

The Main Department of Appanages and the Problem of Supplemental Payments to Construction Contractors for Office Buildings in Livadia

A. A. Efimov

For citation: Efimov A. A. The Main Department of Appanages and the Problem of Supplemental Payments to Construction Contractors for Office Buildings in Livadia. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2024, vol. 69, issue 2, pp. 307–320. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2024.204>

The article refers to one of the episodes of interaction between the Ministry of the Imperial Court and Appanages and construction contractors at the imperial residence Livadia in Crimea. The author, on the basis of materials stored in the Russian State Historical Archive, studies the process of considering the petitions of contractors, who participated in the reconstruction of the complex of the Livadia estate in 1910–1911, to receive additional payments to compensate for the losses incurred. The article notes that all submitted appeals contain a reference to force majeure circumstances that entailed unplanned expenses. The author points out that for the substantive consideration of petitions, the officials sent requests for documents to the Livadsko-Massandra Appanage administration. After receiving the materials, they made a decision based on the results of their analysis. These proceedings including the activity of the specially assigned commission could last several months or even more than a year. The study of archival documents outlined two scenarios for responding to contractors' requests. When the case was considered exclusively by the institutions of the Department of Appanages, the applicants received part of the requested amount. At the same time, the contractors were notified of the final nature of the decision made, and further requests were rejected. According to the second scenario, when the petition reached the leaders of the Ministry of the Imperial Court and the Emperor, the Department of Appanages received the highest order to fully satisfy the contractor's request. But even so, as the article notes, officials sought to cut costs through the use of deductions.

Keywords: Ministry of the Imperial Court, Crimea, Livadia, V. B. Frederiks, V. S. Kochubei, V. N. Kachalov, G. P. Guschin, contractors.

Andrey A. Efimov — PhD (History), Senior Researcher, St. Petersburg Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 7, Petrozavodskaya ul., St. Petersburg, 197110, Russian Federation; aaefimov5@gmail.com

Андрей Александрович Ефимов — канд. ист. наук, ст. науч. сотр., Санкт-Петербургский институт истории РАН, Российская Федерация, 197110, Санкт-Петербург, Петрозаводская ул., 7; aaefimov5@gmail.com

Research conducted at the expense of the Russian Science Foundation grant no. 22-78-00026 “Ensembles of the residences of the Romanovs' kin members in Crimea: conception, realization, development, and transformation (1837–1917)”.

Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 22-78-00026 «Ансамбли резиденций членов дома Романовых в Крыму: замысел, воплощение, развитие и преобразование (1837–1917 гг.)».

© St. Petersburg State University, 2024

А. А. Ефимов

Для цитирования: *Efimov A. A. The Main Department of Appanages and the Problem of Supplemental Payments to Construction Contractors for Office Buildings in Livadia // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2024. Т. 69. Вып. 2. С. 307–320.*

<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2024.204>

Статья обращается к одному из эпизодов взаимодействия Министерства императорского двора и уделов Российской империи с подрядчиками строительных работ, производившихся в Ливадии, резиденции императорской семьи в Крыму. Автор на основе делопроизводственных материалов, хранящихся в Российском государственном историческом архиве, изучает ход рассмотрения прошений подрядчиков И. Д. Холопцева и М. Г. Рыка, Н. А. Васильева и товарищества «Железо-Бетон» о получении дополнительных выплат в возмещение убытков, понесенных при реконструкции комплекса зданий и сооружений имения «Ливадия» в 1910–1911 гг. В статье отмечается, что все представленные обращения содержат ссылку на форс-мажорные обстоятельства, повлекшие незапланированные расходы. Для предметного рассмотрения прошений столичные чиновники направляли запросы о предоставлении отчетной финансовой документации и предварительного заключения в Ливадско-Массандрское удельное управление, отвечавшее за администрирование проводимых в Ливадии работ. После получения запрошенных документов по результатам их анализа чиновниками принималось решение. При этом разбирательство могло продолжаться несколько месяцев или даже больше года, в том числе силами специально сформированной комиссии. Исследование архивных документов позволило выделить два сценария реагирования на обращения подрядчиков. В первом случае, когда дело рассматривалось исключительно учреждениями Удельного ведомства, просители получали часть запрошенной суммы. При этом подрядчиков уведомляли об окончательном характере принятого решения, а в случае поступления вторичных обращений новые запросы отклонялись на основании ранее проведенного разбирательства и факта произведенной доплаты. По второму сценарию, когда петиция доходила до руководства Министерства императорского двора и императора, в Удельное ведомство поступало высочайшее распоряжение о полном удовлетворении запроса подрядчика. Но даже и в этом случае, как отмечается в статье, чиновники стремились сократить расходы путем применения вычетов и удержаний.

Ключевые слова: Министерство императорского двора, Крым, Ливадия, В. Б. Фредерикс, В. С. Кочубей, В. Н. Качалов, Г. П. Гущин, подрядчики.

The Ministry of the Imperial Court was established in 1826, it incorporated several institutions, aimed at servicing of all the needs of the members of the Romanovs kin and acted in many different spheres from formal and official such as granting orders and organizing official meetings with foreign leaders to personal and intimate such as medical care. Among these duties and activities throughout the entire period of its existence from 1826 to 1917 the Ministry was engaged in the creation, development, and improvement of the residences of members of the Romanov dynasty, not only in the capital of the Russian Empire, St. Petersburg¹ and its suburbs, but also in various provinces of the state. From

¹ *Efimov A. A. Sankt-Peterburg XIX veka: Stroitel'naia deiatel'nost' Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora. St. Petersburg, 2019.*

the middle of the 19th century among them is the territory of Tavrida governorate, which by 1914 had taken second place after the capital of the empire in terms of the number of imperial and grand-ducal residences located on its territory, of which there were about a dozen.

When examining the historiography of the Crimean properties owned by the Romanov dynasty, it is important to note that the majority of works exploring the history of these residences are primarily focused on art history. Such publications heavily emphasize the description of the buildings' external and internal decorations, presenting the structures as the creative endeavors of architects rather than the result of comprehensive teamwork, complex negotiations, and agreements among individuals of different professions and social statuses. However, there are several works that delve into the acquisition and establishment of these residences, as well as the organization of construction and landscaping efforts. Monographs by E. M. Koliada and E. M. Litvinova, a book by V. A. Gorokhov, and a dissertation by I. V. Mantsygina are notable among these comprehensive studies². Additionally, works with a broader historical and biographical focus include individual articles and a book by N. N. Kalinin and M. A. Zemlianichenko³, as well as a detailed monograph, co-authored by A. Kadievich, that extensively covers the creative biography of N. P. Krasnov, the Yalta architect responsible for designing and overseeing the construction of several Romanovs' residences⁴. These publications touch upon aspects of construction work organization and execution, such as the selection of an architect and individual contractors, budget allocation, construction stages, and the challenges encountered during the process, without, however, delving into the role of the Ministry of the Imperial Court in the overall endeavor. I. N. Sliun'kova's significant contributions to the study of Livadia's history in the second half of the 19th century are notable⁵, particularly her capital monograph titled "Livadia: The Architecture of the Palace and Garden Complex in the Second Half of the 19th Century"⁶, which utilizes an extensive array of sources to provide a detailed account of the estate's development during the specified period. A. A. Sirotkina's book "The Road to Ai-Petri: Journey into the Past"⁷ is also worth mentioning for shedding light on lesser-known aspects of Livadia's history. Furthermore, the articles by L. A. Efremova,

² Koliada E. M. Sady i parki Kryma XIX — nachala XX veka. Istoriia sozdaniia i stilisticheskii analiz. St. Petersburg, 2009; Litvinova E. M. Tsarskaia sem'ia v Krymu. Simferopol, 2011; Gorokhov V. A. Dvortsy i parki Kryma: v istorii i istoriyakh. Moscow, 2018; Mantsygina I. V. Arkhitektura usadeb "Tsarskogo berega" v Krymu v XIX — nachale XX v.: PhD thesis abstract (Architecture). St. Petersburg, 1999.

³ Kalinin N. N., Zemlianichenko M. A. Romanovy i Krym. "U vsekh nas ostalas' toska po Krymu...". Simferopol, 2018.

⁴ Kalinin N. N., Kadievich A., Zemlianichenko M. A. Arkhitektor Vysochaishego Dvora. "Arkhitektor Krasnov — udivitel'nyi molodets". Simferopol, 2017.

⁵ Sliun'kova I. N.: 1) Livadiia i Il'inskoe — paralleli sozdaniia dvukh imperatorskikh rezidentsii // Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo. 2016. No. 4. P. 20–29; 2) Gradostroitel'nyi zamysel Livadiiskogo dvortsovo-parkovogo ansambliia // Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo. 2018. No. 1. P. 36–43; 3) Eriklik v Livadii (poselok Gornyi Krymskogo gornolesnogo zapovednika) // Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo. 2019. No. 1. P. 18–25; 4) Tserkov' Vozneseniia Gospodnia v Livadii i vizantiiskii stil' arkhitektury. Imperatorskii zakaz i ispolnenie proekta // Vestnik tserkovnogo iskusstva i arkheologii. 2020. No. 2 (3). P. 78–110; 5) Neorenessans i simvolizm v arkhitekture Livadiiskogo dvortsa (1909–1911). Po chertezham, eskizam i sta'e N. P. Krasnova, ocherkam G. K. Lukomskogo // Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo. 2022. No. 3. P. 29–39.

⁶ Sliun'kova I. N. Livadiia. Arkhitektura dvortsovo-parkovogo ansambliia. Vtoraia polovina XIX veka. Moscow, 2022.

⁷ Sirotkina A. A. Doroga na Ai-Petri. Puteshestvie v proshloe. Simferopol, 2021.

E. A. Pal'keeva, A. G. Zima, E. S. Ermakova, N. K. Soloveva, M. M. Khotina, and N. E. Iakovenko⁸ also contribute to our understanding through their analysis from an art criticism and architectural history perspective. Consequently, it can be concluded that the involvement of the Ministry of the Imperial Court in the creation and development of residences for the Romanov dynasty's members in the Crimean Republic remains inadequately examined. Scholars who have investigated the relationship between members of the imperial family and architects have primarily focused on the influence of the esteemed customers' artistic preferences on the design and interior of future residences. This approach is evident in the works of A. S. Loseva, E. A. Borisova, and the book by V. A. Rezvin⁹.

During my research, I adopt an approach that focuses on the organizational and administrative aspects of the construction process. This approach shifts the emphasis from the architect as an independent creator to the activities of a well-structured system. The history of architectural complexes and ensembles created by the Ministry of the Imperial Court is described as a complex and multi-faceted process. In my previous publications, I tried to reveal certain features of the interaction of the most august customers with the officials of the Court Department as organizers of construction work¹⁰. The activity of the Ministry of the Imperial Court in the field of architecture and urban planning on the territory of the Republic of Crimea as a whole retains historiographical gaps. Analysis of the creation and development of residential ensembles for members of the imperial kin in Crimea provides valuable insights into the history of public administration in the Russian Empire. This includes exploring the interactions between high-ranking officials in the Court Department, representatives of local administration, architects, and contractors. It sheds light on the dynamics between the center and the regions, as well as the collaboration between officials in the central apparatus and local institutions of the Ministry of the Imperial Court.

It is worth noting that earlier, as part of the study of the history of the reconstruction of Livadia the issue of compensation for losses of partner contractors Ignat Dmitrievich Kholoptsev and Matvey Ryk was studied¹¹, that is, an isolated case, while in this arti-

⁸ Ermakova E. S. Arkhitekturno-planirovochnoe formirovanie dvortsovogo zdaniia s uchetoм insulitsii na primere tsarskoi rezidentsii v Livadii arkhitekтора N. P. Krasnova // Ekonomika stroitel'stva i prirodopol'zovaniia. 2022. No. 3 (84). P. 116–121; Efremova L. A. Livadiia — romanticheskii simbioz stilei // Arkhitektura. Stroitel'stvo. Dizain. 2015. No. 3 (80). P. 90–95; Zima A. G. Livadiiskii dvortsovo-parkovyi ansambl'. Arkhitekturnaia atributsiia // Estestvennye i tekhnicheskie nauki. 2022. No. 2 (165). P. 286–290; Pal'keeva E. A. Imperatorskoe imenie Livadiia v gody russko-turetskoi voiny 1877–1878 gg. // Istoriiia v podrobnostiakh. 2016. No. 5–6 (71–72). P. 50–57; Solov'ev N. K. Livadiiskii dvorets v Krymu i ego stilisticheskaia variativnost' // Dekorativnoe iskusstvo i predmetno-prostranstvennaia sreda. Vestnik RGKhPU im. S. G. Stroganova. 2019. No. 1–1. P. 11–22; Khotina M. M., Iakovenko N. E. Vostochnaia stilistika v usadebnoi arkhitekture Kryma kontsa XIX veka // Arkhitektura Kryma na rubezhe XIX–XX vekov. Simferopol, 2022. P. 245–250.

⁹ Borisova E. A. K voprosu o vzaimootnosheniakh arkhitekтора i zakazchika v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX v. // Khudozhestvennye problemy russkoi kul'tury vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Moscow, 1994. P. 234–298; Loseva A. S. "Sebia kak v zerkale ia vizhu...": tsarskie rezidentsii glazami zakazchikov. St. Petersburg, 2006; Rezvin V. A. Arkhitekturny i vlast'. Moscow, 2013.

¹⁰ Efimov A. A.: 1) Velikokniazheskie rezidentsii Rossiiskoi imperii v 1826–1917 gg.: ekonomika stroitel'stva. St. Petersburg, 2020; 2) Finansirovanie stroitel'stva velikokniazheskikh rezidentsii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka: peresechenie i stolknovenie vozmozhnostei Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora i zhelanii avgusteishkikh zakazchikov // Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istoriiia. 2021. No. 2 (53). P. 48–56.

¹¹ Efimov A. A. Delo Kholoptseva i Ryka kak primer vzaimodeistviia Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora i udelov s podriadchikami v nachale XX veka // Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo. 2023. No. 1. P. 20–25.

cle, also prepared on the basis of a synthesis and analysis of both research literature and archival documents of institutions of the Court Department stored in the Russian State Historical Archive¹², three cases of interaction between the Ministry of the Imperial Court and contractors working on maintenance of office buildings in Livadia in 1910–1911¹³, when resolving issues of the validity of statements about the need for builders to receive additional payments, are scrutinized, which will highlight different patterns of officials' approach to this problem.

In 1861, a second imperial estate¹⁴ appeared on the southern coast of Crimea. At the turn of 1860–1861, the Department of Appanages¹⁵ bought the Livadia estate for 350,000 rubles from the heirs of Count L. S. Potocki. This deal was formalized on March 10, 1861¹⁶. From the date of purchase until 1904 it was directly governed by the administrators of the Livadia estate, while on April 22, 1904, two separate departments — of the Imperial estate of Livadia and of the Appanage estates of Massandra and Ai-Danil — by command of Emperor Nicholas II announced by the Minister of Justice were merged into one “Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department in the Crimea”¹⁷, the main office of which was located in Massandra.

The staff of the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department at the time of its establishment consisted of the manager himself, the head of the Livadia palace buildings, and an accountant; with the completion of the merger of the administrations of the Imperial estate of Livadia and the Appanage estates of Massandra and Ai-Danil by 1906, an architect and a doctor were added to them¹⁸.

From the moment of its creation, the Oreanda estate acquired in 1894 from the Grand Duke Dmitry Konstantinovich, as well as the estates “Kuchuk-Lambat”, “Chukurlar” and “Jemiet” bought by the Appanage Office in 1900–1903 from private owners, also fell under its control. The former head of the Massandra and Ai-Danil estates, State Councilor Vladimir Nikolaevich Kachalov, became the head of the new directorate¹⁹. By that time, he had proven himself to be a good organizer and diligent manager, who contributed a lot to the construction of the Massandra wine cellar²⁰. In his new position, he had an even

¹² Some materials concerning history of the reconstruction of the Livadia estate are kept in the State Archive of the Republic of Crimea, but the most interesting ones on the issue of the article were proclaimed to the author as being in bad physical condition and inaccessible to the scholars.

¹³ The issue of finding and selecting contractors for the work carried out by the Department of Appanages deserves separate consideration.

¹⁴ Oreanda was the first estate belonging to the Romanovs in the Crimea, it was bought in 1825 and then in 1837 presented by emperor Nicholas I to his wife empress Aleksandra Fedorovna. The palace complex in Oreanda was erected by 1852 according to the project by A. I. Shtakenshneider.

¹⁵ The Department of Appanages was formed in accordance with the Institution of the Imperial Family of April 5, 1797. With the creation of the Ministry of the Imperial Court in 1826, it became part of this department, in 1852 it was separated into a separate Ministry of Appanages, and in 1856 it was again transferred to the Ministry of the Imperial Court and Appanages, in 1892 it was transformed into the Main Directorate of Appanages, retaining subordination to the Minister of the Court.

¹⁶ Kalinin N. N., *Zemlianichenko M. A. Romanovy i Krym*. P. 54; Litvinova E. M. *Tsarskaia sem'ia v Krymu*. P. 95.

¹⁷ *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii. Sobranie Tretie (1881–1913)*. Vol. 24. P. 383–384. No. 24417.

¹⁸ *Adres-kalendar'. Obshchaia rospis' nachal'stvuiushchikh i prochikh dolzhnostnykh lits po vsem upravleniiam v Rossiiskoi imperii*. St. Petersburg, 1905; 1906.

¹⁹ *Adres-kalendar'. Obshchaia rospis' nachal'stvuiushchikh i prochikh dolzhnostnykh lits po vsem upravleniiam v Rossiiskoi imperii*. St. Petersburg, 1904; 1905.

²⁰ Kalinin N. N., *Zemlyanichenko M. A. Romanovy i Krym*. P. 217.

more difficult task: to ensure the smooth implementation of the complete reconstruction of the Livadia estate.

Arriving in Livadia shortly after its acquisition from the capital, the staff architects of the Department of Appanages A. I. Rezanov and V. S. Yesaulov²¹ reported on the need to erect new buildings to accommodate the children of the emperor and members of the retinue, as well as a number of buildings for employees, attendants, and guards²². This task was solved under the guidance of the architect of the Most August Court I. A. Monighetti in 1862–1866²³, whose labors during this period mainly formed the architectural and planning appearance of the already imperial estate Livadia, adapted to the larger level of the imperial residence. Through the efforts of the architect, more than 70 buildings and structures were built or reconstructed²⁴. In 1872, not far from the main residence, a small complex of the palace (cottage) Eriklik was designed and built by A. I. Rezanov for Empress Maria Alexandrova. In the next four decades, spot work was carried out in the residence for the construction or reconstruction of individual service buildings and auxiliary buildings²⁵.

The second reconstruction of Livadia took place in 1910–1911. In the course of these works, the entire residence complex was reconstructed, from the Grand Palace, rebuilt on the site of the former building, and houses for the highest ranks of the retinue and courtiers, up to the bakery, garage, and sheds. The management of these works this time was divided: the new imperial palace, the house of the minister of the imperial court, the retinue building, and the building of the palace kitchen were erected under the guidance of the famous Yalta architect N. P. Krasnov²⁶, while the rest of the construction work was entrusted to the supervision of the staff architect of the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department, civil engineer G. P. Gushchin²⁷.

Given the limited resources in Crimea, from human to material²⁸, the implementation of such a large-scale project quite naturally turned out to be associated with an excess of estimates. Accordingly, the most common difficulties in relations with contractors were financial disagreements, which manifested themselves already at the stage of final pay-

²¹ Rezanov Alexander Ivanovich (1817–1887): in 1862, professor of architecture, collegiate adviser, senior architect of the Department of appanages; Esaulov Vasily Sergeevich — in 1862, collegiate assessor, junior architect of the Department of appanages (Adres-kalendar'. Obshchaia rospis' nachal'stvuiushchikh i prochikh dolzhnostnykh lits po vsem upravleniiam v Rossiiskoi imperii. St. Petersburg, 1862).

²² *Sirotkina A. A.* Doroga na Ai-Petri. P. 35; *Sliun'kova I. N.* Livadiia. P. 71.

²³ Monighetti Ippolit Antonovich — in 1862 he was professor of architecture, collegiate assessor, and architect of the Tsarskoye Selo Palace Administration (Adres-kalendar'. Obshchaia rospis' nachal'stvuiushchikh i prochikh dolzhnostnykh lits po vsem upravleniiam v Rossiiskoi imperii. St. Petersburg, 1862).

²⁴ *Kalinin N. N., Zemlyanichenko M. A.* Romanovy i Krym. P. 65.

²⁵ *Sliun'kova I. N.*: 1) Eriklik v Livadii. P. 18–25; 2) Livadiia. P. 426–465.

²⁶ Krasnov Nikolai Petrovich (1864–1939) was the city architect of Yalta; in parallel from 1889 he was engaged in private orders; he worked for the members of the imperial family from the mid-1890s, and under his leadership, in particular, the Dulber Palace for Grand Duke Peter Nikolayevich (1895–1897) and the complex of the Kharaks Palace for Grand Duke Georgy Mikhailovich (1905–1909) were designed and built.

²⁷ On sending by the Cabinet of His Majesty money for construction of new palace // Russian State Historical Archive (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv — RGIA). F. 515. Op. 70. D. 124. L. 1; On construction of new buildings in Livadia estate and on major renovation works in Livadia and Oreanda // *Ibid.* D. 95. L. 11, 11 ob., 30–32 ob.

²⁸ Directly in the Crimea, for building materials, one could fully rely only on stone (limestones — Inkerman and Kerch stone; Miskhor and Oreanda marble) and sand; other materials were mainly supplied from other regions.

ment for the work performed. In this case, the customer's side either paid less money than was originally agreed, indicating certain shortcomings for which the funds were withheld, or paid exactly the amount of the contract without taking into account changes in the cost of materials, labor, or work performed above the estimate.

The first of the contractors to apply for compensation for losses incurred during the construction of office buildings in Livadia was the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership²⁹. On September 15, 1911, its representatives submitted a statement to the Main Directorate of Appanages, in which, referring to the increase in the cost of materials and hiring workers, as well as to the introduction by the customer, represented by the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department, of changes in the estimate, they announced the losses incurred. They were estimated at 8,433 rubles 13 kopecks for the above-budget work on the construction of the power plant and 12,282 rubles 93 kopecks due to a rise in prices for materials and an increase in the cost of hiring artisans, for a total of 20,716 rubles 6 kopecks. At the same time, the petitioners argued that the costs incurred by the firm resulted from circumstances of an external nature and not from their action or inaction³⁰.

This appeal was considered in the Main Directorate of Appanages by the end of January 1912 and then sent for substantive analysis to the local Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department. A response report signed by the manager V. N. Kachalov was submitted on November 16, 1912. It was noted that, according to the calculations of the architect G. P. Gushchin, the Partnership had to get up to 6,061 rubles 57 kopecks for extra-cost work, and it was recognized that it was possible to issue no more than 6,511 rubles 50 kopecks to pay off losses from price changes, amounting to 15 % of 42,000 rubles, the amount for which the construction of the power plant building was commissioned. Officials in St. Petersburg, having analyzed the materials received, agreed with the proposed assessment of the amount of the payment, which amounted to a total of 12,573 rubles 7 kopecks. This decision was agreed upon on March 12, 1913, by count M. E. Nirod, assistant to the head of the Main Directorate of Appanages, and submitted for approval to the head of the department, Prince V. S. Kochubey, who signed it on March 14 of the same year³¹.

However, the appointed payment could not fully satisfy the claims of the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership. Its leaders, having received and "taking note" of the answer to their letter, on March 30, 1913, filed a new petition. It specifically outlined that the society had been working on orders from the Appanage Department since 1904 and had never filed petitions before, but this time the losses incurred were considered too significant to be ignored. The contractor's side gave a breakdown of the losses incurred, noting the increase in the cost of hiring and the rise in the cost of materials, and also again pointing out the changes made by the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department to the estimate in the

²⁹ The Zhelezo-Beton Partnership was founded in St. Petersburg in 1900 by engineer Heinrich Antonovich Girshson. At first, the company was mainly engaged in the installation of ceilings according to the system of the Hungarian engineer Matray, who transferred the right to use his technology in Russia to the founder of the company, but as the technology of reinforced concrete work developed, it began to expand its activities in this area. In 1908, the list of works performed by the Partnership included 43 groups, the main of which were: skeletal buildings, flat ceilings, ribbed slab ceilings, reinforced concrete vaults and domes, external walls made of reinforced concrete and hollow stones, roofs, and reinforced concrete stairs. See: The reinforced concrete canopy of the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership. Available at: <https://www.citywalls.ru/house29367.html> (accessed: 07.24.2023).

³⁰ On construction of electric power station in Livadia estate // RGIA. F.515. Op.85. D.305. L.1, 1 ob., 7.

³¹ Ibid. L. 7, 7 ob.

amount of 1,700 rubles, the appointment on its part of new work for 7,000 rubles, as well as the omission in the estimate of a clause with the cost of scaffolding for 4,000 rubles. The applicants believed that their justification of the losses, as well as their status as a performance contractor who suffered material damage not due to negligence but due to external circumstances, would allow for a review of the previous decision on the amount of payment and receiving full compensation. At the same time, the requested amounts were adjusted in comparison with the first appeal; now they asked for 12,390 rubles for the construction of the power plant building and 8,069 rubles 13 kopecks for additional work, and in total, 20,459 rubles 13 kopecks³².

The second appeal waited for a response for more than two years, until November 1915. At the same time, in their conclusion, the officials first noted that earlier, at the end of 1911, the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership had already asked for damages of 20,716 rubles 6 kopecks, having received, based on the results of studying the circumstances of the case with the participation of employees of the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department, a compensation of 12,573 rubles 7 kopecks approved by V. S. Kochubey on March 12, 1913. After reviewing the available documents on this case, the 11th (Architectural) Department of the Main Directorate of the Appanages in early November 1915 came to the conclusion that the second appeal was groundless. This judgment was supported by the head of the Main Directorate of Appanages on November 13, and on November 16, a notification was sent to the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership to reject its second application for an additional payment in compensation for losses³³. Thus, the officials of the Main Directorate of Appanages chose the line of limiting contractors' requests for funds for unforeseen expenses for work in Livadia. At the same time, they did not refuse payments in principle, but did not find it possible to repay all the declared financial claims, adhering to the strategy of relying on the financial documents at their disposal.

On September 22, 1911, contractors Ignat Dmitrievich Kholoptsev³⁴ and Matvei Grigorievich Ryk applied to the head of the Main Directorate of Appanages Prince V. S. Kochubey for compensation payments due to significant losses incurred during their work in the Livadia estate³⁵. They claimed that the architect and manager were aware of their situation and had unofficially assured them of full payment. However, their hopes were not fulfilled, leading to the filing of a petition³⁶.

The letter was forwarded to the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department for review. Four months later, in mid-January 1912, the appanage administration acknowledged the exceptional conditions and price increase, recognizing that the contractors did suffer some loss. They estimated that a possible surcharge of 15–20% of the total contract amount could be justified³⁷.

The Main Directorate of Appanages on February 15, 1912, decided to postpone the issue of additional payment until technical reports on the work carried out in 1910–

³² On construction of electric power station in Livadia estate. L. 1–2.

³³ Ibid. L. 3, 3 ob., 6, 6 ob.

³⁴ Ignat (Ignatius) Dmitrievich Kholoptsev (1865–1919), a native of the Kursk province, was engaged in construction work in the Crimea from the end of the 19th century, actively collaborating with the architect N. P. Krasnov. See: *Protopova L. I.* Livadiysky podryadchik // Krymskaya gazeta. 2008. March 21. P. 3.

³⁵ On the construction and repair works in the estates of his majesty Livadia and Oreanda // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 85. D. 194. L. 34–35.

³⁶ *Efimov A. A.* Delo Kholoptseva... P. 21.

³⁷ Ibid.

1911 were submitted by the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department. Despite instructions to speed up the submission of these reports, they were not ready until June 1913. The report stated that the contractors faced difficulties due to competition with the builders of the new Livadia Palace, resulting in a possible shortage of contractors. The architect of the department G. P. Gushchin suggested granting the contractors a share of the additional payment, which would amount to 25,284 rubles³⁸.

After reviewing the report, V. N. Kachalov by June 25 of the same year compiled his letter for the Main Directorate of Appanages, explaining the delay in preparing the report and calculating the additional payments. He recognized the exceptional conditions and cooperation with the contractors but found it difficult to determine the exact number of losses. He estimated that the amount established by G. P. Gushchin, 25,284 rubles, was close to the truth. He petitioned for the allocation of these funds, which were considered insignificant compared to the additional payments declared by other contractors³⁹.

The contractors I. D. Kholoptsev and M. G. Ryk reapplied to the head of the Main Directorate of Appanages in October 1913, but the work did not speed up. The consideration of V. N. Kachalov's report took nine months. In the conclusion prepared on March 27, 1914, the officials of the Main Directorate of Appanages recalculated the losses to be 18,587 rubles. They noted that the request of Kholoptsev and Ryk should not be considered on the same grounds as other contractors but still deserved mercy. The 11th Department of the Main Directorate of Appanages proposed issuing 18,587 rubles as a refund to the reduction of prices for the work performed⁴⁰.

The issue was finally resolved on April 19, 1914, with the approval of paying the contractors an additional sum of 18,587 rubles. The manager of the Livadia-Massandra appanage administration was informed of this decision on April 21, 1914. The payment was to be issued from the current appropriations for the maintenance of the Livadia estate⁴¹. This information was communicated to the 2nd branch of the Main Directorate of Appanages on May 2nd⁴².

The case of railway engineer Nikolai Alexandrovich Vasiliev stands out among the cases of compensation for the financial losses of contractors. Under an agreement dated May 15, 1910, by the autumn of 1911, he had completed the construction or reconstruction of more than twenty outbuildings on the estate, which made up a significant part of the auxiliary buildings. Having suffered a loss as a result of the work, estimated at more than a quarter of a million rubles, on October 11, 1911, the contractor applied for reimbursement of lost funds to the head of the Main Directorate of Appanages, becoming the third of the applicant contractors. In his letter, the contractor succinctly described all those problems and, in his opinion, unforeseen negative situations that led to the occurrence of losses, from common difficulties for all in attracting workers and acquiring materials in contest with higher payments from N. P. Krasnov, who was responsible for

³⁸ On the construction and repair works in the estates of his majesty Livadia and Oreanda // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 85. D. 194. L. 394, 394 ob., 401, 401 ob., 407, 407 ob., 413–416.

³⁹ *Efimov A. A. Delo Kholoptseva...* P. 21–22.

⁴⁰ On the construction and repair works in the estates of his majesty Livadia and Oreanda // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 85. D. 194. L. 395, 398–399, 412, 412 v., 415–416.

⁴¹ *Efimov A. A. Delo Kholoptseva...* P. 23.

⁴² The 2nd branch of the Main Directorate of the Appanages was responsible for “economic affairs relating to the imperial family”, including financing the work carried out at the expense of the Appanage department on the estates of members of the Romanov dynasty.

Livadia palace construction, to problems with subcontractors performing certain types of work. Having familiarized himself with the paper received, the head of the Appanage Directorate ordered a special commission consisting of high-ranking employees of his department, namely of the official for special assignments under the Minister of the Imperial Court V. V. Nikiforov, the head of the 11th (Architectural) department A. A. Stepanov and the head of the 2nd department V. A. Stavrovskii. The choice of these employees could be due to the fact that they worked in the departments responsible for the conduct and administration of construction work, and during 1910–1911 at least once they were on business trips to Livadia, inspecting the progress of the reconstruction of the residence⁴³. At the same time, a general check of the information and arguments provided by the applicant was initiated. At its first meeting on October 13, 1911, the commission, after analyzing the content of the document, made a preliminary decision that, taking into account the discounts made by N. A. Vasiliev at the signing of the contract, the overspending common to all work on Livadia and Massandra in general against estimated calculations and really difficult conditions for the production of work by this contractor, “it would be fair, without waiting for the results of the verification and determination of the amount of Vasiliev’s losses, to issue now Vasiliev an additional payment for work performed by him under a contract in the amount of about 20 % of the contract sum, that is, up to 60,000 rubles⁴⁴. Thus, on the basis of their experience and recognizing in principle the existence of a certain loss, the officials promptly agreed to a partial satisfaction of the petition. The corresponding orders for the payment were given the very next day, October 14, 1911⁴⁵.

The general verification of the information contained in the application and the preparation of the necessary corroborative financial documentation, designed to form a full-fledged conclusion on the size and nature of the contractor’s material losses, took several months. At the same time, in a lengthy letter submitted at the beginning of December 1911 addressed to V. V. Nikiforov, who was a member of the commission, V. N. Kachalov mentioned two possible approaches to resolving the issue of the application: a formal one, according to which all the arguments of the petitioner were refuted, and he had no rights to payment at all; and a humane one, according to which the successes of the contractor were recognized and there were arguments in his favor. Based on the second option, the manager of the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department estimated the contractor’s total losses at 127,700 rubles and noted that the verification of financial documents under the contracts of N. A. Vasiliev “will be a very difficult and complicated matter, and can hardly give new more or less solid data to increase the calculation I have given above”⁴⁶.

The work of the commission continued for more than two months. At the same time, the clarification of financial issues was complicated by the lack of intelligible documentation, which either had not yet been prepared, or was drawn up with omissions. As a result, by December 21, 1911, after careful and detailed consideration of the estimates

⁴³ These inspections carried out by at least one of the mentioned officials took place in June, September and November of the year 1910 and in April and July of 1911 (for further information on these visit: *Efimov A. A. Problemy administrirovaniya stroitel'stva sluzhebnykh zdanii pri rekonstruktsii imeniya Livadiya v 1910–1911 gg. // Vestnik arhivista. 2023. No. 3. P. 823–834).*

⁴⁴ On the August decision concerning reimbursement to contractor engineer Vasiliev of his sustained losses at edifices in Livadia estate in the sum of 230,000 rubles and on application of the other contractors about compensation of their sustained losses at palace construction // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 70. D. 189. L. 1–5 ob.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* L. 7–10 ob.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* L. 14–18.

received, the papers submitted by the applicant and analysis of the circumstances of the case, it was found that the contractor could have been paid 125,000 rubles wherein the remaining amount of the claimed loss in the amount of 100,000 rubles was unable to substantiate. However, provided that the contractor subsequently prepared detailed structured reports for each of the structures he completed separately and submitted the same reports from the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department, this case could be accepted for re-examination. In addition, officials recognized the validity of the special conditions of work mentioned by N. A. Vasiliev, such as: difficulties in hiring and retaining workers with higher wages on the construction of the Great Livadia Palace, the problem of ensuring the protection of building materials on a huge area of the estate with numerous workers, as well as shortcomings in the activities of the local Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department for the administration of work. However, part of the responsibility for the omissions in the organization of construction should, in the opinion of the commission, lie with N. A. Vasiliev himself⁴⁷.

For his part, the contractor, without waiting for the end of the consideration of his case, on December 19, 1911, filed a new petition addressed to V.S. Kochubey, in which he stated that he was afraid of an unfavorable solution to the issue for himself, expressed his readiness to personally give the necessary explanations and emphasized that his only aspiration was the fulfillment of the contractual obligations assumed within the agreed time frame, even at the expense of spending funds in excess of the established estimates⁴⁸.

The head of the Main Directorate of Appanages, having received the conclusion of the commission, prepared on its basis in early January 1912 a draft report for the Minister of the Imperial Court, Baron V.B. Frederiks, according to which the contractor was asked to pay a previously determined amount of 125,000 rubles. However, in the final part, it was also mentioned that N. A. Vasiliev filed a new petition. The presented paper was used by the head of the court department to draw up a report for Emperor Nicholas II. In the course of editing the document, for reasons not yet established⁴⁹, an amendment was made to its final part, according to which the contractor had the opportunity to receive the rest of the loss declared by him in the amount of 105,000 rubles, while the indication of the conditions for receiving this additional payment was removed. Initially, it could be paid after the preparation and verification of technical reports on the construction of the palace and other structures, and its size depended on the results of this verification. It was the corrected version that was presented on January 14, 1912, as a report to Emperor Nicholas II and received the approval of His Majesty⁵⁰. Thus, despite the discreet conclusion of the specialist officials of the Main Directorate of Appanages, the Minister of the Imperial Court V.B. Frederiks nevertheless considered it possible to open the opportunity for the contractor to receive full satisfaction of his request.

⁴⁷ Ibid. L. 21–37.

⁴⁸ Ibid. L. 38–39.

⁴⁹ The documents from the Chancellery of the Ministry of the Imperial Court as well as the files of the Main Directorate of Appanages contain no information on the causes of this decision. Personal fund of V.B. Frederiks also can't provide any specific information as there was no mentioning of N. A. Vasiliev as a sender of letters to the minister.

⁵⁰ On the August decision concerning reimbursement to contractor engineer Vasiliev of his sustained losses at edifices in Livadia estate in the sum of 230,000 rubles and on application of the other contractors about compensation of their sustained losses at palace construction // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 70. D. 189. L. 41–47.

However, in the interdepartmental correspondence that followed the approval of the report, the condition for the payment of 105,000 rubles after the presentation by N. A. Vasiliev of a complete set of reports, it was again established. This requirement was met at the beginning of March 1912. At the same time, the officials of the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department used every opportunity to withhold sums from the contractor for the use of state-owned materials or to cover the costs of correcting the imperfections he had committed. The main settlements with the contractor continued until the late autumn of 1912, and the issue was finally closed only at the beginning of November 1914⁵¹.

It is worth noting that when considering the petition of N. A. Vasiliev, middle-level officials of the Ministry of the Imperial Court sought to carefully evaluate the financial requirements they claimed, limiting the amount of cash payments. However, the contractor N. A. Vasiliev managed in the end to receive full compensation for his losses, which became possible due to the fact that his case reached the head of the Court Department and received a favorable decision from the emperor. At the same time, officials of the Main Directorate of Appanages and the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department nevertheless tried to achieve, if possible, a reduction in the number of payments due to deductions from the contractor for shortcomings or errors in paperwork.

Summing up the consideration of the history of petitions from contractors for the construction of service buildings in Livadia, it must first be emphasized that during the reconstruction of the mentioned type of buildings of the Livadia estate complex, as it was found out from the documents, all the main contractors suffered losses. This situation seems to be the unique one, as studying the history of construction of many other residences and buildings erected with the supervision and financial support from the Ministry of the Imperial Court⁵² never before I found such massive struggle for refunds.

However, the method to resolve the issue of compensation for these losses can be named time-tested as the officials of Ministry of the Imperial Court and Appanages in Saint Petersburg had no doubts how to act and reacted quite promptly. The Main Directorate of Appanages requested the conclusions of the local appanage administration — the Livadia-Massandra Appanage Department. For its part, the latter, in the person of V. N. Kachalov and the architect of the department, G. P. Gushchin, being not that fast in preparing materials for the capital's officials, tried to reasonably approach the determination of the number of payments. The documents submitted from Livadia were each time examined in detail in the Main Directorate of Appanages. The directorate, meeting the demands of the applicants, nevertheless did not allow itself completely arbitrary payments, trying to have clear justifications for expenses, reducing these over planned allocations as much as possible. At the same time, in the case of full or partial satisfaction of the request for additional payments, subsequent petitions from contractors were banned, as in the case of I. D. Kholoptsev and M. G. Ryk⁵³ or rejected, as directed in March 1913 by the Zhelezo-Beton Partnership. However, as the case of N. A. Vasiliev showed, there was also a way to achieve the full satisfaction of the petition, but this required that the paper reach the head of the court department and then receive a positive decision from the emperor.

⁵¹ On the August decision concerning reimbursement to contractor engineer Vasiliev of his sustained losses at edifices in Livadia estate in the sum of 230,000 rubles and on application of the other contractors about compensation of their sustained losses at palace construction // RGIA. F. 515. Op. 70. D. 189. L. 48–51, 55, 55 ob., 57–67, 70–116.

⁵² *Efimov A. A.*: 1) Sankt-Peterburg XIX veka; 2) Velikokniazheskie rezidentsii...

⁵³ *Efimov A. A.* Delo Kholoptseva... P. 23.

References

- Borisova E. A. K voprosu o vzaimootnosheniakh arkhitekatora i zakazchika v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX v. *Khudozhestvennye problemy russkoi kul'tury vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1994, pp. 234–298. (In Russian)
- Efimov A. A. Delo Kholoptseva i Ryka kak primer vzaimodeistviia Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora i udelov s podriadchikami v nachale XX veka. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo*, 2023, no. 1, pp. 20–25. (In Russian)
- Efimov A. A. Finansirovanie stroitel'stva velikokniazheskikh rezidentsii vo vtoroi polovine XIX veka: peresechenie i stolknovenie vozmozhnostei Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora i zhelanii avgusteishikh zakazchikov. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Istorii*, 2021, no. 2 (53), pp. 48–56. (In Russian)
- Efimov A. A. *Sankt-Peterburg XIX veka: Stroitel'naia deiatel'nost' Ministerstva imperatorskogo dvora*. St. Petersburg, Istoricheskaia illiustratsiia Publ., 2019, 288 p. (In Russian)
- Efimov A. A. *Velikokniazheskie rezidentsii Rossiiskoi imperii v 1826–1917 gg.: ekonomika stroitel'stva*. St. Petersburg, Istoricheskaia illiustratsiia Publ., 2020, 288 p. (In Russian)
- Efremova L. A. Livadiia — romanticheskii simbioz stilei. *Arkhitektura. Stroitel'stvo. Dizain*, 2015, no. 3 (80), pp. 90–95. (In Russian)
- Ermakova E. S. Arkhitekturno-planirovochnoe formirovanie dvortsovogo zdaniia s uchetom insoliatsii na primere tsarskoi rezidentsii v Livadii arkhitekatora N. P. Krasnova. *Ekonomika stroitel'stva i prirodopol'zovaniia*, 2022, no. 3 (84), pp. 116–121. (In Russian)
- Gorokhov V. A. *Dvortsy i parki Kryma: v istorii i istoriakh*. Moscow, IN-OKTAVO Publ., 2018, 635 p. (In Russian)
- Kalinin N. N., Kadievich A., Zemlianichenko M. A. *Arkhitekotor Vysochaishego Dvora. "Arkhitekotor Krasnov — udivitel'nyi molodets"*. Simferopol, Biznes-Inform Publ., 2017, 230 p. (In Russian)
- Kalinin N. N., Zemlianichenko M. A. *Romanovy i Krym. "U vsekh nas ostalas' toska po Krymu..."*. Simferopol, Biznes-Inform Publ., 2018, 320 p. (In Russian)
- Khotina M. M., Iakovenko N. E. Vostochnaia stilistika v usadbenoi arkhitekture Kryma kontsa XIX veka. *Arkhitektura Kryma na rubezhe XIX–XX vekov*. Simferopol, 2022, pp. 245–250. (In Russian)
- Koliada E. M. *Sady i parki Kryma XIX — nachala XX veka. Istorii sozdaniia i stilisticheskii analiz*. St. Petersburg, Nevskii institut upravleniia i dizaina Press, 2009, 181 p. (In Russian)
- Litvinova E. M. *Tsarskaia sem'ia v Krymu*. Simferopol, Rubin-Plus Publ.; Amazonka-Krym Publ., 2011, 480 p. (In Russian)
- Loseva A. S. "Sebia kak v zerkale ia vizhu...": tsarskie rezidentsii glazami zakazchikov. St. Petersburg, Dmitrii Bulanin Publ., 2006, 138 p. (In Russian)
- Mantsygina I. V. *Arkhitektura usadeb "Tsarskogo berega" v Krymu v XIX — nachale XX v.*: PhD thesis abstract (Architecture). St. Petersburg, 1999, 404 p. (In Russian)
- Pal'keeva E. A. *Imperatorskoe imenie Livadiia v gody russko-turetskoi voiny 1877–1878 gg.* Istorii v podrobnostiakh. 2016, no. 5–6 (71–72), pp. 50–57. (In Russian)
- Rezvin V. A. *Arkhitekatory i vlast'*. Moscow, Iskusstvo-XXI vek Publ., 2013, 311 p. (In Russian)
- Sirotkina A. A. *Doroga na Ai-Petri. Puteshestvie v proshloe*. Simferopol, Nizhniaia Orianda Publ., 2021, 256 p. (In Russian)
- Sliun'kova I. N. Eriklik v Livadii (poselok Gornyi Krymskogo gornolesnogo zapovednika). *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo*, 2019, no. 1, pp. 18–25. (In Russian)
- Sliun'kova I. N. Gradostroitel'nyi zamysel Livadiiskogo dvortsovo-parkovogo ansambliia. *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo*, 2018, no. 1, pp. 36–43. (In Russian)
- Sliun'kova I. N. Livadiia i Il'inskoe — paralleli sozdaniia dvukh imperatorskikh rezidentsii. *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo*, 2016, no. 4, pp. 20–29. (In Russian)
- Sliun'kova I. N. *Livadiia. Arkhitektura dvortsovo-parkovogo ansambliia. Vtoraia polovina XIX veka*. Moscow, BuksMART Publ., 2022, 476 p. (In Russian)
- Sliun'kova I. N. Neorenessans i simvolizm v arkhitekture Livadiiskogo dvortsa (1909–1911). Po chertezham, eskizam i stat'e N. P. Krasnova, ocherkam G. K. Lukomskogo. *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitel'stvo*, 2022, no. 3, pp. 29–39. (In Russian)

- Sliun'kova I. N. Tserkov' Vozneseniia Gospodnia v Livadii i vizantiiskii stil' arkhitektury. Imperatorskii zakaz i ispolnenie proekta. *Vestnik tserkovnogo iskusstva i arkheologii*, 2020, no. 2 (3), pp. 78–110. (In Russian)
- Solov'ev N. K. Livadiiskii dvorets v Krymu i ego stilisticheskaia variativnost'. Dekorativnoe iskusstvo i predmetno-prostranstvennaia sreda. *Vestnik RGKhPU im. S. G. Stroganova*, 2019, no. 1-1, pp. 11–22. (In Russian)
- Zima A. G. Livadiiskii dvortsovo-parkovyi ansambl'. Arkhitekturnaia atributsiia. *Estestvennye i tekhnicheskie nauki*, 2022, no. 2 (165), pp. 286–290. (In Russian)

Received: October 22, 2023

Accepted: January 10, 2024

Статья поступила в редакцию 22 октября 2023 г.

Рекомендована к печати 10 января 2024 г.