05.\textsuperscript{184}

Since the early 1800s, there is an evidence of the epistolary communication between Malinovskii and Dashkova, although prior to that primary sources are lacking. Their communication turned around Nikolai Sheremetev. Above, I demonstrated that the families of the Sheremetevs and the Vorontsovs were tied by “social friendship”. In her letters to Sheremetev, Dashkova referred to their family history in every her letter to Sheremetev (1802–

\begin{footnotes}
\item[180] Dmitriev, Veselaya, “Zapiski knyaginy Dashkovoy”, 17.
\end{footnotes}
“Your friendship is very sensitive for me; but remember that I have been loving you since your childhood”.

Their relations were shaped merely by the personal features of Dashkova: she “almost demanded from her numerous relatives, friends and admirers that they gave her various things and belongings, which they had in abundance”. Usually Sheremetev supplied her with champagne (150–200 pro package) and tobacco, from time to time with Rheinwein, cheese, or candles. Nevertheless, when in 1802 Dashkova accused a serf of Sheremetev to inflict her a damage of 981 rubles, she got an annoyed response of Sheremetev: he was not going to “get into the business of the peasants”. It did not prevent him to address her two years later during the land division with Aleksander Vorontsov asking to influence on her brother.

Malinovskii’s letters to Dashkova did not survive. From the Dashkova’s letters to him and his correspondence with Sheremetev is obvious that he played the part of a go-between, acting as envoy or liaison, between two grandees. My assumption is that 1801 or 1802 were the years when less informal – than that between an Enlightened lady, and an archival official – relationships between them began. Definitely, Malinovskii met Dashkova personally before 1803: in a letter from January 1803, Malinovskii conveyed to Sheremetev her “own words” of excuse for not responding for a long time because of a disease as well as her gratitude for sending her six fresh lemons from Sheremetev’s greenhouse. Since 1802, Malinovskii, acting as the manager of Sheremetev’s Moscow estate household and an official of a middle rank (collegiate councilor, the 6th rank, since 1800), fulfilled their commissions to each other. Dashkova asked Malinovskii to bring the wine sent by Sheremetev to another house of her; later, in 1805, she commissioned him to convey Sheremetev to send her only 1,5 hundred “thick candles” instead of 200, and to add 200 bottles of Madera, and to put instead of two packages of

---
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tobacco only one. Malinovskii’s own gifts were much more modest, but no less important: usually paper, a means of communication for Dashkova, living mostly outside the city. Malinovskii could take what he considered necessary from Sheremetev’s household to deliver to Dashkova, the fact which also bears out that the level of confidence between Sheremetev and Malinovskii was very high. Nevertheless, it is not a ground to consider their relationships with Dashkova friendly in the contemporary sense of the word though she emphasized it in her letters referring to their relations as ‘friendly’ and calling them amitié (bien sincère or parfaite). Nevertheless, the contents of their correspondence is standard for sociable but not intimately friendly correspondence, such as information on the state of health and regrets about diseases, talking about the guests who came to see Dashkova or those to send her best in Moscow, and, finally, instructions concerning the affairs with Sheremetev. The shade of flattery, discursively interconnected with friendship in the early modern world, was obvious at least for Dashkova, and supposedly for Sheremetev too; nevertheless they both called their friendship with Malinovskii true. Though Dashkova signed her letters to both, either Malinovskii or Sheremetev, as “Votre très humble servant” or “Vasha pokornaia usluzhnitsa”, it should be taken in account that the formal rhetoric of clientage was originally the language of master and servant, that of clientage, which later became the language of courtesy.

The relationships with Dashkova were beneficial for Malinovskii: the land he was owing since 1797 in Rannenburg uezd of Riazan’ province (selo Kochury) hardly accidental turned to be intermingled with that of Prince Pavel Mikhailovich Dashkov (1763–1807), son of Princess Dashkova. After Prince Dashkov’s death in 1807, Malinovskii bought this land from the trustees of his property. Only four years earlier, Prince Dashkov, the nobility marshal of Moscow province, put his signature under Malinovskii’s nobility certificate as a member of Moscow noble assembly.
It was not a coincidence too that Pavel Levashov, on his way to Rogachev uezd in 1786, met Prince Dashkov while staying in Mogilev and reported about him to Aleksander Vorontsov, Dashkov’s uncle. Princess Dashkova, his mother, also owned an estate in Mogilev province since 1782: the estate Krugloe was a gift of Catherine II (167 kilometers away to the north from the Levashov’s estate of Staroe Selo in Rogachev uezd). This indirect evidence contributes to the version that Malinovskii’s nobilitation was prepared with an assistance of the Vorontsovs.

The crucial factor for the development of their relationships was that Dashkova’s brother headed the Foreign Ministry, which the Collegiate Archive was subordinated to. The rupture of Malinovskii’s relations with Dashkova is to be explained in this context. Since at least late 1803, the Chancellor Aleksander Vorontsov had had some serious health problems. That it was not a usual indisposition, is borne out by the fact that his brother, Russian ambassador to London Semen Romanovich Vorontsov, negotiated a contract with a graduate of the Edinburgh medical school doctor James Keir who came to Russia in late 1803 as the personal doctor of the chancellor and stayed with him in Moscow and then in Andreevskoe until Vorontsov died on December 3, 1805. Maybe the rumors on the Vorontsov’s ruined health, which surely circulated among the public, reinforced Malinovskii’s certainty that Vorontsov would not survive the year 1805. On August 25, 1805, Malinovskii wrote an irritated letter to Sheremetev stressing his concern with the fact that Sheremetev presented Princess Dashkova with gifts only because she, to his mind, addressed him via Malinovskii(!). He asked Sheremetev “to teach him how to get rid of her commissions henceforth”. My assumption is, Malinovskii did not need her as a broker and supporter of his official career any more as her brother Vorontsov was dying. In fact, there is no evidence of their further contacts. However, their relationships would have a strong impact on Malinovskii’s biography.

**Malinovskii’s marriage as the pinnacle of his life strategy**

The final step in Malinovskii’s assertion within the imperial elite was his marriage, late but profitable. Few historians who mentioned his wedlock mistook its date and circumstances or regarded it as a simple love-match. Anna Petrovna Islen’eva (1770–1847) was daughter of Aleksander Vorontsov’s and Ekaterina Dashkova’s cousin Elizaveta Petrovna Islen’eva (née Dmitriev, Veselaya, “Zapiski knyaziny Dashkovoy”, 28. Here the date of their marriage – 1812 – is false. Dolgova, “Aleksei Fedorovich Malinovskii”, 209. She did not fix an error made by Petr Bartenev who considered Dar’ia Illarionovna to be a cousin of Dashkova (hence, of Aleksander Vorontsov) whereas she was her aunt (p. 232, note ?).
Khrushcheva, 1747–1811). Anna’s father Petr Alekseevich Islen’ev (1745–1826) ended his life in 1826 as lieutenant general awarded with the order of St. Vladimir of the 1st degree. In 1790s and 1800s, he did not live in his estate in Tula province with his wife but with his mistress in the Western provinces of the empire where he was at the service. In 1795, the empress awarded him an estate with 1,200 male serfs in the annexed Minsk province.²⁰⁹ It is taken for granted that Anna was “educated” at Dashkova’s but it is quite obvious that Dahskova was travelling outside Russia when Anna was a child (1769–1772, 1776–1782). She stayed at her parents’ estate at least until 1792, as in October of that year, Aleksander Vorontsov received a letter from his cousin Elizaveta Islen’eva informing him about the fire which took place in her estate. She asked him to assist her, in particular, in obtaining a loan from the bank in Moscow.²¹⁰ There is no further evidence how Aleksander did help her, but the fact is that the fire deprived Anna (and probably two her sisters) a dowry and she became a bespridannitsa. To send her to Dashkova as a companion, was a good solution and a kind of assistance. Hence, early 1793 was the earliest year when she at the age of 22/23 could move to Dashkova’s. In the early 1800s, Malinovskii, in the age about 40 and still unmarried, could have met her at Dashkova’s. Anna was already about 30, i.e. out of the marriage age. The sisters Catherine and Martha Wilmot who lived with the princess in 1803–08 and kept a close eye on all the events in her house did not mention Malinovskii even once, whereas they recorded their visits and guests and also left some remarks on Anna Islen’eva and her behavior, hinting at their quarrels with her and their competition for Dashkova’s attention.²¹¹ However, Dashkova’s correspondence with Malinovskii reveals that she was eagerly expecting their meetings and conversations to take place in Moscow.²¹² It would be quite likely that Malinovskii visited her in her Moscow house in Bol’shaia Nikitskaia street, where Anna even had her personal chamber²¹³ but lacking of Wilmots’ records on it does not allow us to ascertain it. It can be assumed that they met and conversed with each other during receptions at other houses, for example, at Osterman’s – resigned vice-chancellor’s, whom they both frequented in his Moscow house at the former Fedor Malinovskii’s parish.²¹⁴ Evidently, Malinovskii might have opportunities to marry Islen’eva in 1800s. As he did not, one might assume, first, that Dashkova could allegedly impede a wedlock of two people in order to retain

²¹¹ The journal and the sisters Wilmots’ letters from Russia are the key source about Dashkova’s everyday life in 1800s: Dashkova, Zapiski, 266f., 268f.; original edition: Edith Londonderry (Eds.), The Russian Journals of Martha and Catherine Wilmot (Hyde, 1934).
²¹² RGADA. F. 188. Op. 1. D. 363. L. 19: “I look forward to coming to Moscow as soon as the [winter] road is settled, and I hope to enjoy your pleasant conversation there”, wrote Dashkova in one of her undated letters to Malinovskii.
her companion, or, second, because she did not consider Malinovskii (in fact, a priest’s son!) to be a match for her kinwoman. The assumption about a possible secret love affair can be easily destroyed by the fact mentioned by Martha Wilmot: in 1808, Anna was crazy about an Irish officer who came to visit Dashkova in Troitskoe. Evidently, Malinovskii was not eager to marry a woman without a dowry, although a niece of his patrons, and their future marriage was only a product of a plain calculating: the year they married, Islen’eva was 40, i.e. in the age, typical for widows’ remarriages, but not for the first wedlock. In January 1810, Anna Islen’eva, “still unmarried”, was with dying Dashkova at her last communion – the fact, recorded in the memoirs by a serf musician of the princess.

Islen’eva became attractive for Malinovskii immediately after Dashkova’s death. From the princess, she inherited the Dashkovs’ family estate of Murikovo with 318 male serfs in Volokolamsk uezd valued 52,000 rubles. Earlier, after Dashkova’s return from her short but dramatic exile to Cherepovets uezd in late 1796 – early 1797, Islen’eva was granted with the sum of 20,000 rubles, from which 17,000 rubles were paid immediately, and another 3,000 were bequeathed to her by the princess. As the exact date of Islen’eva’s and Malinovskii’s marriage is unknown, the date of birth of their daughter Ekaterina is the only reference point to calculate it. The exact date was unearthed by me in the register of the church of St. Trinity in the Sheremetev’s Almshouse (Strannopriimnyi dom), where Malinovskii was the chief overseer and where he lived with his family. The date of her birth – March 19, 1811 (baptized on March, 26) speaks for the fact that her parents married not later than in June or early July, 1810. The validity of this date is all the more reliable because a usually six-month mourning for Dashkova, died in January 1810, was over exactly on that days. The girl was named in honor of both Catherines – of Dashkova and of the late empress; her grandfather – archpriest Feodor Malinovskii– became her godfather. He died later that year. It is very likely, that the couple married in the church of St. Tatiana where he was the dean. During the Napoleon’s invasion of 1812 the University block of the city, including the church, burnt out and the church’s registers were reduced to ashes which definitely prevented the historians from the precise dating of their wedding. The time Malinovskii chose to marry Islen’eva – immediately as she became a heiress of Dashkova – brightly reveals the life strategy of Aleksei Malinovskii.
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Later, Anna Petrovna continued to be a source of the Malinovskii well-being. In 1811, her mother died, and she inherited the family estate in Tula province. Probably, that is why Aleksei Malinovskii’s formal entry on his service of the year 1820 contained also an estate in Tula. After her father’s death in 1826, Anna Malinovskaia should have inherited an estate in Minsk province granted him in 1794.

In 1833, Ekaterina Alekseevna Malinovskaia married prince Rostislav Alekseevich Dolgorukov (1805–1849), grandson of Aleksei Alekseevich Dolgorukov, who was brother of the emperor Peter II’s unfortunate favorite Ivan Alekseevich Dolgorukov sentenced to death by Anna Ioannovna (1708–1739). The latter was married to Natalia Borisovna Sheremeteva (1714–1771), Nikolai Petrovich Sheremetev’s aunt. Thus Malinovskii, who was already related via marriage to the Vorontsovs, in 23 years became related also to the Sheremetevs. Natalia Borisovna Sheremeteva-Dolgorukova was at once grandaunt to Prince Rostislav Dolgorukov, Malinovskii’s son-in-law, and to Count Dmitrii Sheremetev, Nikolai and Praskov’ia’s Sheremetev son (1803–1871). Malinovskii’s daughter marriage was the final step, merely symbolic than practical one: he gained the final foothold in the kinship relations with the aristocracy. It concluded his fantastic trajectory from the family of a parish priest to the top of the Russian society. By that time, however, nobody of his patrons was alive.

CONCLUSION

The fantastic take-off of a Moscow parish priest’s son Aleksei Feodorovich Malinovskii was implemented due to his patrons: using the connections of his father gained through his activity as a clergyman in the parish of St. Trinity at the Samoteka-river in Moscow, successfully chose the gymnasium at the Moscow University instead of usual ecclesiastic educational trajectory, then cleverly changed the place of service – Mezhevaia Chancellery – for the Moscow Archive of the College of foreign affairs, definitely using the protection of his patrons and the personal connections of his father priest. By the early 1800s, Malinovskii concentrated in his hands the solution of property matters between two aristocratic families (land division in Saratov province), the management of the Moscow household of Count Sheremetev, the construction and arranging of the Almshouse – the large-scale undertaking by N.P. Sheremetev built as a memorial to his late spouse. Being the right hand of the Archive’s head Bantysh-Kamenskii since late 1790s, he was preparing to obtain his position after he died (1814). His career trajectory in the structure of the patronage was parallel and no less important than the formal

one: having embarked upon the career as a petty official, he became Head of the Moscow archive of the College of Foreign affairs, senator and one of the most influential people on the Moscow bureaucratic scene. His wedlock with the Vorontsovs niece in 1810 strengthened financially and practically, and his daughter’s marriage to the remote kinsman of the Sheremetevs Prince Dolgorukov in 1833 – also symbolically his position as an independent figure, previously a client of aristocratic patrons. He successfully converted his service capital into symbolical one, and managed not only to reach the career heights but to secure his status and welfare.

When regarded within the logic of the official papers, the figure of Aleksei Malinovskii appears to be an organic part of the Russian middle or high bureaucracy. When one “traces the names” (Carlo Ginzburg), however, i.e. connects fragmentized sources originated from the specific social relationship or different institutions, this figure also turns to be an obscurity (a dark hourse). This article reveals the very “woven web” of the network of social relationships into which the individual was inserted.\(^\text{220}\) Alongside with his official career, he made another, inconspicuous one, – as a client in the tangled network of aristocratic patronage which was the real reason of his official career take-off and well-being. He contributed to his social success by a fortunate transition from one soslovie to another which he represented as a restoration of his allegedly noble origin. Such a transition was not an exception but a part of a collective process and at the same time an individual case of personal success.\(^\text{221}\) From this point of view, he was among those who belonged to “the little peoples lost to European history”.
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\(^\text{221}\) The real scale of this process in the late 18th – 19th centuries was demonstrated by Alison K. Smith in her pioneer research: Alison K. Smith, For the Common Good and Their Well-Being: Social Estates in Imperial Russia (Oxford 2014).