

# Research Article

## “Я Тоже:” The Rape of Katerina Stepanova and John Paul Jones’ Russian Legacy<sup>1</sup>

Jacob Bell

*University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign*

---

On March 31, 1789, a young Russian girl named Katerina Stepanova accused John Paul Jones, an ex-American revolutionary serving Catherine II of Russia, of raping her. The allegation blossomed into an international scandal, drawing hardened battle lines between Catherine’s Russia and the Anglo-American/French world. Despite the international significance of the case among its contemporary audiences, it fell out of later historiography, especially among those who write about Jones. Heretofore, his biographers labeled Stepanova’s allegation as fabrication, intrigue, or slander. Drawing on the John L. Senior Moscow papers, which compile the records and documents concerning the allegation, this paper aims to present the case as recorded in police reports and statements presented to Catherine’s government. It contends that the Stepanova case deserves to be heard because it reveals competing ideas of gender and sexual violence between Russia and Western Europe, opening further avenues of exploration for scholars of gender and sexuality in the eighteenth century. Additionally, the specifics of the case and the debate surrounding it offers reflections on the contextualization of sexual assault and consent with particular relevance to our contemporary dialogues.

ON MARCH 31, 1789, TEN-YEAR-old Katerina Stepanova, the daughter of German immigrants living in St. Petersburg, accused Rear Admiral John Paul Jones, a hero of the American Revolution now serving in the Russian Imperial Navy, of raping her. The girl, supported by her mother, Sophia Fyodorovna Golzvalt, brought her case “Against the forcible violation of her chastity” before the St. Petersburg Chief of Police, Major General-Cavalier Nikita Ivanovich Ryleyev, who ordered an inquiry by Captain Dmitriev, Ward Inspector of the First Admiralty District, where the alleged assault occurred.<sup>2</sup> Dmitriev undertook an investigation of the matter, interviewing the girl and her mother, as well as several members of Jones’ household: Pavel Dmitrevski, Jones’ Russian interpreter; Johann Bahl, a secretary to the Rear Admiral; Michailo Yakovlev, a first-seaman from the *Vladimir*, Jones’ ship during the Crimean campaign; and Ivan Vasilyev, Jones’ peasant coachman. Dmitriev also ordered Katerina Stepanova examined by both a regimental surgeon, Christopher Nilus, and a midwife, Christina Lutkerov, and accepted a written declaration from Jones himself.<sup>3</sup> Dmitriev then reported his findings to Ryleyev on April 5, 1789. On the following day, Ryleyev, recognizing Jones’ status as Rear Admiral, decided he had no jurisdiction over the matter and relayed the case to the State Admiralty College, which dealt with allegations against high ranking naval officers.<sup>4</sup> Through the Admiralty College, the case garnered the attention of Petersburg society and, ultimately, its sovereign, the Empress Catherine II (r. 1762-96).

The allegation of rape against Jones

effectively ended his service in the Russian Imperial Navy and forced him into European exile. Furthermore, it grew into something of an international scandal, with the Empress Catherine, French newspapers, multi-national ambassadors in Paris, St. Petersburg, and Copenhagen, and the American Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, engaging in an extended dialogue about the guilt or innocence of the ex-admiral. The rape allegation became a microcosm of attitudes towards gender and sexual violence in an international context. Yet, despite the scandal of the case, it has remained undiscussed in contemporary works on both John Paul Jones and Catherine the Great. This paper aims to tell Katerina Stepanova’s story, heretofore the victim of a cult of silence. I draw primarily on the John L. Senior Moscow papers, a collection of documents collected by Senior, an American ambassador to the USSR and direct descendent of Jones, and deposited in the Naval Academy Museum Archives in Annapolis, MD. Senior consolidated all the documents concerning Jones’ service in Russia, including Katerina Stepanova’s rape, copied the originals, and translated most to English. To augment the stories provided by Senior, I turn to collections of Jones’ personal papers housed in the Peter Force collection at the Library of Congress, as well as several published collections of memoirs and letters. The revelations of the Stepanova case reveal striking differences between Russian and Anglo/Franco-American readings of the case and speak much to our contemporary experience with sexual violence, assault, and the dynamics of power and justice.

### **An American Admiral in St Petersburg: Jones’ Russian Service in Memory**

A QUICK WALK AROUND THE CRYPT of John Paul Jones in the chapel of the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis immediately indicates the lack of conversation on Jones’ Russian service. The Navy etched the names of the vessels he commanded in a ring around his final resting place. The names include the *Ranger*, the *Serapis*, the *Providence*, the *Alfred*, the *Alliance*, and the *Bonhomme Richard*. Noticeably missing is the name of the ship Jones commanded in the Imperial Russian Navy, the *Vladimir*. An obscure plaque in the corner of the crypt, detailing honors Jones received in life lists the Order of St. Anne granted to him by Catherine II of Russia. One enduring legacy of Jones’ time in Russia is the allegation of rape, which might explain the lack of scholarly interest in this period of his life. In fact, the apparent refusal to address Jones’ service in Russia and his private actions while there persists throughout the historiography of the life of the Scots-American.

John Paul Jones was born in 1747, the son of a gardener from Kirkbean in southwest Scotland. His naval career began at thirteen, when he joined as an apprentice to a captain bound for Virginia. He served on a number of slave and merchant ships around the British North American colonies and the West

Indies, having a brother who lived in Virginia. Jones survived a few scandals, most stemming from allegations of excess cruelty in his handling of sailors under his command, before eventually electing to join the American revolutionary struggle shortly after its outbreak in 1775. His service in the Continental Navy culminated in the battle that earned him his immortality, the naval duel between Jones’ vessel *Bonhomme Richard* (named for Benjamin Franklin’s *Poor Richard’s Almanac*) and the HMS *Serapis* off the coast of England on September 23, 1779. Jones triumphed over the British vessel, giving rise to the possibly apocryphal legend that he shouted, “I have not yet begun to fight!” in response to a call to surrender and strike his colors. France’s Louis XVI (r. 1774-92) knighted him for his victory, and Jones preferred to be referred to as “Chevalier” for the remainder of his life.<sup>5</sup>

After the 1783 Treaty of Paris, Jones served the new United States as an agent to various courts in Europe. Working as an American envoy to the King of Denmark, Jones caught the attention of Catherine II, who required naval talent amidst her preparations for a renewed war with the Ottoman Empire in the Black Sea, and sought foreign officers to bolster her ranks.<sup>6</sup> On Catherine’s orders, the Baron de Krudener, the Russian ambassador to Denmark, approached Jones in Copenhagen and offered him a command in the Russian

***The rape allegation became a microcosm  
of attitudes towards gender and sexual  
violence in an international context.***

Imperial Navy.<sup>7</sup> The idea of Russian service appealed to Jones. Since the end of the American Revolution, he was a rebel without a cause and an admiral without a commission. He undertook a number of diplomatic missions on behalf of his adopted nation, culminating in his Danish appointment, yet he longed to return to active naval service.<sup>8</sup>

Catherine, in express order to the Admiralty, named Jones a major general of the captains in the Black Sea Fleet on February 15, 1788.<sup>9</sup> The appointment caused some consternation for the ex-American revolutionary. Writing to Thomas Jefferson, then the American ambassador to the court at Versailles, Jones asserted “I can never renounce the glorious title of a Citizen of the United States,” yet he still felt compelled to better his monetary prospects by accepting the Russian offer.<sup>10</sup> Despite these reservations, Jones nonetheless traveled to St. Petersburg to assume his new command. In a dramatic gesture, he compelled Swedish peasants to row him “4 to 500 miles” across the near-frozen Gulf of Finland to Reva, then part of the Russian Empire’s Baltic possessions.<sup>11</sup> Upon arrival in St. Petersburg, Jones received the honor of an audience with the Empress herself. Writing to the Marquis de Lafayette in June 1788, Jones recorded his encounter with Catherine, saying, “The Empress received me with a distinction the most flattering that perhaps any stranger can boast of on entering the Russian service.”<sup>12</sup> During his audience, Jones gave Catherine a copy of the newly ratified American Constitution, to which the Empress expressed her belief, “That the American Revolution cannot fail to bring about others, and to influence every form of

government.” Catherine immediately named Jones Rear Admiral of the Black Sea fleet and he spent a fortnight as the toast of the Imperial court.<sup>13</sup> Following this sabbatical, Catherine placed Jones under the command of Potemkin and sent him south to the ongoing conflict in the Crimea.

John Paul Jones’ memory continues to enjoy popular respect in the American national consciousness. He benefits from the reverence, if not deference, afforded to most members of the American revolutionary cohort. The myth of Jones originally centered on his Revolutionary naval victories, and this is the image of the man which persists. When France returned Jones’ body to the United States for reinterment in 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt commemorated the event by declaring, “Every officer in our Navy should know by heart the deeds of John Paul Jones,” and, “Every officer in our Navy should feel in each fiber of his being an eager desire to emulate the energy, the professional capacity, the indomitable determination and dauntless scorn of death which marked John Paul Jones above all his fellows.”<sup>14</sup> Roosevelt’s assessment demonstrated the national focus on Jones’ military career and the absence of a conversation on his private life and his time in Russia.

Only one published monograph has ever fully addressed Jones’ service in the Russian Imperial Navy: Lincoln Lorenz’s *The Admiral and the Empress: John Paul Jones and Catherine the Great*, published in 1954. Lorenz, one of Jones’ most dedicated biographers, took up a defense of the Rear Admiral that became the accepted version of events of Jones’ life in Russia. Lorenz, writing in the 1950s, used his account of Jones

as an indictment of the Stalinist system in Eastern Europe, claiming, “In the tragedy of John Paul Jones in Russia, history is prophecy of the Iron Curtain as revealing as the sun.”<sup>15</sup> His clear mistrust of Russia materialized in his description of the country as a product of the “Military aggression of its Germanic founders from Scandinavia, the ruthless cruelty of its assimilated invaders the Asiatic Tartars, the superstitions of its adopted Greek Orthodox Church, and the typical Eastern treachery.”<sup>16</sup> Lorenz’s assessment of Catherine was not much kinder. He labeled her a tyrant whose “Inordinate feminine vanity went hand in hand with her absolutism,” and asked, “What raiment of royal splendor, what jewels of Eastern brilliance, what allurements of Oriental feminine graces, what domination of autocratic power were not on parade” at her court.<sup>17</sup>

Lorenz’s main contribution to the historiography was the establishment of the accepted story of Jones’ involvement in Katerina Stepanova’s rape. Lorenz is one of the only Jones biographers to read the John L. Senior Moscow papers.<sup>18</sup> Lorenz read the papers and included copies of them in his text, yet concluded that he did not trust them, instead choosing to accept the version of events promulgated by Jones and the Comte de Ségur, the French ambassador to Russia during these events. Lorenz declared that Katerina Stepanova was “the girl decoy” in a licentious plot rooted in “The treachery of the Empress Catherine and her favorites in plotting war and love together so as to serve their despotic ambitions even at the price of trying ruthlessly to destroy the professional and private good name of Jones.”<sup>19</sup>

Subsequent Jones biographers,

accepting the version of events established by Lorenz, have ignored the Senior papers and the story they tell of the rape of Katerina Stepanova. Samuel Eliot Morris, author of *John Paul Jones: A Sailor’s Biography*, wrote an extensive chapter on Jones’ Russian service yet still accepted Lorenz’s conclusion that Jones likely kept Katerina Stepanova as a prostitute and she was used to shame him.<sup>20</sup> Morris earned himself the ire of Lorenz, who chided Morris for not going far enough to indict Catherine for the role he believed she exercised in the affair.<sup>21</sup> Another prominent example is the relatively new Joseph Callo biography *John Paul Jones: America’s First Sea Warrior*, sponsored by the Naval Institute. Despite presenting his work as a “Fresh look at America’s first sea warrior,” which “Avoids the hero worship of past biographies and provides a more complete understanding of his accomplishments,” Callo based his conclusions on Jones’ and the Comte de Ségur’s letters and concluded, “The girl was, in all probability, a prostitute whose services Jones had employed. Jones already had a reputation as a womanizer, and his detractors very effectively used that as the weak point at which to attack his character.”<sup>22</sup> Further, he mirrored Lorenz’s argument that Catherine planned the entire affair, noting, “The empress continued to *act* as if she had been deeply offended by his alleged behavior [emphasis added].”<sup>23</sup> In contrast to these readings, this paper attempts to take Katerina Stepanova’s allegation at face value by discussing in full the evidence provided by Stepanova in her denunciation of Jones.

## The Allegation of Rape

**K**ATERINA STEPANOVA'S VERSION of events placed her in the vicinity of Pokhodyashina house in the First Admiralty District, the residence of John Paul Jones in St Petersburg, on March 30, 1789. In her deposition to Dmitriev, Katerina Stepanova swore she was ten years old and that her mother sent her to sell butter near the house.<sup>24</sup> Katerina Stepanova stated that a man-servant summoned her into the apartment on the second floor of the house to sell butter to his master, whom she reported wore "A white uniform, the front of which was embroidered in gold and decorated with a crimson ribbon and gold star."<sup>25</sup> The man locked the door behind her, paid her 25 kopeks for a 15 kopeks allotment of butter, and then grabbed her around the waist when she tried to leave and hit her on the chin with enough force to bust her lip, stuffing a white handkerchief in her mouth to stop her from screaming. Katerina Stepanova swore that he took her into a bedroom, "Took a mattress off the couch...put it on the floor, threw her down on it and with violence had assaulted her."<sup>26</sup> The translation from the German by John Senior uses the milder term "assaulted," though the report leaves little doubt the man forcibly had sex with her.<sup>27</sup> Katerina Stepanova reported that the man spoke Russian very badly, but told her that he would kill her should she tell her mother or anyone else about him, though he let her leave the flat.<sup>28</sup>

Two medical examinations corroborated Katerina Stepanova's account. Christopher Nilus, the regimental surgeon who inspected Katerina Stepanova at the order of Captain Dmitriev, testified that Katerina

Stepanova's "Child-bearing parts were swollen and she received a left blow on her jaw, her lower lip having been cut by teeth," indicating both the physical and sexual assaults that Katerina Stepanova alleged were true.<sup>29</sup> A second examination, conducted by Christina Lutkerov, a registered midwife in the Second Admiralty District where Katerina Stepanova and her mother lived, confirmed that Katerina Stepanova came to her "covered in blood" and "clearly assaulted," with swollen genitalia and a cut lip. Lutkerov assured the Chief of Police, "Having examined the girl, I found that she was truly raped."<sup>30</sup>

Sophia Fyodorovna supported her daughter's claim of rape and extended the charge that Jones was the perpetrator. Sophia testified that her daughter returned home weeping and relayed to her mother everything that transpired and that they sought the advice of a Lutheran pastor in their district, who sent them to Christina Lutkerov.<sup>31</sup> Leaving her daughter in Lutkerov's care, Sophia returned to the Pokhodyashina house to ascertain the identity of her daughter's attacker. She attested that a secretary to Jones informed her that his master lived in the house and he would show her the perpetrator if she returned the next day, as "Were a thing like that to happen in the German land, the culprit would be hanged."<sup>32</sup> Based on this information, Sophia decided Jones was the man who assaulted her daughter and took her case to the Chief of Police.

The testimony of members of Jones' household alleged further that Jones was indeed with Katerina Stepanova Golzvalt on March 30, 1789. Pavel Dmitrevski, Jones' Russian interpreter, affirmed that he saw Katerina Stepanova

in Pokhodyashina house and relayed her to Jones' chambers on March 30; as he explained her presence, “The admiral liked to select his own butter.”<sup>33</sup> He added further that Katerina Stepanova was with Jones for around a half hour before she came back out the entrance he brought her through. He swore he saw no change in the girl, who returned for her gloves and jug.<sup>34</sup> Ivan Vasilyev, a coachman, attested that Katerina Stepanova visited Jones before, at the London Inn and the Pokhodyashina house, to sell butter, and that he saw her arrive and leave the house over an hour later on the day of the alleged assault.<sup>35</sup> A seaman from the *Vladimir*, Michailo Yakovlev, who was mending boots in the servants' quarters on March 30, saw the girl enter for her gloves and jug, noticing she was weeping and her face swollen, but also said he had seen her before at the Pokhodyashina house.<sup>36</sup> Finally, Johann Gottfried Bahl, a lackey to Jones, testified to several details of Katerina Stepanova's account: that Bahl asked her the price of butter, that he showed Jones three fingers, and that Jones was in his dress uniform when the girl went into his chamber.<sup>37</sup> Bahl asserted he looked through the keyhole of Jones' door and saw his master in a nightgown and later saw the girl leaving, her lips covered in blood and face swollen from weeping. He further told the police that he entered his master's chamber to make the bed that night and discovered drops of blood on the floor.<sup>38</sup>

Jones based his defense of his actions on the supposed moral degradation of his accusers. Evidence points to the fact that Jones engaged in sexual activity with the child Katerina Stepanova on March 30, 1789, yet Jones himself painted a much different account of the encounter. After

receiving a folio of the affidavits signed by the Golzvarts, the medical examiners, and his retinue, Jones responded early to the allegations against him in a letter to Nikita Ivanovich Ryleyev, the Chief of Police in St. Petersburg, on April 2, 1789. In this letter, Jones admitted that he did indeed have sex with Katerina Stepanova, though he calls her “A fallen girl who visited my home several times, and with whom I often frolicked, but for which I have always paid her cash.”<sup>39</sup> He argued that he “Did not despoil her of her virginity” and that she was much older than ten years of age, as the magistrate claimed.<sup>40</sup> He offered his chivalrous nature and sense of honor as safe-guards of his defense. He claimed to be incapable of doing harm “To this girl, or to any person of her sex.” He further claimed a long affair with the girl, in which “She submitted most willingly to do everything that a man could desire of her.”<sup>41</sup>

At this point, Jones changed his story. Disavowing his admittance to Ryleyev about having sex with Katerina Stepanova, Jones crafted a new version of events which placed him as the victim of a set-up by the girl and her mother. The Comte de Ségur recorded this version in his memoirs of his tenure as ambassador to Russia. Ségur claimed he called upon Jones at his apartment and found the Rear Admiral attempting suicide.<sup>42</sup> Having prevented the Rear Admiral from taking his life, Ségur received the following testimony: that Katerina Stepanova came to Jones' chamber and “Asked if he could give her some linen or lace to mend.” Jones claimed that Katerina Stepanova then “Performed indecent gestures,” to which he “Advised her not to enter upon so vile a career; gave her some money,

and dismissed her.” Jones then told Ségur that Katerina Stepanova, upon leaving his chamber, “Tore her clothes, screamed that Jones had raped her, and fell into the arms of her mother,” conveniently waiting outside his door.<sup>43</sup> Through this version of events, Jones molded himself into the victim, rather than perpetrator of sexual violence.

Jones saw the root of the accusation as the cupidity of Sophia Fyodorovna, Katerina Stepanova’s mother, who sought to exploit a powerful man for money.<sup>44</sup> After sending the letter to Ryleyev, Jones gathered evidence for his defense to present to the Admiralty College. Stephan Holtzwarthen, the biological father of Katerina Stepanova who lived separately from the girl and her mother, presented himself in court to sign an affidavit saying his daughter was truly twelve years of age, not ten as she asserted. He further alleged that his wife, Sophia Fyodorovna, left him for a younger man, resided in a brothel, and was herself quite licentious.<sup>45</sup> A Lutheran pastor also came to court to swear that Sophia rarely attended church services, as further proof of her supposed fall from grace.<sup>46</sup>

Despite Jones’ best efforts, the allegations did not disappear from the eye of Petersburg society or the palace,

and in a final plea, Jones appealed to his former commander in the Crimea, Prince Grigori Potemkin, to intercede on his behalf with the Empress.<sup>47</sup> In a letter dated April 13, 1789, Jones reminded the Prince of their mutual bond from the Crimean campaign and begged him to remember a previous promise of patronage.<sup>48</sup> Jones decried what he saw as police intimidation of his household to acquire testimony and wrote that he was entirely ignorant of the Russian language and therefore could have said nothing to the girl, as she claimed. He again accused Sophia Fyodorovna of being a “Miserable, adulterous, debauched woman” and a “Strumpet... without religion and without manners.”<sup>49</sup> He questioned Katerina Stepanova’s state after she visited him and alleged she not only frequently slept with him, but also with his servants. Jones admonished Potemkin by adding:

*Will it be said that it is in Russia that a miserable, adulterous, debauched woman, who has abandoned her husband, who has kidnapped her daughter, who live in a house where other strumpets have established their shameful retreat, has succeeded by a bald accusation lacking proof, in attacking the honor and wounding the sensibilities of an officer who has*

***Jones based his defense of his actions on the supposed moral degradation of his accusers.***

*distinguished, and who has merited the orders of France, of America, and of this Empire!*<sup>50</sup>

Finally, Jones admitted he enjoyed sex with women, but that “Pleasures that have to be torn away from them by force cause me horror.” He swore this all on his “Word as a soldier and a gentleman.”<sup>51</sup> From all these collected accounts, two distinct versions of Stepanova’s rape emerged—one which blamed Jones, one which blamed Stepanova. Their reception in both Russia and abroad would become the flashpoint of debate and international scandal.

### The Russian Reaction

IN RUSSIA, THE DEBATE OVER THE allegations against Jones centered primarily on the Rear Admiral and his conduct. Catherine, Potemkin, and St. Petersburg society based their conclusions on the facts of the case itself. Catherine took the side of Katerina Stepanova over her officer, the side of a destitute girl over a decorated man. Based on her actions, it seems that, to Catherine, Jones’ past services and military accomplishments held no bearing on the allegations against him. The rape itself was what mattered.

Catherine did not write specifically about the allegations against Jones, so much must be inferred from her actions and the accounts of those close to the throne. For instance, Jones had legal counsel after his case came before the Admiralty College, yet his lawyer suddenly dropped the case, supposedly on orders of the Empress, relayed through the Governor-General of St. Petersburg.<sup>52</sup> While this remains

speculation, Catherine’s known reaction was just as swift. She forbade Jones access to court and proceeded with plans to bring him to trial.<sup>53</sup>

The Russian military code was quite clear on how to handle accusations of rape. Jones, as Rear Admiral, fell under the jurisdiction of Peter the Great’s *Military Statutes*, drafted for the Imperial Army in 1716 and adapted into *Naval Statutes* in 1720.<sup>54</sup> The *Statutes* reflect a simultaneous effort to severely punish any offenders, but they also offer a plethora of hurdles to accusers. The Articles also strictly refer to women as victims, though Articles 165 and 166 of the code specifically address male-on-male, nonconsensual sex, reflecting the all-masculine sphere of the military.<sup>55</sup> To determine guilt or innocence, a judge must weigh several factors, such as whether the woman called for help, the state of the victim’s and the accused’s clothing, the testimony of witnesses, if any, and the timeliness a victim came forward.<sup>56</sup> Yet, despite their strictness, the *Statutes* laid great importance on the notion that “Rape is rape, whether the victim be a fornicatress or an honest woman” and that a judge must take special care to pay attention to “The act itself and the circumstances,” regardless of the people involved.<sup>57</sup> The punishment for officers found guilty of rape domestically or abroad was straightforward: decapitation or penal labor on the galleys for the rest of their lives.<sup>58</sup>

The military statutes invoke a tradition in Russia in which the victim’s word carried great weight in cases of rape and sexual violence. American historian Daniel Kaiser argued that “Muscovite courts, creations of the same men who

dominated the rest of the patriarchal political and social order, frequently credited women's testimony" in cases of rape. Drawing on case studies, Kaiser concluded that early modern Russian "Women seem to have captured that judicial high ground, and they were therefore able to fend off the rape myths employed by the men they accused."<sup>59</sup> Eve Levin suggested that this understanding held deeper roots within a proclivity to believe women in rape cases among the Orthodox Slavs of Russia, Bulgaria, and Serbia, a point extrapolated by other scholars, including Laura Engelstein in her exploration of sex and legalism in Russia.<sup>60</sup> Katherine Antonova and Sergei Antonov concurred with this assessment of women's power in rape cases, though focused on the upper classes, asserting "Early modern elite women in Russia were generally believed when they made accusations of rape and defended their interests in court."<sup>61</sup>

An initial glance at the statutory codes and an understanding of Russian traditions concerning sexual assault may imply that custom, not Catherine's direct intervention, was the driving force behind the legal proceedings against Jones. However, the articles clearly dictated that any delay in reporting a rape, even one day, implied consensual intercourse.<sup>62</sup> One of Jones' main defenses of his actions was just this scenario—Katerina Stepanova and her mother reported to the chief of police slightly over a day after the assault.<sup>63</sup> According to the codes, and in Jones' argument, this delay equaled consent. However, the Empress chose to override this condition of the military statutes and proceed with legal action against Jones.<sup>64</sup> The fact that Catherine, known

*From all these collected accounts, two distinct versions of Stepanova's rape emerged—one which blamed Jones, one which blamed Stepanova.*

to favor legalistic autocracy and to send items referred to her back to the Imperial Senate if she felt could be settled under the existing law and without the verdict of the sovereign, overruled the statutes in the Jones case implied that the facts of this particular charge mattered greatly to her.<sup>65</sup>

Imperial intervention was not unheard of in cases where women faced insurmountable odds. Catherine II was also to intercede in cases of extreme marital strife to protect women, though nominally the Imperial government ceded most of its authority over family law to the Russian Orthodox Church in the years following Peter the Great's abolition of the patriarchate.<sup>66</sup> One notorious case involved Duke Friedrich William Karl I of Württemberg and his wife, who appeared at the Imperial court in the mid-1780s while the Duke was in Russian service. In December of 1786, the Duchess threw herself at Catherine's feet and begged for imperial intervention, as the Duke often beat her.

## *Catherine took the side of Katerina Stepanova over her officer, the side of a destitute girl over a decorated man.*

Catherine took the Duchess under her personal protection, offering her first rooms in the Winter Palace then an estate and pension, while stripping her husband of his rank and giving him three days to withdraw from Russia entirely, remarking that his actions warranted corporal punishment.<sup>67</sup> In another 1791 incident, Catherine convinced a court actress, Elizaveta Uranova, who sought respite from the unwanted sexual advances of the powerful foreign minister Count Bezborodko to make her case public and “force” the empress to intercede on her behalf. Uranova followed the advice and leapt from the stage during a performance to fall at Catherine’s feet, crying “*matushka-tsarina spasi menia!*” (“little mother-empress, save me!”); following the incident, Catherine stepped in and gave the actress an imperial dispensation to marry her beloved.<sup>68</sup>

Catherine also occasionally used her power to the benefit of women in divorce proceedings. In the case of Count Alexander Stroganov and his wife, Countess Anna Stroganova, Catherine used her authority to benefit Anna Stroganova by refusing to intervene when Stroganov asked for her help in obtaining

a divorce. The Stroganovs had a rocky marriage, fraught with infidelity, abuse, and constant bickering, leading the British ambassador George Macartney to attest that divorce remained “the only thing in which, it is said, they ever agreed in.”<sup>69</sup> Frustrated by official channels, Stroganov directly petitioned Catherine in November of 1764 on the grounds that his union with Anna Stroganova was invalid because it was a forced union, which directly contradicted Peter I’s edict barring parents from forcing their children into marriage.<sup>70</sup> Anna Stroganova, despite clearly wanting a divorce, disputed the charge of forced marriage, instead claiming she entered into the union of her own accord. On December 2, Catherine responded to Stroganov and refused his petition, claiming “A divorce does not depend on me, but is specifically church business, in which I cannot and will not intervene,” but adding that she also refused because Anna Stroganova was not present nor petitioning for a divorce.<sup>71</sup> She told the couple that they may live apart if they wished, and granted Anna Stroganova the right to use her maiden name. Catherine’s actions in this case highlight the importance she placed on a woman’s voice. Anna Stroganova was not part of the petition, so Catherine felt she could not intervene without hearing what the wife had to say.<sup>72</sup>

Catherine again interceded on behalf of Katerina Stepanova against Jones. Faced with the realities of the sentence against him, Jones actively sought to re-ingratiate himself to the Empress. His appeals to Potemkin fell on deaf ears, leaving Jones without Russian support against the judgment of the Russian sovereign.<sup>73</sup> With Catherine’s

intransigence on the issue proved by Potemkin's silence, Jones turned towards his pre-existing connections with the United States and France to influence the Empress. An international campaign by Jones' allies at court, spearheaded by Louis XVI's ambassador to Russia, the Comte de Ségur, altered Catherine's judicial proceedings. The Empress granted Jones a chilling audience, in which the Rear Admiral kissed her hand. She granted him two years leave abroad to pursue "private business."<sup>74</sup> Jones was to keep his title and rank, yet Catherine effectively banished him from Russia during the height of the Turkish war.<sup>75</sup> The Empress' actions here proved her priorities. She dismissed a tried naval commander, especially sought out by her agents abroad, during wartime, showing that she merited the allegations against Jones higher than his potential marital service.

Jones spent his exile engaging in a propaganda war across Europe and the new United States. He actively sought to defend his conduct during the Crimean campaign and his private conduct in St. Petersburg. With the aid of Ségur, Jones promoted a version of events in which the offense to his honor in Russia necessitated his departure for two years; yet, his actions showed a man desperate to return to the Russian service. Two attempts to join the Danish and Swedish navies failed when Catherine used her influence to block his appointments.<sup>76</sup> While abroad, Jones again wrote to Potemkin, congratulating the field marshal on his recent victory over the Turks and begging the Prince's intercession with the Empress to allow Jones to return to Russia. The appeal received no reply.<sup>77</sup> Faced with silence

from the Russian court, Jones sought out Catherine's erstwhile correspondent, the Baron von Grimm, and persuaded him to forward letters from Jones directly to the Empress. In one of these letters, Jones admitted "I was afflicted and even offended at having received a parole for two years in time of war... a parole which it has never entered my head to wish for, and still less to ask."<sup>78</sup> He again entreated the Empress to remember his service and allow him to return to court.

Catherine refused to reply directly to Jones, but wrote to Grimm about him, picking apart Jones' claims of his exceptional service. She added that his two-year sabbatical, which caused him such consternation, resulted from "A suit brought against him for rape, which did little to honor his excellence, his humanity, his justice, or his generosity," and resulted in Russian seamen refusing to serve under him.<sup>79</sup> Catherine's address to Grimm proved the continuation of her belief that the rape allegation colored Jones' entire Russian service—no battlefield glory, real or imagined, nor his desire to serve Russia outweighed the fact that he raped a girl. The refusal of Russian sailors to serve with Jones suggests that other Russians shared Catherine's opinions on rape and those guilty of it. Catherine succinctly summed up her lingering opinion of Jones in another letter to Grimm. Following Jones' death in 1792, Catherine wrote "This Paul Jones was a horrible person, much dignified among despicable persons."<sup>80</sup>

### The International Reaction

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY almost unanimously endorsed

Jones’ version of events surrounding the allegations. In Great Britain, France, and the United States, Jones enjoyed the confidence of statesmen and diplomats. The emerging campaign in favor of Jones and against Catherine mobilized popular support behind the Rear Admiral across western Europe. Notably, this campaign simultaneously highlighted Jones’ virtuous nature and Catherine’s licentious personality, molding the debate into one of the merits of Catherine’s rule and reaction to the allegations against Jones, rather than the purported rape itself.

French public opinion swung behind Jones early in the debate, focusing on his past heroics over his contemporary scandal. The Comte de Ségur proved an erstwhile ally of Jones and a significant force in the shaping of French opinion to ignore the accusations against the Rear Admiral. He promoted the theory of a court conspiracy with a vigor second only to Jones himself. In a letter to the Comte d’Ésternes, French minister to Prussia, dated August 26, 1789, Ségur expounded his belief that Jones angered the Prince Potemkin and others close to the Empress, leading to their feeding of false information to the Empress about the severity of the accusations against Jones.<sup>81</sup>

Ségur believed that carnal sex was at the root of the accusation, but that the fault lay in Catherine’s sexual partners, not the sex between Jones and Katerina Stepanova. Ségur argued two theories: either Jones offended men who shared the Empress’s bed, or Jones himself refused the advances of the Empress, earning her ire either way. Using connections in Paris and Versailles, Ségur arranged lodging for Jones in France and published articles in the *Gazette de France* and other

newspapers lauding Jones’ decorated service in the Crimea and stressing he left Russia having received permission “To kiss the hand of Her Imperial Majesty.”<sup>82</sup> In an accompanying letter to the Comte Montmorin, one of Louis XVI’s press officers, Ségur insisted his article must be printed to emphasize Jones’ merits over the accusations and to assert that the Empress did not truly send Jones away in scandal.<sup>83</sup> The printing succeeded when the article found its way into many foreign gazettes and Jones received letters of confidence from French diplomats abroad.<sup>84</sup> Ségur and the press drew on a French tradition of depicting Catherine as a harlot and usurper: the earliest international account of her coming to power was Claude-Carloman de Rulhière’s unpublished manuscript entitled *Histoire, ou Anecdotes sur la révolution de Russie en l’année 1762*, which accused Catherine of soliciting her lovers to murder her husband and make her empress. This pamphlet began a popular, and largely misogynistic, discourse around her sex life which permeates discussions of Catherine’s legacy into the present day.<sup>85</sup> The fact that Jones was a French citizen and France condemned Catherine’s war with the Ottoman Empire further influenced the shift of blame away from Jones.<sup>86</sup> Popular sentiment featured prominently in the funeral oration, following Jones’ death in 1792, which concentrated on his merits as an admiral and resistance to the despotism of the “Seramis of the North,” rather than the scandal in which he left Russian service.<sup>87</sup> The manner in which the French fixed the blame on Catherine, rather than Jones, suggested that geopolitical, and to an extent, misogynistic ideas about the Empress herself, mattered

more than the details of the case against Jones.

British and American press and politicians joined the Jones camp against the Russian Empress. Thomas Jefferson, then serving as Secretary of State in the Washington administration, wrote to Jones that “No proof was necessary to satisfy us here of your good conduct everywhere,” and that Jones held not only the trust of Jefferson, but George Washington and the rest of his cabinet as well.<sup>88</sup> An American agent in Paris, a Mr. L. Littlepage, echoed the sentiment in a letter to Jefferson in which he blamed the British for undertaking a campaign against Jones to “Ruin him in the opinion of the Empress,” something he claimed they succeeded in by concocting allegations “too ridiculous.”<sup>89</sup> The British, for their part, bearing little love for either Jones or the Russians, branded Jones’ dismissal from court as a prime example of Catherine leaving a lover, reducing the dismissal as “just sex,” rather than rape. One circulating print depicted Catherine replacing a bust of Jones with another lover in her “hall of fame,” a print laden with phallic images and insinuations of bestiality surrounding the wide-hipped Empress, implying sexual undertones to the relationship between the Empress and her former admiral.<sup>90</sup> This particular print mirrored a tradition in British satirical depictions of Catherine; in other instances, she became an Amazon fighting the phallic thrusts of the Ottoman sultan or a wayward Katerina, from William Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew*, who needed to kneel to a Petruchio, always in the guise of an oversexed woman who should be put back in her place.<sup>91</sup> The British and American reactions to the Jones case

proved their priorities. Their perceived opinions of the character of Catherine and Jones mattered far more than the details of the case itself.

## Conclusions

ONE FUNDAMENTAL PIECE OF Jones’ Russian experience and the accusations leveled against him by Katerina Stepanova was that his reputation, not the young girl’s rape, was the key issue. In Jones’ view, whether or not he engaged in sexual activity with Katerina Stepanova was secondary to what their interaction reflected on his personal character. His attacks on the morality of the young girl and her mother were means through which he tried to defend his own moral standing in the eyes of the Russian and pan-European courts. He consistently appealed to Enlightened ideas of justice and fair trial in his complaints to Potemkin and his friends abroad, yet refused to offer the same courtesy to Katerina Stepanova. Jones blamed Russians for allowing preconceived views of his character to influence the worth of his testimony while he simultaneously used his perception of Katerina Stepanova and her mother’s characters as the basis for his own dismissal of their accusations. In Jones’ view, these women with compromised morality held compromised reliability.

The differences in perception between Russia and western Europe became readily apparent when comparing reactions to the Jones case. Catherine took the side of Katerina Stepanova, taking the girl at her word and responding to Jones as a criminal. In a reflection of their cultural tradition to believe accusers, Russians seemed

to agree with their Empress, as Jones faced ridicule from Petersburg society, silence from his former friends while on campaign, and a refusal from Russian sailors to serve under his command. In contrast, Jones’ Western connections rallied to his defense. British press, American statesmen, and French public opinion found a series of excuses and scapegoats to explain away the facts of the case. Katerina Stepanova’s allegations became a conspiracy, the revenge of a spurned lover, or slander, and ceased to be what it was—a rape. One consistent theme in the international reaction remained the absence of a voice for Katerina Stepanova. Her testimony paled in comparison to the interpretations of the Euro-American community.

The Katerina Stepanova case remains important because it offers insight into the issue of power dynamics of sexual violence. The recent *#MeToo* campaign, the popular unveiling of the sexual abuses of the entertainment industry, and the dialogues about sexual violence on U.S. college campuses may imply that these issues are a fairly modern phenomenon. Yet, we must strive to differentiate popular attention from existence. Dynamics of power and status tend to populate the narrative of any act of sexual violence, a fact Jones proved in his interaction with Stepanova.

The facts of the case are not unfamiliar—a man with connections and power took advantage of a woman lacking both. Jones was a man in a powerful position, a war hero decorated by three nations and a Rear Admiral of the Russian Imperial Navy, close to both Potemkin and, by his own account, the Empress.<sup>92</sup> In terms of social and economic status, Katerina Stepanova

lacked agency. Jones held all the power in their relationship. Katerina Stepanova was poor and needed money; Jones had capital, evidenced by his overpaying for the butter he purchased.<sup>93</sup> Ultimately, Jones used his position to exploit the young girl. He took her into his chambers on the pretext of buying butter and raped her, reminding her of his power over her by threatening to kill her should she talk.<sup>94</sup> Had the cast of characters changed to a U.S. Congressman and aide, or a Hollywood producer and actress, the power dynamic would remain static. The threat of violence and reprisal remain a key instrument of ensuring silence: “Nearly all of the people TIME interviewed,” for their cover article on the Silence Breakers as the 2017 Person of the Year, “Expressed a crushing fear of what would happen to them personally... if they spoke up.”<sup>95</sup>

Further examination of the Jones case reveals a troubling trend. Compared to the twenty-first century, his words still invoke the same defenses used by those accused of sexual assault. Two letters in particular highlight this trend, Jones’ letter to Nikita Ivanovich Ryleyev on April 2, 1789 and his first letter to Potemkin on April 13, 1789. In his letter to Ryleyev, Jones first asserted that Katerina and her mother were lying, then proceeded to accuse Katerina of being a whore and frequent visitor to his bedchamber, remarking he always paid her well.<sup>96</sup> His defense expanded to remark on other occasions where she consented to sex with him, when he claimed “She submitted most willingly to do everything that a man could desire of her.”<sup>97</sup> In the account given by Ségur in his memoirs, Katerina tried to initiate sexual relations with Jones, then

screamed rape when he heroically refused her advances.<sup>98</sup> Jones' letter to Potemkin mirrored these assertions, though expanded the charge to say Katerina also had sex with his servants. Yet, Jones also appealed to Potemkin as a fellow soldier and man. He told the Prince that he was guilty of loving women, but only respectfully, callously implying a connection with Potemkin through a shared love of women: a "men-will-be-men" argument.<sup>99</sup> In conjunction with the Ryleyev letter, Jones' defense mirrored those offered by twenty-first century defendants accused of sexual violence. The documentary *The Hunting Ground*, which assessed sexual violence on American college campuses, claimed that previous consent, "boys-will-be-boys" attitudes, and the sexual reputation of a woman are chief excuses for those accused of sexual assault.<sup>100</sup> When placed

in comparison, Jones' actions and his defense of his conduct imply that the dialogue and conversations about sexual violence have undergone little change in two centuries.

Catherinian Russia provided Katerina Stepanova a means of redress against Jones. The preexisting structures surrounding sexual crimes, strengthened by the autocrat's reading of the case gave Katerina Stepanova an opportunity to speak up and hope to bring her rapist to justice. Western proclivity to assume the superiority of the expressions of its institutions and causes often casts Russia as a negative "other," a backwards nation caught in the confines of misogyny and repression. Yet, Catherine's Russia may have represented a tangible, eighteenth-century space where women could exercise an ability to be heard. ♦

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The Russian "я тоже" (*ya tozhe*) closely translates as "I also" or "me too," used here to evoke the #MeToo movement.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Djaner and Nikolai Gagin, Police Office of the City of St. Petersburg, "Report to State Admiralty College," April 6, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #66, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives. Translations from the Russian and French are my own.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Count Tchernyshov, letter to Count Ya. A. Briius, April 21, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #62, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>5</sup> Samuel Eliot Morris, *John Paul Jones: A Sailor's Biography* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1989), 1-52, 480-510.

<sup>6</sup> The Russo-Turkish War of 1787-92.

<sup>7</sup> Baron de Krudener, letter to John Paul Jones, March 22, 1788, in Peter Force Collection, Series 8D, Microfilm Reel 1672, Washington, DC, Library of Congress Manuscript Division.

<sup>8</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Baron de Krudener, March 23, 1788, in Peter Force Collection, Series 8D, Microfilm Reel 1673, Washington, DC, Library of Congress Manuscript Division.

<sup>9</sup> Catherine II, "Order to Admiralty College," in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #64, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>10</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Thomas Jefferson, April 8, 1788, in Peter Force Collection, Series

8D, Microfilm Reel 1682, Washington, DC, Library of Congress Manuscript Division.

<sup>11</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to the Marquis de Lafayette, June 15, 1788, in Peter Force Collection, Series 8D, Microfilm Reel 1724, Washington, DC, Library of Congress Manuscript Division.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Theodore Roosevelt, “Reinternment of John Paul Jones” (speech, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, April 24, 1906).

<sup>15</sup> Lincoln Lorenz, *The Admiral and the Empress: John Paul Jones and Catherine the Great* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1954), 184.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 35.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 35, 149.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 186.

<sup>19</sup> Lorenz, *The Admiral and the Empress*, 17, 123.

<sup>20</sup> Samuel Eliot Morris, *John Paul Jones: A Sailor’s Biography*, 407-98.

<sup>21</sup> Lincoln Lorenz, “Reviewed Work: John Paul Jones: A Sailor’s Biography by Samuel Eliot Morison,” in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (1960), 115-17.

<sup>22</sup> Joseph Callo, *John Paul Jones: America’s First Sea Warrior* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 2006), 167.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Katerina Stepanova Golzvalt, “Statement of Katerina Stepanova,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #68, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives. The affidavits of Katerina and Sophia Fyodorovna bear the signature of Johann Christian Kayzer, Sophia’s stepdaughter as neither the mother nor daughter were literate.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Djaner and Gagin, “Report to State Admiralty College.”

<sup>29</sup> Christopher Nilus, “Report on Examination of Katerina Stepanova,” April 1, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #70, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives. The translation comes from John L. Senior, though the word “assaulted” seems a more modern term.

<sup>30</sup> Christina Lutkerov, “Midwife Statement,” 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #71, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>31</sup> Sophia Fyodorovna Golzvalt, “Statement of Sophia Fyodorovna,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #69, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>32</sup> Sophia Golzvalt, “Statement.” Bahl, the man Sophia referenced, was German.

<sup>33</sup> Pavel Dmitrevski “Statement Pavel Dmitrievski, April 3, 1789,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #72, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>34</sup> Djaner and Gagin, “Report to State Admiralty College.”

<sup>35</sup> Ivan Vasilyev “Statement of Ivan Vasilyev” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #75, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>36</sup> Michailo Yakovlev, “Statement of First-Degree Seaman Michailo Yakovlev, taken by Ivan Dmitriev,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #67, Annapolis, MD, United States

Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>37</sup> Johann Gottfried Bahl “Statement of Johann Gottfried Bahl, April 3, 1789,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #74, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Nikita Ivanovich Ryleyev, April 2, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 1, #57, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Comte de Ségur, *Mémoires: ou Souvenirs et anecdotes par M. Le Comte de Ségur*, Vol. 3, (Paris: Colburn, 1825), 427-8.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 429.

<sup>44</sup> Jones to Ryleyev, April 2 1789.

<sup>45</sup> Stephan Holtzwarthen, “Declarations du nommé Stephan Holtzwarthen,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 1, #59, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>46</sup> L. Lampe “Statement,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 1, #60, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>47</sup> Prince Grigori Potemkin was a powerful man in the Russian court by virtue of being one of the Empress’ “фавориты,” which most directly translates as “favorites.” Like the empresses Anna Ioannovna (r. 1730-40) and Elizabeth Petrovna (r. 1742-62) before her, Catherine took men as lovers. The relationships between the favorites and the empresses should not be misconstrued as purely platonic or entirely romantic. While the empresses almost certainly loved their favorites, they had no intentions of granting them autocratic power. The favorites held prominent ministerial positions while in favor, and courtiers used them to gain the ears of the empresses, though true power still rested with the tsarinas. Potemkin was an exception, whom Catherine loved dearly and with whom she had a three-decade long affair. Unlike the tenuous positions of other favorites, Potemkin and the Empress ruled together for nearly seventeen years. Catherine granted him vast sums of money, estates, offices, and made him a Prince of the Russian and Holy Roman Empire. For a detailed analysis of the relationship between Catherine and Potemkin and an anthology of the volume of letters exchanged between them, see Douglas Smith, ed. *Love and Conquest: Personal Correspondence of Catherine the Great and Prince Grigory Potemkin* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2004).

<sup>48</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Prince Grigori Potemkin, April 13, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 1, #58, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives. Jones served under Potemkin in the Liman campaign around the Crimean Peninsula during the Russo-Turkish War of 1787-92.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Comte de Ségur, letter to Comte d’Ésternes, August 26, 1789, in John Henry Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones, a Captain in the Navy of the United States*

during their Revolutionary War (Washington DC: United States Navy, 1825), 319-20. The US Navy gathered this collection of Jones' letters from the originals in possession of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the Marquis de Lafayette in 1825.

<sup>54</sup> Art. 167, *Voinskie Artikuli pri tom zhe i kratika primechaniya 1714 g.* in N. L. Rubinshayna, *Voinniye Ustavi Petra Velikogo* (Moscow: 1946), 77-8.

<sup>55</sup> Art. 165-166, *Voinskie Artikuli*, 78.

<sup>56</sup> Peter I, “Chapter of Martial Law 20 Article 167 Section,” in John L. Senior *Moscow Papers*, Vol. 2, #85, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> Daniel H. Kaiser, “‘He Said, She Said.’ Rape and Gender Discourse in Early Modern Russia,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 3, no. 2 (Spring 2002), 215-16.

<sup>60</sup> Eve Levin, *Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900-1700* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 212-246; Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002), 75-80.

<sup>61</sup> Katherine Pickering Antonova and Sergei Antonov, “The Maiden and the Wolf: Law, Gender, and Sexual Violence in Imperial Russia,” *Slavic Review* 77, no. 1 (Spring 2018), 105.

<sup>62</sup> Art. 167, *Voinskie Artikuli*, 77-8. For more on the code, see Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle Russia*.

<sup>63</sup> John Paul Jones to Prince Grigori Potemkin, April 13, 1789.

<sup>64</sup> Comte de Ségur, letter to Comte d'Ésternes, August 26, 1789.

<sup>65</sup> Isabel de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1981), 581-7.

<sup>66</sup> Barbara Alpine Engel, “Women, the Family, and Public Life,” in *The Cambridge History of Russia*, edited by Dominic Lieven, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), vol. 2, 309-10. Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow and all Rus (in Russian, Патриарх Московский и всея Руси) in 1700 by refusing to name a successor after the death of the Patriarch Adrian. He established the Holy Synod to govern the church in 1721, vesting ecclesiastical authority in a government body headed by a lay member. See James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1971).

<sup>67</sup> Ivan Mikhailovich Dolgorukov, *Povest' o rozhdenii moem, proiskhozhdenii i vsei zhizni, pisannaia mnoi samim i nachataia v Moskve 1788-ogo goda v avguste mesiatse, na 25-om godu ot rozhdeniia moego*, vol. I, (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2004), 138-139; G.I. Gennadi, ed., *Pamiatnie zapiski A.V. Khrapovitskago, stats-sekretaria imperatritsy Ekateriny Vtoroi* (Moscow: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1862), 18. Catherine could not have truly exercised corporate punishment against the Duke of Wurttemberg, due to his status as a noble. Catherine outlawed corporal punishment against nobles in her 1785 Charter to the Nobility.

<sup>68</sup> Andrey Zorin, “‘Redkaia veshch’: ‘sandunovskii skandal’ i russkii dvor vremen Frantsuzkoi revoliutsii,” *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 80 (2006), 91-110.

<sup>69</sup> A.N., ed., *Sochineniia Imperatritsy Ekateriny II na osnovanii podlinnykh rukopisei i s ob'iasnitel'nymi primechaniami*, 12 vols. (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1907), XII: 404; “Sir George Macartney to His Grace the Duke of Grafton,” *Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva* 12 (1873), 256-257, 328.

<sup>70</sup> *Arkhiv Kniazia Vorontsova, v. 34. Bumagi raznykh sodержaniia* (Moscow: Universitetskaia

tipografia, 1888), 341. Alexander Stroganov was a friend of Catherine's—she granted him the right to live in her former apartments in the Winter Palace. Despite their relationship, she still decided against his petition.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 341, 349-50.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 350.

<sup>73</sup> John Paul Jones to Prince Grigori Potemkin, April 13, 1789.

<sup>74</sup> Comte de Ségur, letter to Comte d'Ésternes, August 26, 1789.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Catherine II, March 8, 1791, in Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 325-27.

<sup>77</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Prince Grigori Potemkin, July 24, 1790, in Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 322-25.

<sup>78</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Catherine II, March 8, 1791.

<sup>79</sup> Catherine II, letter to Friedrich Melchior, Baron von Grimm, May 14, 1791 in *Lettres de Catherine II à Grimm*, ed. by Imperial Russian Historical Society (St. Petersburg: A.A. Polostov, 1876).

<sup>80</sup> Catherine II, letter to Friedrich Melchior, Baron von Grimm, August 15, 1792, in *Lettres de Catherine II à Grimm*.

<sup>81</sup> Comte de Ségur, letter to Comte d'Ésternes, August 26, 1789.

<sup>82</sup> Comte de Ségur, "Article to be inserted in the public prints, and especially in the Gazette of France," July 21, 1789, in Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 320-21.

<sup>83</sup> Comte de Ségur, letter to Comte Montmorin, July 21, 1789, in Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 320.

<sup>84</sup> Baron de la Houze, letter to John Paul Jones, February 9, 1790, in Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 321-22.

<sup>85</sup> Claude-Carloman de Rulhière, *Histoire, ou Anecdotes sur la révolution de Russie en l'année 1762* (Paris: Chez Desenne, 1797). The text was circulated in manuscript form among the Parisian salons decades before its 1797 publication, though Catherine tried her best to suppress it; Charles François Philibert Masson, *Mémoires secrets sur la Russie: et particulièrement sur la fin du règne de Catherine II et le commencement de celui de Paul I. Formant un tableau des moeurs de St. Pétersbourg à la fin du XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: C. Pougens, 1800), 83; For more on the ever-present issue of sexism in relation to depictions and studies of Catherine, see James Cracraft, "Great Catherine," *Slavic Review* 52, no. 1 (1993): 107-15.

<sup>86</sup> "L'enjambée Imperiale," 1792, LC-USZC2-3547, PC 5 - 1792, no. 6 (B size), Washington, D.C. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division.

<sup>87</sup> Paul Henri Marron, "Funeral Elegy for John Paul Jones," quoted in John Paul Jones and Mass. Bibliophile Society, *Letters of John Paul Jones: Printed from the Unpublished Originals in Mr. W.K. Bixby's Collection* (Boston, William K Bixby, Horace Porter, and F Sanborn, 1905), 69-70.

<sup>88</sup> Thomas Jefferson, letter to John Paul Jones, August 31, 1791, in the Thomas Jefferson Papers at the Library of Congress, Series 1, Reel 014, Washington, DC, Library of Congress.

<sup>89</sup> L. Littlepage, letter to Thomas Jefferson, March 23, 1791, Sherburne, *Life and Character of Chevalier John Paul Jones*, 330.

<sup>90</sup> “Catherine II Replaces Jones by Fox in Her Hall of Fame,” Cambridge, MA, Harvard College Library, reproduced in Morris, *John Paul Jones: A Sailor’s Biography*, 379.

<sup>91</sup> “The Christian Amazon with her Invincible Target,” 1868,0808.5663, AN281829001, London, The British Museum; James Gillray “The Taming of the Shrew: Katharine and Petruchio; The Modern Quixote, or what you will,” April 20, 1791, LC-USZ62-123029, PC 1 - 7845 (B size), Washington, D.C., Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division.

<sup>92</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to the Marquis de Lafayette, June 15, 1788.

<sup>93</sup> Katerina Stepanova Golzvar, “Statement of Katerina Stepanova,” in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #68, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Staphanie Zacharek, Eliana Dockterman, and Haley Sweetland Edwards, “The Silence Breakers,” *TIME Magazine*, December 2017.

<sup>96</sup> John Paul Jones, letter to Nikita Ivanovich Ryleyev, April 2, 1789, in John L. Senior Moscow Papers, Vol. 2, #65, Annapolis, MD, United States Naval Academy Museum Archives.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Comte de Ségur, *Mémoires: ou Souvenirs et anecdotes par M. Le Comte de Ségur*, 427-8.

<sup>99</sup> John Paul Jones to Prince Grigori Potemkin, April 13, 1789.

<sup>100</sup> Amy Ziering, *The Hunting Ground*, documentary, directed by Kirby Dick (CNN: Los Angeles, 2015).

**JACOB BELL** is a first-year Ph.D. student in the Department of History at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. His research primarily focuses on gender, sexuality, and global empire in the eighteenth century, predominantly centered on the Russian and Qing empires. Bell received his Bachelor of Arts degree in History and English from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in May 2018. Bell’s other publication, “‘To Make My Happiness and His Own.’ Male Homosexuality in Catherinian Russia,” analyzes the dynamics of public and private spaces in expressions of homosexual desire in late eighteenth-century Russia.

---