

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”

Faculty of Slavic Philology

Department of Russian Literature



Rebecca Gigli

**Pamyat' i kul'turnaya identichnost'
v memuarnoy proze knyazya I. M. Dolgorukova**

**(Memory and Cultural Identity
in the Memoirs of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov)**

AUTOREFERAT

of the PhD thesis for the educational and scientific degree of
“Doctor of Philosophy”

Field of higher education: Humanities (2.1. Philology)

Scientific field of research: Eighteenth-century Russian literature

PhD Tutor: Prof. Dr Angelina Ivanova Vacheva

Sofia

2024

SCIENTIFIC JURY

Reviewers:

Associate Prof. Dr Romyana Parashkevova
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Prof. DrSc Denka Krasteva-Petrova
Shumen University "Konstantin Preslavski"

Authors of the evaluation reports:

Prof. Dr Reneta Bozhankova
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Prof. DrSc Dechka Chavdarova
Shumen University "Konstantin Preslavski"

Associate Prof. Dr Radostin Rusev
Institute for Literature, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

The PhD thesis *Pamyat' i kul'turnaya identichnost' v memuarnoy proze knyazya I. M. Dolgorukova* (*Memory and Cultural Identity in the Memoirs of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov*) was discussed and proposed for public defence by the Department of Russian Literature (Faculty of Slavic Philology) at Sofia University on 27.02.2024.

The public defence of the PhD thesis will take place on 3 July 2024 at 02.30 p.m. in the conference room (Rectorate) of Sofia University.

CONTENTS

1. PHD THESIS TABLE OF CONTENTS IN RUSSIAN	3
2. PHD THESIS TABLE OF CONTENTS IN ENGLISH	5
3. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PHD THESIS: RELEVANCE OF THE THEME AND INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC	7
4. PHD STRUCTURE	10
5. CITED BIBLIOGRAFY IN THE AUTOREFERAT	58
6. MAIN CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PHD THESIS	65
7. PUBLICATIONS ON THE THEME OF THE PHD THESIS	67

1. PHD THESIS TABLE OF CONTENTS

ВВЕДЕНИЕ	5
ГЛАВА ПЕРВАЯ. ПАМЯТЬ, КУЛЬТУРА И МЕМУАРИСТИКА: НАУЧНЫЕ ПАРАДИГМЫ	32
1.1. Память и культура в универсуме интерпретаций гуманитарных наук	32
1.2. Мемуаристика и автобиография между документальностью и фикцией	43
Итоги	53
ГЛАВА ВТОРАЯ. ТИПОЛОГИЯ РУССКОЙ МУЖСКОЙ АВТОБИОГРАФИИ XVIII – НАЧАЛА XIX ВЕКА	55
2.1. Мужская мемуаристика в России XVIII – начала XIX века	55
2.2. Прагматика и поэтика автобиографии И. М. Долгорукова	63
Итоги	77
ГЛАВА ТРЕТЬЯ. АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ «Я» И ЭМОЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ НАРРАТИВ В «ПОВЕСТИ О РОЖДЕНИИ МОЕМ, ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИИ И ВСЕЙ ЖИЗНИ» КН. И. М. ДОЛГОРУКОВА	78
3.1. Автобиография кн. И. М. Долгорукова с точки зрения истории эмоций	78
3.2. «[Я] не мог никогда скрыть своих чувств». Культ эмоций в восприятии И. М. Долгорукова	80
3.3. «Род князей Долгоруких есть род доблестный и знаменитый». Гордость и род	82
3.4. «Что милее родства, искренности и приязни!». Эмоции и семья в интерпретации И. М. Долгорукова	91
3.5. «Что заменит отца или мать?». Родительская привязанность и сыновняя преданность	96
3.6. «Любовь двух сердец, связанных вместе, есть блаженство человека». Эмоции в супружеской жизни И. М. Долгорукова	105
3.7. «Для кого же приличнее всем пожертвовать, как не для детей своих?». Сентиментальность любящего отца	117
3.8. «От тоски сердечной никуда не уйдешь». И. М. Долгоруков, чувства и память о близких	128
Итоги	132
ГЛАВА ЧЕТВЕРТАЯ. СЛУЖБА И ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКОГО МИФА. ДВОРЯНСКАЯ ЭТИКА ДОЛГА И САМОИДЕАЛИЗАЦИЯ КН. И. М. ДОЛГОРУКОВА	133
4.1. Феномен русского дворянства глазами кн. И. М. Долгорукова	133
4.2. «Я [...] делал дело государево с тем совестным страхом, [...] с какою дворянин прямой, потомок Долгоруких рода, должен был звание свое не всуе носить». Самоидеализация служащего дворянина	135
4.3. «Служить отечеству с усердием [...] в безотечественном царстве есть химера [...] и горячка молодого воображения». Долгоруковская борьба с несправедливостью	144
4.3.1. «Служба [...] приходила час от часу в упадок». Коррупция и юстиция	147
4.3.2. «Ревизия требует ума, сметливости, познаний». Ревизии и бюрократизация	152
4.3.3. «Шайка моих врагов и там, и сям была очень велика». Вражда, зависть и обиды в мире службы	154
4.3.4. «Петербург, эт[а] Гоморр[а] нашего времени». Столица и судьба карьеры	157
4.3.5. «Чин и почести суть химеры». Опасное очарование чинов и орденов	160
4.4. «Я знакомился с людьми большого света, находил покровителей, участников в моей судьбе и службе». И. М. Долгоруков и патрон-клиентские отношения	165

4.5. «Царь – все! Он закон! Он истина! Он Бог земной!». Отношения между императорской властью и подданными	173
4.6. «О! Политика того времени обильна была в материалах для разговора!». Политическая идентичность кн. И. М. Долгорукова	186
Итоги	194
ГЛАВА ПЯТАЯ. КН. И. М. ДОЛГОРУКОВ И ДВОРЯНСКАЯ ОБЩЕСТВЕННАЯ ЖИЗНЬ XVIII – НАЧАЛА XIX ВЕКА	196
5.1. Культура и индивид в автобиографическом портрете кн. И. М. Долгорукова	196
5.2. «Я был не патриот пензенский, а эмигрант московский». Столицы и провинция	197
5.2.1. « <i>Это свое, это домашнее</i> ». Дом и имение	202
5.2.2. « <i>Наконец сделался помещиком одной нужде и нищете</i> ». Помещик и крестьяне	207
5.3. «Я любил природу, но в убранстве роскошном». И. М. Долгоруков и природа	212
5.4. «Я совсем не знаток в медицине». Медицина и здоровье	219
5.5. «Терпеть, тужить и уповать на одного Бога – вот единственное прибежище честных людей в нашем мире». Антиклерикализм и вера	231
5.6. «[1812] Год ужасный в летописях русских!». Рецепция и деконструкция «метанарративов»	240
5.7. «Для веселья мне все кажется возможно, пристойно и позволительно». Развлечения и досуг	251
5.7.1. « <i>В меня тогда театральный демон вселился</i> ». Театральность и действительность	255
5.7.2. « <i>В старости, свободе, уединении, что питательнее для сердца и ума, как книги?</i> ». Книги и чтение	258
5.7.3. « <i>Я старался [...] заняться литературой, как единственным моим прибежищем во времена ненастные</i> ». Писатель и поэт	267
Итоги	271
ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ	273
СПИСОК СОКРАЩЕНИЙ	278
БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ	279

2. PHD THESIS TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER ONE. MEMORY, CULTURE AND LIFE WRITING: SCIENTIFIC PARADIGMS	32
1.1. Memory and Culture in the Humanities Interpretive Horizon	32
1.2. Memoir Prose and Autobiography Between Documentality and Fiction	43
Conclusions	53
CHAPTER TWO. TYPOLOGY OF THE RUSSIAN MALE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE 18TH – EARLY 19TH CENTURIES	55
2.1. Men’s Memoirs and Autobiographical Prose in 18th-century and Early 19th-century Russia	55
2.3. Pragmatics and Poetics of I. M. Dolgorukov’s Autobiography	63
Conclusions	77
CHAPTER THREE. THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL “SELF” AND THE EMOTIONAL NARRATIVE IN “POVEST’ O ROZHDENII MOYEM, PROISKHOZHDENII I VSEY ZHIZNI” BY PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV	78
3.1. The Autobiography of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov from the Point of View of the History of Emotions	78
3.2. “[Ya] ne mog nikogda skryt’ svoikh chuvstv”. I. M. Dolgorukov’s Conception of the Cult of Emotions	80
3.3. “Rod knyazey Dolgorukikh yest’ rod doblestvennyy i znamenityy”. Pride and Lineage	82
3.4. “Chto mileye rodstva, iskrennosti i priyazni!”. Emotions and Family in I. M. Dolgorukov’s Understanding	91
3.5. “Chto zamenit ottsa ili mat’?”. Parental Love and Filial Devotion	96
3.6. “Lyubov’ dvukh serdets, svyazannykh vmeste, yest’ blazhenstvo cheloveka”. Emotions in the Married Life of I. M. Dolgorukov	105
3.7. “Dlya kogo zhe prilichneye vsem pozhertvovat’, kak ne dlya detey svoikh?”. The Sentimentality of a Loving Father	117
3.8. “Ot toski serdechnoy nikuda ne uydesh’”. I. M. Dolgorukov, Feelings and the Memory of the Loved Ones	128
Conclusions	132
CHAPTER FOUR. SERVICE AND THE FORMATION OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MYTH. THE DVORYANSTVO ETHICS OF DUTY AND THE SELF-IDEALIZATION OF PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV	133
4.1. The Phenomenon of the Russian Dvoryanstvo Through the Eyes of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov	133
4.2. “Ya [...] delal delo gosudarevo s tem sovestnym strakhom, [...] s kakoyu dvoryanin pryamoy, potomok Dolgorukikh roda, dolzhen byl zvaniye svoye ne vsuye nosit’”. The Self-idealization of a Serving Dvoryanin	135
4.3. “Sluzhit’ otechestvu s userdiyem [...] v bezotechestvennom tsarstve yest’ khimera [...] i goryachka molodogo voobrazheniya”. I. M. Dolgorukov’s Struggle with Injustice	144
4.3.1. “Sluzhba [...] prikhodila chas ot chasu v upadok”. Corruption and Justice	147
4.3.2. “Reviziya trebuyet uma, smetlivosti, poznaniy”. Revisions and Bureaucratisation	152
4.3.3. “Shayka moikh vragov i tam, i syam byla ochen’ velika”. Hostility, Envy and Offences in the World of the Imperial Service	154
4.3.4. “Peterburg, et[a] Gomorr[a] nashego vremeni”. Capital and Career Fortune	157
4.3.5. “Chin i pochesti sut’ khimery”. The Dangerous Charm of Ranks and Orders	160

4.4. “Ya znakomilsya s lyud’mi bol’shogo sveta, nakhodil pokroviteley, uchastnikov v moyey sud’be i sluzhbe”. I. M. Dolgorukov and the Patron-client Relations	165
4.5. “Tsar’ – vse! On zakon! On istina! On Bog zemnoy!”. Imperial Power and Subjects	173
4.6. “O! Politika togo vremeni obil’na byla v materialakh dlya razgovora!”. The Political Profile of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov	186
Conclusions	194
CHAPTER FIVE. PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV AND THE DVORYANSTVO PUBLIC LIFE OF THE 18TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 19TH CENTURIES	196
5.1. Culture and the Individual in the Autobiographical Portrait of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov	196
5.2. “Ya byl ne patriot penzenskiy, a emigrant moskovskiy”. The Capitals and the Province	197
5.2.1. “Eto svoye, eto domashneye”. <i>Home and Mansion</i>	202
5.2.2. “Nakonets sdelalsya pomeshchikom odnoy nuzhde i nishchete “. <i>The Landlord and the Peasants</i>	207
5.3. “Ya lyubil prirodu, no v ubranstve roskoshnom”. I. M. Dolgorukov and Nature	212
5.4. “Ya sovsem ne znatok v meditsine”. Medicine and Health	219
5.5. “Terpet’, tuzhit’ i upovat’ na odnogo Boga – vot edinstvennoye pribezhishche chestnykh lyudey v nashem mire”. Anticlericalism and Faith	231
5.6. “[1812] God uzhasnyy v letopisyakh russkikh!”. Reception and Deconstruction of “Metanarratives”	240
5.7. Dlya vesel’ya mne vse kazhetsya vozmozhno, pristoyno i pozvolitel’no”. Entertainment and Leisure Time	251
5.7.1. “V menya togda teatral’nyy demon vselilsya”. <i>Theatricality and Reality</i>	255
5.7.2. “V starosti, svobode, uyedinenii, chto pitatel’neye dlya serdtsa i uma, kak knigi?”. <i>Books and Reading</i>	258
5.7.3. “Ya staralsya [...] zanyat’sya literaturoy, kak yedinstvennym moim pribezhishchem vo vremena nenastnyye”. <i>I. M. Dolgorukov as a Writer and Poet</i>	267
Conclusions	271
FINAL REMARKS	273
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	278
BIBLIOGRAPHY	279

3. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PHD THESIS: RELEVANCE OF THE THEME AND INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC

The present PhD thesis aims to examine the memoir prose of Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Dolgorukov (1764–1823), an interesting writer, poet, playwright, and noteworthy figure of the Russian cultural scene of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Particular attention is paid to his autobiography, entitled *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsej zhizni, pisannaya mnoy samim i nachataya v Moskve 1788-go goda v avguste mesyatse, na 25-om godu ot rozhdeniya moyego. V knigu siyu vklyucheny budut vse dostopamyatnyye proisshestviya, sluchivshiyesya uzhe so mnoyu do sego goda i vpered' imeyushchiye sluchit'sya. Zdes' zhe vpishutsya kopii s primechatel'neyshikh bumag, koi budut imet' lichnuyu so mnoyu svyaz' i k sobstvennoy istorii moyey uvazhatel'noye otnosheniye* (Dolgorukov 2004/2005)¹, providing a monographic analysis of this little-known and still not properly investigated text.

The study of I. M. Dolgorukov's literary production is particularly intriguing because, in recent years, there has been a renewed attention to his prose and poetry². Despite this, the poetic, dramatic and prosaic works of this writer remain a research field that has yet to be examined in depth.

Although during his lifetime Ivan Mikhailovich was considered a successful writer and some eminent and classical authors of Russian literature (P. A. Vyazemsky, A. S. Pushkin, K. N. Batyushkov, N. V. Gogol and S. T. Aksakov) appreciated his poetry, nowadays he is generally considered a “minor writer”. This explains the modest number of scientific contributions regarding his literary works.

Nonetheless, the study of “marginal” authors provides an opportunity for a deeper and better understanding of the “canonical” literature since, in the literary production of “secondary” writers, the assimilation of the dominant poetics and literary models more clearly stands out.

I. M Dolgorukov's literary legacy is even more interesting because he wrote various autobiographical and memoir texts. In them, the memory of important historical and cultural events is recorded. At the same time, these works manifest the influence of various literary trends and reflect the impact of the changing cultural context on the prince's writing. Moreover, *Povest'* and the other ego-documents of I. M. Dolgorukov offer rich material for the reconstruction of the Russian

¹ Hereinafter only *Povest'*.

² In 1997 V. N. Korovin reprinted *Kapishche moyego serdtsa, ili Slovar' vsekh tekhnicheskikh lits, s koimi ya byl v raznykh otnosheniyakh v techeniye moyey zhizni* (Dolgorukov 1997), while N. V. Kuznetsova and M. O. Mel'tsin published and edited the integral text of the voluminous autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsej zhizni* (Dolgorukov 2004/2005). Now these two researchers are preparing the collection of all the author's poems.

*dvoryanstvo*³ mentality and culture of the turn of the centuries, as their codes and matrices are the basis of I. M. Dolgorukov's life writing.

Since most of the existing relatively sporadic literature on Ivan Mikhailovich focuses on his poetry and his memoir prose (with rare exceptions) remains practically unnoticed, this PhD thesis aims to contribute to the critical interpretation of the latter.

The **aim** of the present PhD thesis is the analysis and interpretation of the interrelationship between memory and the cultural self-identification of the narrator in the autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov. The research presupposes a well-grounded understanding of the specifics of I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiographical prose in the context of the developing Russian memoir literature and of the *dvoryanstvo* culture of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The **object** of the PhD thesis is the reconstruction of the complex and multifaceted cultural identity of the narrator in the author's autobiography. Among the ego-texts of the writer, *Povest'* is the most relevant one to our research target. The second significant memoir work of I. M. Dolgorukov, i.e., *Kapishche moyego serdtsa, ili Slovar' vsekh tekhn lits, s koimi ya byl v raznykh otnosheniyakh v techeniye moyey zhizni* is to a lesser extent related to the topic and subject of the PhD thesis. As it is a "mosaic" of portraits of the writer's contemporaries, its centrifugal, non-chronological and patchy nature "fragment" the image of the memoirist. The author's travelogues also lack the prince's purposeful intention to form his autobiographical self-portrait. However, choosing the autobiography as the main research object does not mean that the other ego-documents of I. M. Dolgorukov are neglected. In fact, they are used as precious sources for comparisons and parallels that contribute to the adequate reading and interpretation of the prince's autobiographical narrative.

For the achievement of the outlined aim, the following **tasks** have been formulated:

1. In accordance with the chosen topic, to demonstrate the relevance of the examined issues and to present an overview both of contemporary "memory studies" and of the main theoretical views on the genre of autobiography in order to specify the methodological basis of the research;
2. To contextualise *Povest'* in the development process of the autobiographical genre in Russian literature of the end of the 18th and the beginning

³ The translation of the term "*dvoryanstvo*" remains a problematic question. Already Mark Raeff underlines the difficulty of translating the word into foreign languages (Raeff 1966: 8) and until now researchers are still far from an exhaustive and universal definition. Keeping in mind the incomplete coincidence of the two terms, in the present autoreferat "nobility" (and related words) will be used as a synonym.

of the 19th centuries, highlighting its similarities with and differences from the autobiographical prose of other authors of this period;

3. To highlight the main typological and poetic characteristics of *Povest'*, which identify it as a rare example of male autobiography in the 18th-century and early 19th-century Russia;

4. To demonstrate the close connection between the behavioural cultural codes, norms and stereotypes of the nobility of the given period and the act of self-description in the autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov;

5. To establish the main areas of self-identification of the narrator in *Povest'* (private, professional and public life) and to analyse the specifics of the author's self-perception in each of them;

6. Given the diverse self-identifications of the narrating subject in the autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov, to gradually reconstruct their characteristic features;

7. To determine the communicative intentions of the self-description in *Povest'*, namely the desire of I. M. Dolgorukov to pass on a positive image of himself to his descendants and to draw moral lessons for his children from his personal experience.

The **hypothesis** that is under proof in the PhD thesis is that the description of the author's life experience in the ego-documents of I. M. Dolgorukov and, above all, in his autobiography is an act of constructing the author's cultural identity in accordance with his intention to self-idealise himself, motivated by his moralising aims.

In the PhD thesis, a multidisciplinary approach is used. The analysis and interpretation of the examined memoir prose is carried out by employing the contributions of various disciplines: history, cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, semiotics, philosophy, etc. The methodology applied in the research is complex and combines general scientific methods, such as historicism, analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, with some more specific research approaches that are consistent with the topic, goals, and tasks of the PhD thesis (framing of biographic circumstances, analysis of genre poetics, reconstruction of the cultural milieu, etc.). New scientific concepts and theories about the autobiographical genres, which see the latter as products of memory and self-representation, are considered as well.

4. PHD THESIS STRUCTURE

The PhD thesis has a total number of 292 standard pages and consists of an illustration, an introduction, five chapters, a conclusion, a list of abbreviations and a bibliography, containing 356 bibliographical sources.

“**VVEDENIE**” (“**INTRODUCTION**”, pp. 5–31) presents the biography and literary legacy of I. M. Dolgorukov with special attention to his memoir prose and, chiefly, to his autobiography. The critical reception of the author’s writings and the rare scientific metatexts about *Povest’* are presented. In this part of the PhD thesis, the object, aim, and tasks of the research are outlined. Finally, the relevance of the chosen topic is argued.

Attention to the past, its reconstruction through memory, and the resulting formation of different cultural identities characterise today’s modern society or, in the terms of the French sociologist and philosopher Gilles Lipovetsky, the “hypermodern” society (Lipovetsky 2008)⁴. In hypermodernity, man is “obsessed” with memory. The latter becomes the target of ideological speculation, but it plays a pivotal role in the determination of individual and collective self-consciousness as well.

The widespread interest in memory has not left indifferent the academic world, which is paying increasingly more attention to the changes in the representation of the past in the cultural history of humanity. Therefore, the study of autobiographical and memoir prose acquires a new relevance. Undeservedly neglected and remained for a long time in the periphery of scholarly interest, today ego-texts are undergoing a real editorial boom⁵. Moreover, they are sources of primary importance for the study of the relationship between memory, culture, and identity.

In the introduction, it is pointed out that cultural memory⁶ and its problematics gained significance already in the “long Russian 18th century”⁷, when autobiographical and memoir prose arose and became established in the Russian cultural context. The popularity of memoirs and autobiographical narratives was related to the formation of a collective historical self-awareness in

⁴ Gilles Lipovetsky coins the term “hypermodernity” to describe the new cultural era that began in the 1990s.

⁵ Today, modern technologies offer innovative approaches and development to the life writing. Nonetheless, readers are still interested in traditional autobiographies, diaries, travelogues, etc. This is evident from their popularity in the publishing market.

⁶ The concept “cultural memory” was introduced by Jan Assmann, cf. Assmann 2004.

⁷ The term “long eighteenth century”, which extends the time frame of the century, is used by researchers of the International Society of Eighteenth-century Studies/Société Internationale d’étude du dix-huitième siècle (ISECS/SIEDS). As for the “Russian long 18th-century”, the Study Group on Eighteenth-century Russia considers the last decades of the 17th century and the Decembrist uprising of 1825 as landmarks for its beginning and end.

the circles of the Russian aristocracy. The spread of the phenomenon was also the result of the development of a more mature understanding of the importance of family-lineage and individual self-reflection. These processes were recorded in the memoir prose of the “forgotten” autobiography of prince I. M. Dolgorukov, which is the focus of the present work. Considering these facts and the current little notoriety of this author, the introduction provides basic biographical information about him, necessary for the correct interpretation of Ivan Mikhailovich’s ego-texts.

Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Dolgorukov (1764–1823) belonged to one of the most ancient families of the Moscow nobility. He was a 28th-generation Rjurikovich. Throughout Russian history, the Dolgorukov boasted several important figures in the court and in the army. During the short reign of Peter II (1715–1730), the family reached the apogee of its economic and political power. However, the sudden death of the young emperor and the accession to the throne of Anna Ioannovna (1730–1740) led to the fall of the lineage into disgrace⁸.

I. M. Dolgorukov was the grandson of Ivan Alekseevich Dolgorukov, the former favourite of Peter II, who was executed for his participation in the realization of the emperor’s forged will. His grandmother was Natalya Borisovna Dolgorukova, member of the Sheremetev, one of the richest and most powerful families in the Russian Empire. She chose to follow her husband into exile in Siberia only three days after their wedding. In 1740, I. A. Dolgorukov was executed. After returning from exile, Natalya Borisovna took monastic vows but first fulfilled her maternal duties, completing the education of her children. Her heroic choice to follow her husband into exile and her marital fidelity always was the object of I. M. Dolgorukov’s admiration. Interestingly, her story also remained impressed in the Russian collective consciousness. N. B. Dolgorukova inspired many Russian romantics, who made her the heroine of their literary works. The imperial disfavour prevented the father of the memoirist, Mikhail Ivanovich Dolgorukov, from occupying powerful positions in the bureaucratic hierarchy that could have brought back the past might of the ancient lineage. Therefore, for I. M. Dolgorukov, the restoration of the previous power of his family became his life mission. With this goal in mind, he started his service by joining the army. However, his experience during the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790 convinced him to prefer an administrative career. The prince became the vice-governor in Penza (1791–1796), a clerk in the “Solyanaya Kontora”⁹ (1797–1801) and the governor of Vladimir (1802–1812). Despite these important posts, I. M. Dolgorukov did not

⁸ The loss of favour of the new empress was due to the attempt of the Dolgorukov to seize power by drawing up a false will of Peter II, in which Ekaterina Alekseevna Dolgorukova, the betrothed of the young emperor, was named as the heir to the throne.

⁹ The “Solyanaya kontora” (“Salt Office”) was an institution established at the beginning of the 18th century by Peter I, abolished by Catherine II (1783) and reintroduced by Paul I (1797). It regulated the distribution of salt in the Russian Empire.

achieve the successes that, according to him, were worthy of his prince title. Therefore, his experience in the Russian administration became a martyrdom for him.

Outside the world of the imperial service, Ivan Mikhailovich showed great interest in literature. He was a poet and dramatist who had a notable success among the readers of his time. The PhD thesis highlights the difficulty to unambiguously categorize this author in one of the then main literary currents. The research embraces the point of view of Dmitriy Nikolayevich Chernigovskiy, who defines I. M. Dolgorukov as an “eclectic poet” (Chernigovskiy 1992: 6). His literary production, variegated in terms of themes, genre, and style, does not fit completely and unproblematically into any of the popular literary paradigms of the time, i.e., classicism, sentimentalism, and early romanticism. Even the author’s membership and interest in “conservative” literary associations such as “*Beseda lyubitelei rossijskogo slova*”¹⁰ did not lead him to consistently apply the group’s principles in his writing. On the contrary, I. M. Dolgorukov was interested in the work of the sentimentalist and “Europhile” Nikolay Mikhailovich Karamzin. This eclecticism also explains the lack of aesthetic treatises of Ivan Mikhailovich, who was always reluctant to theorize his own literary position. The prince wrote elegies, odes, satires, etc., the common feature of which was their “domestic” character. The themes and protagonists of his poetry (and dramas) were often inspired by his everyday life.

I. M. Dolgorukov was a prolific writer of memoir and autobiographical prose as well. He followed a family tradition in his passion for life writing. His grandmother N. B. Dolgorukova was the author of one of the first female autobiographical prose texts in Russia. The grandson highly valued his grandmother’s memoirs. As a matter of fact, thanks to him, her ego-text was published for the first time in the magazine *Drug Yunoshestva* in 1810¹¹.

I. M. Dolgorukov tried his hand at various autobiographical genres. The PhD thesis presents the main characteristics of the texts that have reached us in an integral form¹². The prince wrote three travelogues: *Slavny bubny za gorami ili Puteshestviye moye koye-kuda 1810 goda* (Dolgorukov 1870a), *Zhurnal puteshestviy iz Moskvyy v Nizhniy 1813 goda* (Dolgorukov 1870b) and *Puteshestviye v Kiyev v 1817 godu* (Dolgorukov 1870c). The first two texts are divided into chapters, devoted to the different localities reached by the author during his travels. In these travelogues, the writer’s aim is to inform and entertain the reader with the description of places, people, and adventures, encountered during his wanderings through the Ukrainian lands and his travel to Nizhny Novgorod. In

¹⁰ Founded in St. Petersburg in 1811, “*Beseda lyubitelei rossijskogo slova*” defended a conservative and nationalistic view of literature, opposing the attempts of N. M. Karamzin and his followers to reform and modernize the Russian literary language.

¹¹ The memoirs were published a second time a century later under the title *Svoyeruchnyye zapiski knyagini Natal’i Borisovny Dolgorukoy docheri g. fel’dmarshala grafa Borisa Petrovicha Sheremeteva* (Dolgorukaya 1913).

¹² Unfortunately, the diary *Zapiski svedskogo podhoda*, written by I. M. Dolgorukov during his participation in the Russo-Swedish campaign in 1788–1790, is only partially preserved in manuscript form.

Puteshestviye v Kiyev v 1817 godu I. M. Dolgorukov uses a different approach to the genre. The trip report is written in the form of a diary. The tone is more serious, and the narration includes the author's intimate and philosophical reflections. The three travelogues with their distinct narrative strategies reflect the dynamics of the evolution of the genre in Russia, where it became popular precisely at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. I. M. Dolgorukov uses practices and techniques typical of the travel literature of the time. For example, the writer presents his texts not as an *a posteriori* processing of his journey memories, but rather as a direct testimony of his experiences. By doing this, he places the reader in the position of his virtual travel companion. In these ego-texts, the prince imitates the then popular model of travelogue, established by L. Stern. It is noteworthy that Ivan Mikhailovich was among the first Russian writers to dedicate ego-documents to travels in the Russian Empire and not to a Grand tour abroad.

A unique work is *Kapishche moyego serdtsa, ili Slovar' vsekh tekhnicheskikh lits, s koimi ya byl v raznykh otnosheniyakh v techeniye moyey zhizni* (Dolgorukov 1997). The text is a peculiar calendar, in which each day of the year is dedicated to a literary portrait of a person whom the author had met during his life. Its originality lies in the combination of the literary portrait genre with the autobiographical narrative in the style of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. In addition, through this collection of personal memories, the author pursues various goals. Among them, there is the preservation of subjective impressions of the dialogue with various individuals, which gives the narrative a special poignancy. To this it could be added the prince's intention to get pleasure from recalling different life experiences and his desire to teach "life lessons" to his offspring.

The moralizing aims and J.-J. Rousseau's "confessional" model link *Kapishche moyego serdtsa...* with the autobiography of the writer *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsej zhizni...* The latter occupies a central place in the rich repertoire of I. M. Dolgorukov's ego-texts. Although with some interruptions, the writer wrote "the story of his life" until the end of his days. The result was a voluminous manuscript, integrally published only at the beginning of this century¹³.

In all his memoirs and autobiographical works, Ivan Mikhailovich strove to create a convincing image of himself as a worthy representative of the Russian *dvoryanstvo*, without forgetting to emphasise his uniqueness. To demonstrate this, in the introduction, two self-portraits of the prince are compared. One is written in verse, while the other in prose. They allow to highlight some characteristic features of the prince approach to self-description. In the poem *Ya* and in the self-portrait contained in *Povest'*, I. M. Dolgorukov writes with self-irony and declared "sincerity" about

¹³ Fragments of the autobiography were published in the 19th century in the collection of the author's works and in magazines such as *Moskvityanin*, *Russkaya Starina*, *Russkiy Arkhiv* and *Russkiy Bibliofil*. At the beginning of the last century, an attempt was made to publish the entire manuscript of I. M. Dolgorukov, but the project remained unfulfilled. This publication ends with the narration of the year 1800, cf. (Dolgorukov 1916).

his physical unattractiveness and his modest mind. On the other hand, he emphasises his moral qualities, following the new cultural canons of sentimentalism, which placed more importance on a person's ethical behaviour than on his appearance or erudition.

Although the first publications about I. M. Dolgorukov's literary production appeared already in the 19th century thanks to the articles of Mikhail Nikolayevich Longinov (Longinov 1865a; Longinov 1865b) and the biography by Mikhail Alexandrovich Dmitriev (Dmitriev 1863), to this day research of this author's poetry and prose remain sporadic and too general and vague in nature. The work by Dmitriy Nikolayevich Chernigovskiy, *Dolgorukov kak poet-satirik* (Chernigovskiy 1992), is among the few PhD theses dedicated specifically to I. M. Dolgorukov. It analyses the poet's satirical production and defines its place in the Russian satirical literature of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Pyotr Mihailovich Bitsilli's analysis of I. M. Dolgorukov's poetic production is another remarkable scientific publication about this writer. In his article *Zametki o leksicheskikh i tematicheskikh sovpadeniyakh i zaimstvovaniyakh u russkikh avtorov-klassikov* (Bitsilli 1934), the researcher identifies a possible influence of Ivan Mikhailovich's poetry on various classics of the Russian literature.

Knyaz' Ivan Mikhaylovich Dolgorukov – blagorodnyy artist, rezhisser, dramaturg (Bitsaeva-Stoyanova 2013), written by Rima Bitsaeva-Stoyanova and published in Sofia, is the only contemporary monograph on the writer. This scholar is also the author of the article *I. M. Dolgorukov – avtor satiricheskikh proizvedeniy v adres Aleksandra I* (Bitsaeva-Stoyanova 1988), published in the journal *Bolgarskaya Rusistika*. In this study, R. Bitsaeva-Stoyanova demonstrates that the critique of Alexander I is a leitmotif in several of I. M. Dolgorukov's odes.

For Mikhail Leonovich Gasparov, the prince is a striking example and an emblematic representative of the "alternative poetry". According to the researcher, he even influenced the work of A. S. Pushkin (Gasparov 2001: 113). Indeed, the emphasis on the originality of Ivan Mikhailovich's poetic legacy and its (often forgotten) imprint left in Russian literature bring together many of the scientific publications about him. The present PhD thesis shares the opinions of the above-mentioned scholars and aims to show that originality is also a characteristic feature of the author's ego-texts.

As far as the latter are concerned, studies on the writer's memoirs are rare. The PhD thesis of V. G. Novitskiy, dedicated to the prose of I. M. Dolgorukov, can be considered an exception (Novitskiy 1952)¹⁴. Most of the literature on the prince's memoir and autobiographical prose consists of general observations. Often his ego-texts are used only to demonstrate certain cultural and/or

¹⁴ Unfortunately, this source could not be consulted by the author of the research. However, two reasons allow us to emphasise the novelty of the presented analysis compared to the one of N. V. Novitskiy. His PhD thesis was written before the publication of the integral versions of all the main autobiographical works of I. M. Dolgorukov. In addition, in the 1950s, the new literary approach to the study of ego-texts was not yet established.

literary phenomena, such as the thematization of childhood (Kosheleva 2000), the contrast between the city and the countryside in the 18th-century Russian culture (Persi 2000), the influence of the rhetoric of sentimentalism on poets and prosaists (Kochetkova 1994) or the specific motivations for writing, claimed by 18th-century and early 19th-century Russian writers (Nikolayev 2017). Andrey Grigorievich Tartakovskiy includes the autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov in his seminal monograph *Russkaya memuaristika XVIII – pervoy poloviny XIX veka. Ot rukopisi k knige* (Tartakovskiy 1991). However, since the researcher's aim is to present the evolution of autobiographical genres in Russia during the given period, in his book, A. G. Tartakovskiy only generally describes the features of *Povest'*. N. V. Kuznetsova and M. O. Mel'tsin are the scholars who more deeply devote themselves to the study of this author and, specifically, to *Povest'*¹⁵. They published and edited the voluminous autobiography in the prestigious academic series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* in 2004 and 2005. In their articles and detailed commentaries on the ego-text, they highlight its specifics and analyse the way the writer interprets his past. These researchers explain many cultural realities and biographical facts that are unknown or incomprehensible to a contemporary reader but play a crucial role in the autobiographical narrative of I. M. Dolgorukov.

In general, the memoir prose of Ivan Mikhailovich remains insufficiently studied, which makes its investigation intriguing. The memoirs of this author are a phenomenon of Russian culture of the late 18th and early 19th centuries and a precious source to comprehend the mechanisms of self-understanding and self-determination, reached through memory and writing in this distant time.

The first chapter “**PAMYAT', KUL'TURA I MEMUARISTIKA: NAUCHNYYE PRADIGMY**” (“**MEMORY, CULTURE AND LIFE WRITING: SCIENTIFIC PARADIGMS**”, pp. 32–54) offers an overview of the main trends in “cultural memory” studies and on the role of culture and memory in shaping collective and individual identity. This part of the PhD thesis also includes a discussion of the main positions in Western and Russian life writing studies, with particular attention to the ones concerning the genre of autobiography.

¹⁵ Cf. (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2002), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2005), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2009a), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2009b), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2010), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2013a), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2013b), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014a), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014b), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014c), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2016), (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2017a) and (Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2017b).

The section “**1.1. Pamyat’ i kul’tura v universume interpretatsiy gumanitarnykh nauk**” (“**1.1. Memory and Culture in the Humanities Interpretive Horizon**”, pp. 32-43) states that memory has become a phenomenon of great interest in contemporary society. Its ideological, identifying, speculative, etc. use is closely related to the cultural context. Therefore, memory, culture and their importance for the formation and self-determination of the personality are at the centre of “memory studies”, a new field in the humanities.

The birth of “memory studies” dates to the beginning of the last century when the French school of Annals and Maurice Halbwachs revolutionized the way of thinking about memory. The former proposed to reconstruct the past by examining the various aspects of collective life, including cultural practices and mechanisms of spreading a common and shared representation of the past. M. Halbwachs introduced the concept of “collective memory”. According to the French sociologist, every reminiscence, even the most intimate, is not only individually but also socially constructed (Halbwachs 2007: 71). Memory is a phenomenon influenced by the life context of the person who uses the social and cultural codes of the society to which he belongs to build up his memories and his identity. The ideas of M. Halbwachs influenced Pierre Nora, who introduces the concept of “*lieu de mémoire*” (“memory space”). With this term, the French historian defines symbolic places that are transformed by a community into repositories preserving cultural, national, and collective memory (Nora et al. 1999: 26).

The problematic relationship between memory, culture and identity has attracted and continues to attract the attention of many other historians. For example, Patrick Hatton notes that the new roles taken on by memory in different eras are the result of changes in the cultural context. According to him, revolutions in the forms of information transmission are decisive for the imposition of new approaches to the past (Hatton 2004).

David Lowenthal argues that precisely in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the memory-past-culture interrelatedness became fundamental since the past commenced to be perceived as a “foreign country”. During the Enlightenment, history ceased to be “*magister vitae*” and became a cultural construct that had a defining impact on the self-perception of the individual and the community (Lowenthal 2004).

If historiographic studies often prioritize the relationship between past and culture, other disciplines focus their interest on the conceptualization of identity in relation to the changing cultural contexts. For example, according to Michel Foucault, memory is the result of dominant discourses. At the same time, the philosopher theorized a new role that the recollection of the past could play in modernity. To indicate this new innovative function, M. Foucault coined the term “counter-memory”. The latter aims to show that the past and its representations are in continuous transformation

according to the prevailing rhetoric of power in a certain cultural milieu. This awareness enables the individual to challenge the imposed identity of dominant discourses and to choose among multiple possible self-images.

The pluralistic nature of identity is an aspect that is increasingly emphasised in contemporary debates about the individual self-perception. To this characteristic trait can be added the mutability of the “Self”. The conceptualization of personality as a phenomenon in continuous transformation, depending on cultural circumstances, is the result of the ideas of many culturologists and anthropologists who, like Clifford Geertz, argue that culture is a specific feature of man and affects all aspects of everyday life, including his memory and his self-consciousness.

In this regard, in recent years the expression “cultural identity” has become very popular in the academic world. With it, researchers seek to summarize the modern dynamic conception of individuality. Although there is no lack of criticism of its use (Rogers Brubaker, Frederic Cooper, Pierre Hasner, etc.), in various scientific fields this notion has proven to be very productive. The present PhD thesis agrees with Stewart Hall’s (Hall 1990: 225) position on cultural identity. According to the Jamaican-British sociologist, the latter is the result of the constant process of reworking memory and cultural matrices.

The semiotic approach, considering “cultural memory” and “cultural identity” as constructions of signs and symbols to be interpreted, is fundamental to this research as well. Of particular importance for the methodology of the PhD thesis are the ideas of Yuriy Mihailovich Lotman. The representative of the Tartu School considered culture to be a form of memory created by people who contribute to its enrichment and, at the same time, bear its imprint. Yu. M. Lotman compared culture and memory (and their role in human life) to a text to be decoded (Lotman 1994: 8). Many of his reflections on memory, cultural context and identity are contained in his book on *dvoryanstvo* culture, entitled *Besedy o russkoy kul'ture. Byt i traditsii russkogo dvoryanstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)* (Lotman 1994). Even M. Halbwachs identified the aristocracy as a class in a privileged relationship with collective memory because it places the cult of the past at the centre of its group identity. These considerations are also valid for the Russian nobility of the 18th and early 19th centuries. This period was marked by major changes in the self-consciousness of the Russian nobles.

The reforms of Peter I started a radical process of cultural transformation, during which European models and values were imposed. Nonetheless, transferred to the new context, they acquired a Russian specificity. The *dvoryanstvo* was the social group most affected by this cultural revolution. The latter forced the nobles to rethink their role in society. As a result, the Russian elite created its own culture with distinctive artistic practices. Furthermore, the representatives of the

dvoryanstvo were the protagonists of a kind of class “emancipation”. Their privileged position in society, legally recognized by Catherine II, made them less dependent on monarchical authority and encouraged their social and cultural initiatives.

The atypical evolution of the Russian *dvoryanstvo* is the object of several scientific disputes about the national specificity of this class. According to some researchers, Russian nobles did not differ significantly from representatives of other European elites. Instead, others believe that the Russian nobility was oriented on a different scale of values, at the top of which stood service rather than honour or lineage. The common aim of all modern studies of the phenomenon of Russian *dvoryanstvo* is to challenge the stereotypes about it and to reevaluate its cultural heritage. Ego-texts provide an excellent opportunity to reconstruct the cultural memory and identity of the Russian nobility.

The section “**1.2. Memuaristika i avtobiografiya mezhdu dokumental’nost’yu i fiktsiyey**” (“**1.2. Memoir Prose and Autobiography Between Documentality and Fiction**”, pp. 43-53) highlights that today autobiographical and memoir texts are the object of a renewed attention in the academic world, interested in the bond between the individual and the past. Despite this, life writing is a relatively new field of research in the humanities. Memoir prose (and autobiography as its particular instance) have long been considered a marginal and insignificant phenomenon in literature. At best, they were used as a mere source of historical information. Only since the middle of the 20th century has there been a radical change in the approach to the study of diaries, autobiographies, memoirs, etc. In this period, they began to be considered literary texts worthy of interpretation. The German philosopher Georg Misch first attempted to catalogue all works of an autobiographical nature from antiquity to the present (cf. Vacheva 2015: 54). By doing this, he provided scholars with a first vast corpus of texts, giving the opportunity to trace the history of this writing practice. Georges Gusdorf emphasised the relationship of autobiographical prose with the confessional tradition and links its popularity to the Renaissance, when the idea of the value of individual experience established itself (Gusdorf 1956).

The most popular ideas about the specificity of the autobiographical genre belong to Philippe Lejeune. The French literary theorist presented his point of view in the monographs *L’autobiographie en France* (Lejeune 1971) and *Le pacte autobiographique* (Lejeune 1975). In them, he defines autobiography as “a retrospective narrative in prose in which a real person presents his own existence, emphasizing his individual life and, in particular, the history of his personality”¹⁶ (Lejeune 1975: 14). Ph. Lejeune also points out the main genre features of the autobiography, among which there is the presence of the “autobiographical pact”. The latter is a kind of contract between the autobiographer

¹⁶ The quotes are translated by the author of the text.

and his reader. In it, the writer formulates his intentions, explains the principles on which he builds his autobiography, and defends its authenticity. Ph. Lejeune also stresses that in autobiographies there is a coincidence between the narrator, protagonist, and author (except for autobiographies written in the third person). The just-mentioned position on the author-reader relationship has caused and is at the centre of numerous scientific disputes about the exact and consistent definition of autobiography and other genre related to life writing.

As far as autobiography is concerned, scholars discuss the possibility of self-expression through language. G. Gusdorf is convinced that it is not possible to reach a unified and complete representation of the Self because the word is an unreliable mediator in the process of self-knowledge and self-description. An opposing point of view is expressed by Paul Ricoeur and Georges Poulet, who believe that the very process of writing favours the achievement of self-understanding.

Another widely discussed issue is the sincerity of the author. Ph. Lejeune talks about the impossible sincerity of the autobiographer as he inevitably uses literary devices to present his own life. However, Roy Pascal emphasises that it is not the factual veracity of the narrative that is important, but the truth that the author wants to convey with his text. Today, most scholars believe that it is pointless to debate about this question, since memory is always subjective, selective, and misleading. The criterion of credibility is applicable only to factuality, but not to the autobiographer's personal perception and interpretation of events. Moreover, Giselle Mathieu-Castellani stresses the problem of "self-censorship" in ego-texts. According to certain cultural prohibitions, the authors limit their frankness (Mathieu-Castellani 1996).

Perhaps, in life writing studies, the most debated question is whether the author, narrator, and protagonist coincide. Conventionally autobiographical discourses overlap the three positions. However, the construction of an ego-narrative implies a certain selection of events, the establishment of causal relationships between them, their interpretation, and the play with temporal plans. In other words, the author can create different scenarios of and for his persona, combining the real experience and the imaginary one. To denote the different reworking of life occurrences in the ego-texts of a same author, Paul Ricoeur introduces the concept of "narrative identity" (Ricoeur 1990). According to him, the documentary character of the autobiography is demonstrated by the credibility of the presented events, while its fictionality is manifested in the variety of their interrelations and interpretations. As for the "narrator-character" relationship, the distinction of the two roles concerns the temporal discrepancy between the "I" who is the subject of the narration and the "I" who is its object.

The relation between the autobiography and the novel has also been the object of scholarly research. The novel, written in the first person, often imitates autobiography. Instead,

autobiographical prose usually shows traces of literariness, that is, it is oriented towards certain patterns of fictional prose and narrative strategies used in it.

Ego-texts and autobiographies also pose questions of gender. Gender studies affirm that women's life writing has its own peculiarities. The greater fragmentation of the narrative, the attention to "domestic" themes, the figure of the "other", and the feeling of belonging to a collective female community distinguish women's autobiographical texts from men's ones. For women, especially in the past, autobiographical and memoir writing took on a revolutionary character, as they were often a form of protest against the patriarchal system.

Autobiographical genres are discussed in Russian humanities as well. However, it should be highlighted that in Russia the literary study of ego-texts has become more popular only in the last decades. As a result, in the Russian academic world there is an even more evident lack of clarity and agreement on terminology.

Although many memoirs and autobiographical written testimonies were actively published in magazines already in the 19th century, these excerpts were often accompanied by introductions and critical articles, which were mostly descriptive in nature. Russian formalists were the first to introduce a scientific approach to the study of autobiographical genres. For example, Yuriy Nikolayevich Tynyanov demonstrated his theory of the dynamics of literary genres through epistolary writing, which in the 18th century turned from a peripheral literary phenomenon into a dominant genre (Tynyanov 1993). Instead, Lydiya Yakovlevna Ginzburg explored the similarities and differences between fiction and documentary prose. She observed that, although they handle the same "material", the writer and the memoirist approach it differently. In the writing process, the former moves from a general idea to its eventful and figurative concretization. The writer of memoir prose, on the contrary, starts from the personal fact or specific event to arrive at its interpretation and generalisation (Ginsburg 1977: 11).

During the Soviet period, there was a partial arrest of research on the poetics of memoir prose, as usually scholars limited themselves to reconstructing the factual credibility of autobiographical and memoir narratives.

An interesting point of view was offered by the Russian academic community in emigration. P. M. Bitsilli emphasised the importance of the so-called "domestic literature". He argued that ego-texts were a "laboratory of style" where the Russian literary language was formed and developed (Bitsilli 1934).

For our study, the points of view of G. G. Elazavetina and G. E. Gubieva are important. The first researcher underlines the connection of autobiographical and memoir prose with the tradition of

*letopis*¹⁷. G. E. Gubieva explains the authors' will to moralize and to emphasise their contribution to the "common good" with the influence of classicism in the life writing practice of the time.

A. G. Tartakovskiy was the first to describe the evolution of Russian memoirs from the 18th and early 19th centuries. In his already mentioned monograph, he asserts the idea that in Russia the emergence and development of this type of prose was the expression of the gradual self-awareness of the individual as a participant in the general course of history. The scholar traces the cultural-historical change in the status of memoir prose by presenting the transformations in the characteristics and purposes of the autobiographical discourses of the period. Moreover, he highlights the social belonging of the writers and the cultural phenomena (freemasonry, sentimentalism, access to European literary models, and the spread of education) that favoured the development of memoirs in the Russian context.

To conclude, it could be restated that the active study of memoirs in Russia has established itself only in the last few years, when literary scholars began to actively apply the new interpretive theories developed in the West.

In the second chapter **"ТИПОЛОГИЯ РУССКОЙ МУЖСКОЙ АВТОБИОГРАФИИ XVIII – НАЧАЛА XIX ВЕКА"** (**"TYPOLOGY OF RUSSIAN MALE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE 18TH - BEGINNING OF 19TH CENTURIES"**, pp. 55-77), it is described the origin and development of male memoirs in Russia in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Furthermore, a genre typology of the autobiographies written by men during this period is outlined, mainly by the examples of the ego-texts of A. T. Bolotov and of G. R. Derzhavin. For comparison, the autobiographies of other authors (I. I. Neplyuev, Ya. P. Shakhovskoy, M.V. Danilov, S. I. Mosalov, G. I. Dobrynin, A. S. Pishchevich, etc.) are considered. In the last part of the chapter, I. M. Dolgorukov's *Povest'* is analysed. The PhD thesis highlights its main genre and poetic characteristics, which transform it into an original example of a Russian male autobiography of the turn of the two centuries.

The section **"2.1. Muzhskaya memuaristika v Rossii XVIII – nachale XIX veka"** (**"2.1. Men's Memoirs and Autobiographical Prose in the 18th-century and the Early of the 19th-century Russia"**, pp. 55–63) provides the reader with an overview of some typological characteristics of male autobiographies. Unexpectedly, gender studies focus their attention more on the specifics of women's autobiographical discourses, neglecting the deeper analysis of men's ego-

¹⁷ Recently, A. Yu. Veselova proposed an alternative theory for the emergence of the autobiographical genre in the Russian context. She links its emergence with the practice of writing genealogy histories and of *sluzhebnaya skazka* (a type of business document) (Veselova 2020).

texts. Regarding the Russian male autobiographies of the 18th and early 19th centuries, scholars tend to limit their observation to the constation of their connection with the literary tradition (*letopis'* and *zhitie*), impoverishing their scientific interpretation.

To reconstruct the typology of male life writing in Russia, some preliminary observations are necessary. In the considered period, autobiographical texts were written in Russian or French (hybrid cases also were frequent). Men preferred to use Russian, while women wrote mostly in the foreign language. This bilingualism is not surprising because French was the language in which the nobles began to communicate with each other already in the first third of the 18th century. This characteristic leads us to the second feature of Russian autobiographical prose. Most of its authors at that time belonged to the *dvoryanstvo*. A. G. Tartakovskiy even talks about *dvoryanskaya memuaristika* (“noble memoir prose”, Tartakovskiy 1991: 31) and explains the spread of ego-texts primarily among this social class with the high social status, the access to European models, and the better education of its representatives.

In Russia, the emergence and consolidation of the autobiographical genres was favoured by the process of Europeanization of society, encouraged by the reforms of Peter the Great. The popularity of this type of texts grew rapidly during the reign of Catherine II, in coincidence with its establishment in Western Europe. The male ego-texts, written in this period, usually had a hybrid character, combining the genre features of autobiography and memoir. This does not mean that it is not possible to distinguish some typological trends in them.

The first autobiographical texts were characterized by a narrative focused on “external” events but over the years the narrative repertoire was constantly enriched. Among the leading themes were the imperial service and career, often interpreted in a didactic or self-apologetic key. Interestingly, the topic choice affected the style and manner of narration in autobiographies. P. M. Bitsilli and A. G. Tartakovskiy note that the impersonal tone and the largely bureaucratic style characterise the texts in which is predominant the “professional plot”. The other main narrative line in male autobiographical prose thematizes family-domestic life. In the earlier ego-texts, the authors almost schematically alternated episodes from the two thematic spheres. Gradually, their compositions became more complex and self-reflexive. To this change contributed the influence of sentimentalism, with its cult of feelings, and the spread of Masonic ideas, according to which ego-texts were part of the practices of self-observation and moral self-improvement (Zorin 2016: 109–110).

P. M. Bitsilli distinguishes between an “old” and “new” approach to the “domestic literature” of the period (Bitsilli 1934). The traditional trend of life writing made the imperial service the focus of the narration, while the narrative construction usually followed the *letopis'* pattern. The modern one, which appeared later, was characterized by more complex and largely “fictionalized” ego-texts.

These typological varieties of autobiographical writing can be convincingly illustrated by two of the most famous autobiographies of the period, i.e., *Zhizn' i priklyucheniya Andrey a Bolotova, opisanny e im samim dlya svoikh potomkov* by A. T. Bolotov and *Zapiski iz izvestnykh vsem proissh estviyev i podlinnykh del, zaklyuchayushchiye v sebe zhizn' Gavriily Romanovicha Derzhavina* by G. R. Derzhavin.

In his text, A. T. Bolotov describes and comments on various aspects of his daily life as a provincial nobleman, following the “domestic” line in Russian autobiographical prose. G. R. Derzhavin, on the other hand, focuses on his career, becoming a representative of the “civilian” thematic thread of Russian ego-texts. This affects the different authors’ narrative goals, approaches, and strategies adopted in their literary works. A. T. Bolotov chooses the epistolary form, while G. R. Derzhavin follows the *zhitie* model. Constructing his autobiography as a series of letters to an imaginary friend and skilfully handling a variety of novel techniques¹⁸, A. T. Bolotov gives his narration a markedly subjective, intimate, and familiar tone, which shortens the distance with the reader. G. R. Derzhavin uses the third-person form of narration, suggesting “epicness”, apparent narrative objectivity and distance from the reader. A. T. Bolotov looks for the most convincing way to share his life philosophy with his heirs, while G. R. Derzhavin builds his image of a loyal subject and of a servant of goodness and justice, which he wants to pass on to posterity.

In this context, I. M. Dolgorukov’s autobiography offers an alternative to both the described typological models as the author managed to combine the two described approaches in an innovative way.

The section “**2.2. Pragmatika i poetika avtobiografii I. M. Dolgorukova**” (“**2.2. Pragmatics and Poetics of I. M. Dolgorukov’s Autobiography**”, pp. 63-76) is devoted to the analysis of the original poetics of *Povest'*. At the time when I. M. Dolgorukov lived, the autobiographical genre had not yet developed established characteristics. Therefore, the text creatively combines the features of documentary and fictional prose. This distinguishes it from the other autobiographies of the time.

Although with certain interruptions, Ivan Mikhailovich devoted himself to writing *Povest'* throughout his entire mature life. In the compositional process, he often used diaries and notes. This is testified by the annotations prepared by the prince for the period 1820–1822, which, due to his death, he was unable to revise and include in his autobiography¹⁹.

¹⁸ Among them, there are chronological shifts, interruption of the narrative at the climax, inserted novellas, alternation of comic and tragic scenes, expressive comments in a sentimentalist spirit, rhetorical play with the reader, etc. (Veselova 2015: 94).

¹⁹ *Povest'* ends with the narration of the events of the year 1819.

In the two conserved manuscripts of *Povest'*²⁰, it is clear the literary model chosen by I. M. Dolgorukov. Unlike A. T. Bolotov and G. R. Derzhavin, but as many other 18th-century male autobiographers (Tartakovsky 1991: 42–58), the prince follows the *letopis'* pattern, narrating the main events of his life year by year. Nevertheless, in many other aspects Ivan Mikhailovich's autobiography significantly moves away from the *letopis'* tradition, characterized by its coldly detached and neutral tone. For instance, the influence of the *Confessions* of J.-J. Rousseau is evident. With rare exceptions²¹, other Russian ego-texts of the period lack references to this work of the Genevan philosopher and writer. Instead, in *Povest'*, I. M. Dolgorukov actively uses the Rousseau's rhetoric of sincerity, recounting to the reader intimate, personal and considered impossible to share publicly circumstances.

Like many other contemporary autobiographers of his time, in the traditional autobiographical pact, the prince specifies the reasons that prompted him to write the story of his life. In his case, his father's advice and the desire to follow his grandmother's example²² were decisive.

In the autobiographical pact, I. M. Dolgorukov also indicates the addressees of his text. As A. T. Bolotov, the writer dedicated his autobiography to his children. However, he did not exclude a wider circle of readers. The domestic reading target of *Povest'* determines the markedly personal and subjective tone of the narrative. The author repeats several times that he intends to write only about himself. This is related to the didactic purposes that the prince ascribed to his text²³. Driven by the intent to draw life lessons from his experience for his children, I. M. Dolgorukov collected in his autobiography his reflections on the most diverse aspects of reality, turning his text into a kind of encyclopaedia of the Russian noble culture of the 18th and early 19th centuries²⁴.

²⁰ It should be noted that the texts of I. M. Dolgorukov were almost always immediately copied by friends and relatives due to the illegible handwriting of the author. *Povest'* also went through this process of copying, since in the manuscripts that have reached us there are two handwritings that do not belong to the prince (Kuznetsova 2004: 731).

²¹ Only two other texts from the period contain an explicit reference to the autobiographical text of J.-J. Rousseau. They are *Chistoserdechnoye priznaniye* by Denis Ivanovich Fonvizin (1745–1792) and *Istinnoye povestvovaniye, ili Zhizn' Gavriila Dobrynina, (pozhevshogo 72 g. 2 m. 20 dney) im samim pisannaya v Mogileve i v Vitebske 1752–1823. V trekh chastyakh* by Gavriil Ivanovich Dobrynin.

²² Interestingly, I. M. Dolgorukov passed on his passion for life writing to his children. Pavel, Dmitry and Mariya are known to have written ego-texts.

²³ In Russia, there was a centuries-old tradition according to which the father, through his own example, teaches his children proper behaviours. Some researchers link the birth of this practice with *Poucheniye* of Vladimir Monomakh (1053–1125).

²⁴ In this respect, I. M. Dolgorukov's text is close to A. T. Bolotov's autobiography. A. Yu. Veselova and M. P. Milyutin emphasise the encyclopaedic nature of the autobiographical work *Zhizn' i priklyucheniya Andreyka Bolotova, opisannyye samim im dlya svoikh potomkov...* (Veselova & Milyutin 2021: 21). The two autobiographers created voluminous ego-texts covering the same time frame and describing in detail the daily life of the Russian nobility of that time. However, it should be noted that I. M. Dolgorukov was a Moscow *dvoryanin*, while A. T. Bolotov was a representative of the provincial *dvoryanstvo*. Therefore, they use distinct cultural codes and points of view to represent the life of the nobles in the Russian Empire.

In the initial draft of his autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov wanted to tell the story of his successful career, with which he would have restored the prestige of the Dolgorukov family²⁵. Unforeseen upheavals in his social ascent changed this plan and turned *Povest'* into a mean to defend himself against unfair accusations and to deny malicious rumours about him. These apologetic aims explain another feature of I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiography. In fact, the latter contains a collage of letters, documents, and other written testimonies, with which the author "confirms" the truth of his statements.

Povest', similarly to the autobiography of A. T. Bolotov, is characterised by many examples of literariness. In particular, the influence of sentimentalist plot matrices and stylistics is glaring. I. M. Dolgorukov constructs individual episodes from his own life or that of the others with the enviable ability to intrigue or emotionally move the reader. With the latter, he conducts an almost continuous dialogue. To keep the reader's interest alive, the narrator resorts to various rhetorical techniques. He hints at the upcoming development of events, "stages" possible polemics with the reader and answers to his supposed questions and reactions. This emphasises the "secondary" and literary reworking of the text. This is also confirmed by the frequent commentary on the narrative, in which "sentimental" rhetorical gestures are accompanied by emotional-demonstrating questions and exclamations. Another interesting peculiarity is the presence of a meta-literary discourse. The author explains to the reader his creative writing process, motivates his stylistic choices, etc.

In *Povest'*, I. M. Dolgorukov's often contradicts himself. His contradictions are due to the impossibility of revising the voluminous text and the possible desire of the autobiographer himself to preserve the authenticity of his experiences by recording the changes that occurred in his mental attitude and worldview. Another explanation of their presence is the long period in which the prince wrote his autobiography. The prolonged writing process also allows us to see the evolution in the author's approach to the text. The initial synthetic pages were enriched with details and narrative lines over the years.

Povest' stands out for its original poetics in the Russian literary panorama. Its textual characteristics identify it as an autobiography. The focus on the evolutionary process of the personality, the presence of the autobiographical pact and the identity between author, narrator and character, which are typical of the autobiographical genre, can be found in I. M. Dolgorukov's text. Therefore, *Povest'* appears to be one of the rare examples of male autobiography of the 18th and early 19th centuries in Russia.

²⁵ The original division of the text into parts testifies to this.

The third chapter **“AVTOBIOGRAFICHESKOYE «YA» I EMOTSIONAL’NYY NARRATIV V «POVESTI O ROZHDENII MOYEM, PROISKHOZHDENII I VSEY ZHIZNI» KN. I. M. DOLGORUKOVA”** (**“THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL “SELF” AND THE EMOTIONAL NARRATIVE IN “POVEST’ O ROZHDENII MOYEM, PROISKHOZHDENII I VSEY ZHIZNI” OF PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV”**, pp. 78-132) reconstructs the self-image of I. M. Dolgorukov in his private life. For this purpose, attention is paid to the family emotional relationships described in the autobiography.

In the section **“3.1. Avtobiografiya kn. I. M. Dolgorukova s tochki zreniya istorii emotsiy”** (**“3.1. The Autobiography of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov from the Point of View of the History of Emotions”**, pp. 78–80), the approaches developed by the recently emerged discipline “history of emotions” are used. This new scientific field pays particular attention to the influence of cultural context on the conceptualization of feelings. I. M. Dolgorukov lived in a period when sentimentalism and early romanticism radically changed emotional practices and relationships. This circumstance makes the expression and representation of feelings, related to the family environment, significant for the interpretation of the analysed text.

The section **“3.2. «[Ya] ne mog nikogda skryt’ svoikh chuvstv». Kul’t emotsiy v vospriyatii I. M. Dolgorukova”** (**“3.2. “[Ya] ne mog nikogda skryt’ svoikh chuvstv”. I. M. Dolgorukov’s Conception of the Cult of Emotions”**, pp. 80-82) formulates and argues the thesis that the memoirist is markedly receptive to the new rhetoric of emotion introduced by sentimentalism and early romanticism. In his autobiographical narrative, I. M. Dolgorukov uses many of the tropes and clichés popularized by these cultural currents. In *Povest’*, the author often reflects on the irrational nature of feelings in the spirit of sentimentalist literature. For him, emotions were an expression of moral responsiveness and sincerity, unlike reason, which could mislead a person and rarely brought him comfort in difficult life moments. The writer claims that feelings, being not subject to coercion, give us inner freedom and guarantee the inviolability of our intimate world.

I. M. Dolgorukov shows a strong interest in the figure of the “heart”, a crucial concept in sentimentalism²⁶. He considered the latter a mysterious source of human feelings. Moreover, in the autobiography, he constantly shares with the reader his emotional experiences, seeking understanding and sympathy. Therefore, he stresses the importance of his sincerity when describing his inner world. In *Povest’*, the self-identification of the “I” as a sensitive and emotionally reactive person takes place primarily in the sphere of family relations, which in turn were influenced by the changing ideologies and cultural context.

²⁶ This keyword is even included in the title of *Kapishche moyego serdtsa....*

In this regard, it should be emphasised that, in the 18th and early 19th centuries, the noble family was inseparably linked with the concept of “lineage”. The rubric **“3.3. «Rod knyazey Dolgorukikh yest’ rod doblestvennyy i znamenityy». Gordost’ i rod”** (**“3.3. “Rod knyazey Dolgorukikh yest’ rod doblestvennyy i znamenityy”. Pride and Lineage”, pp. 82-91**) demonstrates the importance that I. M. Dolgorukov attributed to his genealogy. At the beginning of the autobiography, the author narrates his family history. The presence of the genealogy fits into the recurrent patterns of memoir texts. In *Povest’*, it is a mean for the memoirist to pass on to his children his sense of family belonging, which is a basic component of human identity and largely determines the self-awareness of everyone. Idealizing the history of his family, the autobiographer mainly highlights examples of encomiastic behaviour which are aimed to neglect some other morally dubious conducts of his ancestors. The prince pays special attention to those of them who, in his opinion, most convincingly demonstrated the “tragic common fate” of the Dolgorukov, i.e., his grandfather Ivan Alekseevich and his wife Natalya Borisovna.

Ivan Mikhailovich presents his personal and biased version of the fate of the former. Omitting his relative’s involvement in palace intrigues and the struggle for power, he portrays the favourite of Peter II as a “martyr of freedom”, sincerely and emotionally attached to the young emperor and unjustly punished by Anna Ioannovna. In the grandson’s pathetic account of Ivan Alekseevich’s tragic death, more tendentious reworking of the facts can be found. I. M. Dolgorukov changes the type of sentenced capital death, replacing the shameful for every nobleman dismemberment (consecutive cutting off the limbs and finally the head) with the more respectable beheading. Furthermore, he dates the execution of the death sentence a year later, when his grandfather would have been 33 years old, establishing an implicit parallel between the death of Ivan Alekseevich and the martyrdom of Christ.

For I. M. Dolgorukov, the figure of Natalya Borisovna was extremely important. Both the autobiography and his other ego-texts testify to his deep adoration for her. The prince even confessed his intention to write and print her biography. Although this project did not materialise, I. M. Dolgorukov took an active part in publishing her memoirs, considering it a gesture of devotion and respect for her memory.

In the autobiography, Ivan Mikhailovich presents Natalya Borisovna as a typical sentimental heroine who remained faithful to her husband, despite the misfortunes that befell him. In *Kapishche moyego serdtsa...* her image even acquires the typical traits of the heroines of classical tragedies. In her literary portrait, her sense of duty and her morally impeccable behaviour are emphasised. The author also uses another model to describe Natalya Borisovna. In the autobiography, she embodies the Christian “righteous woman” with her humility, piety, stoic patience and striving for an ascetic way of life. In this way, the author wished to pass on the cult of his grandmother to his heirs.

I. M. Dolgorukov did not fail to talk about “bad” relatives. In the writer’s eyes, the Sheremetev played a negative role in the family. The kinship with them was due to Natalya Borisovna’s marriage to Ivan Alekseevich but between the two families there was no emotional closeness.

In *Povest’*, the prince portrays the members of the Sheremetev in a predominantly negative way. Their behaviour contradicted the norms of noble ethics. They showed complete disrespect and indifference to their unfortunate relatives. In addition, the representatives of this family enriched themselves at the expense of the Dolgorukov²⁷. Therefore, in his ego-texts, the prince labels them as “egoists”. It should be noted that this concept, introduced precisely in the 18th century, is central to the autobiographer’s worldview. For I. M. Dolgorukov, it had a completely negative connotation. In the autobiography, he polemizes the idea of “reasonable egoism”, popularised by various philosophers at the time.

In the section “**3.4. «Chto mileye rodstva, iskrennosti i priyazni!»**. **Emotsii i sem’ya v interpretatsii I. M. Dolgorukova**” (“**2.4. “Chto mileye rodstva, iskrennosti i priyazni!”**. **Emotions and Family in I. M. Dolgorukov’s Understanding**”, pp. 91–96), it is analysed the autobiographer’s refiguration of the family as an irreplaceable “emotional refuge”²⁸. In *Povest’*, I. M. Dolgorukov repeatedly comments on the fundamental role of relatives in overcoming life’s difficulties and the importance of family ties in the system of patronage, which was widespread in the Russian Empire.

In the PhD thesis, the emphasis is placed on the very specific and ample semantic spectre of the concept of “family” in the 18th and early 19th centuries. In this period, not only blood relatives were considered members of the family, but distant relatives, tutors, nurses, and other servants were also included in it. During his life, I. M. Dolgorukov proved to be always ready to show his emotional solidarity even to the modest members of this extended domestic community. In other cases, however, he did not hide his indifference to the fate of prestigious relatives, with whom he had no real intimate connection.

The 18th-century type of extended family had its own hierarchy. At the top there was the immediate family circle, which consisted of parents, brothers, sisters, wife, and children. This part of the chapter focuses on the relationship between I. M. Dolgorukov and his sisters, to whom he was sincerely attached and to whom he dedicated laudatory portraits in his autobiography and other memoir texts. The prince showed similar kinship affection to his sisters’ husbands. But he did not

²⁷ N. B. Dolgorukova could not claim her part of the inheritance, being in exile.

²⁸ This term belongs to W. Reddy, according to whom an “emotional refuge” is “A relationship, ritual, or organization (whether informal or formal) that provides safe release from prevailing emotional norms and allows relaxation of emotional effort, with or without an ideological justification, which may shore up or threaten the existing emotional regime” (Reddy 2004: 129).

forgive gestures made by this kind of relatives that did not respect the dignity of the aristocracy of his lineage. For example, I. M. Dolgorukov broke off relations with his first wife's sister, who "disrespectfully" decided to marry a merchant against his approval.

It should not be forgotten that, in 18th-century Russia, "extramarital families" were also considered a kinship responsibility. Thus, I. M. Dolgorukov naturally accepted his half-brothers and sister, as well as their mother, his father's mistress. There is the possibility that the autobiographer himself had an illegitimate child. This fact is completely absent in the text, probably due to the memoirist's will to construct his myth as a responsible, loving, and caring head of the family.

In his autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov tends to condemn the decline of the family institution, which he contrasts with the example of his close and loving family. The emotional dynamics associated with his domestic environment are fundamental to the formation of his autobiographical positive self-image as son, husband, and father.

In the section **"3.5. «Chto zamenit ottsa ili mat'?»». Roditel'skaya privyazannost' i synovnyaya predannost'"** (**"3.5. "Chto zamenit ottsa ili mat'?"". Parental Love and Filial Devotion"**, pp. 96–105), Ivan Mikhailovich's relationship with his parents is examined. *Povest'* registers the change in the public perception of childhood and child-parent relations that occurred in the 18th and early 19th centuries. At that time, Russian writers and philosophers actively discussed the ideas of Western educators about the upbringing and education of children, gradually welcoming the idea that it was the duty of noble parents to personally take care of the moral development of their offspring. They should have provided them with a good education and prepared them for public service in the name of the "common good". In the new educational doctrines, special attention was paid to the Christian virtues (piety, abstinence, love, magnanimity, and respect for parents), to which children should have been introduced through the parental conduct example. A novelty in this Christian-enlightened educational program was the assertion that children had to develop their emotional sensitivity and responsiveness. In *O vospitanii i nastavenii detei...* (1783–1784), Nikolay Ivanovich Novikov writes about the "education of the heart" as an important aspect of the formation of young generations. These new ideas are reflected on the way the parent-son relationship is represented and interpreted in *Povest'*.

In the latter, the author's childhood is described as a "golden age". His parents are loving individuals who show unchanging concern for their children and their education. In accordance with the norms of Christian ethics, I. M. Dolgorukov describes himself as an obedient son who loves and honours his mother and father. He never challenges their decisions. Even the modest inheritance they left him is not a reason for dissatisfaction, because for the prince the love and life lessons of his parents were more important.

In the emotional world of the narrator, the figure of the father is extremely relevant. His portrait is oriented towards the image of the enlightened nobleman, whose authority in the family is built on his moral example, his willingness to self-sacrifice for his loved ones and the Christian stoicism with which he endures the blows of fate. The upbringing methods, used by I. M. Dolgorukov's father, followed the new pedagogical ideas. This is most clearly manifested in the parent's attitude towards his already grown son. Respect for the personality of young Dolgorukov, his consideration of the son as a morally developed individual capable of taking responsibility for his deeds and the desire to convince and not to impose his opinion were the main educational principles of Mikhail Ivanovich. Thanks to them, he was able to maintain a sincere and mutual trust in the relationship with his descendant. For I. M. Dolgorukov, his father was above all a moral mentor and an indispensable adviser in critical life situations. From the narration is evident the genuine love and deep respect that the autobiographer felt for his parent.

In *Povest'*, the image of the mother is less significant in respect to that of the father, whose role in the upbringing and socialization of the son remained paramount in the patriarchal Russian society of the time. In the autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov's feelings towards the mother are revealed when he leaves the Moscow home to start his service in the imperial capital. The rare meetings with her are described in a sentimental-affectionate tone, behind which one perceives the narrator's sense of guilt for the motherly sadness caused by their separation. As Eric Fromm notes, a father's love must be gained, while the relationship with the mother is based on her unconditional love for the child (Fromm 2023: 69–81). These considerations can be applied to the case of Ivan Mikhailovich. In the autobiography, the memoirist represents his mother's love as constant and undemanding. Therefore, since she cannot cause in the son any complex emotional-psychological experience, in *Povest'*, the idealisation of the maternal image does not lead to the mother's individualization.

To highlight the strong emotional connection that exists between the members of his family, I. M. Dolgorukov resorts to an implicit comparison with the family of his first wife Evgeniya. His first wife grew up far from home in the Smolensk Institute for Noble Maidens. This led to the loss of emotional closeness with her relatives, as is evident from the memoirist's ironic description of the meeting after his marriage with Evgeniya's mother and brother²⁹.

²⁹ In this regard, in the autobiography, the author contradicts himself. In the laudatory portrait of Evgeniya, written after her death, he emphasises that his first wife sincerely mourned the death of her mother despite the lack of connection between them in childhood. It can be argued that the heroine follows an expected behaviour as her acts were in full agreement with Christian values.

In the rubric **“3.6. «Lyubov’ dvukh serdets, svyazannykh vmeste, yest’ blazhenstvo cheloveka». Emotsii v supruzheskoy zhizni I. M. Dolgorukova”** (**“3.6. “Lyubov’ dvukh serdets, svyazannykh vmeste, yest’ blazhenstvo cheloveka”. Emotions in the Married Life of I. M. Dolgorukov”, pp. 105–117**), the research focus is on love and marriage. For the author, love was a necessary condition for a successful marriage. The memoirist was a firm defender of love marriage (provided it was between representatives of the same social class). Under the influence of sentimentalism, he poeticized it as a partnership and a friendship between a man and a woman, based on love, mutual respect and understanding. These positions and the treatment of the marital theme in the autobiographical narrative once again reveal I. M. Dolgorukov’s contradictions.

In the description of his first marriage, the prince represents himself as a typical sentimental hero who, despite the poverty of his chosen one, decided to follow his heart, defying public opinion and relatives. Nonetheless, the PhD thesis underlines that there were more pragmatic considerations behind the choice of I. M. Dolgorukov. Evgeniya was a protégé of the future emperor Pavel Petrovich and his wife. This fact made her an attractive partner for the author. Like his father, the young prince hoped that Evgeniya’s connection to the court would have favoured his career and helped him restore the Dolgorukov’s past prestige. Unlike many male autobiographers, Ivan Mikhailovich devotes considerable attention to the description of his wedding, which he defines as one of the happiest periods in his life.

As far as Evgeniya is concerned, the writer models her portrait according to the canons of the sentimental heroine. The stress in her depiction falls on her spiritual rather than physical beauty. Her main virtues are charm, naturalness, and devotion to the family. Not particularly beautiful, but endowed with the best moral qualities, the first wife is an exemplary daughter and mother. She embodies the type of ideal wife according to the norms of patriarchal culture and sentimentalist stereotypes.

According to I. M. Dolgorukov, a successful marriage depended solely on the spiritual qualities of the wife. He always took this consideration into account when choosing his spouses. Therefore, there is a strikingly similarity in the biographies and characters of his two wives. Both Evgeniya and Agrafena were educated at the Smolny Institute of Noble Maidens. For I. M. Dolgorukov, the main merit of this institution was precisely to teach the young noble women to be submissive and obedient wives. At the same time, Evgeniya and Agrafena were strong individuals who firmly protected their family and comforted the prince in the most difficult moments of his life.

I. M. Dolgorukov describes several episodes of the self-sacrifice of his first wife, who always strove to do everything in her power to help him. In some cases, the “deeds” of Evgenia are the subject

of the author's fictionalization. Like the heroine of *Natalya, boyarskaya doch'* (1792) by N. M. Karamzin, Ivan Mikhailovich recounts how his wife joined him to the front, disguised as a man.

Since in sentimentalism and early romanticism the female figure was a corrective to the shortcomings of the beloved, in *Povest'*, Evgeniya is depicted as the author's mentor. The pathos with which the writer describes the relationship with his wife and idealizes her image is also the result of his apologetic purposes. He wanted to contest possible accusations that he was not a good husband. These criticisms were mainly due to his numerous extramarital love affairs. The author did not deny them, but persistently emphasised the platonic nature of his infidelities.

The motif of marital unfaithfulness is actually present in the autobiographical narrative. However, in comparison with the long list of lovers in *Kapishche moego serdtsa...*, *Povest'* mentions much fewer names of the women with whom I. M. Dolgorukov felt in love. This self-censorship can be explained by the positive and exemplary image that the author wants to give of himself in his "official" autobiography.

In the depiction of his love adventures, the writer is far from being a libertine. All the protagonists of his "romantic novels" are described with respect and discretion. The prince follows the codes of chivalrous love³⁰, according to which a man is only platonically in love with his "Lady".

In accordance with the matrices of the new "sentimental" cultural currents, I. M. Dolgorukov often behaves as a hero of romance stories. He represents himself as a defender of women threatened by their cruel husbands. In this way, he justifies his infidelities. Furthermore, the letters exchanged with one of the heroines of his sentimental intrigues testify the use of the literary typical emotional style, the epistolary clichés and means of expression even in everyday life. This rhetoric also plays an important role in the self-description of the autobiographer, who wants to incarnate the prototype of the chivalrous man. However, despite the author seeking to emphasise the sincerity of his narrative and reinforcing his myth as a loyal husband, the many love stories rather demonstrate that his declared marital fidelity is more a literary motif.

The following section **"3.7. «Dlya kogo zhe prilichneye vsem pozhertvovat', kak ne dlya detey svoikh?»». Sentimental'nost' lyubyashchego otsa"** ("2.7. **"Dlya kogo zhe prilichneye vsem pozhertvovat', kak ne dlya detey svoikh?"**. **Sentimentality of a Loving Father**", pp. 117–128) is focused on the self-characterization of I. M. Dolgorukov as a father. In *Povest'*, the prince devotes a relatively large space to his relationship with his children, something which is not typical for the then male autobiographical prose. The memoirist shows sincere affection for all his sons and daughters, mourns the premature loss of some of them, sympathizes with their successes, and constantly worries about their future.

³⁰ At the end of the century, it became popular again thanks to sentimentalism and early romanticism.

Like his father, I. M. Dolgorukov took great care of the education of his offspring. For this purpose, the prince adopted the new educational principles, which proclaimed the importance of naturalness in the upbringing of a child. He avoided violence and sought to have a sincere dialogue with his sons and daughters to gain their trust and respect.

The autobiography was part of the educational program of I. M. Dolgorukov, who never forgot about the moral purposes of his text. Through the telling of the story of his ancestors and of his personal experiences, the writer tried to instil pride of belonging to the Dolgorukov family in his children. Moreover, he wanted to teach them the importance of honour, which in his view was a fundamental value of aristocratic consciousness. On the other hand, it is interesting that the prince strongly condemned duels, which at the time were a popular practice of restoring the name and dignity of a nobleman. In the autobiography, the writer describes duels as a manifestation of unmotivated and senseless violence.

I. M. Dolgorukov paid no less attention to the cultural education of his offspring. The latter was not only a popular theme in 18th-century Russian literature, but also a recurring motif in men's autobiographies of the period. If contemporary autobiographers usually described their poor educational background, Ivan Mikhailovich preferred to point out the quality of his education, which he received thanks to the efforts of his father. Following the example of his parent and learning from his personal experience, I. M. Dolgorukov tried to give his children the best education.

In the 18th-century and early 19th-century Russia, education became a "status symbol" and was essential for the career of every *dvoryanin*. Debates about the best educational forms were widespread and I. M. Dolgorukov did not remain indifferent to them. In *Povest'*, he proves to be a supporter of home education, which was a common practice in the Russian Empire. However, although he preferred Russian teachers, in the text he admits that the hiring of foreigner educators was inevitable due to the shortage of compatriots willing to devote themselves to the non-prestigious teaching profession.

I. M. Dolgorukov graduated from Moscow University and even dedicated a collection of poems to his Alma Mater. Despite this, in the autobiography, the writer usually shows an adverse attitude to institutes and boarding schools. He believed that the high number of students in them negatively affected the education of the young peers. Therefore, in *Povest'*, Ivan Mikhailovich justifies the sending of his sons to the Moscow University Noble Boarding School with the lack of funds for paying a private teacher. I. M. Dolgorukov also expresses his opinions on the widely discussed educational reform of M. M. Speranskiy, which obliged officers to take an exam or prove their competence with a university diploma to advance on the "Table of Ranks". The reform caused discontent among the representatives of the conservative nobility, who considered a humiliation to be

“examined”. I. M. Dolgorukov did not share these noble prejudices, but he was also against the reform, which in his eyes only led to new forms of corruption.

The writer tried to ensure a good career start for his sons and directed them to the administrative sphere. In *Povest'*, he explains this unusual decision by adducing as reasons for the renunciation to the prestigious military service the poor health of his children, his personal dislike of war, the enormous cost of a career in the army, and the immorality of the soldiers. Although some of his sons undermined his efforts to secure them a promising future, the writer's love for them and willingness to help them remained unchanged throughout his whole life.

In the analysed period, a highly debated topic was also daughters' upbringing and education. The latter was usually entrusted to the mother. After the death of his first wife, I. M. Dolgorukov was faced with the problem of whom to entrust with the education of his daughters. The autobiographer did not have a negative opinion of female educational institutes. However, the lack of emotional connections of the young noblewomen student with their parents is the probable explanation for the writer's choice to resort to home education for his daughters.

In the section **“3.8. «Ot toski serdechnoy nikuda ne uydesh'». I. M. Dolgorukov, chuvstva i pamyat' o blizkikh”** (**“3.8. “Ot toski serdechnoy nikuda ne uydesh'”. I. M. Dolgorukov, Feelings and the Memory of the Loved Ones”, pp. 128-132**), it is reconstructed the reception of the cultural codes of sentimentalism and early romanticism related to such an intimate experience as the grief of losing loved ones.

In the autobiography, the author describes the care with which he built and maintained the relatives' and friends' funeral monuments and chose their epitaphs, which were entirely personal and unpretentious. In them, the autobiographer underlines the “simplicity of the language and loftiness of thought”. He grieved equally for his near relatives and his servants. For him, affection for those who had passed away was more important than any difference in social status.

In his personal pantheon, his first wife Evgeniya occupies a central place. He arranged the space around her grave in the spirit of sentimentalist landscapes and turned the place into a refuge of intimate worship. I. M. Dolgorukov dedicates laudatory portraits to her and to other passed away loved ones in his memoirs and poems. By describing their stoic death, the writer hints at the way he himself would like to end his days. This is confirmed by the letter of his son Rafail, in which the death of the prince is described.

In conclusion, it can be summarized that, in I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiographical myth, the family is an emotional community that defines the personality of the writer. Emotions and family are interconnected in the memoirist's universe. Under the influence of sentimentalism and early romanticism, the autobiographer presents his inner world. The emotional community of the family becomes a source of life lessons and behavioural models. At the same time, feelings are an essential element in creating the autobiographical idealised image of I. M. Dolgorukov as a loving son, husband, and father.

In the fourth chapter **“SLUZHBA I FORMIROVANIYE AVTOBIOGRAFICHESKOGO MIFA. DVORYANSKAYA ETIKA DOLGA I SAMOIDEALIZATSIYA KN. I. M. DOLGORUKOVA” (“SERVICE AND THE FORMATION OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MYTH. THE DVORYANSTVO ETHICS OF DUTY AND THE SELF-IDEALIZATION OF PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV”, pp. 133–195)**, the self-image of the autobiographer in the sphere of formal and public relations is under investigation.

In the first rubric **“4.1. Fenomen russkogo dvoryanstva glazami kn. I. M. Dolgorukova” (“4.1. The Phenomenon of the Russian Dvoryanstvo Through the Eyes of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov”, pp. 133-135)**, it is stated the close connection between the public image of a nobleman in the 18th and early 19th centuries and the service. Moreover, in this part of the PhD thesis the importance of a successful career in the life and autobiographical narration of I. M. Dolgorukov is emphasised.

Despite Peter III's *Manifesto o vol'nosti dvoryanstva* (1762) abolished the compulsory service, the latter did not lose its significance in the Russian collective consciousness. On the contrary, the service acquired a new (symbolic) meaning. It became a civic and moral duty and the only worthy activity for a “valuable” nobleman according to the public opinion. *Povest'* confirms the pivotal role of service in the life and self-esteem of Russian aristocrats. As in many other men's autobiographies of the time, it is a central theme in the ego-text of I. M. Dolgorukov.

Ivan Mikhailovich's aspiration for a successful career was driven by personal ambitions. In addition, he felt the duty to live up to the expectations of his family, who was counting on him to return the lost wealth and influence of the Dolgorukov. However, unexpected “unfortunate” turns in the writer's professional life path changed the interpretation of the service-theme in *Povest'*. The memoirist was forced to rethink his place in society and look for defensive arguments that could apologetically justify his failures.

In the section entitled “4.2. «Ya [...] delal delo gosudarevo s tem sovestnym strakhom, [...] s kakoyu dvoryanin pryamoy, potomok Dolgorukikh roda, dolzhen byl zvaniye svoye ne vsuye nosit’». Samoidealizatsiya sluzhashchego dvoryanina” (“4.3. “Ya [...] delal delo gosudarevo s tem sovestnym strakhom, [...] s kakoyu dvoryanin pryamoy, potomok Dolgorukikh roda, dolzhen byl zvaniye svoye ne vsuye nosit’”. The Self-idealization of a Serving Dvoryanin”, pp. 135–144), it is presented in detail the positive self-representation that the writer gives of himself with the intention of achieving his apologetic goals.

In the autobiographical narrative, the author emphasises that he grew up with an idealized view of the service. He describes himself as a young nobleman ready to fulfil his duty by serving his emperor loyally and diligently. However, this naïve enthusiasm soon turned to bitterness and disappointment. In *Povest’*, this change is demonstrated by the increasingly pessimistic tone with which I. M. Dolgorukov depicts service reality. The writer uses a recurring pattern in his description of his different experience in the military and bureaucratic sphere. The initial hopes, with which he accepts each new appointment, are quickly destroyed by the corruption and intrigues of his enemies. Like many other autobiographers of the time, the prince idealizes himself by emphasising his intransigence with all manifestations of bureaucratic abuse. I. M. Dolgorukov tried to embody the ideal of the “new man”, promoted by Catherine II. He read her writings on political issues and was inspired by Enlightenment dreams of a just society. Furthermore, following the models developed in classicist tragedy, he portrays himself as the only positive hero who must alone face the service vicious reality full of intrigues and enemies.

For I. M. Dolgorukov, service was a moral duty, to which he devoted himself wholeheartedly and zealously. At a time when patriotism was one of the identifying values of a worthy nobleman, in the autobiography, the memoirist emphasises his patriotic attitude. He demonstrates his devotion to the motherland and the monarch by fulfilling all the duties assigned to him by the emperor. Despite his distaste for a military career, I. M. Dolgorukov took part in the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790. In addition, he did not hesitate to undertake various unpleasant tasks required by his administrative activities.

The prince saw his service not only as a duty, but also as a personal responsibility and strove to be a competent and fair administrator. As governor of Vladimir, he tried to introduce a more “human” model of government, probably inspired by the political ideas of Catherine the Great. Faithful to the enlightened precept to altruistically serve the “common good”, I. M. Dolgorukov was the initiator of a wide philanthropic activity in the administered territories. The construction of buildings, the improvements in the infrastructure, and the attempts to promote culture in the province are just some of his deeds described in *Povest’*. The zeal of the prince as a governor is also highlighted

by the many journeys (another major aspect of the life of an 18th-century and 19th-century administrator) that he undertook to properly and efficiently administrate the lands entrusted to him. The autobiographer also represents himself as a “sensitive” governor who showed compassion to the villagers during the recruitment campaigns. Finally, Ivan Mikhailovich creates symbolic episodes that emphasise his loyalty to the emperor even when the latter entrusted him with undesirable mansions.

Only once does I. M. Dolgorukov express his categorical dissatisfaction with his assigned position. He considered humiliating his post in the Salt Office as it was not up to his capacities and his prestigious social rank. The author’s sarcasm in describing this period of his life also denounces the inability of the central administration to take advantage of the ideas and dedication of many aristocrats like him, who were ready to contribute to the progress of the country. In *Povest’*, the Salt Office is transformed into a symbol of the ridiculousness and inefficiency of the imperial bureaucracy.

In the autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov writes about the for him painful topic of his resignation. Convinced that he had been the victim of an injustice, he experienced the end of his career as a personal drama. Nonetheless, even outside the service, the autobiographer continued to follow the noble ethic of duty and refused to ask for a pension to ease his financial situation. For him, not material benefits but honour was the leading principle in his career.

The self-idealization as an excellent servant of the emperor is typical of male memoir prose of the 18th and early 19th centuries. In this regard, many parallels can be found between I. M. Dolgorukov’s autobiographical narrative and G. R. Derzhavin’s autobiography.

The section **“4.3. «Sluzhit’ otechestvu s userdiyem [...] v bezotechestvennom tsarstve, yest’ khimera [...] i goryachka molodogo voobrazheniya». Dolgorukovskaya bor’ba s nespravedlivost’yu”** (“4.3. “Sluzhit’ otechestvu s userdiyem [...] v bezotechestvennom tsarstve, yest’ khimera [...] i goryachka molodogo voobrazheniya”. **I. M. Dolgorukov’s Struggle with Injustice**”, pp. 144–147) analyses other apologetic strategies used by I. M. Dolgorukov in *Povest’*.

In this part of the PhD thesis, attention is paid to Ivan Mikhailovich’s narrative tactics in the account of his service. The writer alternates ironic passages with serious analytical reflections. For example, in an atypical (for the time) way, irony dominates the description of the years spent in the army. The memoirist presents military life in a comical, even farcical way. At the same time, I. M. Dolgorukov often reflects on the pitiful state of the military-administrative system of the Russian Empire. He saw in this non-idyllic reality the main reason for his unsuccessful career. In the prince’s apology, the change of tone in the narrative is a rhetorical artifice that aims to win the reader’s sympathy and to bring the reading public to his point of view.

To more convincingly argue his critical attitude towards the Russian administrative system and, respectively, the validity of the idealised portrait he gives of himself as an administrator, in the

autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov lists and comments in detail many of the shortcomings of the bureaucratic world of the Russian Empire.

The following subsections of this chapter examine the description of the flaws of the Russian military and bureaucratic system, which I. M. Dolgorukov made with the intention of justifying the premature and unfortunate end of his career. His criticism also has the purpose of emphasizing his qualities as a loyal subject, always concerned for the “common good”.

“4.3.1. «Sluzhba [...] prikhodila chas ot chasu v upadok». Korrupsiya i yustitsiya” (“4.3.1. “Sluzhba [...] prikhodila chas ot chasu v upadok”. Corruption and Justice”, pp. 147–152) focuses on the pivotal themes of corruption and justice in the autobiographical narrative of I. M. Dolgorukov. In *Povest’*, the author systematically deconstructs the official myth of the Russian committed and wholehearted bureaucrat, showing the drastic discrepancy between this idealized image and reality. According to the author, in the professional world the merits and qualities of the individual are neglected. Everything seems to be dominated by “chance” (in the sense of favouritism), transforming the service in the realm of chaos and corruption. Moreover, in his autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov gives a rich inventory of examples of exploitation, bribery, and fraud. The memoirist shares the interpretation and representation of these phenomena, given by Russian satirical literature of the period. As the province was one of the privileged places where abuses could widespread, it became the main target of the writer’s sarcasm. I. M. Dolgorukov’s description of this reality is particularly interesting because it has many similarities with the satirical representation of the Russian periphery made by Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin a few decades later in his collections of stories from provincial life.

Corruption is so pervasive, claims I. M. Dolgorukov, that laws are completely ineffective. Even the government’s initiatives to stop the phenomenon did not yield any results. The autobiographer notes the completely vitiate functioning of the Russian judicial system. In developing this theme (as well as the career plot in general), the writer relies on the rich repertoire of motifs familiar to him from satirical literature. Like Antioch Dmitrievich Kantemir, Alexander Petrovich Sumarokov, Vasily Vasilievich Kapnist, Ivan Ivanovich Khemnitser, and as in many of his own satirical poems, I. M. Dolgorukov depicts an absurd judicial world in which trials are based on bribes and not on the establishment of the legal order.

In this way, in *Povest’*, it is built a convincing background for the author’s self-defence. Often involved in “biased” trials, the prince includes in his autobiography documents, letters, etc., which demonstrate his innocence. Since the usually great social activity of the male autobiographers, these “collages” are generally characteristic of their ego-texts.

“4.3.2. «Reviziya trebuyet uma, smetlivosti, poznaniy». Revizii i byurokratizatsiya” (“4.3.2. “Reviziya trebuyet uma, smetlivosti, poznaniy”. Revisions and Bureaucratization”, pp. 152–154) describes and analyses the autobiographer’s attitude towards revisions and the process of bureaucratization, typical of the service reality of the time and considered by him vicious and dangerous.

According to Ivan Mikhailovich, the revisions and espionage did not respect the noble code of honour and threatened the values of the Russian nobility, calling into question the necessary mutual trust between the sovereign and his subjects. In *Povest’*, the author states that these practices caused only fear, which, in the literary paradigm of classicism, was associated with tyrannical authority. Moreover, I. M. Dolgorukov uses irony to point out the absolute uselessness of these control methods.

As anticipated, the autobiographer also criticizes the process of bureaucratization that began to spread in the Russian Empire at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. I. M. Dolgorukov saw this change in the administrative system as a danger to the political hegemony of the *dvoryanstvo*. In his ego-text, the prince exposes symptomatic cases of the moral decay in the imperial bureaucracy and fervently condemns “impermissible” praxis. All this is the memoirist’s way to defend the privileges and moral code of his social class. For him, only the *dvoryany* possessed a developed “civic sense” and served the motherland in a worthy way. In this way, I. M. Dolgorukov testifies to his strong sense of belonging to the noble elite and the interiorization of its scale of values.

In *Povest’*, the depicted service reality is dominated by enmities and rivalries as well. This aspect is the focus of the subsection **“4.3.3. «Shayka moikh vragov i tam, i syam byla ochen’ velika». Vrazhda, zavist’ i obidy v mire sluzhby” (“4.3.3. “Shayka moikh vragov i tam, i syam byla ochen’ velika”. Hostility, Envy and Offences in the World of the Imperial Service”, pp. 154–157)**. In the examined autobiographical narrative, the figure of an antagonist is always present. The latter takes the form of greedy merchants, corrupt officials, nonbenevolent superiors and colleagues. Ivan Mikhailovich assigned the role of enemy even to the emperors Paul I and Alexander I. The theme of foes is particularly functional for the prince’s autobiographical aims. In fact, the self-identification of the “I” is also built through the contrast between the “Self” and the malicious “Others”. The negative portraits of his antagonists corroborate the autobiographer’s positive image. The memoirist represents himself as a man with an unbreakable value system whom the numerous attacks of his opponents cannot undermine. At the same time, seeking the sympathy of the reader, the prince takes on the role of an innocent victim of the envy and treachery of his antagonists. To complete his self-idealization, I. M. Dolgorukov claims that he did not suffer so much from personal offenses, but rather from the consequences of his enemies’ intrigues, which harmed the “common good”.

The subsection **“4.3.5. «Peterburg, et[aj] Gomorr[aj] nashego vremeni». Stolitsa i sud’ba kar’yery”** (**“4.3.5. “Peterburg, et[aj] Gomorr[aj] nashego vremeni”. Capital and Career Fortune”, pp. 157–160**) examines the image of St. Petersburg and its role in the career world, depicted in *Povest’*. The capital of the Russian Empire was a place that offered great opportunities for those seeking a successful social and professional ascent. The stay in the city was even an obligatory stage in the professional biography of every nobleman. Using a “climatic” metaphor, I. M. Dolgorukov explains that the distance from the capital could lead to a cool down in the relations with the “sun-emperor”, since the nobleman could remain untouched by the rays of his generosity. The service of I. M. Dolgorukov also began in Petersburg. The young prince was at first struck by the magnificence of the gatherings and ceremonies at the court of Catherine II. Over time, however, his perception of the city and its atmosphere changed. He began to perceive it as a space of hypocrisy, aristocratic arrogance, and bureaucratic heartlessness. This depiction is present in his poetry as well. The autobiographer associated St. Petersburg with the more critical and humiliating episodes of his career. In the capital he was forced to defend himself against the intrigues of his enemies, without receiving any sympathy and assistance from the powerful metropolitan bureaucrats. Therefore, for the writer, the city became the symbolic place of all the persecutions suffered. In it, the author represents himself as a kind of martyr, who fought for the truth and the preservation of noble values.

“4.3.5. «Chin i pochesti sut’ khimery». Opasnoye ocharovaniye china i ordenov” (**“4.3.5. “Chin i pochesti sut’ khimery”. The Dangerous Charm of Ranks and Orders”, pp. 160–165**) develops and argues the thesis that the attitude towards rank and orders is an important aspect of the story line, which in the autobiography of I. M. Dolgorukov is devoted to service. The obtaining of a new rank or order officially showed the advancement and change in social status of a Russian nobleman and had an immediate impact on his public image and way of life. For the ambitious I. M. Dolgorukov, rank promotion and orders became an obsessive idea, which influenced the construction of his autobiographical myth. At the beginning of the *Povest’*, the acquisition of new ranks underlined the untypical rapidity with which Ivan Mikhailovich reached prestigious positions in the “Table of Ranks”. When his career came to a standstill, the lack of rewards, he thought he deserved, was used by the prince to represent himself as a victim of the intrigues of his enemies.

The change in the pace of his professional growth affected the memoirist’s attitude to officialdom and its form of recognitions. For example, the young I. M. Dolgorukov severely criticized the practice of enrolling noble children into the army at birth. Nonetheless, when Paul I abolished this form of abuse and his sons were deprived of this privilege, he became the defender of the practice. His views on the importance of rapid career successes changed as well. If, at first, he proudly described his rapid professional rise, then, due to his personal experience, he became sceptical of

every quick career development. According to him, the obsession with rank and order was a longing of empty-headed, vain, and ambitious nobleman. Despite this, I. M. Dolgorukov continued to aspire for promotion in the service. He was convinced that his diligence, his assiduity, and his rigour deserved public praise and recognition. These contrasting points of view manifest a tendency characteristic of the then representatives of the *dvoryanstvo*. Many of them, including Ivan Mikhailovich, questioned the value of ranks and orders due to their often-unfair distribution. At the same time, they continued to feel the great importance they had in society and in the regulation of social relations.

Another decisive factor for the career of a Russian nobleman of the 18th and early 19th centuries was clientelism, which in turn became a significant theme in the prince's autobiographical narrative. This social practice is the subject of the rubric **“4.4. «Ya znakomilsya s lyud'mi bol'shogo sveta, nakhodil pokroviteley, uchastnikov v moyey sud'be i sluzhbe». I. M. Dolgorukov i patron-kliyentskiye otnosheniya”** (“4.4. **“Ya znakomilsya s lyud'mi bol'shogo sveta, nakhodil pokroviteley, uchastnikov v moyey sud'be i sluzhbe”**. **I. M. Dolgorukov and the Patron-client Relations**”, pp. 165–172). Patronage had been a system spread throughout Europe since ancient times. In the Russian Empire it gained wide popularity and remained one of the main regulators of political and social life longer than in other European countries. Patronage was based on family ties or simply close relationships with influential individuals. Probably under the influence of sentimentalism, I. M. Dolgorukov often emphasised the closeness and friendship he had with his patrons. For him, a real benefactor was the one who provided not only social, but also emotional support to the protégé. In the ego-text, I. M. Dolgorukov repeatedly notes the important role of patrons in his life and in that of his loved ones. He attributed many of his father's career failures to the parent's inability to submit himself to an influential benefactor. Unlike his father, the memoirist was constantly looking for patrons and tried to maintain his good relationship with them. For reaching this aim, it was necessary to observe an impeccable moral conduct, which did not discredit the name of those who took care of a client.

In *Povest'*, Ivan Mikhailovich expresses his usual contradictory opinion about clientelism. On the one hand, he recognizes the benefits that patronage provided for the protégé, especially in his career development. On the other hand, he also points out the various negative consequences caused by this system of protections (incompetent officials in important positions, disregard for moral values, favouritism, etc.). The writer distinguished two types of patrons, i.e., benevolent patrons and false benefactors who did not care about their client and sought only public popularity. In the autobiography, the prince expresses his sincere gratitude to the former, who were often magnanimous noblewomen. Instead, I. M. Dolgorukov is critical of the false benefactors because they, driven by

selfish considerations, neglected their moral obligations and undermined the prestige of this informal institution regulating the Russian social life. In general, Ivan Mikhailovich was convinced of the impossibility of living without patronage and always tried to present himself as a loyal client.

The service for a Russian nobleman was inextricably linked with the figure of the emperor. Therefore, the section **“4.5. «Tsar’ – vse! On zakon! On istina! On Bog zemnoy!»». Otnosheniya mezhdru imperatorskoy vlast’yu i poddannymi”** (“4.5. **“Tsar’ – vse! On zakon! On istina! On Bog zemnoy!”**. **Imperial Power and Subjects**”, pp. 173–186) reconstructs the relationship between I. M. Dolgorukov and the monarchs. In the 18th and early 19th centuries, the form of political government and the role of the ruler were current and widely discussed topics. They were recurring themes in the works of several Russian writers of the epoch, who criticized despotism and exalted the model of the “enlightened monarchy”. Among them, there was I. M. Dolgorukov. Both in his poetry and in *Povest’*, he openly expresses his inclination to enlightened absolutism, rejecting any form of despotic power. In the autobiography, his political ideas are a criterion for evaluating both the Russian rulers of the past (Peter I, Anna Ioannovna, Elisaveta Alekseevna) and contemporary ones. In fact, the memoirist lived under the reign of three emperors (Catherine II, Paul I and Alexander I), leaving his own opinion about each of them.

The reign of Catherine II is presented as the happiest period in the life of the writer, during which he achieved his greatest career successes. I. M. Dolgorukov idealises the empress, whom he considered the embodiment of an enlightened ruler. Her political and legislative reforms, her bold foreign policy, her educational and cultural initiatives were the object of the prince’s respect and admiration. Ivan Mikhailovich particularly appreciated the magnanimity and tolerance shown by the empress towards her subjects. Even when some political decisions of Catherine II seemed strange to him, his unconditional faith in her wisdom dissolved all doubts about the correctness of her behaviour.

If, for the memoirist, Catherine II personified his ideal of a monarch, her successor Paul I was a tyrant and a “new Nero”, prone to paranoia and madness. The latter did not even respect such a sacred bond as devotion to the mother. The personal resentment of the author, who felt deceived and betrayed by Paul I, contributed to the enrichment of the negative portrait of this sovereign. During Catherine’s reign, the heir to the throne paid particularly attention to I. M. Dolgorukov. After the death of the empress, he sharply changed his attitude towards Ivan Mikhailovich, becoming one of the main enemies of the memoirist. As a result, in *Povest’*, Paul I is portrayed as a despot, unable to appreciate and reward I. M. Dolgorukov’s zeal to serve the motherland. However, despite the joy with which the autobiographer welcomed the death of the emperor, he did not approve of regicide. According to him, the murder of the ruler foretold misfortunes for the country and his personal life. Indeed, once again,

the hopes of I. M. Dolgorukov to restore the glory of his family were destroyed since the new emperor did not show much inclination to appreciate the writer's devotion to service.

Ivan Mihailovich's judgement of the reign of Alexander I is essentially no different from that of his father. For the memoirist, the new sovereign was a "tyrant" who hid his despotism behind the mask of benevolence. Contrary to the official propaganda, the prince depicts Alexander I not as an "angel on the throne" (Wortman 2002a: 261) but as a heartless hypocrite, who unjustly ended his career. This caused I. M. Dolgorukov's distancing from the court. As Elena Nigmatova Marasinova notes, the loss of trust in the emperor was a tendency shared by many other nobles of the late 18th and early 19th centuries (Marasinova 2008: 308–387). In the PhD thesis, this shift is also confirmed through the analysis of the author's changing attitude towards the "scenarios of power"³¹ of the Russian rulers.

In contrast to the admiration and euphoric transport of the memoirist in front of the magnificent celebrations of Catherine II's reign, the ceremonies organized at the court of Paul I and Alexander I are described critically. I. M. Dolgorukov considered Paul I's celebrations as a demonstration of his despotic ambitions. On the other hand, the modesty of Alexander I's "rituals of power" was a proof of the falseness of the monarch. In his description of this form of imperial propaganda, I. M. Dolgorukov shows that the heirs of Catherine II were looking for an answer to the crisis of the monarchical institution after the French Revolution. If Paul I sought to restore the signs and symbols of the old absolute monarchy, Alexander I tried to destroy them (Wortman 2002a: 228). In the author's view, both solutions were unacceptable because in both cases the trust and respect between the nobles and the sovereign, achieved by Catherine II, had been lost.

The section **“4.6. «O! Politika togo vremeni obil'na byla v materialakh dlya razgovora!».** **Politicheskaya identichnost' kn. I. M. Dolgorukova**” (**“4.6. “O! Politika togo vremeni obil'na byla v materialakh dlya razgovora!”.** **The Political Profile of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov**”, pp. **186–193**) completes the author's autobiographical public portrait by outlining his political profile. Political views were an important aspect of a 18th-century and early 19th-century nobleman's worldview, as the *dvoryanstvo* was the main political actor in the Russian Empire of the time. Moreover, political events often change the self-perception of the “I” and, subsequently, influence autobiographical writing. The political positions and comments, collected in the *Povest'*, allow to reconstruct I. M. Dolgorukov's political thoughts and to highlight their dependence or not on public common ideas.

³¹ The expression is taken from the titles of Richard Wortman's famous monographs devoted to the reconstruction of the symbolic meaning of the court rituals of Russian emperors (Wortman 2002a; Wortman 2002b).

In this part of the PhD thesis, the attitude of the memoirist to two famous statesmen of his time, namely Grigory Alexandrovich Potemkin and Mikhail Mikhailovich Speranskiy, is presented. The autobiographer mythologizes the “prince of Taurida” using the image of the “bogatyř”, which in the collective consciousness of the time was generally associated with G. A. Potemkin. The writer points out the physical, behavioural, and political exceptionality of the famous Catherine II’s favourite. Instead, the representation of M. M. Speranskiy is based on the memoirist’s personal impressions and contradicts the widespread negative portrait of this historical character among the nobles, who were dissatisfied by his reform projects. The most powerful and influential adviser of Alexander I is described by I. M. Dolgorukov as a brilliant statesman, a delicate interlocutor, and a victim of the imperial capriciousness.

The research demonstrates that I. M. Dolgorukov was conservative in politics. A staunch defender of the privileges of the Russian nobility, the writer criticized Alexander I’s attempts to introduce a constitution. Both in *Povest’* and in his travelogues, Ivan Mikhailovich expresses distrust towards the constitutional monarchy and claims that Russia was not ready for it.

The political theme plays an important role in the autobiographic apologetic discourse. In his youth, the writer was suspected and accused of sympathizing with the French Revolution. Therefore, the author always felt the need to categorically deny that he was ever tempted by republican ideas.

Instead, in the controversies related to the “Europeanization” of Russia, I. M. Dolgorukov had a compromise position. According to him, only the valuable European experience should have been assimilated, while extremes should have been avoided to preserve the Russian national identity and culture. His desire to be objective in the assessment of the value of both “his” and “foreign” cultural models caused him accusations of xenophile attitudes. Therefore, in his texts the writer explains his personal view of patriotism. I. M. Dolgorukov clearly differentiated and opposed the concepts of “*otechestvo*” (“fatherland”) and “*rodina*” (“motherland”). For him, the former had rather political semantics and was subject to different interpretations, while the latter was associated with the place of birth, traditions, and people with whom the individual was emotionally connected. Love for “*rodina*” was natural and spontaneous, while attachment to the “*otechestvo*” was rationally based and depended on the social recognition a person received by the monarch and society. As a result, I. M. Dolgorukov considered himself a real patriot, always sentimentally connected to the “*rodina*”, whereas his attitude towards the “*otechestvo*” was rather critical or, at best, restrained.

Thus, career was central to the worldview of the autobiographer, a typical nobleman of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. In *Povest'*, one can observe the change in the function of the theme of service, which from a means of praise of the author's persona and career successes becomes the leitmotif of his apologetic discourse. In the construction of his autobiographical myth in public life, the prince uses the codes of classicism, which explain the constant emphasis on his personal cult of duty. Moreover, to present the corrupt reality of the Russian Empire, I. M. Dolgorukov relies on the wide repertoire of motifs and images offered by Russian satirical literature, always committed to exposing the abnormalities in the Russian society of the time.

The last chapter **“KN. I. M. DOLGORUKOV I DVORYANSKAYA OBSHCHESTVENNAYA ZHIZN' XVIII – NACHALA XIX VEKA” (“PRINCE I. M. DOLGORUKOV AND THE DVORYANSTVO PUBLIC LIFE OF THE 18TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 19TH CENTURIES”, pp. 196–272)** is devoted to the analysis of the autobiographical portrait that I. M. Dolgorukov gives of himself in the lively Russian cultural panorama of the last decades of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. In this respect, *Povest'* provides a valuable repertoire of the social and cultural codes and matrixes of the noble life of the time.

The section **“5.1. Kul'tura i individ v avtobiograficheskom portrete kn. I. M. Dolgorukova” (“5.1. Culture and the Individual in the Autobiographical Portrait of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov”, pp. 196–197)** is based on the study approach to autobiographical narratives proposed by Roy Pascal. The researcher finds a close connection between self-description and the cultural context to which the author of an ego-text belongs (Pascal 2017: 8). I. M. Dolgorukov did not limit himself to being a careful observer of his surrounding reality but used cultural codes to build his autobiographical myth. The choice of one or another topic in his autobiography is never accidental but acquires importance in the interpretive act of his past. The sections of this chapter examine the various aspects of noble culture that the author treats to present himself as a worthy representative of his social class.

The proverbial opposition between the metropolitan and provincial Russian nobility is clearly present in I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiography. The rubric **“5.2. «Ya byl ne patriot penzenskiy, a emigrant moskovskiy». Stolitsy i provintsiya” (“4.2. “Ya byl ne patriot penzenskiy, a emigrant moskovskiy”. The Capitals and the Province”, pp. 197-202)** explores the narrator's view on three *topoi* (Petersburg, Moscow, and the province) as a manifestation of his self-identification. The writer belonged by birth to the prestigious Moscow nobility. For him, the old Russian capital was the

cherished place to which he remained sentimentally attached until the end of his life. On the contrary, the city on the Neva was a repulsive and largely hostile space. In the ego-text, the latter is depicted as a hypocrite and selfish reality, while Moscow is the true “heart” of the country. The description of the two capitals is based on their opposition along the “own” – “other” axis. In the autobiographical narrative (and in his poetry), I. M. Dolgorukov repeatedly expresses his strong emotional attachment to his birthplace. The author writes lyrical-pathetic passages in which he describes his feelings caused by his returning to or leaving Moscow. For Ivan Mikhailovich, the ancient capital emblemized Russian history and was a symbol of the heroic Russian spirit. For this reason, he did not fail to express his indignation at its abandonment in the hands of the enemy during the Napoleonic invasion in 1812.

Completely opposite emotions were those that the prince felt towards the provincial reality. During his service, he, a representative of Moscow’s cultural elite, had to deal with the retrograde provincial society and its bureaucracy. Life in the periphery of the Russian Empire was far from the memoirist’s high and enlightened standards. From his point of view, the countryside was a barbaric and uncultured world. His attempts to “civilize” the places he administrated proved unsuccessful. To show his complete distance from the provincial milieu, the autobiographer resorts to his loved irony in the description of the local society’s desire to imitate metropolitan mores.

The subsection “5.2.1. *«Eto svoye, eto domashneye». Dom i imeniye»* (“5.2.1. *“Eto svoye, eto domashneye». Home and Estate”, pp. 202-207*) analyses and interprets the memoirist’s relationship to the *loci* of home and estate as possible spaces of self-identification.

In *Povest’*, the writer professes his reverent attachment to the Moscow family home. For I. M. Dolgorukov, the stone house, built by his father, symbolized not only the family’s belonging to the prestigious Moscow elite, but also part of the family history and the relationship between the different generations in it. The Moscow property was also his personal refuge from the life troubles. Therefore, the prince stresses his attachment to the place by the detailed description of his efforts to restore the family church after the occupation of Moscow by the French in 1812. In particular, he highlights that rare objects belonging to his “ancestors” were kept in the family religious place. Ivan Mikhailovich emphasises his care in renovating the houses in which he lived while accomplishing his duties as vice governor in Penza and governor in Vladimir as well.

The home environment was the main source of poetic inspiration for the prince. The cabinet was his preferred secluded place for writing poems. Sometimes even some element of the domestic interior became the object of poetic inspiration, as shown in the poem *Kamin*. For I. M. Dolgorukov,

the home was a socio-cultural locus³², which had a high symbolic value in forming his individuality. However, debts forced the prince to consider selling the home several times, which caused him reluctance and a painful sense of guilt.

The autobiographer was far less attached to his estates. For example, in *Povest'*, Nikolskoe is presented as a "*locus horribilis*", because it was associated with the author's saddest memories. The negative semantic aura attributed to this estate contradicts the cultural paradigm of the time, according to which "noble nests" were seen through the "earthly paradise" mythologeme (Shchukin 2007: 222). The non-idyllic representation of Nikolskoe provides a justification for the decision of I. M. Dolgorukov to sell the estate to alleviate the financial situation of his family.

Despite his antipathy to the countryside, I. M. Dolgorukov represents himself as an excellent landowner. To this self-characteristic is devoted the subsection "5.2.2. «*Nakonets sdelalsya pomeshchikom odnoy nuzhde i nishchete*». *Pomeshchik i krest'yane*" ("5.2.2. "*Nakonets sdelalsya pomeshchikom odnoy nuzhde i nishchete*". *The Landlord and the Peasants*", pp. 207–212). As in his political views, I. M. Dolgorukov was a conservative landlord. However, if he was not a supporter of innovations in the management of his estates and the cultivation of the land, he was more progressive in the treatment of his serfs. At a time when philanthropy was encouraged by the press and by sentimentalism, Ivan Mihailovich emphasises his "enlightened", sympathetic, and benevolent attitude towards his peasants. This does not mean that he supported the abolition of serfdom, a hotly debated issue at the time. Once again, *Povest'* records the change in the author's point of view about the matter. If in his youth the prince condemned the "barbarism" of this institution, in his old age he became its supporter. I. M. Dolgorukov believed that Alexander I's project to free the peasants was unrealistic. According to him (and many other nobles), the reform threatened the privileges of the *dvoryanstvo*. Furthermore, the peasants, due to their ignorance and moral backwardness, were not prepared for it. Behind these judgments probably lies one of the greatest fears of the Russian elite: the danger of peasant revolts. A fear made even more frightening for the memoirist by his traumatic childhood memories of the Pugachev uprising. I. M. Dolgorukov attributed the sudden impoverishment of his family to this historical upheaval. In this regard, the PhD thesis highlights that the theme of debts is a recurring topic not only in the Russian literature of the time, but also in *Povest'*. The difficult situation is a leitmotif, through which the prince seeks compassion and sympathy from his reader. Nonetheless, it should be noted that, despite I. M. Dolgorukov's claims, his economic condition was not at all catastrophic. Therefore, the memoirist's constant laments reveal his wounded

³² Vasily Georgievich Shchukin characterizes the function of these places as follows: "[Socio-cultural loci] act as repositories of different meanings and types of memory: personal, family, as well as collective, cultural and mythopoetic memory" (Shchukin 2007: 177).

class pride and dissatisfaction with his failure to secure the standards of living he considered appropriate for his title and family history.

The section **“5.3. «Ya lyubil prirodu, no v ubranstve roskoshnom». I. M. Dolgorukov i priroda”** (**“5.3. “Ya lyubil prirodu, no v ubranstve roskoshnom”. I. M. Dolgorukov and Nature”, pp. 212–219**) shifts the focus of the attention to I. M. Dolgorukov’s reception of one of the new cultural paradigms of the epoch. Between the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, a revolutionary and unprecedented sensibility to the natural world spread in Europe and Russia. Thanks to sentimentalism and early romanticism, a true obsession with nature emerged. The influence of the new “natural” rhetoric is evident in the ego-texts of I. M. Dolgorukov. Especially in the writer’s travelogues, there are many clichés that praise nature. In *Povest’*, there are passages exalting the charms of landscapes, sunsets, etc. On the other hand, in this ego-text it can be seen how in the everyday life of the Russian nobleman, nature was mainly associated with parks and gardens. The author expresses his amazement at the superb green corners created in the rich mansions of important political personality. I. M. Dolgorukov states his preference for the then popular English garden, in which the owner combined nature and art, inserting monuments, fountains and various elements aimed at surprising the visitor.

Yuriy Mihailovich Lotman and Vasily Georgievich Shchukin note that, in the semiotized everyday life of the Russian aristocrats, different types of space also determined specific pattern of behaviour. In the estate, the nobles behaved more sincerely and simply. Nonetheless, Ivan Mikhailovich was aware how far the “natural life”, boasted by the Russian elite, was from the harsh reality of rural life. In fact, in the aristocratic culture of the time, nature was primarily associated with the estate and its entertainments.

The PhD thesis analyses the changing attitude towards nature in the autobiographical narrative. Initially, the author showed a weak inclination to the natural world and preferred urban leisure. Over time, instead, nature was transformed in an important element in the memoirist’s self-representation. Under the influence of sentimentalism and early romanticism, the natural world became the place where the prince sought peace from his love torments. Nature consoled him after his humiliating resignation and inspired his literary works. On the other hand, in *Povest’*, Ivan Mikhailovich lists all the dangers of rural life (lack of doctors, accidents, etc.) as well. These are only partial contradictions in his worldview. It could be said that the memoirist remained true to himself. For him, nature could only be appreciated if there was a trace of human intervention in it.

The topic of the following section **“5.4. «Ya sovsem ne znatok v meditsine». Meditsina i zdorovye”** (**“5.4. “Ya sovsem ne znatok v meditsine”. Medicine and Health”, pp. 219–231**) is the memoirist’s attitude towards medicine, the new achievements of science and his understanding of man. Unlike many other male autobiographers of that time, in *Povest’*, I. M. Dolgorukov often focuses on medical issues.

The interest of the writer is not surprising. In 18th-century Russia, terrible pandemics, innovative treatments, and many rapid advances in medicine were popular issues in newspapers, literary works, and sparked public debate. In the text, the pages devoted to health matters help the author to achieve the goals of his autobiographical writing, illuminating interesting and even unexpected aspects of his self-image.

In *Povest’*, I. M. Dolgorukov specifies that a patient at that time could rely on traditional forms of folk medicine, religion, and doctors. Regarding the latter, the author expresses his usual contradictory opinions. He defended the work of medics, but also repeatedly complained about their inefficiency in the fight against diseases. By doing this, he shows to have been influenced by the then distrust in medical practitioner, widespread in the Russian collective consciousness.

The memoirist was intrigued by some of the new therapies and treatments introduced into practice during his life. For example, he was a supporter of animal magnetism. Vaccines were another medical innovation that attracted his attention. In *Povest’*, I. M. Dolgorukov admires Catherine II, who bravely tested the vaccine on herself and her son. The empress’ “experiment” had the expected effect. Ivan Mikhailovich, as well as many other representatives of the elite, followed her example. The prince vaccinated his sons and daughters. In this way, he proved to be a loving father, who took care of the health of his children. However, in relation to vaccines, the text shows another contradiction of the conservative I. M. Dolgorukov. Years later, the campaign to immunise all peasant children against smallpox, encouraged by Alexander I, gives the prince an occasion to sharply criticize the administration of the hated emperor. In particular, the prince points out the senselessness of the taken initiative.

The same changing opinion characterize the description of the pandemics that the author witnessed during his lifetime. Full of pathos is the memory of the plague epidemic that struck Moscow in 1770 and 1771. The event, narrated in an apocalyptic tone, was shocking because of the large number of victims caused. In the eyes of a nobleman, the plague had an even more terrible consequence: the “Plague riot”. The crowd, exhausted by the restrictive measures, rose against the authorities and literally tore the Moscow Metropolitan Amvrosiy apart. In the autobiography, the description of the chaos in the city is contrasted with the successful handling of the difficult and dangerous situation by the writer’s enlightened father, who took all possible precautions known at the

time to avoid the contagion. If in this case the memoirist praises his parent's deeds, he is much more critical of the health preventive action, introduced by Alexander I. The prince was forced to apply the emperor's directives to protect the population from the risk of another plague epidemic during his administration in Vladimir. I. M. Dolgorukov believed that the Alexander I's decrees only caused the appearance of fake news, which he, true to his duty, tried to fight in every way.

In the author's treatment of the medical theme, a humorous and a serious tone are alternated. In several episodes, the narrator ironically comments on widespread healing practices such as bloodletting or he often satirizes the application of dubious healing methods. At the same time, the health of the writer and his loved ones were an opportunity to reflect on the sense of life. This is evident when the autobiographer talks about pregnancy, at the time considered a disease. He expresses his sorrow and preoccupation for the high risk of mortality for mother and child during childbirth. Despite this sensibility, he rather selfishly denies that the life of his seriously tuberculosis-stricken spouse was at risk during her multiple pregnancies.

Diseases also fulfil other aims of I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiographical writing. The description of the long illness of his first wife and all his worries about her were a new way for the writer to prove false the accusations that he was a "bad and carelessly husband". Her disease permitted the author to denounce the insensitivity of the imperial family towards him as well. The death of his beloved daughter Mariya from tuberculosis acquires even a symbolic meaning in the narrative. Fatalistically, Ivan Mikhailovich interpreted the loss of his daughter as the price he had to pay for career success. The prince did not omit to talk about his own illnesses, among which were melancholy and hypochondria³³. The latter became fashionable among the representatives of the nobility of the period, but for the writer they were also an explanation for his literary passion. Sergey Ivanovich Nikolayev notes: "On the one hand, writing provoked hypochondria, on the other hand, writing cured this disease" (Nikolayev 2017: 15).

In the section **"5.5. «Terpet', tuzhit' i upovat' na odnogo Boga – vot yedinstvennoye pribezhishche chestnykh lyudey v nashem mire». Antiklerikalizm i vera"** ("5.5. "Terpet', tuzhit' i upovat' na odnogo Boga – vot yedinstvennoye pribezhishche chestnykh lyudey v nashem mire". **Anticlericalism and Faith**", pp. 231–240) the analysis is concentrated on religion, a primary aspect of the life of I. M. Dolgorukov. It is interesting to note that also in this case the *Povest'* traces the evolution of the writer's convictions on religious matters.

In accordance with the traditional educational practice of the *dvoryanstvo*, the author received his first Christian education in childhood. This initial religious imprint was not based on the teaching of dogmas. Rather, the autobiographer's parents only required their son to follow their example. The

³³ In the 18th century they were considered real diseases and the two terms were often used interchangeably (Otin 1986).

young I. M. Dolgorukov became interested in the ideas of deism, popular in the 18th century. In *Povest'*, the influence of the teachings of the Deists results in an often critical and satirical depiction of monasteries, churches, and clergy. This is a theme that was also popular in the satirical literature of the time. The author criticized the excessive luxury and moral degradation of the Church. This does not mean that Ivan Mikhailovich stopped visiting places of worship with interest or did not participate in religious rituals. In his ego-texts, he usually notes the progressive moral decay of the Church and its representatives. One of the rare positive portraits of a clergyman is dedicated to Platon, the Metropolitan of Moscow³⁴, whom the prince defines as an exemplary spiritual shepherd gifted with remarkable oratorical skills.

In his travelogues, I. M. Dolgorukov represents himself as a person, who is tolerant of other religions. Tolerance was one of the key words in the religious affairs of the century. Catherine II's Russia was considered an exemplary model in this regard. Moreover, Voltaire dedicated his "Treatise on Tolerance" (1763) precisely to the importance of religious acceptance. However, this book of the French philosopher attracted the criticism of I. M. Dolgorukov, who in his old age began to have an increasingly conservative vision of religion. Many of the author's personal dramas contributed to this change. After the death of his first wife Evgeniya, he commenced to explain every episode of his existence as a result of the divine will.

Certainly, one of the prince's aims was to present himself as a man of impeccable faith. Therefore, he took a clear position against Freemasonry. Despite the father's probable sympathy for Masonic lodges, they seem to have been completely alien to Ivan Mihailovich. In *Povest'*, Freemasons, described as fanatics and charlatans, are the objects of the author's sarcasm. In their representation I. M. Dolgorukov embraces many of the typical anti-Masonic ideas widespread in the Russian collective consciousness. In the PhD thesis, the anti-Masonic comedies of Catherine II are identified as one of the sources that the writer used to create his negative characterization of Freemasonry.

³⁴ Platon Levshin (1737–1812) was the Metropolitan of Moscow and one of the most prominent and active figures of the 18th-century and early 19th-century Russian Church. He strove to establish a dialogue with the Old Believers and was actively involved in improving the education standards of the clergy.

The rubric **“5.6. «[1812] God uzhasnyy v letopisyakh russkikh!»». Retseptsiya i dekonstruktsiya «metanarrativov»”** (“5.6. “[1812] God uzhasnyy v letopisyakh russkikh!”). **Reception and Deconstruction of “Metanarratives”**”, pp. 240–251) is dedicated to the question of acceptance or rejection of metanarratives³⁵ of imperial power by I. M. Dolgorukov in the construction of his autobiographical “Self”.

In this part of the research, the focus is on the prince’s deconstruction of the propaganda associated with the anti-Napoleonic campaign in Russia of 1812. The PhD thesis interprets the latter as a form of “metanarrative” or “grand narrative”, given the ideological and symbolic value attributed to the event. It is noteworthy that the testimony of I. M. Dolgorukov differs from many other ego-texts of this period, dedicated to the “Patriotic” war of 1812³⁶.

Although in *Povest’* there are some traces of the influence of the propaganda rhetoric of the time (emphasis on the “saving mission” of Russia, the unpatriotic behaviour of Napoleon’s Grand Army, parallels with the heroes of Russian history Minin and Pozharsky, etc.), the autobiography of the prince is far from the triumphant and heroic tones usually present in fiction and memoirs on the subject.

I. M. Dolgorukov was categorically against the defamatory campaigns against the French promoted by the representatives of the authorities and the clergy. Being a pacifist by nature, the author strongly condemned the bloodshed caused by the conflicts and Napoleon’s longing for power. In sharp contrast to Russian propaganda, which glorified the heroism of soldiers, in his ego-text, I. M. Dolgorukov gives a completely opposite and non-idealized image of the Russian army. The latter is represented as a mass of incompetent combatants driven exclusively by the desire to obtain rewards.

In *Povest’*, all the main actors of the “terrible” year 1812 are described. As for Napoleon, the prince was not influenced by the charisma of the famous military leader. The autobiographer deconstructs his heroic representation, portraying him as a false genius and megalomaniac, hungry only for power. Fyodor Vasilievich Rastopchin is another target of the criticism of the writer, who felt deceived by his false assurances about the defence of Moscow. On the contrary, Russian generals such as Mikhail Ilarionovich Kutuzov and Pyotr Wittgenstein earned his praise. Interestingly, the figure of Alexander I is almost missing. Laconism in the description of the role and actions of the Russian emperor can be explained by the absence of mutual sympathy between the subject and the sovereign.

³⁵ The French philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard uses the term “grand narrative” or “metanarrative” to describe epistemological theories that attempt to rationalize the world, cf. (Lyotard 1984).

³⁶ In Russia, the Napoleonic campaign of 1812 is also known as “Patriotic War (*Otechestvennaya vojna*)”. This definition is due to the fact that the entire Russian population took an active part in the conflict in an attempt to protect the homeland from the invasion of the foreign enemy.

As in most ego-texts about the Napoleonic campaign, in *Povest'* are described the Battle of Borodino, the occupation and burning of Moscow. The writer pays more attention to the last two episodes. This is due to the writer's need to respond to the new accusations that he was a supporter of the French since he was among the last residents to leave the city. The escape provides a new chance for the author to challenge another cornerstone of the official metanarrative of 1812, namely the sense of self-sacrifice and altruism of the Russian people. Far from Moscow, I. M. Dolgorukov witnessed the complete indifference of people to the terrible fate of the ancient capital of the Russian Empire.

The PhD thesis also emphasises the many parallels that can be identified between I. M. Dolgorukov's account of the events of 1812 and L. N. Tolstoy's masterpiece *War and Peace*³⁷.

In the rubric **“5.7. «Dlya vesel'ya mne vse kazhetsya vozmozhno, pristoyno i pozvolitel'no». Razvlecheniya i dosug”** (**“5.7. “Dlya vesel'ya mne vse kazhetsya vozmozhno, pristoyno i pozvolitel'no”. Entertainment and Leisure Time”, pp. 251–255**) interprets the role of the 18th-century and early 19th-century Russian aristocratic forms of recreation in the autobiographical narrative of I. M. Dolgorukov.

Yuriy Mikhailovich Lotman underlines the importance of entertainment in the life of the Russian *dvoryanstvo* (Lotman 1994: 91). In the world of public and recreative gatherings, the representatives of this social class showed their personality beyond the etiquette and limitations of everyday life. Entertainment was the favourite aspect of the writer's life. He was a great lover of parties and fun. The PhD thesis underlines that Ivan Mikhailovich attributed an important educational function to the salons in St. Petersburg and Moscow. According to the memoirist, in them young noblemen learned the correct codes of conduct in society. For the author, entertainment was also a form of consolation from the misfortunes and failures in his life. Dances, clubs, cards, etc. form the rich repertoire of recreational leisure activities mentioned in *Povest'*. Some of the prince's preferences were dictated by the new tastes of the “sentimental” public. For example, I. M. Dolgorukov represents himself as a great admirer of music, which, in his opinion, was even capable of civilizing the culturally retrograde provinces of the Russian Empire.

Fashion was another passion of the writer. Like the satirical literature of the time, the author makes fun of his obsession for fashionable and gorgeous clothes. At the same time, fashion was another means of demonstrating his belonging to the elite of the Russian Empire since clothing had

³⁷ The publication of the book caused great discussion about the historical truth of the narrative. In this regard, it should be noted that *War and Peace* by L. N. Tolstoy (1828–1910) is closely related to the Russian memoir of 1812 (Tartakovskiy 1980: 256). To write his book, the writer did extensive historical research and took into account memoirs published at the time. I. M. Dolgorukov's ego-text is not mentioned among the sources used by L. N. Tolstoy (Tolstoy 1955: 141–145). This makes the similarities between the two narratives even more striking.

an important symbolic value in the cultural codes of the *dvoryanstvo*. In the autobiography, the prince gives an important place to his greatest passions, namely theatre and literature.

The role of the former in the life of I. M. Dolgorukov is discussed in the subsection “5.7.1. «*V menya togda teatral’nyy demon vselilsya*». *Teatral’nost’ i deystvitel’nost’*” (“5.7.1. “*V menya togda teatral’nyy demon vselilsya*”. *Theatricality and Reality*”, pp. 255-258). At the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, the behaviour of the Russian nobility had a strong theatrical character. This is a feature that many scholars, from Yuriy Mihailovich Lotman (Lotman 1994; Lotman 1992a; Lotman 1992b) to Andrei Zorin (Zorin 2016), have repeatedly emphasised. In addition, as a nobleman who grew up during the Catherine era, it is not unexpected I. M. Dolgorukov’s love for the theatre.

In *Povest’*, this form of entertainment acquires an original interpretation. The author turns it into a key and symbolic component of his narrative. Being a talented playwright, director, and actor, I. M. Dolgorukov linked the theatre with the greatest joys of his existence and considered it a kind of talisman of his life. In the autobiography, the writer presents the most important events in his existence clearly related to the theatre. Thanks to his participation in amateur performances, the prince entered the circle of the court of the heir Paul Petrovich.

Theatrical performances were also a way to face the difficulties in professional life and the sorrow for the many loved ones he lost. The theatre had other significant functions for Ivan Mikhailovich. It was a form of education that taught viewers the behaviours and emotional matrices that had to be imitated. Furthermore, the theatre scene often became an interpretive key to real life. In *Povest’*, the author reports on several episodes in which the boundary between reality and theatrical fiction was violated.

The subsection “5.7.2. «*V starosti, svobode, uyedinenii, chto pitatel’neye dlya serdtsa i uma, kak knigi?*». *Knigi i chteniye*” (“5.7.2. “*V starosti, svobode, uyedinenii, chto pitatel’neye dlya serdtsa i uma, kak knigi?*”. *Books and Reading*”, pp. 258–267) reconstructs the profile of I. M. Dolgorukov as a reader. The 18th and the beginning of the 19th century was a revolutionary period for Russian reading practices. In the autobiography, the cultural scene that the memoirist describes is dominated by an interest in books. Reading is often presented as a public event and opportunity for socialization. Particularly interesting are the testimonies of I. M. Dolgorukov about his attendance at the evenings of “*Beseda lyubiteley rossiyskogo slova*”, which he tried to emulate, creating his personal version of this literary circle in Vladimir. In *Povest’*, the writer boasts his inclusion as an honorary member in the St. Petersburg literary assembly, which consoled him for the humiliating end of his career.

The spread of reading in the everyday life of the nobility was also favoured by sentimentalism and its literature, in which heroes and heroines were often presented in the act of reading. The novel became a genre of particular interest to the audience. This led I. M. Dolgorukov and his contemporaries to imitate literary characters in their behaviour, something Yuriy Mikhailovich Lotman defines as “literariness”. There are numerous examples in the autobiography of this tendency to imitate novelistic motifs and heroes. In *Povest*, the reading of letters, and above all of books, is often mentioned. From the titles cited, it can be concluded that Ivan Mikhailovich was an eclectic reader who knew Latin and French literature and read classical, romantic, renaissance, or fashionable Russian authors with great interest. In the autobiography, I. M. Dolgorukov expresses his opinion about other writers. For example, the author comments negatively on the literary production of Voltaire, Catherine II, Alexander Petrovich Sumarokov and Vasily Kirilovich Trediakovskiy. The prince criticizes the atheism in the works of the French philosopher. In the case of Catherine II, his negative opinion is due to his conviction that the literary activity could not be combined with the ruling of the empire³⁸. As for A. P. Sumarokov and V. K. Trediakovskiy, I. M. Dolgorukov thinks that their work did not fit into the new taste of the “sentimental” public and into the aesthetic canons promoted by sentimentalism and romanticism. Ivan Mikhailovich’s comments about modern authors are laconic. Rare are the pages of his ego-texts in which the memoirist focuses on his fellow penmen. Usually, such fragments are implicit forms of (self) praise of his literary talent and his own poetic ideas. For example, the expressed admiration for the poetry of Vasilii Lvovich Pushkin allows I. M. Dolgorukov to expose his views on the “correct” approach to satirical writing. Ivan Mikhailovich mentions the encounter with Mikhail Matveevich Kheraskov because of the “poetic investiture” that, during the meeting, he received from the author of the first Russian epic poem³⁹. The omission of memories about Vasilii Andreevich Zhukovsky, whom the prince knew personally during the years spent in the Salt Office, is striking. Resentment against the famous poet, generational differences and personal antipathy are the reasons for the absence of V. A. Zhukovsky among the characters of *Povest*⁴⁰ (Kuznetsova & Mel’tsin 2014a). However, in the literary portrait of the latter, contained in *Kapishche moyego serdtsa...*, I. M. Dolgorukov curiously represents himself as one of the first literary mentors of the still young poet.

³⁸ On the contrary, Catherine II considered literature a crucial tool of her cultural policy. Vera Proskurina and Andrey Zorin devote their research to this aspect of the empress’s political program, cf. (Zorin 2001; Proskurina 2017).

³⁹ Mikhail Matveevich Kheraskov (1733–1807) was the author of *Rossyada* (1779), which is considered the first canonical example of an epic poem in Russia. Written according to the canons of classicism, the poetic text recounts the capture of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible.

⁴⁰ In the autobiography, V. A. Zhukovsky is mentioned only once *en passant*.

In the last subsection “5.7.3. «*Ya staralsya [...] zanyat’sya literaturoy, kak yedinstvennym moim pribezhishchem vo vremena nenastnyye*». *Pisatel’ i poet*” (“5.7.3. “*Ya staralsya [...] zanyat’sya literaturoy, kak yedinstvennym moim pribezhishchem vo vremena nenastnyye*”. *I. M. Dolgorukov As a Writer and Poet*”, pp. 267–271), the self-image of I. M. Dolgorukov as a writer and poet is presented.

In the 18th and early 19th centuries, there was still no professionalization of the figure of the writer, which is why authors often felt the need to justify their passion for literature. During the life of the prince there were two different writing paradigms. On the one hand, there was the model of G. R. Derzhavin, which gave more importance to the career than to the literary activity. On the other hand, there was the example of N. M. Karamzin, who made writing the main occupation of his life. The PhD thesis shows that I. M. Dolgorukov was closer to G. R. Derzhavin’s model, since he saw literature as a worthy entertainment in leisure time. However, in his self-portrait as a writer, Ivan Mikhailovich adopted many of N. M. Karamzin’s ideas about the qualities an author should possess. Sincerity, sensitivity, good heart, etc. were some of the characteristics that the prince attributed to himself as a writer and borrowed from N. M. Karamzin’s views.

The eclecticism of Ivan Mihailovich, a representative of the conservative literary group “*Beseda lyubiteley rossiyskogo slova*” but also interested in the novelties of sentimentalist literature, sometimes seems to have caused complexes in the writer, who felt like an “outsider” in the literary panorama of the time.

Although I. M. Dolgorukov did not leave treatises on poetics, his literary ideas and principles are exposed in the autobiography. For example, the author emphasises the “domestic” character of his poems and criticizes the “utilitarian” use of literature. The research also underlines the ever-increasing importance that literary activity acquired in the author’s life. Especially after the humiliating end of his career, prose and poetry became a new vital mission for I. M. Dolgorukov.

For the memoirist, the involvement in the cultural dynamic reality of his time was an important aspect of the creation of his autobiographical image. Ivan Mikhailovich modelled his self-portrait in accordance with those cultural codes and matrices that identified him as a culturally developed representative of the Russian *dvoryanstvo*.

“ZAKLYUCHENIYE” (“FINAL REMARKS”, pp. 273–277) of the PhD thesis summarizes the results achieved in the research. This part confirms the importance of studying sources, works and authors considered “secondary” because they allow a better understanding of past and contemporary phenomena, offering interesting new interpretive keys to reality.

In particular, the analysis of *Povest'* permits a deeper insight into the problems of autobiographical prose (sincerity of the author, fictionalization, etc.), the identification of some typological characteristics of the rare male autobiographies from the second half of the 18th century and the first decades of the 19th century and the highlighting of the writer's specific and innovative autobiographical narrative strategies.

The research reconstructs the complex and multifaceted personality of the author. As shown, I. M. Dolgorukov wanted to assess his status as a representative of the ancient Moscow nobility. This desire, along with his hopes of restoring his lineage's former glory, influenced many of his life choices and shaped the construction of his autobiographical myth. For the latter, Ivan Mihailovich skilfully combines the characteristics of autobiographical discourse with old and new cultural codes.

In his portrait in the private life, the author uses the new rhetoric of feelings of sentimentalism and early romanticism not only to describe the emotional universe associated with relatives, but also to create his positive portrait of a loving son, husband, and father. In the autobiography, the prince shows how the new cult of emotions had a strong influence on some aspects of everyday life such as the upbringing and education of children and the dealing with the loss of loved ones, which also affected the autobiographer's self-perception.

The self-image of the writer in the service is dominated by the matrices of classicism. I. M. Dolgorukov idealizes himself, emphasizing his sense of duty, honesty, zeal, and commitment to the “common good”. He contrasts his positive example with the corrupt reality of the military and administrative system of the Russian Empire. At the same time, he shows to feel himself undervalued and a victim of intrigues and selfishness.

In public life, fashion, religion, new social practices, wars, metanarratives, entertainment, reading, and writing are cultural phenomena thematized and reworked by Ivan Mikhailovich to restate and confirm his own cultural identity as a worthy representative of the traditional Russian *dvoryanstvo*, who is well-informed of new cultural trends.

All this transforms *Povest'* not only into an encyclopaedia of the Russian noble reality of the 18th and early 19th centuries, but also into an introspective journey that follows I. M. Dolgorukov's search for his identity.

5. CITED BIBLIOGRAPHY IN THE AUTOREFERAT

Assman 2004 – Assman, Ja. *Kul'turnaya pamyat': pis'mo, pamyat' o proshlom i politicheskaya identichnost' v vysokikh kul'turakh drevnosti*. Moskva, Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury, 2004. [Ассман 2004 – Ассман, Я. *Культурная память: письмо, память о прошлом и политическая идентичность в высоких культурах древности*. Москва, Языки славянской культуры, 2004].

Bilinkis 1995 – Bilinkis, M. Ya. *Russkaya proza XVIII veka. Dokumental'nyye zhanry. Povest'. Roman*. Sankt-Peterburg, SPb Gos. Universitet, 1995. [Билинкис 1995 – Билинкис, М. Я. *Русская проза XVIII века. Документальные жанры. Повесть. Роман*. Санкт-Петербург, СПб Гос. Университет, 1995].

Bitsayeva-Stoyanova 1988 – Bitsayeva-Stoyanova, R. I. M. Dolgorukov – avtor satiricheskikh proizvedeniy v adres Aleksandra I. – V: *Bolgarskaya rusistika*, № 2, 1988, s. 43–54. [Бицаева-Стойанова 1988 – Бицаева-Стойанова, Р. И. М. Долгоруков – автор сатирических произведений в адрес Александра I. – В: *Болгарская русистика*, № 2, 1988, с. 43–54].

Bitsayeva-Stoyanova 2013 – Bitsayeva-Stoyanova, R. *Knyaz' Ivan Mikhaylovich Dolgorukov – blagorodnyy artist, rezhisser, dramaturg*. Sofia, ID Print, 2013. [Бицаева-Стойанова 2013 – Бицаева-Стойанова, Р. *Князь Иван Михайлович Долгоруков – благородный артист, режиссер, драматург*. София, ИД Принт, 2013].

Bitsilli 1934 – Bitsilli, P. M. «Domashnyaya» literatura i istoki klassicheskoy literatury v Rossii. – V: *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, № 69, 2019, <http://sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/69/Bicilli69.pdf>, 24.05.2023 (izdaniye na prevoda na statiyata ot 1934 g.). [Бицилли 1934 – Бицилли, П. М. «Домашняя» литература и истоки классической литературы в России. – В: *Toronto Slavic Quarterly*, № 69, 2019, <http://sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/69/Bicilli69.pdf>, 24.05.2023 (издание на превода на статията от 1934 г.)].

Chernigovskiy 1992 – Chernigovskiy, D. M. *I. M. Dolgorukov kak poet-satirik*. Avtoreferat, Moskva, 1992. [Черниговский 1992 – Черниговский, Д. М. *И. М. Долгоруков как поэт-сатирик*. Автореферат, Москва, 1992].

Dmitriyev 1863 – Dmitriyev, M. A. *Knyaz' Ivan Mikhaylovich Dolgorukoy i yego sochineniya*. Moskva, Tipografiya L. I. Stepanovoy, 1863. [Дмитриев 1863 – Дмитриев, М. А. *Князь Иван Михайлович Долгорукой и его сочинения*. Москва, Типография Л. И. Степановой, 1863].

Dolgorukaya 1810 – Dolgorukaya, N. B. *Svoyeruchnyye zapiski knyagini Natal'i Borisovny Dolgorukoy*. – V: *Drug Yunoshstva*, № 1, 1810, s. 8–69. [Долгорукая 1810 – Долгорукая, Н. Б. *Своеручные записки княгини Натальи Борисовны Долгорукой*. – В: *Друг Юношества*, № 1, 1810, с. 8–69].

Dolgorukaya 1913 – Dolgorukaya, N. B. *Svoyeruchnyye zapiski knyagini Natal'i Borisovny Dolgorukoy docheri g. fel'dmarshala grafa Borisa Petrovicha Sheremeteva*. Sankt-Peterburg, Tip. Sirius, 1913. [Долгорукая 1913 – Долгорукая, Н. Б. *Своеручные записки княгини Натальи Борисовны Долгорукой дочери г. фельдмаршала графа Бориса Петровича Шереметева*. Санкт-Петербург, Тип. Сириус, 1913].

Dolgorukov 1849a – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy russkikh avtorov. Sochineniya Dolgorukogo (knyazu Ivana Mikhaylovicha). Tom 1*. Sankt-Peterburg, Tipografiya Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk, 1849. [Долгоруков 1849a – Долгоруков, И. М. *Полное собрание сочинений русских авторов. Сочинения Долгорукого (князя Ивана Михайловича). Том 1*. Санкт-Петербург, Типография Императорской Академии наук, 1849].

Dolgorukov 1849b – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy russkikh avtorov. Sochineniya Dolgorukogo (knyazu Ivana Mikhaylovicha). Tom 2*. Sankt-Peterburg, Tipografiya Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk, 1849. [Долгоруков 1849b – Долгоруков, И. М. *Полное собрание сочинений русских авторов. Сочинения Долгорукого (князя Ивана Михайловича). Том 2*. Санкт-Петербург, Типография Императорской Академии наук, 1849].

сочинений русских авторов. Сочинения Долгорукого (князя Ивана Михайловича). Том 2. Санкт-Петербург, Типография Императорской Академии наук, 1849].

Dolgorukov 1870a – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Slavny bubny za gorami ili Puteshestviye moye koe-kuda 1810 goda*. Moskva, Universitetskaya tipografiya (Katkov i K), 1870. [**Долгоруков 1870a** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Славны бубны за горами или Путешествие мое кое-куда 1810 года*. Москва, Университетская типография (Катков и К), 1870].

Dolgorukov 1870b – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Zhurnal puteshestviya iz Moskvy v Nizhniy 1813 goda*. Moskva, Universitetskaya tipografiya (Katkov i K), 1870. [**Долгоруков 1870b** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Журнал путешествия из Москвы в Нижний 1813 года*. Москва, Университетская типография (Катков и К), 1870].

Dolgorukov 1870c – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Puteshestviye v Kiyev v 1817 godu*. Moskva, Universitetskaya tipografiya (Katkov i K), 1870. [**Долгоруков 1870c** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Путешествие в Киев в 1817 году*. Москва, Университетская типография (Катков и К), 1870].

Dolgorukov 1916 – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsej zhizni, pisannaya mnoy samim i nachataya v Moskve 1788 goda v Avguste mesyatse na 25 godu ot rozhdeniya moyego*. Ch. I: 1764–1800. Sankt-Peterburg, Tip. Sirius, 1916. [**Долгоруков 1916** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Повесть о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни, писанная мной самим и начатая в Москве 1788 года в Августе месяце на 25 году от рождения моего*. Ч. I: 1764–1800. Санкт-Петербург, Тип. Сириус, 1916].

Dolgorukov 1997 – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Kapishche moyego serdtsa, ili Slovar' vsekh tekhnits, s koimi ya byl v raznykh otnosheniyakh v techeniye moyey zhizni*. Moskva, Nauka, 1997. [**Долгоруков 1997** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Капище моего сердца, или Словарь всех тех лиц, с которыми я был в разных отношениях в течение моей жизни*. Москва, Наука, 1997].

Dolgorukov 2004/2005 – Dolgorukov, I. M. *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsej zhizni*. V 2-kh tt. Sankt-Peterburg, Nauka, 2004–2005. [**Долгоруков 2004/2005** – Долгоруков, И. М. *Повесть о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни*. В 2-х тт. Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 2004–2005].

Fromm 2023 – Fromm, E. *Iskusstvo lyubit'*. Moskva, AST, 2023. [**Фромм 2023** – Фромм, Э. *Искусство любить*. Москва, АСТ, 2023].

Foucault 1996 – Fuko, M. *Nitshe, genealogiya i istoriya*. – V: *Filosofiya epokhi postmoderna: Sbornik perevodov i referatov*. Minsk, Izd. ООО «Krasiko-print», 1996, s. 74–97. [**Фуко 1996** – Фуко, М. Ницше, генеалогия и история. – В: *Философия эпохи постмодерна: Сборник переводов и рефератов*. Минск, Изд. ООО «Красико-принт», 1996, с. 74–97].

Gasparov 2001 – Gasparov, M. L. *Zapiski i vypiski*. Moskva, NLO, 2001. [**Гаспаров 2001** – Гаспаров, М. Л. *Записки и выписки*. Москва, НЛО, 2001].

Geertz 2004 – Girts, K. G. *Interpretatsiya kul'tur*. Moskva, ROSSPEN, 2004. [**Гирц 2004** – Гирц, К. Г. *Интерпретация культур*. Москва, РОССПЭН, 2004].

Ginzburg 1977 – Ginzburg, L. Ya. *O psikhologicheskoy proze*. Leningrad, Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1977. [**Гинзбург 1977** – Гинзбург, Л. Я. *О психологической прозе*. Ленинград, Художественная литература, 1977].

Gusdorf 1956 – Gusdorf, G. *Conditions et limites d'autobiographie*. – In: *Formen der Selbstdarstellung. Anketen zu einer Geschichte des literarischen Selbstportraits. Festgabe für Fritz Neubert*, Berlin, Dunker & Humbold, 1956, pp. 105–123.

Halbwachs 2007 – Khal'bvaks, M. *Sotsial'nyye ramki pamyati*. Moskva, Novoye izdatel'stvo, 2007. [**Хальбвакс 2007** – Хальбвакс, М. *Социальные рамки памяти*. Москва, Новое издательство, 2007].

Hall 1990 – Hall, S. *Cultural Identity and Diaspora*. – In: *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1990, pp. 222–237.

Hatton 2004 – Khatton, P. *Istoriya kak iskusstvo pamyati*. Sankt-Peterburg, Izdatel'stvo «Vladimir Dal'», 2004. [**Хаттон 2004** – Хаттон, П. *История как искусство памяти*. Санкт-Петербург, Издательство «Владимир Даль», 2004].

Kochetkova 1994 – Kochetkova, N. D. *Literatura russkogo sentimentalizma (Esteticheskiye i khudozhestvennyye iskaniya)*. Sankt-Peterburg, Nauka, 1994. [**Кочеткова 1994** – Кочеткова, Н. Д. *Литература русского сентиментализма (Эстетические и художественные искания)*. Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 1994].

Kosheleva 2000 – Kosheleva, O. E. «*Svoye detstvo*» v drevney rusi i v Rossii epokhi Prosveshcheniya (XVI–XVIII vv.). Moskva, Izdatel'stvo URAO, 2000. [**Кошелева 2000** – Кошелева, О. Е. «*Свое детство*» в древней руси и в России эпохи Просвещения (XVI–XVIII вв.). Москва, Издательство УРАО, 2000].

Kuznetsova 2004 – Kuznetsova, N. V. Tekstologicheskiye printsiipy izdaniya. – V: Dolgorukov, I. M. *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsey zhizni. V 2-kh tt.* Sankt-Peterburg, Nauka, 2004, s. 721–738. [**Кузнецова 2004** – Кузнецова, Н. В. Текстологические принципы издания. – В: Долгоруков, И. М. *Повесть о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни. В 2-х тт.* Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 2004, с. 721–738].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2002 – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Tekstologo-arkheograficheskoye opisaniye memuarov kn. I. M. Dolgorukova. – V: *Yubileynyy sb. nauch. tr. k desyatiletuyu kafedry «Gumanitarnykh i sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh distsiplin»*. Sankt-Peterburg, Izdatel'stvo «Peterburgskiy institut pečhati», 2002, s. 9–20. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2002** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Текстолого-археографическое описание мемуаров кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: *Юбилейный сб. науч. тр. к десятилетию кафедры «Гуманитарных и социально-экономических дисциплин»*. Санкт-Петербург, Издательство «Петербургский институт печати», 2002, с. 9–20].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2005 – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Preobrazheniye real'nosti v «Povesti...» kn. I. M. Dolgorukova. – V: Dolgorukov, I. M. *Povest' o rozhdenii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsey zhizni. V 2-kh tt.* Sankt-Peterburg, Nauka, 2005, s. 491–513. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2005** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Преображение реальности в «Повести...» кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: Долгоруков, И. М. *Повесть о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни. В 2-х тт.* Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 2005, с. 491–513].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2009a – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Vospominaniya kompozitora N. Ya. Afanas'yeva i legenda o yego rodstve s kn. I. M. Dolgorukovym. – V: *Peçhat' i slovo Sankt-Peterburga (Peterburgskiy chteniye – 2008): v 2 ch. – Ch. 1: Knizhnoye delo. Kul'turologiya: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Sankt-Peterburg, SPGUTD, 2009, s. 151–162. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2009a** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Воспоминания композитора Н. Я. Афанасьева и легенда о его родстве с кн. И. М. Долгоруковым. – В: *Печать и слово Санкт-Петербурга (Петербургские чтения – 2008): в 2 ч. – Ч. 1: Книжное дело. Культурология: Сборник научных трудов*. Санкт-Петербург, СПГУТД, 2009, с. 151–162].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2009b – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Genealogicheskaya legenda o rodstve s kn. I. M. Dolgorukovym, otrazhennaya v vospominaniyakh kompozitora N. Ya. Afanas'yeva. – V: *Vspomogatel'nyye istoricheskiye distsipliny v prostranstve gumanitarnogo znaniya: Materialy XXI Mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii. [K 70-letiyu kafedry istochnikovedeniya i vspomogatel'nykh istoricheskikh distsiplin Istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta RGGU]*. Moskva, RGGU, 2009, s. 264–267. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2009b** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Генеалогическая легенда о родстве с кн. И. М. Долгоруковым, отраженная в воспоминаниях композитора Н. Я. Афанасьева. – В: *Вспомогательные исторические дисциплины в пространстве гуманитарного знания: Материалы XXI Международной конференции. [К 70-летию кафедры источниковедения и вспомогательных исторических дисциплин Историко-архивного института РГГУ]*. Москва, РГГУ, 2009, с. 264–267].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2010 – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. «Vsyu okolo yeyo dyshalo roskosh'yu!»: Zhizn' yekaterininskogo gvardeytsa. – V: *Rodina*, №2, 2010, s. 106–110. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2010** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. «*Всё около её дышало роскошью!*»: Жизнь екатерининского гвардейца. – В: *Родина*, №2, 2010, с. 106–110].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2013a – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Stikhi knyazyya Ivana Mikhaylovicha Dolgorukova v sostave putevykh zametok «Slavny bubny za gorami, ili Puteshestviye moye koe-kuda 1810 goda». – V: *Pivden' Ukraini: yetnoistorichniy, movniy, kul'turniy ta religiyiniy vimiri: zb. nauk. Prats' IV Mizhn. nauk. konf., 26–27 kvit. 2013 r., Odesa.* Odesa, VMV, 2013, s. 202–207. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2013a** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Стихи князя Ивана Михайловича Долгорукова в составе путевых заметок «Славны бубны за горами, или Путешествие мое кое-куда 1810 года». – В: *Південь України: етноісторичний, мовний, культурний та релігійний виміри: зб. наук. праць IV Міжн. наук. конф., 26–27 квіт. 2013 р., Одеса.* Одеса, ВМВ, 2013, с. 202–207].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2013b – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Antikutuzovskiye nastroyeniya v poezii nachala XIX v.: neopublikovannaya satira kn. I. M. Dolgorukova «Pobaska p'yanogo muzhika pod Moskvoyu posle frantsuza». – V: *Pushkin i 1812 god: Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii «Zolotoy vek frantsuzskoy knigi v Rossii» (4–8 aprelya 2012 goda) i Mikhaylovskikh Pushkinskikh chteniy «Pushkin i 1812 god» (15–19 avgusta 2012 goda).* Sel'tso Mikhaylovskoye, Pushkinskiy Zapovednik, 2013, s. 177–185. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2013b** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Антикутузовские настроения в поэзии начала XIX в.: неопубликованная сатира кн. И. М. Долгорукова «Побаска пьяного мужика под Москвою после француза». – В: *Пушкин и 1812 год: Материалы научно-практической конференции «Золотой век французской книги в России» (4–8 апреля 2012 года) и Михайловских Пушкинских чтений «Пушкин и 1812 год» (15–19 августа 2012 года).* Сельцо Михайловское, Пушкинский Заповедник, 2013, с. 177–185].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014a – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Knyaz' I. M. Dolgorukov i V. A. Zhukovskiy: k probleme vzaimootnosheniy dvukh poetov. – V: *Pechat' i slovo Sankt-Peterburga (Peterburgskiy chteniya – 2013): v 2 ch. Ch. 1: Knizhnoye delo. Kul'turologiya. Lingvistika: sb. nauch. tr.* Taborisskaya, E. M. (red.). Sankt-Peterburg, SPGUTD, 2014, s. 178–187. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2014a** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Князь И. М. Долгоруков и В. А. Жуковский: к проблеме взаимоотношений двух поэтов. – В: *Печать и слово Санкт-Петербурга (Петербургские чтения – 2013): в 2 ч. Ч. 1: Книжное дело. Культурология. Лингвистика: сб. науч. тр.* Табориская, Е. М. (ред.). Санкт-Петербург, СПГУТД, 2014, с. 178–187].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014b – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Stikhotvoreniye knyazyya I. M. Dolgorukova «Na osvobozhdeniye knyazyya Sibirskogo» kak oda, posvyashchennaya vosshestviyu na prestol imperatora Aleksandra I. – V: «Kogda b ya byl tsar'...»: *Materialy Mikhaylovskikh Pushkinskikh chteniy «„Kogda b ya byl tsar'...”. Khudozhnik i vlast'» (21–25 avgusta 2013 goda) i nauchno-prakticheskikh chteniy «Biblioteka v usad'be» «...Na ikh polyakh ona vstrechayet Cherty yego karandasha...» (23–27 aprelya 2014 goda): [sb. st.]*. Sel'tso Mikhaylovskoye, Pushkinskiy Zapovednik, 2014, s. 99–111. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2014b** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Стихотворение князя И. М. Долгорукова «На освобождение князя Сибирского» как ода, посвященная восшествию на престол императора Александра I. – В: «Когда б я был царь...»: *Материалы Михайловских Пушкинских чтений «„Когда б я был царь...”. Художник и власть» (21–25 августа 2013 года) и научно-практических чтений «Библиотека в усадьбе» «...На их полях она встречает Черты его карандаша...» (23–27 апреля 2014 года): [сб. ст.]*. Сельцо Михайловское, Пушкинский Заповедник, 2014, с. 99–111].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2014c – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Marginalii na ekzemplyare sobraniya sochineniy kn. I. M. Dolgorukova. – V: «Kogda b ya byl tsar'...»: *Materialy Mikhaylovskikh Pushkinskikh chteniy «„Kogda b ya byl tsar'...”. Khudozhnik i vlast'» (21–25 avgusta 2013 goda) i nauchno-prakticheskikh chteniy «Biblioteka v usad'be» «...Na ikh polyakh ona vstrechayet Cherty yego karandasha...» (23–27 aprelya 2014 goda): [sb. st.]*. Sel'tso Mikhaylovskoye, Pushkinskiy Zapovednik, 2014, s. 228–242. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2014c** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Маргиналии на экземпляре собрания сочинений кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: «Когда б я был царь...»: *Материалы Михайловских Пушкинских чтений*

«Когда б я был царь...». Художник и власть» (21–25 августа 2013 года) и научно-практических чтений «Библиотека в усадьбе» «...На их полях она встречает Черты его карандаша...» (23–27 апреля 2014 года): [сб. ст.]. Сельцо Михайловское, Пушкинский Заповедник, 2014, с. 228–242].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2016 – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Poeticheskiye poslaniya kn. I. M. Dolgorukova k M. P. Teleginu v istoriko-biograficheskom kontekste. – V: *Zhanr. Stil'. Obraz: Aktual'nyye voprosy sovremennoy filologii: Mezhvuzovskiy sbornik statey s mezhdunarodnym uchastiyem*. Chernigovskiy, D. N., Red'kina, O. V. (red.). Kirov, b. i., 2016, s. 60–65. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2016** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Поэтические послания кн. И. М. Долгорукова к М. П. Телегину в историко-биографическом контексте. – В: *Жанр. Стиль. Образ: Актуальные вопросы современной филологии: Межвузовский сборник статей с международным участием*. Черниговский, Д. Н., Редькина, О. В. (ред.). Киров, б. и., 2016, с. 60–65].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2017a – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. Knyaz' I. M. Dolgorukov v sele Mishenskom: iz istorii sozdaniya dvukh stikhotvoreniy. – V: «... Ya mogu tvorit'»: [Sb. st.]. Sel'tso Mikhaylovskoye, Pushkinskiy Zapovednik, 2017, s. 88–95. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2017a** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. Князь И. М. Долгоруков в селе Мишенском: из истории создания двух стихотворений. – В: «...Я могу творить»: [Сб. ст.]. Сельцо Михайловское, Пушкинский Заповедник, 2017, с. 88–95].

Kuznetsova & Mel'tsin 2017b – Kuznetsova, N. V., Mel'tsin, M. O. K voprosu ob adresate «Poslaniya k priyatelyu» (1822) Kn. I. M. Dolgorukova. – V: *Evgeniy Aleksandrovich Maymin i yego vremena: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii «VIII Mayminskiye chteniya»*. 22–24 oktyabrya 2015 g. Pskov, Pskovskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet, 2017, s. 168–173. [**Кузнецова & Мельцин 2017b** – Кузнецова, Н. В., Мельцин, М. О. К вопросу об адресате «Послания к приятелю» (1822) Кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: *Евгений Александрович Маймин и его время: Материалы Международной научной конференции «VIII Майминские чтения»*. 22–24 октября 2015 г. Псков, Псковский государственный университет, 2017, с. 168–173].

Lejeune 1971 – Lejeune, Ph. *L'autobiographie en France*. Paris, A. Colin, 1971.

Lejeune 1975 – Lejeune, Ph. *Le pacte autobiographique*. Paris, Édition du Seuil, 1975.

Lipovetsky 2008 – Lipovetsky, G., Sébastien, C. *Los tiempos hipermodernos*. Barcelona, Editorial Anagrama, 2008.

Longinov 1865a – Longinov, M. N. Izvestiye o zapiskakh knyazya Ivana Mikhailovicha Dolgorukogo. – V: *Russkiy arkhiv*, № 3, 1865, s. 964–968. [**Лонгинов 1865a** – Лонгинов, М. Н. Известие о записках князя Ивана Михайловича Долгорукого. – В: *Русский архив*, № 3, 1865, с. 964–968].

Longinov 1865b – Longinov, M. N. Khronologiya nekotorykh stikhotvoreniy knyazya I. M. Dolgorukova. – V: *Russkiy arkhiv*, № 3, 1865, s. 968–972. [**Лонгинов 1865b** – Лонгинов, М. Н. Хронология некоторых стихотворений князя И. М. Долгорукова. – В: *Русский архив*, № 3, 1865, с. 968–972].

Lotman 1992a – Lotman, Yu. M. Poetika bytovogo povedeniya v russkoy kul'ture XVIII veka. – V: Lotman, Yu. M. *Izbrannyye stat'i*. V 3-kh t. T. 1. Tallinn, Aleksandra, 1992, s. 248–268. [**Лотман 1992a** – Лотман, Ю. М. Поэтика бытового поведения в русской культуре XVIII века. – В: Лотман, Ю. М. *Избранные статьи*. В 3-х т. Т. 1. Таллинн, Александра, 1992, с. 248–268].

Lotman 1992b – Lotman, Yu. M. Teatr i teatral'nost' v stroye kul'tury nachala XIX veka. – V: Lotman, Yu. M. *Izbrannyye stat'i*. V 3-kh t. T. 1. Tallinn, Aleksandra, 1992, s. 269–286. [**Лотман 1992b** – Лотман, Ю. М. Театр и театральность в строе культуры начала XIX века. – В: Лотман, Ю. М. *Избранные статьи*. В 3-х т. Т. 1. Таллинн, Александра, 1992, с. 269–286].

Lotman 1994 – Lotman, Yu. M. *Besedy o russkoy kul'ture. Byt i traditsii russkogo dvoryanstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)*. Sankt-Peterburg, «Iskusstvo–SPB», 1994. [**Лотман 1994** – Лотман, Ю. М. *Беседы о русской культуре. Быт и традиции русского дворянства (XVIII – начало XIX века)*. Санкт-Петербург, «Искусство–СПБ», 1994].

Lowental 2004 – Louental', D. *Proshloye – chuzhaya strana*. Sankt-Peterburg, Izdatel'stvo «RUSSKIY OSTROV», 2004. [**Лоуэнталь 2004** – Лоуэнталь, Д. *Прошлое – чужая страна*. Санкт-Петербург, Издательство «РУССКИЙ ОСТРОВ», 2004].

Lyotard 1984 – Lyotard, J. F. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Marasinova 2008 – Marasinova, E. N. *Vlast' i lichnost': ocherki russkoy istorii XVIII veka*. Moskva, Nauka, 2008. [**Марасинова 2008** – Марасинова, Е. Н. *Власть и личность: очерки русской истории XVIII века*. Москва, Наука, 2008].

Mathieu-Castellani 1996 – Mathieu-Castellani, G. *La scène judiciaire de l'autobiographie*. Paris, PUF, 1996.

Nikolayev 2017 – Nikolayev, S. I. Russkiye pisateli XVIII veka o motivatsii svoikh zanyatiy literaturnym trudom. – V: *XVIII vek. Sbornik 29. Literaturnaya zhizn' Rossii XVIII veka*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg, Al'yans-Arkheo, 2017, s. 5–20. [**Николаев 2017** – Николаев, С. И. Русские писатели XVIII века о мотивации своих занятий литературным трудом. – В: *XVIII век. Сборник 29. Литературная жизнь России XVIII века*. Москва, Санкт-Петербург, Альянс-Архео, 2017, с. 5–20].

Novitskiy 1952 – Novitskiy V. G. *Proza I. M. Dolgorukova (opyt literaturnoy kharakteristiki i nablyudeniy nad yazykom prozy)*. Avtoreferat, Khar'kov, Khar'k. gos. un-t im. A. M. Gor'kogo, 1952. [**Новицкий 1952** – Новицкий В. Г. *Проза И. М. Долгорукова (опыт литературной характеристики и наблюдений над языком прозы)*. Автореферат, Харьков, Харьк. гос. ун-т им. А. М. Горького, 1952].

Nora et al. 1999 – Nora, P., Ozuf, M., de Pyuimezh, Zh., Vinok, M. *Frantsiya-pamyat'*. Sankt-Peterburg, Izd-vo S.-Peterb. un-ta, 1999. [**Нора и др. 1999** – Нора, П., Озуф, М., де Пюимеж, Ж., Винок, М. *Франция-память*. Санкт-Петербург, Изд-во С.-Петерб. ун-та, 1999].

Otin 1986 – Otin, E. S. Melenkoliya, kotoraya bolezni' nazyvayetsa khipokhondriya. – V: *Russkaya rech'*, № 2, 1986, s. 130–135. [**Отин 1986** – Отин, Е. С. Меленколия, которая болезнь называется хипохондрия. – В: *Русская речь*, № 2, 1986, с. 130–135].

Pascal 2017 – Pascal, R. *Design and Truth in Autobiography*. London, Routledge, 2017.

Persi 2000 – Persi, U. Russkiye stolitsy i russkaya provintsiya v memuarnykh tekstakh Ivana M. Dolgorukova. – V: *Russkaya provintsiya: mif – tekst – real'nost'*. Sankt-Peterburg, Tema, 2000, s. 56–64. [**Перси 2000** – Перси, У. Русские столицы и русская провинция в мемуарных текстах Ивана М. Долгорукова. – В: *Русская провинция: миф – текст – реальность*. Санкт-Петербург, Тема, 2000, с. 56–64].

Petkova 1999 – Petkova, G. Neopublikovannaya rukopis' Petra Mikhaylovicha Bitsilli: Zametki o leksicheskikh i tematicheskikh sovpadeniyakh i zaimstvovaniyakh u russkikh avtorov-klassikov. – V: *Revue des études slaves*, tome 71, fascicule 2, 1999, pp. 437–460. [**Петкова 1999** – Петкова, Г. Неопубликованная рукопись Петра Михайловича Бицилли: Заметки о лексических и тематических совпадениях и заимствованиях у русских авторов-классиков. – В: *Revue des études slaves*, tome 71, fascicule 2, 1999, pp. 437–460].

Proskurina 2017 – Proskurina, V. Yu. *Imperiya pera Ekateriny II. Literatura kak politika*. Moskva, NLO, 2017. [**Проскурина 2017** – Проскурина, В. Ю. *Империя пера Екатерины II. Литература как политика*. Москва, НЛО, 2017].

Raeff 1966 – Raeff, M. *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia. The Eighteenth-Century Nobility*. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1966.

Reddy 2004 – Reddy, W. M. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Ricœur 1990 – Ricœur, P. *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris, Seuil, 1990.

Shchukin 2007 – Shchukin, V. G. Rossiyskiy geniy prosveshcheniya. Issledovaniya v oblasti mifopoetiki i istorii idey. Moskva, ROSSPEN, 2007. [**Щукин 2007** – Щукин, В. Г. *Российский гений просвещения. Исследования в области мифопоэтики и истории идей*. Москва, РОССПЭН, 2007].

Tartakovskiy 1980 – Tartakovskiy, A. G. *1812 god i russkaya memuaristika (Opyta istochnikovedcheskogo izucheniya)*. Moskva, Nauka, 1980. [**Тартаковский 1980** – Тартаковский, А. Г. *1812 год и русская мемуаристика (Опыта источниковедческого изучения)*. Москва, Наука, 1980].

Tartakovskiy 1991 – Tartakovskiy, A. G. *Russkaya memuaristika XVIII – pervoy poloviny XIX veka. Ot rukopisi k knige*. Moskva, Nauka, 1991. [**Тартаковский 1991** – Тартаковский, А. Г. *Русская мемуаристика XVIII – первой половины XIX века. От рукописи к книге*. Москва, Наука, 1991].

Tolstoy 1955 – Tolstoy, L. N. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy v 90 tomakh. Tom 16*. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo «Khudozhestvennaya literatura», 1955. [**Толстой 1955** – Толстой, Л. Н. *Полное собрание сочинений в 90 томах. Том 16*. Москва, Издательство «Художественная литература», 1955].

Туньянов 1993 – Туньянов Yu. N. *Literaturnyy fakt*. Moskva, Vyssh. shk., 1993. [**Тынянов 1993** – Тынянов Ю. Н. *Литературный факт*. Москва, Высш. шк., 1993].

Vacheva 2015 – Vacheva, A. *Potomstvu Ekaterina II. Idei i narrativnyye strategii v avtobiografii imperatritsy*. Sofia, UI “Sv. Kliment Okhridski”, 2015. [**Вачева 2015** – Вачева, А. *Потомству Екатерина II. Идеи и нарративные стратегии в автобиографии императрицы*. София, УИ «Св. Климент Охридски», 2015].

Veselova 2015 – Veselova, A. Yu. *Romany v krughe chteniya i v memuarakh A. T. Bolotova. – V: XVIII vek. Sbornik 28*. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg, Al'yans-Arkheo, 2015, s. 86–104. [**Веселова 2015** – Веселова, А. Ю. *Романы в круге чтения и в мемуарах А. Т. Болотова. – В: XVIII век. Сборник 28*. Москва, Санкт-Петербург, Альянс-Архео, 2015, с. 86–104].

Veselova 2020 – Veselova, A. Yu. «Pravo na biografuyu» i russkaya memuaristika 1740–1770-kh godov. – V: *AvtobiografiYa*, № 9, 2020, s. 25–44. [**Веселова 2020** – Веселова, А. Ю. «Право на биографию» и русская мемуаристика 1740–1770-х годов. – В: *AvtobiografiYa*, № 9, 2020, с. 25–44].

Veselova & Milyutin 2021 – Veselova, A. Yu., Milyutin, M. P. *Zhizn' i priklyucheniya schastlivogo cheloveka. – V: Bolotov, A. T. Zhizn' i priklyucheniya Andrey a Bolotova, opisannyye samim im dlya svoikh potomkov. 1738–1757. Kn. 2*. Sankt-Peterburg, Izdatel'stvo «Pushkinskiy Dom», 2021, s. 11–96. [**Веселова & Милютин 2021** – Веселова, А. Ю., Милютин, М. П. *Жизнь и приключения счастливого человека. – В: Болотов, А. Т. Жизнь и приключения Андрея Болотова, описанные самим им для своих потомков. 1738–1757. Кн. 2*. Санкт-Петербург, Издательство «Пушкинский Дом», 2021, с. 11–96].

Wortman 2002a – Wortman, R. S. *Stsenarii vlasti. Mify i tseremonii russkoy monarkhii. Tom 1: Ot Petra Velikogo do smerti Nikolaya I*. Moskva, OGI, 2002. [**Уортман 2002a** – Уортман, Р. С. *Сценарии власти. Мифы и церемонии русской монархии. Том 1: От Петра Великого до смерти Николая I*. Москва, ОГИ, 2002].

Wortman 2002b – Wortman, R. S. *Stsenarii vlasti. Mify i tseremonii russkoy monarkhii. Tom 2. Ot Aleksandra II do otrecheniya Nikolaya II*. Moskva, OGI, 2002. [**Уортман 2002b** – Уортман, Р. С. *Сценарии власти. Мифы и церемонии русской монархии. Том 2. От Александра II до отречения Николая II*. Москва, ОГИ, 2002].

Zorin 2016 – Zorin, A. *Poyavleniye geroya. Iz istorii russkoy emotsional'noy kul'tury kontsa XVIII – nachala XIX veka*. Moskva, NLO, 2016. [**Зорин 2016** – Зорин, А. *Появление героя. Из истории русской эмоциональной культуры конца XVIII – начала XIX века*. Москва, НЛО, 2016].

6. MAIN CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PHD THESIS

1. The research draws attention to an interesting and original writer of 18th-century and early 19th-century Russian literature, who has so far remained on the periphery of scholarly attention and whose variegated poetic and prose production, with few exceptions, remains practically unstudied. The analysis of I. M. Dolgorukov literary eclecticism (in this case in his memoirs) makes it possible to show the coexistence, affirmation, and reception of old and new cultural and writing paradigms in the literature of the period.

2. The PhD thesis studies monographically the almost forgotten autobiography *Povest' o rozhdenii moem, proiskhozhdenii i vsei zhizni* of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov, comparing it with his other ego-texts. Until now, in-depth analyses of this literary work do not exist in Bulgaria, in Russia, and abroad.

3. The research reconstructs the evolution of I. M. Dolgorukov's personality in private and public life, emphasizing the author's aspiration to embody the role of the ideal representative of the Russian *dvoryanstvo*. This reconstruction is particularly important for the understanding of the writer's literary production since his works are characterized by their marked "domestic" and biographical nature.

4. The PhD thesis demonstrates the potential of applying the concepts of "cultural memory" and "cultural identity" in literature. The research highlights the close relationship between memory, culture and identity in memoir and autobiographical prose. It is shown how the cultural codes and memory of the past are used by every author of an ego-text to create his autobiographical myth.

5. *Povest' o rozhdenii moem, proiskhozhdenii i vsei zhizni* is one of the rare examples of a male autobiography in Russia of the 18th and early 19th centuries. Unlike female autobiographies, there is still no comprehensive typological characterization of Russian male autobiographical prose in literary studies. Therefore, the PhD thesis examines the typology of this type of ego-texts written by men in the considered period (the second half of the 18th century and the first decades of the 19th century).

6. The textual analysis of I. M. Dolgorukov's autobiography offers new perspectives and deepens the traditional questions and problems related to autobiographical writing (sincerity of the author, novelistic discourse, etc.).

7. The PhD thesis contributes to the understanding of the importance of *dvoryanstvo* culture and its codes for the self-awareness of the representatives of the Russian nobility of the period.

7. PUBLICATIONS ON THE THEME OF THE PHD THESIS

1. Article “Apologeticheskiy diskurs v avtobiograficheskom narrative kn. I. M. Dolgorukova”. – V: *INITIUM. Khudozhestvennaya literatura: opyt sovremennogo prochteniya: sbornik statey molodykh uchenykh*. Ekaterinburg, UGI UrFU, 2023, s. 37–41. [Апологетический дискурс в автобиографическом нарративе кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: *INITIUM. Художественная литература: опыт современного прочтения: сборник статей молодых ученых*. Екатеринбург, УГИ УрФУ, 2023, с. 37–41].
2. Article „«Ya lyubil prirodu, no v ubranstve roskoshnom»: prirodata v avtobiografichnoto povesstvovanie na I. M. Dolgorukov (1764–1823)“. – V: *Literatura i priroda*, 2023, <https://litteraturaetnatura.eu/Cat-1>. [«Я любил природу, но в убранстве роскошном»: природата в автобиографичното повествование на И. М. Долгоруков (1764–1823). – В: *Литература и природа*, 2023, достъпно на сайта: <https://litteraturaetnatura.eu/Cat-1>].
3. Article “Emotsional’nyu mir sem’i v «Povesti o rozhdanii moyem, proiskhozhdenii i vsey zhizni» kn. I. M. Dolgorukova (1764–1823)”. – V: *Lyubosloviye*, № 22, 2022, s. 213–232. [Эмоциональный мир семьи в «Повести о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни» кн. И. М. Долгорукова (1764–1823). – В: *Любословие*, № 22, 2022, с. 213–232].
4. Study “Eighteenth-Century Medicine, Health and the Memoirs of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov (1764–1823)”. – V: *Godishnik na Sofiyskiya universitet „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“*. Fakultet po slavyanski filologii. Tom. 107. Sofia, Universitetsko izdatelstvo „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 2022, s. 103–126.
5. Synopsis “Eighteenth-Century Medicine, Health and the Memoirs of Prince I. M. Dolgorukov (1764–1823)”. – In : *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter (New Series). Volume 8 (2022-23)*, 2022, <https://www.sgecr.co.uk/newsletter2022-23/gigli.html>.
6. Article “Metanarativat za Frensko-ruskata voyna ot 1812 g. i “Povest’ o rozhdanii moem, proishozhdenii i vsey zhizni” ot kn. I. M. Dolgorukov (1764–1823)“. – V: *Dalgiyat osemnadeseti vek - Hartieni revolyutsii. Rakopisnite i pechatni izdaniya kato ideologicheski instrumenti*. Sofia, Balgarsko obshtestvo za prouchvane na osemnadeseti vek, 2022, s. 157–175.

[Метанаративът за Френско-руската война от 1812 г. и „Повестъ о рождении моем, происхождении и всей жизни“ от кн. И. М. Долгоруков (1764–1823). – В: *Дългият осемнадесети век - Хартиени революции. Ръкописните и печатни издания като идеологически инструменти*. София, Българско общество за проучване на осемнадесети век, 2022, с. 157–175].

7. Article “Ideologiyata na Az-a v memoarnata proza na knyaz I. M. Dolgorukov“. – V: *Pisaneto za sebe si i negovite zhanrove (Pisma, dnevnitsi i drugi formi na avtobiografichniya razkaz v evropeyskata pismena praktika (XVIII – XX vek)*. Sofia, Izdatelski tsentar “Boyan Penev”, 2021, s. 266–277. [Идеологията на Аз-а в мемоарната проза на княз И. М. Долгоруков. – В: *Писането за себе си и неговите жанрове (Писма, дневници и други форми на автобиографичния разказ в европейската писмена практика (XVIII – XX век)*. София, Издателски център „Боян Пенев“, 2021, с. 266–277].

8. Article “Poetika memuarnoy prozy kn. I. M. Dolgorukova“. – V: *INITIUM. Khudozhestvennaya literatura: opyt sovremennogo prochleniya: sbornik statey molodykh uchenykh*. Ekaterinburg, UGI UrFU, 2021, s. 58–62. [Поэтика мемуарной прозы кн. И. М. Долгорукова. – В: *INITIUM. Художественная литература: опыт современного прочтения: сборник статей молодых ученых*. Екатеринбург, УГИ УрФУ, 2021, с. 58–62].