



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Maya Lavrinovich

**THE SHEREMETEV ALMSHOUSE
IN 1810–1812: ARRANGING A
MODERN INSTITUTION IN A
PRE-MODERN URBAN SOCIETY**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 65/HUM/2014

*Maya B. Lavrinovich*¹

**THE SHEREMETEV ALMSHOUSE IN 1810–1812:
ARRANGING A MODERN INSTITUTION IN A
PRE-MODERN URBAN SOCIETY²**

This paper examines an attempt to implement modern disciplinary practices in a new charity institution in early 19th century Moscow. The Sheremetev Almshouse was the first charity institution in Russia to expose the applicants for relief to inspections and visitations – practice borrowed from the system of outdoor relief established in Central and Western Europe since Reformation. The study demonstrates that the recipients were married men or widows with numerous children. They all belonged to the *middling sort* of Moscow dwellers, i.e. they were families of clerks and officials or non-commissioned and commissioned officers of middle ranks, sometimes, of priests, and considerable number of them had additional sources of income besides the relief they intended to receive from the Almshouse. Apparently, for members of these strata, applying for an extraneous relief was a kind of everyday practice. Yet, even though for none of them this relief was crucial for survival, they were still willing to consent to the inspections conducted for the administration in order to confirm their decent way of life. The focus of administrators on evaluating the social and moral conditions on the poor indicates that the Sheremetev Almshouse played a role generally associated with the state institutions established during the Catherine II's reign in order to extend the modernizing efforts to a wider strata of the Empire's population.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: early modern state, Russia, the Sheremetev Almshouse, Malinovsky, Moscow, poor relief, social discipline

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Center for History Sources, senior research fellow. E-mail: mlavrinovich@hse.ru

² This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented as part of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

Introduction

This article intends to relate the problem of modernization in Russia with some empirical observations which shed some light on the social composition and economic conditions of Moscow population in the late 18th – early 19th centuries. In the second half of the 18th century an approach to mould a well-ordered police state in Russia took place.¹ According to Marc Raeff, in the legislation of Catherine II one finds logical extension of a social policy paving the way for modernization while also displaying all the ambiguities of the *Polizeystaat* approach.² Trying to involve into the process of modernization as many subjects as possible, and especially the young ones, Catherine II used not so much officials which were still lacking, and not estates which she had been trying to develop in order create the socioinstitutional matrix for the modernization of Russia,³ but state educational and correctional institutions which were created, reformed or projected during the empress's reign (Moscow Foundling House and the Smolny Institute for noble maidens as common examples). Though being formally a private charity institution, Sheremetev Almshouse which was conceived in the late years of Catherine's reign, ranks with the institutions prescribed in details in the Police Statute (*Ustav blagočiniya*) of 1782. The Statute, so Raeff, had a strong moralistic bias which was combined with modern Western European and scriptural precepts, borrowed from the Protestant ordinances.⁴

In the focus of the study there are the recipients of the Sheremetev Almshouse's outdoor relief in the early 1810s. The Sheremetev Almshouse was the first one in the Russian Empire to arrange the system of outdoor poor relief, a complicated system accompanied by regular visitations, neighbors' testimonies and inspections. From the very beginning it is important to emphasize that I consider the Sheremetev Almshouse to be a phenomenon of the 18th century. The Almshouse was conceived at least in 1780s when not only the founder of the Almshouse earl Nikolai Petrovič Sheremetev (1751–1809) but his father Petr Borisovič Sheremetev (1713–1788), a son of a close Peter I's collaborator general field marshal Boris Petrovič Sheremetev, – was still alive⁵. The Almshouse was created and built in 1790s – 1800s both in its external classical form and in its internal administrative form by those who belonged to the cultural and intellectual elite of the Russian Enlightenment.

Sheremetev Almshouse was not the first private charitable institution in Russia and in Moscow. In the late 18th century there existed a couple of almshouses in Moscow which were founded by the rich aristocratic families. One of them was that of the Kurakins family. The almshouse (*špital'*) was opened according to the will of Boris Ivanovič Kurakin (1676–1727), one of Peter I's close collaborators, and was sponsored by the family of Kurakins at least till the end of

the 19th century.⁶ Only a few evidences about this almshouse in the 18th century are kept in the archives. From the almshouse's book of income and expenditures (1790) appears that the number of its inmates (*špitalety*) fluctuated around 25–26 persons.⁷ The social and gender status of the inmates still remains unknown. According to Natal'ya Kozlova, from 87 Moscow almshouses existed in the early 1780s more than 25% were arranged by different persons. All of them were placed at the parishes' lands excluding that of Kurakins and another one arranged by prince Boris Grigor'evic Shakhovskoy on his own land albeit at the parish of St Nicolas church in Kotel'niki. And since by 1780s a significant number of parish almshouses, so Kozlova, were not used for indoor relief for different reasons any more, about 60% of really functioning almshouses (37) were private. They granted asylum to approximately 200 people: each of them was inhabited by 5–18 inmates.⁸ Besides public and private almshouses since 1776 there existed so called Catherinian almshouse (*Ekaterininsky bogadelenny dom*) subordinated to Moscow police and assigned in 1782 to the office of Moscow board of public relief established according to the new administrative Law of 1775 (art. 38). It was in fact the largest almshouse of Moscow (350 inmates in 1787, 430 in 1797, 810 in 1803⁹) which was supported by public costs but did not belong to any parish.

Taking in account these data, the Sheremetev Almshouse which could admit 100 inmates and 50 sick poor to its hospital can be considered an institution of a large scale. In fact, it was the first institution in Russian Empire to arrange the system of outdoor poor relief, a complicated system accompanied by regular visitations, neighbors' testimonies and inspections. This system took its shape in early modern Europe, in some German lands – since 15th century, and flourished in 17th–19th centuries. Institutional outdoor relief (excepting traditional almsgiving as a pre-modern form of the relief) was not practiced in Russia in contrast to other European countries, either catholic or protestant.¹⁰ As the latest studies reveal, this sort of poor relief usually was used by the natives both in catholic and protestant lands, whereas the newly arrived poor populated municipal and monastery hospitals¹¹ (excepting work- and correction houses which are out of my concern here). Supplying 25 marriageable poor girls with dowries and assisting financially 50 impoverished families, to add an unspecified in the Statute number of impoverished craftsmen (usually about a dozen) every year¹², the Almshouse became the largest institution in the Empire providing poor with outdoor relief, and the largest private charitable institution providing both indoor relief and free medical care for the poor.

Primary Sources

The main primary sources for this research are office records of the Sheremetev Almshouse. First to mention are annual register books of the council's board meetings held in the Moscow

Central historical archive (TsIAM). For the purposes of this research register books of 1810, 1811, 1812 years are used. The register book of 1812 has a long caesura from September 1st till the very end of December because of Napoleon's seizure of Moscow, but the lists of the recipients of relief were confirmed in the first half of the year and therefore it is a source of full value. The annual register books were held beginning from March 1810 (the Almshouse and its hospital began to admit the poor in June 1810) and contain the Council's decisions on every item of the agenda: admitting of the poor to the Almshouse, purchasing of the foodstuffs, hiring and firing of all the employees, punishing of the serfs who worked in the Almshouse, expenses on everyday needs, building and renovation of the House, sewing of clothes for the inmates of the Almshouse and of the hospital, drugstore expenses both for the inmates and for the sick, salary payments. The administration (the responsible 3rd assistant) held the yearbook of the impoverished families (Family books) and the yearbook of the artisans (Artisans books) who received allowances from the House. There existed yearbooks of poor marriageable girls as well – the detailed lists of the poor girls who were supposed to receive a dowry from the House if married. The lists of the recipients of all three types of outdoor relief had been confirmed by the Council and therefore included in the register books of the Council. Besides, the Council's register books supplement the yearbooks of the same years since there are quoted the applications of Moscow dwellers which are not held in the fund of the Almshouse any more. The details contained in the lists of the recipients of the relief, both in the Council's annual register books or in the yearbooks of poor relief (social status of the recipients, their households' composition, age of the families' members) are crucial to conclude why did the administration decide to grant an allowance or a dowry or to deny an application.

The final list of the recipients of 1810 is contained in the Family book for 1810. This list contains personal information and that about the recipients' households composition. Family books of 1811 and 1812 are used as primary sources for this article as well. As opposed to the Family book of 1810 the Family books of the next two years do not contain this information. But this lack of information is met by the testimonials composed by the 3rd assistant in 1811 after the recipients of 1810 were inspected. These testimonials are held in another file which contains inter alia the register of the recipients of allowances for 1810 supplied by the testimonials and the list of new applicants for the allowances composed by Nikolay Murav'ev, the 3rd assistant of the overseer¹³. The both registers contain the decisions of the Council made in February 1811: to continue paying of the allowance, to cease paying an allowance, to move a recipient to another allowance rating or to deny an application of a new claimant.

At the beginning of 1811 all the relief recipients of 1810 who claimed to have their allowances extended for the next year were inspected by the 3rd assistant of the overseer. In 1811 this position was held by the college secretary (*kolležsky serkretar'*) Nikolay Vasil'evič Murav'ev. In early 1811 Murav'ev visited them all and examined personally if the conditions of the claimants remained so poor that the allowances could be prolonged for the next year as well. In fact, the recipients were examined if they had undergone any changes during the last year. The testimonials submitted by Murav'ev are interesting from the point of view of moral judgments and their correlation with the economic conditions and social characteristics of the applicants. On the other hand, the testimonials open a particular world Moscow dwellers lived in on the eve of 1812. Murav'ev's report makes also possible to speculate what did push them to apply for the relief, if they considered themselves to be poor enough and to conclude about the danger of stigmatization of a poor receiving an allowance from the Almshouse.

Administration of the Sheremetev Almshouse

All decisions concerning the internal everyday life of the Almshouse, discipline of the staff and of the inmates were made up by the chief overseer (*Glavny smotritel'*) of the Almshouse personally or by the Council chaired by him and under his supervision. Aleksey Fedorovič Malinovsky (1762–1840), the chief overseer of the Almshouse in 1807–1826 is mostly known as a historian and the head of Moscow Archive of Collegium of Foreign affairs from 1814 to 1840, the position he for some period held along with that in the Almshouse.¹⁴ Other members of the council were his three assistants, the head doctor (in the regarded period of time – Scotsman James Keer) and the Almshouse priest Alexander Otradinsky. The assistants of the chief overseer swapped their duties every year according to the Statute (art. VI).¹⁵ The chief overseer, Malinovsky, was accountable only to the founder of the Almshouse count Nikolay Petrovič Šeremetev, and after his death (1809) till the year when his son Dmitry Nikolaevič attained his full age (1824) – to the warden (*popečitel'*) of the Almshouse, count Sheremetev's cousin major general Vasily Sergeyevič Šeremetev. As the head of count Sheremetev house manager's office (1794–1806) Malinovsky supervised the Almshouse during all the period of its construction till he was appointed its chief overseer and the head of the Šeremetev Almshouse council in 1807.

Implementation of Modern Practices in the Sheremetev Almshouse

The future outlook of the Almshouse was discussed in the correspondence between earl Nikolay Sheremetev and the head of his house manager's office Alexey Malinovsky. Malinovsky stood for arranging rather a refuge (*srannopriimnitsa*) for indigent people than a hospital. He also suggested to build an outhouse (or annex) to arrange everyday dinners for the impoverished people. Here those who came could have obtained free medical care if needed as well.

Sheremetev considered admitting sick and indigent persons to the almshouse its first mission, and agreed to arrange additionally an everyday dinner to feed those who had not got any refuge (a sort of a hostel). Then the correspondents came to the point to supply those coming to have dinner with 10 kopeks as an alms.¹⁶ Later in the Statute this idea took shape of the extended system of outdoor relief of three types: an almshouse (*bogadel'nya*) itself, a hospital, and public relief* for the poor living outside the Almshouse.¹⁷

On April 25, 1803 the Emperor Alexander I confirmed Sheremetev Almshouse's Statute and staff list composed by Alexey Malinovsky.¹⁸ The Statute is prefaced by an address of Nikolay Petrovič Sheremetev to the Emperor Alexander I. The founder of the Almshouse appeals to the standard Christian values, particularly that of well-to-do men's compassion to the neighbors bearing need and of the attention paid by the monarchs to the poor. Christian obligations and patriotic zeal, so Sheremetev, guided him when founding the Almshouse.¹⁹ Thus the address of Sheremetev is entirely embedded in the pre-modern discourse of relief rendered to all suffering persons, and this is absolutely controversial to the text of the Statute. If the correspondence between Sheremetev and Malinovsky was full of ideas of gratuitousness and good deeds which would be blessed by God,²⁰ twenty-eight paragraphs and the staff list written by Malinovsky reflect an opposite glance – that of a modern administrator, and the Almshouse had obtained finally distinct features of an early modern institution.

First, the institution had a clear budget. The basic budget of 43.000 rubles per year included salaries of the staff, food and clothes supply of the inmates, maintenance of the hospital and of the Almshouse's church of St. Dmitry Rostovsky. The budget of the outdoor relief was separated from the basic funds: 6.000 rubles were appropriated to supply 25 poor marriageable girls with dowries, 5.000 rubles to grant 50 indigent families with the allowances, 4.000 rubles to maintain impoverished artisans (their number was not fixed), 5.000 to donate to the cloisters and churches and for other different godly deeds,** e.g. burial of the poor. In fact this sum was mostly spent for one-time payments to those who applied to the Almshouse but did not get an annual allowance. The last 2.000 were invested to the treasury of Moscow Foundling house as a fund in the case of unexpected developments.²¹ Total budget for all types of outdoor relief and corresponding expenses was 20.000 per year.

Secondly, and it was a real novelty, the inmates of the Almshouse and the recipients of all types of its outdoor relief were expected to correspond the standards of morality as a condition of the relief. They were to be responsible for the information they provided about themselves as well.

* «общественные вспоможения»

** «всякого рода богоугодные дела»

Thus the responsibility of the Almshouse and of those who enjoyed its charity was reciprocal, likewise the charity was a part and a parcel of the system of the state surveillance: the chief overseer, so the Statute, should observe that the persons who entered the almshouse had legal passports or other certificates where their social “station” (*sostoianie*),²² or status, was specified. The article proclaimed that poverty was not a sufficient reason to grant a relief: a needy person should have deserved it because of his/her faultless (*besporočny*) behavior as well. The Almshouse, so article V, in no way was a refuge of idleness, and a shameless sponger might not deprive a family man of his due part.²³ Marriageable girls seeking for dowries should have conducted modest (decent) life (*blagopristoyny*), orphans and girls with good principles (*blagonravie*) were favoured to be included to the top of the list (to receive dowries of greater amount)²⁴.

The observation of the moral behavior and the economic conditions of the applicants were controlled through inspections, or visitations by one of the chief overseer’s assistants, -- a proven method of the outdoor relief. Article XIV on the impoverished families contains information on the procedure of the inspection. The impoverished family men and women who would like to obtain allowances from the House should have presented two or three testimonies from “respectable and reliable inhabitants”*: the applicant was to be sober and industrious, he/she should have got income but its amount should have been insufficient to maintain his /her family, and the number of the family members specified in his/her application should have corresponded reality. Having received an application and examined it the Council should have inspected the applicant not later than in a week. Then it could have decided, an allowance of what rate to grant^{**25}.

The article emphasized that this relief was temporary. The yearly renewing testimonies of other people according to the article XIV served this aim: in order to be enrolled into the Family book for the next year, a claimant should have presented renewed testimonies. The idea expressed was not to let those whom favored the fortune to continue enjoying this kind of charity again.²⁶ It supposed that every recipient should have done his/her best to restore his/her economic conditions during this year. But in fact it could be perceived by a recipient as an opportunity not to make efforts to come of the dire straits in order to receive an allowance later on.

From the articles of the Statute quoted above (XIII, XIV and XV) is clear that Malinovsky as the author of the Statute and the chief overseer of the Almshouse did not intend to provide assistance of the Almshouse according to the broadly perceived charity as a Christian virtue. Unlike his

* «добропорядочных и надежных обывателей»

** «в какую из четырех статей причислить»

supervisor count Sheremetev, Malinovsky inclined to estimate his activities in the categories of modern values of the social order. In this context poverty, destitute, illness were by no means a virtue or something deserving an award as itself. These phenomenon were no more positive or even neutral since the modernizing efforts of Peter I. As far as they disturbed social order they should have been overcome or eliminated if possible. There was no place for those who did not contribute to the nation's development or productivity, no matter through idleness or vice.²⁷ The Statute's preface signed by Sheremetev was only a formal text necessary to present a new institution in the traditional terms of charity and to obtain a confirmation from the supreme authority. In fact it was not a charitable institution in the traditional sense, which identified charity as an indispensable component of the Orthodox Christianity with the national character. The Sheremetev Almshouse was in fact an institution breaking off the Russian conception of the world which compassion to the poor belonged to²⁸.

By now it is not possible to explain how did Malinovsky come to the ideas of inspection and monitoring and what document he used (if used) as a pattern for the Statute of the Almshouse. The fact is that he served a translator at the Collegium for Foreign affairs since 1783,²⁹ and that he translated moral edifying, philosophical and religious texts by European authors from French and Italian for Nikolay I. Novikov's journals as well,³⁰ so he could be familiar with some appropriate patterns.³¹ At least one can assert that the origins of his ideas undoubtedly go back to the early modern European practices.*

Reformation which desacralized the poor³² paved the way to rationalization of the spheres which prior were considered to belong to pure spiritual or not-controlled sectors. The area of poor relief along with education, regulation of sexuality and marriage was mould by new rational regulations: total prohibiting of begging and vagabondage (but not their eradication in

* Reformation was the point of departure which stimulated social process and formation of the early modern state. (See one of the recent works where the early modern period is interpreted through the confessionalization paradigm and social discipline as it emerged from this process: *Gorsky P. Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago, 2003. P. 17–19.) Since social disciplining was a part of confessionalization, which followed Reformation, ecclesiastic discipline (*Kirchenzucht*) cultivated the habit of the order among the population and became a significant secular instrument of the process of the disciplining since Reformation. Philipp Gorsky follows the assertion of Heinz Schilling about the alliance of confessionalization and state-building in early modern period. Church-building (*Konfessionalisierung*) also enhanced state power indirectly by establishing new mechanisms of moral regulation and social control. Reformation cleared the way for a reorganization of the system of social relief, its rationalization and centralization both in Protestant and Catholic regions. These new politics based on the cooperation of religious and civil authorities. Pastors and elders, so Schilling, became the most important mediators of a new system of moral-ethical and political-legal norms. Through household visitations, church discipline, and ecclesiastical courts, they monitored and disciplined everyday life-conduct, penetrating into the last house in the most isolated little village. (See: *Schilling H. Aufbruch und Krise. Deutschland 1517–1648*. Berlin, 1988. S. 274, see also: S. 366, 369) Following earlier works of Schilling whose ideas originated and developed from the theory of *Sozialdisziplinierung* von Gerhard Oestreich, Gorsky does not take into account the fact that later Schilling acknowledged this perspective to be one-sided since communities are presented here only as objects of discipline, not the subjects. He suggested to study practices of discipline, community self-control and self-regulation mechanisms, without confessional and geographical restrictions, and to put aside etatistic, administrative, and even absolutistic tendencies. (*Schilling H. Disziplinierung oder „Selbstregulierung der Untertanen“? Ein Plädoyer für die Doppelperspektive von Makro- und Mikrohistorie bei der Erforschung der frühmodernen Kirchzucht // Historische Zeitschrift. Bd. 264 (1997). S. 675–691, hier S. 6.)*

reality of course) was accompanied by the community's responsibility for the support of its poor. The finances were centralized and distributed by the community (i.e. by clerks, elected or appointed by the magistrate) according to the discriminative principle: only truly deserving poor could obtain the relief.³³

The church after Reformation (Protestant and Calvinist, later Catholic as well) established new mechanisms of moral regulation and social control. It was nothing new about it for the people since the rulers tried to impose social discipline for years. But prior they lacked administrative capacities to enforce these rules. The tight collaboration with the church both in Protestant and Catholic lands provided this important instrument³⁴. In Russia as well since the reign of Peter I secularization of poor relief was a part of the modernization process. The Orthodox church according to Russian historian Alexander Lavrov became the instrument of *Sozialdisziplinierung*, since it reached a greater number of subjects than the state itself.³⁵ Religion disciplining started in mid 17th century by secular and church authorities and became the state policy at the reign of Peter I.³⁶ Nevertheless the state stepped back in the disciplining of the masses of population since it did not manage to ensure a yearly confession of every Orthodox believer. The disciplinary revolution of the 18th century underwent its total failure, so Viktor Živov.³⁷

Malinovsky, an “enlightened official”, who conceptualized the poor relief in the terms of modernization had probably caught this trend: a regular state supposes rational principals to be applied everywhere – and he had been trying to realize them as the chief overseer of the Almshouse. The institution occurs to be closely bound to the state structures: later it obtained the highest imperial approval and rendered its assistance only to those who had got official passports and demanding moral behavior from the applicants. The Sheremetev Almshouse albeit being a private institution adopted ideological trends of early modern state and state-building. The appearance of the Sheremetev Almshouse resulted from the secularization of poor relief in Russia beginning with Catherine II: according to her, government should sponsor and encourage public initiative.³⁸ Everyone's conformity on the state level was formulated in terms of moral behavior and was expressed on the level of everyday practices and their control. The Almshouse acted along with the state, representing a part of its infrastructure. If in the Protestant lands Ph. Gorsky observes the early modern symbiosis of the church and state during and a result of confessionalization which turned to be more profitable for the latter since it monopolized control over the new infrastructures of power – prisons, workhouses, schools and universities, law and courts,³⁹ in Russia, at least on the institutional level, one finds symbiosis of state and private initiatives, and not only the state profited by it.

Inspections and visitations

An official report about the Emperor's confirmation of the Statute and staff list of Sheremetev Almshouse was published in Moscow newspaper *Moskovskie vedomosti* on May 20, 1803.⁴⁰ As a result of this publication, in the period between the years 1803 and 1807 Malinovskii received 196 applications from the poor. According to his own assessment he himself inspected some of them by occasion, others were only put in the lists.⁴¹ How many of these first applicants entered the Almshouse in 1810 or became its "pensioners" (*pansionery*) and how they had been living during the years previous to its opening is mostly not documented. In April 1810 the first list of the inmates of the Almshouse consisting of 38 poor men and 50 poor women was presented at the board meeting of the Council.⁴² The total number of the applications received prior to the official opening of the House, besides mentioned above 196 applications, is unknown. Family composition, economic conditions of the applicants, excepting social and marital status of those admitted to the Almshouse and pointed out in the list, on the one hand, and moral judgments of the administrators on the other hand are not available. Therefore one cannot conclude how did the selection for the first pool of the inmates proceeded.

On June 28, 1810 the inauguration of the House took place. On that day the inmates according to the list earlier confirmed by the Council were finally lodged in the Almshouse.⁴³ *Strannopriimny dom* advertised about the opening of its hospital in a June issue of *Moskovskie vedomosti*: people suffering from diseases were welcomed to get medical treatment in the hospital to be opened on June 28.⁴⁴ In June the Council started to consider the lists of the recipients of the outdoor relief. By that moment the administration of the Almshouse made use of the practice of inspections. Some peculiarities of the inspections are evident from on the example of poor artisans. On June 25 Krest'en Karpovic Valler'ian who was in duty of the 3rd assistant in 1810⁴⁵, presented a list of 15 impoverished artisans he found out in the city.⁴⁶ Obviously they did not apply to the Almshouse themselves but they agreed to admit financial aid from it. Granted with allowances of different rates they were enrolled into the Artisans book,⁴⁷ their original "passports" (*vidy*) were collected (to be kept in a special chest in the board meetings hall) and replaced with copies. This practice was a significant condition of the relief: thus the dependence of an artisan receiving an allowance from the Almshouse became emphasized. It was a sort of bondage, an entry in the Council's register book proclaimed, even if it was temporary.⁴⁸

The Council ordered the 3rd assistant to inspect every artisan at least once a month and investigate further about artisans' family conditions. Valler'ian should inform the Council about the new circumstances that might have been revealed during inspections. This ambiguous phrase makes to assume that there were implied some improvements of their economical conditions and

further depriving or ceasing of the relief. But in fact this assertion supposed rather a possible need in the additional relief. Nevertheless, the 3rd assistant was ordered to pay attention to the behavior of the artisans and to inspire them to make their items in the best way, since receiving a relief from the Almshouse signified they must not have their products made anyhow*. In this sense the relief of the House was not one-way: it imposed some moral obligations on the artisans, i.e. of decent behavior and of high-quality work. Likewise, the Almshouse ordered the artisans to produce things for its internal needs, and the recipients of the allowances had to carry out such an order without a delay, demonstrating all highs and lows of their work.⁴⁹

The Family book for 1810 was started on July 1, 1810. In all probability, it was composed at a time, but since applications were probably received beforehand, at least partly, some claimants might have been inspected in advance. There are no traces of first applications in the earlier entries of the Council. Only since July 1810 and further the applications which reached the administration of the Almshouse were recorded to the register books of the Council.

According to the Statute (art. XIV) every claimant was inspected by the 3rd assistant of the chief overseer in order to verify the information provided in their applications. He composed testimonials on every claimant but they are not held in the fund any more (presumably both applications and testimonials were lost in the fire which took place in the Sheremetev Almshouse in autumn of 1812) but some of them are mentioned in the register book of the Council for 1810. The final list in the Family book of 1810 contains information on every of 52 families: name and age of the householder – recipient of an allowance, and of every family member; in the case when other relatives, or step-children lived in the household of the recipient they were specified too.⁵⁰ As a rule, the families were – if were – extended by mothers and mothers-in-law, sometimes – nephews or adult children of the female householder. As for 1811, the full list of the recipients of that year is contained in the annual register book of the Council and in the Family book for the years 1811–1812.⁵¹ The lists in this book contain information only on the general size of the household and on the head of it. The detailed information on the household, including the age of family members, economic conditions, employment, marriage perspectives for daughters and educational plans for sons is contained in the file composed in 1811 as a result of inspections provided by the 3rd assistant.⁵²

On January 14 1811 Nikolay Murav'ev who revealed Valler'ian in his position of the 3rd assistant declared on the Council's meeting that he had to visit all claimants who applied for the relief for 1811 and lived far-off in Moscow* and even out of the city. Therefore he asked the

* «кое-как».

* «в отдаленных в Москве местах».

Council to provide him with a carriage at the expense of the Almshouse.⁵³ Less than in two months, on March 4 1811 Murav'ev reported at the Council's meeting that he had inspected all the recipients of the allowances and inquired about everyone's conditions and behavior. His observations consisting of two parts, he continued, were attached to his report: first, of those who had been recipients of the allowances from the House (i.e. since 1810), and second, of those who were newly applying for relief. The Council passed a resolution on every case deciding if a recipient deserved to have his /her allowance continued.⁵⁴

German historian Norbert Finzsch estimates the significance of the neighbors' testimonials for the poor as very high. The more their number was, the bigger were the chances to be included into the program of relief.⁵⁵ Finzsch considers social coherence of the neighborhood practiced among people to be the motive power of signing the testimonials. The second possible reason could be their belief that someone should compensate or pay for the poor, and it is better when it is the public sector (*öffentlicher Hand*) than the neighbors themselves.⁵⁶

According to the pre-modern discourse there was a linear relation between being a "true" poor and the moral way of life. A "true" poor conducted moral way of life by definition,⁵⁷ but later in the early modern legislation the bias changed: it characterized the sturdy beggar as the incarnation of idleness.⁵⁸ The moral argumentation was usually applied to the male householders because solitarily living women and widows obtained bad reputation more often.⁵⁹ In the testimonials written by responsible administrators or neighbors in the late 18th – early 19th century in the city of Cologne German historian Norbert Finzsch found out both two types of the discourse: old, or pre-modern, and the modern one. The first went back to the Christian charity ideal and belonged usually to the priests who considered poverty to be something natural, the will of the God, and therefore it did not need any objective reasoning. The second one was the discourse to which usually doctors and other administration representatives resorted. This "modern" type of discourse emphasized the reasons of poverty in every case.⁶⁰ These testimonials dwelled on the causes of poverty and proceeded from the idea that every applicant should prove his/her right to obtain a relief. Age, illness or family situation were enough reasons for that.⁶¹ The neighbors too were more ready to sign a testimonial when an applicant was old or ill. The charity administration, so Finzsch, was more inclined to accept illness than any other as a cause of poverty.⁶²

Social and Economic Conditions Of the Recipients Of the Outdoor Relief (according to the testimonials)

The testimonials composed by the 3rd assistant Murav'ev in early 1811 correspond the list of the relief recipients in the Family book of 1810. Every testimonial contains the list of household

members, information about their social status, age, employment, state of health (if it was not optimal), economic and living conditions of the family. It is specified if there were marriageable daughters in the family or sons studying or serving elsewhere. As mentioned above there are 52 testimonials on the recipients and 13 testimonials on the new applicants. Murav'ev's testimonials describe the social tier which coincides with the *middling sort* which Alexander Martin analyzes in his recent book on imperial Moscow. Martin derived this definition from *sredny rod lyudey* – the key category of the Catherine II's town legislation. Martin extended it to the urban dwellers concerned by the imperial social project of the last decades of the 18th century.⁶³ This tier, the middling sort of Moscow dwellers, consisted according to Martin from lesser nobles (i.e. officials within the Table of ranks), clergy, and merchants.⁶⁴ Those who held ranks 14. through 9., personal nobles, came from diverse backgrounds, enjoyed a modest prosperity, and could rise through skill and effort. They could not own serfs. Their sons often became clerks in their fathers' offices. They were 44% of the entire Russian nobility in 1795.⁶⁵ Whereas Martin constructs Moscow middling sort within the frame of law, lifestyle and culture,⁶⁶ the source documents of Sheremetev Almshouse complete this picture with social practices and everyday experiences of this strata.

Definitely these categories appear to be the main recipients of the Almshouse's outdoor relief. The majority of the recipients of the outdoor relief in 1810–1812, on the eve of the Napoleonic war, were families of clerks and officials, clergy, non-commissioned and commissioned officers. From 52 recipients of the first year 32 families belonged to those who had got civil or military ranks according to the Table of ranks. Six widows of clergymen of different ranks, three townsmen (two widows and one family man) and two merchants' widows were also enrolled.⁶⁷ There were clerks and officers who had obtained not personal but hereditary noble status as well due to their service. For instance, the colonel Mikhail Il'in stayed for three years in the lists, *nadvorny sovetnik* Ivan Starov – for 2 years in the lists of the Almshouse, college assessor Ivan Smirnenkov whose economic conditions were really dramatic – 3 years. All the ten recipients who received the allowances of the first rate (180 rubles) in 1810 were granted allowances for the next year but not all were granted the allowances of the same amount.

From the source documents is obvious that lifestyles and economic conditions of those who had inherited their noble status (even not aristocrats) and those who had obtained it (both hereditary or personal) due to their service were very different. Roman Bezobrazov who, being ill, was receiving an allowance of 120 roubles was *podporučik* (12. rank) but his hereditary status secured his relative well-being which was revealed on the inspection (he held not only 13 house serfs and hound dogs and rented a whole back wing in Moscow but owned a village with serfs as well)⁶⁸.

On the contrary, as obvious from the Murav'ev's testimonials the newly obtained noble status did not ensured officials from poverty. Further I am going to examine how did the people from this social strata survive⁶⁹ taking in account their restricted economic resources. I consider generally only the top ten recipients (i.e. the recipients of the amounts of the first rate) but I draw also other cases from the register to compare to them.

Almost everybody from the top ten relief recipients had a source of income besides the relief from the Almshouse: either a salary or a pension of the head of the household, or a pension paid to a widow for her late husband, or a rent for a hired out part of a private house or of a rented apartment. These resources helped them to survive before they had obtained the relief and were kept by them during the period of relief. The Statute of the Almshouse permitted the recipients of its relief to have an additional source of income but its amount should have been insufficient to feed his / her family (art. XVI)⁷⁰. The amount of these income fluctuated between 120 and 180 rubles per year. The fact that every household received a comparable sum from the Almshouse meant that its income increased at least twice or even more. For example, Ol'ga Il'inskaya, the widow of a *nadvorny sovetnik*, received 100 rubles from hiring out two rooms in her apartment. Besides she received a pension of 170 rubles for her late husband.⁷¹ In two cases when any other source of income is not specified the elder daughters were knitting stockings and sewed clothes (or underwear) for sale,⁷² and the widow Veniaminova let out her apartment for 170 rubles per year. No regular pension for her late husband received a widow of the colleague assessor Anis'ya Kičeeva but she had got a one-time payment of 900 rubles after his death.⁷³

The economic conditions of the top ten recipients were albeit dramatic but not so awful. Almost all the recipients of the first rate allowances had home servants. According to the Murav'ev's testimonial even the poorest family of the 56-years old college assessor Smirnenkov had a soldier's wife as a maidservant. Likewise, Smirnenkov indebted her 50 rubles for bread, and she stayed at his family without getting any salary only in order not to have this money lost.⁷⁴ No maid is specified at the family of the priest's widow Aleksandra Veniaminova, of the college assessor's widow Kičeeva and of the college registrar's wife Dar'ya Maksimova. On the contrary, the colonel Il'insky had three servants: a boy, a maid and a cook, whereas his family was characterized as "ruined".⁷⁵

The desperate situation of Smirnenkov's family is to be explained through the large number of children living with him under the same roof. Otherwise there was nothing exceptional in his family and economic conditions. Among this group even widows who had got no sources of income being burdened with children coped with the circumstances (there are a few examples of extreme poverty of officials' widows with children who had almost to beg for living in other

groups of recipients). Dar'ya Maksimova of 48 years, a college registrar's widow, a mother of five children receiving no pension for her late husband lived in much better conditions. Murav'ev reported, he noticed no abject poverty*. Her two youngest sons of 8 and 12 were sent to Preobrazhenskoe *učilišče* (orphan's boarding school) on the public costs; her eldest daughter of 27 served as a maid at a German jeweller, two youngest daughters of 17 and 23 stayed with her embroidering and knitting stockings (for sale). She had not got any maid at home. All that let Maksimova survive and rent a room for 60 rubles per year. No doubt, 180 rubles of allowance in 1810 (from July till January 1811) composed a considerable part of the family's budget. But the reverse side of the family's relative well-being was the excluding of Maksimova from the recipients of the first rate allowances and granting her only 60 rubles per year (an allowance of the third rate) for the year of 1811.⁷⁶ After the inspection of Murav'ev as it was found out that in fact only two daughters lived with her, the allowance was sharply cut back. If in the Family book for 1810 Maksimova's family was specified as that of six (she herself and five children), in the Family book for 1811 her family turned to be consisting only of three members⁷⁷. And in the next year of 1812 she was expelled from the recipients of the Almshouse's allowances. Comparing the families of Smirnenkov and Maksimova it is evident that the economic conditions of the families depended directly on the number of children living with their parents under the same roof. In all cases where children (approximately above 8 years old) were sent to boarding schools or adult children could work or even lived separately the situation was much better. Not only numerous little children but adult unmarried daughters was a burden for a family as well. Smirnenkov's sons were only 6 and 8, whereas his daughters of 18 and 20 years old were not married. It was obviously a serious source of the family's dire straits since it should have provided them with dowries in order to marry them.

It is acknowledged nowadays that in the pre-industrial economy the children's and women's contribution to the family income was greater than previously assumed, and children's earnings represented an integral part of the family budget.⁷⁸ Needlework fulfilled by females – knitting stockings, sewing and embroidery – was not left unnoticed by Murav'ev. Needlework was the only activity which elder daughters could fulfill to earn some money for the family, likewise, the needlework justified their staying unmarried at their parents in the opinion of the latter. The needlework was also a factor to estimate if the family was industrious*, the quality which belonged to the modern discourse. This assessment occurs four times among the top ten recipients of the relief. The fact of industry was important no less than the economic output of this kind of activity. The needlework of the daughters, often together with their mother, occurs

* «крайней бедности не видно».

* «трудолюбивы».

seven times among ten families of the first-rate allowance. Three times Murav'ev recorded that at the inspection he found the girls at the needlework^{**} and more often he mentioned the fact of knitting, sewing or embroidery as a means to earn the family living in the widows' families.⁷⁹ For one part of the recipients the needlework was the main source of income. It is true for the families of widows who lived with a couple of daughters, adult enough to perform needlework in economically significant extent.⁸⁰ On the contrary, the needlework of the elder daughters played no significant role in the families' economy where a large number of children lived under the same roof with their parents. The Smirnenkov's elder daughters (of 20, 18, and 11 years) being industrious could not work out enough to ensure subsistence for the family.⁸¹ The same was true for the family of an extremely desperate townsman's widow Kudrina, whose four daughters (aged 19, 18, 17 and 16) sewed underwear and knitted stockings for sale.⁸²

Age composition of the recipients of outdoor relief of the Sheremetev Almshouse proves that the female recipients of the relief, widowed, burdened with children but averagely not old, were deprived or, more often, short of sources of income (which were sewing, knitting or hiring out their apartments). The women – heads of households who applied for allowances, received them in 1810 and then applied for a prolongation in 1811 (35 recipients from the totally 52) were all widows.⁸³ By contrast male applicants (16 male recipients listed in 1810 in the Family book) being much older were all married without exception (there were no widowers at all), sometimes ill, and mostly burdened with children. The essential difference in the average age between male and female recipients proves that many of males were remarried.⁸⁴

Advanced age accompanied by illnesses of the householder ruined household's economy taking in account the shortage of financial means. For example, an insane *titulyarny sovetnik* Aleksey Alekseev Sakharov (52) was specified in the list of 1810 as the recipient of relief, though in fact his wife of 47 was the head of the household.⁸⁵ The women's age varied from 20 to 72 with the median age of 45. The median age of 16 male recipients – heads of the households (the age only of one of them is unknown) – was 58, and it varied from 54 to 72 being much (13 years) higher than that of the women.⁸⁶ The female recipients of the allowances from the Sheremetev Almshouse could not be considered averagely old, whereas males approached their old age. This age and gender composition of the applicants for the relief was normal for the early modern society: the applicants for outdoor relief in Cologne in the late 18th – early 19th century were either widowed women or married men, because married women were supplied over their husbands, and the death of the wife disrupted the economy of the household not so dramatically as the death of the husband.⁸⁷

^{**} «застал за рукоделием».

The Administration's Guidelines When Granting Allowances

Neither in the Statute of the Almshouse nor in the annual register books of the Council there was mentioned the number of children which could secure granting an allowance to a family. In the Family book of 1810 the number of children was specified by every recipient. At the households of the widows this number fluctuated from 3 to 11, with a median number of 5,25. Thus three children was a sufficient condition to grant relief. Children were considered by the Council a real cause of poverty. Having inspected the domicile of *poručik* Yanov Murav'ev concluded: "...because of the number of children Yanov can be considered poor".⁸⁸

The category *mногоčislennoe semeystvo* (a numerous family) and vice versa *malosemeystvo* (a family of a few members) seem to be crucial for the Council to decide about an allowance. A family whose children did not live under the same roof with their parents or were quite adult to take service or work could not be considered numerous. Two another cases confirm this thesis. In July 1810 the Council denied an application of a *gubernsky* secretary (12. rank) Grigory Strakhov which had been received from the warden Vasilii Sheremetev. Though the application was supplied with all necessary certificates about long-term and immaculate service*, and Strakhov was described as ill for a long period, he did not obtain any relief because of his *malosemeystvo* (unfortunately, it is not specified how many family members he had). The Council refused him to pay his debts as well, having added that there were other people even more poor.⁸⁹

In August of 1810 the Council received an application of another *gubernskii* secretary Petr Andreev of 72. The application was again resent from the office of Vasilii Šeremetev. From the Council's annual register book is evident that Andreev's application was supplied with copies of four certificates about the long-term and immaculate service from different offices. On August 27 the Council decided to grant him a half of a 120-ruble allowance per year but remarked that Andreev owned a house, and, secondly, the number of children specified in his application from June 19 did not correspond the reality⁹⁰. It is absolutely unclear why did the Council knowing about the fraud, granted Andreev an allowance. On September 10 the 3rd assistant Valler'ian even referred to an earlier application of Andreev, from June 5 declined by the Council because of his *malosemeystvo* (in fact he had got only one child) and the income of 160 rubles a year of rental fee he had got.⁹¹ Obviously that Andreev, after his first application was declined by the Council, tried to deceive the administration: he managed to reach the warden Vasilii Sheremetev, withheld about owning a house and specified 4 family members instead 3 he had got in reality.⁹² The Council did not deprive him of the allowance it had granted but decided to inform

* «долговременная беспорочная служба»

Sheremetev about Andreev's false statement.⁹³ Petr Andreev is listed in the Family book of the House for 1810 with his wife of 47 and a daughter of 10⁹⁴; he was also inspected along with the other recipients by Murav'ev in February 1811 but he did not obtain any prolongation of the allowance for the year 1811. Murav'ev's conclusion after having seen his domicile was: "his family consisting of his wife who is still strong, and of his daughter in the age of 11 is not so poor to require an extraneous relief". It was the case when a neighbours' opinion played a crucial role: "he [Andreev] got used to request [an aid] representing himself as a poor".⁹⁵ Thus *malosemeystvo* was a decisive factor to decline an application for outdoor relief. Owing a private house and profiting by it did not play a crucial role in the decision making. The decisions of the Council made about the recipients in early 1811 prove that the less number of children living under the same roof with their parents was, the less amount of the allowance the family received for that year, or even were stricken off the list of the recipients.

Conclusion

The case of the Sheremetev Almshouse which prior was not examined from the point of view of modern attitudes to poor relief is a part of a broader problem of implementation of modern social practices on the eve of modernity in Russia. The implementation of modern practices in the Almshouse had to do with the reassessment of poverty and of the poor which was a trend in the wide process of the transition to modernity. This process has to do with the key role of rationality as the decisive factor in the sphere of social relations. This trend was inherent with that of disciplining of the society, in this case – of Moscow dwellers of middling sort. The study of the source documents reveals that the recipients of the outdoor relief were mostly officials and military of middle ranks, personal and sometimes hereditary nobles and their widows but not representatives of the urban marginal groups at all. It is exactly the middle sort of Moscow inhabitants who usually appears in the historiography as "shadowy, undifferentiated mass".⁹⁶ Due to the testimonials of the 3rd assistant there is opened a whole world of everyday life of Moscow dwellers who would have suffered from the French invasion two years later. The source documents of Sheremetev Almshouse complete picture of their life with social practices and everyday experiences of this strata. Applying to an extraneous aid belonged to these practices, but in order to get this sort of relief town dwellers should have exposed themselves to inspections and judgments based on their reputation as industrious persons, good family men or miserable widows conducting decent way of life.

- ¹ Raeff, M 1975, “Well-ordered police state and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Europe: An Attempt of a Comparative Approach”, *American Historical Review*, vol. 80, no. 5, pp. 1221–1243.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 1236.
- ³ *Ibid.*, p. 1238.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1236.
- ⁵ Vinogradov, AI 1910, *Strannopriimny dom grafa Sheremeteva v Moskve. 1810–1910*, M., p. 2.
- ⁶ For Boris I. Kurakin’s testament, see: *Russkii arkhiv* 1893, kn. 1, no. 2, pp. 152–157.
- ⁷ The Department of Manuscripts of the State Historical Museum (Otdel pis’mennykh istochnikov Gosudarstvennogo istoričeskogo muzeya), further referred as OPI GIM, f. 3 (Kurakiny), staraya opis’, d. 994, l. 19.
- ⁸ Kozlova, NV 2010, *Lyudi dryakhlye, bol’nye, ubogiy v Moskve XVIII veka*, ROSSPEN, M., p. 309.
- ⁹ [Lavrov, AI] 1875, *Kratkii istoričeskii očerk imperatorskogo Ekaterininskogo bogadelennogo doma. 1775–1875*. M., p. 6.
- ¹⁰ For details, see: Lindenmeyr, A 1996, *Poverty Is Not a Vice: Charity, Society and the State in Imperial Russia*, Princeton, Princeton Univ. press.
- ¹¹ Schmidt, S 2006, “‘Gott wohlgefällig und den Menschen nützlich’: Zu Gemeinsamkeiten und Konfessionsspezifischen Unterschieden Frühneuzeitlicher Armenfürsorge“, in S Schmidt & J Aspelmeier (eds.), *Norm und Praxis der Armenfürsorge in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, pp. 61–90, here p. 78; Dinges, M 1988, *Stadtarmut in Bordeaux. Alltag, Politik, Mentalitäten*, Rörscheid, Bonn, pp. 128–129.
- ¹² *Učreždenie i stat Strannopriimnogo v Moskve doma, zavodimogo izževeniem grafa Sheremeteva, 1803*, M., p. 23–28.
- ¹³ Central Historical Archive of the city of Moscow (Tsentral’ny Istoričeskii arkhiv Moskvy), further referred as TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 61 (Register of distribution of money among the poor maidens got married, and among the pensioners, artisans and needy marriageable girls who got allowances from the Almshouse).
- ¹⁴ Detailed data on Malinovsky’s biography and on his historical studies as well: Dolgova, SR 1999, “Malinovsky Alexey Fedorovič”, in ND Kočetkova et al. (eds.), *Slovar’ russkikh pisateley XVIII veka*, vyp. 2: K–P, Nauka, SPb., pp. 267–271.
- ¹⁵ *Učreždenie i stat*, p. 16–17.
- ¹⁶ Vinogradov 1910, *Strannopriimny dom grafa Sheremeteva*, p. 18–19.
- ¹⁷ *Učreždenie i stat* 1803, p. 11–12 (art. 1)
- ¹⁸ See: *Učreždenie i stat* 1803.
- ¹⁹ „Во всех веках и у всех народов бедные люди, не имеющие способов к пропитанию, болезнями удручаемые и от многочисленности семейств своих бедствующие, обращали на себя предусмотрительную внимательность Государей и возбуждали сострадание избыточествующих граждан...“. Quoted in: *Učreždenie i stat* 1803, p. 5.
- ²⁰ See quotations in: Vinogradov 1910, *Strannopriimny dom grafa Sheremeteva*, p. 18.
- ²¹ *Učreždenie i stat* 1803, p. 23–29.
- ²² This word as an analogue and a translation for “sostoianie” is suggested in: Munro, GE 2008, *The Most International City: St. Petersburg in the Reign of Catherine the Great*, Madison, p. 58.
- ²³ *Učreždenie i stat* 1803, p. 15
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24 (art. XIII).
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26 (art. XIV).
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24 (art. XIV).
- ²⁷ Lindenmeyr 1996, *Poverty*, p. 30.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 23.
- ²⁹ Dolgova 1999, *Malinovsky*, p. 268.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 269.
- ³¹ The catalogue of Malinovsky’s library is held in: OPI GIM, f. 33, d. 1 (See: Dolgova 1999, *Malinovsky*.)
- ³² Gorsky, PS 2003, *Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe*, Chicago, Chicago Univ. press, p. 18.
- ³³ Jütte, R 1984, *Obrigkeitliche Armenfürsorge in deutschen Reichsstädten der frühen Neuzeit: Städtisches Armenwesen in Frankfurt am Main und Köln*, Böhlau Verlag, Köln, Wien, pp. 33, 91; Gorsky 2003, *Disciplinary Revolution*, p. 19.
- ³⁴ Gorsky 2003, *Disciplinary Revolution*, pp. 18–19.
- ³⁵ Lavrov, AS 2000, *Koldovstvo i religiya v Rossii. 1700–1740 gg.*, Drevlekhранилище, M., p. 346.
- ³⁶ Živov, VM 2009, “Distziplinarnaya revolyutsiya i bor’ba s suevoeriem v Rossii XVIII veka: „provaly» i ikh posledstviya”, in: I Prokhorova et al. (eds.), *Antropologičeskaya revolyutsiya, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, M., pp. 327–360, here p. 329.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 349.
- ³⁸ Lindenmeyr 1996, *Poverty*, p. 32–33.
- ³⁹ Gorsky 2003, *Disciplinary Revolution*, p. 19.
- ⁴⁰ *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 1803, 20 May, p. 663–664.
- ⁴¹ Vinogradov argued, all the applicants before 1807 were inspected by Malinovsky personally, others – by his 3rd assistant (Vinogradov 1910, *Strannopriimny dom*, p. 81–82.)
- ⁴² TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 20 (*Žurnaly Strannopriimnogo v Moskve doma Grafa Sheremeteva, 1810*), l. 92–94.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 1810, 25 June, p. 2107.
- ⁴⁵ *Učreždenie i stat* 1803, p. 26.
- ⁴⁶ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 20, l. 97f.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, l. 98 ob.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 99 ob.

-
- ⁵⁰ Ibid, d. 44, l. 1ff.
- ⁵¹ Ibid, d. 69 (Family book for 1811 and 1812), l. 2–15, l. 156 ob. ff.
- ⁵² Ibid, d. 61.
- ⁵³ Ibid, d. 46, l. 9–9 ob.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid, l. 23 ob.; Učreždenie i stat 1803, p. 25 (art. XIV).
- ⁵⁵ Finzsch, N 1990, Obrigkeit und Unterschichten: zur Geschichte der rheinischen Unterschichten gegen Ende des 18. und zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, p. 73.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 59.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 76–77.
- ⁵⁸ Jütte, R 1994, Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe, Cambridge Univ. press, Cambridge, p. 164.
- ⁵⁹ Finzsch 1990, Obrigkeit und Unterschichten, p. 77.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 76.
- ⁶¹ Ibid, p. 78.
- ⁶² Ibid, p. 79.
- ⁶³ Martin, A 2013, Enlightened Metropolis. Constructing Imperial Moscow, 1762–1855, Oxford, Oxford Univ. press, p. 13.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 31, 144–145.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 146.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 140.
- ⁶⁷ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 44, l. 1 ob.–169 ob.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid, d. 61, l. 19.
- ⁶⁹ Fontain, L& Schlumbohm, J 2000, “Household Strategies for Survival: An Introduction: From the Study of Poverty to the Study of Survival Strategies”, in L Fontain & J Schlumbohm (eds.), Household Strategies for Survival 1600–2000: Fission, Faction and Cooperation, Cambridge Univ. press, Cambridge, pp. 1–17.
- ⁷⁰ Učreždenie i stat 1803, p. 26.
- ⁷¹ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 61, l. 14 ob.
- ⁷² Ibid, l. 16.
- ⁷³ Ibid, l. 4.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid, l. 16 ob.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid, l. 14.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid, l. 15 ob.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid, l. 14.
- ⁷⁸ Sokoll, T 2000, “Negotiating a living : Essex Pauper Letters from London, 1800–1834”, in Household strategies for Survival: 1600–2000, pp. 19–46, p. 19; Caracausi, A 2014, “Beaten Children and Women’s Work”, Past and Present: A journal of historical studies, vol. 222, pp. 95–128, here p. 106.
- ⁷⁹ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 61, l. 14, 14 ob., 17, 17 ob., 21, 22 ob., 26 ob., 30 ob., 33 ob., 40.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid, l. 15 ob., 19 ob., 25 (families of the widows – recipients of the second rate allowances: Dari’a Maksimova, Katerina Gopfe, Afim’ia Volokhova, and Aleksandra Panova).
- ⁸¹ Ibid, l. 16 ob.
- ⁸² Ibid, l. 26 ob.
- ⁸³ The only exception was the wife of the insane *titulyarny sovetnik* Sakharov (“*pomešenny v ume*”) (Ibid, d. 44, l. 18.)
- ⁸⁴ Marriages with the age difference of 11 years and more between spouses are usually referred as remarriages. (for details, see: Rabinovič, MG 1978, “Russkaya gorodskaya sem’ya v načale XVIII v.”, Sovetskaya Etnografiya, no 5, pp. 96–108, here p. 106) Daniel Kaiser argues that the average age difference between spouses fluctuated from 3,2 to 7,3 years (Kaiser, D 1994, “Vozrast pri brake i raznitsa v vozraste suprugov v gorodakh Rossii v načale XVIII v.”, Sosloviya i gosudarstvennaya vlast’ v Rossii. XV – seređina XIX vv., Materialy konferentsii, part II, M., pp. 225–231, here p. 231.
- ⁸⁵ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 44, l. 18.
- ⁸⁶ Calculated at: Ibid, d. 61, l. 3–50 ob.
- ⁸⁷ Finzsch 1990, Obrigkeit und Unterschichten, p. 81.
- ⁸⁸ TsIAM, f. 208, op. 1, d. 61, l. 18 ob.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid, d. 20, l. 130.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid, l. 161–161 ob.
- ⁹¹ Ibid, l. 177 ob.
- ⁹² Ibid, l. 161.
- ⁹³ Ibid, l. 177 ob.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid, d. 44, l. 162 ob.–163.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid, d. 61, l. 26.
- ⁹⁶ Martin 2013, Enlightened Metropolis, p. 142.

Author:

Maya Lavrinovich, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Center for History Sources, senior research fellow

E-mail: mlavrinovich@hse.ru

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

© Lavrinovich, 2014